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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) kewejl’elŋudaŋa
       kewej-l’el-ŋu-l-daŋa
       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-γi
       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 FDG (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 → d / sonorant+ underscore 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 junctures89 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’aarčimneŋ ‘badly’ < n’aarčiuu-j-ŋeŋ
be.bad-INTR.3SG-ADV
‘[it] is bad’
(derivational analysis from Kreinovič 1958: 202)

(89b) med’uol- ‘to be born’ < men’- to take + ŋol- ‘to be’

(89c) sayaa- ‘to disappear’ > sayuse- ‘to lose’ vs. son-đič- ‘to lose-ITR’

(89d) iletej- ‘to push.SEM-’ vs. ildič- ‘to push.İTR’

(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. ayuon’ ‘[s/he] stands’ < ayuol- ‘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 morphemes90. For instance, the ending –m can be TR.3SG and 1SG.İTR, 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: –l (accusative case ending or the pertensive suffix with the possessor in 3SG), -lm (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 –j, 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’
čuguoł ‘to be quick’ ~ čuguoł ‘quickness’, ‘speed’
jaqteyol ‘to be sung’ ~ jaqteyol ‘being sung’
kijuoł ‘to be two’ ~ kijuoł ‘two’
ikił’al ‘to be hard/firm’ ~ ikił’al ‘firmness’

(90b) werwe- ‘to be strong’ ~ werwel ‘to be strong.GER’
aawe- ‘to sleep’ ~ aawel ‘sleeping’
ieruuoł ‘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’
čuguoł-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), -InIz (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. Synchronically 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 *orj* ‘almost’ or *waaj* ‘again/also’ are most probably basic. The adverb *n’id’erpejne* is clearly synchronically derived as it is easily parsed into the stem *n’id’erpej* ‘it is new’ and the derivational adverbial suffix –*ne*. On the other hand adverbs like *iitne* 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-j* uraritče *uo-gi*
    be.new-PTCP teacher child-PERT
‘the new teacher’s child’

(91b) *tuŋ* *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 PP=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) \textit{Met} lalime \textit{me=köje-s-\text{-}uŋ.} \\
\textit{1SG} sledge[\text{ACC}] \textit{PF=break-CAUS-1SG/TR} \\
‘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

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

- inflectional suffixation:

(94) \textit{ayal’we} ‘to laugh’ + -j ‘\text{INTR.3SG} > \text{ayal’wej}’ [s/he] laughed’ \\
\textit{ayal’we} + -aa ‘\text{INCH} > \text{ayal’wa}\text{a}-’ to burst out laughing’ \\
\textit{ayal’we} + -j ‘\text{SEM} > \text{ayal’wej}-’ to smile’ \\
\textit{ayal’we} + -ji ‘\text{ITR} > \text{ayalwi}\text{j}-’ keep smiling’

- derivational suffixation:

(95) \textit{ayal’we} + ri ‘\text{TRZ} > \text{ayal’weri}-’ to mock’ \\
\textit{ayal’we} + -s ‘\text{CAUS} > \text{ayal’wes}-’ to make [smb.] laugh’ \\
\textit{ayal’we} + -tki ‘\text{AUG} > \text{ayal’wetki}-’ to laugh loudly’

Depending on whether one is inclined to see the respective formatives as prefixes or clitics, prefixation in TY is marginal to inexistent. There are five items that occupy pre-radical positions in a word. These are the reciprocal \textit{n’i(ŋ)=}, the potential \textit{at=}., the negative \textit{el=}., the verbal focus marker \textit{me(r)=} and the semi-productive reflexive \textit{tur=}.. If one applies the criterion of host faithfulness, the morphemes \textit{el=}., \textit{me(r)=}, \textit{n’i(ŋ)=} and \textit{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, \textit{at=} is regarded here as a clitic too\footnote{Apart from these five proclitics, there is the enclitic \text{=dayi}, which expresses assumption. Kurilov (2008:84) derives it from the independent invisible demonstrative \text{toyi}.}.

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

(96) \textit{n’i\text{yakaajil’} ‘brothers’ < n’i- ‘RECP’ + \text{akaa ‘brother’} + -jil’ ‘PL’}
\( n'\text{in}'\text{and}'\text{i}j\text{i}l \) ‘relatives addressing one another in the third person’ \(<\ n'\text{andii-} \) ‘to overcome oneself’

\( n'\text{in}'\text{aajgönmijil} \) ‘wives of brothers in relation to one another’ \(<\ n'\text{aail} \) ‘in-law’ + könme ‘partner’

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

(97) \( ök\text{uo}l\text{-} \) ‘to have holes’ \sim \( ök\text{te-} \) ‘to pierce’
\( \text{leu}- \) ‘to eat’ \sim \( \text{lögi}- \) ‘to eat.\text{INCH’}
\( \text{iire-} \) ‘to tie’ \sim \( \text{ikči} \) ‘to tie.\text{ITR’}

In noun formation compounding is widespread:

(98) \( \text{awunsaal} \) ‘cradle’ \(<\ \text{awur} \) ‘container’ + -n ‘\text{GEN’} + saal ‘wood’
\( \text{jo\text{onduul} \) ‘grouch’ \(<\ \text{jo\text{ŋo}} \) ‘anger’ + -n ‘\text{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) \( \text{wieses-} \) ‘to make/let [smb.] do [smth.]’ \(<\ \text{wie-} \) ‘to do’ + -se ‘\text{CAUS’} + -s ‘\text{CAUS’}
\( \text{wel'ii}\text{ses-} \) ‘to make/let [smb.] lift [smth.]’ \(<\ \text{wel'ii-} \) ‘to lift’ + -se ‘\text{CAUS’} + -s ‘\text{CAUS’}
\( n'im\text{ieses-} \) ‘to let extinguish’ \(<\ n'im\text{ie-} \) ‘to go out’ + -se ‘\text{CAUS’} + -s ‘\text{CAUS’}

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

(99b) \( \text{med'uo}l\text{uol} \) ‘birth’ (‘to take.\text{be.be[GER]}’) vs. \( q\text{oyjuol} \) ‘to dug out.\text{be[GER]}’
\( \text{ist\text{uo}l ayuol\text{uol} \) ‘the place where a table stood’ vs. \( \text{lačidayuol} \) ‘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) \( \text{köde} \) ‘man’ vs. \( \text{čii} \) ‘people’
\( \text{maarquon} \) ‘one’ vs. \( \text{el'ill'e} \) ‘first’
\( \text{kijuon} \) ‘two’ vs. \( \text{könmegišče} \) ‘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:

\[(101a) \quad \text{Igi yií ga.} \quad \text{‘This tree is tall.’} \quad (101b) \quad \text{igi yií giiga.} \quad \text{‘this tall tree’} \]

(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:

\[(102a) \quad \text{Aṣọ náà dúdú.} \quad \text{‘The cloth is red.’} \quad (102b) \quad \text{aṣọ dúdú} \quad \text{‘red cloth’} \]

(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 than 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 *tóbi* ‘to be big’ and *dára* ‘to be good/lovely’. The attributive form of the former is derived from it in a regular way: *tííbí* ‘big’. That of the latter is derived by a total reduplication of the derivational base: *dáradyá* ‘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: 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 fulfills 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 not 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/enye giza ‘dark’ < giza ‘darkness’, -a nguvi ’strong’ < nguvi ‘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 sолид’е-γа
    big gathering-LOC

‘at a big reunion’

(103b) juku jаlyа
    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\(^{100}\), 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(104a) } & \text{Nime-re}-j & \text{(104b) } & \text{Nime-te-m} \\
& \text{house-VBLZ-INTR.3SG} & & \text{house-VBLZ-TR.3SG} \\
& '[S/he] acquired a house.' & & '[S/he] endowed [smb.] with a house.'
\end{align*}
\]

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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(105a) } & \text{Tennime-}l\text{ej.} & \text{(105b) } & \text{Tuginimeyotej.} \\
& \text{DEIC house-COP} & & \text{ADL.PROX house be-FUT-INTR.3SG} \\
& '[\text{This is a house.}'] & & '[\text{This will be a house.}']
\end{align*}
\]

In (105a) the predicatively used noun does not exhibit any verbal morphology and in (105b) the verbal morphology is associated with the copular verb \(\text{ŋol-} \) ‘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 \(\text{ŋol-}:
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(106) & \text{qajruol-} \text{ ‘to be bent’ } < *\text{qajra-} + \text{ŋol-} \text{ ‘to be’} \\
& \text{maarquol-} \text{ ‘to be one’ } < *\text{maarqa-} + \text{ŋol-} \text{ ‘to be’} \\
& \text{jaluol-} \text{ ‘to be three’ } < *\text{jaal-} + \text{ŋol-} \text{ ‘to be’} \quad (\text{Kurilov 2006:63})
\end{align*}
\]

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 \(\text{ŋol-} \) 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

\(^{100}\) 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 ʒol- 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:

(107a) Levejl ʒoll’en’.
levejl ʒol-l’el-i
summer be-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘It was summer.’ \textsuperscript{(Kurilov 2005:126)}

(107b) Met tetqa ɔlyin’ el jaadie ʒod’eŋ.
met tet-qa ɔlyin’ el jaadie ʒol-jeŋ
1SG 2SG-LOC completely NEG aunt be-INTR.1SG
‘I am not at all your aunt.’

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’e to form color terms e.g. qomon’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’\textsuperscript{102}. The latter do not seem to be derived at all, e.g. jalaklal- ‘to be four’, imdald’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’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 \textit{me(r)=} can be inserted between the predicate noun and the copular verb:

(108) Ten nime me ʒotej?
—
Me ʒotej.
ten nime me=ʒol-te-j
DEIC house PF=be-FUT-INTR.3SG
‘Is this going to become a house?’
me=ʒol-te-j
PF=be-FUT-INTR.3SG
‘[Yes], it is.’

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 ʒol- ‘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: könmegisčče ‘second’,
jalmasčče103 ‘third’, jeleklesčče ‘fourth’ etc.
Apart from that quantitative verbs can occur as converses104:

(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
3PL three-be-CIRC there wait-3PL.TR

‘The four of us have begun to drive [the geese] from here and the three of them
are waiting there.’
(Kurilov 2001:110, jalaklar)

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) Lawjedekuqya juoraanund’eli.
lawje-n-ekuu-ŋa 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 ņol- 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 quantitative 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.

(112)  
\begin{verbatim}
Idaraŋŋa  tub  čajlaŋŋa  git’uo  maaruojneŋ  peld’iiŋan.
\end{verbatim}

next.year  ADL.PROX  day-LOC  till
naaaruol-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 suffix but the genitive case ending –neŋ attached directly to the stem of qualitative verbs to derive manner adverbs:

(113)  
\begin{verbatim}
Taat  maaruol-neŋ  ewl’ikie-j ...
\end{verbatim}

so  be.happy-ADV  disappear-INTR.3SG
‘So, he died happily.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:140)

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:

(114)  
\begin{verbatim}
Taat  maaruol-neŋ  ewl’ikie-j ...
\end{verbatim}

so  be.happy-ADV  disappear-INTR.3SG
‘So, he died happily.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:140)

Isolated participial forms of the numerals ‘one’ and ‘two’ are either lexicalized as the noun kijuod’ęŋ ‘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.

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’ < *jaluoλ* ‘to be three’ + -n ‘GEN’ + *nime* ‘house’

Numeric bases can even attach case endings, e.g. *kunil-γa-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!*

*ičuo-k*  |  *ada.破*  |  *čoγoje*

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, adverbial 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+V+N+N N, 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:

108 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: \( n'i=gedel 'each other', n'ŋ=akaajil 'brothers' \) 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) \( el=molčuon 'without staying overnight' < mol- 'to stay overnight' \)
\( el=nimečuon 'without a house/homeless' < nime 'house' \)

The delimitative postposition \( gitn'er 'till', 'as far as' \) can have a converb as a dependent:

(123) \( lugumu-r gitn'er \)
\( get.old-CIRC till \)
\( 'till old age' \)

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 sawaṙat wiejuolnuni.*
    pajpe-n mayil’ jaa-n sawa-γa-t wie-ŋ̂ol-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=menče-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’il-le paaj-l’el-um*  
mouse-ACC hit-NVIS-TR.3SG  
‘[He] hit the mouse!’ (Kurilov 1994:8)

(128)  *Maarqad’ey Qaalid’e tolon ilele pundelek keči’elum.*  
*maarqad’ey 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 saal-jin’ uurelek saale iitnεγ ičuorelek tuŋ tude n’umud’iilek saale pajl’elmele.*  
*Taatl’er tuŋ saal-jin’ uu-relek saal-le iitnεγ iču-o-relek*  
therefore ADL.PROX tree-DAT go-ANT tree-ACC long.time look-ANT  
*tuŋ tude n’umud’ii-lek saal-le paji-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’ kőde-k mooj-te-l?*  
*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-γa.*  
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)  *Taj sayanereŋ tuŋ enieγane jaqtam.*  
*taj 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.
(132b) \textit{enie-gi-n čítne-j kötine-j monil’e-da-γane}  
mother-PERT-GEN be.long-PTCP be.thick-PTCP hair-PERT-ACC  
‘(She recalled …) [her] mother’s long, thick hair’

(133a) \textit{Tude laame-pe-γane mer=aatterej-m.}  
3SG.POSS dog-pl-ACC PF=stop-TR.3SG  
‘[He] stopped his dogs.’

(133b) \textit{Ugoneγ mit juödiyane čajleresum!}  
uguneγ mit juödiyane čajlerej-s-um  
MP 1PL eye-ACC become.sober-CAUS-TR.3SG  
‘Luckily [he] calmed us (our eyes)!’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:52)

(133c) \textit{Tude jaqteγane me jaqtaal’en’}.  
tude jaqte-γane me=jaqte-aa-l’el-i  
3SG.POSS song-ACC PF=sing-INTR.3SG  
‘[He] began to sing his song.’

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

(134) \textit{Amaa-pe qajl’ čiribe-pe ugoneγ el=sayuse-jli!}  
father-PL stone plummet-PL MP NEG=lose-INTR.1PL  
‘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)):

(135) ‘\textit{Jo-o-o!}, qoyoraal’en’ Qaalid’e, taat anne samqaraal mendelek.  
\textit{jo qoyore-aa-l’i} Qaalid’e taat anne samqaraal men’-relek  
INTJ howl-INTR.3SG Wolf so just table take-ANT  
‘ “O-o-oh!” the Wolf howled having grabbed the table.’ (Kurilov 1994:8)

3.3.1.1.3 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\textsuperscript{110}. However, instances of an unmarked

\textsuperscript{110} 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 ṭegete tuŋ nime-le? — Met amaa ṭegete.*

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(ŋ) 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-ŋul.*

bone-PL-FOC.ABS only remain-PL-GER.SF

‘Only the bones are left.’ (Kurilov 1994:8)


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 saŋane-l’elŋul-

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) *Lewejeŋeŋ jaŋden wal’did’e-k mennull’elŋumle.

lewej-蓊 men’-nu-l’elŋumle

sumer-ADV goose-GEN liver-FOC.ABS take-HAB-NVIS-PL-TR.3SG.OF

‘In summer one takes geese liver.’

(139a) *Tienaaŋar jayil-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-ya Jovy-tek ebal-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)
(140) **Tudel tittel nime-pe-gi n’idannu-mle.**

3SG 3PL house-PL-PERT buy-TR.3SG.OF

‘It is their house that he bought.’

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.

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 in (144a) as opposed to (144b) (Kurilov 2006:74):

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:

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 aruun ‘of the word’ does not seem natural.

---

112 The validity of this test is undermined by the fact that some speakers would accept (144a).
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) Tideŋ pajpen kewejutherland içuonaal’elum.

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

three GEN tea GEN cup

‘three tea cups’

(146b) n’oronruske

hill GEN cup

‘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 čaaj-ek law-meŋ.

three GEN cup tea FOC ABS drink TR 1/2 SG OF

‘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 tideŋ ile-n jawul-ek.

track old ANPH reindeer GEN track COP

‘This track of that reindeer is old.’

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

reindeer GEN track PERT 1 SG yesterday see 1 SG TR

‘This track of that reindeer I found yesterday.’

(148c) tuoŋ met ile-n jawul

1 SG reindeer GEN track

‘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 Kreinovič (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 čii-ŋin’ qad’ir me=nemele kečinunŋa qad’ir puŋuoldeŋ mennunŋa.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tindaa</th>
<th>met</th>
<th>čii-ŋin’</th>
<th>qad’ir me=neme-le</th>
<th>keči-nunŋa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>previously</td>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>people-DAT</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>IND what-ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qad’ir puŋuol-reŋ men’-nunŋa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>rejoice-SIM</td>
<td>take-HAB-3PL.TR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘In previous times, when [one] brought something to my parents, they used to take [it] with joy.’

(154a) *Qaduŋudeŋ kewej? — Jakuskej-n’.*

| where | leave[3SG.ITRG] | Jakutsk-DAT |

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’umudiiyane n’aachtelek qad’ir tidan tude saaljin’ kwejej’en’.

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

(155) Met amaa tit qajcie labunmejin’ nonolpe içuonurej ewliikel’en’.

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

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:84)

(156) Obez’jana n’aachte-lek kőde-jin’ ban-i.

‘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 eguoije met nimien’ kwejmorijen

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

(157b) Tadaat taat mondelek ičie ayuoldelek tude nimien’ me kwejej’en’.

‘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-jin’ uu-se-ŋi-k!

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

Tuŋ körel akaad’e-γane tuŋ wadun nime laŋudeŋ
ADL.PROX devil elder.brother-ACC ADL.PROX Yukaghir-GEN house towards
nimeŋin’ sewrel’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 nimeŋin’ pengejnaaday ilwiimureŋ mod’eŋ ...

tude nime-ŋin’ pengej-naa-l-daya ilwii-nu-ŋey mon-jeŋ
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 čojo-e-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 čayade-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) Tañnigine labunmelek legulnienunŋi.
tañnigine labunme-lek legul-n’e-nun-ŋi
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 [meet].’

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*.

    *tuŋ*  | *uŋŋ*  | *ileγa*  | *l’iel’en*  
    ADL.PROX | child | reindeer-LOC | be-NVIS-INTR.3SG 

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

(164b) *Maarqa-n n’umun’al-γa qarandaas-len pon’aα-l’el-ul*

    *one.*  | *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’γal-γa Čieriskej-γa ewl’ikie-j.*

    *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 ŋodayane lukunsišayuyγa tubegejl’en*.

    *mouse*  | *top.cntr*  | *earth-GEN-crack-LOC*  | *rush-INVIS-INTR.3SG* 

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

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

    *house-LOC*  | *reach-ANT*  | *door-LOC*  | *reach-ANT*  | *DM* 

    *3SG.POSS*  | *thing-ACC*  | *everything.do fall-CAUS-NVIS-TR.3SG* 

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

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

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

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

(167c) *Tadaa jalyil ord’eday γoγyaanudayγa anme saγaaaj.*

    *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)
3.3.1.1.9 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) Pajpeya 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 juòdiiyat aawale me čantajrem.
tuŋ Ukul’e juòdii-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 ködë-γa-t engene
remain-NVIS-PTCP people leave-NVIS-PTCP person-LOC-ABL very
puguol-deŋ pon’aa-nun-i
rejoice-SIM remain-hab-INTR.3SG
‘People that remain feel happier than a person that has left.’

3.3.1.1.10 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 aqçayuol erimeyan ölkinenuni.
tet uraa-nu-lyə aqçayuol 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 iču-o-l’el-um.
so hole-PERT-LOC-PROL look-NVIS-TR.3SG
‘He looked into [its] the hole.’

(173) Taŋ tude nimie-n’ kewej-relek iitnem jaa-n čajle-γa-n
DM 3SG.POSS house-DAT leave-ANT long.time three-GEN day-LOC-PROL
tude n’umudii-γane n’aàče-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’eŋ.

(174) Qarandaas met čii’n’eŋ ewrienujẽ monur puŋuolur mer ayal’waaj me mōnd’eč!
qarandaas met čii-n’eŋ ewre-nu-jeŋ mon-ur
pencil 1SG people-COM walk-DUR-INTR.1SG say-CIRC
puŋuol-nu-r  me=ayal’we-aa-j  me=mōnd’ej-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 ŋol-, 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.
maarqal-ll’e tet mirije-pol könmegi me-l’e-uol
one-RLN 2SG wife-be another.1 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’ kirije-γane tanjtude-γane men’tem könme ŋol.
maalaa kin nide-t mit margil’ kirije-γane
MP who[FOC.ERG] name-FUT[AF] 1SG daughter name-ACC
tanjt udel-γane men’te-m könme ŋol
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 obligative 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) Qualiće 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 tanjt ‘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 –pul ~ -pel (117) which immediately follow the base. A number of nouns have suppletive plurals, e.g. köde ‘man’ vs. čii (118) ‘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 lewnunŋumle qand’e me n’ord’e le lewnunŋa (119).

\[\text{ileŋ} \quad \text{lewej}-\text{me} \quad \text{pulgid’}-\text{lele} \quad \text{lewnunŋ}-\text{mele} \]

reindeer summer-NMLZ flower-ACC eat-HAB-PL-TR.3.OF

\[\text{qand’e}-\text{me} \quad \text{n’ord’e}-\text{le} \quad \text{lewnunŋ}-\text{a} \]

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: ugorče ‘leg(s)’, juödii ‘eyes’:

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

\[\text{MP} \quad \text{so} \quad \text{look}-\text{GER}-3\text{SG.DS} \quad \text{one} \quad \text{GEN} \quad \text{polar.fox-DIM} \quad 3\text{SG.POSS} \]

\[\text{juödii pilie}-\text{nu}-\text{l’el-mele} \]

eye wipe-DUR-NVIS-TR.3SG.OF

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

Krejnovič (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 –pul attaches the possession marker –gi, and even states these phenomena explicitly (Krejnovič 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 ködepeŋane (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 Krejnovič (1982:43) notes, that the plural suffix –p is found in word-final position in kinship terms, e.g. očidiep ‘father’s younger brother’, qawd’idep ‘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 are 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’etle-pul-leŋ kelu-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 ilwiičepe ‘herders’, where ilwiiče 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. qajcie-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. jewlid’e-p-le ‘reindeer calf-PL-ACC’.\(^{124}\)

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:

\[-pe \quad -p\]

(181) laame-pe ‘dog-PL’ \hspace{1cm} laame-p-pe ‘dog-PL-ACC’
laamepe-γane ‘dog-PL-ACC’ \hspace{1cm} laame-p-tie ‘dog-PL-DIM’
laame-pe-gi ‘dog-PL-PERT’ \hspace{1cm} 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\(^{125}\). 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, waawečepleŋ 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-len ‘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 [a].

\(^{125}\) 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’etlepelęŋ ‘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) *Joqopelya 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) *Tēn’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, wheter 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’n’iiimije čii-pe-da-γane köde-pul me=pun-l’e-ŋa.*  
‘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 [ə].
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' ~ 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-pe me=kelu-ŋi.
Kolya-PL PF=come-3PL.INTR
‘Kolya and his family members have come.’ (Kurilov 2006:69)

(188b)  Petja-pe mer=uraa-nu-ŋi.
Petya-PL PF=learn-DUR-3PL.INTR
‘Petya and his classmates/friends are learning.’ (Kurilov 2006:69)

(188c)  Qad’ir taŋi Daurov Vasja-pei ile dite čama laame-n’-ŋi.
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)  Tittel an Kurilew-pe-ley.
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)  lačilpe ~ lačipe ‘fires’
joqopul < joqol ‘Yakut’ + -pul ‘PL’ ~ 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 3rd person:

(190)  Met l’ukuoler čamijaa Lötii könme-gi-n’ey, Tretyakov Aleksej Semjonovič, ilwiče ŋoler ewre-jeŋ.
met l’uku-ŋol-er čamijaa Lötii könme-gi-n’ey Tretyakov
1SG small-BE-CIRC aunt Lyotee husband-PERT-COM Tretyakov
Aleksej Semjonovič ilwič-če ŋol-er ewre-jeŋ
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, Alexey 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  
child-0-children-PERT-GEN
juödii-pe-gi  
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, -d’e, -jaal/-jie:

(194) l’iteged’ieje ‘blacksmith’ < l’iteged’ie ‘to forge’
    ilwičč ’herdsman’ < ilwič ’to pasture’
    amalad’ače ‘doctor’ < amalad’aa- ‘to treat medically’
    moojče ‘chief’ < mooj- ‘to hold’
    lajinid’ače ’soldier’ < lajinid’aa- ‘to be a professional soldier’
    löl’d’e ‘step father’, ’educator’ < löl- ‘to bring up’

There are also derivationally unclear cases, such as moojdi je ‘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) jaqtija ja ‘singer’ < jaqte- ’to sing’
    ann’ijaa ‘orator’ < ann’e- ’to speak’
    lawnija ja ‘drunkard’ < lawnu- ’to drink’ (durative form)
    ölikijia ‘runner’ < ölke- ’to run’
    čungdijia ’wiseman’ < čungde- ’to think’
    werwijia ‘hercules’ < werwe- ’to be strong’

b) Semantically related to the suffix -jaal/-jie is the suffix –čaa/-čee, 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’
    morqacaa ‘a place where many dwarf birches grow’ < morqe ‘dwarf birch’
    čićeče ‘a place full of people’ < čii ‘people’
    čuučeče ‘a peace of the reindeer body with a lot of meat’ < čuu ‘meat’
    amunčaa ‘a bony portion (of a fish)’ < amun ‘bone’
    n’anmečaa ‘rose willow bushes’ < n’anme ‘rose willow’
    lačincaa ‘a place abounding in firewood’ < lačil ‘fire(wood)’

---

128 Not any obstacle can be referred to as moojdi je. 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 laŷar sanye-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’aα/-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=girijid’ie ‘ring finger’ < el= ‘NEG’ + kirije ‘name’
el=mirijed’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’aα/-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) čoγje ‘knife’ < čoγu- ~ čaw- ‘cut (off)’
igihe ‘belt’ < ige- ‘to be tied’,
 n’i=muoje ‘strait’ < mooj- ‘to hold’
amaličče ‘medicine’ < amaleč- ‘to treat medically. ITR’ < amaler- ‘to cure’
wel’iče ‘rucksack’ < wel’ii- ‘to lug’
miri ‘file’ < miara- ‘to whet’
tolii ‘staff’ < tolie- ‘to prop up’
lewdii ‘fork’ < lewde- ‘to eat’
loyorii ‘sponge’ < loyore- ‘to wash’
juõdii ‘eye’ < juõ- ‘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’uojie ‘ice-hole’ < al’uol- ‘to thawed’  
uraričće ‘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’  
köjlue ‘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)  
wajajiye ‘current, flow’ < wajaya- ‘to flow away’  
lajniče ‘war’ < lajnu- ‘to fight’  
juoričće ‘festival’ < juora- ‘to play’  
lögirind’e ‘wedding’ < lögirič- ‘to feed.ITER’  
l’erkejend’e ‘shamanic praying’ < l’erkejen’- ‘to engage in shamanic praying’  
wel’il ‘bag’ < wel’ii- ‘to lug’  
örl ‘cry’ < örm’e- ‘to shout’  
legul ‘food’ < lew- ‘to eat’ ~ lögite- ‘to feed’  
kičil ‘end’ < kći- ‘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)  
watniye ‘(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):
(205) Oorin’ereŋ tude sukunyane oŋum. Taat qodejm kewejle.

oro-in-e-reŋ tu-de su-kun-yane oŋum.

cry-SIM 3SG.POSS clouthes-ACC put.on-TR.3SG

taat qodej-m kewej-l-le

so be.reluctant-TR.3SG leave-GER-ACC

‘She cried while putting on her clothes, so much was she disinclined to leave.’

(Kurilov 2001:517, qodej-)

(206) Taŋ pajdaŋ anme tuŋ n’umud’iigin tidaŋ pajuoldaŋ ejuuleñ möruul’elul.

taŋ paaj-daŋ anme tuŋ n’umud’ii-gi-n tidaŋ paaj-nol-da-ɣa

DM hit-3SG.DS simply ADL.PROX axe-PERT-GEN ANPH hit-be[GER]-PERT-LOC

ejuul-leñ möruu-l’el-ul

moan-FOC.ABS resound-NVIS-GER.SF

‘When he hit, at the place where he hit with his axe a moan resounded.’

(207) Tideŋ n’irnujuolgi nuojiiteŋaney.

tideŋ n’ir-nuŋ-gi nuojii-te-ɣaney

ANPH vomit-DUR-be[GER]-PERT scrape.off-CAUS-FUT-IMP.SG

‘Make [him] clean up his spew.’(Kurilov 2001:321, adaateŋ)

Gerunds freely combines with case endings. Sentences (205, 206) provide examples of the accusative, absolutive and locative. The following examples illustrate the use of the prolative (208) and Instrumental (209).

(208) Maarqad’eŋ apanalaa ičuo’el-um miralpe’e me nemen toron’ereŋ keluunul.

maarqad’eŋ apanalaa ičuo-l’el-um mira-l-pe-ɣa-n

once old.woman look-NVIS-TR.3SG walk-GER-PL-PERT-LOC-PROL

pojuol-je me=nemen toron’e-reŋ kelu-nu-l

be.numerous-PTCP IND=what be.black-SIM come-DUR-GER

‘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)

(209) Ileɣa ewrelek tudel me qaalič.

ile-ɣa ewre-lek tudel me=qaaluu-j

reindeer-LOC go-INS 3SG PF=be.strong-INTR.3SG

‘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’edoŋane jukuolel taŋunyanme waaj taŋ nime laŋudeŋ uuselek me sewrēj’elum.*

*Tuŋ* ADL.PROX  *quod’edoŋane* boy-ACC  *jukuolel* small-be-PTCP  *taŋunyanme* INVS.DEM-ACC  *waaj* also  

*taŋ nime laŋudeŋ uu-se-l-lek me=sew-re-j-l’el-um*  

‘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>jaqteγu-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*

*ölke-l-d* run-GER-0  *amuo-d’e-gi* be.good-NMLZ-PERT  

‘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 egojiole al’γaŋ ejuudaγane tel’iedal’γa mer=at=wie-j.*

*eu* ITJ  *ejk* if  *ewri* if  *egojiole* tomorrow  *al’γaŋ* fish  *ejuudaγane* get.caught-3SG.DS  

tel’ie-l-d-al’γa dry-GER-0-fish  *mer=at=wie-j.* PF=POT=make-1PL.TR  

‘when I/you etc. sing’
‘Oh, if only fish got caught tomorrow, we would make yukola.’

(Kurilov 2001:589, ejk 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 kewejlγane kinek endiit tittelγane.
    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?’

(214b) Tet kewejqane kinek tittel endiitle tittelγane.

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’.130

(215) sayanebul ‘bench’ (‘a place where one sits’) < sayane- ‘to sit’
    moojnuɓe ‘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’)\footnote{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’
\hspace{1em} \textit{čirebe} ‘plummet’ < \textit{čire}j- ‘to sink’
\hspace{1em} \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 derivatives 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’
\hspace{1em} \textit{pugud’eme} ‘early spring’ < \textit{pugud’e} ‘warmth’
\hspace{1em} \textit{čajleme} ‘daytime’ < \textit{čajle} ‘light’

These derivates 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 derivates with –me by checking if they can trigger agreement, one arrives at controversial results:

(219a) $\text{\textit{Tidaŋγa} \textit{amdur} \textit{čuŋγajme} \textit{ŋol-aa-j}.$
\hspace{1em} ‘Last year the spring arrived earlier.’

(219b) $\text{*\textit{Tidaŋγa} \textit{čuŋγajme} \textit{amdu-r} \textit{kelu-j}.$
\hspace{1em} ‘Last year the spring arrived early.’

In (219a), where the predicate is non-verbal, \textit{čuŋγajme} ‘spring’ is formally the subject since it makes the copular verb \textit{ŋol-} 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{čuŋγal’e} ‘spring(like)’ is derived not from the stem \textit{čuŋγajme} ‘spring’, as one might me expect, but from the stem *\textit{čuŋγaj}, 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) Lawjeme surun’e-j ličuorke-k pun’-ŋu-mle.
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 čuoyajmede ‘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) Čuoyajme-lenj.
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) čupurqa ‘point’ < čuoyaj- ‘to become pointed’
jataraq ‘smth. straight’ < tatayaj- ‘to become straight’
lasurqa ‘smth. bushy’ < lasune- ‘to be bushy, thick’
pömörke ‘circle’, ‘ring’ < pönne- ‘to be round’
čičirke ‘length’ < čičigej- ‘to become long’

k) Nouns with diminutive-affective meaning are derived by the suffix –(d)ie/-tie:

(223) nimedie ‘small house’
al’yaptie ‘small fishes’
punjie ‘little soup’ < punje ‘soup’
irajanie ‘reindeer with a light brown fell.DIM’ < irajal ‘reindeer with a light brown fell’
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) nime(t)tegel/nimetke ‘big house’
laame(t)tegel/laametke ‘big dog’
al’ya(t)tegel/al’yatke ‘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’
  *imdald’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’
    *aŋlačil* ‘an eloquent person’ < *aja* ‘mouth’ + *lačil* ‘fire’
    *samnaldaŋ’e* ‘mushroom’ < *samnel* ‘to be flat.GER’ + *taŋ’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’oyurqa* ‘a thin strip of land between two lakes’ < *jalyil* ‘lake’ + -*n* ‘gen’ +
    *čoyurqa* ‘smth.thin’

- stem + epenthetic /d/ + stem

  (229) *čiidoŋjdayat* ‘pocket’ < *čii* ‘people’ + *d* ‘0’ + *ŋoŋ* ‘bag’
    *qayimeduon’ebul* ‘crows’ nesting site’ < *qayime* ‘crow’ + -*d* ‘0’ + *uo* ‘child’ +
    -*n’e* ‘COM’ + -*bul* ‘NMLZ’
    *čuŋdedamud’aa* < ‘good-natured person’ < *čuŋde* ‘mind’ + -*d* ‘0’ + *amud’e* ‘the
good’ + -d’ai ‘NMLZ’

Very common are compounds whose second member is the word sukun ‘thing’:

(230) ujen’ejrukan ‘bird’ < uje ‘wing’ + -n’e ‘VBLZ’ + -j ‘PTCP’ + sukun ‘thing’
    mumnejrukan ‘retard’ < munne- ‘to be incomplete’ + -j ‘PTCP’ + sukun ‘thing’
    ijuunujrukun ‘smth. groaning’ < ijuu- ‘to groan’ + -nu ‘DUR’ + -j ‘PTCP’ + sukun
    ‘thing’

Though rarely, nominal compounds consisting of three bases can be found:

(231) lačin wieče ćuotege ‘poker’ < lačil ‘fire’ + -n ‘GEN’ + wieče ‘to do.NMLZ’ +
    ćuotege ‘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) juönd’aduu ‘echo’ < juönd’e ‘mirage’ + ad’uu ‘voice’ (KY) ~ aruu ‘TY’
    qaldawa ‘scales’ < kala ‘fish’ (Finnish) + sawa ‘skin’
    qonmeraw ‘skin from reindeer’s legs’ < gonme ‘leg’ (Omok) + sawa ‘skin’

The TY word waaweče ‘Russian’, which historically is a participle, is found in several
recent compounds owing their existence to the cultural contact between Yukaghirs and
Russians. The compound nouns involving this ethnonym must have once been NPs in
which the word waaweče ‘Russian’ turned into a relational quasi-adjective by dropping
the final /e/ of its originally participial ending –če. 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) waaweče legul ‘Russian kitchen’ vs. waaweče legul ‘food of a (certain) Russian’
    waaweče laame ‘sheep-dog’ vs. waaweče laame ‘the dog of a (certain) Russian’
    waaweče čoroje ‘table knife’ (‘Russian knife’)
    waaweče 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)  
\text{el}=\text{war} \ ‘[it] is not solid’ \\
\text{el}=\text{men} ‘[s/he] did not take’ \\
\text{el}=\text{kelu} ‘[s/he] did not come’ \\
\text{el}=\text{čayad’aanu} ‘[s/he] is not working’ \\
\text{el}=\text{jawtaanaa} ‘[s/he] did not begin to sing’ \\
\text{el}=\text{juoraamun} ‘[s/he] did not use to play’ \\
\text{el}=\text{ayal’wes} ‘[s/he] did not make laugh’ \\
\text{el}=\text{siigerejse} ‘[s/he] did not let drop’ \\
\text{el}=\text{nimen’e} ‘[s/he] does not have a house’ \\
\text{el}=\text{lalimen} ‘[s/he] does not have a sledge’ \\
\text{el}=\text{nimere} ‘[s/he] did not acquire a house’ \\
\text{el}=\text{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’} \quad \text{mon}? \quad \quad \text{who-DAT} \quad \text{say} \\
‘Whom did [he] tell [this].’

(236)  
\text{Kin} \quad \text{nide-t}? \quad \quad \text{who-FOC.ERG} \quad \text{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}=\text{amuø} ‘[it] is not good’ vs. e.g. \text{mer}=\text{amuøč} ‘[it] is good’
\text{mer}=\text{amuøyji} ‘[they] are good’/\text{el}=\text{amuøyu} ‘[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 transitivity 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>(238a) <em>jaw-</em> ‘to ache’</td>
<td>(238b) <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>*paaj- ‘to hit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>peč-</em> ‘to trot’</td>
<td>*mooj- ‘to hold’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*law- ‘to drink’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*lew- ‘to eat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*čaw- ‘to cut off’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*čuŋ- ‘to count’, ‘to read’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*pun- ‘to kill’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*men- ‘to take’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*par- ‘to submerge’, ‘to cook’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*mör- ‘to sense’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*mon- ‘to say’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*mol- ‘to stay overnight’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*löl- ‘to raise’, ‘to educate’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also disyllabic action verbs which are potentially basic:\(^{131}\):

---

\(^{131}\) 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 transitivity suffixes can overlap functionally, it would not be unreasonable to assume that –wii is an unproductive transitivity 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’            iîwii- ‘to herd’
    elej- ‘to set down’ (about the sun) welie- ‘to hang’
    iimu- ‘to be drunk’        aji- ‘to shoot’
                        waŋči- ‘to look for’

b) A great proportion of action verbs consist of a root and a suffix with the generalized structure $-CVj$\textsuperscript{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 indispensable 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\textsuperscript{133}, except combinatorially in some cases. The suffixes $-we$, $-ge(j)$, $-ya(j)$ are clearly restricted to intransitive\textsuperscript{134} verbs, while the suffix $-te$ is found only in transitive verbs. Only the most productive suffixes are included in the overview below\textsuperscript{135}.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline
intransitive & transitive \\
\hline
(240a) \textit{aa-we-} ‘to sleep’ & (240b) \textit{ök-te-} ‘to pierce’ \\
\textit{ayal’-we-} ‘to laugh’ & \textit{öge-te-} ‘to install’ \\
\textit{aa-rej-} ‘to stop’ & \textit{ele-rej-} ‘to swallow’\textsuperscript{136} \\
\textit{čugi-re-} ‘to whistle’ & \textit{iiime-rej-} ‘to confirm’, ‘to respond’ \\
\textit{möm-de-} ‘to burn’ & \textit{en-de-} ‘to burn’ \\
\textit{juö-dej-} ‘to glance’ & \textit{juö-dej-} ‘to glance’ \\
\textit{qui-dej-} ‘to clime’ & \\
\textit{sii-ge-} ‘to drip’ & \\
\textit{pul-gej-} ‘to come out’ & \\
\textit{pod’a-ya-} ‘to glitter’ & \\
\textit{porča-ya-} ‘to splash’ & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

c) In the verbs belonging to this group the derivational morphemes are also stem forming but are grammatically non-empty, e.g. \textit{lögite-} ‘to feed’ $< \ast\textit{lögi-} + \textit{-te} \ ‘\textit{CAUS’}$.\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{132} The glide is in all instances the semiactive aspect suffix, which is with some verbs an integral part of the minimal stem, e.g. \textit{aarej-}/\textit{aare-} ‘to stop’.

\textsuperscript{133} This is in contrast to some homophonouse suffixes. For instance, the suffix $\sim\textit{de}$ is a detranzitivizer: \textit{lewde-} ‘to eat’ (vi) $< \textit{lew-} ‘to eat’ (vt). The suffix $\sim\textit{re}$ is a tranzitivizer or causativizer: \textit{porčayarej-} ‘to sprinkle.SEM’ $< \textit{porčayaj-} ‘to splash.SEM’$, \textit{sewre-} ‘to bring in’ $< \textit{sew-} ‘to enter’$.

\textsuperscript{134} Primary intransitivity is meant here. Intransitive verbs containing these suffixes can be tranzitivized, of course.

\textsuperscript{135} Most of the examples are from Kurilov (2003:71-96).

\textsuperscript{136} The sequence $<\textit{re}>$ 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 \( \text{ŋol-} \), 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 \(-ne\), \(-uu\), \(-n'e\)\(^{137}\), \(-ge\) 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 \( \text{ŋol-} \). A few examples follow.

\[(241a) \text{köti-ne} \ ‘\text{to be thick}’ \quad \text{pom-ne} \ ‘\text{to be round}’ \quad \text{maaruol} \ ‘\text{to be happy}’
\]
\[(241b) \text{čamuol} \ ‘\text{to be big}’ \quad \text{n’arč-uu} \ ‘\text{to be bad}’ \quad \text{čuguol} \ ‘\text{to be quick}’
\]
\[\text{wald’uu} \ ‘\text{to be sour}’ \quad \text{imal’al} \ ‘\text{to be heavy}’
\]
\[\text{tora-n’e} \ ‘\text{to be sour}’ \quad \text{toro-n’e} \ ‘\text{to be blue/green}’ \quad \text{ikl’al} \ ‘\text{to be hard}’
\]
\[\text{qomo-n’e} \ ‘\text{to be blue/green}’ \quad \text{lu-ge} \ ‘\text{to be older}’ \quad \text{toro-n’e} \ ‘\text{to be black}’
\]
\[\text{pu-ge} \ ‘\text{to be hot}’ \quad \text{toro-n’e} \ ‘\text{to be blue/green}’
\]
\[\text{n’aa-we} \ ‘\text{to be white}’
\]

### 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).

\[(242) \text{maarquol} \ ‘\text{to be one}’ \quad \text{kijuol} \ ‘\text{to be two}’ \quad \text{jaluo} \ ‘\text{to be three}’
\]
\[\text{jalakal} \ ‘\text{to be four}’ \quad \text{imdal’al} \ ‘\text{to be five}’ \quad \text{maalajal} \ ‘\text{to be six}’
\]

---

\(^{137}\) 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’ \( \sim n’amuče‘redness’\). 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’
maalajlaklal- ‘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 amaaphan tude jerkeje mooj-reŋ mon-i
      finish-ANT father 3SG.POSS drum hold-SIM say-INTR.3SG

Ilya ten’i me=1’e-jek? Tadaa Lanya amaaphan čii
Ilya here PF=be-INTR.3SG then Lankha father peole

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’ apanalaa-le kewrej-te-menŋ. qoll’e adu-qi?
only old.woman-ABS.FOC carry.away-1/2SG.OF where.be son-PERT
köde tudurruu-t maarqa-n adil-ek pulgejl-l mon-reŋ. ten-n’e-jeŋ
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’e-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 Krejnovič (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>jaqte-jeŋ</td>
<td>SG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>jaqte-jek</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>jaqte-j</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td>jaqte-jli</td>
<td>PL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>jaqte-jmut</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>jaqte-ŋi</td>
<td>3</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>aji-ŋ139</td>
<td>SG1</td>
<td>aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>aji-mek</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>aji-m</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td>aji-j</td>
<td>PL1</td>
<td>aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>aji-mk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>aji-ŋa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>aji-ŋu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is evident from the paradigms, most of the intransitive forms of the BC carry the sequence <je>. At the same time, the BC of transitive verbs and the OF paradigm contain forms with the sequence <me>. 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 –i if the base-final consonant is /n/, /n'/, /ŋ/, /č/, /d'/ or /l/. Given the heterogeneous nature of these segments, it is more reasonable to consider the allomorph –i 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-i ‘say-3SG’, but not vice versa: *jagte-j ‘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 –ŋu ‘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 –yan (Krejnoviĉ 1958:132)\(^\text{140}\), indicating that in plural forms the plural suffix is followed by the (in)transitivity marker. The ending –yumle ‘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 –yumle, never *-numele. 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 kelunameŋ, amutneŋ kelu-jli.

\(\text{tan} \ \text{ten} \ \text{migideŋ} \ \text{kelu-nu-reŋ} \ \text{amuč-neŋ} \ \text{kelu-jli}\)

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.

\(\text{so} \ \text{DEIC} \ \text{Sapokylaq-LOC-ABL} \ \text{here,ADV} \ \text{very} \ \text{be.good,ADV} \ \text{come-INTR.1PL}\)

‘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 Krejnoviĉ’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 /a/, /e/ < /a/, /o/ < /a/\(^\text{141}\) 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 /e/ and /o/, in Krejnoviĉ’s (1982:38) view, diachronically derive from /a/. It is on these 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 *-yumele ‘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 keći|yum|le ‘bring.PL.TR.3.OF’ as compared with grammatically equivalent hypothetic *keći|yume|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 pattern142. 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 singular143 and has only the ending indicating number in the plural.

aji- ‘to shoot’ (a transitive verb)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>el=aji-jej</td>
<td>el=aji-jeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>el=aji-jek</td>
<td>el=aji-jemut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>el=aji</td>
<td>el=aji-ŋu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, characterized, 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>-ŋu</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 puŋuotejeŋ.*

nemuol  qodej-te-m?  qata   me=puŋuol-te-jeŋ
why    decline-FUT-1SG.ITRG  MP(Yak)  PF=joinre-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) *Nemenol uuusienut?*

nemenol  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) Aγαν juō-se-t.  
MP see-CAUS-FUT[1SG.TR]  
‘[I] will definitely show.’

(248b) Uogi el aγuot monur maarqan wolmek menčiel’eljumle.  
uo-gi el=ayuol-t  mon-ur  
child-PERT el=stand-FUT[3SG] say-CIRC  
maarqa-n wolme-k men’-če-l’el-ŋu-mle  
one-GEN shaman-FOC.ABS take-ITV-NVIS-PL.TR.3S.OF  
‘Since it was feared that her children will not survive, one brought a shaman.’

(Kurilov 2001:29, aγuol-)

(248c) El lačidayuolčuon quodeŋ en’ŋut.  
el=lačil-d-aγuol-čuon  quodeŋ  en’-ŋu-t  
NEG=fire-0-stand-PRIV how be.alive-PL-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 epthetic /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 puŋuolden  ölkiennull’elut.  
uo-gi molid’ee el=men’-ŋol-daya quodeŋ tudel tuŋ ile-pe tite  
child-PERT slightly NEG=take-be-3SG.DS how 3SG ADL.PROX reindeer-PL like  
puŋuol-reŋ ölke-nun-l’el-ut  
rejoice-SIM run-HAB-NVIS-FUT[3SG.ITRG]  
(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:
(250) Qadaa-t n’ijuo-nu-t-uok
where-ABL compete-DUR-FUT-1PL.ITRG
‘Where shall we be competing from?’

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):

(251a) Qadinuoler kejen aji-te-l?145
which.of.us earlier shoot-FUT-GER.SF
‘Which one of us will be first to shoot?’

(251b) Eguojie id’igojginden me ilepul mendelek me kewejteje.
egojie id’igojginden met ile-pul men’-relek me=kewej-te-je
tomorrow morning 1SG reindeer-PL take-ANT PF=leave-FUT-INTR.1SG
‘Tomorrow morning I will take my reindeer and leave.’

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) jaqte-te-jeŋ ‘to sing-FUT-INTR.1SG’ > *jaqtetjeŋ > jaqtetčęŋ > jaqteččęŋ

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) Neme-le pundu-t-mey qad’ir?
what-FOC.ABS tell-FUT-TR.3SG.OF DM
‘Well, what’s new?’

(254b) Ise tideŋ pajpe jawul-gi nuu-te-mey.
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:

145 Note the presence of an SF vebal ending in a transitive verb.
The future tense suffix can express the meaning comparable with that of the irrealis mood:

(256) *Ekje Tuopu-γa-t jaadie Anna-die-γa-t-γe me=łuqe-te-γ.*

sister Topu-LOC-ABL aunt Anna-DIM-LOC-ABL-EMPH PF-be.older-FUT-INTR.3SG

‘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)ο (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-tayan* ‘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 kerje-ŋ.*

1PL 1PL thing wear-SIM DM fall-INTR.1SG

‘Being dressed in our clothes I am being recorded.’

---

146 1SG present tense form of this verb is *lu* (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 kelu-ŋu-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) čonja- ‘to defend.INCH’ < čonju-
 jonjon’a- ‘to be angry.INCH’ < jonjon’e-
 jaqt’aa- ‘to sing.INCH’ < jaqt’e-
 čagad’esaa- ‘to work.CAUS.INCH’ < čayad’es-
 öl’k’ie- ‘to run.INCH’ < ölke-
lolie- ‘to educate.INCH’ < löl-
 nerie- ‘to gnaw.INCH’ < ner-
 kepčie- ‘to carry away.ITR.INCH’ < kepči-
 uunan’aa- ‘to go.INCH’ < uu-
 čambii’aa- ‘to help.INCH’ < čambii-
 kerienceaa- ‘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. ijeri- ‘to look down at smb.INCH’ < ijerii-
(231a) Taat čuđegudienreŋ mer aawaaŋ.
    taat čuđe-kudie-nu-reŋ 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-jeli.
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-leŋ möruu-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:

(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’ < jaluol- ‘to be three’
kurul’uomu- ‘to become visible’ < kuril’uol- ‘to be visible’
arinn’emu- ‘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 wadul aruulek ann’ej köde mer alyamnumuj.
now Tundra.Yukaghir-GEN 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[SG.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’amučerej- ‘to become red’ ~ n’amuchen’- ‘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 iliye Tiij okean laayarut čawul’yan keluununi, taŋun lajaat mer erimerejnuni.
qand’e-me puguol-je iliye Tiij okean laayar-ut čawul-ya-n
winter-ADV be.warm-PTCP wind Pacific ocean side-ABL sea-LOC-PROL
kelu-nun-i taŋun lajaat-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/-*pape-pegie- ‘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 meaning:

(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) *maaliinaa*- ‘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’
    *mördiej* ‘to inform.INTR.3SG’ < *mörd’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’ < *eduj* ‘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 (Kreinović 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 punnŋudayane.
    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-‘to fight.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.*  
\( \text{met mer=en’-nu-jeŋ} \)  

1SG PF=be.alive-DUR-INTR.1SG

‘I live.’

(246b) *Met mer end’eŋ.*  
\( \text{met mer=en’-jeŋ} \)  

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 keluunureŋ amutneŋ kelujeli.*  
\( \text{tan ten migideŋ kelu-nu-reŋ amuč-neŋ kelu-jeli} \)  

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’aanaare titte mayilha iiirenunŋa.*  
\( \text{čayad’e-nu-aa-re titte mayil-γa iiire-nun-ŋa} \)  

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’eŋ id’igojgir laamepegi lajsaanaal’elŋi!*

\( \text{maarqad’eŋ id’igojgir laame-pε-gi lajse-nu-aa-l’el-ŋi} \)

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) Ėcul’uol’yan n’id’erpeγan jawnuo lawnanug.
čuol’-ŋol-yan n’id’erpe-γan jawnuo law-nun-uŋ
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 saγane-rem uaj saγaanaunureŋ tuŋ pajpeŋ el uon’ienull’en’.
taat saγane-renem uaj saγane-nu-renem tuŋ pajpeŋ
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) Taŋnigi nimepegi jukuruskun ñoll’en’.
tañŋigi nime-pe-gi juku-sukun ñol-l’el-i
then house-PL-PERT small-thing be-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘At that time their house was small.’

(253b) Taŋnigi nimepegi jukuruskun ñolnull’en’, lewejn nimek.
tañŋigi nime-pe-gi juku-sukun ñol-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:
(254a) Ćuol’e d’ii paad’eduo purie lewnureŋ me sayaal’en’. Pomniir juǒd’inullen’. Maarquon’ aq n’oronburieŋat n’amučend’e, kičilgi el kulur’uod’e ćamuod’e jereguu ord’aŋa tude t’el’eyane kulur’iim. Ćuol’e ciī paad’eduo purie lew-nu-reŋ me=saŋa-l’el-e. old people girl berry eat-DUR-SIM PF=get.lost-NAV-INTR.3SG

Pomniir juǒd’i-nun-l’el-e, maarquon’ aq n’oronburieŋat n’amučen’-je around glance-HAB-NAV-INTR.3SG only MP cloudberry-LOC-ABL be.red-PTCP kicił-gi el=kuril’iŋol-je čamaŋol-je jereguu ord’aŋa edge-PERT NEG=know-be-PCTC big-be-PTCP plain middle-LOC tude l’e-l-iŋane kuril’iŋ-m. 3SG.POSS be-GER-ACC know-TR.3SG

‘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)

(254b) Ćuondoliigiga ubaannunul … gojn lawjelek porčatterejunjuna tayi me pileejŋ. čuo-n-toli-igi ubaa-nun-ul gojl-n lawje-lek porčattere-j-nun-ŋa iron-GEN-STAFF-PER kiss-HAB-1PL.TR.OF God water-INS splash.ITS-PTRVZ-NAV-HAB-3PL.TR tayi me=pileejŋ NVIS.DEM PF=wipe-1SG.TR ‘[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) tiwaŋaj- ‘to wink.SEM’ < tiwaŋa- ‘to wink’
    siigej- ‘to drop.SEM’ < siige- ‘to drop’
    örtej- ‘to shout.SEM’ < örñe- ‘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 uktejrelek čamanęŋ čamanęŋ mer örtej’en’. taŋ uktej-relek čama-neŋ čama-neŋ mer=örte-j-l’el-i DM get.tired-ANT big-ADV big-ADV PF=cry-NAV-NAV-INTR.3SG

‘He became tired and shouted very loudly.’
The semlfactive can simply express a short duration of an action, functioning as some kind of diminutive:

\[\text{Ise me sily\textsuperscript{a}l\textsuperscript{'}esejutem, maarquon\' me či\textsuperscript{a}nič\textsuperscript{c}ernaaj.} \]
\[\text{ise me=silyal\textsuperscript{a}l\textsuperscript{'}-se-j\textsuperscript{u}-te-m maarquon\' me=či\textsuperscript{a}ničel-r-nu-aa-j} \]
\[\text{MP PF=\text{dry-C\textsuperscript{a}US-SEM-PL-FUT-TR,3SG only PF=\text{darkness-VBLZ-DUR-INCH-INTR,3SG}}.} \]

‘Maybe they’ll dry it just a bit, but the problem is that it is getting dark.’

(Kurilov 2001:434, silyal\textsuperscript{a}l\textsuperscript{'}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 –\textsuperscript{j}i:

\[(259) \text{aawiji- ‘to sleep.ITR’ < aawe-} \]
\[\text{kőjliji- ‘to break.ITR’ < kőjle-} \]

Group II

Verb bases ending with the glide /j/ or a long /aa/ acquire the suffix –\textsuperscript{u}uji or –\textsuperscript{uo}ji. The latter usually attaches to verb roots terminating in long /aa/. The suffix outst the final vowel or dipthong:

\[(260) \text{ayuuji- ‘to touch’.ITR < ayaj-} \]
\[\text{ponduuji-/ponruuji- ‘to separate/to break off.itr’ < pondej-/ponrej-} \]
\[\text{maruojii- ‘to dress.ITR’ < maraa-} \]

Group III

In verb bases with the final syllable \textsuperscript{ge(j)} or \textsuperscript{γa(j)} the syllable is replaced by the suffix –\textsuperscript{d}i:

\[(261) \text{siid\textsuperscript{'}}i- ‘to drop.ITR’ < siige-} \]
\[\text{sisad\textsuperscript{'}}i- ‘to tear.ITR’ < sis\textsuperscript{a}γaj-} \]

Group IV

In verb bases with the final syllable \textsuperscript{re(j)} the syllable is replaced by the suffixes –\textsuperscript{či} or
When the suffix –či is attached, further phonological changes take place in the root, which are difficult to systematize:

(262) čugind’i- ‘to whistle.ITR’ < čugire-
pukind’i- ‘to jump/run/fly out.ITR’ < pukirej-
kudiči- ‘to put.ITR’ < kudere-
kepči- ‘to carry away.ITR’ < kewrej-
ikči- ‘to tie.ITR’ < idire-
sōkči- ‘to bring in.ITR’ < sewre-
pomorči- ‘to roll.ITR’ < pomore-
jojči- ‘to become angry.ITR’ < joyon’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) wierči- ‘to untie.ITR’ < wiete-
ayierči- ‘to hide.ITR’ < ayite-
weldič- ‘to hang.ITR’ < welte-
jojdič- ‘to open.ITR’ < jojotej-
sōndič- ‘to lose.ITR’ < sayuse-

Group VI

Verb bases ending in <γarej>/<gerej> have the final syllable rej replaced by the suffix -s.

(264) sal’γas- ‘to break.ITR’ < sal’γarej-
sisγas- ‘to tear.ITR’ < sisγarej-
silγas- ‘to dry very quickly.ITR’ < silγagyarej-
pulges- ‘to take/pull/let out.ITR’ < 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.ITR’ < aarej-
tanudu- ‘to chase.ITR’ < tonore-
weludu- ‘to hang.ITR’ < 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.
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(266)  *qalyudu*- ‘to run away.ITR’ < *qaldej-

Group VIII

With a few verbs, possibly only those whose stems end with the syllable sej, the indicator of the iterative aspect is suffix –dii. 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.

(267)  *pöndii-* ‘to let go.ITR’ < *pöčesej-

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.

(268)  *sunjdii-* ‘to throw.ITR’ < *suusej-

A text example illustrates the use of the iterative:

(269)  *Tidaa mitt et lukunburebeγa l’elaqane tet mitul ogol’ tanjuddunmek.*

\[
\text{Previously PL 2SG land-GEN-upper.side-LOC be-1/2PL-DS}
\]

\[
\text{tet mit-ul ogol’ tanjuddu-nun-mek}
\]

\[
\text{2SG 1PL-ACC always chase.ITR-HAB-TR.2SG}
\]

‘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:

(270)  *čulyaj-* ‘to poke.SEM’ < *čulya-* ‘to poke’ > *čuld’i-* ‘to poke.ITR’

\[
\text{tiwayaγaj- ‘to wink.SEM’ < tiwyaγa- ‘to wink’ > tiwad’i- ‘to wink.ITR’}
\]

Incompleteness is manifest in the absence of one of the members of the triad:

(271)  *pulgej-* ‘to get out.SEM’ < *pulge- > puld’i- ‘to get out.ITR’

\[
\text{lieγaj- ‘to rush.SEM’ < lieγa- ‘to run about’ > *lied’i- ‘to rush/run about.ITR’}
\]

\[
\text{*aawej- ‘to sleep.SEM’ < aawe- ‘to sleep’ > aawuji- ‘to sleep.ITR’}
\]

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 atelic verbs lieγa- ‘to run about’ and aawe- ‘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.150 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 čajlepedaγa jalyipul, enupul ma čaaqarnunγi. Tadaat ijun’ čajlepedaγa mer al’anunγi. Čama jalyipul čawłaayar l’ej iskil’uod’e jalyipul tuγ kind’e n’id’aγajnudaγa mirin al’aanunγi.

Oktjabr’ el’i čajle-pe-daγa jalyi-pul enu-pul me=čaaqar-nunγi.
October(Russ) first day-PL-PERT-LOC lake-PL river-PL PF=freeze-HAB-3PL_INTR

tadaat ijun’ čajle-pe-da-γa mer=al’aa-nunγi. čama jalyi-pul
then June(Russ) day-PL-PERT-LOC PF=thaw-HAB-3PL_INTR big lake-PL

čawul-laayar l’e-j iskil’uol-je jalyi-pul tuγ kind’e
sea-side be-INTR.3SG be.deep-PTCP lake-PL ADL.PROX month

n’id’aγa-j-nu-l-daγa mirin’ al’aa-nunγi
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 quodir ciyoγajme kelu-unγunu tadaat qomdeme lajyudeγ pengeγunγi?

Amaa tigin jaŋde-pe quodir ciyoγajme kelu-nunγu
father DEIC goose-PL why spring come-HAB-PL[3.İTRG]

tadaat qomdeme lajyudeγ pengeγunγi
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.\(^\text{151}\)

Oblique participles often contain the durative aspect suffix \(–nu\), which can also be preceded by the semelfactiv suffix \(–j\):

\[(275)\]  
\[jerpeje \ logos-o\text{-}j\text{-}nu\text{-}be\]  
\[sun \ walk.\text{athletically}\text{-SEM-DUR-OP}\]  
\[‘east’\]  
\[“the place where the sun travels”\]

Examples of the semelfactive followed by the durative are not rare in the corpus.

3.4.2.3.6 Resultative

A combination of an intransitive stem with the copular verb \(ŋοl\) expresses the resulting state of an action:

\[(276)\]  
\[Lalime me köjluon’.\]  
\[lalime \ me=köjle\text{-}ŋοl-i\]  
\[sledge \ =\text{break}\text{-be}\text{-INTR.3SG}\]  
\[‘The sledge is broken.’\]

\[(277)\]  
\[Taŋ \ n’amučend’erukungi ord’ada\text{–}ya el kötkuolnun.\]  
\[taŋ \ n’amuče\text{-}n’\text{-}je\text{-sukun\text{-}gi} \ ord\text{–a}\text{-da\text{-}ya} \ el=kötkej\text{-}ŋοl\text{-nun}\]  
\[INVS.DEM \ redness\text{-VBLZ-PTCP-thing\text{-PERT}} \ middle\text{-PERT-LOC NEG=reach\text{-be-HAB}[3SG]}\]  
\[‘That red part [of the fir wood] does not reach the middle.’\]  
\[\text{(Kurilov 2001:164, kötkuol–)}\]

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:

\[151\] 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):

\[(278)\]  
\[My \ celye \ sutki \ do\text{birali\text{-}s’} \ do \ Andrjaškino.\]  
\[1\text{PL} \ whole \ day.night \ reach.\text{IPF.PAST.1PL} \ as.far.as \ Andrjaškino\]  
\[‘Reaching Andrjaškino took us a whole day.’\]
(279) *po Julie- to be numerous* ~ po-
čuguol- *to be quick* ~ čuguV-/čuwC
maaruol- *to be happy* ~ maar
pujuol- *to rejoice* ~ puj-
ayuol- *to stand* ~ ayV-/ayC
quduol- *to lie* ~ qudv-/quC

The resultative meaning can be expressed by apparently underived verb forms:

(280) *puju-* *to be cooked*
ige- *to be tied*

Very frequent are nominalized forms of the resultative, especially functioning as attributive verb forms:

(281) *Met kelujuol laamepul me lewbun‘n.*
met kelu-ŋol 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 tadijuol paad‘eduo met emd’.*
Lasu moŋo-le tadi-ŋol paad‘eduo met emd’
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-l-ŋin’ l’e-jeg.*
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‘-jeŋ
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’eduγane med’ilįn’ l’ienųj.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{taŋ} & \text{körel} & \text{mit} & \text{paad’eduγane} & \text{men’-ilįn’} & \text{l’e-nu-j} \\
\text{INVS.DEM} & \text{devil} & \text{1PL} & \text{girl-ACC} & \text{take-GER-DAT} & \text{be-DUR-INTR.3SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘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-įn’ le’-jeŋ.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{1SG} & \text{come-GER-DAT} & \text{be-INTR.1SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I am/was going/about to come.’

(286b) Met kelulįn’ l’ienųjeŋ.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{1SG} & \text{come-GER-DAT} & \text{be-DUR-INTR.1SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I am/*was going to come (later on).’

3.4.2.3.8 Periphrastic perfective

There is a periphrastic verb form involving the auxiliary juoγaj- ‘to finish’ that expresses the completion of an action. It follows the circumstantial adverb carrying the lexical content of the expression:

(287) Lewder juoγačeli.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{lewde-r} & \text{juoγaj-jeli} \\
\text{eat-CIRC} & \text{finish-INTR.1PL} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘We finished eating.’

(288) Jaqte-r juoγaj-releŋ pure-n laŋudeŋ oŋidigil’ laŋudeŋ juö-čii-m.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{sing-CIRC} & \text{finish-ANT} & \text{upper.side-GEN} & \text{toward roof.opening toward see-DIM-TR.3SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘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 4.4.2.2.2). 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 quruul�at kerie̖l̄γane met juo pure erimeley at l’el, tan lukulyat pulgej̄el̄γane met juo pure lukuley 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) Sukun’n’el’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, sukun’e-)

The potential can express a shade of deontic modality:

(291) (A) Tuŋ čajle-γa mer=at=wie-γa.

‘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) Taŋi taat kuril’ii-k!

‘Know that [to be] so!’

(292b) Sal’ildie, nimated ögetek!

‘Little mouse, build a little house!’ (Kurilov 1994:8)
(292c) *Mal tet kejen ajik moll’ en’ Edilwej!*

\[ \text{mal tet kejen aji-k mon-l’el-i Edilwej.} \]

‘“Come, be the first to shoot!” Edilwey said.’

(292d) *Tit saaband’e tit nonol ieruu-l čajleŋ enmun juö-nun-ŋi-k.*

\[ \text{2PL net 2PL snare hunt-GER day every see-HAB-PL-IMP} \]

‘Check your nets, snares and your catch every day.’

(293a) *Met-ul el=urari-l’ek!*

\[ \text{1SG-ACC NEG=teach-PROH.SG} \]

‘Don’t teach me!’

(293b) *Qajście, Lačin Meruuŋin’ čojoje ewče el uuśienull’eŋik! N’anič.*

\[ \text{qajście lačil-n meruŋ-ŋin’ čojoje ewče el=uu-se-nun-l’e-ŋi-k!} \]

grandfather fire-GEN fire-DAT knife edge NEG=go-CAUS-HAB-PROH-PL-PROH

\[ \text{n’anuu-j be.sinful-INTR.3SG} \]

‘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 /e/ 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 niediteγaney.*

\[ \text{čaj law-k lewde-k me=qad’uu-qaa-te-j} \]

tea drink-IMP.SG eat-IMP.SG PF=be.cold-INTR.3SG

\[ \text{tadaat ladineŋ niedi-te-γaney, then peacefully narrate-FUT-IMP} \]

‘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 amuoriŋyan!*

\[ \text{Qojl amuo-rii-γan God be.good-CAUS-JUSS.SG} \]

‘May God bless!’
The meaning of the jussive mood can be enhanced by the modal particle köčejk ‘may …’/‘let …’:  

(296) Ee köčejk men’-yan.

‘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! (297b) Čoγul-gi law-γa!  

elder.sister door press-HORT.PL bone.marrow-PERT eat-HORT.PL  

‘Sister, let’s block the door!’ ‘Let’s eat its bone marrow.’  

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:100) (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:\(^{152}\).  

(298a) Tittel me=law-l-bun’-ηi.  

3PL PF=drink-GER-DES-3PL.INTR  

‘They are thirsty.’  

(298b) Tittel n’aarče lawjele me lawlbun’ηa.  

tittel n’aarčiu-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) \[\text{Met al’γα-leγ } \text{lew-l-bun’-mεγ.}\]
\[
1\text{SG fish-FOC.ABS eat-GER-TR.TR.1/2SG.OF}
\]
‘I want to eat fish.’ (as opposed to e.g. pine-apples)

(300b) \[\text{Met tuŋ al’γα-k } \text{lew-l-bun’-mεγ.}\]
\[
1\text{SG ADL.PROX fish-FOC.ABS eat-GER-TR.TR.1/2SG.OF}
\]
‘I want to eat this fish.’ (as opposed to some other fish)

(300c) \[\text{Met tuŋ ċajleγa tet ejitejuol al’γak lewlbun’mεγ.}\]
\[\text{Met tuŋ ċajle-γa tet ejuu-teŋ ol al’γa-k lew-l-bun’-mεγ.}\]
\[
1\text{SG ADL.PROX day-LOC 2SG get.caught-CAUS-be fish-FOC.ABS eat-GER-TR.TR.1/2SG.OF}
\]
‘I want to eat the fish that you have caught today.’

Under object focus the transitive paradigm is obligatory in the desiderative:

(301a) \[\text{Neme-le wie-l-bun’-mεγ?}\]
\[
\text{what-FOC.ABS do-GER-TR.TR.1/2SG.OF}
\]
‘What do you want to do?’

(301b) \[\text{Tadaat juorqa pulgejrere čupčepleγ pelulbunnunŋumle čieme pun’uod’edile med’ilin’}.\]
\[
\text{tadaat juorqa pulgej-re-re čupče-p-λeŋ pel-ul-bun’-nun-ŋu-mle}
\]
\[
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’
\[
\text{blood kill-be-PTCP-0-reindeer take-GER-DAT}
\]
‘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 ůol- 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) \[\text{Tudel amutneγ juorpejbuon’}.\]
\[
tudel amuć-neγ juorpej-bru-ŋol-i
\]
\[
3\text{SG be.good.INTR.3SG-ADV make.fun.of-DES-be-INTR.3SG}
\]
‘He was fond of pulling one’s leg.’
(302b) **Tamnigl’ed uorpe al’yad’aa me möribuol'gi.**

*Tamnigi-l’e-d  uorpe  al’ya’d’aa  me=mörü-buŋ-ŋi*

then-RLN-0 children extremely  PF=obey-DES-be-3PL..INTR

‘Children were very obedient back then.’

(302c) **Ködeŋ utkejnuuboll’en’.**

*Ködeŋ  uttej-nu-buŋ-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 –*mori*, 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 Krejnovič (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 Krejnovič (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 –*mori* 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 quodedey tet ile solyaniimoriteyanek.**

*Ilijere-j-daya  quode-ey  tet  ile  solya-jyay-nii-mori-te-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) \( El=maa-mori-jeli. \)
\( \text{NEG=wait-PRSP-INTR.1PL} \)
\( \text{‘We will not be able to wait.’} \)

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 \( \text{moraw} \). 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 \( \text{moraw} \) can be followed by case endings. A verb must undergo nominalization before it can take the obligative suffix. The nominalizer is the verb \( \text{ yol-} \) ‘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) \( Tudel kelujuol moraw cajlek. \)
\( \text{3SG come-be[GER] OBLG day-COP} \)
\( \text{‘It is the day on which he must come.’} \)
References to persons other than 3SG are made by simply alternating the forms of personal pronouns:

(309) Ten'i tet nemenolley tet wiejuolmoraw ewl’e.
\[\text{Ten’i tet neme-ŋol-leŋ tet wie-ŋol-moraw el-l’e}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{here} & 2SG & \text{what-be-FOC} & 2SG \text{ do-be[GER]-OBLG} & \text{NEG-be}
\end{array}
\]
‘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) Met tuŋ kinige čuŋol moraw’n’e-jeŋ.
\[\text{met tuŋ kinige čuŋ-ŋol moraw-n’e-jeŋ}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{1SG} & \text{ADL.PROX} & \text{book read-be[GER]} & \text{OBLG-VBLZ-INTR.1SG}
\end{array}
\]
‘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 evidentional 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) Qad’ir tuŋ sajrepul jawner näyaal’eljudayu tuŋ körel waaj tideŋ n’iŋakaajilpulyane me tojorala’elum.
\[\text{Qad’ir tuŋ sajre-pul jawner näya-aa-l’el-ŋu-l-daya tuŋ körel waaj tideŋ n’iŋ=akaa-jil-pul-ŋane me=tojore-aa-l’el-um}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{DM} & \text{ADL.PROX} & \text{peregrine-PL all fall-INCH-NVIS-PL-GER-3.DS ADL.PROX devil again tideŋ n’iŋ=brother-PL-PL-LOC PF=chase-INCH-NVIS-TR.3SG}
\end{array}
\]
‘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) Jeguor waaj met waaj kiileŋ taat janduil’eld’eli.
\[\text{Jeguor waaj met waaj kiileŋ taat janduu-l’el-jeli}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{Yegor also} & 1SG & \text{also both so fall.asleep-NVIS-INTR.1PL}
\end{array}
\]
‘Both I and Yegor fell asleep like that, as it turned out.’ (Kurilov 2001:56, waaj)

(312b) Met jugullaayande uguɾe-ŋa jaulaayande uguɾcheduul oŋu-l’el-un.
\[\text{Met jugullaayande uguɾe-ŋa jaułaayande uguɾcheduul oŋu-l’el-un}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{1SG right.side.ATTR foot-LOC left.side.ATTR shoe put.on-NVIS-1SG.TR}
\end{array}
\]
‘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.

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):

(313a) Aqun lačīl wie-r neme čambii-nu-l’el-ŋu-te-m.
‘I guess, they at least helped to lay in firewood, or something.’

(313b) Metqat lugiel’eltej lem ilelek kelu taŋnigi?!
‘He must be older than me, or else why would he come riding reindeer?!’

Interestingly, this combination is attested in interrogative sentences too:

(314) Taŋ čiile waaj lögitienuel’elŋu-temle?
‘Did one feed also those people?’

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.

(315a) Taŋ čiile talaw-le pojuol pun’-l’el-ŋu-te-m.
‘Those people must have killed many wild reindeer.’

(315b) Questa gente avrà ucciso molte renne.
(315c) Diese Leute werden viele Rentiere getötet haben.

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’:

---

154 This is an interesting parallel to Turkish (Hengeveld, personal communication).
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.**

  `PF=POT=tell-INTR.2SG`

  ‘You should speak with him.’

Deontic modality can be additionally indicated by the obligative mood:

(319) **Tanudje tet at uujuol moraw el’e.**

  `PF=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 sayaneččen?**

  `PF=sit-FUT-INTR.1SG`

  ‘May I sit here?’

Evaluative expressions serve the same purpose:

(321) **El amuod’e pajpepul nomýalawlégi me n’yarčič.**

  `PF=be.good-PTCP woman-PL tobacco-drink-GER-PL-PERT`

  ‘Pregnant women should not smoke.’

Finally, a loan from Russian expresses necessity:

(322) **Pojuod’e lačilek naduolel l’ie taŋ.**

  `PF=be.necessary-GER.SF`

  ‘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 joŋotejł čantajraų.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{qad’ir tuŋ} & \quad \text{sespe-gi} & \quad \text{joŋotej-l} & \quad \text{čantajre-ŋ} \\
\text{MP} & \quad \text{ADL.PROX} & \quad \text{door-PERT} & \quad \text{open-GER} & \quad \text{fail-1SG.TR} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘I did not manage to open his door.’  
(Kurilov 2001:547, čantajraa-)

(324)  
Peldudie qodej-naa-re ömge-le meranme me=čaw-te-m.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{old.man} & \quad \text{be.reluctant-INCH-COND} & \quad \text{skin.strip-ACC} & \quad \text{simply} & \quad \text{PF=cut.off-FUT-TR.3SG} \\
\text{taat} & \quad \text{qodej-m} & \quad \text{kwej-l-le} & \quad \text{be.reluctant-TR.3SG} & \quad \text{leave-GER-ACC} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘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.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{oorin’e-renaŋ} & \quad \text{tude} & \quad \text{sukun-γane} & \quad \text{oŋu-m.} \\
\text{cry-SIM} & \quad \text{3SG.POSS} & \quad \text{clouthes-ACC} & \quad \text{put.on-TR.3SG} \\
\text{taat} & \quad \text{qodejm} & \quad \text{kwej-l-le} & \quad \text{so} & \quad \text{be.reluctant-TR.3SG} & \quad \text{leave-GER-ACC} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘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\(^\text{156}\). 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\(^\text{157}\). The participial endings follow tense, aspect, mood and voice markers.

(326)  
čitnej ‘long’ < čitne- ‘to be long’

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{qaalıče ‘strong’} & \quad \text{< qaalu-n} \\
\text{n’amućend’e ‘red’} & \quad \text{< n’amučen’- ‘to be red’} \\
\text{jadarqand’e ‘with pearls’} & \quad \text{< jadarqan’- ‘to have pearls’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

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 gaalid’epe

\[
\begin{align*}
pude & \quad \text{l’e-j} & \quad \text{gaalu-je-pe} \\
\text{outside} & \quad \text{be-PTCP} & \quad \text{be.frightful-NMLZ-PL} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{156}\) 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).
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 ŋol-, which creates passive forms of verbs (see more on orientation of participles in 4.3.3):

\[(\text{328a}) \text{ögöte-je kõde} \quad (\text{328b}) \text{ögöte-ŋol-je nime}\]

\(\text{install-PTCP} \quad \text{person} \quad \text{install-be-PTCP} \quad \text{house}\)

‘the person who installs’

‘the house that was built’

Krejnovič (1958:144-145) and Maslova (2003c:24) report personal participial forms.158 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):

\[(\text{329}) \text{tuŋ jawnuo mooj-mele rukun amutney mooje gödek.} \quad \text{tuŋ jawnuo mooj-mele sukun amuč-nej mooj-je kõde-k}\]

\(\text{ADL\_PROX} \quad \text{everything\_DO} \quad \text{hold-REL\_TR\_3SG} \quad \text{thing be\_good\_INTR\_3SG\_ADV} \quad \text{hold-PTCP} \quad \text{man\_FOC\_ABS}\)

‘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:

\[(\text{330}) \text{könmegisčë}^{160} \quad \text{‘second’} \quad \text{jalmasčë} \quad \text{‘third’} \quad \text{jeleklisčë} \quad \text{‘fourth’} \quad \text{imdald’isčë} \quad \text{‘fifth’} \quad \text{maalajlisčë} \quad \text{‘sixth’} \quad \text{puskijisčë} \quad \text{‘seventh’}\]

\[158 \text{It may be interesting for the reader that in North-Eastern Asia personal participial forms, which in itself are a striking phenomenon since per commonly accepted definition participles are non-finite verb forms, exist in Siberian Eskimo (Menovščikov 1967:179).}\]

\[159 \text{The attributive forms of the quantitative verb for ‘one’ is not a participle: el’ill’e ‘first’ < el’i ‘first’ + -ll’e ‘RLN’.}\]

\[160 \text{This form, obviously, cannot be regarded as causative since it carries the pertensive suffix, indicating being possessed in nouns. Perhaps the form könmegisčë ‘second’ could be explained in terms of paradigm pressure.}\]
Doublets exist for some forms, e.g. jalmisče/jalmasče ‘third’. A textual example follows:

(331) Maarqad’ey met čamuolel uo Ganja, taŋnigi jalmesče klasqa uraanuj, puŋuoldeŋ nimeŋa tubegeč.

Maarqa-d’ey met čamaŋol-el uo Ganja taŋnigi jalmesče
one-ADV 1SG big-be-GER child Ganya then three-PTCP
klas-γa uraa-nu-j puŋuol-reŋ nime-γa 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 (334b) has the present tense reference161.

(332) Lugu-mu-r giin’er at=en’-te-j apanalaa-γane uorpę-gi
be.old-INCH-CIRC till POT=be.alive-FUT-PTCP old.woman-ACC children-PERT
taat ewlikie-se-ŋa.
so disappear-CAUS-TR.3SG
‘The children killed in this way their old mother who would have lived till very old age.’

(333) Motineŋ puŋiel’el’d ed al’ya pöd’el met joyul’ya mörčic.
motineŋ puŋi-e’l-d’e-d al’ya pöd’el met joyul-ya mörčii-j
already be.cooked-NVIS-PTCP-0 fish smell 1SG nose-LOC spread-INTR.3SG
‘I have already sensed the smell of cooked fish.’

(334a) jawnuo kuril’iilbud’e Apuodie
jawnuo 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 köde waduleŋ.
poyode met men’-nu-be köde wadul-legen
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 converb ending in –ren/-den/-te describes an action simultaneous with the action of the main clause.

(335a) Taŋnigi qaaliće ieruučeγane lemlʼe ditelʼuo ičuonunγa. Ieruuče kődek mondeŋ tudeγane taŋudunγa.

then strong-PTCP hunter-ACC chief like look-HAB-3PL.TR

ieruuče kőde-k mon-renγ tudel-γane taŋudu-nunγa

hunter man-COP say-SIM 3SG-ACC 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)

The converb formed with the suffix –relek,(-llek)162/-delek/-telek describes an action that took place before the action of the main clause:

(336a) Eguo-relek neme-les wie-nun-ul?

get.up-ANT what-FOC.ABS do-HAB-GER

‘What do we do, after we have got up?’

(336b) Idʼie ewrellek tudel me juötem.

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 converb ending in –rel/-de/-te has conditional meaning:

(337) Tagi lʼie naadii-re menʼ-ji-k.

INVS.DEM MP need-COND take-PL-IMP

‘If you need [it], take [it]’

---

162 This is a reduced form or -relek, 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 –reŋ/-deŋ. On the other hand, the following example is a very clear instantiation of the non-‘fused’ use of this converb.

(338)  
Elen’ mirin’ tet maalayur čald’e sal’γas-ur pon’i-te-mek.  
NEG only 2SG both hand break-CIRC leave-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)  
Aq örn’er tenmegi mer umdiči’il’en’.  
aq  örn’e-r  tenme-gi  mer=umdiči-il’el-i  
constantly shout-CIRC throat-PERT PF=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)  
Ile waŋčićeř saalaŋudeŋ kewejni.  
ile  waŋči-če-r  saal-laŋudeŋ kewe-j-ŋi  
reindeer search-ITV-CIRC wood-toward leave-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 ... tindaa jukuoler ... aq piečien’e monnund’eli.

jawner tindaa juku-uol-er aq piečien’e mon-nun-jeli
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) Id’ie taŋ stadaya puskijaler čayad’aanují.

id’ie taŋ stada-γa puskijal-er čayad’e-nu-ŋi
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) Tindaa mit čii neme l’edayane taat qad’ir el tiñničuon jawnuo l’ie n’ikedelyn’

previously 1PL people what be-GER-3SG.DS so MP NEG=stint-PRIV
jawnuo l’ie n’i=kedel-ŋin’taat l’ie-ie-nun-ŋa.
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) N’ied’il čuŋreleŋ el ičuocuon n’ied’iŋik.

n’ied’i-l čuŋ-releŋ el=ičuo-čuon n’ied’iŋi-k
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) An qad’ir köden aruu el mőrir mitqane uudek me n’aarčaqaasum.

an qad’ir köde-n aruu el=mőri-r mit-γane uudek
DM person-GEN speech NEG=hear-CIRC 1PL-ACC EMPH
me=n’aarčuu-qaa-su-m.
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, 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) *Nimelesićeəlek n’iedilej nimelesuolel.*

writer-INS n’iedi-FOC story-ABS write-GER

‘A story was written by the writer.’

(345b) *Lalime n’imud’iilek köjlesuon*. 

sledge-INS axe-INS break-CAUS-be-INTR.3SG

‘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 *nimelesiće* ‘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

---

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’ < *spavati* ‘to sleep’, *naježen* ‘bristly’ < *naježiti se* ‘to get goose pimples’, *otkaćen* ‘freakish’ < *otkaćiti* ‘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.
action. Since writers customarily engage in writing, *nimelesičelek* ‘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 uraričiičelek leitejuo-lel?*  
*kin-ek*  
*uraričiič-lek*  
*leitej-ŋol-el?*  
who-FOC.ABS  
teacher-INS  
recognize-be-GER.SF  
‘Who was recognized by the teacher?’

(B) *Uraričiičelek uŋođ-e ieruućepel leitejulu."*  
*uraričiič-lek*  
*uŋoł-je*  
*ieruuće-pe-k*  
*leitej-ŋol-ŋul."*  
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*  
*nimeles-ŋol-i*  
story  
write-be-INTR.3SG  
‘A story is written.’

(347b) *Lalime köjle-suon’.*  
*lalime*  
*köjle-s-uol-j*  
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’itegen- ‘to engage in forging’. The formation of the passiveis 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.*  
*pajpel-ll’e*  
*ten’i-n*  
*ök-ŋol-nun-i*  
woman-RLN  
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 $S_j$ do P$^{165}$ (to $O_k$).

In TY a multiple/indirect causative is possible: $S_i$ via $S_j$ makes $S_k$ 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 $-čii^{166}$ 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. law- ‘to drink’ $\sim$ lawite- ‘to drink.CAUS’. Even without a stem alternation an alternative suffix may be used, e.g. čawse- $\sim$ čawjii ‘to cut.CAUS’ 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) pon’aas- ‘to remain.CAUS’ $< pon’aa$ ‘to remain’
    maraas- ‘to provide with material for clothing’ $< maraa$ ‘to dress’, ‘to acquire material for clothing’ (vi)
    čayaaas- ‘to bring over a river’ $<$ čayaa- ‘to cross over a river’

(349b) papaase- ‘to urinate.CAUS’ $< papaa$- ‘to urinate’
    maase- ‘to wait.CAUS’ $<$ maa- ‘to wait’
    wel’iise- ‘to lift.CAUS’ $<$ wel’ii- ‘to lift’
    tonose- ‘to drive.CAUS’ $<$ tono- ‘to drive’
    čawse- ‘to cut.CAUS’ $<$ čaw- ‘to cut (off)’
    köčegejse- ‘to rush.CAUS’ $<$ köčegej- ‘to rush’
    čawse- ‘to cut.CAUS’ $<$ čaw- ‘to cut (off)’

(349c) mugete- ‘to undress.CAUS’ $<$ muge- ‘to undress’ (vi)
    pegite- ‘to steal’ $<$ pegie- ‘to follow’
    ejite- ‘to catch (with a net)’ $<$ ējuu- ‘to get caught’
    lögite- ‘to feed’ $\sim$ lögie- ‘to eat.INCH’ $<$ lew- ‘to eat’
    warite- ‘to strengthen’ $<$ war- ‘to be solid’
    ökte- ‘to pierce’ $\sim$ ökuol- ‘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) *pard’ii- ‘to cook.CAUS’ < *par- ‘to cook’
*čun’ji- ‘to read.CAUS’ < *čun- ‘to read’
*mold’ii- ‘to stay overnight.CAUS’ < *mol- ‘to stay overnight’
*mend’ii- ‘to take.CAUS’ < *men- ‘to take’

*maajji- ‘to wait.CAUS’ < *maa- ‘to wait’
*čawjii- ‘to cut.CAUS’ < *čaw- ‘to cut (off)’

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.

(350) *ay’al’wii- ‘to make laugh’ < *ay’al’we- ‘to laugh’
*aawii- ‘to put to sleep’ < *aawe- ‘to sleep’
*jon’orii- ‘to infuriate’ < jonji- ‘to take offence/to be angry’ < jojo ‘anger’
*ŋorii- ‘to make’ < ŋol- ‘to be’
*amuo’orii- ‘to grant well-being’ < *amuoo- ‘to be well’
*loqni- ‘to lift’, ‘to keep lifted’ ~ loqnej ‘to pile.INTR.3SG’
*solyanii- ‘to keep close together’ ~ sol’yayac ‘to gether.INTR.3SG’
*sewre- ‘to bring in’, ‘to let in’ < sew ‘to enter’
*wel’ire- ‘to load’ < wel’ii- ‘to lift’
*moj’ayarej- ‘to make soft’ < *moj’ayaj- ‘to get soft’

These forms can coexist with the ‘regular’ causative: *sewre-/sewse-, *ay’al’wii-/ay’al’wes-, *jon’orii- ~ jon’on’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 nuyutiil’etem, n’aw n’iklie-le.
maarquon’ kil’il laame me=nuyu-te-iil’e-te-m n’aw n’ikli-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:

---

*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).*
(352) *Lewejdeme čuule el pard’iinun, aq al’γaleŋ. Taayanek me quode gurčiir maaqadeŋ me pard’iišem čuule.*

summer-NMLZ-ADV meat-ACC NEG=cook-CAUS-HAB[3SG] only fish-FOC.ABS
taayanek me=quode kurčii-r maarqadeŋ me=par-d’ii-se-m čuul-le
still IND-how become-CIRC once PF=cook-CAUS-CAUS-TR.3SG meat-ACC

‘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:

(353) *Maarqad’eŋ ten Palaša mit-gane mōrej-se-r anaan čewnus-sčii-m.*

once DM Palasha 1PL-ACC smell.SEM-CAUS-CIRC very sneeze-CAUS-TR.3SG

‘Once Palasha gave us to smell something and made us sneeze heavily.’ (Kurilov 2001:574, čewnusčii-)

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.

(354) *Uguneŋ aduŋ qaalid’ele Qojl mitqat uuseresčiiirem pojuol-e köde-γa kötkeresčii!*

MP ADA.PROX wolf-ACC God 1PL-LOC-ABL go-CAUS-CAUS-SEM-CAUS-TR.3SG
be.numerous-PTCP person-LOC reach-CAUS-SEM-CAUS-TR.3SG

‘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)

(355) *Jaadeŋ qanaa-jeli taŋun l’uolγa gitn’er el=men-d’ii-se.*

thrice roam-INTR.1PL INVS.DEM instead till NEG=take-CAUS-CAUS[3SG]

‘We roamed 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-.
(356) Tetul čald’eya moojreŋ Daša, Varvara n’i=laajaa moojseščiiřeŋ sespeŋin’ miraajen.  
Tet-ul  čal-de-γa mooj-řeŋ Daša Varvara n’i=laajaa
2SG-ACC arm-LOC hold-SIM Dasha Varvara RECP=behind  

mooj-se-sčii-řeŋ sespe-ŋin’ mira-aa-jeŋ
hold-CAUS-CAUS door-DAT walk-INTCH-INTR.1SG

‘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’
čawseččii- ‘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’
jollesččii- ‘to use moss in a diaper.CAUS’

(359b) ugorče ‘foot’, ‘leg’, ‘shoe(s)’
ugorčes- ‘to provide with shoes’
ugorčesččii- ‘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 čuuleŋ lewsemle.
Tudel met-γane čul-leŋ 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 does P to S. There are two strategies for deriving the reflexive voice: a synthetic and an analytical one. The synthetic strategy makes use of the proclitic tur=(360), the analytical one is realized by inserting into the object slot a possessive NP with the word kedel ‘body, ‘self’ functioning as the possessor and the corresponding personal pronoun as the possessor (361):

(360) Quodeŋ turliwienunmek?
quodeŋ
turl-iwe-nun-mek
why
REFL-entertain-HAB-TR.2SG
‘How do you usually entertain yourself?’

(361) Qad’ir tideŋ mit laamepul waaj papaarelek qaqaaarelek erimeya titte kedelyane loyoranaaŋa čanamaaq quduolaaŋi.
qad’ir tideŋ mit 
DM
laame-pul waaj papaarelek 
ANPH
qaqaaarelek 
1PL
erimeya 
again urinate-ANT
titte 
3SG.POSS
kedelyane 
body-ACC
loyoranaaŋa 
wash-DUR-INCH-3PL-TR
čanamaaq 
on.ones.back
quduolaaŋi.
3PL
‘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 from 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 tittelöl- ‘to maintain oneself’ < ittte ‘3PL.POSS’ + löl- ‘to raise’. It always has multiple referents:

(362) Tidaane met amaa čii aq aarii nurul joyulek tittelölnull’elŋi.
tidaanemet amaačii aq aarii-l joyul-lek tittelöl-nun-l’el-ŋi
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_{non-i}-O_{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) *Qajčietege n’awn’iklie-n’eny 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

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’iņajinaŋi.*

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 *ćaγaj-* ‘to disappear.SEM’.

(367) *Ten metqa me juoč met čieme me n’idaγajnuj.*

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:

\[ ^{169}\text{Note that the predicate exhibits a singular agreement ending.} \]
(368) *Timraal n’i=gedel-γa ige-j.*  
central.pole RECP-body-LOC be.tied-INTR.3SG  
‘Central poles [of a summer jaranga] are tied to each other.’  
(Kurilov 2001:312, *n’igedel*)

Apart from that, a quasi-reciprocal pronoun can be employed:

(369) *Qad’ir n’itiitkedelyane ičuonael’elγa.*  
qad’ir n’i=titte-kedel-γane ičuo-nu-aa-l’el-γa  
DM RECP=3PL.POSS-body-ACC look-DUR-INTR-3PL.TR  
‘Now they began to look at each other.’

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-leγ γeusad’i-γu-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 (2001:526)

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’ilwey el miraanun, aq ölkereγ enupele, juku jalγapele qusad’ireγ ewrienuni.*  
Ed’ilwey NEG=walk-hab[3SG] only run-SIM river-PL-ACC small  
jalγapele qusad’ireγ 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.INTR3SG’ 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)  
ayal’werim ‘to deride.TRVZ.TR.3SG’ < ayal’wej ‘to laugh.3SG.INTR’  
maalijuarim ‘to be surprised at.TRVZ.TR.3SG’ < *maalijuol ‘to be surprised’ <  
< maaliim ‘to surprise.TR.3SG’  
jaqterim ‘to glorify. TRVZ.TR.3SG’ < jaqtej ‘to sing.3SG.INTR’  
čuŋderim ‘to think about. TRVZ.TR.3SG’ < čuŋdej ‘to think.3SG.INTR’

Suffix –re is confined to the semelfactive:

(382)  
sal’γarejm ‘to break.TRVZ.SEM.TR.3SG’ < sal’γač ‘to break.SEM.INTR.3SG’  
pomogerejm ‘to circumambulate/to turn around. TRVZ.SEM.TR.3SG’ < pomogeč ‘to turn around.SEM.3SG’  
köčegejrem170 ‘to rush at.SEM.TRVZ.TR.3SG’ < köčegeč ‘to gallop.SEM.INTR.3SG’

A means of transitivization is the use of the causative, e.g. köjlesum ‘to break.CAUS.TR.3SG’ < köjlej ‘to break.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 –de171:

(383)  
ičuodej ‘to examine.DTRV.INTR.3SG’ < ičuom ‘to look.3SG.TR’  
löläej ‘to lull.DTRV.INTR.3SG’ < löllum ‘to raise.3SG.TR’  
lewdej ‘to eat.DTRV.INTR.3SG’ < lewm ‘to drink.3SG.TR’

Suffix –uu:

(384)  
mörič < möruu- ‘to be audible.DTRV’+ -j ‘INTR.3SG’ < mörum ‘to perceive.3SG.TR’  
newrič < newruu- ‘to be scared.DTRV’ + -j ‘INTR.3SG’ < newrem ‘to scare.3SG.TR’

Suffix –ne:

(385)  
layanej ‘to be scatterd.DTRV.INTR.3SG’ < layaniim ‘to keep a reindeer herd loosely.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. puŋde ‘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’aaj, apart from deriving intransitive verbs, also has a habitual or durative meaning:

(386) \( waŋčid’aaj \) ‘to engage in looking for.\[\text{DTRV.INTR.3SG}\] < waŋčim ‘to look for.\[\text{TR.3SG}\]

\( amalad’aaj \) ‘to engage in medical treatment.\[\text{DTRV.INTR.3SG}\] ~ amalečim ‘to treat.\[\text{ITER.TR.3SG}\], amalerum ‘to cure.\[\text{TR.3SG}\]

\( urarid’aaj \) ‘to engage in teaching.\[\text{DTRV.INTR.3SG}\] < urarič- ‘to teach.\[\text{TR.3SG}\]

\( maad’aaj \) ‘to be in the position of someone waiting for something.

\[\text{DTRV.INTR.3SG}\] < maam ‘to wait.\[\text{TR.3SG}\]

\( lajnid’aaj \) ‘to be a professional soldier.\[\text{DTRV.INTR.3SG}\] < lajnuj ‘to fight.\[\text{INTR.3SG}\]’

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. Krejnovič (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’\(^{172}\). 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 /aa/ (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) \( Al’γa ejuuγan monur me miračejli. \)
\[\text{al’γa ejuu-γan mon-ur me=mira-če-jli}\]
\( \text{fish get.caught say-CIRC PF=walk-ITV-INTR.1PL} \)
\( \text{‘In order that fish get caught, we went [off the bank] to walk.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:86)} \)

(387b) \( Malaa wien čiiŋin’ ćayad’aaček! \)
\[\text{malaa wien čii-ŋin’ ćayad’e-če-k}\]
\( \text{MP other people-DAT work-ITV-IMP.SG} \)

\(^{172}\) 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) *Ileŋ iériečereŋ ličuorke jewlid’e enmurpe jawnuo aptellek sirilya tuutiennyja.*

- *Ileŋ* (reindeer-ITV-SIM)
- *iériečereŋ* (female.reindeer one.year.old.calf antler-PL all.DO)
- *ličuorke* (gather-ANT)
- *jewlid’e* (lower.edge.of.tent.cover-LOC)
- *enmurpe* (pile.up-HAB-3PL.TR)
- *jawnuo aptellek* (gather-ANT)
- *sirilya* (lower.edge.of.tent.cover-LOC)
- *tuutiennyja.* (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) *Talawŋin’ uunuj čiile monŋutem lewejnureaubeŋin’ me juöd’iičeŋyi.*

- *Talawŋin’* (wild.reindeer go-DUR-PTCP people-Acc say-PL-FUT.TR.3)
- *uunuj čiile* (wild.reindeer go-DUR-PTCP people-Acc)
- *monŋutem* (land-DAT =look.ITR-ITV-3PL.INTR)
- *lewejnureaubeŋin’* (land-DAT =look.ITR-ITV-3PL.INTR)
- *me juöd’iičeŋyi.* (land-DAT =look.ITR-ITV-3PL.INTR)

‘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) *Ekya jarqa kečičeŋya!*

- *ekya* (elder.sister ice bring-ITV-HORT.TR)
- *jarqa kečičeŋya* (ice bring-ITV-HORT.TR)

‘Sister, let’s go bring some ice!’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:120)

(387f) *N’anme sisayas-ii-če-k!*

- *N’anme* (willow tear-0-ITV-IMP.SG)
- *sisayas-ii-če-k!* (willow tear-0-ITV-IMP.SG)

‘Go and tear some willows!’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:178)

(387g) *Joŋulwa enuŋ jaŋde pun’iičer qanilya me tałuqōl’eli.*

- *Joŋulwa enuŋ jaŋde pun’iičer qanilya me tałuqōl’eli.* (Yogulwa river-LOC geese kill-0-ITV-CIRC shelter-LOC 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) *Maarqad’eŋ met waaj čambii-če-ŋ.*

- *Maarqad’eŋ* (once 1SG also help-ITV-1SG.TR)
- *met waaj čambii-če-ŋ.* (once 1SG also help-ITV-1SG.TR)

‘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) *Hristos ul’ege wiečer kewec.*

- *Hristos ul’ege wiečer kewec.* (Christ grass do-ITV-CIRC go-INTR.3SG)

‘Christ goes to create grass.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:208)
(388b) *Legul waničičer uułin’ l’ieniaajeŋ.*

\begin{align*}
\text{legul} & \quad \text{waniči-čer} & \quad \text{uu-łin’} & \quad \text{l’ieniaajeŋ} \\
\text{food} & \quad \text{search-ITV-CIRC} & \quad \text{go-GER-DAT} & \quad \text{be-INCH-INTR,3SG}
\end{align*}

‘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 –ködi 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 nimeŋin’ uuködil’en aq titul mond’esel çantajrer.*

\begin{align*}
taŋ & \quad \text{nimeŋin’} & \quad \text{uu-ködi-l’el-i} & \quad \text{aq} & \quad \text{tit-ul} \\
\text{INVS,DEM} & \quad \text{house-DAT} & \quad \text{go-CMSR-NVIS-INTR,3SG} & \quad \text{only} & \quad \text{2PL-ACC}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
mönd’e-se-j-l & \quad \text{çantajre-r} \\
\text{be.alert-CAUS-SEM-GER} & \quad \text{fail-CIRC}
\end{align*}

‘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 ködeŋin’ uul kiejie ile-n sawa puolekle joŋotej köđi moni, ‘Kinek quode gurčil?’*

\begin{align*}
elin & \quad \text{köde-ŋin’} & \quad \text{uu-l} & \quad \text{kiejie} & \quad \text{ile-n} & \quad \text{sawa} & \quad \text{puolekle} \\
\text{first,ADV} & \quad \text{man-DAT} & \quad \text{go-GER} & \quad \text{before} & \quad \text{reindeer-GEN} & \quad \text{skin} & \quad \text{bed,curtains(Russ)-ACC}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
joŋotej-ködı-j & \quad \text{mon-i} & \quad \text{kin-ek} & \quad \text{quodegurčii-l} \\
\text{open-CMSR-3SG.INTR} & \quad \text{say-INTR,3SG} & \quad \text{who-FOC.ABS} & \quad \text{how,become-GER,SF}
\end{align*}

‘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) *joŋdičičii- ‘to open slightly’ < joŋdičii- ‘to open’*

\begin{align*}
lögitiečči- & \quad \text{‘to give a little food’ < lögite- ‘to feed’} \\
juöčči- & \quad \text{‘to glance’ < juö- ‘to see’} \\
eguöčči- & \quad \text{‘to stand up for a little while’ < eguo- ‘to stand up’} \\
lugemuol- & \quad \text{‘to be slightly older’ < luge- ‘to be older’}
\end{align*}
qomon'emuol- ‘to be blueish/greenish’ < qomon’e- ‘to be blue/green’

(392) **Id’ie met uttegewre-čii-relek tadaat tit en’ie aγan juö-t.**
now 1SG rest-DIM-ANT then 2PL mother MP see-FUT[1SG.TR]
‘I will now rest for a little while and then examine your mother.’

With quantitative verbs the diminutive has the delimitative meaning ‘only so many’:

(393) **Tuŋ čiiŋ jaluociir sayanaamaaŋi.**
**Tuŋ čiiŋ-ŋ jaluol-čii-r sayane-nu-na-γi**
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, jaluociir)

The verbal diminutive suffix in denominal verbs expresses the diminuition of the noun serving as the original derivational base:

(394) **n’ugurukunn’ečii- ‘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) **Aγal’we-γre tdik neγe-j-re-te-m.**
laugh-AUG-SIM be.flat-SIM jump-SEM-TRVZ-TR.3SG
‘Laughing loudly, with a flat face, he will jump at you.’
(Kurilov 2001:23, aγal’wetki-)

(395b) **Qaalid’e jewlid’ele pun’delek tude čumurya suosejrelek ölke-nu-tegi.**
**Qaalid’e jewlid’ele-le pun’-relek tude umur-γa suosej-relek ölke-nu-tegi-j**
wolf reindeer-calf-ACC kill-ANT 3SG.POSS back-LOC run-DUR-AUG-INTR.3SG
‘The wolf, having killed a reindeer calf, threw it on its back and was racing.’

(395c) **Tudejlede suren’e-γt.**
**Tudejlede suren’e-γt-γi-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
Krejnovič (1982:138) as momental aspect\(^{173}\). Semelfactive verbs containing the augmentative suffix \(-tte\) describe, according to Krejnovič (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 tranzitivizer suffix.

(396) \(\text{porčatterej- ‘to splash.} \text{AUG.TRVZ.SEM’ < porčaγarej-}
\text{libatterej- ‘to snatch.} \text{AUG.TRVZ.SEM’ < libaγarej-}
\text{čarqa\text{tterej- ‘to strain.} \text{AUG.TRVZ.SEM’ < čaruγa\text{terej-}
\text{sisatterej- ‘to tear.} \text{AUG.TRVZ.SEM’ < sisawγarej-}
\text{n’oqotterej- ‘to pull out.} \text{AUG.TRVZ.SEM’ < n’oqoγorej- ‘to rip off}\)

(397) \(\text{Tuŋ pajpej miraanudaya Umčagin tuŋ pajpele me libatterejl’elum.}
\quad \text{tuŋ} \quad \text{pajpej mira-nu-l-daya} \quad \text{Umčagin}
\quad \text{ADL.PROX} \quad \text{woman walk-DUR-GER-3SG.DS} \quad \text{Umčagin}
\quad \text{tuŋ} \quad \text{pajpe-le} \quad \text{me=libatte-re-j-l’el-um}
\quad \text{ADL.PROX} \quad \text{woman-ACC} \quad \text{PF=snatch.AUG.TRVZ-SEM-NVIS.-TR.3SG}
\quad \text{‘When that woman was passing, Umčagin quickly snatched her.’}

(398) \(\text{Erew, met ugurče me čarqa\text{tterejj, juo\text{daya.}}}
\quad \text{erew met ugurče} \quad \text{me=čarqatte-re-j-η} \quad \text{juo-l-daya.}
\quad \text{ITJ 1SG leg} \quad \text{PF=strain.AUG-TRVZ-SEM-1SG.TR} \quad \text{see-GER-3SG.DS}
\quad \text{‘Oh my, it seems like I strained my legs.’}
\quad \text{(Kurilov 2001:136, juo\text{daya)}}

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) \(\text{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) \(\text{čuŋdegudie- ‘to contemplate’ < čuŋde ‘thought’ + kudie- ‘to keep’}
\text{arawgurčii- ‘to undress’ < araw ‘naked(ness)’ + kurčii- ‘to become’}
\text{quodeban- ‘to be unclear/inexplicable’ < quode ‘how’ + pan- ‘be’}
\text{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) \textit{Molid’aa tudel kötinedaya amuonuni.}
\begin{tabular}{l l l l}
\textit{molid’aa} & \textit{tudel} & \textit{kötine-l-daya} & \textit{amuo-nun-i} \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l l l l}
\textit{little.bit} & 3SG & \textit{be.thick-GER-3SG.DS} & \textit{be.good-HAB-INTR.3SG} \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l l l l}
\hspace{1cm} ‘If it is a bit thick, it is all right.’ (speaking about fishing line) \\
\end{tabular}

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>

Table 3.5.1

In Krejnović (1958:73) the truncated forms of the 3\(^{rd}\) person are mentioned: \textit{tude} and \textit{titte} respectively, which are to be used when the pronoun is the subject of the sentence displaying the \textit{AF} focal pattern\(^{176}\). From the examples in Krejnović (1958:133) it follows that the final /e/ of those two pronouns gets elided, which yields the forms \textit{tud} ‘s/he’ and \textit{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.

\(^{176}\) Krejnović (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 3rd 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>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>
| Acc. | met/metul/metqane | tet/tetul/tetqane | tudel/tudeγane/tudeγate
| Abs. | metek | tetek | tudel |
| Erg. | met | tet | tud(e(l)
| Dat. | metin’ | tetin’ | tuden’ |
| Loc. | metqa | tetqa | tudeγa |
| Abl. | metqat | tetqat | tudeγat |
| Prol. | metqan | tetqan | tudeγan |
| Com. | metn’eŋ | tetn’eŋ | tuden’e(ŋ)

<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/titteγane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abs.</td>
<td>mitek</td>
<td>titek</td>
<td>tittel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Erg. | mit | tit | tit(e(l)
| Dat. | mitin’ | titin’ | titin’ |
| Loc. | mitqa | titqa | titteγa |
| Abl. | mitqat | titqat | titteγat |
| Prol. | mitqan | titqan | titteγan |
| Com. | mitn’eŋ | titn’eŋ | titten’eŋ |

As is apparent from this overview, when the dative case ending is attached to the 3rd person pronouns, their final syllable is truncated. When the endings of other cases are attached, only the final /l/ gets elided.

---

177 This form is idiolectally heavily restricted. Its similarity with the accusative case ending in KY (Maslova 2003a) is obvious.

178 As noted above, the reduced forms in the 3rd person are only attested by Krejnovič (1958, 1982).

179 In Krejnovič (1958:77) one finds the ending form -qane:

(402) Met-qane legul me=l’e-j.
    1SG-LOC food PF=be-INTR.3SG
    ‘I do have food.’

Nowadays, speakers reject this locative case ending as ungrammatical.

180 The velar nasal is omitted in certain phonological environments, e.g. when followed by another nasal: tuden’e n’aya ‘together with him/her’.
The following examples illustrate some of the case uses.

(403) Lasu quodeŋ čayad’e? – Leml’e tudeŋane/tudeŋale me kerd’isum.
Lasu quodeŋ čayad’e
Lasu how work[3SG.ITRG]
leml’e tudeŋ-γane / tudeŋ-γale me=kerd’i-s-um
boss 3SG-ACC / 3SG-ACC PF=boast-CAUS-TR.3SG

‘How does Lasu work? – The boss praises him.’

(404) Teti’n ten serugesnuŋ.

teti’n ten seruge-s-nuŋ
2SG-DAT DM be.noisy-CAUS-DUR-1SG.TR

‘Here I am calling you up.’

(405) Qad’ir taŋmiɣi 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 taŋudeŋ taŋ kewejdaya, aduŋ Alajiidieγane monnuŋi taŋudeŋ uuγan, mitn’eŋ!

taŋ taŋun-deŋ taŋ kewej-l-daya aduŋ Alajii-die-γane
DM INVS.DEM-ADV DM leave-GER-3SG.DS ADA.PROX Alayee-DM-ACC
mon-nuŋi taŋun-deŋ uuγan mit-n’eŋ
DM 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\textsuperscript{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 maarga-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-reŋ sayane-t-ganeŋ 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=kevej-te-jek tet-ejk
2SG and NEG=leave-FUT-INTR.2SG 2SG-EMPH

‘And you yourself, won’t you go?’

\textsuperscript{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 assistance or involvement:

(409a) *Tan qomdemede čaajledenmun quruul qan’qaanulgi tetejlek kuril’iimek.*
\[\text{tan qomdememe-de čaajle-d-enmun quruul qad’uu-qaa-nu-l-gi} \]
\[\text{and autumn-ADV day-0-every sky be.cold-INCH-DUR-GER-PERT} \]
\[\text{tet-ejlek kuril’ii-mek} \]
\[\text{2SG-EMPH know-TR.2SG} \]

‘And that in autumn the weather gets colder every day, you know yourself.’

(Kurilov 1994:9)

(409b) *Lewejme mit ile mitejlek kičieččesnunuj.*
\[\text{lewejl-me mit ile mit-ejlek kičieččes-nun-uj} \]
\[\text{summer-ADV 1PL reindeer 1PL-EMPH pasture-HAB-1PL.TR} \]

‘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 uumul’en’.*
\[\text{qad’ir tudel-ejlek tur=id’ie uu-nu-l’el-i} \]
\[\text{DM 3SG-EMPH REFL=alone go-DUR-NVIS-INTR.3SG} \]

‘He rode on his own, alone.’

(409d) *Quodiir el iliečuon tudejlek anme ayuoldeŋ čayad’ej saalek?*
\[\text{quodiir el=ilie-čuon tudel-ejlek anme ayuol-reŋ} \]
\[\text{why NEG=wind-PRIV 3SG-EMPH simply stand-SIM} \]
\[\text{čayad’e-j saal-ek?} \]
\[\text{move-PTCP tree-COP} \]

‘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) *Nuğinnmur Köndie juömele. ‘Jewluge, met qarandaas, turid’ie n’umun’alya ponjaaj!’ moni Köndie.*
\[\text{nuğinn’-nu-r Köndie juô-mele. jewluge met qarandaas} \]
\[\text{dream-DUR-CIRC Kyondie see-TR.3SG.OF dear.create 1SG pencil(Russ)} \]
\[\text{tur=id’ie n’umun’al’-ya ponja-a-j mon-i Köndie} \]
\[\text{REFL=alone former.nomad.camp-LOC remain-INTR.3SG say-INTR.3SG Kyondie} \]

(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)):

(410b) Tit kewejl’elaqa eguojie jielgi čajleya du kewejŋutej, qanaaŋutej. – Titt... Tittid’ie? Tittejlek? – Ėe, tittejlek qanaaŋutej monŋi.

tit kewej-l’el-aqa eguojie jielgi čajle-ya du
2PL leave-NVIS-1/2PL.DS tomorrow farther day-LOC MP(Yak)
kewej-ŋu-te-j qanaa-ŋu-te-j. titt... tittel-id’ie? tittel-ejlek?
e e tittel-ejlek qanaa-ŋu-te-j mon-ŋi

‘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 nimeŋat keluunjey, metejlek el kuril’iiyen qaduŋudeŋ met uul.
met ten met nime-ŋa-t kelu-nu-jeŋ
1SG DM 1SG hous-LOC-ABL come-DUR-INTR.1SG
met-ejlek el=kuril’ii-jeŋ qaduŋun-jeŋ met uu-l
1SG-EMPH NEG=know-INTR.1SG which-ADV 1SG go-GER

‘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 ščukagi waaj poltora metra.
tudel-ejlek poltora metra any
3SG-EMPH one.and.a.half(Russ) meter(Russ) MP(Yak)
ščuka-gi waaj poltora metra
pike(Russ)-PERT also one.and.a.half(Russ) meter(Russ)

‘He himself is one and a half meters [tall] and the pike is also one and a half meters [long].’

(412b) Tan tudejle buollayna čayad’e-le waņčinumle.
tan tudel-ejlek buollayna čayad’e-le waņči-nu-mle
and 3SG-EMPH and(Yak) work-ACC look.for-DUR.TR.3SG.OF

‘And as for him, he is looking for a job.’

(412c) Tadaa mod’eŋ buolla, ‘Metqane el aawesčuon tudejlek mer aawej,’ mod’eŋ.
tadaa mon-jeŋ buolla met-qane el=aawe-s-čuon
then say-INTR.1SG MP(Yak) 1SG-ACC NEG=sleep-CAUS-PRIV
tudel-ejlek mer=aawe-j mon-jeŋ
3SG-EMPH PF=sleep-INTR.3SG say-INTR.1SG

‘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 taynigi-ne amutneg inje-ŋ.
be.afraid.of-1SG.TR
‘As for me, back then I was quite afraid of graves for some reason.’

(413b) Iidie, amungi čamuod’erukune, tudeejlede182 kötinej.
Iidie bone-PERT big-be-PTCP-thing-COP 3SG-EMPH be.fat-INTR.3SG
‘Iidye was tall and stout.’

(413c) Quduon’ tudeejlede. Semien sayanaareluk joqodile ŋorinumun.
quduo-l-i tude-ejlede. Semien sayane-aal-relek
lie-INTR.3SG 3SG-EMPH Semyon sit-INC-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.’

(414a) Iidie moni, ‘Uo tet wal’γareŋin ’kewrejk.’ Tudeejlede aruule ildićten monnuni,
ayaregi me lolyaj.
Iidie say-INTR.3SG child 2SG opposite.side-DAT carry.away-IMP.SG
tude-ejlede aru-ле ildić-reŋ mon-nun-i
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.’

(414b) Tet amaa ŋodayane, me quodiir qad’ir turid’ie lewejmeny sayanaanuni.
Tudeejlede, juōdigi el ičuo.
tet amaa ŋodayane me=quodiir qad’ir turid’ie lewejl-meny
2SG father TOP-CNTR IND=why DM alone summer-ADV
sayane-nun-i. tude-ejlede juōdii-gi el=ičuo
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’.

riad-ejlede čama-nej čawuričii-l’el-i
3SG-EMPH big-ADV get.frightend-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-uul’eljek
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-pul-γane juö-mele.

Sal’il Qaalud’el tadaat tadel könn’e-pul juö-mele.

Mouse 3SG.POSS relative-PL-ACC see-TR.3SG.OF

‘The Mouse saw her relatives.’

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)  
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Juku köde Apuodie ile tuduu} & \text{miraanureŋ, tude amaa} & \text{at kuril}’ičl’elum} \\
\text{small man Apuodie reindeer inner.side-PROL} & \text{walk-DUR-SIM} \\
\text{tude amaa-γa-t kuril’ič-l’el-um} & 3SG.POSS father-LOC-ABL ask-NVIS-TR.3SG \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Little Apuodie asked his father while walking in the midst of the reindeer [herd].’  
(Kurilov 1994:9)

(418)  
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Tadaa alγad’aa me l’ukuon’, tude uoduorpe dite.} & \\
\text{then MP} & \text{pf=small-be-INTR.3SG} & \text{3SG.POSS child-0-children like} \\
\text{tadaa alγad’aa me=l’ukuŋ ol-i tude uo-d-uorpe dite} & 3SG.3SG.3SG.POSS.\text{like} \\
\text{‘Back then she was too small, like her grand children.’} & \\
\end{array}
\]

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)  
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Tude en’ie-lek pandin-d’e-n-deŋ ewre-jli} & \\
\text{3SG.POSS mother-INS cook-NMLZ-VBLZ-SIM go-INTR.1PL} \\
\text{amaa-gi ewlikie-l’el-da} & \text{father-PERT disappear-NVIS[GER]-3SG.DS} \\
\text{‘Her mother cooked for us when her father died.’} & \\
\end{array}
\]

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)  
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Met id’ie mit sukun onjie-reno} & \text{ten kerie-jen.} \\
\text{1SG now 1PL thing wear-SIM DEIC fall-INTR.1SG} \\
\text{‘Here I am being filmed in our traditional clothes.’} & \\
\end{array}
\]

(421)  
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Quodiir tet aruu ewl’ikiej?} & \\
\text{why 2SG speech NEG=be-INCH-INTR.3SG} \\
\text{‘Why don’t you speak?’} & \\
\end{array}
\]

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></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>metl’e</td>
<td>mitl’e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tetl’e</td>
<td>ttel’e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tudem’e</td>
<td>ttel’e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(422a) *Met tet jaqte jaqte-t-men* 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 čaaŋ lawnube suske ewl’e, tudem’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’adaŋy mer okuolnuni tittel’e, pajpell’e jawner jadartaŋyolnuni tujn’egi ayilgi.*

here-PROL middle-PERT-LOC-PROL PF=pierce-be-HAB-INTR.3SG 3PL-RLN woman-RLN
jawner jadartaŋyolnuni tujn’egi ayilgi

‘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 čiiŋat … met kedel čama maaruold’e kōdelek čuŋdegudičin.*

ADL.PROX 1SG people-LOC-ABL 1SG body big be.happy-PTTCP
kedel-ek čuŋdegudičin

‘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 kōdeŋ taat ayuolden tude kedelayane lejričnaal’elum.*

EMPH 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)  

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{then} \quad \text{DM} \quad \text{go-DUR-SIM} \quad \text{look-GER-3SG.DS} \quad \text{one-GEN} \quad \text{area-LOC} \\
\text{be.numerous-PTCP} \quad \text{grandfather-AUG-PL-FOC.ABS} \quad \text{wander-DUR-NVIS-PL-GER.SF} \\
\text{fortuna-taŋ uu-nu-reŋ ičuodayane maarqan lukunburebe-γa pojuod’e qajie-tege-pe-γa ewre-nu-l’el-γa ul.}
\end{array}
\]

‘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 (ičuodayane ‘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) Tuŋ čii puŋuoseŋ ewri!
tuŋ čii puŋuol-seŋ ewri
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) Tuŋ moŋojd’ii deputatqa el men’l’eŋik! Wolmeŋin’ kewec! Tan aduŋ wolme aruugi jaan sukummol’yalya čañik!
tuŋ moŋojd’ii deputat-ya el=men’-l’e-ŋi-k!
ADL.PROX married.woman deputy-LOC NEG=take-NEG-PL-IMP
wolme-ŋin’ kewe-j!
tan aduŋ wolme aruu-gi
shaman-DAT go.away-INTR.3SG and ADA.PROX shaman voice-PERT
jaan sukummol’yal-ya čaw-ŋi-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!’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:40)

(425c) Taŋmigi tuŋ körel waaj tittel, tieŋ n’injakaajil’pulγane waaj me toŋoraal’elum.
taŋmigi tuŋ körel waaj tittel tieŋ n’in=aaka-jil’-pulγane
then ADL.PROX devil again 3PL DIST RECP=brother-PL-ACC
waaj me=toŋore-aa-l’el-um
again PF=chase-INCH-NVIS-TR.3SG
‘Then that devil again began to chase them, those brothers.’

(425d) 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) Tideŋ purieŋ pulgejdaya onnoγor …
tideŋ purieŋ pulgej-l-daya onnoγor
ANPH berry sprout-GER-3SG.DS even(Yak)
(from a telephone conversation) ‘If even the (above-mentioned) berries ripen …’

Despite the fact that all demonstrative pronouns can be used for anaphoric reference, most prototypically it is the (sole) function of tideŋ184. The remaining four demonstratives can function as deictic devices. One of them, namely the pronoun tuŋ, indicates invisible referents:

184 Thus, for instance, in a tale (Kurilov 2005:242-244) the two main protagonists are referred to anaphorically six times by tideŋ while tuŋ – and no other pronouns – occurs in this function only once.
(426) *Taŋ lewejnburebeγa muoqaden’enγ l’iel’en’.*

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{INVS.DEM} & \text{area-LOC} & \text{broad.whitefish-EMPH} \\
\text{taŋ} & \text{lewejnburebe-γa} & \text{muoqa-den’enγ} \\
\text{l’e-l’el-i} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Well, in that area the broad whitefish is found.’

If one sits in a room and makes a statement about a knife lying on the kitchen table, only *taŋ* is felicitous:

(427) *Taŋ čoγoje mer=unn’e-j.*

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{INVS.DEM} & \text{knife} & \text{PF=be.blunt-INTR.3SG} \\
\text{taŋ} & \text{čo} & \text{oγoje} \\
\text{mer} & \text{=unn’} & \text{e-j} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘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. *Tuŋ* indicates the referents near the speaker, *aduŋ* those near the addressee and *tieŋ* those distant from both interlocutors.

(428) *Tadaat apanalaa moll’en’ tet n’anmen pugil ŋolaarelek mitin’ cambii-bun’de tuŋ n’oyodayil albaya sewk.*

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{then old.woman say-NVIS-INTR.3SG} & \text{willow-GEN} & \text{be-INTR.3SG} \\
tadaat & \text{mon-l’el-i} & \text{say-NVIS-INTR.3SG} \\
\text{apanalaa} & \text{tet n’anme-n} & \text{willow-GEN} \\
\text{2SG} & \text{willow-LOC} & \text{be-INTR.3SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

(A man is requested upon entering a tent.) ‘Then the old woman said, “If you wish to help us, turn into a willow leaf and get under this bedding.” ’

(429) *Taŋ köldelek moll’en’ el čawnull’ek, aduŋ lačilya endek jawnuo, edieŋyan moll’en’.*

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{DM} & \text{come-ANT} & \text{NEG=cut-HAB-PROH.SG} \\
taŋ & \text{köl-relek} & \text{say-NVIS-INTR.3SG} \\
\text{mon-l’el-i} & \text{NEG=be-blunt-INTR.3SG} & \text{ADA.PROX} \\
\text{el=čaw-nun-l’ek} & \text{all.DO} & \text{say-NVIS-INTR.3SG} \\
\text{aduŋ} & \text{fire-LOC} & \text{burn-PL-JUSS} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘When she came she said, “Don’t cut [them]! Better burn [them] all in that fire. Let them burn up.” ’

(430) *Nimeγat jökedie čumun-saburqak l’iel’elul. Taŋuden oore-lek čupčen moll’en’ tieŋ čumun saburyat alyan n’injajinaatęj.*

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{house-LOC-ABL} & \text{fire-LOC} & \text{be-NVIS-GER.SF} \\
nimeγat & \text{jöke-die} & \text{NEG=be-blunt-INTR.3SG} \\
\text{čumun-n} & \text{burn-PL-JUSS} & \text{NEG=be-blunt-INTR.3SG} \\
saburqak & \text{all.DO} & \\
l’e-l’el-ul. & \text{say-NVIS-INTR.3SG} & \\
taŋuden-adv & \text{point-ANT} & \text{Chukcha} \\
oore-lek & \text{NEG=be-blunt-INTR.3SG} & \text{say-NVIS-INTR.3SG} \\
čupčen & \text{plane-LOC-ABL} & \text{point-ANT} \\
mon-l’el-i & \text{CHP-shoot-DUR-LOC} & \text{say-NVIS-INTR.3SG} \\
tieŋ & \text{NEG=be-blunt-INTR.3SG} & \text{NEG=be-blunt-INTR.3SG} \\
čumun-n & \text{plane-LOC-ABL} & \text{NEG=be-blunt-INTR.3SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘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 Jeguortegeγane tadaat qajicie Diŋen kewγane mer il’iteγan monur taat moni.

Tuŋ Jeguorteγane tadaat qajicie Diŋen kewγane
ADL.DEDEM Jeguor-teγane tadaat qajicie Diŋen’kewγane
ADL.AUG-ACC and grandfather Dingen’kew-ACC
mer=il’iteγan 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 laŋudeŋ ölkiek. Tuŋ juku jalyaγa qal’arqaapul me l’iel’elγutej moll’en’.

Maalek tieŋ juku jalya laŋudeŋ ölkiek.
MP DIST small lake toward run- INCH-IMP.SG
Tuŋ juku jalyaγa qal’arqaapul
ADL.PROX small lake-LOC Ross’s.gull-PL
me=l’e-l’el-γutej mon-l’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 tideγ 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 tideγ n’awn’iklie waŋčimle.

O-o d’e mendelek qad’ir tuŋ tideγ 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 tideγ can be used to reinforce anaphoric reference and yield the meaning ‘that very X’:

(433) Araj juöciidayane tideγ n’awn’iklie ηollen’.

Araj juöci-l-dayane tideγ n’awn’iklie ηol-l’el-i
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 *tideŋ*, 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.

1st series: *tuŋun, aduŋun, tieŋun, taŋun, tideŋun*

2nd series: *tugi, adugi, tagí185, tiegi*

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.


pöd’el-ek l’e-l? e-e ten tet amaa ugu르[č]eduu
smell-ABS.FOC be-GER.SF ITI DEIC 2SG father reindeer.skin.shoes
gojo-ŋoli kiči-relek lačili-ya suusejŋ mon-l’el-i
break-[GER]-PERT bind-ANT fire-LOC dump-1SG.TR say-NVIS-INTR.3SG
taŋun pödel ŋoll’el-te-j mon-l’el-i
INVS.DEM smell be-NVIS-FUT-INTR.3SG say-NVIS-INTR.3SG

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.”


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e-e</th>
<th>elen’=dayı</th>
<th>mon’-l’el-i</th>
<th>ten</th>
<th>en’ie.</th>
<th>amaa</th>
<th>arime-gi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITJ</td>
<td>DM=ASMP</td>
<td>say-NVIS</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>sole-PERT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>köjil-yol-el.</td>
<td>tadın</td>
<td>wiete-relek</td>
<td>lačıl-ya</td>
<td>suusej-ı.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVS.DEM</td>
<td>break-be-GER, SF</td>
<td>unite-ANT</td>
<td>fire-LOC</td>
<td>dump-1SG, TR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanjun</td>
<td>pöd’el-ek=dayı</td>
<td>mon’-l’el-i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVS.DEM</td>
<td>smell-COP=ASMP</td>
<td>say-NVIS-INTR.3SG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Oh, probably not,’’ said mother, ‘Father’s soles tore. I removed them and threw [them] in the fire. It is that smell, probably.’

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 tadın pöd’el ‘the smell of that’ in (434a) as well as in tadın pöd’el-ek da yi ‘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. In contrast to that, in the expression tadın 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 1st 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 1st series independent demonstratives.

As for the suffix –gi of the 2nd 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 3rd 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. 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 1st and 2nd 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)’, sajyŋŋy ‘summer.ADJ’ < sajyn ‘summer’, bëyeheŋji ‘yesterday’s’ < bëyehe ‘yesterday’ etc. (Korkina and Slepcov 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 tigín 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 Siberia. 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 relation.

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’.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{taγi} & \text{waaj} & \text{wej}-\text{jol-i} \\
\text{INVS} & \text{also} & \text{wide-be-INTRA.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘That one is also spacious.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:26)

(435b) Taγn’e-le Ajwan’ tude apanalaa-n’

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{taγn’e-le} & \text{Ajwan’} & \text{tude} & \text{apanalaa-n’} \\
\text{INVS.DEF-ACC} & \text{Ajwan} & \text{3SG.POSS} & \text{old.woman-DAT}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
tadi-m, & \text{taγi} & \text{mer=elerej}-\text{l’el-um}. \\
give-TR.3SG & \text{INVS} & \text{PF=swallow-NVIS-TR.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘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 ‘s/he’.

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 Krejnovič’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.

The demonstratives of the 3rd series have a wider array of functions. They can, opposite to Krejnovič’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) Tien’e-leŋ pegie-te-l.
DIST-FOC.ABS follow-FUT-GER.SF
‘That one will follow [us].’ (Kurilov 2001:468, tieŋ’eŋ)

(437b) Tān’e-le met toŋu-du-nun-meŋ.
INVS.DEM-FOC.ABS 1SG chase-ITER-HAB-TR.3SG.OF
‘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) Tuŋn’ele jawnuo Anderuske laŋundeŋ tet akaa Semien tadaat Kūōcere kerewen ličielek Anderuske laŋudeŋ tonajna.
tuŋn’ele jawnuo Anderuske laŋudeŋ tet akaa Semien
ADL.PROX-ACC everything.DO Andryushkino toward 2SG elder.brother Semyon
tadaat Kūōcere kerewe-n ličie-lek Anderuske laŋudeŋ tonoj-ŋa.
and Kwochere cow-GEN six.year.bull-INS Andryushkino toward drive-3PL.TR
‘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 3rd series demonstratives in oblique cases are rather rare. The case endings are those characteristic of nouns:

‘By this the family members will know: a wild reindeer has successfully been hunted.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:156)

‘The sky behaves toward that.’

(Kurilov 2001:173, kurie-)

The demonstrative pronouns of the 1st 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 –t, uniquely characteristic of their declensional paradigm. When it is attached, it ousts the final /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 /n/ as required by the restrictions on consonant clusters. Various case uses of the 1st series demonstratives are illustrated below.

‘“You see, dust has got into my eyes, I am taking it out,” (the polar fox) said.’

(Kurilov 2001:475, tujun)

‘I even lost my sleep, it must have happened as that (event) approached.’

(Kurilov 2001:475, tujun)
(444) *Aduŋunyat me čamuon*.  
*aduŋun-γa-t* me=čama-ŋol-i  
ADA.PROX-LOC-ABL PF=big-be-INTR.3SG  
‘It is bigger than that one.’ (Kurilov 2001:30, *aduŋunyat*)

(445) *Akaagi saale wiemele. Moni tuŋulel čaγadejrukun 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  
čaγade-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, *tuŋun*)

(446) *Čaγad’iiče-pul-gi lawje-le men-če-mle taŋun-嫩’n i’ed’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 taŋuntegielel mer aawaaködijli.*  
*qad’ir* taŋun-tegie-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’e-ŋu-l. N’umud’el enmun*  
*two.GEN Yukaghir-GEN-0-child-FOC.ABS* be-PL-GER.SF camp every  
tay-pe-k worperti-s-nun-ŋu-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’eduγane jukuolel taŋunγane waaj taŋ nime laŋudeŋ uu-se-l-lek me sewrejl’elum.*  
*tuŋ* kuod’edu-γane juku-ŋol-el taŋun-γane waaj  
ADL.PROX boy-ACC small-be-PTCP INVS.DEM-ACC also  
tay 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 tēt amaa-n’ n’iéd’i-l’el-um.
Ada.prox-nominative Aku father 2SG father-DAT tell-Nonfinite.3SG
‘Father Kakau told that to your father.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:38)

(450b) Čuoajme čajledenmun me pugekietej, taŋ’ele jaŋdepe me kuril’iiŋa moni amaa-gi.
Nouns-Dem-Acc Goose-PL tell-Nonfinite.3SG INVIS.DEM-INSTR.3SG
‘ “In spring, it will get warmer every day and geese know that,” said the father.’
(Kurilov 1994:9)

(450c) Taŋ unumep-le čuŋjel me qadi waard’ya qabun ile med’uoluoldayane ile uon’er juojaŋdayane taŋul-lek kuril’ii-nun-ŋa.
INVS.DEM-Adv which herd-LOC how.many reindeer
‘(During calving herders cut off the tips of the new born 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 qudoqel?
M.P AD.L. Prox what fox-FOC.ABS lie-Nonfinite.
‘This is a fox lying, isn’t it?’

(451b) Aduŋ’e modʼeŋ nemen puŋuolek? Titqa el me l’ej taatband’erukun.
Ada.prox what-GEN what-GEN say-INfinite.1SG rejoicing[GER]-COP
‘What kind of joy is this? You do have [already] something like this, don’t you?’

3.5.5 Interrogative pronouns

Following Krejnović (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)\textsuperscript{192} ‘who’, ‘whose’ and neme(ŋ)/leme(ŋ) ‘what’\textsuperscript{193}. The second group includes derived pronouns whose first syllable is <qa>:

\begin{description}
\item[(452)] qaduŋ ‘which’, ‘what kind of’ < q- ‘ITRG’ + aduŋ ‘ADA.PROX’ (‘which that’)
\item[qad ‘which’, ‘what kind of’]
\item[quodeband’e ‘what kind of’ < quode ‘how’ + pan- ‘to be’ + -je ‘PTCP’]
\item[qadinuoler ‘which’ < qadı ‘which’ + -n ‘GEN’ + -ŋ ‘to be’ + er ‘CIRC’]
\item[qadugi ‘which’ < q- ‘ITRG’ + adugi ‘ADA.PROX’]
\item[qaduŋut ‘which’ < q- ‘ITRG’ + aduŋun ‘ADA.PROX’ + -t ‘FOC.ABS’]
\item[qabun ‘how many’]
\end{description}

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 adlocutitorial 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.

\begin{description}
\item[(453)] Qadı kind’e-γa pulgej-nun?
which month-LOC come.out-HAB[3SG.ITAL]
‘In which month do [leaves] come out?’ (Kurilov 2001:499, qadı)
\item[(454)] Qaduŋut at kiime tuŋ čoŋjejpeγat? — Tuŋut.
qu-aduŋun-t at=ki=meŋ tuŋ čoŋjepe-γa-t? tuŋun-t.
‘Which of these knives would you give [me]? — This [one].’
(Kurilov 2001:499, qaduŋut)
\item[(455)] Qabun čaas-γa eguo-nun-mut?
how.many hour-LOC rise-HAB-2PL.ITAL
Puskijan čaas-γa eguo-nun-jeli.
seven.ENG hour-LOC rise-HAB-INTR.1PL
‘What time do you get up? — We get up at seven o’clock.’
\end{description}

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:

\begin{description}
\item[(456)] Tuŋ čii 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)
\end{description}

\textsuperscript{192} The form \textit{kin} is used in questions about subjects of transitive verbs, while the form \textit{kinek} is normally reserved for questions about subjects of intransitive verbs.

\textsuperscript{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 *ŋolle* 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-ŋolle* el=quduol.  
table-LOC what-EMPH NEG=lie[3SG]  
‘Nothing is lying on the table.’

(459) *Ten’i tet nemeolley tet wiejuolmoraw ewl’e.*  
ten’i tet neme-ŋolle 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-ŋolle* el=lejrii-jeŋ.  
big measles what-EMPH NEG=remember-INTR.3SG Sobul  
tit akaa-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-ŋaat-ŋa el=aarej.*  
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)  
Aq  
tudel  
iilugul’-r 
kin-n’e-đeŋ  
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)  
Tadaa me kinek ejuul’en’.  
tadaa  
me=kinek  
ejuu-l’el-i  
there  
IND=who  
get.caught-NVIS-INTR.3SG  
‘Somebody moaned (got caught) there.’

(465)  
Anne maarqan čajle’ya me kinek öruul mörič.  
anne  
maarqan  
čajle-γa  
me=kinek  
örul  
möruu-j  
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)  
Akaa tienaayarut me nemej toron’ejrukunek mit lajudeŋ keluunul.  
akaa  
tieŋ-laayar-ut  
me=nemej  
toron’e-j-sukun-ek  
elder.brother  
DIST-side-ABL  
PF=what  
be.black-PTCP-THING-FOC.ABS  
mit  
lajudeŋ  
kelu-nu-l  
1PL  
toward  
come-DUR-GER.SF  
‘Brother, from there something black is approaching us.’

(467)  
Maarqad’ęŋ Uluroy’at anmorji me qabun joqon miraiγa sayanejmut.  
maarqad’ęŋ  
Uluro-γa-t  
anmorγi  
me=qabun  
joqol-n  
once  
Uluro-LOC-ABL  
MP  
IND=how.many  
Yakut-GEN  
mira=l-γa  
sayane-jmut  
walk-GER-LOC  
sit-INTR.2PL  
‘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)  
Umčagim’e n’aya tuŋ paad’eduo iitneŋ qabunda čajle’ya sayanaal’elŋi tadaat tuŋ qadumudeŋel el pulgejl’uon el quodejčuon.  
Umčagim’-e  
n’aya  
tuŋ  
paad’eduo  
iitneŋ  
qabunda  
čajle-γa  
Umčagim-COM  
together  
ADL.PROX  
girl  
long.time  
several  
day-LOC  
sayane-l’el-ŋi  
tadaat  
tuŋ  
qadumun-de-đeŋ  
sit-NVIS-3PL.INTR  
and  
ADL.PROX  
where-ADV-EMPH  
el=pulge-čuon  
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-l’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 lewejnubrebya jawnej enupulŋat čamuon’
    Alasej enu tuŋ lewejnubrebe-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.INTR
‘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 nayaaḷ’elŋudayā tuŋ körel waaj tideŋ n’iŋakaajilputyane me toŋoraal’elum.
    qad’ir tuŋ sajre-pul jawner nay-a-l’el-ŋu-daya tuŋ körel
    DM ADL.PROX hawk-pl all fall-NVIS-PL-3DS ADL.PROX devil
    waaj tideŋ n’iy=akaa-jil-pul-γane me=toŋore-l’el-um
    again ANPH RECP=brother-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 molčuon meručiil’elŋi.

ile-le jawnuo lew-relek el=mol-čuon mer=uučii-l’el-ŋi.

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) Tidėŋ sukune jawnuo endu jukuolucciónuo saal enmun weldčim.

tidėŋ sukun-le jawnuo endu jukuolucciónuo saal enmun weldč-im

ANPH thing-ACC all.DO DISTR little tree every hang-ITR TR 3SG

‘He hanged all those things a bit on every tree.’ (Kurilov 2001:131, jukuolucciónuo)

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 reservations:194

(474) Tieŋ juku jalya lanuđenŋ waaj ölkienaak, ölkienaak.

tieŋ juku jalya lanuđenŋ waaj ölke- nu-aa-k ölke-nu-aa-k

DIST small lake toward again run-DUR-INC-HM. SG run-DUR-INC-HM. SG

‘Do run toward that small lake.’

(475) Ten tugi waaj čama solyind’e-ŋa me=gadaa ewre-r

DEIC ADL PROX also big reunion-LOC IND=where go-CIRC

onie-nun-me ugurče-k.

wear-HAB-PTCP.COP 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 < čamul- ‘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 \textit{fatherly love} or \textit{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*}
maargan & \text{‘one’} < maarquol- \text{‘to be one’} \\
\text{kin} & \text{‘two’} < kijuol- \text{‘to be two’} \\
\text{jaan} & \text{‘three’} < jaluol- \text{‘to be three’} \\
\text{jelukun} & \text{‘three’} < jålaklal- \text{‘to be four’} \\
\text{imdald’an} & \text{‘five’} < \text{imdald’al-} \text{‘to be five’} \\
\text{maalajin} & \text{‘six’} < \text{maalajlal-} \text{‘to be six’} \\
\text{puskijan} & \text{‘seven’} < \text{puskijal-} \text{‘to be seven’} \\
\text{maalajlukun} & \text{‘eight’} < \text{maalajlaklal-} \text{‘to be eight’} \\
\text{kunil’} & \text{‘ten’} < \text{kunil’al-} \text{‘to be ten’}
\end{align*}

The origin of the suffix \(-(l)l’e\) is harder to trace. It plays an essential role in the pronominal 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’e/\text{elpajpepl’e} & \text{‘womanly’, ‘of women’} < \text{pajpe} \text{‘woman’} \\
ködell’e & \text{‘manly’, ‘of men’} < \text{köde} \text{‘man’} \\
\text{kejpep(l)l’e} & \text{‘manly’, ‘of men’} < \text{kejpe} \text{‘male’, ‘lad’} \\
pudel’e & \text{‘outer’} < \text{pude} \text{‘outside’}
\end{align*}

\(^{195}\) The attributive form of the quantitative verb \(wal’yarumkuruol-\) ‘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 ‘of olden times’, ‘ancient’ < tidaa ‘long ago’
tindaal’e ‘former’, ‘olden’ < tindaa ‘earlier’, ‘previously’, ‘long ago’
qomde(me)l’e ‘autumnal’ < qomdeme ‘autumn’
qand’el’elqand’emel’e ‘wintry’ < qand’elqand’eme ‘cold’, ‘winter’
čuoyajil’e ‘of spring’ < čuoyajme ‘spring’
awjaal’e ‘yesterday’s’

(478)  Lewejl’e nimelek sayanejli.
lewejl-l’e nime-lek sayane-jli
summer-RLN house-INS sit-1PL.INTR
‘We lived in a summer house.’  (Kurilov and Odé 2012:30)

The petrified form čuoł’e ‘ancient’ ~ čuoł’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 čal’d’e-d-awur-ek.
DEIC ADL.PROX male-GEN hand-0-container-COP
‘Here, this is a men’s mitten.’

(479b) Pajpen moŋo ten jewlid’en sawayat iirienunuj.
pajpe-n moŋo ten jewlid’e-n sawa-γα-t iire-nun-uj
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-l’l’ek.
DEIC male-RLN-COP
‘Here are men’s ones.’

(480b) Ten jadarqa-lek wie-nun-ŋa ten ten’i-n pajp-l’e-γanye
DEIC bead-INS do-HAB-3PL.TR DEIC here-prol woman-RLN-ACC
but male-PL-RLN bead-INS NEG=do-HAB-PL[3]
tan kejpe-p-l’l’e jadarqa-lek el=wie-nun-ŋu.
‘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
derivates with –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:

(481)  
$\text{miilgel}_e \text{‘closer’ < } \text{miilger}_e \text{‘the side of smth. located closer to the speaker’}$

\text{jieglalel/jieglger/jieglinde} ‘farther’ < \text{jiegle}_e ‘unknown part of something’

(482)  
\begin{align*}
\text{Jieglalel} & \quad \text{kičuol-el} & \quad \text{serge-γa} & \quad \text{ire-m.} \\
\text{farther} & \quad \text{be.extreme-ADJZ} & \quad \text{tethering:post(Yak)-LOC} & \quad \text{tie-TR.3SG}
\end{align*}
‘He tied [it] at the farther, outer tethering post.’ (Kurilov 2001:121, jieglalel)

The adjective \text{albelel} ‘lower’ makes it possible to identify the suffix –lel, also present in \text{miilgel} and \text{jieglalel}, which may be assumed to derive adjectives from nouns with spatial meaning:

(483)  
\begin{align*}
\text{Albelel} & \quad \text{n’umd’egi alun lukulyan uul’en’ taat gin’er ölke-l’el-i’}. \\
\text{al-be-lel} & \quad \text{n’umd’e-gi} & \quad \text{al-un} & \quad \text{lukul-γa-n}
\end{align*}
lower.side-NMLZ-ADJZ \quad \text{jaw-PERT} \quad \text{lower.side-PROL} \quad \text{ground-LOC-PROL}
\begin{align*}
\text{uu-l’el-i} & \quad \text{taat} & \quad \text{kin’er} & \quad \text{ölke-l’el-i} \\
go-NVIS-INTR.3SG & \quad \text{so} & \quad \text{till} & \quad \text{run-NVIS-INTR.3SG}
\end{align*}
‘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)  
$\text{wayine} \sim \text{wayane} \text{‘own (of possessions and kin)’, ‘personal’}$
\text{ewje} ‘real’, ‘true’, ‘genuine’, ‘own (of kin)’

(485)  
\begin{align*}
\text{Čendiluu-pe} & \quad \text{ewje} & \quad \text{alajii-pe-leŋ}. \\
\text{Chendiluu-PL} & \quad \text{real} & \quad \text{Alayi-PL-COP}
\end{align*}
‘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 jawnej ‘everybody’, as in (487):

\begin{align*}
\text{jawnej} & \quad \text{taw-me} & \quad \text{chendilu-leŋ} & \quad \text{alajii-pe-leŋ}. \\
\text{everybody} & \quad \text{tie-TR.3SG} & \quad \text{Chendilu-PL} & \quad \text{real Alayi-PL-COP}
\end{align*}
‘Chendilu and his relatives are (as) everybody they are (as) real Alayi people.’

\begin{align*}
\text{jawnej} & \quad \text{taw-me} & \quad \text{chendilu-leŋ} & \quad \text{alajii-pe-leŋ}. \\
\text{everybody} & \quad \text{tie-TR.3SG} & \quad \text{Chendilu-PL} & \quad \text{real Alayi-PL-COP}
\end{align*}
‘Chendilu and his relatives are (as) everybody they are (as) real Alayi people.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:248)

\begin{align*}
\text{jawnej} & \quad \text{taw-me} & \quad \text{chendilu-leŋ} & \quad \text{alajii-pe-leŋ}. \\
\text{everybody} & \quad \text{tie-TR.3SG} & \quad \text{Chendilu-PL} & \quad \text{real Alayi-PL-COP}
\end{align*}
‘Chendilu and his relatives are (as) everybody they are (as) real Alayi people.’

\begin{align*}
\text{jawnej} & \quad \text{taw-me} & \quad \text{chendilu-leŋ} & \quad \text{alajii-pe-leŋ}. \\
\text{everybody} & \quad \text{tie-TR.3SG} & \quad \text{Chendilu-PL} & \quad \text{real Alayi-PL-COP}
\end{align*}
‘Chendilu and his relatives are (as) everybody they are (as) real Alayi people.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:248)

\begin{align*}
\text{jawnej} & \quad \text{taw-me} & \quad \text{chendilu-leŋ} & \quad \text{alajii-pe-leŋ}. \\
\text{everybody} & \quad \text{tie-TR.3SG} & \quad \text{Chendilu-PL} & \quad \text{real Alayi-PL-COP}
\end{align*}
‘Chendilu and his relatives are (as) everybody they are (as) real Alayi people.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:248)

\begin{align*}
\text{jawnej} & \quad \text{taw-me} & \quad \text{chendilu-leŋ} & \quad \text{alajii-pe-leŋ}. \\
\text{everybody} & \quad \text{tie-TR.3SG} & \quad \text{Chendilu-PL} & \quad \text{real Alayi-PL-COP}
\end{align*}
‘Chendilu and his relatives are (as) everybody they are (as) real Alayi people.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:248)
‘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 verbs:

\[ n’id’erpejney \] ‘in a new fashion’ & \[ n’id’erpej \] ‘[it] is new’ & \[ n’id’erpe \] ‘to be new’
\[ qaaličnej \] ‘terribly’ & \[ qaalič \] ‘[it] is terrible’ & \[ qaaluu \] ‘to be terrible’
\[ warinej \] ‘firmly’ & \[ war \] ‘[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 \( n’ \rightarrow j / _n \) takes place facilitating smooth, quick pronunciation:

\[ maaruojne \] ‘happily’ & \[ maaruon’ \] ‘[s/he] is happy’ & \[ maaruol- \] ‘to be happy’
\[ čuguojne \] ‘quickly’ & \[ čugun’ \] ‘[it] is quick’ & \[ čuguol- \] ‘to be quick’

It has to be noted that formerly some speakers used the stem of such verbs as derivational base:

\[ Taat maaruol-nej ewl’ikie-j … \]
so be.happy-ADV disappear-INTR.3SG
‘He died so, happily.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:140)

This is a regular derivational pattern for \( n’anduolnej \) ‘superfluously’ & \( n’anduol- \) ‘to exceed’ & + -nej ‘ADV’, which could be regarded as a degree adverb.

In the derivation of the two following adverbs a further morphophonemic alternation takes place:

\[ amutnej \] ‘well’ & \[ amuč \] ‘it is good’
\[ n’aarčiney \] ‘badly’ & \[ n’aarčič č \] ‘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 \( *n’aarčičnej \), according to the same rule which applies in the case of the adverb \( qaaličnej \) ‘terribly’. Taking into consideration the existence of the participle \( amuče, \) one could postulate also for \( amutnej \) ‘well’ the ancient form.

---

198 This was first noted by Krejnović (1958:202) and supported by Kurilov (2006:196).
199 In Lukina (2008:62) an instance of \( n’arčičnej \) can indeed be found. It is not clear whether this is a spelling mistake or an isolated example of this pronunciation.
*amučneŋ. 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 [tʃn]. The adverb for ‘badly’ might have then changed its sound shape in analogy to its antonym. In the corpus, the form qaalitneŋ ‘terribly’, which is also a very frequent adverb, can be found too, instead of the dictionary form qaaličneŋ. In the following example it is used rather as a degree adverb:

(492) Tudejlede qaalitneŋ tenuben’iej.
    tudel-ejlede qaalič-neŋ tenubun‘ie-j
    3SG-EMPH be.frightful.INTR.3SG-ADV be.hungry-INCH-INTR.3SG
    ‘And he himself got terribly hungry.’ (Kurilov 2001:495, qaaličneŋ)

Derivational bases of some manner adverbs undergo irregular alternations:

(493a) warajneŋ ‘early’ < waruon’ ‘[it] is early’
(493b) notiqneŋ ‘neatly’, ‘carefully’ < notinej ‘[it] is beautiful’

Noteworthy in the derivation of manner adverbs is the unproductive lexicalization of converbs:

(494) anmel‘ereŋ ‘causelessly’ < anme ‘simply’ + l’e- ‘to be’ + -reŋ ‘SIM’

In some instances it is impossible to identify the lexeme on whose basis the adverb is formed, e.g. iitneŋ ‘for a long time’. It is definitely derived since it displays the derivational suffix –neŋ 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) O tieŋ mit laame war-ii-neŋ at=iire-j.
    oh DIST 1PL dog be.firm-INTR.3SG-ADV POT=tie-1PL.TR
    Imuŋ n’awn’ikliek pun’mele mer iimietej.
    be.rabid-PTCP polar.fox-FOC.ABS kill-TR.3SG.OF PF=be.rabid-inch-FUT-INTR.3SG
    ‘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, warineŋ)

Manner adverbs can be derived with the suffix –neŋ also from parts of speech other than qualitative verbs:

(496) ančejneŋ ‘anxiously’ < ančejl ‘anxiety’
    uguneŋ ‘rightly/correctly’ < uguje ‘truth’

---

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) *jukuolučuo*\(^{201}\) ‘bit by bit’ < *jukuol-* ‘to be small’.

*n’idojo* ‘repeatedly’ < *n’i*= ‘RECP’ + *tőnore-* ‘to follow’, ‘to chase’

*n’ilajaat* ‘one after another’ < *n’i*= ‘RECP’ + *laajaat* ‘behind.ABL’

*n’ibure* ‘above one another’, ‘in a row’ < *n’i*= ‘RECP’ + *pure* ‘upper.part’

*n’iduun* ‘mixing’ < *n’i*= ‘RECP’ + *tuul* ‘contents’

(498) An el *n’ilajaat talaw uudaya an ... pomorcirej uunull’en’.

*an el=* *n’ilajaat* talaw uu-*l-daya*

DEIC NEG=one.after.another wild.reindeer go-GER-3SG.DS

*an pomoreči-rej uu-nun-l’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)

With the common adverbial suffix –*de(y)* the adverb *wiede(y)* ‘differently’, ‘in a different way’ ~ *wien* (an)other’ is derived:

(499) *Id’ie l’ie wiede*ŋ *yolaaj*.

now MP different.ADV be-INCH-INTR.3SG

‘Now [it] has become different.’

Among the adverbs belonging to this group, lexicalized converses can be found too, e.g. *uureŋ* ‘gradually’ < *uu-* ‘go’ + -*ren* ‘SIM’. Instances of historically derived adverbs of this type may be the words *n’ipijikin*\(^{202}\) ‘equally of all sorts’, ‘from all sides’, *ijer*\(^{203}\) ‘separately’, *pölčenme* ‘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) *jukuol* ‘little’ < *jukuol-* ‘to be small’

*alγamlal* ‘little’ < *alγamlal-* ‘to be few/little’

\(^{201}\) -čuo is a diminutive suffix.

\(^{202}\) The segment <n’i> is almost surely the reciprocal proclitic.

\(^{203}\) A connection with *iije*- ‘to be afraid’ taking the circumstantial converb ending –r can be considered.

\(^{204}\) 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) čamaney ‘greatly’, ‘very’, ‘too much’< čama ‘big’

This is not so for the other non-relational adjective, juku ‘small’. Instead, the stem jukuol- ‘to be small’ functions as the derivational base for the corresponding degree adverb, attaching the suffix –ćuo. This is accompanied by the truncation of the final stem consonant: jukućuo206 ‘a little’. A combination of the suffixes –ćuo and –nėy produces an enhanced meaning: jukućuoney ‘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’ < čajled’aa ‘in the twilight’
molid’aa ‘a little bit’ < moli ‘for a while’, ‘seemingly’

The adverb alyad’aa ‘very’, ‘excessively’, ‘too’, which is obviously related to the verb alyamlal- ‘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’
engeney ‘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 pojuojney ‘many times’, whose derivation follows the general pattern of manner adverbs:

(504) pojuojney ‘many times’ < pojuon’ ‘[it] is in a great number/quantity’ < pojuol- ‘to be numerous’

Here is an example from a text:

(505) Taat pojuojne Kakau amaa miraanudaŋa met en’ie monl’en’ …
taat pojuol-j-ne Kakau amaa mira-aa-nu-l-da
so be.numerous-INTR.3SG-ADV Kakau father walk-INCH-DUR-GER-3SG.DS
met en’ie mon-l’el-i
1SG mother say-NVIS-INTR.3SG

---

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’ukoće 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’ēŋ. Regarding the derivational base these adverbs show different provenience:

(506) maarqad’ēŋ ‘once’ < maarqan ‘one’ (attributive) ~ maarquol- ‘to be one’
    kid’ēŋ ‘twice’ < kin ‘two’ (attributive) ~ kijuol- ‘to be two’
    jalmid’ēŋ ‘three’ < jalmisčē ‘third’ ~ jaluol- ‘to be three’
    jalaklid’ēŋ ‘four times’ < jalaklal- ‘to be four’
    kunil’id’ēŋ ‘ten times’ < kun’il’al- ‘to be ten’

(507) Met lögitenununŋ kid’eŋ.
    met lögite-nun-ŋ kid’ēŋ
    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’
    jalmasčēsur ‘for the third time’ < jalmisčē ‘third’ + -s ‘CAUS’ + -ur ‘CIRC’
    jalmisčed’ēŋ ‘for the third time’ < jalmisčē ‘third’ + -d’ēŋ ‘ADV’

(509a) Ten’i jalmasčēsur tuŋ tet aɣuoluol’γa kötkejlyane
    čulyajtej.
    ten’i jalmasčē-su-r tuŋ tet aɣuol’-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 iitneng iču-relek jalmisčē-d’ēŋ aji-m.
    then long.time look-ANT third-ADV schoot-TR.3SG
    ‘He aimed carefully and shot for the third time.’

The unproductive 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’yarumkuronjเนy ‘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 *ti* ‘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):

(511) *Tidaa čuöl’e d’ii tadaa lalime-le pon’i-nun-ya.*

then ancient people there sledge-ACC leave-HAB-3PL.TR

*Qad’ir tadaat*210 *n’awniklie pun-delek al’ya talaw-le*

DM then polar.fox kill-ANT fish wild.reindeer-ACC

*tadaa-t  qad’ir saa lanuđeŋ CAST kewej-ŋi.*

there-ABL DM wood toward leave-3PL.TR

‘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)

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.

(512) *Uureŋ pudepul’yan egurieg.*

gradually outer.part-PL-LOC-PROL tread-1NCH-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)  
- ten’i ‘here’ < ten ‘here’ (proximal adlocutorial deictic particle)  
- ada ‘there’ < adu ‘that’ (proximal adauditorial demonstrative pronoun)  
- tigiraa ‘there’ < tigin ‘there’ (distal deictic particle)  
- tadaa ‘there’ < tay ‘that’ (invisible demonstrative pronoun)

Spatial adverbs related to the deictic particles ten and tig in as well as the one stemming from the proximal demonstrative adu 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)  
- Tadaa-ney mirije ŋol-nun-d’eli kerewe-ŋin’ ul’ege wie-če-r.

  there-ADV reindeer.file be-HAB-1PL.INTR cow(Russ)-DAT grass make-ITV-CIRC

(Prior to this sentence an area is roughly located.) ‘And somewhere there we used to roam when we went to gather grass for cows.’

The spatial case endings, those of ablative and prolatative, designate a location from which an action is carried out and an area over which an action takes place respectively:

---

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(g) can be seen as an emphatic form of a given spatial adverb in prolate, 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’itey ‘and from here’ (Kurilov 2001:481). See also (518b) and consider forms like jukuočuoney ‘at least a bit’ < jukuočuo ‘a little’, tuduruuney ‘inner.part.EMPH’.
Since in our neighborhood, on the river Chukochya, there were no women, one took [them] from here. (Kurilov and Odé 2012:252)

Well, I am cutting my cap. It blows too much at this spot.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:150)

To indicate a location toward which an action is directed, the common adverbalizing suffix –de(ŋ) attaches to the independent demonstrative pronouns of the 1st series (see 3.5.4.2):

And then at last one man hits pikes with a stick and throws them onto the bank.

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)

Krejnovič (1982:155 ff.) regards this formative as the (al)lative case suffix. I do not adopt this analysis because the suffix –de(ŋ) is a very common adverbal 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.
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 sewreya.  
met-qane  kiejie-n  sew-re-na  
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)’ < ime213  
‘opposite’  
lajγar ‘behind’, ‘on the back side’ < lajaa ‘behind’  
kejγur ‘in front’ < kiejie ‘in front of’  
wal’γar ‘opposite side’  
alyar ‘lower side’

These forms can take spatial case endings:

(521)  

lajγudeŋ ‘back’ (direction)  
lajyargurut ‘from the back side’  
wal’γargudeŋ ‘in the opposite direction’  
kejγude(n) ‘forward’  
alyγudeŋ ‘down’ (direction)

(522)  

Tuŋ n’iŋakaajilpul ölker ölker tuŋ čumurγan alγudeŋ id’ie ölkeŋutej.  
tuŋ  n’iŋ=akaa-jil-pul  ölke-r  ölke-r  tuŋ  čumur-γa-n  alγar-δeŋ  
ADL.PROX  RECP=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 laaγar ‘side’, whose derivates can have adverbial functions:

(523)  

čawlaaγar ‘north’ < čawul ‘sea’ + laaγar ‘side’  
saalaaγar ‘south’ < saal ‘wood’ + laaγar ‘side’  
puregelaγaγa ‘west’214 < purege ‘upper reaches of a river’ + laaγar ‘side’
jugullaayar ‘right side’
jawlaayar ‘left side’

(524a) Čawlaayar čamaney qan’qaadayà mitek maarquon’ pon’aatel?
cawlaayar čama-ñey qad’uu-qaal-dayà
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 tajn’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’gyarejn’ ‘to the opposite side’ < wal’gare ‘(other) half’ (spatially)
jöket ‘from far away’ < jöke216 ‘great distance’, ‘far’

(526a) Lajadaya ayuod’e čii maarquon’ wolmomaaadayà igijedayat mennunya.
laja-da-γa ayuol-je čii maarquon’
rear.part-PERT stand-PTCP people only
wolmomaada-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’.

Uluro-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.

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’aačin’ ‘opposite each other’ < n’i= RESP + n’aache ‘face’ + in’ ‘dat’

n’iloployo ‘toward each other’ (e.g. throwing smth.)

n’iŋikin ‘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’

awjaa ‘yesterday’

id’igajgir ‘morning’

e1i ‘first/for the time being’

uudek ‘always’

motineŋ ‘already’

id’ie, id’ire ‘now’

taŋnigi ‘then’

idaraa ‘later (on)’

From these, secondary adverbs can be derived:
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)  

tidaŋγa ‘last year’ < tidaa ‘long ago’

idaranγa ‘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 ŋolaar mer aawaaŋi.

Čiŋičel-me ŋol-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-menŋ 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) čiŋičedin’ uuj

čiŋičel-din’ uu-j.

darkness-ADV go-INTR.3SG

‘…, he traveled at night.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:110)
Spatial adverbs are frequently used temporally:

(536)  
tadaaa ‘then’
tadaatkumun ‘from then on’
ten’it kejgudee ‘from now on’
ten’i gim’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 ṭoll’en’, n’aačeledenę amuol’en’.

‘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.

‘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 adaą ‘there’. The interrogative pronoun qadunjudeŋ, indicating direction, derives not from qadaą ‘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’
    qaduṇden ‘where’ (direction)
    qaduṇdet ‘where from’
    qan’in ‘when’
    qawdeŋ ‘how’
    quoden ‘how’ < q- ‘ITRG’ + ḋol- ‘to be’ + –deŋ ‘ADV’
    quodiir ‘why’ < q- ‘ITRG’ + ḋol- ‘to be’ + -d’ii ‘CAUS’ + -r ‘CIRC’
    qamlal ‘how many’ < q- ‘ITRG’ + amlal ~ alyamlal- ‘to be few’
    qamlid’eŋ ‘how many times’

About a reason or purpose one can inquire using adverbs which are derived from the pronoun neme ‘what’:

(540) nemuol ‘why’ < neme ‘what’ + ḋol- ‘be’
     nemenyol ‘what for’ < neme ‘what’ + ḋol- ‘be’
     nemenyin ‘what for’ < neme ‘what’ + ḋin- ‘DAT’
     nemenyot ‘what for’ < neme ‘what’ + ḋol- ‘be’ + -t ‘ABL’

A text example follows:

(541) Ten met qadaat köll’eld’e ködek ṣodeŋ?
     ten met qadaa-t köl-l’el-je köde ḋol-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-nej el=kelu-t
     when-EMPH NEG=come-FUT[3SG]
     ‘Where have I come from?’

(543) Qaduŋnaayaruteŋ ilije el l’irere.
     qaduŋ-laayar-ut-nej 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:

(546) sukīn ‘in the wilderness’, ‘aimlessly’, ‘capriciously’, ‘whimsically’, ‘unwarranted’
maranme ‘idly’, ‘carefree’, ‘without doing or saying anything’, ‘causeless’, ‘easily’
ŋ’injide’ie ‘on the same height, depth’, ‘equally’, ‘simultaneously’, ‘together’

Ed’ilwej maranme sukīn’ keweč, čiin’ mörd’iečej.
‘Edilwey went in the wilderness; he went to let people know.’

(Kurilov 2005:126)

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).
(545) *Jawulγa sajdenγ quduon*'.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{jawul-γ} & \text{sajdenγ quduol-i} \\
\text{road-LOC} & \text{across lie-INTR.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘[It] is lying across the road.’ (Kurilov 2006:227)

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) *Tude purε me=kudere-m.*

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{3SG.Poss} & \text{upper.side} & \text{PF=put-TR.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘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) *Met tudel purε me=kudere-ŋ.*

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{1SG} & \text{3SG} & \text{upper.side} & \text{PF=put-1SG.TR}
\end{array}
\]

‘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) *Nime-n tuduruu amutnenγ janun’e-j.*

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{house-GEN} & \text{inner.side} & \text{be.goodADV} & \text{be.neat-INTR.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘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 *wal* ‘near’ behaves as a *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) *Tuγ saal wal’dayα layubuorenγ quduollelul.*

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{tuγ} & \text{saal} & \text{wal’-da-γ} & \text{layubuor-γ} & \text{quduol-l’el-ul}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{ADL.PROX} & \text{wood near-PERT-LOC} & \text{snag-FOC.ABS} & \text{lie-NVIS-GER.SF}
\end{array}
\]

‘Beside that tree a snag was lying.’
The sentence in (548a) could be constructed without any marking on the postposition:

(548b) Tuŋ saal wal’ layubuoreŋ 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 possesseum 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 adposited 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 aawilγyane n’idoŋo kuderelek puredaya sayãanaarelek …

tude aawilγyane n’idoŋo kuderelek
3SG.POSS sleeping.bag-ACC repeatedly put-ANT

pure-daγya sayãane-aa-relek
upper.side-PERT-LOC sit-INCCH-ANT

‘He used to fold his sleeping bag several times and having sat down on it …’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:148)

(549b) Tit ekya ñodayane abučieγya-t el=pon’aa

tit ekya ñodayane abučieγya-t el=pon’aa
2PL elder.sister(Even) TOP.CNTR grandmother-locABL NEG=leave[3SG]
toili-gi mooj-rey kiejie-daγya čigirči-j.
staff-PEERT hold-SIM front.side-PERT-LOC limp-INCH-3SG

‘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, jalγil-pe-le maranmi pure-daγya-n qusad′i-j.

river-PL-ACC lake-PL-ACC simply upper.side-PERT-LOC-PROL jump,ITR-INTR.3SG

‘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-gi-ŋ wal’
girl house-PERT-GEN near

‘near the girl’s house’ (literally: ‘at the side of the house of the girl’)

(550b) Omčukur ekye-gi-ŋ uo

Omčukur elder.sister-PERT-GEN child

‘the child of Omčukur’s elder sister’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:242)

(550c) nime-gi-ŋ saal
	house-PL-PERT-GEN stick

‘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:

(560)  

\[\text{purenluknburebe} \quad \text{‘upper world’ (a metaphysical concept)} < \text{pure} \quad \text{‘upper.side’} + \quad \text{+ -n ‘GEN’} + \text{luknburebe} \quad \text{‘area’ (literally: ‘area of the upper side’)}\]

\[\text{purendayi} \quad \text{‘the upper/elder one’} < \text{pure} \quad \text{‘upper.side’} + \text{+ -n ‘GEN’} + \text{+ tayi ‘INVS.DEM’}\]

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:

(561)  

\[\text{Taŋ saal tudurru laayandaya me qoŋnaačii …}\]

\[\text{tay} \quad \text{saal} \quad \text{tudurru} \quad \text{laayan-da-γa} \quad \text{me=qoŋne-čii}\]

\[\text{INVS.DEM} \quad \text{stick} \quad \text{inner.part} \quad \text{side-PERT-LOC} \quad \text{PF=be.concave-DIM}\]

‘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:

(562)  

\[\text{puren} \quad \text{‘up(wards)’} < \text{pure} \quad \text{‘above’} + \text{+ -n ‘PROL’}\]

\[\text{alun} \quad \text{‘below’} < \text{al} \quad \text{‘under’} + \text{+ -n ‘PROL’}\]

\[\text{lajaat} \quad \text{‘behind’} < \text{lajaa} \quad \text{‘behind’} + \text{+ t ‘ABL’}.\]

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’, ‘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’ ~ nimeya ‘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:

(563)  

\[\text{mod’il’en-d’e pure-wre}\]

\[\text{be.rough-PTCP} \quad \text{upper.side-NMLZ}\]

‘a rough surface’

---

219 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*.

\[^{\text{Tuŋ . ADL.PROX}}\] \[^{\text{layubuor . snag}}\] \[^{\text{pure . upper.side}}\] \[^{\text{sayane-aa-l'el-i . sit-INCH-NVIS-INTR.3SG}}\]

‘[He] sat down on that snag.’

(564b) *Qularqaa-pul tideŋ körel bure kerie-nu-ŋu-daya ...*

\[^{\text{gull-PL . ANPH}}\] \[^{\text{devil . upper.side}}\] \[^{\text{fall-DUR-PL-3.DS}}\]

‘When gulls were attacking that devil …’

(564c) *Tadaat taŋ monqa bure me quudečeli.*

\[^{\text{tadaat . then}}\] \[^{\text{taŋ . INVS.DEM}}\] \[^{\text{monqa bure . hill . upper.side}}\] \[^{\text{me=quudej-jeli . PF=clime-INTR.1PL}}\]

‘Then we went up that hill.’

This postposition can have a more abstract meaning:

(564d) *Tudejlede sukungi čandeŋ loqnaanuni. Taŋun puren wayčid’aanuni.*

\[^{\text{tudej-ejle . 3SG-EMPH}}\] \[^{\text{sukun-gi . thing-PERT}}\] \[^{\text{čandeŋ . upwards}}\] \[^{\text{loqne-nun-i . pile-HAB-INTR.3SG}}\]

\[^{\text{taŋun . INVS.DEM}}\] \[^{\text{pure-n . upper.side-PROL}}\] \[^{\text{wayči-d’aa-nun-i . look.for-DTRV-HAB-INTR.3SG}}\]

‘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.*

\[^{\text{ADL.PROX . child}}\] \[^{\text{sledge . lower.side-PROL}}\] \[^{\text{lower.side-PROL . look-DTR-INTR.3SG}}\]

‘The child was looking around under the sledge.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:132)

(565b) *Taŋun kiejie čoçoje-pe-gi lalime-n n’oyoyayil’ al ayite-ŋ.*

\[^{\text{INVS.DEM . front.side}}\] \[^{\text{knife-PL-PERT . sledge-GEN}}\] \[^{\text{floor.covering . lower.side . hide-1SG.TR}}\]
‘Before that I hid his knives under the floor covering of the sledge.’

(Kurilov 2001:33, al)

wal’ ‘near’

(566a) Maarqan nime wal’ taŋ körelen quduol-l’el-ul.
maarqa-n nime wal’ taŋ körelen quduol-l’el-ul.
one-GEN house near INVS.DEF 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 pewgeč.
al’γa met ime pewge-j
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 mongqa-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) Tanun kiejie elin’ me miraal’en’.
tanun kiejie el’in me=mira-l’el-i
INVS.DEF front.side first PF=walk-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘Before that he went [somewhere] first.’

(568c) Tan ewl’ikie-l kiejie amaa-pegi moll’en’.
tan ewl’ikie-l kiejie amaa-pe-gi mon-l’el-i
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.
ječlie ‘behind’, ‘after’

This postposition is probably related to the noun jegil ‘back of the head’ and the adverbial ječledaγa ‘through’ (Kurilov 2006:229).

(569a) Tan juku jalya ječlie-daγa ičuo-dayane
DM small lake back.side-PERT-LOC look-3.SG.DS
nime-pe-leγ ayuol-l’el-ŋu-l.
house-PL-FOCUS 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 jaqtaanaaγaγa anme ochuoch ječlie me neme qamlid’edey pömöreel’en’.
as tea.pot(Russ) sing-DUR-INC-3SG.DS suddenly fire.place(Yak) behind
me=neme qamlid’edey 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)

laγaa ‘behind’, ‘after’

This postposition derives from the tautosemous noun laγa ‘back side’.

(570a) Titte laγaa-t marqil’ čii-pe-gi
3SG.POSS back.side-ABL girl parents-PL-PERT
tadaate sukun-gi neme-gi uuŋ-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 ječlie temporal meaning is possible with laγaa as well:

(570b) Tanun laγaa-t qad’ir tuŋ 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 tuul ‘contents of a bag’ and eventually to the noun tuul ‘contents’ and the verb tuun’e- ‘to contain’, ‘to be loaded’.
(571) Juku köde Apuodie ile tuduruun miraanurej, tude amaa-ya-1 kuril’ič-l’el-um ...

juku köde Apuodie ile tuduru-n mira-nu-re
small man Apuodie reindeer inner.side–PROL walk–DUR–SIM
tude amaa-γ-a kuril’ič-l’el-um
3SG.POSS father–LOC–ABL ask–NVIS–TR.3SG

‘Little Apuodie asked his father while walking in the midst of the reindeer [herd].’
(Kurilov 1994:9)

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.

(572) Joqopulya uraaγ yan monur joqopul pudilie nime n’el’elγ i.

joqol-pul-γ a uraa-γ yan mon-ur joqol-pul pudilie nime-n’e-l’el-γ i.

‘In order that she get used to Yakuts, [they] settled near Yakuts.’
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:246)

laγar ‘beside’, ‘by’

According to Kurilov (2006:231), this postposition can be traced back to the ancient root laγ recognizable in the postposition laγudej ‘towards’ (see below). The suffix –γar or its cognates occur in spatial adverbials such as alγar ‘downstream’, pureger ‘upstream’ or kejγur ‘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.

(573) Ilije wadun nime laγarut l’irerejdaγ ow n’anmen köjrid’e amuyγa!

ilije wadul-n nime laγar-ut l’irere-j-daγ ow n’anme-n köjrid’e amuyγa!

‘When the wind blows from a Yukaghir house, oh, how wonderful the willows’ smoke is!’

laγudej ‘towards’

(574) Elyajuorii Uluruo laγudej me köcêgereγ.

elyajuorii Uluruo laγudej me=köcêgereγ-j
without.delay Uluro toward PF=galloping-1PL.TR

‘Without delay, we galloped towards Uluro.’
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 įod’e jalyitegeleŋ l’el.
      Sien Küöl on.this.side.of Mungurdakh be-PTCP lake-AUG-FOC be-GER.SF
   ‘On this side of Sien Kyuol 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 ilije n’aačin’ uu-nu-l-yane ...
      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’.
      ITF=walk-DUR-FUT-INTR.3SG woo-PTCP man old.man-VBLZ-PTCP old.woman in.front.of
      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 juösem.
      u-u mon-reŋ juo-lek jawul čičirkin’ pure-t 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 jarga 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’uolγα ‘instead of’

This postposition derives most probably from the noun l’uoluol ‘place’ and the locative case ending –γα:

(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. aγal’wii- ‘to make laugh’ < aγal’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, aγal’wii-layal’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 kőde saale pomniir miraanaal’en’.
qad’ir tuŋ kőde saal-le pomniir mira-nu-aa-l’el-i
DM ADL.PROX man tree-ACC around walk-DUR-INCT-NVIS-INTR.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 kinthin’er both meaning ‘up to’ ‘as far as’, ‘till’. Kurilov (2003;2003) links these words to the verb kitičii- ‘to exhaust itself’. There is also an apparently related noun kicil ‘end’. This allows interpreting the words kitn’uo and kinthin’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’γadun-γa  gitn’uo  
knee-LOC  up.to  
‘up to the knees’

(581b) sisidun-γa  gitn’er  
breast.bone-LOC  up.to  
‘up to the breasts’

(581c) Toγoyja  gitn’uo  uu-jeli.  
Tohoj  up.to  go-INTR.1PL  
‘We went as far as Tohoj.’

(581d) Buran-γa  gitn’uo  uu-se-ηj-k.  
snow-LOC  up.to  go-CAS-PL-IMP  
‘Bring [him] to the snow-scooter.’

(581e) Tadaat taγ  kunil’an  čaas-γa  gitn’uo  
then  DM  ten.GEN  hour-LOC  till  
uo’dayane  sayane-jli  čaaj  law-nu-reν.  
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 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’e  endoįkonojrenull’eljumtelenqand’eme  gitn’uo.  
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  juođii  n’amuce-re-j-dya  kitn’er  
why  ANPL.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) Tuyuγ toŋoraanudya  n’iŋakaajil’pul  qad’ir  uttejl  gitn’er  öl’kilel’ηi.  
utuyγ  toŋore-nu-l-dya  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-ηi.  
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’e-gin tibegel aŋjadaŋya keluj taat kitn’er injienaam.*

\begin{align*}
\text{Sugud’-gi-n} & \quad \text{tibege-l} & \quad \text{aŋjada-ŋya} & \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 injie-nu-aa-m.} & \quad \text{so till fear-DUR-INCH-TR.3SG}
\end{align*}

‘Her heart was in her mouth, so much she got frightened.’

(585b) *Taat gitn’er qad’ir mojaŋ ajl’en’ titte lajnujuol lukulpulgi.*

\begin{align*}
\text{taat} & \quad \text{kitn’er qad’ir mojaŋ ajl’el-i titte lajnu-ŋol lukul-pul-gi} \\
\text{so till DM get.soft-NVIS-INTR.3SG 3PL.POSS fight-BE[GER] ground-PL-PERT}
\end{align*}

‘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.*

\begin{align*}
\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 invite} & \quad \text{he is MP} \\
\text{een} & \quad \text{van} & \quad \text{mijn} & \quad \text{beste} & \quad \text{vrienden.} & \quad \text{one of my best friends}
\end{align*}

‘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:

\[(587)\]  
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{tan} & \text{met} & \text{mon-je} & \text{ejk} \\
1\text{SG} & \text{say-INTR.1SG} & \text{at.all} & \text{NEG=take-FUT-INTR.1SG} \\
ejk & \text{el}=\text{lew-te-je}n & \text{NEG=eat-FUT-INTR.1SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘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 \(-\text{yoll’elk}\):

\[(588a)\]  
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Tudel} & \text{ejk} & \text{jagte-l-\text{\-yane}} & \text{ejk} \\
3\text{SG} & \text{sing-GER-1/2.SG.DS} & \text{ejk} & \text{ann’e-l-\text{\-yane}} \\
\text{qanine} & \text{el=aatterej-nun} & \text{NEG=stop-HAB[3SG]} \\
\text{ever} & \text{NEG=stop-HAB[3SG]} & \text{NEG=stop-HAB[3SG]} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘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 \(-\text{ejk}\) with the lexical meaning ‘also’ was presented. It was observed that combinatorial analysis involving other emphatic suffixes allows parsing of \(-\text{ejk}\) into \(-\text{ej}\) and \(-\text{k}\). 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” ŋød’erukune wayčinuny.  
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’ide Qaalid’e sayanegi.  
mouse and uncle Wolf sit-3PL.INTR  
‘There lived a mouse and Uncle Wolf.’ (Kurilov 1994:8)

(590) Tuŋ ileŋ me čamuon’ (tadaat) me suren’e.  
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 kiilen taat janduu’eld’eli.  
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 < qaalu-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’ , ‘but’ :

(592a) *Erime kerietej quruul čamanęŋ qan’qaatej monur qondemę qaldaajnęŋ monl’en’ amaagi tan čuoyajme čii puŋuoseńin’ keluŋi mondęŋ erime jarqa al’aayan pulgid’ilepe amdur jendejnuŋ!*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>erime</th>
<th>quruul</th>
<th>čama-neų</th>
<th>qad’uu-qaa-te-j</th>
<th>mon-ur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>snow</td>
<td>fall-FUT-INTR.3SG</td>
<td>sky</td>
<td>big-ADV</td>
<td>be.cold-INCH-FUT-INTR.3SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qondemę</td>
<td>qaldej-nu-ŋi</td>
<td>mon-l’el-i</td>
<td>amaagi</td>
<td>tan čuoyajme čii puŋuol-se-l-ŋin’ kelu-ŋi mon-reŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autumn</td>
<td>run.away-DUR-3PL.INTR</td>
<td>say-NVIS-INTR.3SG</td>
<td>father-PERT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>spring</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>rejoice-CAUS-GER-DAT</td>
<td>come-3PL.INTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erime jarqa al’aa-yan</td>
<td>pulgid’ile-pe amdur jendej-ŋu-ŋan</td>
<td>snow</td>
<td>ice</td>
<td>melt-JUSS</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 nimatedų ŋoll’en’. Tan qawd’idie Qaalid’e nime wiel qodejnur el nimečuon ewrienuŋ.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sal’il</th>
<th>nime</th>
<th>ewje</th>
<th>wadun</th>
<th>nime-die</th>
<th>ŋol-l’el-i.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mouse</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>real</td>
<td>Yukaghir-GEN</td>
<td>house-DIM</td>
<td>be-NVIS-INTR.3SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan qawd’idie</td>
<td>Qaalid’e</td>
<td>nime</td>
<td>wie-l</td>
<td>qodej-nu-r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>uncle</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>do-GER</td>
<td>be.lazy.to.do.smth-DUR-CIRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el=nome-čuon</td>
<td>ewre-nu-j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG=house-PRIV</td>
<td>go-DUR-INTR.3SG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘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 qaalaqqaar tan Sal’ildie newruuru el aruud’aa yolaal’elbi.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qaalid’e</th>
<th>jonō-gi</th>
<th>qaalaqqaar</th>
<th>tan</th>
<th>Sal’il-die</th>
<th>newruuur-r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>anger-pert</td>
<td>increase- CIRC</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>mouse-DIM</td>
<td>be.frightened-CIRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el=aruu-d’aa</td>
<td>ŋol-aa-l’el-ŋi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG=speech-NMLZ</td>
<td>be-INCH-NVIS-3PL.INTR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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, tįgin jądepe quodii quoyajme kelœnuŋu tadaat qondemę lajyudeŋ penjeńuŋ?*

225 The contrastive meaning of ‘and’ is intended here, not the copulative one.
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 daγi taaγanek tite köjrïd’en’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-aqanej tit amaa wegie-je ile-pe-n igije sisayaj-r
go-DUR-GER-1/2PL.DS 2PL father lead-PTCP reindeer-PL-GEN cord tear-CIRC

‘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-γa me=kinek ejk Mikalaj ejk Varvara me=sew-te-j.
people-0-speech-LOC IND=who or Mikalay 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’ðan sukunmol’yaln’e ejk me=čamuočiij.
Kačikan imdal’ðal’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) Taγ tanjullek kuril’iinull’elum ten juōdayane lukunburube me qanqaaj ten juoda
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 amaα-γa*

*two,GEN year-LOC-PROL or three,GEN year-LOC-PROL 1SG father-LOC
cayad’e-te-j kōde-le mon-nun-ŋi qand’aače.*

‘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’.*

*DEIC NEG=one.after.another wild.reindeer go-GER-3SG,DS
an pomoreći-řey uu-nun-l’el-i*  

‘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 köde-ŋin’ uul kiejie ilen sawa puolekle joŋotej kōdi moni, ‘Kinek quode gurčiil?’

‘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’ied’il kiejie titte uon’ monųtem, ‘Tieŋ čiiya sewk, tadaat ileŋin’ uuk!’

‘Parents who have a son will say to their child before negotiating, “Drop in on those people and then go straight away to the herd!” ’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:40)

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 keluuunci.

‘When we roamed, he used to come [to a new camp] before we reached [it].’

In (601) the presence of the converb qanaar ‘while roaming’ implies that another clause follows. Since converbs indicate that the subjects are coreferential in the successive clauses, and since the personal ending of the finite verb of the sentence does not satisfy this condition, it has to be concluded that apart from keluuunci ‘he used to come’ there is another clause in the sentence which qanaar ‘while roaming’ shares the subject with. The only candidate for this role is kötkejl ‘reaching’, whose subject is, indeed, identical with
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.

\[
\text{wadu-d-aruu-lek pulgej-l’el-je tuŋ el’ill’e kniga tit čuŋ-naa-l kiejie} \\
\text{Yukaghir-0-language-INS come.out-NVIS-PTCP ADL.PROX first book 2PL read-INCH-GER before} \\
\text{met tit-in’ me=mon-ŋol-moraw-n’e-jeŋ} \\
\text{1SG 1PL-DAT PF=say-be-OBLG-VBLZ-INTR.1SG} \\
\text{‘Before you begin to read this first book [written] in Tundra Yukaghir, I must tell you [something].} \text{ (Ado 1980:3)}
\]

\[(602b)\] Wadud aruulek pulgejl’elde tuŋ elill’e knigale tudel čuŋnaal kiejie …

\[
\text{wadu-d-aruu-lek pulgej-l’el-je tuŋ el’ill’e} \\
\text{Yukaghir-0-language-INS come.out-NVIS-PTCP ADL.PROX first} \\
\text{kniga-le tudel čuŋ-naa-l kiejie} \\
\text{book-ACC 3SG read-INCH-GER before} \\
\text{‘Before he begins to read this first book [written] in Tundra Yukaghir, …’}
\]

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 …

\[
\text{wadu-d-aruu-lek pulgej-l’el-je tuŋ el’ill’e} \\
\text{Yukaghir-0-language-INS come.out-NVIS-PTCP ADL.PROX first} \\
\text{kniga-le tittel čuŋ-naa-l-pe-gi-n kiejie} \\
\text{book-ACC 3PL read-INCH-GER-PL-PERT-GEN before} \\
\text{‘Before he begins to read this first book [written] in Tundra Yukaghir, …’}
\]

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.

\(in = ‘(just) as’, ‘as soon as’ is a basic conjunction:

\[(603)\] In jawulγa sayaaŋi Qaalid’e tubegejl’en’ łögitek örtejl’en’.

\[
\text{in jawul-γa sayaa-ŋi qaalid’e tubegej-l’el-i} \\
\text{just.as road-LOC disappear-3PL.INTR Wolf rush.in-NVIS-INTR.3SG}
\]
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* gawd’aa ayaregi čayaa mer amaqaaj.  

*quodeŋ* qawd’aa ayare-gi čayaa mer=amu-o-qaa-j  

‘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 aaweren jabaanul’elŋi.  

*quodeŋ* čii aawe-ŋi taat aawe-reŋ jaba-nu-l’el-ŋi  

‘(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 ejuuudayane tel’iедal’γa mer=at=wie-j.*  

*eu* ejk ewri eguojie al’γaŋ ejuu-l-dayane  

*te*l’i-ed-al’γa mer=at=wie-j.  

*Kurilov and Odé 2012:162*
‘Oh, if only fish got caught tomorrow, we would make yukola.’
(Kurilov 2001:589, ejk ewri)

3.9.2.3 Causal conjunctions

_alyad’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 _alyad’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 _alyad’aa_. That second sentence is introduced by _taatl’er_ ‘therefore’, making any notion of ‘since’ in the preceding sentence superfluous. The only example where _alyad’aa_ arguably acts as a causal conjunction can be found in Kurilov (2006:220):

(607) _Met araad’iwa el mönd’ienund’ey alyad’aa waawačedaruu el kuril’jiije._

_Semyon will not work as a reindeer herdsman because he is too lazy._

Otherwise, the meaning of ‘because’ can be rendered by the expression _quodiir monulγane_ , which literally means ‘if I/you/we say why’, where _quodiir_ means ‘why’ and _monulγane_ 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-γa el=čayad’e-t quodiir monu-γane_

_Semyon will not work as a reindeer herdsman because he is too lazy._

(608b) _Eguoje met čayad’e-l-ηn’ el=uu-te-jeγ_

_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
ileŋ’ arγaa stadanįŋ’ počesejŋa.’

Therefore sovkhoz director say-IMP.SG now MP people

el=pelieŋu taatl’er taat ileŋ’ arγaa stadanįŋ’ 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 muolγa kötkejrelek juoćiįl’elum me marqaan čald’edawure
moojmele! Tadaat, quode l’etem? Me pengeč, qan’γa!

me=quodiik Joqon muolγa kötkej-relek juoćiįl’el-um
EMPH=MP Yokhon muol-LOC reach-ANT glance-NVIS-TR.3SG

me=marqaan čald’ed-awur-le mooj-mele! EMPH=one.GEN hand-bag-FOC.ABS hold-TR.3SG.OF

tadaat quode l’e-te-m. me=pengej-j qan’γa then how be-FUT-TR.3SG PF=return-INTR.3SG ITJ

‘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)

tajullek ‘thereby’, ‘thus’, ‘that’s why’, derived by conversion from the independent form
of the invisible demonstrative tajun and the instrumental case ending –lek:

(611) Taŋ tajullek kuril’inuḷ’elum ten juodayane lukunburube me qanqaaj ten juoda
gane lukunburerebe me pugikieįj.

taŋ tajullek kuril’inuḷ’el-um ten juodayane lukunburube DM thereby know-HAB-NVIS-TR.3SG now apparently land

me=qad’uu-qaa-j ten juodayane lukunburube me=pugie-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 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) *Jalyil puren miraanulya jarqa sisayjal dajdite möğerere mörimen.*

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{jal} & \text{yil} & \text{pure-} & \text{n} & \text{mira-} & \text{nul-yə} \\
\text{lake} & \text{upper.part-PROL} & \text{walk-DUR-GER-1/2SG.DS} & \text{ice} & \text{crack-GER} & \text{as.if} \\
\text{möğer-le} & \text{möri-mey} & \text{noise-FOC.ABS} & \text{hear-TR.1/2.OF} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘When I walked over a [frozen] lake, I heard a sound as if ice was cracking.’

(612b) *Met unumeya ilije keriel dite band’eq.*

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{met} & \text{unume-} & \text{ya} & \text{ilije} & \text{kerie-l} & \text{dite} \\
1SG & \text{ear-LOC} & \text{wind} & \text{fall-GER} & \text{as.if} & \text{be-INTR.1SG} \\
\text{pan-jeq} & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘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’.*

\[
\begin{array}{lllllll}
\text{mit} & \text{čama} & \text{gripp-} & \text{ya} & \text{jamd’} & \text{i-r} & \text{dite} \\
1PL & \text{big} & \text{influenza-LOC} & \text{be.ill-CIRC} & \text{just.as} & \text{ADL.DEM} & \text{old.woman} \\
\text{tuŋ} & \text{apanalaa} & \text{čamayatek} & \text{jamd’} & \text{i-aa-l’el-i} & \text{be.ill-INCH-NVIS-INTR.3SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘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). 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.

*alyad’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’ugun’ 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.

köçejk 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.

quodiik expresses a doubt, assumption, supposition with varying degrees of uncertainty: ‘possibly’, ‘looks like’, ‘probably’, ‘must be’.
quodeŋ can initiate sentences implying that the action expressed in the predicate of the sentence is a forced one or carried out as having no alternative²²⁷.

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.

uguneŋ 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 taŋ, in some idiolects and the deictic particle ten.

ŋodaŋane 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 quodeŋ ‘how’ with the future tense marker is lexicalized as a modal particle quodittuŋq ‘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*[^228] 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[^229].

*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 form 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’ya, derived from the verb qad’uu- ‘to be cold’, is an interjection used to indicate that it is cold.

qaalayajuo, which stems from the qualitative verb qaalu- ‘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).