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4. Syntax

4.1 Noun phrase

4.1.1 Word order

A general principle of the syntax in TY is that a dependent precedes its head\(^{230}\). (614), an elicitation, and (615), a dictionary example taken from field materials, illustrate that the relative order of the dependents in a noun phrase is as follows:

DEM/POSS NUM ADJ HEAD\(^{231}\)

\[(614)\] Tuŋ / Tit jaan n’id’erpe-j uraričiče-peon me=sayane-ŋi.
ADL.PROX / 2PL three.GEN be.new-PTCP teacher-PL PF=sit-3PL.INTR
‘These / Your three new teachers sit.’

\[(615)\] Tuŋ tet pulije el lačinčaa med’uon’.
ADL.PROX 2SG uncle NEG=firewood-NMLZ take-be-INTR.3SG
‘That uncle of yours was born in a place where there wasn’t firewood.’

\[(Kurilov 2001:202, lačinčaa)\]

The dependent of a possessive NP can function as the head of another NP. It is possible to modify the possessee by ADJ and NUM but not by DEM in such constructions:

\[(616)\] Tit n’id’erpe-j uraričiče jaan l’uku uorpe-gi me=juora-na-ni.
2PL be.new-PTCP teacher three.GEN small children-PERT PF=play-DUR-3PL.INTR
‘Three little children of your new teacher are playing.’

If the head of the possessive NP is to be modified by DEM, the relative order of the head and the dependent in a possessive NP is reversed, and the dependent receives the relational suffix –l’e:

\[(617)\] Tuŋ l’uku uorpe tit n’id’erpe-j uraričiče-l’e me=juora-na-ŋi.
ADL.PROX small children 2PL be.new-PTCP teacher-RLN PF=play-dur-3PL.INTR
‘These little children of your new teacher are playing.’

The position of relative clauses is not specifically addressed here because they are normally realized as participles.

Deviations from the basic order of constituents of an NP are possible. They are always ‘in favor’ of POSS, which is placed closer to the head:

\(^{230}\) Only the pronoun enmun ‘every’ (see e.g. (72) in 3.5.8) can follow a noun.

\(^{231}\) ADJ implies here an attributive form of a qualitative verb, e.g. a participle, NUM stands for a word with a numeric meaning, i.e. an attributive form of a quantitative verb, while POSS refers to a pronominal possessor.
(618) Pojuod’e mit sukunyat neme ṭoll’elk el pon’aa.

Pojuol-je mit sukun-γa-t neme ṭoll’elk el=pon’aa
be.numerous-PTCP 1PL thing-LOC-ABL what EMPH NEG=remain[3SG]

‘From our numerous things nothing remained.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:58)

(619) Kin met juödii tuduruul-γane jawnuo juoru-m.

two GEN 1SG eye inner.part-ACC everything DO scratch-TR.3SG

‘[She] scratched the inside of both of my eyes.’

4.1.2 Modification

As follows from the formula for the linear order of the dependents in an NP, the head of
an NP can be modified by a pronoun, an attributively used numeric base, adjective and
participle. Apart from that, it can be modified by another NP, i.e. by a possessor, or a
noun in apposition. Since the other modifiers have already been presented in 4.1.1, only
possessive constructions and cases of apposition are discussed in the following.

4.1.2.1 Possession

The core meanings of possession are ownership, the whole-part relation (including
inanimate possessors such as plants) and the kinship relation (Payne 2007:104,
Aikhenvald 2013:3). In many languages, however, the same construction can cover other
closely related meanings, which can be generally labeled as those of association, e.g.
‘John’s dentist’ (Aikhenvald 2013:4-5). This is true for TY too. Therefore ‘possession’
will serve here as a cover term for a wide range of meanings comparable with those of
the core meanings of possession.

There are three strategies to encode a possessive relation in TY: juxtaposition of
the possessor and the possessum in this order, marking of the possessor with the genitive
case ending –n and marking of the possessum with the pertensive suffix –gi/-da. For non-
human animate possessors all three strategies are available. Thus the NP ‘a trace of a
reindeer’ can be rendered in TY by the following expressions, where ile means ‘reindeer’
and jawul stands for ‘track’:

(620a) ile jawul
reindeer track

(620b) ile-n jawul
reindeer-GEN track

(620c) ile jawul-gi
reindeer track-PERT

The expression in (620b) can also be used non-referentially and thus be translated as ‘a
reindeer track’, or a track with the properties of a reindeer track, which endows the form
ilen with the qualities of a relational adjective (see discussion in 3.3.1.1.5).

Nouns denoting humans in the vast majority of cases enter possessive relations as
possessors according to the schemes in (620a) and (620c):
(621a) Anna Kurilova n’iedi-l-pe
Anna Kurilova narrate-GER-PL
‘Anna Kurilova’s stories’ (the title of Kurilov and Odé 2012)

(621b) tude amaa kerie-γane
3SG.POSS father name-ACC
‘his father’s name’ (Kurilov 2001:282, nides-

(621c) tuŋ apanalaal oo
ADL.PROX old.woman child
‘the son of that old woman’ (Kurilov 2001:227, l’uoriiche

(621d) nimelesiic lejterej-l
writer remind-GER
‘the writer’s reminder’ (Ado 1979:3)

(622a) čii sayane-l-pe-gi (622b) Aluona aduo-gi
people sit-GER-PL-PERT Alyona son-PERT
‘people’s lives’ ‘Alyona’s son’

(622c) Qojl l’ie toile-l-gi (622d) könmel’e-pul l’ie ile-pul-gi
God support-GER-PERT other-PL MP reindeer-PL-PERT
‘God’s support’ ‘others’ reindeer’

Marking of human possessors with the genitive case ending is very rare:

(623a) Tuŋ uo-n kirije Qabanga
ADL.PROX child-GEN name Qabanga
‘This child’s name was Khabanga.’ (Kurilov 2005:192)

(623b) Tidend paijpen kewjejulyan içuonaa’elum.
tidend paipe-n kewej-γol-γa-n içuonaa-l’el-um
ANPH woman-GEN leave-be[GER]-LOC-PROL look-INCH-NVIS-TR.3SG
‘He began to examine [the hole in the tree] through which the woman disappeared.’

Cases of multiple redundancy can be found with human possessors:

(624) qawd’aa Miičee ile-gi-n-da-γane
uncle Miche reindeer-PERT-GEN-PERT-ACC
‘uncle Miche’s reindeer’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:106)

The presence of the genitive case ending in the head in (624) cannot be explained at the moment. There is no head licensing it. The suffix sequence –gi ‘PERT’ + -n ‘GEN’ + -da ‘PERT’ seems to be an idiolectal peculiarity restricted to nouns in object position (–γane ‘ACC’).

Inanimate possessors can be zero-marked:
(625a) urasaα  köjluu-γa-n
cone.shaped.tent hole-LOC-PROL
‘through the holes in the tent’

(625b) čumul’  čieme-k
summer.antlers blood-FOC.ABS
‘blood from the summer antlers’ (Kurilov 2005:126)

Zero-marked dependent inanimate nouns functioning as possessors should not be confused with those serving simply as attributes having essentially converted to relational adjectives:

(626) čuoraske loγorii-le čitne-j saal-γa iire-lelek
cauldron sponge-ACC be.long-PTCP stick-LOC tie-ANT
‘having tied a cauldron sponge to a long stick’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:22)

Inanimate nouns carrying the genitive case ending also more often than not convert to relational adjectives, but can function as possessors as well, especially in cases of embedded possessive constructions (see below). The marking of an inanimate possessor with the pertensive suffix seems to be limited to instances in which postpositions serve as heads:

(627) pure-da-γa
upper.side-PERT-LOC
‘on it’
‘on its upper side’

A possessive relation can be redundantly marked both on the head and on the dependent:

(628) Ow amuγa jewlid’en toyuod’e aruupegi!
ow amuγa jewlid’e-n toyuol-je aruu-pe-γi
ITJ ITJ reindeer.calf be.deep-PTCP voice-PL-PERT
‘Oh, how beautiful the deep voices of the reindeer calves are!’

When a possessive construction is embedded in another possessive construction, a variety of constellations is possible: GEN-0-0 (629a), GEN-GEN-0 (629b), possessive pronoun-0-PERT (629c), ellipsis-PERT-PERT (629d), 0-PERT+GEN-0 (629e, the most frequent strategy) and ellipsis-PERT+GEN-PERT (629f).

(629a) lalime-n  n’oγodayil’  al
sledge-GEN floor.covering lower.side
‘under the floor covering of the sledge’ (Kurilov 2001:33, al)

(629b) laame-n  purie-n  pugil
dog-GEN berry-GEN leaf
‘cowberry leaves’
4.1.2.2 Apposition

In instances of apposition of two nouns, the first of them is normally the dependent:

(630a) Kurilew peldudie
Kurilov old.man
‘the old man Kurilov’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:30)

(630b) Edilwey alajii wadul-ek.
Edilwey Alayee Yukaghir-COP
‘Edilwey was an Alayee Yukaghir.’ (Kurilov 2005:126)

The reverse order is also possible, though:

(631) met očidie Puraama-ya
1SG paternal.uncle Puraama-LOC
‘with my paternal uncle Purama’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:24)

4.1.3 Agreement

The dependent never agrees with its head in the TY noun phrase:

(632) pude l’ej qaaliid’epel
outside be-PTCP be.frightful-PTCP-PL-ACC
‘creatures of the wilderness’

Conversely, the head of a possessive construction exhibits some limited agreement, taking the plural suffix in a possessive construction when the possessor is a 3rd person:
Since this agreement takes place irrespective of the head’s own number, in case of ellipsis of a pronominal possessor it makes alternative interpretations possible:

(634) Ten amaa-pe-gi.

‘This is their father.’ or ‘These are his/their fathers.’

4.1.4 Coordination

Two NPs can be coordinated with the help of the comitative suffix –n’e:

(635) wadul odul-n’e folklore-gi

‘the folklore of the Tundra and Kolyma Yukaghirs’ (the title of Kurilov 2005)

The first of the coordinated NPs can be verbalized and surface as a participle:

(636) wegii-n’e-j köde-k jedej-l

‘[A] team with a sledge appeared’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:122)

Proper nouns are coordinated by the conjunction tadaat ‘and’:

(637) Varvara tadaat Sutawkan

‘Varvara and Sutawkan’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:250)

Coordinated NPs can be simply juxtaposed:

(638) Erime jarqa al’aa-γan!

‘May the snow and ice melt!’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

Attributes of a head of an NP can also be coordinated by a conjunction:

(639) Jaan ejk jelukun uorellek ...

‘After getting three or four children ...’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:154)

Juxtaposition occurs as well:

---

232 This is reminiscent of the situation in Turkish.
In those times our folk had winter and summer clothes.

4.2 Simple sentences

4.2.1 Word order

4.2.1.1 Basic word order

From Krejnič (1968:450) the idealized basic word order of TY can be inducted: SO(X)\[233\]V:

\[(640)\] *Tindaa mit čii qand’el’e lewejl’e sukunn’eŋi.*

then 1PL people cold-RLN summer-RLN clothes-VBLZ-3PL.INTR

‘In those times our folk had winter and summer clothes.’

\[(641)\] *Tidaa tet amaa maarqan čigirči-j apanalaa-k mit-in’ kečimele.*

long.ago 2SG father one.GEN limp-PTCP old.woman-FOC.ABS 1PL-DAT bring-TR.3SG.OF

‘Once, a long time ago your father brought an old lame woman to our place.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:146)

This conclusion needs some consideration. The basic, unmarked word order of a language is determined in what Payne (2007:77) calls ‘pragmatically neutral clauses’. Though admitting that it might not be easy to identify such clauses, Payne (2007:77) suggests that certain clause types have to be excluded from the consideration as a priori not pragmatically neutral. These include – apart from dependent clauses, which in any case cannot be the subject of this section – paragraph-initial clauses\[234\], clauses that introduce participants, interrogative and negative clauses, as well as clearly contrastive clauses (clefts, answers etc.)\[235\]. Additionally, the pattern potentially identifiable as basic in the remaining clause types should recur with some reasonable regularity.

TY allows quite some variation in the word order of major constituents: predicate and core arguments. Establishing a basic order for these is additionally complicated by the pronounced characteristic of TY to omit activated arguments (see 4.2.3.2.1 for examples). For this reason, it is difficult to find sentences with a transitive verb whose full argument structure would be represented overtly making it possible to determine the relative order of the core arguments. Another problem stems from the fact that TY rather favors subordination over coordination. Therefore, sentences which could otherwise be taken as good instantiations of word order templates, have to be discarded. Thus, the

---

233 Temporal adverbials normally occur sentence initially. Other adverbials occupy the position after the object as frequently as in front of it, therefore the sequence S(X)OV could just as well be regarded as the basic word order. In Kurilov’s opinion (personal communication) the word order SO(X)V isn’t, in fact, pragmatically neutral since the immediate preverbal position is focal.

234 This condition would disqualify (641) as a diagnostic sentence.

235 One may wonder how valuable the identification of a basic word order in the remaining clause types is. Moreover, to what extent can it still be regarded as the basic word order in a given language? It is hardly representative statistically, which becomes clear after even a superficial analysis of textual material during a tedious search for ‘suitable’ sentences.
The following sentence would be a good example of a clause with both S and O overtly present and indicate the SOV word order if its two predicates were coordinated. Since, however, its first predicate is realized as a converb, its arguments, the direct objects, belong to that clause, while the subject of the sentence is the only argument of the sentence final intransitive verb, the other clause.

(642) **Edilwey tude gajčieyane abučieyane ubaabarelek me kweč.**

Edilwey 3SG.POSS grandfather-ACC grandmother-ACC kiss-ANT
me=leave-INTR.3SG

‘Edilwey kissed his grandfather and grandmother and left.’ (Kurilov 2005:128)

However, it can be safely stated that TY is basically a verb final language. Both S- (643a) and O-arguments (643b) as well as adjuncts (643c, d) normally precede the predicate.

(643a) **Tudel maarquon’ me=qonyayaj-nun-i.**

3SG only PF=bow-HAB-INTR.3SG

‘He would only bow [to greet].’ (Kurilov 2005:130)

(643b) **Ilele tonaanuj ködek juömele.**

reindeer-ACC drive-DUR-PTCP person-FOC.ABS see-TR.3SG.OF

‘[She] saw a man who was driving reindeer.’ (Kurilov 2005:146)

(643c) **Qad’ir qajčietetegen’ey me kweč.**

grandfather-AUG-COM PF=leave-INTR.3SG

‘And so [she] went with the bear.’ (Kurilov 2005: 144)

(643d) **Lawje-d-ekuu-γa juoraa-nun-d’eli.**

water-0-whole-LOC play-HAB-INTR.1PL

‘We played at an ice-hole.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:20)

A context in which both core arguments are likely to be overtly expressed is one in which one of them is in focus and the other refers to a referent which needs to be (re)activated. Under such circumstances, it can indeed be demonstrated that the basic order of the core arguments and their predicate is SOV:

(644a) **Kin pajpe kin mirije-gi monile-gi anyi-nu-ŋu-mle.**

two.GEN woman two.GEN wife-PERT hair-PERT comb-DUR-PL-TR.3.OF

‘Two women, his two wives, were combing his hair.’ (Kurilov 2005:132)

(644b) **Tadaat aran’n’e-j d’ii enu-leŋ qusad’i-ŋu-te-mle.**

then be.def-DUR people river-FOC.ABS jump.INTR-PL-FUT-TR.3.OF

‘Then deft people would jump over the river.’

Kurilov (2001:526, qusad’i-)
4.2.1.2 Marked word orders

Different deviations from the basic word order can be observed in the recorded material. Most, if not all of them, are in one or another way dictated by pragmatic considerations. Very generally they fall into two groups: left and right dislocation. The reference point of the latter is normally the predicate.

4.2.1.2.1 Right dislocation

Right dislocation affects S, O and peripheral constituents alike. It can be motivated by the desire of the speaker to reactivate a referent, even though it may still be explicitly (645), (646), (650) or implicitly (647), (651) active, or to focalize it\textsuperscript{236} (648) and (649). Right dislocation aiming at a reactivation is sometimes accompanied by a short pause, which is reflected by a comma in writing. Thus it could be interpreted as a kind of afterthought completing the utterance and, hence, have to be taken as an extra-clausal element. Strictly speaking, if this interpretation is correct, such instances of postposed constituents cannot be regarded as instances of deviant word order.

postverbal S:

(645) \textit{Nimedord'a ya quduon' taŋ leml'epulgi.}
\textit{nime-d-ord'a-ya quduol-i taŋ leml'e-pul-gi}  
\textit{house-0-middle-LOC lie-INTR.3SG INVS.DEM boss-PL-PERT}  
\textit{‘In the middle of the house he lay, that chieftain of theirs.’} (A couple of sentences earlier the chieftain was introduced.) (Kurilov 2005:132)

(646) \textit{Awjaayar enmun jerkeje-n-nun-i qajčie.}
\textit{evening every tambourine-VBLZ-HAB-INTR.3SG grandfather}  
\textit{‘They asked grandfather to perform the shamanic rite. It turned out that this boy had fallen ill.) [He] performed the right every night, my grandfather, that is.’}  
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:154)

postverbal O:

(647) \textit{El'uguon ten'i maa-k met-ul}
\textit{MP here wait-IMP.SG 1SG-ACC}  
\textit{‘Just a second, wait for me here, …’} (After being invited to go along.)  
(Kurilov 2005:144)

\textsuperscript{236} According to Kurilov (personal communication) the postverbal position is associated with the pragmatic function of focus and is a purely syntactic means to attach the function of focus to a constituent.
In some instances right dislocation in the preverbal field seems to serve the goal of focalization of arguments. In the following example the subject occurs later in the clause than the peripheral constituent and is arguably the focus of the utterance, which is in this case realized by purely syntactic means:

(652) **Ile-γa-t qawd’a Toŋti kelu-ŋi.**
reindeer-LOC-ABL maternal.uncle Tongti come-3PL.INTR

(A number of people had just been introduced.) ‘My uncle Tongti came from the herd’  
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:30)

4.2.1.2.2 Left dislocation

Left dislocation is meant for topicalization of constituents other than the subject, most typically the direct object as in (653a, b) and for emphasis (654a, b, c):

(653a) **čii-pe-da-γane köde-pul me=pun-l’el-ŋa.**
people-PL-PERT-ACC person-PL PF=kill-NVIS-3PL.TR

‘…, his parents were killed by some people.’ (Kurilov 2005:126)

(653b) **Sukun-pe-da-γane tan kelu-je d’ii me=men-l’el-ŋa.**
thing-PL-PERT-ACC INVS.DEM come-PTCP people PF=take-NVIS-3PL.TR

‘Their property was taken by those intruders.’ (Kurilov 2005:126)
(654a) *Taŋunγane jaŋdepe waaj me kuril’iŋa.*

    taŋun-γane    jaŋde-pe    waaj    me=kuril’iŋa.

    INVS.DEM-ACC    geese-PL    also    PF=know-3PL.TR

    ‘(And that in autumn the weather gets colder every day, you know yourself.) That
    is known to geese too.’

    (Kurilov 1994:9)

(654b) *Oryi oryi kōde-le moŋojd’ii juoŋa-re-j-ŋa,*

    almost    almost    person-ACC    married.woman    end-TRVZ-SEM-3PL.TR

    ‘Old women nearly finished off the man.’ (The person had just been introduced.)

    (Kurilov and Odé 2012:32)

(654c) *Amunŋe uučićjawner?*

    amu-ŋe    uučić-j    jawner

    good.3SG.INTR-ADV    pass-INTR.3SG    everything

    ‘Everything went well, [didn’t it]?’

4.2.1.2.3 Position of question words

An SOV language is expected to place question words in the immediate preverbal position, and this is what one finds in TY:

(655a) *Met emd’e neme-lek puŋuol-d’ii-te-m?*

    1SG    younger.brother    what-INS    rejoce-CAUS-FUT-1SG.ITRG

    ‘How shall I make my younger brother glad?’

(655b) *Qajcie tuŋ kōden saalya tite gitn’er pojuod’e emmurle quodiir kudere-l’elŋu?*

    qajcie    tuŋ    kōden    saalya    tite    gitn’er

    grandfather    ADL.PROX    person-GEN    wood-LOC    why    put-3PL.TR

    ‘Grandfather, why has one put so many antlers on this man’s grave?’

However, this position is not obligatory for question words and they can occupy the clause-initial position or, less frequently, occur clause-medially:

(656a) *Quodiir tet čoŋoje n’aache-s-nu-mek?*

    why    2SG    knife    face-VBLZ-DUR-TR.2SG

    ‘Why are you sharpening your knife?’

(656b) *Abučie quodey čuŋ-nunu-mk taŋ čama ilije-γa med’uol-l’el’d’e jewlid’e-pul?*

    abučie    quodey    čuŋ-nunu-mk    taŋ    čama    ilije-γa

    grandmother    how    count-HAB-TR.2PL    INVS.DEM    big    wind-LOC

    ‘Grandmother, how did you count the reindeer calves born during a storm?’

(657) *Tuŋ uorpe quodiir tite uttejl kitn’er ewriewunŋu?*

    tuŋ    uorpe    quodiir    tite    uttej-l    kitn’er    ewre-nun-ŋu

    ADL.PROX    children    why    so    get.tired-GER    up.to    go-HAB-3PL.ITRG
‘Why have these children been tired by work so much?’

4.2.2 Alignment system

The alignment system is not uniform in TY. The predicate always agrees with the subject (S or A) of the sentence and never with its object, therefore from this perspective the accusative alignment system is present. On the other hand, verbal personal endings differ depending on whether the subject is S or A. Thus there is no formal alignment of the S with A as far as conjugation is concerned. Moreover, there are two agreement patterns for S and three for A, depending on the type of focus expressed in a given sentence (see the paradigms in 3.4.2.1). As for the core arguments, the alignment of a nominal S either with A or O is determined by a pragmatic factor, namely by the focal status of S. If it is in the focus of an utterance and is actually focalized it aligns with the focal(ized) O and differs from A, either under focus or not, thus giving rise to the ergative alignment system. If S is not assigned the pragmatic function of focus it aligns with A and differs from O, which results in the accusative alignment system. Previously, it was believed that the focus opposition was neutralized in negative sentences (Comrie 1992:64, Matić and Nikolaeva 2008:2), which left no room for ergative alignment under negation. Recently this claim was proven incorrect (Schmalz 2012:93-97): the alignment rules are equally applicable in affirmative and in negative clauses (see 5.2.6).

The ergativity split is conditioned not only by information structure of a clause but also by the position of the core arguments in the person hierarchy. Specifically, the 3rd person pronouns disrupt the pragmatically triggered regular alternation between accusative and ergative alignment characteristic of other syntactic classes of core arguments: under focus, the 3rd person pronouns have neutral alignment. If not in focus, the distinction between pronominal and nominal arguments in the 3rd person becomes irrelevant and two alignment patterns can be distinguished depending on whether the subject of the clause is represented by an interlocutor pronoun or a different linguistic item: the neutral pattern and the accusative pattern respectively. Thus, TY not only has split ergativity, it also has split accusativity. What was said above is illustrated below in Tables 4.2.1, 4.2.2 and 4.2.3.

Table 4.2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st person</th>
<th>2nd person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[+foc]</td>
<td>[-foc]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>metek</td>
<td>met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>met</td>
<td>met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>metek</td>
<td>metul/metqane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd person pronominal</th>
<th>[+foc]</th>
<th>[-foc]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>tittel</td>
<td>tittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>tittel</td>
<td>tittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A is 1st or 2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A is 3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A is 1st or 2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A is 3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd person nominal</th>
<th>[+foc]</th>
<th>[-foc]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S ileelen\textsuperscript{237}</td>
<td>ile</td>
<td>ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ile</td>
<td>ile</td>
<td>ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O ilele</td>
<td>ile</td>
<td>ilele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A is 1st or 2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A is 3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These facts are summarized in Table 4.2.4.

Table 4.2.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interlocutor argument</th>
<th>3rd person argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+]</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alignment</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nominal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that in a transitive clause only one of the arguments may potentially follow the ergative alignment pattern since the pragmatic function of focus can be assigned morphologically to one constituent only. The other core argument will necessarily follow the accusative or neutral alignment pattern. Therefore the ergative construction in TY is trans-clausal: the arguments exhibiting the ergative alignment must occur in separate clauses. This analysis might seem unorthodox at first glance, but if one considers that the determination of the alignment system in a language already involves looking across clause boundaries in order to establish what S aligns with, one should not be opposed to recognizing an ergative pattern if all core arguments following it are in different clauses. Since the trans-clausal distribution of case markers displaying the ergative pattern is conditioned by information structure, the phenomenon can be conveniently labeled ‘pragmatic ergativity’, as opposed to morphological, or intra-clausal, ergativity and syntactic, or inter-clausal, ergativity, the two structural ergativity types recognized by Dixon (1994).

In the following the ergative and accusative alignment system of nominal arguments is demonstrated for illustration.

\textsuperscript{237} Ile stands for ‘reindeer’.
- ergative alignment:

focal S

(658) Apanala-ŋ pong’aa-ŋu.
old.woman-PL-FOC.ABS remain-PL-GER.SF
‘Only the old women stayed.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:32)

focal A

(659) El’in tovariščestve-le met amaa wie.
first.ADV association-ACC 1SG father[FOC.ERG] make[AF]
‘First, my father organized the association.’ (Kurilov 2001:589, ejk)

focal O

(660) Tittel buollar lewejmenq aq n’id’ayajl’eld’e sawdayil’ek ojienumjumle.
3PL summer-ADV constantly end-NVIS-PTCP coat-FOC.ABS
‘They constantly wore a worn out coat in summer.’

- accusative alignment:

non-focal S

(661) Puge-če čajle-pe ayuol-ŋi.
be.hot-PTCP day-PL stand-3PL.INTR
‘The days are hot.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:206)

non-focal A and O

(662) Ganja tude amaa-ŋane öníd’e-lek sujdiim-ŋu.
Ganya 3SG.POSS father-ACC clay-INS throw.ITR-DUR-TR.3SG
‘Ganya was throwing clay at his father.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:96)

The alignment principles delineated above are sometimes violated and reliable claims cannot always be made about the reasons for that. A few cases of deviant alignment are presented below.

(663) Id’ire an met-ek qad’ir qoyi-ŋu-be kudiči-nun-ŋu.
now DM 1SG-FOC.ABS DM dig-DUR-NMLZ put.ITR-HAB-1SG.TR
‘And, you see, now I myself put a toothpick next to me.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:46)

238 In lexically modified arguments the focus suffix is usually –k, and not –leŋ.
This sentence has an impossible combination of a transitive verb with a subject formally encoded as an S-argument. The verbal ending also does not show agreement in focus with the subject: the SF verbal ending would be expected given the marking of the S-argument, but the verb is in the BC form that would normally indicate adjunct-focus. The consequence of (663) is that focalized core arguments can follow the neutral alignment system under focus. This entails a descriptive problem: the focus markers are treated here as absolutive case endings since they show an ergative distributional pattern marking S and O. But (663) shows that the focus marker can be used indiscriminately with all core arguments under focus. The consequence of this is that the ergative distributional pattern is not there any longer. How can one speak under such circumstances about the focus markers being absolutive case endings? A potential solution for this problem is a possibility that the sentence is incorrect. Indeed, three informants consulted regarding this sentence rejected it substituting metejlek ‘1SG.EMPH’ (see 3.5.1) or met waaj ‘I too’ for metek. The suggested substitutions are compatible with the rest of the sentence both from the viewpoint of the alignment system and of the agreement system.

Kurilov (personal communication) claims that the accusative ending –le is attached to a non-interlocutor O regardless of the person of the subject.

(664) Met-ek  ile-le  nuu-l.
1SG-FOC.ABS  reindeer-ACC  find-GER.SF

‘It is I who found the reindeer.’

According to the existing descriptions this ending is attached only if the subject is a non-interlocutor. This elicited sentence poses the same problem as (663) and another one, suggesting that nominal non-focal direct objects follow the accusative alignment pattern irrespective of the position of A in the person hierarchy. This contradicts what is reflected in Tables 4.2.3 and 4.2.4. Again, several informants regard the sentence in (664) as ungrammatical. Yet another informant gave controversial judgments on different occasion ranging from rejection to acceptance. In the former case he claimed that the correct sentence would be (665), which is common way to encode a focal A. In the latter case he said that (664) was equivalent to (665).

(665) Ile  met  nuu.
reindeer 1SG[FOC,ERG]  find[AF]

‘It is I who found the reindeer.’

I take these deviant alignment structures as signs of incepting erosion of the focus system in TY, which are especially clearly manifest in younger speakers (see 5.2.8).
4.2.3 Predication types

4.2.3.1 Nonverbal predicates

Nominal, locative and existential predicates are nonverbal in TY. Predication of properties is done by qualitative verbs (but see 4.2.3.1.5). The bulk of nonverbal predicates require a copula device. There are four linguistic devices to form a copular clause: the copula –leŋ or –k as well as the copular verbs yol-, l’e-, and pan-. The terminological distinction made here between ‘copula’ and ‘copular verbs’ is justified by the differences in their behavior on different levels. The copula can have the non-future tense reference only, does not take personal endings and cannot be used if the subject of the copular clause is not in the 3rd person. The plural is denoted only in the predicate noun itself and not in the copula. The copula is suffixed to the predicate noun and forms an integral part of it; no pause is possible between the copula and the predicate. The use of the copular verbs, on the other hand, is not restricted by the person of the subject or the tense frame. They agree with the subject both in person and number attaching regular personal endings of intransitive verbs. It is possible to insert a pause or even a clitic between the predicate nominal and a copular verb. Despite the formal similarities between copular verbs and true verbs, the former are regarded here as forming non-verbal predicates because they are semantically empty.

The copula and the copular verbs occur clause-finally as verbs usually do in TY. Several types of copular clauses can be distinguished.

4.2.3.1.1 Identification: This is R

Identification clauses are characterized by the absence of a subject, an entity is merely recognized as such. Identification clauses are supported by the copula –leŋ/-k and the copular verb yol-, but these devices show partly complementary distribution: in clauses with future tense reference the copular verb is the only option:

(666) Ten nime-leŋ.
      DEIC house-COP
(667) Ten met-ek.
      DEIC 1SG-COP

239 It is necessary to note here that many qualitative verbs seem to require the copular verb yol- in order to be capable of acting as predicates. But the relation between the base and the copular verb in those verbs is different from that between this copular verb and noun predicates, which makes it reasonable to regard adjectival predicates as verbal. See 3.2 for details.

240 The choice of a copula is determined by the internal structure of the respective NP. If its head is not modified in any way, the copula –leŋ is employed. If the head of an NP constituting the predicate of a nonverbal clause is modified lexically or by a derivational morpheme (e.g. by the diminutive suffix), the copula normally surfaces as –k.

241 In this sense the TY copular verbs are unusual as ‘copular verbs tend to be very irregular’ (Payne 2007:117).

242 The designation R is borrowed from Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008:88) where it stands for ‘Subact of Reference’, which is ‘an attempt by the Speaker to evoke a referent’.

243 Ten and an in the illustrating examples are purely deictic element used for pointing at objects being identified and do not fill an argument position. They differ from other deictic devices, demonstrative pronouns, also in that they cannot function as attributes.
‘Here is a house.’  ‘This is me.’ (e.g. on a photo)

(668) *Ten paipə-n mono-k.*  (669) *Ten kejen nime-leŋ*
DEIC woman-GEN cap-COP DEIC previously house-COP
‘Here’s a women’s cap.’  ‘This was a house.’

(670) *An kejen nimeŋon*.  (671) *Ten nimeŋotej*
an kejen nime-ŋol-i ten nime-ŋol-te-j
DEIC previously house-be-INTR.3SG DEIC house-be-FUT-INTR.3SG
‘This was a house.’  ‘This will be a house.’

This distribution of the copular devices is summarized in Table 4.2.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-future tense</th>
<th>Future tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-leŋ/-le(k)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋol-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The deictic particle *ten* often occurs in identification clauses but isn’t obligatory:

(672) *Neme wienuj čiipeleŋ? — Geologpeleŋ*
Neme whe-nu-j čii-ple-ŋ geolog-ple-ŋ
what do-DUR-PTCP people-PL-COP geologist-PL-COP
‘What are [these] people doing?’  ‘[These] are geologists.’
(Kurilov 1994:9)

Nouns functioning as predicates that are overtly marked as possessed must lack the copula, a behavior which can also be observed when the copula is used as the nominal focus marker (see 5.2.1.2).

(673) *Ten amaa-gi.*  (674) *Ten mit uraričiće.*
DEIC father-PERT DEIC 1PL teacher
‘This is his/her father.’  ‘This is our teacher.’

The copular verb is not subject to such a restriction:

(675) *Kakau amaa čulyad’ii ŋoll’en*.  (Kakau amaa čulya-d’ii ŋol-l’el-i)
Kakau father poke-NMLZ be-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘It was father Kakau’s ice-pick’  (Kurilov and Odé 2012:20)

Identification clauses are negated by the regular negative proclitic *el=*

(676) *(Ten) el=ile-leŋ.*

244 A speaker rejected this sentence because of the cognitive contradiction between the proximal value of the particle *ten* and the past tense reference, which is perceived as distant. The particle, which expresses proximity to a lesser degree would be quite felicitous.
(DEIC) NEG=reindeer-COP
   ‘This is not a reindeer.’

4.2.3.1.2 Equation: $R_1$ is $R_2$.

In equation clauses the referents of two NPs are identified with each other. An equation clause has an overt subject NP. They are also supported by both the copula –leŋ/-k and the copular verb ŋol-, having the same temporal scope as in identification clauses:

\[
\begin{align*}
(677) & \quad \text{Tugi}^{245} \text{nime-leŋ.} \\
& \quad \text{ADL.PROX house-COP}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(678) & \quad \text{Tugi kejen nime-leŋ.} \\
& \quad \text{ADL.PROX previously house-COP}
\end{align*}
\]

‘This is a house.’   ‘This was a house.’

\[
\begin{align*}
(679) & \quad \text{Tugi kejen nimeŋon’} \\
& \quad \text{Tugi kejen nime-ŋol-j} \\
& \quad \text{ADL.PROX previously house-be-INTR.3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘This was a house.’

\[
\begin{align*}
(680) & \quad \text{Tugi nime ŋotej.} \\
& \quad \text{ADL.PROX house be-FUT-INTR.3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘This will be a house.’

\[
\begin{align*}
(681) & \quad \text{Tuŋ nime škuola-leŋ.} \\
& \quad \text{ADL.DEM house school-COP}
\end{align*}
\]

‘This house is a school.’

\[
\begin{align*}
(682) & \quad \text{Tudel tetčie-leŋ.} \\
& \quad \text{3SG rich.man-COP}
\end{align*}
\]

‘He is a rich man.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:26)

(683) Roza amaa-gi Aleksej-die ilwiiče-leŋ.  
Roza father-PERT Aleksey-DIM herder-COP
‘Roza’s father, Aleksashka, worked as a herder.’  (Kurilov and Odé 2012:146)

As is stated in footnote 240, the suffix –k is employed when the nominal predicate is modified:

\[
\begin{align*}
(684) & \quad \text{Ed’ilwej alajii wadul-ek.} \\
& \quad \text{Edilwej Alayee Yukaghir-COP}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Edilwey is a Yukaghir from the Alayee clan’  (Kurilov 2005:126)

The same happens if the modification is purely morphological. In the following example an ancient root not easily interpretable synchronically (therefore no detailed gloss) is preceded by the negative clitic $el=$ and possibly the reciprocal clitic $n’i=$.

\[
\begin{align*}
(685) & \quad \text{Ed’ilwej eln’iimije-k} \\
& \quad \text{Edilwey orphan-COP}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Edilwey is an orphan, …’  (Kurilov 2005:126)

The copula –k is also used when the predicate is a compound noun:

\[
\begin{align*}
(686) & \quad \text{Neme-leŋ  čaaqii-nu-meŋ} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[245\] Some speakers do not accept this kind of clauses and replace tugi by ten. They obviously perceive them as identification clauses and resort to the deictic particle.
Nonverbal clauses can be quite complex in written TY.

(687) Čiŋŋ amutneŋ el kuril’iime, el mörime, tan učuonajpe amutneŋ el uraričuol tadaate el d’anjet n’imelesuol juorpure en’nuj maarqan omopegi wadulpeley.

‘Yukaghirs are one of the peoples living in the tundra, about who people hardly know or have heard anything and who has poorly been studied and described by scientists.’ (Kurilov 2000:7)

Nominal predicates encoded without a copula are common when naming referents:

(688) Met kirije N’iraqa.

‘My name is Nyirakha.’ (Kurilov 1991:38)

Compare (688) with (689), where the predicate is a common noun and the copula is obligatory.

(689) Alajip Muoqatke jalyilen

‘Alayip Muokhatke is a lake, …’ (Kurilov 2001:272, muoqan’-)

The omission of the copula in (688), as opposed to (689), marks the distinction between specification and characterization (Hengeveld 1992:82-89).

Equation clauses with referential nouns as predicates are formed in the same way as those with non-referential noun predicates.

(690a) Taŋ köde uraričiuče ƞon’.

‘That man is a teacher.’

(690b) Taŋ köde n’id’erpej uraričiuče ƞon’.

‘That man is the new teacher.’
As is apparent from the examples, the verbal focus marker, the proclitic *me(r=)*, is omitted in nominal predicates supported by the copular verb. However, the proclitic is compatible with nominal predicates and fulfills pragmatic functions (see 5.2.3).

The alternative use of the copula and copular verb can in an appropriate context bring about a semantic difference. While (691a) is a categorical statement not allowing any doubts, (691b) implies that the subject referent does not consider himself Yukaghir although he has Yukaghirs among his ancestors:

(691a) *Tudel* wadu-*lej*.  
     3SG Yukaghir-COP  
     ‘He is Yukaghir.’

(691b) *Tudel* wadul *yon*.  
     3SG Yukaghir be-INTR.3SG  
     ‘He is Yukaghir.’

Negation of the copular verb *yol-* is achieved by the use of the negative proclitic *el=*, which is employed in this function with verbal clauses too:

(692) *Ukul’e, tet metul akaa el monl’ek, ten met tetqa el akaa yol’ej*.  
     *ukul’e* tet met-ul akaa el=mon-l’ek  
     Akulina 2SG 1SG-ACC elder.brother NEG=say-PROH.SG  
     ten met tet-qa el=akaak yol’ej  
     DM 1SG 2SG-LOC NEG=elder.brother be-INTR.1SG  
     ‘Akulina, don’t you call me [your] elder brother; I am not your elder brother.’

Again, if the predicate noun is overtly marked as having entered a possessive relation, there is no copular device:

(693a) *Semien* el=tet akaa.  
     Semyon NEG=2SG elder.brother  
     ‘Semyon isn’t your elder brother.’

(693b) *Tuŋ saal čupče adpanalaa saal*.  
     *tuŋ* saal čupče-n-d adpanalaa saal  
     ADL.PROX wood Chukchi-gen-0 old.woman wood  
     ‘This grave is an old Chukchi woman’s grave.’

The suffix deriving relational adjectives produces the same effect:

(694) *Jarqa dite n’aawe-j ile-pe wadul-pe-l’e*.  
     ice like be.white-PTCP reindeer-PL Yukaghir-PL-RLN  
     ‘Reindeer white as ice belong to the Yukaghirs.’  
     (Kurilov and Odé 2012:176)

4.2.3.1.3 Existence (*There is R*) and Location (*R*₁ is at *R*₂)

Existential and locative clauses make use of the same linguistic means, namely of another copular verb, *l’e-* . An important difference between the two types of clauses is that existential clauses may be analyzed as lacking a subject and merely asserting the
existence of an entity that is not presupposed. Locative clauses always have a subject with a presupposed referent, whose location is asserted. One of the important pragmatic functions of existential clauses is to open a narrative as in (695a, b) or introduce a new participant into the discourse as in (696).

(695a) *N’id’anmijil’-pe-k l’e-ŋu-l*

\[\text{brothers-PL-FOC.ABS be-PL-GER}\]

‘There were two brothers, …’ (Kurilov 1991:30)

(695b) *Eln’iimije wadulpe l’iel’elŋi.*

\[\text{eln’iimije wadul-pe l’e-l’el-ŋi}\]

‘There lived Yukaghirs, which were orphans.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:182)

Existential clauses may contain a location. The crucial distinction between such existential clauses and locative clauses is that in the former the location is often, as in (696), though possibly not always, part of the presupposition, while the entity whose existence is asserted is never presupposed. In other words, in existential clauses the theme expression (in terms of Dryer (2007:241)) is in focus, not the location, which is reflected in a corresponding focus agreement ending of the copular verb, making expressions in (696) and (697a, b) formally distinct constructions: existential and locative, respectively.

(696) *Tadaat l’ie stada-ŋin’ počesej-ŋa met-qane. Tadaa stada-ŋa*

\[\text{then MP herd(Russ) bring-3PL.TR 1SG-ACC there hear(Russ)-LOC}\]

\[\text{met brigadier Kurilov Ivan Vasil’evič l’e-l.}\]

1SG team-leader Kurilov Ivan Vasilyevich be-GER.SF

‘Then [one] sent me to the herd. There, in the herd, there was my team-leader, Kurilov Ivan Vasilyevich.’

Locative nonverbal clauses locate a presupposed entity in space without the help of a lexical verb:

(697a) *Met taymigi pude l’e-jeng*

\[\text{1SG then outside be-INTR.1SG}\]

‘At that moment I was outside, …’ (Kurilov 2006: 209)

(697b) *Tuustaaq Sien ųod’e poselokqa l’ukuče l’e-jey.*

\[\text{Tuustaaq Sien ųol-reny poselok-qa l’ukuče l’e-jey}\]

\[\text{Tustakh Sien be-SIM settlement(Russ)-LOC a.little be-INTR.1SG}\]

‘Then I lived for a while in the settlement Tuustakh-Sien.’

Interrogative location clauses are special in the sense that they are formed with the help of the interrogative copula *qoll’e*, which is most probably the result of amalgamation of the question word *qada* ‘where’ and the copular verb *l’e-.*

(698) *Saand’awjii qoll’e dajinne?*
4.2.3.1.4 Possession: \( R_1 \) has \( R_2 \) or \( R_1 \) is of \( R_2 \) / \( R_1 \) belongs to \( R_2 \)

Apart from the verbal clauses whose predicate is derived from nouns by the verbalizing suffix \(-n'e\) (see 3.4.1.4), possession can be expressed by non-verbal predicates. The majority of possessive clauses with non-verbal predicates are of two types. The formation of the first type of possessive clauses involves a locative construction. The possessor behaves as if it was a location, constituting together with the copular verb \( l'e\)- the predicate, and the possessum, if overtly present, is the subject of the clause:

(699a) Tadaat buollar ise titqa me l’iel’eltej.

\[ \text{then MP(Yak) MP(Yak) 2PL-LOC PF=be-NVIS-FUT-INTR.3SG} \]

‘But then, maybe you have it.’

(699b) Met-qa legul (me)=l’e-j.

\[ \text{1SG-LOC food (PF)=be-INTR.3SG} \]

‘I have food.’

In the second type of possessive clauses the possessum is also the subject, but the predicate does not employ a copular device and consists only of an independent possessive pronoun denoting the possessor:

(700a) Tuŋ nime met-l’e.

\[ \text{ADL.PROX house 1SG-RLN} \]

‘This house is mine.’

(700b) Tugi tudel’e.

\[ \text{ADL.PROX 3SG-RLN} \]

‘This is his.’

Additionally, TY has a strategy for expressing possession which is characteristic for Turkic languages. The possessive relation is encoded in a possessive construction whose head is the subject of an existential non-verbal clause:


\[ \text{why kill-DUR-TR.2SG DEIC 1PL food PF=be-INTR.3SG} \]

‘Why are you slaughtering [a reindeer]? Here, we have food. (Our food exists.)’

(Kurilov 2001:227, \( l'e\)-)

4.2.3.1.5 Qualification: \( R \) has a property \( T \)^246

As stated in 4.2.3.1, encoding properties in predicates follows the pattern of verbal predicates. This is not the only strategy: the lexeme expressing a property can form a

---

^246 The letter \( T \) stands for ‘Subact of Ascription’ (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008:88), which is ‘an attempt by the Speaker to evoke a Property’.
compound with the word *sukun* ‘thing’ and be predicated with the help of the copular verb *ŋol-* (see also 711)\(^{247}\).

\(\text{(702)}\) \text{Taŋnigi nimepegi jukurukun *ŋoll’en*.} \\
\text{taŋnigi nime-pe gi juku-sukun *ŋol-l’el-i*} \\
\text{then house-PL-PERT small-thing be-NVIS-INTR.3SG} \\
‘At that time their tent was small.’

Some of the meanings are covered by the copular verb *pan*–:

\(\text{(703)}\) \text{N’iruonban yan n’amiidamunden’uo.} \\
\text{n’iruon-ban-γ an n’amiil-n-d-amun-den’uo} \\
\text{separately-be-JUSS neck-GEN-0-bone-EMPH} \\
‘Let the neck vertebrae also be separate.’

The clause in (703) presents a transition to comparative clauses described below.

\(\text{4.2.3.1.6 Comparison: R is so}\)

This very general, trivial indeed, formulation of the function fulfilled by comparative clauses is chosen because the copula *pan*–, specialized in these clauses, forms predicates with nouns and adverbs alike. In (703), which could be taken as an instance of comparative clauses, it predicates the adverb *n’iruon* ‘separately’. Another adverb commonly associated with this copula is *taat* ‘so:

\(\text{(704)}\) \text{Tan id’ie l’ie el=taat ban, jawnuo me=čuy-nun-γa.} \\
\text{and now MP NEG=so be everything.DO PF=count-HAB-3PL.TR} \\
‘Nowadays it isn’t like that, one counts everything.’

Such expressions with *pan*– can be taken as compounds, a fact which is sometimes reflected in writing:

\(\text{(705)}\) \text{Tadaat l’ie mono-pul-gi bukatyn wiede-ban-i.} \\
\text{then MP cap-PL-PERT completely another.ADV-be-INTR.3SG} \\
‘Back then, caps were quite different.’

The copular verb *pan*– interacts with the word *jöke* ‘far’, which functions as an adverbial, but is, in fact, a noun, since it can be inflected for spatial cases:

\(\text{(706)}\) \text{Nime-pul n’aŋał’aruul jöke ban-i.} \\
\text{house-PL interval far be-INTR.3SG} \\
‘The houses are situated far from one another.’ \(\text{(Kurilov and Odé 2012:58)}\)

\(^{247}\) This is a wide spread construction. It can be used also with attributive forms of action verbs:

\(\text{(707)}\) \text{Nasiilej ann’e-j-rukun} \\
\text{with.difficulty(Russ) speak-PTCP-thing} \\
‘He speaks with difficulty.’
With nouns serving as a standard for comparison, the copular verb *pan-* is normally associated via the adverb *dite* ‘like’:

(708a) *Anme samolet seruge dite ban-i.*

just airplane(Russ) drone like be-INTR.3SG

‘It is just like the drone of an airplane.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:58)

(708b) *Tet Nataša dite ban-i.*

‘[He] was like your Natasha.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:150)

4.2.3.1.7 Compatibility of nonverbal predicates with TAM markers.

It is often a characteristic of nonverbal predicates that the range of TAM markers they are compatible with is narrower than that of verbal predicates. From some of the examples above it is apparent that the only true temporal affix of TY, the suffix –*t*, is readily compatible with nonverbal predicates. These can attach aspectual markers as well. In (709) the habitual aspect suffix indicates that the pike catch is abundant if one applies a certain fishing technique.

(709) *Aμutνeγ pojuod’e li’e umuje ȵolunui*.248

be.good.INTR.3SG-ADV be.numerous-PTCP MP pike be-HAB-INTR.3SG

‘There is really much pike normally.’

Nonverbal predicates can interact with the inchoative. The copular verb *ŋol-* acquires the meaning ‘to become’ in this event:

(710) *Tuŋ körel örn’e-reŋ quore-reŋ me nayaal’en’ taŋ nayadayya lukumburebe jawner köd’e ȵolaal’en’*.248

ADL.PROX devil cry-SIM scream-SIM PF=fall.down-NVIS-INTR.3SG

fall.down-3SG.DS ground everything worm be-INCH-NVIS-INTR

‘That devil cried, screamed and fell down. When he fell down the whole ground turned into worms.’

In (711) the non-visual mood suffix accompanies successively the verbal and the nonverbal predicate.

---

248 The choice of the copular verb *ŋol-*., used in identification and equation clauses, is unexpected here because the pike is already identified in the immediately preceding discourse and it is the only fish species that is spoken about. In this context the sentence can be interpreted only as existential one, asserting the existence of the known referent under given circumstances. Existential clauses require the copular verb *l’e-*.

Informants have divided opinions about the grammaticality of this sentence.
The combination of the non-visual and future tense suffix in (47) expresses the belief on the part of the speaker that a fish sort is found in the reservoir spoken about. With verbal predicates, the combination of these suffixes also has epistemic value.

Apart from the non-visual mood, the copular verb $\eta ol$- is compatible with the desiderative mood suffix:

(713) *Met doktor $\eta ol$aalbud'ęŋ.*

met doktor $\eta ol$-aa-l-bun'-jeŋ

1SG doctor be-INCH-GER-DES-INTR.1SG

‘I wish to become a doctor.’ (Kurilov 1994:43)

4.2.3.2 Verbal predicates

Verbal predicates in TY are very clearly divided into intransitive and transitive. The clarity of the division stems not only from the capacity of transitive verbs to take direct objects that are marked as such with the accusative case ending, or from the number of the arguments possible, but also from the existence of the distinct conjugational paradigms for transitive and intransitive verbs (see 3.4.2.1).

As is not uncommon cross-linguistically, predicates represented by intransitive verbs can be further subdivided into groups according to different (sets of) criteria. Thus, for instance, there are five subgroups of intransitive verbs according to their semantics: intransitive action verbs, qualitative, quantitative, denominal and deictic verbs. These groups of verbs exhibit also other differences from each other, apart from the obvious semantic one (see 3.4.1 for details). Highly important for communicative purposes is the subgroup of denominal intransitive verbs that express possession.

Another important division that can be made with respect to intransitive predicates is purely syntactic in nature: argument taking predicates and zero-place predicates. TY grammar allows ditransitive predicates, which form a subgroup of predicates represented by transitive verbs.

One encounters discrepancies in TY between the expected argument structure and the (in)transitivity of a verb, which can be classified as instances of semi-transitivity in TY, in terms of Dryer (2007:270-274). Semi-transitive clauses display mixed properties of intransitive and transitive clauses. The nuclei of semi-transitive clauses belong to two uneven groups. Only a handful of them are determined lexically, e.g. the verbs $mon$- ‘to
say’, čuŋde- ‘to think’, juɔŋaj- ‘to finish’. The whole rest of the semi-transitive clauses are conditioned by negation, information structure or presence of detransitivizing suffixes (e.g. the desiderative suffix), thus grammatically.

4.2.3.2.1 Intransitive vs. transitive predicates

The main general difference between intransitive and transitive predicates lies in the capability of the latter to take more than one argument. Thus, in (714) the only further participant apart from that of the primary one, or the S-argument, can be an adjunct.

(714) 
Maarqad’eŋ waaweče-p-leŋ mit-qa kel-ŋu-l.

once Russian-PL-ABS.FOC 1PL-LOC come-PL-GER.SF

‘Once Russians came to us.’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

In (715), on the other hand, whose predicate is represented by a transitive verb, two arguments are present, the pronominal subject and two objects, explicitly marked as such.

(715) 
Tittel qajl’pele tadaat gaz ɣod’erukune wanjčinųŋa.

tittel qajl’-pe-le tadaat gaz ɣol-je-sukun-le wanjči-nun-ŋa

3PL stone-PL-ACC and gas(Russ) be-PTCP-thing-ACC look.for-HAB-3PL.TR

‘They search for stones and the so-called gas.’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

Arguments denoting activated referents can be and often are omitted. This may make them look like zero-argument predicates but they still crucially differ from those in that it is possible to supplement them with their arguments whereas zero-argument predicates can under no circumstances take overt NPs as arguments. The predicates of the two last finite clauses in (716) are stripped of their subjects, whose referents are known.

(716) 
Waawečepe keweŋnudaya met wal’ben’eŋ Mejqejn’ęŋ geolog ɣoldeŋ juorajli. […] Geologe dite jokd’ie ayuod’e monqajniŋ. […] Mejqej ɣaŋ gaz lačilya ɬolyasut mondelek ewresuol čaajnikki, lawjen’iireŋ eluojij. Iral’an!’

waaweče-pe keweŋ-ȵu-l-da-ya met wal’be-n’ęŋ Mejqej-n’ęŋ

gaz lačilya ɬolyasut mondelek ewresuol čaajnikki, lawjen’iireŋ eluojij. Iral’an!’

Russian-PL leave-PL-GER-PERT-LOC 1SG friend-COM Meykhey-COM

geolog ɣol-ren ɣorua-jli.
geolog-PL like far-DIM stand-PTCP knoll-DAT

Mejqej ɣaŋ gaz lačilya ɬolyasut mon-relek ewre-s-uol

Mejqej INV.S.DEM gas fire-LOC boil-CAUS-FUT[1SG] say-ANT go-CAUS-be[GER]

čaajnik-gi lawje-n’-ii-ren eluojij-ji. iral’al-i

tea.pot-PERT water-VBLZ-CAUS-SIM carry-1PL.TR be.heavy-INTR.3SG

‘When the Russians left, I played geologists with my friend Meykhey. […] [Just] like geologists, [we walked] to a knoll standing pretty far away. […] We dragged along Meykhey’s tea-pot full of water about which he had said, ‘I will cook on the fire of that gas’. [It] was heavy!’

(Kurilov 1994:9-10)

---

249 The two latter verbs take clauses and not NPs as their semantic O-arguments.
After the protagonists of this children’s story, the narrator and his friend Meykhey, have been introduced into the discourse as a group, they do not surface in the following sentences as long as they are considered by the narrator as identifiable, except in the verbal ending, as the subject of the transitive verb *eluoi*- ‘to carry’. In the concluding clause the tea-pot is only implied as the only argument of the intransitive verb *iral’al*- ‘to be heavy’.

In (717) both arguments of a transitive verb are omitted:

(717)  
\[ Qad’ir \, me=kewrej-m. \]
\[ DM \, PF=carry.away-TR.3SG \]
‘("I will take with me only the old woman. Where is her son?’ A young man stepped forward and said, ‘Here am I.’ Edilwey said, “You too, take the reindeer and clothes. If you don’t mind, I would like to take you with me.” – “Why should I mind, I’d rather be glad.”) So [he] took [them] away.’ (Kurilov 2005:158)

4.2.3.2.2 Subgroups of intransitive predicates

As stated in 4.2.3.2, intransitive verbs can be divided into five groups according to the lexical meaning of the verbs functioning as their predicates. The verbs belonging to the first group predicate actions. Within this subgroup, TY does not make a distinction between stative and dynamic verbs based on the notion of greater or lesser agentivity of the subject referent. Neither does the volitionality of the action play any role, therefore the general cover term ‘action intransitive verbs’ for this subgroup. (718a) and (718b) illustrate this point.

(718a)  
\[ Akaagi \, tite \, jaqtaal’en’. \]
\[ akaa-gi \, tite \, jaqte-aa-l’el-i \]
elder.brother-PERT \, so \, sing-INCH-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘The elder brother began to sing like that.’

(718b)  
\[ Nimepegin \, saal \, in’uor \, purepeda \, kerie-l’en’. \]
\[ nime-pe-gi-n \, saal \, in’uor \, pure-pe-da-γa \, kerie-l’el-i. \]
house-PL-PERT-GEN \, stick \, even \, upper.part-PL-PERT-LOC \, fall.down-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘Suddenly the carrying poles of their house fell down on them.’

The verbs belonging to the two following semantic subgroups of intransitive verbs predicate qualities and quantities respectively:

(719)  
\[ Sukungi \, nemegi \, jawner \, amuoll’en’. \]
\[ sukun-gi \, neme-gi \, jawner \, amuo-l’el-i \]
clothes-PERT \, what-PERT \, everything \, be.good-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘Her garments, just everything was beautiful.’

(720)  
\[ Met \, laame \, imdald’an’, \, tan \, tetl’e? \]
\[ met \, laame \, imdald’al-i \, tan \, tet-l’e \]
1SG \, dog \, be.five-INTR.3SG \, and \, 2SG-RLN
‘I have five dogs, and you?’ (Kurilov 2001:95, *imdald’an’*)
The morphosyntactic distinctions between these three semantic groups of intransitive verbs are presented in 3.4.1.

A very important subgroup of intransitive clauses is that derived from nouns. They predicate e.g. the possession of the referent of the verbalized noun to the subject referent. The derivational device of these ‘verbs of possession’ is homophonous to the comitative suffix –n’e:

\[(721) \text{Met } ta'yn'e \text{ law-re ise } mer=at=uo-n’e-je.\]

\[1SG \text{ INVSD.EVM } \text{drink-COND MP PF= POT=child-VBLZ-INTR.1SG}\]

‘If I drink this I might have children.’

The last group of intransitive verbs is represented by the deictic verb (see 3.4.1.5 for details).

While transitive predicates can have more than one argument, intransitive predicates can have less than one argument in TY, or, in other words, be zero-argument predicates. The conjugational ending of the verb in such a predicate does show agreement with 3SG and could thus be said to have a syntactic subject on that level but unlike other intransitive verbs it can never be actually supplied with an overt NP in the subject position.

As might be expected, zero-place predicates are typically represented by verbs describing some atmospheric phenomena:

\[(722a) Tu'yn wal’ avjaayandeŋ jukuq'co tuwen’iel’elde id’igojgiden ise mer at amuč.\]

\[tu'yn wal’ avjaayandeŋ jukuq'co tiwe-n’e-l’el-re id’igojgiden\]

\[ADL.PROX instead.of yesterday a.little rain-VBLZ-NVIS-COND in.the.morning\]

\[ise mer=at=amuo-j\]

\[MP PF=POT=be.good-INTR.3SG\]

‘If instead of that it had rained yesterday, the weather would possibly improve in the morning.’

(Kurilov 2001:462)

\[(722b) Tuŋ čaje-ya quode-ban? — Mer=erin’e-j.\]

\[ADL.PROX day-LOC how-be[3SG.ITRG] PF=thaw-INTR.3SG\]

‘How is [the weather] today?’

‘[It] is thawing.’

(Kurilov 2001:604, erin’e-)

4.2.3.2.3 Ditransitive predicates

Ditransitive predicates allow, as the name suggests, two arguments apart from the subject (A-argument): the direct (T-argument) and indirect object (R-argument). The indirect object/R is encoded, as may be expected, with the dative case. The T-argument is marked depending on its pragmatic status either by the accusative or the absolutive case.

\[(723) Taŋ kewejnaadaya amaapulgi tuŋ wolmeŋin’ tideŋ čagad’ejuoldaya ten mitin’ ködlelek me čagad’ej monur me wolmewej monur taŋ ködeŋin’ kin ilek tadil’elmele.\]

\[taŋ kewej-naa-l-daya amaapul-gi tuŋ wolme-ŋin’ tideŋ čagad’e-ŋol-daya\]
‘When he was leaving, their father gave two reindeer to the shaman for his coming to them, for his work, the exorcism.’

4.2.3.2.4 Discrepancies between the (in)transitivity of a predicate and argument structure

There are two main types of semi-transitive clauses in TY. Those of the first type are characterized by the combination of a formally intransitive verb (it can be intransitive either primarily like the verb \(\text{mon-} \) ‘to say’ and a few other or detransitivized in a certain grammatical context) with two core arguments. Moreover, the direct object of such an intransitive verb can have an overt accusative case ending if the conditions for that are met (see 3.3.1.1.2). The grammatically conditioned predicates of semi-transitive clauses are found in the context of negation when no core argument is under focus:

\[
(724) \quad \text{Mit } \text{čii } \text{wiedeŋ } \text{an’aanul’elŋi } \text{waawečedaruule } \text{el } \text{kuril’iŋu.}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mit} & \quad \text{čii} & \quad \text{wiedeŋ} & \quad \text{an’e-nu-l’el-ŋi} \\
\text{1PL} & \quad \text{people} & \quad \text{another} & \quad \text{speak-DUR-NVIS-3PL_INTR} \\
\text{waaweče-n-d-aruu-le} & \quad \text{el=kuril’iŋu} \\
\text{Russian-GEN-0-language-ACC} & \quad \text{NEG=know-3PL}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Our people pronounced [it] differently; they did not speak Russian.’

Semi-transitive predicates also obtain when a grammatical affix with a subsidiary detransitivizing function is attached, e.g. the desiderative suffix \(\text{bun’-} \).

\[
(724) \quad \text{Ilije } \text{köde-le } \text{nayate-l-bun’-i.}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wind} & \quad \text{person-ACC} & \quad \text{blow.down-GER-DES-INTR.3SG} \\
\text{waaweče-n-d-aruu-lek} & \quad \text{Russian-GEN-0-language-INS}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The wind wants to blow one down.’

The subclass of the lexically determined semi-transitive predicates is confined to the verb \(\text{mon-} \) ‘to say’:

\[
(725) \quad \text{Mit } \text{moŋo } \text{malaqaqaj } \text{monnumŋi } \text{waawečed aruulek.}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mit} & \quad \text{moŋo} & \quad \text{malaqaqaj} & \quad \text{moŋ-nun-ŋi} & \quad \text{waaweče-n-d aruu-lek} \\
\text{1PL} & \quad \text{cap} & \quad \text{malakhay} & \quad \text{say-HAB-3PL_INTR} & \quad \text{Russian-GEN-0 language-INS}
\end{align*}
\]

‘One calls our caps “malakhay” in Russian.’

Semi-transitive clauses of the second type contain predicates which are formally transitive verbs. The deviation does not affect the number of the core arguments but has to do with their formal properties. Since focalization triggers application of the ergative

---

\[250\] According to Kurilov (2006:161) transitive verbs do not undergo detransitivization in the desiderative mood, but many speakers, including Kurilov (personal communication) do detransitivize in this grammatical context in spontaneous speech.
alignment system to the focal core argument (see 4.2.2), constellations arise of an A-argument in the nominative combined with an O-argument in the absolutive case or of an A-argument in the ergative co-occurring with the O-argument in the accusative case. A true transitive clause must, however, contain either an O-argument in the accusative or an A-argument in the ergative. Therefore the former constellation (nominative + absolutive) classifies as a pragmatically conditioned instance of clausal semi-transitivity, while the latter one (ergative + accusative) could be more appropriately labeled as 'super-transitive', if A-arguments in the ergative differed formally from A-arguments in the nominative.

Apart from these discrepancies, which are in themselves regular and do not contradict the TY grammar, there are also such that are best understood as signs of the focus system being unstable, because they do reflect contradictory constellations. In the following example, for instance, the interrogative pronoun functioning as the semantic A-argument of a transitive verb displays the absolutive case ending, available only for focal S- and O-arguments. The verb itself is in a form characteristic for the \( \text{AF} \) pattern and has a direct object in the overtly marked accusative. Thus (726) presents an ‘impossible’ combination of formal properties of the predicate and one of its arguments.

(726)  \textit{Tet kewej\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma kinek endiit titte\textgamma\textgamma.}
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{tet} & kewe\text{-}\textgamma j\textgamma n-e\textgamma k & en\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma-t & tittel\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
2SG & leave-GER-1/2SG.DS & who-FOC.ABS & be.alive-CAUS-FUT[AF]
\end{tabular} \quad 3PL-ACC

‘If you leave, who will provide for them?’

This kind of deviation is especially characteristic of the question word ‘who’ functioning as subject. Some more examples of the alignment principles being violated are presented in 4.2.2 and occur throughout the text of the grammar.

4.2.4 Sentence types

In TY several types of sentences can be distinguished: declarative, interrogative, imperative (including hortative and jussive) as well as exclamative.

4.2.4.1 Declarative sentences

The main function of declarative sentences is to assert something. Depending on the focus type there can be 6 morpho-syntactic patterns of declarative sentences: predicate focus (intransitive verb), predicate focus (transitive verb), S-focus, A-focus, O-focus and X-focus. They are illustrated in the following examples

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\text{predicate focus (intransitive verb):} & \text{predicate focus (transitive verb):}
\end{tabular}

(727)  \textit{Met me kewe\texttextgamma\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma.}
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{met} & me=kewe\text{-}\textgamma j\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
1SG & PF=leave-INTR.1SG
\end{tabular}

\textit{‘I am leaving.’} (Kurilov 2005:144)

(728)  \textit{Lawje\texttextgamma\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma\textgamma le mer=uu-se-m.}
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{Lawje-le} & mer=uu-se-m.
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{water-ACC} & PF=go-CAUS-TR.3SG
\end{tabular}

‘She brought the water away.’ (Kurilov 2005:144)
S-focus:

(729)  
\[ \text{Tadaa ĺupće-p-lej} \quad \text{l’e-ŋu-l.} \]
\[ \text{there Chukchi-PL-ABS.FOC} \quad \text{be-PL-GER.SF} \]
\[ \text{‘Chukchis lived there.’} \]
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:24)

A-focus:

(730)  
\[ \text{Metqane ilije uusaanun.} \]
\[ \text{met-γane ilije uuse-nun} \]
\[ 1SG-ACC \quad \text{wind[FOC,ERG]} \quad \text{carry.away-HAB[AF]} \]
\[ \text{‘The wind carries me around.’} \]
(Kurilov 2005:242)

O-focus:

(731)  
\[ \text{Lawjeme surun’e-j ličuorke-k pun’-ŋu-mle.} \]
\[ \text{late.autumn.ADV} \quad \text{fat-PTCP} \quad \text{femail.reindeer-ABS.FOC} \quad \text{kill-PL-TR.3.OF} \]
\[ \text{‘In late autumn one would slaughter a fat female reindeer.’} \]
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:176)

X-focus:

(732)  
\[ \text{Tet qawd’a-γa-t kuril’ič-ŋa.} \]
\[ 2SG \quad \text{uncle-LOC-ABL} \quad \text{ask-3PL.TR} \]
\[ \text{‘One asked your uncle.’} \]
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:176)

Verbal predicates in negated declarative sentences – except those whose subjects are in the 3rd person; they carry a zero personal ending – follow the conjugational pattern of intransitive verbs under predicate focus. This kind of detransitivisation does not occur in sentences with a focal direct object (see 5.2.6). The negation is conveyed by the proclitic \emph{el=}:

(733)  
\[ \text{El=möri.} \]
\[ \text{NEG=hear[3SG]} \]
\[ \text{‘She does not listen.’} \]
(Kurilov 2005: 144)

(734)  
\[ \text{Ta} \quad \text{γi el=amuo-nun.} \]
\[ \text{INVS.DEM} \quad \text{NEG=be.good-HAB[3SG]} \]
\[ \text{‘That is not good.’} \]

(735)  
\[ \text{Elen’. El=kuril’ii-jey mon-i.} \]
\[ \text{neg=know-INTR.1SG} \quad \text{say-INTR.3SG} \]
\[ \text{‘No. I don’t know,’ he says.} \]
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:20)

(736)  
\[ \text{Tet mod’ek učuonajpe nemen end’erukune el nuuŋu lejtejmen’.} \]
\[ \text{tet mon-jek učuonaj-pe neme-n en’je-sukun-le} \]
\[ 2SG \quad \text{say-INTR.2SG} \quad \text{scientist(Russ)-PL} \quad \text{what-GEN} \quad \text{be.alive-PTCP-thing-ACC} \]
\[ \text{el=nuuŋu lejtej-men’} \quad \text{recall-TR.1/2SG.OF} \]
\[ \text{NEG=find-PL[3]} \]

\[ 251 \text{ Note that the focal argument of the verb ‘recall’ is a whole clause.} \]
‘You said that scientists had not discovered any living entities [in space]. That I recalled.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:48)

4.2.4.2 Interrogative sentences

Interrogative sentences focusing on peripheral constituents can have finite verb forms with a specific conjugational paradigm (see 3.4.2.1), e.g. in the 3rd person of intransitive verbs it is a meaningful zero:

(737) Tag quodilir titel čamaneŋ qaŋ’qaadaya elkeweŋu?
    tan quodilir titel čama-neŋ qad’uu-qaa-l-daya el=keweŋ-ŋu?
    ‘And why don’t they leave [only] when it gets very cold?’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

If it is polarity that is in the scope of interrogation, the morpho-syntactic pattern is identical with that of declarative sentences but the sentence has a specific intonation contour, with a prominent pitch rise on the penultimate syllable of the predicate followed by an abrupt pitch fall in the last syllable (see 2.6.2 for an oscillogram and pitch contour):

(738) Malaa n’i=jaŋte pundu-r juora-jli?
    MPA RECP=song repeat-CIRC play-INTR.1PL.
    ‘Come on! Shall we play imitating each other’s songs?’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:30)

Interrogative sentences introduced by *quodeŋ* ‘how’ are often rhetoric:

(739a) Iide, quodeŋ čaaŋ lawtem? Tet istuol el=loyoruol!
    iide quodeŋ čaaŋ law-te-m? tet istuol el=loyoreŋol
    aunt how tea drink-FUT-1SG.ITRG 2SG chair(Russ) NEG=wash-be[3SG]
    ‘Aunt, how should I drink tea, your table has not been wiped clean.’
    (Kurilov and Odé 2012:38)

(739b) Quodeŋ el=oorin’e-t-uok?
    how NEG=cty-FUT-1PL.ITRG
    ‘How could we withhold our tears?’

(739c) Quode l’etuok? Tanuŋeŋ, tan jalyilŋin’ miraaljelj.
    quod l’e-t-uok? tanun-deŋ tan jalyilŋin’ mira-jelj
    how be-FUT-1PL.ITRG INVS.DEM-ADV INVS.DEM lake-DAT walk-INTR.1PL
    ‘What could we do? We went there, to that lake.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:38)

(739d) Amaa quodle wie-te-m? Lačil tuduruu sew-relek kukuul’
    father how do-FUT-TR.3SG fire inner.part enter-ANT sleeping.bag
    qonmedawur-da-γa (aq pugud’e-γa sew-l’el-te-j)
    partition.for.legs-PERT-LOC (aqua) heat-LOC enter-NVIS-FUT-INTR.3SG
    uo-le waarej-relek kelu-j.
    child-ACC take.out-ANT come-INTR.3SG
    (A house caught fire and one of the female tenants forgot her child inside.) ‘What could your father do? He entered the flames, grabbed the child from the bottom of
the sleeping bag (the child must have crawled into the sleeping bag fleeing the heat) and came out.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:58)

The interrogative ending –m seems, unlike the interrogative ending –(j)uok, compatible with explicitly future tense verb forms alone:

(740a) *Eld’e met quode juora-m?
(740b) Eld’e mit quode juora-juok?

‘How did I play?’

The question in (740b) can be formulated with the regular verb form used in declarative sentences:

(741) Eld’e mit quode juora-jli?

‘How did we play?’

According to a speaker the question in (741) is a ‘neutral’ one, about the objective manner (‘We took a ball, put it in the middle of the field and …’), whereas (740b) is a request to give an assessment.

Interrogative sentences with question words trigger specific focus patterns in accordance with the syntactic function of the question word, while interrogative sentences without question words are compatible with different focus patterns. The following example illustrates the SF pattern.

(742) Aluona aduo-gi tan el=panie-l-bun’-il?

‘Is it Alyona’s son who doesn’t want to fish?’

As is clear from (742), questions may contain a negation. This is illustrated by another sentence below:

(743) Quodiir čiščelmen’ el=aarejnund’eli?

‘Why don’t we stop at night?’

For transitive verbs in polarity questions one can speak of a separate subtype of negative interrogative clauses. In interrogative sentences with negative polarity transitive verbs do not undergo detransitivisation, which is otherwise obligatory, with an exception, in declarative negative sentences (see 4.2.4.1). In other words, the positive conjugational paradigm with the (in)transitivity distinction, characteristic for declarative sentences under predicate focus and otherwise neutralized in negative sentences with non-focal direct object, is maintained:
(744a) Tan tite band’e n’awn’iklie el juōmek?
    tan  tite  pan-je n’awn’iklie  el=juō-mek?
    and  so  be-PTCP polar.fox  NEG=see-TR.2SG
    ‘And didn’t you see such polar-fox?’

(744b) Aduŋ peldudie quodiir ogol’ keluunaa, taği el kuril’iimek?
    aduŋ  peldudie  quodiir  ogol’  kelu-nu-aa
    ADL.DEM  old.man  why  constantly  come-DUR-INCH[3SG.ITRG]
    taği  el=kuril’ii-mek?
    INVS.DEM  NEG=know-TR.2SG
    ‘Why has that old man made [it] a habit to come constantly? Don’t you know
    that?’

(744c) Eld’e Anne mit ḡula-d’ii ten’i el=juō-mek?
    mp  Anna 1PL poke-NMLZ here  NEG=see-TR.2SG
    ‘Well, Anna, haven’t you seen our ice-pick here?’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:20)

4.2.4.3 Imperative sentences

Under this label the sentences are subsumed whose predicates are either in the
imperative, or hortative, or jussive mood, since they all share the idea of prompting for an
action. For the sake of clarity of presentation the mood labels will be used in the
following to refer to the subtypes of imperative sentences as just defined.

Syntactically, imperative sentences are characterized by the omission of the
subject, which is a cross-linguistically common phenomenon (König and Siemund
2007:304). This is natural in sentences where the directive speech act is issued to an
interlocutor, i.e. in the imperative and hortative, because the personal endings in the
predicate unequivocally indicate the addressee. In the jussive, however, due to a
multitude of potential ‘addressees’ it is not uncommon to have a subject, which is omitted
only when the successful identification by the listener of the referent for which the speech
act is valid is not at risk:

(745a) Eguoje kewej-k!
    tomorrow leave-IMP.SG
    ‘Depart tomorrow.’ (Kurilov 2005:144)

(745b) Wayadiiliele el omolornumŋu. Saan’eγan qad’ir. Tiweŋa amuč.
    wayadiiliele  el=omolor-num-ŋu.  saal-n’e-γan  qad’ir.
    shawl  NEG=crumple-HAB-3PL  wood-VBLZ-JUSS.SG  MP
    tiwe-ya  amuo-ŋ
    rain-LOC  be.good-INTR.3SG
    ‘One doesn’t crumple the shawl. Let it be hard, then it is good in the rain.’
    (Kurilov and Odé 2012:190)

Out of e.g. politeness, one may introduce a clause with the predicate in the imperative by
naming the addressee even when his identity is quite clear:
As can be understood from the above, predicates of imperative sentences are morphologically marked as such by dedicated endings clearly distinguishing the different subtypes of this sentence type among themselves and from other sentence types as well as differentiating singular and plural forms. The hortative is an exception. Its plural form of intransitive verbs is identical with the corresponding indicative form, their common ending being –jeli. A singular form of the hortative does not exist in TY, which is in accordance with the hierarchy established by Aikhenvald (2003 cited by König and Siemund 2007:303): 2 > 1PL (inclusive) > 3SG/PL > 1SG and/or 1PL (exclusive). The hortative is special among the subtypes of imperative sentences in one more aspect: the (in)transitivity is irrelevant in the imperative and jussive but is reflected in the forms of the hortative, where the ending of transitive verbs is –γa, as opposed to –jeli:

(747a) ‘Me kewejnaajeli!’ mod’eŋ252. (747b) Neme-ŋin’ sew-jeli.
me=kewej-naa-jeli mon-jey
PF=leave-INCH-INTR.1PL talk-INTR.1SG
‘Let’s get ready for leaving!’ I say. ‘Let’s go inside.’
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:154)

(745) Luguje čiínin’ tadi-γa.
luge-je čiί-ŋin’ tadi-γa
be.old-PTCP people-DAT give-HORT.PL
‘Let’s give [it] to the elderly.’  (Kurilov and Odé 2012:132)

The negative imperative employs in TY the third strategy listed in König and Siemund (2007:308). It makes a combined use of the negator found in declaratives and a verb form ‘other than the positive imperative’ (see more examples in 3.4.2.4):

(746) Abučie tet mit-ul el=janaspejre-l’ek!
grandmother 2SG 1PL-ACC NEG=forget-PROH.SG
‘Grandmother, don’t forget us!’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:230)

As for indirect strategies for encoding directive speech acts, a non-verbal substitute for the jussive exists. Its jussive meaning is conveyed by the particle köčëjk, which is not uncommon in verbal jussives too:

(747) Köčëjk čoyume-j-rukun.
köčëjk čoyume-j-rukun.
be.thin-PTCP-thing
‘Let it [be] thin.’

Note the presence of the focal proclitic me=.

252 Note the presence of the focal proclitic me=.
4.2.4.4 Exclamatives

Exclamatives are often introduced by the modal particle *ugune* ‘oh, (how) nice that …’:

(748)  
\[
\text{MP} \quad \text{ilije kerie-r} \quad \text{engeg\text{\textemdash}e} \quad \text{el=pugu\text{\textemdash}re-je\text{\textemdash}e}. \\
\text{wind} \quad \text{fall-CIRC} \quad \text{excessively} \quad \text{NEG=wool-VBLZ-INTR.1SG}
\]

‘It is good that the wind is blowing; I have not sweated.’

4.2.5 Agreement

As was already mentioned in 4.2.2, the TY predicate shows agreement with the subject. It agrees with it in person and number. Apart from that it agrees with whichever constituent (subject, object or an adjunct) is in focus of the utterance, indicating the focus type. The respective conjugational paradigms can be reviewed in 3.4.2.1 or 5.2.

The absence of plural marking in a subject represented by a generic noun can result in discrepancy in the agreement in number:

(749)  
\[
\text{ilen lewejem pulgid\text{\textemdash}ile lewnun\text{\textemdash}qand\text{\textemdash}eme} \quad \text{n\text{\textemdash}ord\text{\textemdash}ele lewnun\text{\textemdash}a}^{253}. \\
\text{reindeer} \quad \text{summer-NMLZ} \quad \text{flower-ACC} \quad \text{eat-HAB-PL-TR.3.OF} \\
\text{qand\text{\textemdash}eme} \quad \text{n\text{\textemdash}ord\text{\textemdash}ele} \quad \text{lewnun\text{\textemdash}a} \\
\text{cold-NMLZ} \quad \text{reindeer.moss-ACC} \quad \text{eat-HAB-3PL.TR}
\]

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

Speakers may chose to employ a singular verb form of the verb in such a case:

(750)  
\[
\text{tet mitqa jede\text{\textemdash}cek mit ile pojomuj!’ monnuni metin’ met amaa.} \\
2SG \quad 1PL-LOC \quad \text{appear-INTR.2SG} \quad 1PL \quad \text{reindeer be.many-INCH-INTR.3SG} \\
\text{mon-nun\text{\textemdash}i} \quad \text{met-in’} \quad \text{met amaa.} \\
\text{say-HAB-INTR.3SG} \quad 1SG-DAT \quad 1SG \quad \text{father}
\]

‘You were born and our reindeer [herd] increased in number!’ my father used to tell me.       (Kurilov and Odé 2012:20)

NPs with the comitative trigger plural agreement:

(751a)  
\[
\text{Tan akaa Semenn\text{\textemdash}ey maargan qand\text{\textemdash}e\text{\textemdash}a} \\
\text{and elder.brother Semeny\text{\textemdash}COM one.GEN cold-LOC} \\
\text{n\text{\textemdash}aya ilwii\text{\textemdash}jeli.} \\
\text{together herd-INTR.1PL}
\]

‘And with [my] elder brother Semyon I herded one winter.’

(751b)  
\[
\text{Um\text{\textemdash}cginn\text{\textemdash}e n\text{\textemdash}aya tu\text{\textemdash}y paad\text{\textemdash}eduuo itmen\text{\textemdash}ey qabunda \text{\textemdash}aj\text{\textemdash}eya sayanaa\text{\textemdash}el\text{\textemdash}i tadaat tu\text{\textemdash}y qadunjude\text{\textemdash}en el pulgeji\text{\textemdash}cun el quodej\text{\textemdash}cun.}
\]

\footnotesize
253 Note the lack of the OF pattern in the second clause, where the BC pattern is employed instead. The contrastive meaning implied by the translation would actually make one expect OF in the second clause too.
'Together with Umchagin the girl stayed home for a long time, for several days, not going anywhere or doing anything.'

4.2.6 Impersonal constructions

The impersonal character of a clause can be indicated by employing the word köde ‘person’ functioning as an impersonal subject:

(752) Sukunn’iel’eldayane ködeŋ kid’e at čuŋrej.

sukun-n’e-l’el-dayane ködeŋ kid’e at=čuŋre=j
clothes-VBLZ-NVIS[GER]-3SG.DS man twice POT=think-INTR.3SG

‘If he had clothes, one could have alternative assumptions. (i.e. one could hope that the person, who lost his way, is still alive)’ (Kurilov 2001:447, sukunn’e-)

A much more common strategy is, however, to encode the predicate as 3PL with subject ellipsis:

(753) Ilediisiile qajaq wienunŋa. L’ukumon’ọŋojya tuutellek me mojienunŋa, sukune loyorel dite. Tadaat ganče lukul qawarqya kuderienunŋa. Amdur qajaq dite ikl’amununi.

Ile-n-diisi-ile qajaq wie-nun-ŋa. l’ukumon’ọŋoj-γa tuute-relek
reindeer-GEN-0-milk-ACC khayakh make-HAB-3PL.TR stomach-LOC stuff-ANT
me=mojie-nun-ŋa sukun-le loyore-l dite. tadaat qad’uu-je
pe=rub-HAB-3PL.TR thing-ACC wash-GER like then be.cold-PTCP
lukul qawarqya-γa kudere-nun-ŋa. amdu-r qajaq dite ikl’al-mu-nun-i.

place pit-LOC put-HAB-3PL.TR haste-CIRC khayakh like be.hard-INCH-HAB-INTR.3SG

‘From reindeer milk one makes khayakh (condensed milk). One puts (milk) into a (cleaned reindeer) stomach and rubs [it] as if washing clothes. Then one puts it in a cold place, in a pit. It hardens quickly.’

(Krilov and Odé 2012:188)

4.3 Complex sentences

Complex sentences in TY subsume instances of complementation, adverbial subordination, relative clauses and compound sentences.

4.3.1 Complementation

Complementation is defined as ‘the syntactic situation that arises when a notional sentence or predication is an argument of a predicate’ (Noonan 2007:52). This definition has to be extended for TY in order to accommodate the special kind of complementation existing in TY, in which the predicate semantically requiring an object complement is
formally an intransitive verb and cannot take another argument apart from the subject for syntactic reasons. Thus, for the purpose of this presentation a complement clause is a clause that represents a necessary, purely semantic complement of the predicate of another clause.

The complement types can be classified as follows. Complement clauses can be both reduced and sentence-like. The nucleus of a reduced complement is non-finite and represented either by a gerund or a converb (4.3.1.1). In case of nominalization, the relation between the predicate of the complement with its arguments is that of possession. The nominalized predicate, or the head of this possessive construction, carries the accusative case ending when it functions as an object complement and the general requirements for the overt object marking (see 3.3.1.1.2) are met. The predicate of the complement can also occur in the dative case. Sentence-like complements (4.3.1.2) have finite predicates in the indicative, whose argument structure is preserved. Complement taking predicates (CTP) take sentence-like complements without the help of a complementizer.

### 4.3.1.1 Reduced complements

The predicate of a desententialized complement is in most cases realized by the gerund, which enters a possessive relation with the notional subject (cf. 754a) and (754b) with (754c), which is a more common constellation cross-linguistically than both arguments having this relation with the predicate (Noonan 2007:70):

(754a) $Qad’ir kösl’elek köde sayanelgi anaan at amuč id’ie.$

$qad’ir  kösl’e-lek köde sayane-l-gi anaan at=amu-o-j id’ie$

MP burbot-INS person sit-GER-PERT very POT=be.good-INTR.3SG now

‘Well, it would be nice to subsist on burbot now.’

(754b) $Mol tuŋ moŋøj’ii me=qan’ineŋ ćajlen’-il-gi el=juō-nun-jęŋ.$

MP ADL.DEM married.woman EMPH=never be.sober-GER-PERT NEG=see-HAB-INTR.1SG

‘Well, I never see this woman sober.’ (Kurilov 2001:539, ćajlen’-)

(754c) $Mit bočka potaya-re-j-l čantajre-ŋ.$

1PL barrel fill-TRVZ-SEM-GER fail-1SG.TR

‘I did not manage to fill our barrel.’ (Kurilov 2001:385, potaya-rej)

When a reduced complement acts as an O-argument of a CTP, it can be marked as such by the accusative case ending:

(755) $... tindaa uogi med’uoll’eldaya wanarek piliejuolyane pedijuolyane iisesuolyane jабal kiejie lejtejl’eltem.$

$tindaa  uo-gi  men’-ŋol-l’el-daya wanar-lek pilie-ŋol-yane$

long.ago child-PERT take-be-NVIS[GER]-3SG.DS tongue-INS wipe-be[GER]-ACC

$pedi-ŋol-yane  iise-s-ŋol-yane  jaba-l  kiejie  lejtejl’el-te-m$

lick-be[GER]-ACC suck-CAUS-be[GER]-ACC die-GER before recall-NVIS-FUT-TR.3SG

---

254 Basically, these are cases of semi-intransitivity (see 4.2.3.2 and 4.2.3.2.4), in which the O-argument is represented not by an NP but by a whole clause.
'Before she died, she probably recalled how [her cub] was wiped by [her] tongue, licked and let suck when it was born, long ago.'

Reduced complements can be introduced by the interrogative adverb quodey ‘how’:

(756) Mit čajle quodey uucijuol olyin’ el kuril’iinund’eli.255
mit čajle quodey uucii-yol olyin’ el=kuril’ii-nun-jeli
1PL day how pass-be[GER] completely NEG=know-HAB-INTR.1PL
'We did not notice at all how our day passed.'

A complement clause can also be represented by the dative case form of the gerund256:

(757a) Taŋudeg uulŋin’ čuŋden’i.
    taŋun-deŋ uu-l-ŋin’ čuŋde-n’-i
    INVS.DEM-ADV go-GER-DAT thought-VBLZ-INTR.3SG
    ‘He intends to go there.’ (Kurilov 2001:567, čuŋden’-)

(757b) Met taŋudeg uulŋin’ mer=ŋiŋe-ŋ.
       met taŋun-deŋ uu-l-ŋin’ mer=ŋiŋe-ŋ.
       1SG INVS.DEM-ADV go-GER-DAT PF=be.afraid-1SG.TR
       ‘I am afraid to go there.’

The same expression can be supplemented by the obligative suffix without a discernible change of meaning:

(758) Met taŋudeg uuŋolmoraw mer ĳieŋ.
       met taŋun-deŋ uu-ŋol-moraw mer=ĳieŋ.
       1SG INVS.DEM-DAT go-be[ger]-OBLG PF=be.afraid-INTR.1SG
       ‘I am afraid to go there.’

A reduced complement whose predicate is a gerund, can be encoded in the same way as a dependent adverbial clause (see 4.3.2):

(759a) … mer ičuom punnuŋudayane.
       mer=ičuom pun’-nu-ŋu-l-dayane
       PF=look-TR.3SG kill-DUR-PL-GER-3SG.DS
       ‘… he saw how they were killing.’ (Kurilov 2005:126)

(759b) Uoduorpegi mōndieŋudayə amutneŋ amuč juōdayane.
       uoduorpe-gi mōndie-ŋu-l-daya amuč-neŋ amuo-j juōdayane
       grandchildren-PERT listen-PL-GER-3SD.DS be.good.INTR.3SG-ADV be.good-INTR.3SG it.seems
       ‘It is very nice for her grandchildren to listen, as it seems.’

255 This sentence shows that the marking of the possessive relation between the nominalized predicate of the complement and its subject is sometimes foregone.
256 This is an interesting parallel to Turkish, where the dative of the gerund is also used for goals (Noonan 2007:71).
Encoding predicates of reduced complements as converses is a much less frequent phenomenon in TY:

(760a) *Met čayad’er me juoračeŋ.*

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{met} & \text{čayad’e-r} & \text{me=juoraʃ-jen} \\
1\text{SG} & \text{work-CIRC} & \text{PF=finish-INTR.1SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘I stopped working.’

(760b) *Juorpure tadaateŋ saal tuduruunenŋ n’ord’e pulgejnumi taatl’er ten’i ile moojojolde amuč.*

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{juorpure} & \text{tadaat-ey} & \text{saal} & \text{tuduruu-neŋ} & \text{n’ord’e} & \text{pulgej-nun-i} \\
\text{tundra} & \text{and-EMPH} & \text{wood} & \text{inner.part-EMPH} & \text{reindeer.moss} & \text{come.out-HAB-INTR.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{taatl’er} & \text{ten’i} & \text{ile} & \text{mooj-ŋol-de} & \text{amujo} \\
\text{therefore} & \text{here} & \text{reindeer} & \text{hold-be-COND be.good-INTR.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘In the tundra there is a lot of reindeer moss, therefore it is good to keep reindeer here.’

The interpretation of the dependent clauses in (760a) and (760b) is based only on the presence of CTPs. They are borderline cases between genuine complement clauses and adverbial clauses. The complements in (760b) could be also translated as ‘… if one keeps reindeer here, it is good’, while (760a) is already rendered into English as if it were an adverbial clause.

4.3.1.2 Sentence-like complements

A complement clause can occur as a finite clause accompanying the predicate of a main clause that requires a complement. Such sentence-like complements are only possible in the object function:

(761a) *Kind’e kin kind’e uučiil’eldayə mōriŋa čuʃpepe me jabaanaal’elŋi.*

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{kind’e} & \text{kin} & \text{kind’e} & \text{uučiil’-el’daŋa} & \text{mōriŋa} \\
\text{month} & \text{two GEN} & \text{month} & \text{pass-NV[GER]-3SG.DS hear-3PL.TR}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{čuʃpepe} & \text{me=jaba-nu-aal’elŋi} \\
\text{Chukchi-PL} & \text{PF=die-DUR-INC-NVIS-3PL.INTR}
\end{array}
\]

‘One month, two months passed and they heard that Chukchis began to die.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:162)

(761b) *Mōriŋ čiqaŋaunureŋ me nemeŋə miraanul!*

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{mōriŋ} & \text{čiqaŋa-ŋu-reŋ me=neme-ŋeŋ mira-nu-l} \\
\text{hear-1SG.TR} & \text{crunch-DUR-SIM IND=what-FOC walk-DUR-GER.SF}
\end{array}
\]

‘I hear something moving about outside, crunching on the snow!’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:32)

It is noteworthy that a sentence-like complement clause follows a CTP. Normally no predicates follow that of the main clause, except in compound sentences (4.3.4). Just to illustrate the default word order involving a reduced clausal complement of the same *verbum sentiendi* the following example may be given:
(762) Taat anme iidie örtég-l möri-men qaala-yajuo!
so simply aunt cry-GER hear-TR.1/2SG.OF ITJ
‘Suddenly I heard the aunt crying, “How terrible!”’
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:62)

Sentence-like complementation can also be conditioned by purely semantic considerations, as in the following examples, where the verbs requiring complementation are intransitive and whose only argument slot is already filled:

(763a) Met čuŋde-jen tudel me=kelu-te-j.
1SG think-INTR.1SG 3SG PF=come-FUT-INTR.3SG
‘I thought that he would come.’

(763b) Met čuŋde-jen mit n’ikönmiepe ŋod’eli.
 met čuŋde-jen mit n’i-könme-pe ŋol-jeli.
1SG think-INTR.1SG 1PL RECP-friend-PL be-INTR.1PL
‘I thought that we were friends.’

(763c) Met čuŋde-jen tadaat me=kelu-te-j.
1SG think-INTR.1SG then PF=come-FUT-INTR.3SG
‘I thought that he would come later.’

The same, purely semantic, relation exists between the intransitive verb mon- ‘to say’ and its sentence-like complements (see 4.3.1.4.1).

The logical complement clause can be promoted to the status of the main clause while the logical matrix clause is demoted to a dependent clause:

(764) Met möri-l-γa me=kinek me=jaqte-j.
1SG hear-GER-1/2SG.DS IND=who PF=sing-INTR.3SG
‘I heard somebody singing.’
‘When I heard, somebody was singing.’

(765) Id’iene lewejme mönd’ielγane tay mit lajaat waaj qabun ködek taat kurčiil’elul.
 id’ie-ne lewej-me mönd’ie-l-γane tay mit lajaa-t
now.EMPH listen-GER-1/2SG.DS DM 1PL back.part-ABL
 waaj qabun köde-k taat kurčit-l’el-ul
more how.many person-FOC.ABS so become-NVIS-GER.SF
‘I heard now, in the summer, that after us some more people became like this (were poisoned by charcoal fumes).’
(Kurilov 2001:261, mönd’iel)

4.3.1.3 Complementation in embedded clauses

The matrix clause of a clausal complement can itself be an embedded clause. This kind of complementation does not differ principally from that of main clauses: the complement clause appears as the gerund functioning as an argument of the predicate of the embedded clause.
(766) *Met quoden cayad’elpgi quoden iiselpegi ičuor itimen sayanaamund’en.*

| 1SG | how | stir-GER-PL-PERT | how | suck-GER-PL-PERT | look-CIRC |

\[itimen\] sayane-nun-jeŋ

for.a.long.time siiHAB-INTR.1SG

‘I sit for a long time watching them move about and suck.’

(767) *Tan qawd’idie Qaalid’e nime wiel qodejnur el nimečuon ewrienuj.*

but\[uncle\] Wolf\[house\] do-GER be.lazy.to.do-GERBE-DUR-CIRC

\[el=nimečuon\] ewre-nu-j

NEG=house-PRIV go-DUR-INTR.3SG

‘(The Mouse’s house was a real Yukaghir little house.) But Uncle Wolf had no home because he was too lazy to build one.’  (Kurilov 1994:8)

(768) *Čama-ne edie-l-gi mör-delek me=segu-j.*

big-ADV burn-GER-PERT notice-ANT PF=enter-INTR.3SG

‘Having noticed that it burnt heavily, he entered.’  (Kurilov (2001:586, ediel)

4.3.1.4 Speech-reporting strategies as instances of clausal complementation

Speech can be conveyed directly and indirectly in TY. Direct speech is characterized by the use of the finite forms of its predicates and the retention of reference perspective, while indirect speech can be represented by gerunds, just as other non-finite complement clauses are, and is accompanied by a shift in person reference of the subject.

4.3.1.4.1 Direct speech

The indicator of direct speech is the verb *mon-* ‘to say/to speak’ which can either follow or precede the direct speech:

(769a) *El=kewej-l’ek  mon-ŋi.*

NEG=leave-PROH.SG say-3PL.INTR

‘They say, “Do not go!” ’  (Kurilov 2005:144)

(769b) *Peldudie mon-i  sukun  me=čingičer-i  qaduŋudeŋ.*

old.man say-INTR.3SG thing PF=get.dark-INTR.3SG where

kewej-nu-k? Eguojie kewej-k.

leave-DUR-2SG[ITRG] tomorrow leave-IMP.SG

‘The old man said, “It is getting dark. Where will you go? Go tomorrow.” ’  (Kurilov 2005:144)

Instead of the verb *mon-* ‘to say’ another *verbum dicendi* can be used:

(770) *In jawulya sayaaŋi Qaalid’e tubegejl’en’ lögitek örtel’en’.*

just.as road-LOC disappear-3PL.INTR Wolf rush.in-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘Hardly had they disappeared on the road, the Wolf rushed in and shouted, “Feed [me]!” ’

(Kurilov 1994:8)

Sometimes indirect speech too must be considered a purely semantic complement, because a *verbum dicendi* cannot not take another complement for valence reasons. The direct speech in (771) cannot be the complement of the finite perception verb either, since its only available argument position is already filled. This means that the direct speech enters here a kind of relation with the rest of the sentence which is formally not to distinguish from parataxis. Semantically, however, it is quite clear that (771) is not a case of coordination.

\begin{verbatim}
(771)   Ladid’aa ann’elgi mörič tideŋ qajčiepul nimepegin jewęeŋ.
       ladid’aa ann’e-l-gi möruu-j tideŋ qajčie-pul nime-pe-gi jewęe-ŋ
softly speak-GER-PERT be.heard-INTR.3SG ANPH grandfather-PL house-PL-PERT check.on-1SG.TR
   ‘I hear him saying softly, “I will go and check the house of those old people.” ’
\end{verbatim}

4.3.1.4.2 Indirect speech

The same marker *mon-* ‘to say’ can be used to introduce indirect speech, which is a significantly rarer phenomenon than direct speech. The reported speech is a complement clause whose predicate is encoded as a gerund.

\begin{verbatim}
(772)   Met kewejl mod’eŋ.
       met kewej-l  mon-jeŋ
1SG leave-GER say-INTR.1SG
   ‘I will tell [them] that I am leaving.’
   (Kurilov 2005:144)
\end{verbatim}

The indirect speech can surface as a finite clause too:

\begin{verbatim}
(773)   Ee, tittejlek qanaaŋutej monyi.
       ee tittel-ejleq qanaa-ŋu-te-j mon-ŋi
yes 3PL-EMPH roam-PL-FUT-INTR say-3PL.INTR
   ‘Yes, they said they would roam on their own.’
\end{verbatim}

It has to be noted that indirect speech is not equally acceptable with all speakers. Some reject (772) as ungrammatical and form the sentence using direct speech:

\begin{verbatim}
(774)   Met tittin’ me=mon-te-jeŋ me=keweŋ-nu-jeŋ.
       met tittel-in’ me=mon-te-jeŋ me=keweŋ-nu-jeŋ.
1SG 3PL-DAT PF=say-FUT-INTR.1SG PF=leave-DUR-INTR.1SG
   ‘I told them, “I will leave.” ’
\end{verbatim}
4.3.1.5 Predicate clause as a subtype of complement clauses

A predicate clause (term from Hengeveld, personal communication) is essentially the clausal complement of a copula:

(775) Čuguod’e čoyojelek juorul dite bani.

\[
\text{čugu-ŋol-je } \text{čoyojelek } \text{juorul-} \text{tite } \text{pan-}\text{j}
\]

\[
\text{sharp-be-PTCP} \quad \text{knife=INS} \quad \text{scratch-GER} \quad \text{like be-INTR.3SG}
\]

‘[It felt] as if one scratched with a sharp knife.’

4.3.1.6 Substitutes for complementation

Despite the fact that complementation is widespread in TY this language shows a tendency to avoid it. This may be conditioned by the lack of corresponding CTPs available in other languages and becomes obvious only in elicitation sessions. Thus for achievement CTPs one employs the desiderative mood or future tense verb forms. For phasal CTPs expressing termination of an action one may simply resort to negation:

(776) Met amutmeŋ uraalbud’ęŋ l uraatjeęŋ.

\[
\text{met amuć-neŋ } \text{uraa-l-bun’-jeŋ } / \text{ uraa-te-jeŋ}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
1\text{SG} & \text{be.good.INTR.3SG-ADV} & \text{learn-GER-DES-INTR.1SG} \\
& & \text{learn-FUT-INTR.1SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I try to learn well.’

“I want to learn well. / I will learn well.”

(777) Met tet-in’ me=čambii-t.

\[
\begin{align*}
1\text{SG} & \text{MP} & \text{NEG=steal-INTR.2SG} & \text{PF=be.good-INTR.3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I decided to help you.’

‘I will help you.’

(778) Met el=čayad’e-jeŋ.

\[
\begin{align*}
1\text{SG} & \text{NEG=work-INTR.1SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I stopped working.’

“I did not work.”

Sometimes one simply creates two adjacent independent clauses:

(779) L’ie tet el pegitejek mer amuč.

\[
\text{l’ie } \text{tet el=pegite-jek mer=amu-o-j}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MP} & \text{2SG} & \text{NEG=steal-INTR.2SG} & \text{PF=be.good-INTR.3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘After all, you did not steal [and] this is good.’

The equivalent of a CTP can be a synthetic verbal category. This is the case e.g. with desiderative (780) and manipulative (781), in Noonan’s (2007:132, 136) terms, predicates:

(780) Tittel el=lewde-l-bun’-yu.

\[
\begin{align*}
3\text{PL} & \text{NEG=eat-GER-DES-3PL}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The don’t’ want to eat.’

(781) Tudel metqane čuuleŋ lewsemle.

\[
\text{tudel } \text{met-jane } \text{čuul-} \text{leŋ} \text{ lew-se-mle}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
3\text{SG} & \text{1SG-ACC} & \text{meat-FOC.ABS} & \text{eat-CAUS-TR.3SG.OF}
\end{align*}
\]
‘He forced me to eat meat.’

4.3.2 Adverbial clauses

Adverbial clauses describe a circumstance (temporal, causal etc.) that serves as a background against which the action of the main clause unfolds. Adverbial clauses can be linked with main clauses via a conjunction (see 3.9) or the connection can be conjunctionless. In this latter case the parameter of [+coreferentiality] plays a central role in determining the form of the predicate and the rules of switch-reference (4.3.2.1) apply. A peculiar feature of conjunctionless adverbial clauses in TY is that they are often underspecified as far as the semantic relation between their predicate and the predicate of the main clause is concerned, i.e. one and the same encoding strategy can be employed to convey a range of meanings. In this sense adverbial clauses in TY are very generally circumstantial. Which specific meaning is intended by a given adverbial clause, is in most cases determined by the context.

4.3.2.1 Switch-reference

The predicate of an adverbial subordinate clause, as long as it is realized as a non-finite verb form, takes different shapes depending on whether or not its subject is coreferential with that of the following clause. If it is, a converb is used in the dependent clause. If the subjects are not coreferential, a gerund in the locative case is employed, which can have the extension –ne, which tends to be associated with conditional clauses. The form of the gerund makes it possible to distinguish number and person of the subject to some extent. The interlocutors are set off from the 3rd person by the pertensive suffix, which appears only in the latter. The exponents of plural are the verbal suffix –ŋu in 3PL and the vowel /a/ in 1PL and 2PL (see 3.3.2.1 g for the paradigm).

Dependent adverbial clauses whose predicate is a converb naturally lack an overt subject, for it is coreferential with that of the main clause. In clauses with disjoint reference the pronominal subject is normally omitted in the 3rd person since the corresponding singular and plural verbal forms are distinct. When the subject is one of the interlocutors, where there is a potential confusion between the 1st and 2nd person due to the identity of their verb forms in singular and plural respectively, the subject is preferably omitted if the identity of its referent is clear or can be easily deduced within the discourse. In fact, alternative identification of the subject of an adverbial clause as the 1st or 2nd person and ambiguity stemming form that are only theoretically possible when the subject of the main clause is in the 3rd person. If both clauses have speech act participants as their subjects as in (785), then the non-coreferential subject of the ambiguously encoded predicate of the dependent clause is necessarily the respectively other speech act participant than that represented by the subject of the main clause, in which its person and number are clearly indicated. When the subject of the main clause is in the 3rd person and that of the adverbial clause is an interlocutor, this mutual exclusiveness is not given any longer and ambiguity may arise.

In (782) one can see the concatenations of gerund+finite verb form, converb+finite verb form as well as converb+gerund+finite verb form. In (783) the

257 This is always so when subordination is conjunctionless.
concatenation gerund+converb+finite verb form is exemplified. Sentences with more than three clauses are hardly found.


*Tuŋ* sayane-aa-l-daya *tuŋ* layuborgi me=čayad’e-nu-aa-l’el-i.

DM sit-INCH-GER-3SG.DS ADL.PROX snag-PERT PF=move-DUR-INCH-NVIS-INTR.3SG

tan čayad’e-nu-aa-relek pure-n qurul-ya jōke jōke čendej-l’el-i.

DM move-DUR-INCH-ANT upper.side-PROL sky-LOC far far fly.away-NVIS-INTR.3SG
tuŋ såal-lek čendej-nu-renq uu-nu-renq iitnen uu-l’el-i.

ADL.PROX wood-INS fly.away-DUR-SIM go-DUR-SIM long.ADV go-NVIS-INTR.3SG

uu-nu-renq tude juo-yane tude čal’d’e-lek uuse-j-l-dayane könmedaya

go-DUR-SIM 3SG.POSS head-ACC 3SG.POSS hand-INS touch-SEM-GER-3SG.DS sometimes

monil’egi me=čaaqar-nun-l’el-i könmedaya mer=al’aa-nun-l’el-i.

hair-PERT PF=freeze-HAB-NVIS-INTR.3SG sometimes PF=thaw-HAB-NVIS-INTR.3SG

‘Well, when he sat down, the snag began to stir. And having stirred, it flew up high in the sky. After he had flown up on that snag, he flew, he flew for a long time. While flying, he touched his head with his hand. Sometimes his hairs were frozen and sometimes they thawed.’

(783) *Tuŋ* quod’edwurpegi jukuoyudaya tittel en’ien’ej amaapegi tittejlek jawnuo titte čayad’al’yane čayad’e-reŋ sayanaal’elni.

Tuŋ quod’edwurpe-gi juku-yl-ŋu-l-daya tittel en’ie-n’e-j

ADL.PROX male.children-PERT small-be-PL-GER-3SG.DS 3PL.POSS mother-VBLZ-PTCP

amaa-pe-gi tittel-elek jawnuo titte čayad’e-l’yane

father-PL-PERT 3PL.EMPH everything.DO 3PL.POSS work-GER-ACC

čayad’e-reŋ sayane-l’el-ŋi

work-SIM live-NVIS-3PL.INTR

‘As long as their children were small, their parents lived doing all their work themselves.’

A few more examples illustrating different switch-reference forms depending on the grammatical properties of the subject follow.

(784) *Met* nimien’ kewejlyane tet met jawul el ončileteyaneŋ.

met nime-n’ kwej-l-yane tet met jawul

1SG house-DAT leave-GER-1/2SG.DS 2SG 1SG track

el=onči-l’e-te-yaneŋ

NEG=track.ITER-PROH-FUT-PROH

‘When I go home, don’t follow me.’

(785) *Ann’el* juoyajliya jewligir me jaqtaanund’eŋ.

ann’e-l juɔyaj-l-yə jewligi-r me=jaqt-e-nun-jen.

speak-GER finish-GER-1/2SG.DS love-CIRC PF=sing-INCH-HAB-INTR.1SG

‘When you stop talking, I begin to sing out of love.’
It is interesting that gerunds functioning as complements can trigger the application of the switch-reference rule while remaining insensitive to it, i.e. they themselves do not carry exponents of this grammatical category and, consequently, do not have reference clauses. This is not to be confused with the lack of adjacency of a marking clause and a reference clause, mentioned in Haiman and Munro (1983:xiii, G). The existence of such ruptures in marking switch-reference does not seem to be adequately reflected in the typology of switch-reference.

Quite striking is the fact that in TY even participles can function as reference clauses:

The following example shows that it is not merely the grammatical properties of the subjects in the main and dependent clauses that determine the form of the predicate in the latter, but rather the actual, physical identity of the subjects. The DS marker is employed despite the grammatical characteristics of the subjects in the chained clauses being identical, as long as the actual subject referents are different:

Children, the subject of the dependent clause in (789), naturally cannot own reindeer. The identity of the subject referents of the main clause must thus be different. At the same time the grammatical properties of these subjects, despite their being formally encoded as non-coreferential, are the same: 1PL. The we of the dependent clause is exclusive of anyone but the speaker and her siblings, which were small at the time referred to, while in the main clause the subject we is inclusive of the parents and maybe other adult members

---

258 In terms of Haiman and Munro (1983:xii), the clause in which switch-reference is marked is identified as the marking clause and the clause with respect to which switch-reference is marked as the reference clause. In a concatenation of more than two clauses, one and the same clause will, normally, be a reference clause and a marking clause at the same time, as long as it is not the first or the last one in the sentence.
of the family, who could possess reindeer. Since this purely semantic difference is the only thing that differentiates the subjects of the main and dependent clause in (789), one is compelled to conclude that the switch reference markers of TY are semantic in nature.

On the other hand, SS verb forms can be found in contexts when there is no complete identity of the subject referents. This is often the case when the relation between two subject referents is that of a part to a whole (e.g. body parts), or when the speaker wants to associate two different referents, for pragmatic reasons:

(790a) *Juödii-gi jaw-r taat tiwad’i-nun-i.*

eye-PERT ache-CIRC so blink.ITR-HAB-INTR.3SG

‘He keeps blinking like that because his eyes are aching.’

(Kurilov 2001:462, *tiwad’i-*)

(790b) *Me=n’imie-j uu-nu-reŋ.*

pf=go.out-INTR.3SG go-DUR-SIM

‘It (the engine of the snow-scooter) went out while we were riding.’

SS verb forms are also used in idiomatic expressions serving as adverbials irrespective of the actual switch-reference considerations:

(791) *Jalmid’ey moldelek čamuod’e l’uoriiček l’etel.*

jalmid’ey mol-relek čamuol-je l’uoriiče-k l’e-te-l

thrice stay.overnight-ANT be.big-PTCP game-FOC.ABS be-FUT-GER.SF

‘In three days there will be great games.’ (Kurilov 2001, 227, l’uoriiče)

“After having stayed overnight three times …”

4.3.2.2 Types of adverbial clauses

As indicated in 4.3.2, different types of conjunctionless adverbial clauses are often realized in the same way, without the employment of specific devices to indicate the particular clause type: either, under coreferentiality of the subjects, as one of the converbs available in TY or according to the switch-reference rule described above when the identity of the subject referents is different. Obligatory, clear specializations exist only under coreferentiality of the subjects for the conditional and final meanings. Other specializations represent optional, alternative encoding strategies.

4.3.2.2.1 Temporal clauses

Temporal clauses relate a preceding clause to the following one from the viewpoint of the relative time at which the action of the dependent clause takes place. Three relative temporal values are recognized: anteriority, simultaneity and posteriority. Under coreferentiality of the subjects anteriority and simultaneity are expressed by the converbs terminating in *–relek* and *–reŋ* (see 3.4.2.7) respectively:

(792) *Jawnuo juörelek mit nimien’ me kewečeli.*

jawnuo juö-relek mit nime-n’ me=kwej-jeli

everything.DO see-ANT 1PL home-DAT PF=leave-INTR.1PL
'After we had checked all [nets], we returned home.' (Kurilov and Odé 2012:26)

(793) *Me miraanutej meniid’ieje köde peldudien’ej apanalaa n’aačin’. Taat miranureŋ ann’etej.*

me=mira-nu-te-j meniid’ie-je köde peldudie-n’e-j ap analaa n’aačin’.  
so walk-DUR-SIM speak-FUT-INTR

‘The matchmaker walks in front of the parents. Walking like this, he speaks.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:40)

Under disjoint reference, both anteriority (794) and simultaneity (795a) and (795b) are conveyed by a corresponding gerund form, as discussed in (4.3.2.1):

(794) *Kuril’ golova ewlikieda ilegi čaureŋ tet amaan’ tadijaas.*

Kuril’ golova el=’e-kie-l-daya ile-gi čaw-reŋ 
Kuril head(Russ) NEG-be-INCH-GER-3SG.DS reindeer-PERT cut.off-SIM
tet amaa-n’ tadi-ŋa 2SG father-DAT give-3PL.TR

‘When chief Kuril died, they divided his reindeer and gave [a number of them] to your father.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:30)

(795a) *Čaaj lawnujudaya amaaγat kuril’ičiŋ.*
čaaj law-nu-ŋu-l-daya amaa-γa-t kuril’ičiŋ
‘While they were drinking tea, I asked my father.’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

(795b) *Taŋ körel quduolday a maarqan nimeγat maarqan pajpe lawjele menčiel’elmele.*

taŋ körel quduol-daya maarqan nime-γa-t maarqan pajpe
INVS.DEM devil lie[GER]-3SG.DS one.GEN house-LOC-ABS one.GEN woman

tlawje-le men’-če-l’el-mele
water-FOC.ABS take-ITV-NVIS-TR.3SG.OF

‘While that devil was lying, a woman came out of one of the houses and went to fetch water.’

Note that the suffix –reŋ of the converb in (794) expresses anteriority rather than simultaneity, which is a not infrequent phenomenon:

(796) *Kakau amaa sewreŋ jalmid’eŋ qonyač.*
Kakau amaa sew-reŋ jalmid’eŋ qonya-j-j
Kakau father enter-SIM thrice bow.down-SEM-INTR.3SG

‘Father Kakau entered and bowed three times.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:38)

This semantic difference might be conditioned by the telicity of the verbs. Atelic verbs with the suffix –reŋ seem to express simultaneity in all instances, while telic verbs with this suffix convey anteriority. The translation of the successively used converbs čendejnureŋ and uunureŋ in (782) is an especially telling illustration of this semantic dichotomy.
Posteriority in temporal clauses cannot be rendered by conjunctionless clauses. Along with other finer shades of temporal meaning, its expression is facilitated by conjunctions (see 3.9.2.1). The reader is also referred to 4.3.2.1, where there are several examples of temporal adverbial clauses.

4.3.2.2.2 Conditional clauses

Conditional clauses contain the condition necessary for the completion of the action of the main clause. The predicate of a non-coreferential subject of the conditional clause is encoded according to the switch-reference rule described in 4.3.2.1. There is a strong tendency to employ the extended form of the DS verb form (see also (786)):

(797a) L’ukudal’γa naaduodayane mekinek men’γan l’ie metqat.

l’uku-d-al’γa naaduol-dayane
small-0-fish be.necessary[GER]-3SG.DS
me=kinek men’-γan l’ie met-γa-t
IND=who take-JUSS MP 1SG-LOC-ABL

‘If small fish is necessary, let somebody take it from me.’

(797b) Maarqan nimeγa qabun Anne l’eadayane montem tet Annad’aa ηολ-k tan Mejqej en’ie Anna!

maarqa-n nime-γa qabun Anne l’e-l-dayane mon-te-m
one-GEN house-LOC how.many Anna be-GER-3SG.DS say-FUT-TR.3SG
tet Annad’aa ηol-k tan Mejqej en’ie Anna
2SG Annadya be-IMP.SG and Meykhey mother Anna

‘If there were more Annas in the house, he used to say, “You will be Annadya and the mother of Meykhey [will be] Anna.” ’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:30)

(797c) Anyiŋudayga buollar jawner sisad’itej buolla taatl’er el anyiçuọn iirienunγa maranmi taat.

anyi-ŋu-l-daya buollar jawner sisad’i-te-j buolla
scrape.inner.side.of.hide-PL-GER.3SG.DS MP(Yak) everything tear.ITER-FUT-INTR.3SG MP(Yak)
taatl’er el=anyi-čuọn iire-nun-γa maranmi taat
therefore NEG=scrape.inner.side.of.hide-PRIV sew-HAB-3PL.TR just so

‘If one scrapes the inner side of the hide, they (mittens) will tear soon, that’s why one sews just like that, without scraping.’

(797d) Met tudin’ monulya tudel me kelutej.

met tudel-in’ mon-ul-γa tudel me=kelu-te-j
1SG 3SG-DAT say-GER-1/2SG.DS 3SG PF=come-FUT-INTR.3SG

‘If I ask him, he will come.’

Encoding of the predicate of a conditional clause with a coreferential subject is one of the few specializations of the TY adverbial clause. It is achieved with the help of the converbal suffix –re/-de/-te:

259 This form shows an idiosyncratic morphophonemic behavior. The base-final /l/ is retained in the event of the disjoint reference suffix attaching to such a base.
(798) *Pojuol čayd'ere tetčie me yolaatejek.*

\[pojuol \quad čayd'e-re \quad tetčie \quad me=yol-aat-je]\n
be.numerous[GER] work-COND richman PF=be-INCH-FUT-INTR.2SG

‘If you work a lot, you will become rich.’

The presence of the verbal proclitic \( at= \), the indicator of the potential mood, in the apodosis indicates irreals:

(799a) *Poγode mende magazin'ın mer at keweč.*

\[poγode \quad men'-de \quad magazin-šın'ın \quad mer=at=kwej-j\]

money take-COND shop(Russ)-DAT PF=leve-INTR.3SG

‘If he had money, he would go shopping.’

(799b) *Met ielen čieme lelwane at amuč.*

\[met \quad ile-n \quad čieme \quad lew-l-šane \quad at=amuo-j\]

reindeer blood drink-GER-1/2SG.DS POT=be.good-INTR.3SG

‘If I drank reindeer blood, it would be good.’

The non-visual suffix \( -l'el \) in the protasis signals past tense reference (800a-c) or presents the condition as counterfactual (800d):

(800a) *Met qajčie fonarik met men'elyane kinuoll'elk metqane at el ann'e.*

\[met \quad qajčie \quad fonarik \quad met \quad men'-l-γane^{260} \quad kin-uoll'elk\]

1SG grandfather torch.light 1SG take-NVIS[GER]-1/2SG.DS who-EMPH

\[metγane \quad at=el=ann'e\]

1SG-ACC POT=NEG=speak[3SG]

‘If I had taken my grandfather’s torch-light, no-one would have rebuked me.’

(800b) *Tadaa tet juösiel'elyane tadaa mer at kuril’iića.*

\[tadaa \quad tet \quad juö-se-l-γane \quad tadaa \quad mer=at=kuril’iića\]

there 2SG see-CAUS-NVIS[GER]-1/2SG.DS there PF=POT=know-3PL.TR

‘If you had had yourself examined there, there they would know [it].’

(800c) *Iidie wien köde yol-l'el-de mer=at=ewre-s-um.*

\[aunt \quad another \quad person \quad be-NVIS-COND \quad PF=POT=go-CAUS-TR.3SG\]

\[260] The gloss of this form requires some explanation. \( l'el \) is a mood suffix, i.e. a purely verbal device and as such cannot indicate a gerund, a noun that is. Theoretically, the expected relevant surface structure here is \(*-l'el-ul-γane, \) where \(-ul \) is the nominalizer suffix deriving gerunds. Phonologically nothing prevents this hypothetical string. The suffix sequence \(-l'el-ul \) ‘NVIS-GER.SF’ does exist and the velar fricative of the 1/2SG.DS suffix \(-γane \) does not, unlike \(/l/ \) present in the 3SG.DS suffix \(-daya, \) exert any restrictive influence upon the sonorant of the gerund suffix, which can be concluded from the form monul'ya ‘when/if I said’, as in (16d). How can then the absence of the gerund suffix be explained here? Possibly it could be explained by analogy: verb bases ending in an \(/l/ \) do not receive this suffix when they act as gerunds (see 3.3.2.1 g) unless they function as predicates of clauses with SF. Thus the gloss GER attached to the suffix \(-l'el \) in this narrow grammatical context does not by any means suggest a nominalizing faculty of this suffix but simply reflects this postulated analogy and the inner necessity of the TY grammar that the disjoint reference verb form be a verbal noun, a gerund.
‘If she had been a different kind of person, [my] aunt would have taken me with her.’

(800d) Met leml’e ųoll’el’yane met vremja at ewl’e.

If I were a boss, I wouldn’t have time.

The non-visual suffix occurring in the apodosis does not place the state of affairs into the past and most probably has its original modal meaning. Such examples are rare:

(801) Kötineda at amuol’en’.

If it [fishing line] were thick, it would be nice.

4.3.2.2.3 Causal clauses

Causal clauses indicate the cause of the action of the main clause. Under coreferentiality of the subjects their predicates tend to be represented by the circumstantial converb:

(802) Inje-r met el ićuo-jęęż.

‘Out of fear I did not look.’

In case of disjoint reference, the predicate of the causal clause is represented by the default gerund form discussed in 4.3.2.1. The causal meaning can be optionally enhanced by the modal particle aq ‘excessively’, ‘too much’, ‘only’:

(803a) Metuolde pude čaajle loľa-s-nu-mej aq puguodaya.

And I was cooking tea in the yard because it was very warm.

---

261 This is a theoretical form required by the inner logic of the TY grammar, namely that gerunds must have an /l/ word-finally. In the majority of qualitative verbs, to which puguo- ‘to be hot’ belongs, the word final /l/ stems from the integrated copular verb žol-. Despite the fact that the pure base, indicated in the dictionary and confirmed by the negation test (see 3.4) of this verb does not have an /l/, it must be present at some level of phonology in this verb since its BC form in the 3SG is puguon ‘[it] is hot’, just as with all verbs whose bases end with /l/ and not *puguč, the form that would be expected if the /l/ was absolutely absent (sf. amuč ‘[it] is good’ < amuо- ‘to be good').
(803b) **Kőde pojwodəya iitnəy maad’aajəŋ təŋ leml’e sespedəya.**

Kőde pojwodəya iitnəy maad’aajəŋ təŋ leml’e sespedəya.

According to the long wait for quite a while in front of the chief’s cabinet.

(Kurilov 2001:229, maad’aajə-)  

See also 4.3.2.2.8

Causal clauses formed with the help of a conjunction are discussed in 3.9.2.3.

4.3.2.2.4 Consecutive clauses

Consecutive clauses contain the consequence of the action or state of the main clause. TY does not seem to possess conjunctionless consecutive clauses. Consecutive clauses introduced by a conjunction are described in 3.9.2.4.

4.3.2.2.5 Final clauses

Final clauses express the goal of the action of the main clause. The second of the two aforesaid specializations (see 4.3.2.2) is displayed in final clauses with a subject that is coreferential with that of the main clause. For the purpose of encoding of its predicate the dative case form of the gerund is used as in (804a) and (804b). Alternatively the circumstantial converb (804c) is employed:

(804a) **Maarqan jewlid’e tude en’ieyane iisenaadayane kunil’id’ie jewlid’e iiselyin’ kőčegęjriemunə.**

Maarqan jewlid’e tude en’ieyane iisenaadayane kunil’id’ie jewlid’e iiselyin’ kőčegęjriemunə.

‘When one reindeer calf begins to suck his mother, about ten [other] calves rush to suck.’

(804b) **Qad’ir tuŋ Edilwej’in’ tigin Kuluma jemuguryat pojwoler kelul’elŋi tudeyane pun’ilŋin’.**

Qad’ir tuŋ Edilwej’in’ tigin Kuluma jemuguryat pojwoler kelul’elŋi tudeyane pun’ilŋin’.

‘Many people came to Edilwey from the other side of Kolyma in order to murder him.’

(804c) **Qan’in Spaasew ɣol-aat taiy môričer kelujeŋ.**

Qan’in Spaasew ɣol-aat taiy môričer kelujeŋ.

‘I have come to learn when it will be the Day of the Savior.’

(Kurilov 2001:265, môričer-)

See also 4.3.2.2.8

Causal clauses formed with the help of a conjunction are discussed in 3.9.2.3.

4.3.2.2.4 Consecutive clauses

Consecutive clauses contain the consequence of the action or state of the main clause. TY does not seem to possess conjunctionless consecutive clauses. Consecutive clauses introduced by a conjunction are described in 3.9.2.4.

4.3.2.2.5 Final clauses

Final clauses express the goal of the action of the main clause. The second of the two aforesaid specializations (see 4.3.2.2) is displayed in final clauses with a subject that is coreferential with that of the main clause. For the purpose of encoding of its predicate the dative case form of the gerund is used as in (804a) and (804b). Alternatively the circumstantial converb (804c) is employed:

(804a) **Maarqan jewlid’e tude en’ieyane iisenaadayane kunil’id’ie jewlid’e iiselyin’ kőčegęjriemunə.**

Maarqan jewlid’e tude en’ieyane iisenaadayane kunil’id’ie jewlid’e iiselyin’ kőčegęjriemunə.

‘When one reindeer calf begins to suck his mother, about ten [other] calves rush to suck.’

(804b) **Qad’ir tuŋ Edilwej’in’ tigin Kuluma jemuguryat pojwoler kelul’elŋi tudeyane pun’ilŋin’.**

Qad’ir tuŋ Edilwej’in’ tigin Kuluma jemuguryat pojwoler kelul’elŋi tudeyane pun’ilŋin’.

‘Many people came to Edilwey from the other side of Kolyma in order to murder him.’

(804c) **Qan’in Spaasew ɣol-aat taiy môričer kelujeŋ.**

Qan’in Spaasew ɣol-aat taiy môričer kelujeŋ.

‘I have come to learn when it will be the Day of the Savior.’

(Kurilov 2001:265, môričer-)

See also 4.3.2.2.8

Causal clauses formed with the help of a conjunction are discussed in 3.9.2.3.

4.3.2.2.4 Consecutive clauses

Consecutive clauses contain the consequence of the action or state of the main clause. TY does not seem to possess conjunctionless consecutive clauses. Consecutive clauses introduced by a conjunction are described in 3.9.2.4.

4.3.2.2.5 Final clauses

Final clauses express the goal of the action of the main clause. The second of the two aforesaid specializations (see 4.3.2.2) is displayed in final clauses with a subject that is coreferential with that of the main clause. For the purpose of encoding of its predicate the dative case form of the gerund is used as in (804a) and (804b). Alternatively the circumstantial converb (804c) is employed:

(804a) **Maarqan jewlid’e tude en’ieyane iisenaadayane kunil’id’ie jewlid’e iiselyin’ kőčegęjriemunə.**

Maarqan jewlid’e tude en’ieyane iisenaadayane kunil’id’ie jewlid’e iiselyin’ kőčegęjriemunə.

‘When one reindeer calf begins to suck his mother, about ten [other] calves rush to suck.’

(804b) **Qad’ir tuŋ Edilwej’in’ tigin Kuluma jemuguryat pojwoler kelul’elŋi tudeyane pun’ilŋin’.**

Qad’ir tuŋ Edilwej’in’ tigin Kuluma jemuguryat pojwoler kelul’elŋi tudeyane pun’ilŋin’.

‘Many people came to Edilwey from the other side of Kolyma in order to murder him.’

(804c) **Qan’in Spaasew ɣol-aat taiy môričer kelujeŋ.**

Qan’in Spaasew ɣol-aat taiy môričer kelujeŋ.

‘I have come to learn when it will be the Day of the Savior.’

(Kurilov 2001:265, môričer-)
When there is no coreferentiality, the only way to form final clauses is to use the converb *monur* ‘in order that’ (see 4.3.2.2.8). The final meaning coupled with the idea of motion can be expressed in a final verb form in a main clause (see 3.4.3.3.1).

Negative final clauses can be encoded in a language in a different way than affirmative ones. Compare the English final conjunctions ‘in order that’ and ‘lest’. This holds also for TY, where the predicate of a negative final clause is a finite verb form in the jussive mood and the final clause itself is formally an independent one.

(805) *Met-ul ende-t-ganek met-ul kōd’e el=lew-gan …*

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
1SG-ACC & burn-FUT-IMP & 1SG-ACC & worm \text{ NEG=} e at-JUSS.SG \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Burn me, lest insects eat me …’  (Kurilov and Odé 2012:28)

4.3.2.2.6 Concessive clauses

Concessive clauses present a circumstance despite which the action of the main clause is carried out or a state is achieved. Concessive clauses are formed in a similar way as temporal ones.

- coreferential subjects:

(806a) *Joqol ƞolen ƞet tit tite band’eƞ.*

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{joqol } ƞoI-ƞeƞ \text{ tit \ tit } \text{ pan-jeƞ} \\
\text{Yakut be-SIM } \text{ 2PL like be-INTR.1SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Although I am Yakut, I resemble you.’

- non-coreferential subjects:

(806b) *Met joqol ƞolyane metul titl’e ƞoriimk.*

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{met } & \text{joqol } & ƞoI-ƞane & \text{met-ul} & \text{tit-l’e} & \text{ŋol-rii-mk} \\
1SG & \text{Yakut be-1/2SG.DS } & 1SG-ACC & \text{2PL-POSS } & \text{be-CAUS-TR.2PL} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Although I am Yakut, you consider me yours.’

An optional specialization allows rendering the concessive meaning in copulative dependent clauses by the emphatic particle *ŋoll’elk* when the subjects are coreferential.

(807) *Joqol ƞoll’elk tit tite band’eƞ.*

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{joqol } ƞoll’elk \text{ tit \ tit } \text{ pan-jeƞ} \\
\text{Yakut EMPH } \text{ 2PL like be-INTR.1SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Although I am Yakut, I resemble you.’

4.3.2.2.7 Comparative clauses

Comparative clauses imply (an imaginary or subjective) likeness. Their formation is in all instances aided by the postposition *(daŋ)ɗite* ‘as if’ (see 3.9.2.6).
The circumstantial converb *monur*, which is a form of the verb *mon- ‘to say’* plays an important role in creating adverbial clauses. In this function it behaves as a complement taking predicate, whose complement is grammaticalized direct speech. Together with its complement clause the converb *monur* constitutes a dependent clause, whose function is either final or causal, depending on the mood of the predicate of the complement clause of the converb. The indicative mood signals the causal meaning, while the final meaning is indicated by the jussive mood.

**- causal meaning:**

(808a) *Tuŋ’e Moturuona l’ükuduo čińiće-łe čaajlele kuril’iitem monur l’ejke ediemek?*

*DM Motryona small-0-child darkness-ACC light-ACC know-FUT-TR.3SG*  
*mon-ur l’ejke edie-mek*

say-CIRC candle burn-TR.2SG

‘So, Motryona, you light up a candle since you think that the suckling can distinguish day from night, don’t you?’

“So, Motryona, you light up a candle saying, ‘The child will be able to tell darkness from light,’ don’t you?” (Kurilov and Odé 2012:54)

(808b) *Čuoyajmeŋ met qajcie Ponqotaa met’in’ čambe jotejek monur Tustaaq pisuolekqa laamelek keluj.*

*spring.ADV 1SG grandfather Ponkhota 1SG-DAT help be-FUT-INTR.2SG*  
*mon-ur Tustaaq pisuolek-qa laame-lek kelu-j*

say-CIRC Tustakh settlement(Russ) dog-INS come-INTR.3SG

‘In spring, my grandfather Ponkhota came riding his dogs to me, to the settlement Tustakh, thinking that I would be of help.’

“In spring, my grandfather Ponkhota came riding his dogs to me, to the settlement Tustakh, saying, ‘You will be of help.’ ”

(808c) *Taŋ nime lajudeŋ uu-nu-reŋ d’e tuŋ körel metqane kuril’iitem monur injier lad’id’a miraal’en’.*

*INV.S.DEM house toward go-DUR-SIM MP(Yak) ADL.PROX devil*  
*met-yane kuril’ii-te-m mon-ur injie-r lad’id’a mirror-l’el-i*

1SG-ACC know-FUT-TR.3SG say-CIRC get.scared-CIRC slowly walk-NVIS-INTR

‘Going toward that house and being afraid that that devil would recognize him, he walked cautiously.’

“Going toward that house and saying in fear, ‘That devil will recognize me,’ he walked cautiously.”

**- final meaning:**

(809) *Tuŋ Jeguortegyane tadaat qajcie Diŋen’kewyane mer il’iteyjan monur taat moni.*
In (808a, b) and (809) the converb monur resembles a complementizer somewhat and in (808c) it approximates a complementizer in its function, because it does not function as a complement taking predicate, delegating this function to the converb ijer ‘being afraid’. Yet, in all these examples the converb monur takes a complement in the form of direct speech suggesting that even here it formally acts as a proper verbum dicendi and that its grammaticalization into a complementizer is not completed. That monur is on a grammaticalization route is corroborated, on the other hand, by the fact that normally no other converb of the verb mon- ‘to say’ can be employed in this function and translating it with a form of the verb ‘to say’ would be unnatural in the above examples, which is indicative of an advanced semantic bleaching. The following example serves to illustrate this point. Compare the use of the converb monur in (809), where it marks a final clause, and that of the converb mondeŋ in (810), where it actually introduces reported speech.

(810)  Tan čuøyajme čii puŋuoselŋin’ keluŋi mondeŋ erime jarqa al’aaŋan pulgid’ilepe amdur jedejŋyan

and spring,ADV people rejoice-CAUS-GER-DAT come-3PL_INTR say-SIM

erime jarqa al’aaŋan pulgid’ile-pe amdur jedejŋuŋyan

snow ice melt-JUSS.SG plant-PL quickly appear-PL_JUSS

‘And in spring they come to make people glad by saying, “May the snow and ice melt, may plants appear soon!” ’  

(Kurilov 1994:9)

4.3.3 Relative clauses

4.3.3.1 General observations

Relative clauses are understood here as clauses that function as attributes of NPs. As there are no relative pronouns in TY, relative clauses are realized as participial constructions or gerunds. Participles of TY are not readily compatible with the simple typological division in terms of orientation, applied in Haspelmath (1994:153-154). In TY there is no generally applicable participial form that would indiscriminately be oriented toward agent, patient and, as is possible in many languages, to a peripheral constituent, therefore the TY participles cannot be regarded as contextually oriented. On

---

262 It is important to note that restrictive relative clauses are represented by the form of the gerund which is used to indicate SF and differs formally from non-focal gerunds in verbs whose bases end with /l/, the latter being converted bases and the former derived by the suffix -l. For simplicity of presentation and, more importantly, due to the fact that they are not in all case modifiers of S-arguments, they are glossed simply as GER and not as GER.SF.
the other hand, the most common participial markers -j(e), -če, -d’e do not indicate orientation of participles. Rather it is the verbal stem that provides this information: if it lacks the copular verb ŋol-, it is active and the participle is normally agent-oriented, if it contains the copular verb, it is a passive form and patient oriented.

The matter is, in fact, more complicated: there are two participial markers that do indicate orientation of the participles. The first of them, the suffix –me, shows that the participle of a transitive verb is patient-oriented, and this without the presence of the passivizing copular verb, which obligatorily lacks in these participles. The second, the suffix –be, is a marker of participles oriented toward a peripheral constituent. However, it occurs only in participles of transitive verbs. For attributive forms of intransitive verbs to be adjunct oriented there are two strategies: a regular participle in the active voice or a gerund can be employed. The former strategy has a restricted usage and seems to be possible only when there is a strong cognitive link between the verb and the adjunct, which acquires the status of a quasi-object, the only one semantically possible with a given intransitive verb (cf. the Mamas and Papas’ ‘Dream a little dream of me!’), which is illustrated in (811a). If such a tight conceptual link is not there, the –l-gerund (see 3.3.2.1 g on gerund formation) must be employed as in (812a). Apart from the –l-gerund, the –ŋol-gerund is available for the purpose of creating attributive forms of intransitive verbs with adjunct orientation. The functional difference between the participle and –l-gerund on the one hand and the –ŋol-gerund on the other hand lies in their aspectual value. The presence of the copula ŋol-lends it a perfective, or resultative meaning (811b), or simply indicates past tense reference (812b), whereas its absence, sometimes coupled with the presence of the durative aspect suffix, indicates imperfectivity (811a) and (812a).

(811a) *Tudel uu-nuj / uu-nul jawulgi erimelek umduon*.

\[
\text{tudel} \quad \text{uu-nu-j} / \text{uu-nu-l} \quad \text{jawul-gi} \quad \text{erime-lek} \quad \text{umduol-i}
\]

\[
3\text{SG} \quad \text{go-DUR-INTR.3SG} / \text{go-DUR-GER} \quad \text{path-PERT} \quad \text{snow-INS} \quad \text{be.covered-INTR.3SG}
\]

‘The road he was walking along was covered with snow.’

(811b) *Tudel uujuol jawulgi erimelek umduon*.

\[
\text{tudel} \quad \text{uu-ŋol} \quad \text{jawul-gi} \quad \text{erime-lek} \quad \text{umduol-i}
\]

\[
3\text{SG} \quad \text{go-be[GER]} \quad \text{path-PERT} \quad \text{snow-INS} \quad \text{be.covered-INTR.3SG}
\]

‘The road he walked along was covered with snow.’

(812a) *Met *saγane-j / saγane-l nime juku nime-k*.

\[
1\text{SG} \quad \text{sit-PTCP} / \text{sit-GER} \quad \text{house small} \quad \text{house-COP}
\]

‘The house I live in is small.’

(812b) *Met saγanejuol nime juku nimek*.

\[
1\text{SG} \quad \text{sit-be[GER]} \quad \text{house small} \quad \text{house-COP}
\]

‘The house I lived in is small.’

---

263 Adjunct orientation of –ŋol-gerunds is not confined to primarily intransitive verbs. Gerunds obtained by conversion from bases of passivized transitive verbs also can act as adjunct oriented relative clauses.
Resuming, TY participles cannot be regarded in their totality as either contextually or inherently oriented, which is undoubtedly a peculiar typological feature.

From the above it is clear that TY participles can be oriented toward arguments and peripheral constituents. It is noteworthy in this connection that the accessibility of adjuncts for relativization seems to be primarily a characteristic of languages with clearly contextually oriented participles (Schmalz 2008:89), among which TY, as has been explained, cannot be counted.

4.3.3.2 Syntactic types of relative clauses

Relative clauses in TY can have a head and can be headless as well. Different constellations of orientation and presence or absence of a head are illustrated in the following examples.

- agent oriented, headed:

This kind of relative clauses can be realized only by the –j(e), -če, -d’e participles.

(813a) Sugud’eyat pulgeče jaqte ñolaar l’uku ñoldaya ewlikiel’eld’e tude en’ieyane leitej’elum.

\begin{verbatim}
sugud’-e-ya-t pulgej-je jaqte ñol-aa-r l’uku ñol-daya ewlikie-l’el-je tude enie-γane leitej-l’el-um
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
heart-LOC-ABL come.out-PTCP song be-INCH-CIRC small be[GER]-3SG.DS disappear-NVIS-PTCP
\end{verbatim}

‘Since it was a song, which came from the heart, she recalled her mother, who had died when she was small.’

(813b) qajl’e wayčij čii.

\begin{verbatim}
qajl’-le wayči-j čii
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
stone-ACC look.for-PTCP people
\end{verbatim}

‘people searching for stones.’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

- agent oriented, headless:

This kind of relative clauses is represented very sparsely in my material and actually only in the form of nominalized participles:

(814) Metul mnennaar aruudewresče pöčesejitem.

\begin{verbatim}
met-ul men’-nu-aa-r aruu-d-ewre-s-je pöčesej-te-m
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
1SG-ACC take-DUR-INCH-CIRC speech-0-go-CAUS-PTCP send-FUT-TR.3SG
\end{verbatim}

‘In order to marry me, they sent a match-maker.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:36)

- patient oriented, headed:

The predicate of a patient oriented relative clause can be encoded as –je-participle (815a) or –me-participle (815b) as well as be represented by a gerund (815c).
(815a) Tide met peldudie mirin’ tude čama nonyalawjettegeγane, ilen sawayat wiejuod’e
mayil čidoŋjojdej≥t waarej≥m.

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{tide met peldudie mirin’ tude} & \text{čama nonyalawjettegeγane} \\
\text{ANPH} & \text{1SG old.man} & \text{just} & \text{3SG.POSS big pipe-AUG-ACC}
\end{array}
\]

‘That old man of mine had just pulled his big pipe, made of a reindeer skin, out of
a pocket of [his] dress.’

(815b) met ögötienume nime

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{met ögöte-nu-me} & \text{nime} \\
1\text{SG erect-DUR-PTCP.PASS house}
\end{array}
\]

‘the house I am building’

(815c) Uorpedie, met tindaa kunil’kin sukumnol’γaln’er ileγa ilwiicie ůldeγe ewrer
mörüjouol met n’ied’il n’ied’itemeγ.

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Uorpedie, met tindaa kunil’kin sukumnol’γal} & \text{n’er ileγa ilwiicie ůldeγe} & \text{ewrer mörüjouol met} & \text{n’ied’il n’ied’itemeγ} \\
\text{children-DIM} & \text{1SG long.ago ten-two.GEN year-VBLZ-CIRC} & \text{reindeer-LOC}
\end{array}
\]

‘Little children, I will tell you a story which I heard long ago when I, a 12 year
old child, worked as a herder.’

A relative clause involving a transitive verb often contains the agent, which occupies the
position in front of the attributively used verb form.

(816a) … l’ukuolγa tet en’ie jaqtejuol jaqtelgi.

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
l’ukuolγa & \text{tet en’ie jaqteγa} & \text{jaqte-l-gi} \\
\text{small-be[GER]-1/2DS.2SG mother sing-be[GER]} & \text{sing-GER-PERT}
\end{array}
\]

‘… the song your mother sang when you were small.’

(816b) Tittel wiejuolpegin nime mer amuč.

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
tittel & \text{wie-jol-pe-gi} & \text{nime} & \text{mer=amu-o-j} \\
3\text{PL make-be-PL-PERT-GEN house PF-be-good-INTR.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘The house built by them is nice.’

The following example demonstrates that a relative clause in TY does not have to
precede its head and linguistic material can be inserted in-between.

(817) Sukungi ilegi čiiγat med’uoloul taat pojuon’ kičilgi el kurul’uol.

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
sukun-gi & \text{ile-gi} & \text{čii-ga-t} & \text{men’-jol-jol} & \text{taat pojuol-i} \\
\text{thing-PERT} & \text{reindeer-PERT} & \text{people-LOC-ABL.} & \text{take-be} & \text{so be.numerous-INTR.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
kičil-gi & \text{el=kurul’-jol} \\
\text{end-PERT} & \text{NEG=know-be[3SG]}
\end{array}
\]

‘The belongings and reindeer that were taken away [by him] from people were so
numerous that they were endless.’    (Kurilov 2005:130)
- patient oriented, headless:

This kind of relative clauses is represented only by –ŋol-gerunds and forms, in fact, together with the doer of the action expressed by the gerund, a possessive construction, the gerund being the possessum and the preceding nominal being the possessor.

(818a) Met sibaajuol maranme liynareŋ kerienuni.

met siba-ŋol maranne liyna-ŋ kerienuni
1SG besmar-be[GER] simply be.nice-SIM fall-HAB-INTR.3SG

‘[What] I have besmeared, just falls off in pieces.’ (Kurilov 2001:181, kerie-)

(818b) L’ie čii kečijuol monnguni qad’ir puŋuoldenŋ.

l’ie čii keči-ŋol mon-nun-ŋi qad’ir puŋuol-ŋeŋ
MP people bring-be[GER] say-HAB-3PL..INTR MP rejoice-SIM

‘But [this is] what people have brought,’ they say rejoicing.

- adjunct oriented, headed:

Some examples of headed adjunct oriented relative clauses were given above (811a, b) and (812a, b). Here is an example with the oblique participle:

(819) Al’γadeluojinube kuul’γa mit amaape qajl’ čiribepe tuutellek me miraajeli.

al’γa-d-eluoji-nu-be kuul’γa mit amaape qajl’ čiribe-pe
fish-0-carry-DUR-OP sack-LOC 1PL father-PL stone plummet-PL

tuute-relek me=mira-aa-jeli
put-ANT =walk-INC..HAB.1PL

‘We put our fathers’ stone plummets into a sack for carrying fish and began to walk.’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

- adjunct oriented, headless:

Unlike the preceding headless relative clauses, these can be represented by both nominalized oblique participles (820a) or by gerunds (820b). They too can be interpreted syntactically as possessive constructions.

(820a) Elugurčend’e peldudie Luoqaa čuguo’d’e čoŋojeɣane lačiŋ sisayasnubeŋa sayanereŋ n’aacëšnum.

el=uggurče-n’-je peldudie Luoqaa čuguo-je čoŋoje-ɣane
NEG=leg-VBLZ-PTCP old.man Luokhaa be.sharp-PTCP knife-ACC

lačil-n sisay-a-s-nu-be-ɣa sayane-ŋeŋ n’aacëš-nu-m
fire-GEN tear-TR-DUR-LOC sit-SIM grind-DUR-TR,3SG

‘The legless old Lokhaa ground the sharp knife sitting at [the place] for chopping firewood.’

(820b) Tuŋ ködeŋ tude saalŋin’ waaj laŋyudeŋ kölelek qad’ir tideŋ pajpen kewejuluŋan ičuonaal’elum.
That man came up to the tree and began to examine the hole through which that woman disappeared.

4.3.3.3 Restrictive vs. non-restrictive relative clauses

As is common in many languages, TY makes a distinction between restrictive relative clauses, which single out one referent from a multitude of potential referents, and non-restrictive relative clauses, which simply provide an optional description of a referent.

According to Kurilov (personal communication), restrictive relative clauses are realized as gerunds. This claim can be refined by saying that gerund forms otherwise employed to signal SF can have only restrictive meaning:

(821a) Luge-l pełudie n’aače-gi me=n’amuçen’-i.
be.older-GER old.man face-PERT PF=be.red-INTR.3SG
‘The oldest of the seniors had a red face.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:86)

(821b) Jewl’id’e med’uolel kind’eye puolek me keriesnumuj me kuderej.
reinder.calf take-be-GER month-LOC fur.curtain PF=fall-CAUS-HAB-1PL.TR
me=kudere-j.
PF=put-1PL.TR
‘In the month when reindeer calves are born, we take off the fur curtains and put them aside.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:176)

(821c) Ieruuče wadun nimele Čamuolel Uluruo-γa ögetem.
hunter Yukaghir-GEN house-ACC Big-be-GER Uluro-LOC install-TR.3SG
‘The hunter put the tent at [the shore of] Big Uluro.’

(821d) Tan Sveta kelul kind’eye moni l’ie otpuskagi juoγajdaya ten’i bol’nicαya me sewtejen moni čayad’αačer.
and Sveta come-GER month-LOC say-INTR.3SG holidays(Russ)-PERT end-GER.3SG.DS
ten’i bol’nicα-γa me=sew-te-jeŋ mon-i čayad’e-če-r
hospital(Russ)-LOC PF=enter-FUT-INTR.1SG say-INTR.3SG work-ITV-CIRC
‘And Sveta said that next month, when her holidays were over, she would go to work in the hospital here.’

As for the non-focal gerund forms, these also seem to embody restrictive relative clauses but not as consistently. Thus in the following example the first gerund certainly represents a non-restrictive relative clause because the woman’s husband is intended by the head of the participial construction, who principally does not require being singled out since Yukaghirs are monogamous. The second gerund can, however, be interpreted as indicating a restrictive relative clause since money could be borrowed or stolen:
As for the participial forms, it appears that they also allow both readings: restrictive and non-restrictive. In Kurilov’s opinion (personal communication) participles in –j(e), -če, -d’e are by default non-restrictive. In (815a) the relative clause is arguably non-restrictive, while in (823) it is undoubtedly restrictive. It should be noted, however, that in (823) the participle is accompanied by the adverb aq ‘only’, which might be responsible for the restrictive meaning.

(823) Ličuorkele me pon’im, aq uruođ’edilelek keweč.
ličuorke-le me=pon’i-m aq uraa-ŋol-je-d-ile-lek kewe-j
femail.reindeer-ACC PF=leave-TR.3SG only learn-be-PTCP-0-reindeer-INS leave-INTR.3SG
‘He left female reindeer [and] traveled on the trained reindeer only.’

(Kurilov 2005:128)

Summarizing, it can be stated that focal forms of gerunds always represent restrictive relative clauses. This is probably true also of –me and –be-participles. As for non-focal gerundial forms and the –j(e), -če, -d’e participles, they are insensitive to the criterion of restrictivity and, depending on the context and presence of other linguistic devices, such as the adverb aq ‘only’ in (823), produce both restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses.

4.3.3.4 Relativizers

Although it was stated in 4.3.3.1 that relative pronouns are absent from TY, interrogative pronouns can aid the formation of relative clauses.

(824) Školaya kinek el ’uọŋarejl’eld’e čii aptaanunŋa.
škola-γa kinek el=l’uọŋa-re-j-l’el-je čii apte-nunŋa
school(Russ)-LOC who NEG=finish-TR-SEM-NVIS-PTCP people gather-HAB-TR.3PL
‘They gather the people who have not finished school.’

4.3.4 Compound sentences

Coordinated clauses in TY form compound sentences with or without the help of a conjunction. Since compound sentences without an explicit coordinating signal can be difficult to distinguish from a sequence of adjoining independent clauses264, only such conjunctionless sentences are regarded as compound in the following overview which consist of clauses which, in turn, constitute a semantic whole describing a state of affairs as if representing different facets of one and the same state of affairs. This typically applies to same subject clauses, but can hold also for predicates with non-coreferential

264 This made Maslova (2003a:369) assert the absence of compound sentences for the related KY.
subjects if the (admittedly subjective) degree of interrelation of the clauses involved is relatively high, judging by the context. A useful formal criterion in this connection could be the identity of the focus pattern of the clauses in question, which makes viewing co-occurring predicates as describing one and the same situation from different angles more plausible.

Following Rozental’ et al. (2002:380-384) sentences involving coordination of clauses are grouped and characterized according to the semantic relations the coordinated clauses comprising the sentence enter into with one another. Those are copulative, adversative, disjunctive, explanatory, contrastive and additive relations.

4.3.4.1 Copulative compound sentences

Copulative clauses can be coordinated in TY without a conjunction. In (825) and (826) the typical cases of multipredicative sentences with one shared subject are illustrated. The coordinated clauses in (825a) and (825b) are enclosed in square brackets.

(825a) Anmolyīn’ nemej el lawčuon taat köčid’iejeŋ jaqtaanaajen.  
Anmolyin’ nemej el=law-čuon taat [köčid’i-ie-jen] [jaqte-nu-aa-jen]  
Without drinking anything [alcoholic] I began to jump and sing like that.  
(Kurilov 1991:45, anmolyin’)

(825b) Taŋ wolmetke jaqtaanureŋ aŋale [padyuusaam][ köčid’iej]!  
tay wolme-tke jaqte-nu-reŋ aŋa-le padyu-s-aa-m  
DEM shaman-AUG sing-DUR-SIM mouth-ACC tremble-CAUS-INTR.3SG  
‘This huge shaman, while singing, began to smack his lip and dart about.’  
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:32)

In (826) the two predicates arguably describe one state of affairs exhibiting the same focal pattern and are thus regarded as coordinated.

(826) ‘Tet mitqa jedeček mit ile pojumuj!’ monnuni metin’ met amaa.  
tet mit-γa jedej-jek mit ile pojuol-mu-j  
2SG 1PL-LOC appear-INTR.2SG 1PL reindeer be.many-INTR.3SG  
mon-nun-i met-in’ met amaa.  
say-HAB-INTR.3SG 1SG-DAT 1SG father  
‘You were born and our reindeer [herd] increased in number!’ my father used to tell me.  
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:20)

In (827) the coordinated clauses with non-coreferential subjects describe together the cause for the action of the main clause. Again, their focal patterns are identical:

(827) Erime kerieteŋ quruul čamaney qan’qaatej monur qomdeme galdejnuji.  
erime kerie-te-j quruul čama-reŋ qad’uu-qaa-te-j mon-ur  
snow fall-FUT-INTR.3SG sky big-ADV be.cold-INTR.3SG say-CIRC
For the sake of contrast the example in (828) is given, where the interpretation of the sentence as compound is controversial. These might just as well be two separate juxtaposed clauses. The subjects of the clauses as well as their focal patterns are different. The SF focal pattern in the second clause is indicative of the introduction of a new topic, therefore it cannot be plausibly taken as describing the same state of affairs as the first clause:

(828)  \textit{N’umun’alya quduon’, erimeley kerienaal …} \\
former.nomad.camp-LOC lie-INTR.3SG snow-FOC fall-DUR-1NCH-GER.SF \\
‘[But there] he lies in the camp, it started to snow …’ \\
(Kurilov 1994:7)

Finite clauses are unambiguously coordinated when they are joined with the help of conjunctions, which in the case of copulative clauses are \textit{tadaat} ‘and’ \textit{tadaate} ‘and.EMPH’:

(829)  \textit{Čupče peldudie mer eguoj tadaata tude aduonj qonyad’inaaj.} \\
Chukchi-GEN old.man PF=get.up-INTR.3SG tadaate 3SG.POSS son-DAT bow.down.ITR-DUR-1NCH-INTR.3SG \\
‘The Chukchi old man woke up and began to bow down before his son.’ \\
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:24)

4.3.4.2 Adversative compound sentences

Sentences of this type ‘express opposition or confrontation, sometimes with different additional shades of meaning (discrepancy, limitation, concession etc.)’ (Rozental’ et al. 2002:382) Coordination of clauses in adversative compound sentences is normally mediated by the conjunction \textit{tan} ‘but’, ‘and’ as in (830a) and (830b) or is conjunctionless as in (830c).

(830a)  \textit{Met tudel me=maa-ŋ tan tudel el=kelu.} \\
1SG 3SG PF=wait-1SG.TR but 3SG NEG=come[3SG] \\
‘I waited for him but he did not come.’

(830b)  \textit{Jerpeje me=sayaa-ŋ tan juorpure wajidek me=čajle-n´i.} \\
sun PF=disappear-INTR.3SG but tundra still PF=light-VBLZ-INTR.3SG \\
‘The sun has set down but it is still light in the tundra.’

(830c)  \textit{Mit wadulpe ýod’eli (tan) tittel joqolpeley.} \\
1PL Yukaghir be-INTR.1PL and 3PL Yakut-PL-COP
‘We are Yukaghirs and they are Yakuts.’

4.3.4.3 Disjunctive compound sentences

Sentences of this type ‘indicate alternation of events, their succession, incompatibility’ (Rozental’ et al. 2002:383).

(831) Kačikan imdal’d’an sukunmol’γaln’ej ejk me čammučiij.
    Kačikan imdal’d’al-n sukunmol’γal-n’e-j ejk me=čama-γol-čii-j
Kačikan five-GEN year-VBLZ-INTR.3SG or PF=big-be-DIM-INTR.3SG
‘Kačikan was five or a little older.’ (Kurilov and Odé 12:108)

4.3.4.4 Explanatory compound sentences

Explanatory compound sentences contain clauses that provide supplementary, clarifying, paraphrase-like information about the state of affairs described in another clause.

(832) Anaan amuče čajle ɣon’, jerpen’i, l’ukučuo qad’uučii, neme γoll’elk el mörüu.
    anaan amu-o-je čajle ɣol-i jerpeje-n’-i
very be.good-PTCP day be-INTR.3SG sun-VBLZ-INTR.3SG
l’ukučuo qad’uu-čii neme γoll’elk el=mörüu
little.bit be.cold-DIM what EMPH NEG=be.audible[3SG]
‘It was a very nice day; it was sunny, slightly frosty and completely quiet.’

4.3.4.5 Contrastive compound sentences

Contrastive compound sentences ‘express discrepancy, limitation, opposition of the confronted clauses’ (Rozental’ et al. 2002:383).

(833) Met el=inje-naa-jeŋ maarquon’ met čuŋda-ɣa el=amu-o.
    1SG NEG=be.afraid-INCH-INTR.1SG only 1SG mind-LOC NEG=be.good
‘It’s not that I got scared but a timid feeling crept into my heart.’

4.3.4.6 Additive compound sentences

In this type of sentences ‘the contents of the second clause represent additional information or a supplementary remark, related to the first clause’ (Rozental’ et al. 2002:384).

(834) Čii čamu-neγ yew-l-bun’-ie-yi ile-pul waaj
    people big-ADV drink-GER-DES-INCH-3PL.INTR reindeer-PL also
werwe-pe-gi n’id’ayaj-l.
    strength-PL-PERT be.exhausted-GER.SF
‘The people became very hungry, the reindeer also needed rest.’