

This study is intended to provide a grammatical description of Ostyak, one of the Uralic languages spoken in Western Siberia. The description is based on the Northern Ostyak dialect of Obdorsk, although divergent features of other dialects are also discussed. The present paper emphasizes the syntactic aspect of the language, typically ignored in previous descriptive work on Ostyak, which mostly concentrates on its phonology and morphology.

Part 1 is a concise sketch of the Ostyak grammar, made up of the following sections: "Introductory remarks" (geo- and sociolinguistic data, previous studies, dialect division), "Phonology" (including phonotactics and prosody), "Morphology" (grammatical categories, word formation, illustrative paradigms), and "Basic syntax" (types of simple and complex sentences, discourse phenomena). A sample text in the Obdorsk dialect of Ostyak is provided.

Part 2 elaborates on certain syntactic topics that are of a particular interest from the typological viewpoint. In particular, the following topics are discussed: information structure and word order, object agreement, passivization, the relative clause, clause-chaining and reference tracking, and the category of the evidential.

Part 3 serves to provide the necessary reference. It contains the bibliography relevant to the present study, as well as the basic bibliography on Ostyak. The latter includes editions of the folklore texts, lexicographic publications, comprehensive descriptions, and the most important studies on certain aspects of the Ostyak grammar.

Irina Nikolaeva completed her dissertation at the Finno-Ugric department of the Institute for Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Science. She has been publishing on synchronic and diachronic aspects on various Siberian languages.

ISBN 3 89586 562 1



LINCOM EUROPA

academic publishers

LW/M 305

Irina Nikolaeva : Ostyak

LINCOM EUROPA

# *Ostyak*

**Irina Nikolaeva**

*Languages of the World/Materials 305*  
LINCOM EUROPA

# *Ostyak*

Irina Nikolaeva

*Languages of the World/Materials 305*

1999  
LINCOM EUROPA

Published by LINCOM EUROPA 1999.

All correspondence concerning *Languages of the World/Materials* should be addressed to:

LINCOM EUROPA  
Paul-Preuss-Str. 25  
D-80995 Muenchen

LINCOM.EUROPA@t-online.de  
<http://home.t-online.de/home/LINCOM.EUROPA>

All rights reserved, including the rights of translation into any foreign language. No part of this book may be reproduced in any way without the permission of the publisher.

Printed in E.C.

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

**Nikolaeva, Irina A.:**  
Ostyak / Irina Nikolaeva. – München ; Newcastle : LINCOM Europa,  
1999  
(Languages of the World : Materials ; 305)  
ISBN 3-89586-562-1

Printed on chlorine-free paper

## Contents

Part 1: Essential of Ostyak grammar .....	3
0. Introductory remarks .....	3
0.1. Geo- and sociolinguistic data .....	3
0.2. Ostyak dialects .....	3
0.3. Previous studies .....	4
1. Phonology .....	5
1.1. Vowels .....	5
1.2. Consonants .....	6
1.3. Phonotactics and phonological alternations .....	6
1.3.1. Vowel deletion and consonantal epenthesis .....	6
1.3.2. <i>ə</i> as an epenthetic vowel .....	7
1.3.3. Consonant clusters .....	9
1.3.4. Phonological alternations of vowels .....	10
1.4. Prosodic phenomena .....	11
2. Morphology .....	11
2.1. Nominal morphology .....	12
2.1.1. Noun .....	12
2.1.1.1. Number .....	12
2.1.1.2. Case .....	13
2.1.1.3. Possession .....	14
2.1.1.4. Nominal derivation .....	14
2.1.2. Pronouns .....	15
2.1.2.1. Personal pronouns .....	15
2.1.2.2. Demonstratives .....	16
2.1.2.3. Reciprocals .....	16
2.1.2.4. Interrogative pronouns .....	17
2.1.2.5. Indefinite pronouns .....	18
2.1.2.6. Quantitative pronouns .....	19
2.1.3. Numerals .....	19
2.1.4. Adjectives .....	20
2.1.5. Adverbs .....	21
2.1.6. Nominal categorizers .....	22
2.2. Verbal morphology .....	23
2.2.1. Conjugation .....	23
2.2.2. TAM-system .....	25
2.2.2.1. Mood .....	25
2.2.2.2. Tense .....	26
2.2.2.3. Aspect .....	27
2.2.3. Negation .....	28
2.2.4. Verbal categorizers .....	29
2.2.4.1. Verbalizers .....	29
2.2.4.2. Valence-changing affixes .....	30
2.2.4.3. Passive .....	30
2.2.5. Verbal modifiers .....	33
2.2.6. Verbal derivation .....	34
2.3. Other grammatical classes .....	36
2.3.1. Postpositions .....	36
2.3.2. Particles and conjunctions .....	37
2.3.3. Interjections .....	38

2	
3. Basic syntax	38
3.1. Sentence types	39
3.1.1. Verbal clauses	39
3.1.2. Copular clauses	40
3.2. Grammatical relations	42
3.3. Complex sentences	44
3.3.1. Coordination	44
3.3.2. Subordination	45
3.3.2.1. Finite clauses	45
3.3.2.2. Non-finite clauses	46
3.4. Discourse phenomena	49
3.4. Noun phrase	51
3.4.1. Possessive NPs	52
3.4.2. Non-possessive NPs	52
4. Sample text	54
Part 2: Topics in syntax and semantics	57
5. Word order and information structure	57
5.1. Verb finality	57
5.2. Subject and topic initiality	58
5.3. Focus position	60
5.4. Complex predicates	61
5.5. Object position	63
6. Object agreement	64
6.1. Syntactic properties of the object	65
6.2. Constituent structure	67
6.3. Argument structure	70
6.4. Information structure	73
7. Relative clauses	76
7.1. Agreement within the relative clause	76
7.2. Relative clauses and possessives	79
7.3. Semantics of the possessive construction in Ostyak	80
7.4. Motivating the relative clause construction	84
8. Evidentials	88
8.1. Hearsay use	89
8.2. Resultative use	90
8.3. Inferential use	92
8.4. Mirative use	93
8.5. Evidentials and other verbal categories	94
Bibliography	99
Abbreviations	106

## PART I: Essentials of Ostyak grammar

### 0. Introductory remarks

#### 0.1. Geo- and sociolinguistic data

The Ostyak language, together with Vogul and Hungarian, belongs to the Ugric group of the Uralic language family. The closest linguistic relatives of the Ostyaks are the Voguls, with whom they form the so-called Ob-Ugric subgroup within the Ugric group. The official modern name of the Ostyaks in Russian is Khanty, which goes back to their self-designation. However, the linguistic literature in languages other than Russian uses the term "Ostyak" instead, based on the nineteenth century Russian tradition.

The modern Ostyaks live in the northwestern part of Siberia, along the lower and the middle reaches of the river Ob and on its tributaries. The great majority of the Ostyaks live in the territory of the Khanty-Mansi and Yamalo-Nenets national districts (about 63% and 30% of the Ostyaks respectively); smaller Ostyak groups can also be found in the Tomsk region of the Tumen district. In the Khanty-Mansi national district the Ostyaks constitute the majority of the population in the Beryozovo, Shuryshkary, Surgut and Nizhnevartovsk regions. The modern Ostyaks usually live in small villages, which sometimes consist of only a few houses. Their main occupations are fishing and hunting; the northernmost Ostyaks also engage in reindeer breeding. The Ostyaks began to use written records in the 1930s, based on the Cyrillic alphabet. However writing and reading skills in the native language are not widespread.

The Ostyaks at present constitute one of the smallest ethnic groups in Siberia. As with most other northern minorities of Russia, only an estimate of their population can be given. The main reason for this is that the Ostyaks are often involved in ethnically mixed marriages. Children of mixed marriages are registered by their parents as Ostyaks whenever possible, because the Ostyaks until recently enjoyed certain economic privileges over the Russian population of the same territories. According to the official census, in 1989 there were about 22 thousand ethnic Ostyaks. Among them the Ostyak language is the first language for about 13 thousand people (61%). For most other ethnic Ostyaks Russian is the first, and often the only language. Generally speaking, Ostyaks under age 35 rarely consider Ostyak as their native language, though the precise age of transition into Russian varies greatly among the territories. The older generation is sometimes bilingual or multilingual: apart from Ostyak and Russian, northern Ostyaks may know some Vogul, Komi, or Nenets, and eastern Ostyaks some Selkup and/or Ket.

#### 0.2. Ostyak dialects

Compared with other Uralic tongues, Ostyak is remarkable for its great divergence of dialects. At the extremes, the dialects demonstrate significant difference at all levels of grammar and are entirely mutually incomprehensible. According to the various classifications, there are from 5 to 14 dialects and within these a great number of local idioms. An uncontroversial classification of dialects is difficult to establish, because, first, the Ostyak language area is composed of a continuum of language variants and it is not possible to draw strict borders between different local idioms (Vértes 1985; Schiefer 1985), and second, many dialects are mixed in character (Steinitz 1937). The most commonly accepted classification, which goes back to Steinitz (1937), subdivides the Ostyak continuum into three major groups:

(i) eastern dialects (dialects of Vakh-Vasyugan, Surgut, and Salym);

(ii) southern dialects (dialects of Irtysh and Demyanka);

(iii) northern dialects (dialects of middle-Ob, Kazym, Shuryshkary, and Obdorsk).

The dialects vary in their degree of preservation. The southern dialects and the dialect of Salym have almost died out; there are no precise data about a number of surviving speakers. The eastern dialects of Vakh-Vasyugan and Surgut are still spoken but are being lost fairly quickly. The reason for this is that the eastern Ostyaks are more mixed ethnically

than those in the north, since their homeland is a place of active industrial development, to which the Russian population is attracted. Furthermore, until recently the eastern Ostyaks have not had writing and school teaching in Ostyak, thus the standardization of the language has not occurred to the same degree as in the north. The best preserved are northern dialects, which have always had more speakers and where the tradition of the use of the language has not been broken. The northern dialects of Kazym and Shuryshkary constitute a basis of the so-called Ostyak literary language, i.e. of the writing system, published materials, and school teaching.

Phonologically, eastern Ostyak is distinguished from northern and southern Ostyak by the presence of vowel harmony, by its rich system of the paradigmatic vowel alternations, and by more intricate vocalism in general. As shown in Steinitz (1944), eastern Ostyak is the most archaic from the phonological point of view and plays an important role in the reconstruction of Proto-Finno-Ugric phonology. The morphology of eastern Ostyak possesses a more complicated system of case marking (about 10–11 cases as distinct from 3 or 4 in the northern dialects) and of verbal tenses (6 as distinct from 3 in the northern dialects). Syntactically, the eastern dialects are characterized by the ergative construction, which is completely absent from the northern Ostyak dialects and the other Uralic languages in general. The ergative strategy co-exists with the Accusative pattern, which makes the eastern dialects the most intriguing from the syntactic viewpoint. A comprehensive compendium of the dialectal divergences can be found in Honti (1984).

This paper describes the so-called Sob local idiom of the most northern Ostyak dialect, the dialect of Obdorsk. It is spoken by approximately 500 people in the settlements Katravozh and Pelvozh, situated in the lower basin of the Ob in the Jamalo-Nenets national district and the Khanty-Mansi national district, respectively. It should be noticed that the Sob idiom of the Obdorsk dialect is phonologically very close to the dialect of Shuryshkary. Its vocalic system is identical to that of the Shuryshkary dialect and differs from that of the other Obdorsk idioms. However, by other criteria the Sob idiom belongs to the Obdorsk dialect. It lacks the Lative case present in the Shuryshkary dialect; unlike the Shuryshkary dialect it does not oppose *s* and *ʃ*, and it has the Locative in *-na* (as distinct from Shuryshkary *-n*). Otherwise, all northern Ostyak dialects are fairly close with respect to their morphology and syntax, so I believe that the dialect described here well represents the northern Ostyak grammar in general.

### 0.3. Previous studies

The first Ostyak data were put down in writing during the eighteenth century "word collecting" period of the Russian Academy. On these and the works from the early nineteenth century (the primer books and the Bible translations, compiled by Missionaries) see Honti (1984: 8–9). The late nineteenth and early twentieth century saw the collection of many native Ostyak texts. The first scholar to visit the Ostyaks was the Hungarian Antal Reguly, who in the 1840s set down in writing northern Ostyak folklore (Reguly et al. 1944, 1951). Although subsequent researches also examined the southern and eastern dialects, the northern Ostyaks remained the principle focus of study. The major collections of folklore texts were compiled by Pápay (1905, 1906–1908), Steinitz (1975–1980), Karjalainen (1976), and Paasonen (1980). Lexical data from practically all the Ostyak dialects have been published in dialectological dictionaries (Karjalainen 1948; Steinitz 1966–1989).

During the second half of the twentieth century only occasional texts and collections of words have appeared. Studies of Ostyak have concentrated mainly on language history and etymology. The most remarkable results in the reconstruction of the Proto-Ostyak and Proto-Ob-Ugric phonological system are associated with the names of Steinitz (1944) and Honti (1982). In the field of the history of loanwords the most important works are those of Rédei (1973) on loanwords from Komi, of Korényi (1972) on those from Iranian, and of Futaki (1975) on those from Tungus. The other principle focus of study has been morphology, and

this has also been approached mainly from the historical perspective. Historical considerations underlay the works of Ganschow on Ostyak verbal word formation (Ganschow 1965), the works of Vértes on the pronominal system (Vértes 1967), and of Sauer (Sauer 1967) on the nominal word formation, among others.

Syntax has traditionally been less thoroughly studied. Only a few works, focussing on particular topics and containing basic descriptive information, have appeared. Examples are Csepregi (1978–1979) on participial embedded clauses, Gulya (1970) on the ergative construction, Kulonen (1989) on the passive, and Klemm (1928–1930), Gulya (1970) and Szalacsek (1984) on the so-called objective conjugation (object agreement). In recent years several descriptive works on various aspects of the syntax of the northern dialects appeared in Novosibirsk. The most important are Čeremisina and Koškareva (1991), Kovgan (1991), and Koškareva (1991) on the structure of the embedded clause; Čeremisina and Kovgan (1989) and Kaksin (1993) on temporal and modal categories; Nikolaeva et al. (1993) on communicative motivations in syntax; and Salovar (1991) on argument structure and the constructions of the simple clause.

Ostyak still lacks a comprehensive grammar. Only two monograph descriptions of Ostyak are available, that of the Vach dialect by Tereškin (1961), and of the Obdorsk dialect by Nikolaeva (1995). The former concentrates only on phonological and morphological aspects and does not discuss phrasal and clausal syntax. The most representative smaller descriptions are Rédei (1965) on the northern dialects, Gulya (1966) on the eastern dialects, and Paasonen (1965) on the southern dialects. Honti (1984) gives a useful overview of Ostyak grammar in historical perspective, as well as a detailed bibliography of Ostyak studies till 1984.

## 1. Phonology

### 1.1. Vowels

The vocalic system of Obdorsk Ostyak is presented below.

TABLE 1. VOWEL SYSTEM

	front		central		back	
	short	long	short	long	short	long
high	i				u	u:
mid		e:			o	o:
low			a	a:		

As shown above, distinction in vowel length is phonemic. There are no diphthongs. Mid back vowels in addition to the quantity distinction also differ in quality: the vowel represented here, for the sake of convenience, as /o:/ is in fact the lower-mid /ɔ:/, while the short /o/ has a higher articulation.

Note that the transcription of vowels I use here deviates from the transcription traditionally accepted to render Ostyak data. Rather than designating long vowels, the traditional transcription designates short vowels by the breve sign; for example, the opposition *u* vs. *u:* in traditional transcription would be represented as *ū* vs. *u*, etc. The short mid central vowel *ə* traditionally cited in all descriptions of Ostyak is analyzed here as a non-phonemic epenthetic element whose position is fully predictable phonologically (see 1.3.2).

The full inventory of vowels represented in table 1 occurs only in the first syllable of the word. After the first syllable certain restrictions on vowel occurrence apply. Only the following vowels may be present further on than the first syllable: /a:/, /a/, /u/, /i/, and /e:/. The exception is presented by compounds and prefixed words, cf. *imosa* 'once' < *i* 'one' + *mosa* 'what', *a:mola* 'something' < *a:*- indefinite pronouns prefix + *mola* 'what'. Vowels /a/ and /a:/ in non-initial syllables are distributed complementarily depending on syllabic

conditions (see section 1.3.4). Word-finally only vowels /a/ and /i/ are allowed. Word-final /u:/ (from *uw*) occurs only in a few words in the pronunciation of some speakers, for example, *mujəku:* or *mujəkuw* 'internal winter lining of the tent'.

In some words vowels /u/ and /i/ may be in free or idiolectal variations, for example, *sjuuw* ~ *sjuw* 'reindeer calf'. On phonological vowel alternations see section 1.3.4.

## 1.2. Consonants

The consonantal system is represented in Table 2.

TABLE 2. CONSONANTAL SYSTEM

	bilabial	alveolar	palatal	velar
stops	p	t	t'	k
fricatives		s	š	x
glides	w		j	
nasals	m	n	ñ	ŋ
laterals		l	l'	
trill		r		

Ostyak lacks voiced consonantal phonemes. Obstruents can be sporadically voiced in the intervocalic position or after a sonorant, for example, *wo:s-e:m* 'my city' (1SG) can be represented phonetically as [*wo:ze:m*]. Voicing, however, is less frequent in the dialect of Obdorsk than in other Northern Ostyak dialects. There are no phonemic geminates, but clusters of two identical consonants occur on the morpheme border, for example, in the Translative affix (see 2.1.1.2) or—more rarely—morpheme-internally, cf. the 3<sup>rd</sup> person Singular agreement affix of the so-called objective conjugation *-lli*. The intervocalic cluster *t'š* may optionally be pronounced as the geminated affricate *čč*, cf. *u:t'ša* ~ *u:čča* 'alone'.

As for vowels, there are certain restrictions on the position of consonants within a word. The phonemes /t'/ and /ŋ/ are extremely rare in the word-initial position and are found in only some ideophones. The palatal /i/ and /t'/ do not occur word-finally. On phonotactic conditions on the cooccurrence of consonants see 1.3.3.

## 1.3. Phonotactics and phonological alternations

### 1.3.1. Vowel deletion and consonantal epenthesis

Onsetless syllables are tolerated only word-initially, therefore vowel clusters are not accepted. In vowel clusters that are formed on the word boundaries when two words are conflated in one phonological word the first vowel is typically deleted. The syntactic contexts of this change typically involve a noun phrase and a postpositional phrase, cf.:

- (1) a. *puti a:mp* > *puta:mp*  
 black dog  
 'black dog'  
 b. *ma e:wəlt-e:m* > *me:wəlte:m*  
 I from-1SG  
 'from me'

In other contexts onsetless syllables may be prevented by consonant epenthesis /j/. For example, the attributive numeral *i* 'one' is augmented with an epenthetic consonant when followed by a vowel-initial head noun, cf. *i xa:t* 'one house' but *ij a:mp* 'one dog'. The epenthetic /j/ was historically present after *a*-final nominal stems before vowel-initial affixes,

see 2.1 and after the Passive affix *-a-*, see 2.2.4.3, but in the modern language it is rather reanalyzed as part of the stem or of the Passive morpheme, correspondingly.

### 1.3.2. *ə* as an epenthetic vowel

The most important syllable structure constraint in Ostyak is that two consonants cannot be associated with one syllable position. This has the following two phonotactic consequences. First, consonant clusters do not occur at the word boundaries. Second, three-consonantal clusters are banned. Word-final bi-consonantal clusters as well as potential three-consonantal clusters that may be expected to appear in the course of morphological derivation are prevented by means of vocalic epenthesis. The epenthetic vowel is *ə*. In the examples cited in this book it is separated by hyphens and glossed as EP when it occurs between morphemes. However, when it is found within a morpheme it is not indicated specially. Some morphemes always contain an epenthetic vowel, for example, the nominal Dual affix *-ŋəŋ*.

The epenthesis environment can be formulated in the following way. First, it occurs when a word-final consonantal affix follows a consonant-final stem (2a); or in a nominal stem ending in *-CaC#*, while the same stem followed by a vowel-initial affix does not have *ə* (3a).

- (2) SG PL gloss  
 a. *xo:t* *xo:t-ə-t* 'house'  
 b. *ke:si* *ke:se:t* 'knife'
- (3) 1SG SG gloss  
 a. *ñoxs-e:m* *ñox-ə-s* 'sable'  
 b. *xo:t-e:m* *xo:t* 'house'

These cases illustrate vocalic epenthesis which prevents word-final consonantal clusters.

Furthermore, *ə* is inserted in order to prevent three-consonantal clusters word-medially. Under the templatic approach to syllabification which represents syllabification as a mapping of segments to appropriate structural positions in the syllabic template (Itô 1989), epenthesis sites in three-consonantal clusters are usually accounted for by the directionality effect: the position of the epenthetic vowel depends on the right-to-left or left-to-right direction of mapping to the template. With left-to-right syllabification, the structure CCC would result in the pattern *CəCC*, and right-to-left syllabification will yield *CCəC*. However, predicting epenthesis sites in Ostyak is not as straightforward as this, because both cases are attested. In nominal stems ending in a consonantal cluster if they are followed by a consonant-initial cluster, the epenthesis is inserted after the first consonant, as in (4b).

- (4) stem LOC gloss  
 a. *xo:t* *xo:t-na* 'house'  
 b. *ñoxs-* *ñoxs-na* 'sable'

In verbal forms the position of epenthesis is sensitive to morphological parsing. The epenthetic vowel may be located either before or after the cluster, but crucially, in neither case does it break a morpheme. In (5) the verbal stems end in two consonants. When they are inflected for a consonant-initial affix, the epenthesis immediately follows the stem; this yields the structure *CCəC*. In contrast, in (6) suffixes that begin with a cluster follow a consonant-final stem. In this case as well the epenthesis follows the root so the resulting structure is *CəCC*.



(10)	a.	sa:s	sa:ns-e:m (1SG)	gloss
	b.	man-ə-s (PAST, 3 SG)		'back'
				'go'

#### 1.3.4. Phonological alternations of vowels

A few stems exhibit the qualificative and/or quantificative alternations of vowels conditioned historically, for example, *ji-* 'come' but *juw-a* 2SG IMP; *tu-* 'bring' but *tuw-a* 2SG IMP; *ma-* 'give' but *mij-a* 2SG IMP; *ka:t* 'two' but *ki-mət* 'second'. The regular phonological alternations which operate in the course of morphological derivation concern the change of the stem-final vowel (/i/ > /e:/ and /a/ > a:j). They are addressed in the corresponding sections on nominal and verbal morphology.

As mentioned in section 1.1, in non-first syllables short /a/ and long /a:/ are in complementary distribution (with the exception of compound words): /a/ occurs in closed syllables and in word-final syllables and /a:/ in open non-final syllables. In the course of derivation these segments can alternate within one stem, depending on the type of syllable in which they are present, cf.:

(11)	SG	PL	gloss
	taxa	taxa:j-ə-t	'place'
	pasan	pasa:-n-ə-t	'table'

#### 1.4. Prosodic phenomena

As argued in section 1.3.2, Ostyak syllabification rules out complex onsets and complex codas, except for homorganic consonantal clusters in the coda position. Therefore the maximum syllable has the structure CVCC where CC is a homorganic cluster. Onsetless syllables are allowed only word-initially. Non-derived stems typically consist of one or two syllables, three-syllabic stems are infrequent, while four-syllabic stems occur only in loanwords. Most affixes are monosyllabic. The minimal lexical word has the structure (C)VC, for example, *sus* 'autumn', *xon* 'stomach', *a:r* 'many'.

The stress system is based on an unbounded quantity-sensitive foot constructed from left to right. The primary stress falls on the leftmost heavy syllable. In the absence of heavy syllables, stress lodges on the first syllable in the word. From the point of view of stress assignment light syllables are those that contain short vowels (including closed syllables), while heavy syllables contain long vowels. The secondary stress may fall on the following heavy syllables in the word (if there are any), however, it is fairly weak. The assignment of stress is illustrated below. Examples (12a) show that words that do not contain heavy syllables (long vowels) exhibit primary stress on the first syllable. In (12b) I demonstrate that the long vowel bears the primary stress although it may not be located in the first syllable. Examples (12c) show that in the presence of more than one long vowel the primary stress falls on the leftmost long vowel, while other long vowels may bear secondary stress. Primary stress and secondary stress are indicated by the symbols ' and ', respectively, before the corresponding vowel.

(12)	a.	m'ošatsuw	'we found' (PAST 1PL)	t'axa	'place'
		j'oxətsəm	'I came' (PAST, 1SG)	n'oməsna	'mind' (LOC)
		l'askəsli	'threw' (PAST SG 3SG)	š'itiji	'so'
	b.	imos'a:jna	'once'	man'a:tən	'go' (2DU IMP)
		jar'a:ša	'be proud' (2SG IMP)	muw'e:mna	'earth' (1SG LOC)
		tul'a:-pa	'is brought' (3SG PAS FOC)		
	c.	n'a:wr'e:m'e:m	'my child' (1SG)	'o:m'e:l	'his mother' (3SG)
		'o:ritl'a:jət	'are torn' (PAS 3PL)		

Since the epenthetic vowel ə is never present in the first syllable (1.3.2) it never bears the stress.

The word-final syllable is extrametrical with respect to primary stress. This means that when the word-final syllable contains a long vowel (which is always the vowel /e/, the only long vowel allowed in this position), it does not count as heavy with respect to stress assignment. The primary stress falls on the leftmost heavy syllable with the exception of the final syllable. However, a long vowel in the word-final syllable may bear the secondary stress, cf.:

(13)	'im'e:l	'his wife' (3SG)	m'uŋ'ew	'us' (ACC)
	t'us'e:m	'I brought' (PAST SG 1SG)	'a:š'e:m	'my father' (1SG)

Examples (14) illustrate that while the last syllable is extrametrical, the same syllable within the same word may bear the primary stress if followed by other syllables in the course of morphological derivation.

(14)	im'e:l-na	'his wife' (3SG LOC)
	tus'e:m-pa	'I brought' (PAST SG 1SG FOC)

## 2. Morphology

Ostyak exhibits a rather high degree of morphological synthesis, so the inflectional words usually have more than one morpheme. Theoretically, the nominal form may include at most five morphemes (root, derivational affix, number, possessive, and case), and the verbal form may include six or seven morphemes (root, two or three derivational affixes, tense, voice, and agreement). In practice, however, such cases are rarely found; the noun normally contains no more than three morphemes, while the verb contains no more than five morphemes.

The morphological structure is predominantly agglutinative. Typically, the words can be easily divided into a linear sequence of distinct morphs, each of which has a regular shape and a single function. Verb and nouns do not have morphological classes (inflection types). The agglutination, however, is not absolute. In some cases the boundaries between the morphemes are not clear-cut, and several grammatical meanings may be combined within one 'portmanteau' morpheme. For example, the affix *-a* expresses both 3SG subject agreement and passive voice, and the affix *-e:m* expresses both 1SG subject agreement and SG object agreement.

The overwhelming majority of affixes are suffixes. The only prefix is the prefix of indefinite pronouns *a:-*. The so-called preverbs represent a category intermediate between a free lexical item and a bound morpheme (see 2.2.6). Some function words (mostly focus particle, see 2.3.2) are characterized as clitics. Clitics do not bear an independent phonological stress but influence stress assignment patterns in the host word. Although synthesis predominates in the expression of grammatical meanings, there are a few analytical constructions: certain aspectual, temporal, and modal categories are formed with the auxiliary verbs *u:(l)-* 'be' and *pit-* 'start, fall'. Other widespread morphological processes are compounding and conversion, while incorporation, reduplication, and paradigmatic sound alternations are not typical. On incorporation see 5.4.

The major open word classes (nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs) are easily distinguished by morphological and syntactic criteria, although in certain syntactic positions they may have identical form and function. For example, nouns are formally and often functionally indistinguishable from adjectives when they act as non-possessive prenominal modifiers. Other word classes are: numerals, pronouns, and functional words (postpositions, particles, and conjunctions).



## 2.1. Nominal morphology

### 2.1.1. Noun

Nouns function as arguments, adjuncts, possessive and non-possessive modifiers, and finite predicates. They inflect for number, case, and possession, but do not have grammatical categories of gender, class, or definiteness. The order of inflectional morphemes within a nominal word is as follows:

- (15) stem-(number)-(possession)-(case)

Nominal stems can end in a single consonant, in the vowels /a/ or /i/, or in a consonantal cluster. Stems ending in /a/ usually insert an epenthetic /j/ when augmented by most inflectional and derivational morphemes. In /i/-final stems the stem-final vowel changes into /e:/ in the course of morphological derivation before certain consonant-initial affixes. Before the vowel-initial affix the stem-final vowel is syncopated. Stems ending in a cluster insert the epenthetic vowel *ə* according to the general phonotactic rules addressed in 1.3.2.

#### 2.1.1.1. Number

In Ostyak number morphemes are phonologically different for non-possessive and possessive nouns. The possessive number markers are addressed in section 2.1.1.3. In non-possessive forms the number is marked by null in the Singular, *-ŋən* in the Dual, and *-t* in the Plural. Number inflection for the four types of stems is shown below.

(16)	SG	DU	PL	gloss
	xo:t	xo:t-ŋən	xo:t-ə-t	'house'
	e:wi	e:we:-ŋən	e:we:-t	'girl'
	ku:ša	ku:ša:j-ŋən	ku:ša:j-ə-t	'master'
	ńox-ə-s	ńox-ə-s-ŋən	ńoxs-ə-t	'sable'

Basically every noun may have all number forms in an appropriate context, i.e. there are no nouns which are *Singularia*, *Dualia*, or *Pluralia tantum*.

The Singular denotes a unique object in general or in the situation of speech, paired objects (*po:s* 'mittens', *se:m* 'eyes'), abstract and generic notions, and marks nouns within a quantified NP (see 3.5.2). There is a strong tendency to use non-Singular forms only for referential nouns. Thus, nouns that function as non-possessive modifiers occur only in the Singular (17a), as well as nouns which denote abstract and generic nouns (17b)

- (17) a. ke:w (\*ke:w-ə-t) xo:t  
stone (stone-EP-PL) house  
'stone house'
- b. a:pše:-m iwe:ŋna a:n il pa:jət-l  
younger.brother-1SG always down drop-NPAST.3SG cup  
'My younger brother always drops cups.'

However, the Dual and Plural occur with non-referential nouns in the predicative position, cf.:

- (18) luwət le:kka:r-ə-t  
they doctor-EP-PL  
'They are doctors.'

Singularity may be emphasized by the numeral *i(j)* 'one' or the noun *pelək* 'half' when the corresponding unmarked nominal is inherently dual or is an uncountable mass notion, for example: *se:m pelək* 'one eye' and *i mu:ræx* 'one cloudberry'.

The Dual denotes paired objects (for example, *lox-ŋən* 'skis') and may express NP coordination (see 3.3.1).

The Plural denotes multiple referents and the measure of indiscrete materials (*sa:kkar-ə-t* 'a lot of sugar', *na:wr-ə-t* 'a lot of foam'). Abstract and generic nouns may sometimes be used in the Plural with a change in meaning, for example, *xoram* 'beauty' but *xoram-ə-t* 'decorations, jewelry'; *noməs* 'mind' but *noms-ə-t* 'thoughts'.

#### 2.1.1.2. Case

The case system includes the unmarked Nominative, the Locative in *-na* and the Translative. The affix of the Translative is *-ji* after a vowel and *-Ci* after a consonant-final stem, where C assimilates to the stem-final consonant. Oblique cases are illustrated in (19).

(19)	LOC	xo:t-na	ku:ša:j-na	e:wi-na	ńoxəs-na
	TRANS	xo:t-ti	ku:ša:-ji	e:wi-ji	ńoxəs-si

Below I list the major meanings of cases.

Nominative: subject of the matrix and embedded clause; direct object with the semantic role of patient/theme or recipient/benefactive (see 3.1.1); possessive and non-possessive nominal modifier (see 3.5); object of postpositions, and temporal adjunct denoting period of time, cf.:

- (20) ka:t tal xo:p we:r-s-ə-lli  
two year boat do-PAST-EP-SG.3SG  
'He was making the boat for two years.'

Locative: place and direction; passive agent (see 2.2.4.3); patient argument in certain ditransitive constructions (see 3.1.1); rarely agent of in active constructions (3.2); adjunct indicating point in time (21a), measure (21b), instrument or means (21c), distributive (21d), and indirect object of some verbs (22).

- (21) a. we:t-na  
five-LOC  
'at five o'clock'
- b. ka:t tal-na o:lŋəs  
two year-LOC before  
'two years earlier'
- c. luw toxəl-na man-l  
he wing-LOC go-NPAST.3SG  
'He is flying.'
- d. xu:ləm taxa:j-na e:wət-s-ə-lli  
three place-LOC cut-PAST-EP-SG.3SG  
'He cut (it) into three pieces.'
- (22) jik-ə-l-na j ara:š-l  
son-EP-3SG-LOC proud-NPAST.3SG  
'He is proud of his son.'

Translative: secondary predicate (23a); result or final point of movement or other verbal action (23b), and main predicate with the copula *ji-* 'become' (23c).

- (23) a. ma luw-e:l ma jik-e:m-mi lu: ɲət-l-e:m  
 I he-ACC I son-1SG-TRANS count-NPAST-SG.1SG  
 'I consider him my son.'
- b. saɲxəŋ-ŋi le:l-s-ə-ŋən  
 top-TRANS load-PAST-EP-3DU  
 'They loaded (it) till the top.'
- c. ɲa:wre:m-ə-ŋ-ŋi ji-s  
 child-EP-PROPR-TRANS become-PAST.3SG  
 'She had a child.'

### 2.1.1.3. Possession

The possessive forms indicate one of the three numbers (the Singular, Dual, and Plural) and three persons (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup>) of the possessor by means of the possessive suffixes that attach to the possessed noun. The number of the possessed noun is expressed by a number affix preceding the possessive affixes (null for the Singular, *-ŋil-* for the Dual, and *-l-* for the Plural). The possessive paradigm is illustrated below for the consonant-final stem.

TABLE 3: POSSESSIVE DECLENSION

possessed	SG	DU	PL
possessor			
SG 1.	xo:t-e:m	xo:t-ŋil-am	xo:t-l-am
2.	xo:t-e:n	xo:t-ŋil-an	xo:t-l-an
3.	xo:t-l	xo:t-ŋil-al	xo:t-l-al
DU 1.	xo:t-e:mən	xo:t-ŋil-mən	xo:t-l-ə-mən
2.	xo:t-lən	xo:t-ŋil-lən	xo:t-l-ə-lən
3.	xo:t-lən	xo:t-ŋil-lən	xo:t-l-ə-lən
PL 1.	xo:t-e:w	xo:t-ŋil-uw	xo:t-l-uw
2.	xo:t-lən	xo:t-ŋil-lən	xo:t-l-ə-lən
3.	xo:t-e:l	xo:t-ŋil-al	xo:t-l-al

Examples of the possessive forms of vowel-final stems are: *ku:sa:j-əm* 'my master', *e:we:-m* 'my girl', *ku:sa:j-l-am* 'my master', and *e:wi-l-am* 'my girl'.

Separate forms for reflexive possessives are missing, so the regular possessive affixes are used in the reflexive function:

- (24) luw xo:t-ə-l-na o:məs-l  
 he house-EP-3SG-LOC sit-PRES.3SG  
 'He<sub>i</sub> is sitting in his<sub>j</sub> house.'

Apart from marking alienable and inalienable possession, possessive affixes have a wide range of meanings. This issue is addressed in more detail in section 7.3.

### 2.1.1.4. Nominal derivation

The most important means of nouns formation are denominal and deverbal suffixation and compounding. Denominal suffixation is not very frequent. One example is a suffix *-at* which derives abstract nouns from parametric adjectives, for example, *mal* 'deep' > *mal-at*

'depth' and *pal* 'high' > *palat* 'height'. Nouns with spatial meaning can be derived from adverbial stems with the suffix *-pi*, for example: *wuti* 'down on the riverbank' > *wut-pi* 'place on the riverbank', *il* 'down' > *il-pi* 'place under something'. On some other affixes of denominal derivation of nouns see 2.1.6.

Affixes of deverbal derivation of nouns are more numerous, although the most typical way to derive nominalizations is through the derivation of participles and the Converb (see 2.2.5). Fairly productive are the affix *-pəs* which derives deverbal abstract nouns (25a), the affix *-pti/-psi* which derives abstract nouns or nouns of result (25b), and the affix *-(tə)ɲ* denoting nouns of instrument (25c).

- (25) a. we:l-pəs 'hunting' < we:l- 'to kill, hunt'  
 u:l-pəs 'life' < u:(l)- 'to be, to live'
- b. potərt-ə-psi 'talk' < potərt- 'to talk'  
 mo:jl-ə-psi 'gift, present' < mo:jl- 'to visit somebody'
- c. kuns-ə-p 'comb' < kuns- 'to comb'  
 xuŋ-təp 'stair' < xu:ŋ- 'to climb'

Nominal compounding is widespread. Examples of compounding are: *ke:w-a:n* 'bottle' (from *kew* 'stone' and *a:n* 'cup, mug') and *a:t-jiŋk* 'dew' (from *a:t* 'night' and *jiŋk* 'water'). Especially common are compounds with the second component *rex* 'berry', *xul* 'fish', and *wo:j* 'animal, bird', for example: *šiški-rex* 'blackberry' (*šiški* 'little bird'), *a:tkəəl-wo:j* 'owl' (*a:ŋkəl* 'pole'), and *tuw-xul* 'crucian carp' (*tuw* 'lake'). In some compounds the first component is an adjective, for example: *wul-o:mi* 'grandmother' (from *wul* 'big' and *o:mi* 'mother'), *puti-ke:w* 'coal' (from *puti* 'black' and *ke:w* 'stone'). Components of compounds seem to preserve their individual properties, such as phonological stress. The second component may include segments which are not otherwise allowed in non-first syllables, such as, for example, /o:/ in *wul-o:mi* 'grandmother'. This suggests that the components of compounds are phonologically independent.

### 2.1.2. Pronouns

According to their morphology and syntax, pronouns fall into the categories of pronouns, pro-adjectives, and pro-adverbs, each of these groups sharing the properties of the corresponding grammatical classes. The following semantic classes of pronouns can be identified on functional grounds.

#### 2.1.2.1. Personal pronouns

Personal pronouns are pro-nouns in the strict sense. They are distinguished for three numbers and three persons: *ma* 'I', *naŋ* 'you (SG)', *luw* 'he, she', *min* 'we (DU)', *nin* 'you (DU)', *lin* 'they (DU)', *muŋ* 'we (PL)', *niŋ* 'you (PL)', *luw(ət)* 'they (PL)'. The pronoun *luw* typically denotes only animate referents; for a second referring to inanimate objects, the corresponding noun may be repeated in the clause or be substituted by an anaphorical demonstrative pronoun (see 3.4). Since separate reflexive pronouns are missing, personal pronouns are also used in a reflexive function.

Personal pronouns inflect for case, but their case paradigm differs from that of nouns in the following three respects. First, personal pronouns have a morphologically marked Accusative-Dative which encodes the following meanings: direct object; indirect object, and experiencer in experiential constructions (see 3.2). Second, personal pronouns lack the Translative, the corresponding meaning being rendered by a postpositional construction. Third, the Locative of personal pronouns is used fairly rarely. In particular, it cannot correspond to an agent in passive constructions, unlike the Locative of lexical NPs (see 2.2.4.3) and does not have locational meaning, (various postpositional phrases are used

instead). So the paradigm includes three cases: the morphologically unmarked Nominative, the Accusative-Dative which is usually formed from the Nominative stem augmented by the corresponding possessive affix, and the Locative formed from the Accusative-Dative with the affix *-na*. Examples of the case paradigms for some personal pronouns are presented below.

TABLE 4: DECLENSION OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS

	1SG	3SG	1PL	1DU
NOM	ma	luw	muŋ	min
ACC	ma:-ne:m	luw-e:l	muŋ-e:w	min-e:mən
LOC	ma:-ne:m-na	luw-e:l-na	mu-e:w-na	min-e:mən-na

Personal pronouns have possessive forms which are used within headless NPs. Possessive pronouns are distinguished for three persons and three numbers of the possessor and three numbers of the possessed. Their morphological structure is as follows: the corresponding personal pronoun stem sometimes slightly modified + (number of the possessed noun) + the corresponding possessive affix. For example: *man-e:m* 'mine' (SG), *luw-i-l-al* 'their' (PL), *naŋe:-ŋil-an* 'your' (DU), *nine:-ŋil-an* 'of you two' (DU), *nij-i-ŋil-ə-n* 'of you (many)' (DU), *nij-i-l-ə-n* 'of you (many)' (PL). Possessive personal pronouns inflect for case as regular nouns (see 3.5.2).

#### 2.1.2.2. Demonstratives

Demonstratives may be pro-nouns, pro-adjectives, or pro-adverbs. Pro-nouns inflect for case, number, and possession like nouns; pro-adjectives function as uninflected nominal modifiers, while pro-adverbs are uninflected verbal modifiers or adjuncts. As shown below, deictic demonstratives oppose two degrees of deixis: distal and proximal deixis. There is also a special series of anaphoric-only demonstrative pronouns primarily used within complex sentences (see 3.3.2.1), but deictic pronouns of the distal deixis may also be used in the anaphoric function.

TABLE 5. DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

	proximal deixis	distal deixis	anaphoric-only
pro-adjectives	tam	tum	ši 'that' siməś 'such' itta(m) 'that'
pro-nouns	tami	tumi	šit
pro-adverbs	Locative	tata, ti	šita
	Ablative	talta	šalta
	Lative	tijəś	šijəś
	manner	tata:ji	šiti(ji), šitaś

Other demonstrative adverbial expressions are formed as a combination of demonstrative pro-adjectives and certain nouns, for example: *tam pora:j-na* 'at that time' (from *pora* 'time'), *tum šir-na* 'that way' (from *šir* 'way, means'), *tum a:rat* 'that much' (from *a:rat* 'amount').

#### 2.1.2.3. Reciprocals

Reciprocal pronouns are distinguished for three persons and two numbers (the Plural and the Dual). They are derived from the stem *kut-* 'space in between' followed by the Plural affix *-l-* and the corresponding possessive affix, for example: *kut-l-ə-mən* 'we (two) each

other', *kut-l-uw* 'we (many) each other', *kut-l-ə-n* 'you (two) each other'. Reciprocals inflect for the Locative case with the regular Locative marker *-na*. The basic uninflected form is used in the direct object function (26a). In other functions reciprocals are used in the Locative (26b) or are combined with a postposition (26c).

- (26) a. *nij kut-l-ə-n sija:ləs-l-ə-n*  
you between-PL-EP-2PL see-NPAST-EP-2PL  
'You (PL) see each other.'
- b. *mun we:t ne:ŋxe:t kut-l-uw-na jax-s-uw*  
we five man-PL between-PL-1PL-LOC walk-PAST-1PL  
'We five people visit each other.'
- c. *nin kut-l-ə-n e:walt potər-l-ə-tən*  
you between-PL-EP-2DU from talk-NPAST-EP-2DU  
'You two talk about each other.'

Reciprocalization is always controlled by the grammatical subject.

#### 2.1.2.4. Interrogative pronouns

Interrogative pronouns fall into specific, non-specific, and emphatic classes. Specific and non-specific pronouns are opposed only for the interrogatives 'who' and 'what'. Specific emphatic interrogatives are formed from non-specific interrogatives with the prefix *a:-*. Interrogative pronouns are presented below.

TABLE 6. INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS

	specific definite	non-specific	emphatic	gloss
pro-nouns	<i>xoj</i> <i>mola</i> <i>matit</i>	<i>xojtaw</i> <i>mosa</i> <i>matit</i>	<i>a:xojtaw</i> <i>a:mosa</i> -	'who' 'what' 'which ne'
pro-adjectives	<i>mati</i> <i>mola</i>	<i>mati</i> <i>mosa</i>	- <i>a:mosa</i>	'which' 'what sort'
pro-adverbs	<i>xata</i> <i>xalša</i> <i>xoti</i> <i>mola:ji</i> <i>xunti</i>	<i>xata</i> <i>xalša</i> <i>xoti</i> <i>mosa:ji</i> <i>xunti</i>	<i>a:xata</i> <i>a:xalša</i> <i>a:xoti</i> <i>a:mosa:ji</i> -	'where' 'from here' 'how' 'why' 'when'

Specific pronouns question about a specific referent often observed by the speaker or somehow familiar to her (27a), while emphatic interrogatives question about a completely unfamiliar object, cf.:

- (27) a. *tami mola?*  
that what  
'What is this?'
- b. *tami a:-mosa?*  
that IND-what  
'What (on earth) is it?'

Specific pronouns (both regular and emphatic) are normally used in a question that refers to the situation in the present or past. They can also be used as generalized indefinite pronouns, cf.:

- (28) mola an we:r-l-ən naj ma:n-e:m  
 what NEG do-NPAST-2SG you I-ACC  
 mo:s-l-ə-n  
 need-NPAST-EP-2SG  
 'Whatever you do, I love you.'

Non-specific interrogatives are typically used in questions about the future or questions asked in the irrealis modality and do not imply the existence of their referent, cf. (29) and (30).

- (29) a. mola li-l-ə-n?  
 what eat-NPAST-EP-2SG  
 'What are you eating?'  
 b. mola xoj e:lti ma-s-l-ə-n?  
 what who to give-PAST-PL-EP-2SG  
 'What did you give to whom?'  
 (30) a. mosa pe:li li-ti pit-l-ə-n?  
 what EMPH eat-INF start-NPAST-EP-2SG  
 'What will you eat?'  
 b. tuta u:-l xojtaw?  
 there be-NPAST.3SG who  
 'Is there anybody?'

### 2.1.2.5. Indefinite pronouns

There are specific, non-specific, negative, and free-choice indefinite pronouns. Specific and non-specific indefinite pronouns formally coincide with the corresponding classes of interrogative pronouns (see 2.1.2.4). The semantic difference between them is also preserved: specific indefinite pronouns imply an referent that exists but is unknown to the speaker (31), while non-specific indefinite pronouns do not refer to a particular entity (32).

- (31) a. luw a:-mosa ke:si wo:s e:walt tu-s  
 he IND-what knife city from bring-PAST.3SG  
 'He has brought some knife from the city.'  
 b. nin xo:t-ə-n-na a:-xojtaw u:-l  
 you house-EP-2PL-LOC IND-who be-NPAST.3SG  
 'There is somebody in your house.'  
 (32) we:r-a naj je:lən mosa  
 make-IMP.2SG you at.home what  
 'Do something at home.'

Free-choice indefinite pronouns are formed from non-specific (or more rarely, specific definite) interrogative pronouns with the postpositive particle *a:tul* or the prepositive particle *kus*, for example: *mosa a:tul* 'whatever', *kus xalša* 'from wherever', *xojtaw a:tul* 'whoever'. If a pronoun functions as pronominal modifier, the particle *a:tul* is placed after the head noun:

- (33) mosa a:mp a:tul  
 what dog ever  
 'every dog, whichever dog'

Negative indefinite pronouns are *ne:moltət* 'nobody' and *ne:mosa* 'nothing', as well as the adverbial expressions which use the word *ne:mosa* as their first component and interrogative pronouns as their second component, for example: *ne:mosa xata* 'nowhere', *ne:mosa xalša* 'from nowhere', etc.

### 2.1.2.6. Quantitative pronouns

The list of quantitative pronouns available in Ostyak is presented below.

TABLE 7. QUANTITATIVE PRONOUNS

pro-nouns	itliji	'everybody'
	asat	'everybody'
	asa	'everything'
	isukliji	'completely everybody/everything'
pro-adjectives	asa	'all'
	itliji	'all'
	ka:səŋ	'each'
pro-adverbs	iju:lti	'everywhere'
	iwe:ŋna	'always'

Ostyak also uses the following adverbial expressions with the quantitative meaning: *asa mola a:rat* 'any amount' and *asa šir-na* 'in any way'.

Universal quantifiers in the subject position trigger the Plural agreement on the verb, for example:

- (34) itliji o:məs-l-ə-t  
 everybody sit-NPAST-EP-3PL  
 'Everybody is sitting.'

Quantitative pro-adjectives typically precede the noun they modify but in certain syntactic environments float in the postnominal position (see 6.1).

### 2.1.3. Numerals

Cardinal numerals 1–8, 10, 20, 100 and 1000 are morphologically simple: *it* 'one' (non-attributive form), *ka:tn* 'two' (non-attributive form), *xu:ləm* 'three', *niil* 'four', *we:t* 'five', *xut* 'six', *la:pət* 'seven', *niijəl* 'eight', *ja:ŋ* 'ten', *xus* 'twenty', *so:t* 'hundred', *šaras* 'thousand'. Numerals 1 and 2 additionally have attributive forms, *ij* and *ka:t*, respectively. Other numerals are compound. The numeral 'nine' is derived from a bound component *jar-* (unclear in meaning) and the numeral 'ten': *jar-t'a:ŋ*. Numerals 11–17 are formed with the suffix *-xoš-* which goes back to the postposition *xoša* 'to, at', for example: *we:t-xoš-ja:ŋ* 'fifteen' (from *we:t* 'five', and *ja:ŋ* 'ten'). Numerals 18 and 19 are formed as compounds with the word *xu:s* 'twenty', for example: *niijəl-xu:s* '18' (from *niijəl* 'eight'). Tens involve the numerals *ja:ŋ* 'ten' or *so:t* 'hundred' as their second component, for example: *we:t-ja:ŋ* 'fifty', but *niijəl-so:t* 'eighty'. Numerals 'nineteen' and 'ninety' involve the bound component *jar-*, cf. *jar-xus* 'nineteen' and *jar-so:t* 'ninety'. Numerals higher than 100 are formed by

combining the corresponding names for hundreds, tens, and unities, sometimes also the conjunction *pa* 'and', cf.:

- (35)            šarəs            jart'a:ŋ            so:t            jar-so:t            pa    xu:ləm  
                  thousand            nine            hundred            ninety            and    three  
                  '1993'

Numerals inflect for case and possession only within a headless NP (see 3.5.2) or in the predicative function (for possession). In the attributive function they remain uninflected.

Ordinal numerals are derived with the suffix *-mət* from cardinal numerals, for example, *we:t-mət* 'fifth', *ni:l-mət* 'fourth'. Cf. also the irregular ordinal numerals *o:ləH* 'first' and *kimət* 'second'. For compound numerals the suffix *-mət* is added only to the last component: *xu:ləm-ja:ŋ pa ni:l-mət* 'thirty fourth'. Fractions are formed with ordinal numerals and (optionally) the word *su:p* 'part', for example: (i) *we:t-mət (su:p)* 'one fifth'.

For some numerals there are also morphologically distinct distributive and collective forms: *kitəmtak* 'both', *ka:təs* 'in two'. The Translative of the ordinal numeral renders the repetitive meaning: *xu:l-mət-ti* 'the third time'. The Locative forms of the cardinal numerals have distributive or temporal meaning: *xu:ləm-na* 'at three (o'clock)' or 'by three, into three parts'.

#### 2.1.4. Adjectives

With regard to their inflectional properties, adjectives are not distinguishable from nouns. Like nouns, they are morphologically unmarked in a modifier function, for example:

- (36)            so:ra    xo:p-na  
                  fast    boat-LOC  
                  'in a fast boat'

In the predicative function adjectives take number inflections, cf.:

- (37)            tam    xo:t-ə-t            wul-ə-t  
                  this    house-EP-PL    big-EP-PL  
                  'These houses are big.'

Within a headless NP adjectives take other morphological markings typical of nouns (case, number, and possessive): *a:j-na* 'in a small one (LOC)' (see 3.5.2 for more detail). Inflection of adjectives is identical to that of nouns.

However, the syntactic distribution of adjectives differs from that of nouns in at least in two respects. First, unlike nouns, some parametric adjectives may function as verbal modifiers of manner. In this function they remain uninflected, for example:

- (38)            so:ra    man-l  
                  fast    go-NPAST.3SG  
                  '(he) walks fast'

Second, adjectives participate in comparative and superlative constructions. The comparative and superlative are formed analytically. In the comparative construction the standard of comparison is expressed by the postpositional phrase with the postposition *e:wəlt* 'from' (rarely the postpositions *kiŋša* or *wa:ntman* 'compared with') while the adjective remains unmarked (39a). The postpositional phrase which corresponds to the standard of comparison may either precede or follow the NP. The absolute comparative is derived with the enclitic -

*sək* following the adjective (39b). The superlative is formed with the free-standing particle *met* which need not be immediately adjacent to the (39c).

- (39) a.            naŋ    ke:se:-n            e:wəlt    jam    ke:si  
                  you    knife-2SG            from    good    knife  
                  'a knife better than your knife'  
       b.            luw    jam-sək            juŋ    k-ə-l  
                  he    good-COMP            dance-EP-NPAST.3SG  
                  'He dances better.'  
       c.            me:t            ka:t            so:ra    xo:p  
                  SUPER            two            fast    boat  
                  'two fastest boats'

Adjectives may be derived from nouns (more rarely, from verbs) by suffixation. The most frequent and fully productive affixes of derived adjectives are the caritive affix *-li* (40a), and the propriative affixes *-(a)ŋ*, *-i*, and *-pi*. Apart from the regular propriative meaning (40b), the propriative *-(a)ŋ* may denote an abundance in something (40c), while *-i* sometimes denotes the content (40d). The propriative *-pi* is only used when the base adjective heads its own phrase (40e).

- (40) a.            loš-li            'without a snow'  
                  se:m-li            'blind' (without eyes)  
       b.            ime:-ŋ            'married, having a woman'  
       c.            juŋ-ə-ŋ            'having many trees'  
       d.            ŋaŋ-i            'with bread'  
                  jɪŋk-i            'watery, wet'  
       e.            aŋ se:m-pi            'with small eye'  
                  i jis-pi            'with one relative'

Propriative adjectives in *-i* are commonly used with the postposition *te:lna* 'with', for example:

- (41)            mil-i            te:lna  
                  cap-PROPR            with  
                  'with the cap'

Some ideophonic adjectives are formed as partial reduplication where the second component exhibits a word-initial labial consonant, for example: *kasli-pu:sli* 'boring, without interest', *sisap-marap* 'very quick', *sitak-marak* 'quiet', and *kuli-mari* 'plump'.

#### 2.1.5. Adverbs

In most cases verbal modification is expressed by morphologically unmarked adjectives (see 2.1.4). There are only a few manner adverbs that are morphologically distinct from the adjective, for example, the following adverbs are derived from adjectives: *jam-ə-š* 'well' (from *jam* 'good, nice'), *a:tm-ə-š* 'badly' (from *a:təm* 'bad'), *ku:n-tat* 'easily' (from *ku:n* 'easy'), *ta:k-an* 'tight' (from *ta:k* 'tight'), as well as the adverbs derived from the Translative forms of adjectives, such as *so:ra-ji* 'for a short time' and *kun-ni* 'easily'. Examples of non-derived manner adverbs which do not have a corresponding adjective are: *ta:kəlji* 'in vain' and *sukap* 'quietly.'

Spatial adverbs are typically distributed among three fairly regular series with the Locative, Lative, and Ablative meaning, for example:

(42)	gloss	LOC	LAT	ABL
	'above'	nu:mən	noxəś	nu:məltə
	'outside'	ka:mən	kiməś	ka:məltə
	'at home'	je:lən	joxəś	je:lta

There are also numerous adverbial expressions which include the word *pe:lək* 'half, side' in various forms and denote orientation in space, for example: *jam pe:ləkna* 'from the right side', *parta pe:ləkś* 'to the left', *nim pe:lek e:wəlt* 'from the north'.

Most temporal adverbs are represented by frozen Locative or Nominative forms of nouns, for example: *a:tlna* 'in the night', *su:sən* 'in autumn', *a:tl xatl* 'day and night'. Examples of other temporal adverbs are: *munti* 'long ago', *xale:wət* 'tomorrow', and *motta* 'earlier'.

Examples of degree adverbs are: *talajti* 'wholly, as a whole', *a:r(tan)* 'much', *jesa* 'little', *mort* 'enough', *se:ŋk* 'very', and *wulli* 'completely'. The degree adverb meaning may be rendered by some logical particles (see 2.3.2) or preverbs (see 2.2.6).

Manner adverbs and certain spatial and temporal adverbs form the analytical comparative and superlative, identical to that of adjectives (see 2.1.4). For example, the absolute comparative may be formed with the clitic *-sək* added to the adverb itself, or to the postposition within the periphrastic adverbial expression:

(43)	jam pe:lək-sək ewəlt	or:	jam pe:lək ewəlt-sək
	good side-COMP from		good side from-COMP
	'more from the right'		

### 2.1.6. Nominal categorizers

Adjectives, certain pro-adjectives, and Past and Non-Past participles can be nominalized with a very productive nominalizer *-t*, which possibly goes back to the independent word *at* 'thing'. This nominalizer attaches to the fully derived word. For example, according to the regular phonotactic rule of Ostyak (1.3.2), if the base adjective or participle ends in two consonants the epenthetic *ə* is inserted between them. In further derivation the nominalizer *-t* in its turn is preceded by another epenthetic *ə*; thus, the resulting form is, for example, *man-ə-m-ə-t* 'the one who went' (from *man-* 'go', *-m* Past participle) instead of \**man-m-ə-t* which would normally be expected. This suggests that the nominalizer *-t*, although bound to its host, is outside the phonological word and can be identified as a clitic. Examples (44a) illustrate the substantivization of adjectives, while examples (44b) show the substantivization of participles.

(44)	a.	wo:s-ə-ŋ-ə-t	'city person'	city + EP + PROPR + EP + NOMN
		xo:r-pi-t	'something like'	appearance + PROPR + NOMN
	b.	we:r-ə-m-ə-t	'the one who made'	make + EP + PP + EP + NOMN
		we:r-ti-t	'the one who makes'	make + NPP + NOMN

Substantivated participles may have a fully lexicalized meaning, such as those in (45), sometimes within a lexicalized compound expression (46).

(45)	jan-ti-t	'toy'	play + NPP + NOMN
	u:nlt-ə-ti-t	'teacher'	teach + EP + NPP + NOMN
	li-ti-t	'food'	eat + NPP + NOMN
	xal-ə-m-ə-t	'dead body'	die + EP + PP + EP + NOMN

(46)	a.	lil-ə-l	man-ə-m-ə-t
		soul-EP-3SG	go-EP-PP-EP-NOMN
		'dead body'	
	b.	a:t	la:jəl-ti-t
		night	wait-NPP-NOMN
		'wolf'	

Nominalized adjectives and participles function within a headless NP or a headless relative clause, respectively, and inflect as regular nouns (see 3.5.2).

The Diminutive is derived by means of the productive suffix *-ji* preceded by the epenthetic */i/* when attached to the consonant-final stem, cf. *pe:rna-ji* 'little cross' but *xo:t-i-ji* 'little house'. The Diminutive often has an affectionate rather than a purely diminutive meaning. In this function it is very commonly used in folklore, where it can co-occur not only with nouns but also with adjectives (*a:j-i-ji* 'very small'), personal pronouns (*nan-i-ji* 'you'), and postpositions (*joxan xuwa:t-i-ji* 'along the river').

Furthermore, Ostyak has a number of bound words that always follow a noun and serve as its semantic modifiers. These words are phonologically independent of the preceding noun, but semantically and syntactically function as categorizing morphemes. They are exemplified below.

(47)		example	
	diminutive	taxti	jɪŋk taxti 'a little water'
	augmentative	iki	ju:ŋk lo:pəs iki 'a large piece of ice'
	augmentative	siki	por-niŋ siki 'huge Por woman'
	affectionate	loxi	je:rtəp loxi 'poor, bad fence'

The constructions in questions exhibit a remarkable split in head properties. The bound words occupy a phrase-final position typical of the nominal head and may bear number, case and possessive affixes in the way the head noun normally does. On the other hand, the preceding noun exhibits the semantic, controlling and distributional properties of a syntactic head.

(48)	ta:ś	loxe:-l
	herd	poor-3SG
	'his poor herd'	

## 2.2. Verbal morphology

Verbs function as finite and non-finite predicates. The finite verb has grammatical categories of tense/mood/aspect, voice, subject agreement, and object agreement. Most non-Indicative moods are analytical. The general structure of the verbal form in the Indicative is as follows:

(49) stem-tense-(passive)-(number of the object)-subject agreement

The verbal stems end in a single consonant (*we:r-* 'make, do') or a consonantal cluster (*re:sk-* 'hit'). Several verbal stems are vowel-final (*ma-* 'give', *ji-* 'come, become', *tu-* 'take', *wu-* 'bring, u:(l)- 'be'), these exhibit some irregularities in conjugation.

### 2.2.1. Conjugation

Ostyak has obligatory subject agreement and optional object agreement. Intransitive verbs inflect for subject agreement, that is, the person and number of the subject. This paradigm is traditionally referred to as the subjective conjugation. Transitive verbs also conjugate by the subjective type. In addition, they have the second paradigm, which is

traditionally referred to as the objective conjugation. The latter exhibits both subject and object agreement. The verb in the objective conjugation takes an affix referring to the number of the direct object followed by the subject agreement affix, as shown by the diagrams in (50). The subject agreement markers in the two conjugations are phonologically different.

- (50) a. subjective conjugation (intransitive and transitive verbs):  
stem - tense - subject agreement  
b. subjective conjugation (transitive verbs only):  
stem - tense - number of the object - subject agreement

Thus, transitive verbs are used either in the subjective or in the objective conjugation. The conditions on the use of object agreement (the objective conjugation) for transitive verbs are addressed in more detail in section 6.

Below I present the subjective and the objective paradigms for the Non-Past tense of the verb *we:r-* 'make, do'. The Past tense forms are formed in a similar way.

TABLE 8. SUBJECTIVE CONJUGATION

	SG	DU	PL
1.	we:r-l-ø-m	we:r-l-ø-møn	we:r-l-uw
2.	we:r-l-ø-n	we:r-l-ø-tøn	we:r-l-ø-ti
3.	we:r-l	we:r-l-ø-Nøn	we:r-l-ø-t

TABLE 9. OBJECTIVE CONJUGATION

	object subject	SG	DU	PL
SG	1.	we:r-l-ø-e:m	we:r-l-ø-ŋil-am	we:r-l-ø-l-am
	2.	we:r-l-ø-e:n	we:r-l-ø-ŋil-an	we:r-l-ø-l-an
	3.	we:r-l-ø-ø-l-li	we:r-l-ø-ŋil-li	we:r-l-ø-l-ø-l-li
DU	1.	we:r-l-ø-e:møn	we:r-l-ø-ŋil-møn	we:r-l-ø-l-ø-møn
	2.	we:r-l-ø-ø-løn	we:r-l-ø-ŋil-løn	we:r-l-ø-l-ø-l-løn
	3.	we:r-l-ø-ø-løn	we:r-l-ø-ŋil-løn	we:r-l-ø-l-ø-l-løn
PL	1.	we:r-l-ø-e:w	we:r-l-ø-ŋil-uw	we:r-l-ø-l-uw
	2.	we:r-l-ø-ø-løn	we:r-l-ø-ŋil-løn	we:r-l-ø-l-ø-l-løn
	3.	we:r-l-ø-e:l	we:r-l-ø-ŋil-al	we:r-l-ø-l-al

As can be seen from Table 9, in the objective paradigm the object agreement marker is null for the Singular, *-ŋil-* for the Dual, and *-l-* for the Plural object. In the glosses for the Singular object null will not be marked hereafter, but the gloss for the subject agreement affix will include the indication 'SG'. For example, the objective conjugation form *we:r-l-e:m* will be glossed as 'do-NPAST-SG.1SG', while *we:r-l-ø-ŋil-am* will be glossed as 'do-NPAST-EP-DU-1SG'.

The subjective and objective conjugations are also opposed in the Imperative (see 2.2.2).

## 2.2.2. TAM-system

### 2.2.2.1. Mood

The following modal categories are distinguished:

(i) The Indicative. The Indicative is morphologically unmarked and is realized through tense forms (see 2.2.2.2). The Indicative may denote the irrealis modality if combined with modal particles such as *ki* 'if'. The Non-Past Indicative may have a deliberative meaning:

- (51) ma man-l-ø-m?  
I go-NPAST-EP-1SG  
'Shall I go?'

(ii) The Evidential (see section 8).

(iii) The Adhortative. The Adhortative is formed with the Non-Past Indicative verb and the particles *a:t* 'let'. It may be used in the main clause (52a) and in the embedded clause introduced by modal verbs (52b). When the Adhortative verb co-occurs with the particle *a:l* it has the preventive meaning (52c).

- (52) a. luw a:t man-l  
he let go-NPAST.3SG  
'Let him go.'  
b. mo:s-l naŋ tami a:t we:r-l-e:n  
need-NPAST.3SG you this let do-NPAST-SG.2SG  
'It is necessary that you do this.'  
c. a:t a:l man-l  
let NEG go-NPAST.3SG  
'If only he didn't go.'

(iv) The Optative. The Optative is formed analytically by combination of the Past tense Indicative verb and the particles *a:t* and *lu:løn* 'let'. The former typically precedes the verb, while the latter is optional. The Optative expresses wish and is used either in the matrix (53a) or in the embedded clause (53b).

- (53) a. xul lu:løn a:t tu:s.  
fish let let bring-PAST.3SG  
'I wish he would bring some fish.'  
b. luw lit-l muŋ a:t we:r-s-uw luw-e:l  
he want-NPAST.3SG we let make-PAST-1PL he-ACC  
lo:x  
ski

'He wants us to make him skis.'

(v) The Conjunctive. The Conjunctive is formed with the Past tense Indicative verb and the particles *ki* 'if' and *lu:løn* 'let'. Both particles have a fairly free position in the clause, but the particle *ki* tends to be clause-final. In the dependent clause the Conjunctive expresses the counterfactual condition (54). In the main clause of the corresponding sentences the verb is used in the Indicative, but the modal particle *lu:løn* may be repeated. Within an independent clause the Conjunctive may have a wide range of modal meanings (55). In this case the particle *ki* may be omitted (cf. (55a)).

- (54)      naŋ    lu:løn to:mætta      ki      joxət-s-ə-n              ma    lu:løn  
           you    let    yesterday      if      come-PAST-EP-2SG I      let  
           a:mət-s-ə-m  
           rejoice-PAST-EP-1SG

'If you had come yesterday, I would have been happy.'

- (55) a.      ma    lu:løn we:r-s-e:m              tami  
           I      let    make-PAST-SG.1SG this  
           'I would have done this.'
- b.      ma    a:še:-m      lu:løn liləŋ      ki      u:-s  
           I      father-1SG    let    alive    if      be-PAST.3SG  
           'If only my father were alive!'
- c.      mosa lu:løn li-s-uw              ki?  
           what    let    eat-PAST-1PL if  
           'What shall we eat?'

(vi) The Imperative. The Imperative is the only non-analytical mood apart from the Indicative. It is formed with special inflectional affixes not employed otherwise. The Imperative is operative only for the 2<sup>nd</sup> person of the Singular, Dual, and Plural. It distinguishes the subjective and objective conjugation, the latter indicating the number of the direct object. The objective paradigm forms for the Dual and the Plural object are morphologically derived from the 2<sup>nd</sup> person Singular Imperative objective form for the Singular object ending in *-i*. Examples of the Imperative forms are:

- (56) a.      subjective conjugation  
           man-a                      go + IMP.2SG  
           man-a:tən                go + IMP.2PL
- b.      objective conjugation  
           we:r-i                      do + SG.2SG  
           we:r-i-l-a                do + IMP + PL + 2SG  
           we:r-i-njil-ə-n        do + IMP + DU + EP + 2DU

#### 2.2.2.2. Tense

Temporal categories exist only in the Indicative and Evidential. Ostyak does not have relative tenses, but distinguishes the Non-Past, the Past, and the Future. In the Indicative the Non-Past tense is represented by the marker *-l-*, the Past tense is represented by the marker *-s-*, and the Future is analytical. On temporal categories in the Evidential see section 8.

The Non-Past refers to the moment of speech, expresses the universal situation, or (immediate) future, for example: *man-l-ə-m* 'I am going, I (usually) go, I will go' (go + NPAST + EP + 1SG). It can also be used as the narrative past, especially in folklore texts. The Past tense refers to the situation in the past: *man-s-ə-m* 'I went, I was going, I had gone' (go + PAST + EP + 1SG). The Analytical Future is formed with the Non-Past form of the auxiliary verb *pit-* 'fall, start' inflected for subject and (optionally) object agreement and the Infinitive of the content verb in *-ti* (on the Infinitive see 2.2.5). The Future refers to the future situation, typically remote in time:

- (57)      man-ti              pit-l-ə-m  
           go-INF            start-NPAST-EP-1SG  
           'I will go.'

In copular constructions the copula verb *u:(l)-* in the Future can be absent, so that the corresponding meaning is rendered only by the auxiliary *pit-*, cf.:

- (58)      tata    ne:-mosa      ne:nxi              an      pit-l  
           here    NEG-what    man                NEG    start-NPAST.3SG  
           'There won't be any men here.'

#### 2.2.2.3. Aspect

Various aspectual meanings are expressed by derivational means, namely, with *Aktionsart* suffixes and preverbs (2.2.6).

In addition, Ostyak has a fairly regular analytical Stative construction. The Stative is formed with the Converb in *-man* of the content verb (on the Converb see 2.2.5) and the auxiliary verb *u:(l)-* 'be' inflected for tense (Non-Past, Past, and—rarely—analytical Future) and subject agreement. The Stative is mostly formed from transitive verbs, and in this case it has a passive meaning, that is, is semantically oriented towards the patient/theme argument. The verb undergoes detransitivization, so the agent argument cannot be expressed within the construction.

- (59)      Non-Past      we:r-man u:-l              'is done'  
           Past              ka:wər-man u:-s          'was cooked'  
           Future            we:r-man u:l-ti pit-l      'will be done'

The 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person subject occurs fairly rarely within the Stative construction, but is not altogether impossible, cf.:

- (60)      xunti ma      we:rl-ə-s-E-m              naŋ      uže      jirsəl-ə-man  
           when I      wake.up-EP-PAST-EP-1SG    you    already tie-EP-CONV  
           u:l-l-ə-n  
           be-NPAST-EP-2SG

'When I woke up you were already tied down.'

The Stative can be also formed from a number of intransitive verbs, for example, from the verbs *likaš-* 'get angry', *joxət-* 'come', *il woj-* 'get asleep', *jiš-* 'drink, get drunk', *su:rət-* 'become gray-haired', and *kori-* 'get thin, lose weight'. In this case it has an active meaning, that is, is semantically oriented towards the only argument of the corresponding verb:

- (61)      likaš-man u:-l              '(got angry and) is angry'  
           jiš-man u:-s              'was drunk'

The Stative denotes the state resulting from the previous action. For this reason it can only be formed from telic verbs and cannot co-occur with adverbs that characterize the completion of action (such as, for example, *tu:p* 'just') but is easily combined with continuative adverbs (such as *xuwan* 'long time' and *iwe:yna* 'always'). The Converb within the Stative construction may fall into the scope of the comparative particle *-sək* and form the comparative in the same way as adjectives (see 2.1.4 on the comparative degree of adjectives), cf.:



- (62) tam xul-e:n so:r-ø-l-man-sək u:-l  
 this fish-2SG dry-EP-CAUS-CONV-COMP be-NPAST.3SG  
 tu:m xul-ø-l e:wəlt  
 that fish-EP-3SG from

'This fish of yours is better dried than that his fish.'

On the Stative construction in the Evidential see 8.5.

### 2.2.3. Negation

Both sentence and constituent negation is expressed with the negative particle *an(t)* which usually immediately precedes the main verb. The variant *ant* is present before a vowel, while the variant *an* occurs before a consonant.

- (63) a. tami naŋ ke:se:-n ant u:-l  
 this you knife-2SG NEG be-NPAST.3SG  
 'This is not your knife.'  
 b. niŋ ne:ŋxi an taj-ø-l  
 woman man NEG have-EP-NPAST.3SG  
 'He doesn't have a wife.'

The elements that can intervene between the negative particle and the verb are certain other grammatical particles, such as the adhortative particle *a:t* 'let' or the conditional particle *ki* 'if'. In the analytic Future the negative particle is typically located before the auxiliary verb (64). In the analytical Stative the negative particle may be located either immediately before the content verb (65a) or immediately before the copula (65b). The latter case implies that the result of the action is temporarily absent.

- (64) we:r-ti an pit-l  
 make-INF NEG start-NPAST.3SG  
 'he will not do'  
 (65) a. xo:t an we:r-man u:-l  
 house NEG do-CONV be-NPAST.3SG  
 'The house is not built.'  
 b. xo:t we:r-man ant u:-l  
 house do-CONV NEG be-NPAST.3SG  
 'The house is not (yet) built.'

Sporadically, constituent negation may also be expressed with the particle *anta(m)* situated immediately before the negated element (66a). The same particle is also used in contrastive negation (66b).

- (66) a. anta(m) naŋ pil-e:n-na potər-l-ø-m  
 NEG you with-2SG-LOC talk-NPAST-EP-1SG  
 'I am not talking with you.'  
 b. ma juwan wa:n-s-ø-m anta pe:tra  
 I John see-PAST-EP-1SG NEG Peter  
 'I saw John, not Peter.'

Existential sentences are negated with the existential negative copula 'there are/is no' which inflects for number (but not person). Its forms are presented below.

- (67) SG DU PL  
 anta(m) antam-ŋən antam-ø-t

In the Past the negative existential copula is combined with the Past tense of the copula *u:(l)-* 'be':

- (68) antam-ø-t u:-s-ø-t  
 no-EP-PL be-PAST-EP-3PL  
 'there were no'

Non-existential copular sentences are negated in a regular manner, that is, with the negative particle *an(t)*.

The Imperative is negated with the special prohibitive particle *a:l*, cf.:

- (69) a:l jox-t-a.  
 NEG come-IMP.2SG  
 'Don't come.'

In the presence of negative pronouns a sentence contains double of multiple negation, cf.:

- (70) luw ne:mosa xalša ne:mosa an  
 he nothing from.where nothing NEG  
 lut-ø-li-j-ø-l  
 buy-EP-IMF-FREQ-EP-NPAST.3SG  
 'He does not buy anything anywhere.'

One special construction can be used in the Past tense to express absolute emphatic negation: the nominalized form of the Past participle inflected for subject agreement + the negative copula *antam*, cf.:

- (71) ma wa:nt-ø-m-ø-t-e:m antam  
 I see-EP-PP-EP-NOMN-1SG no  
 'I haven't seen/did not see anything.'

The Evidential has two formally and semantically different types of negation. See .... for more detail.

### 2.2.4. Verbal categorizers

#### 2.2.4.1. Verbalizers

Verbs are derived from adjectives and nouns by means of derivational suffixes. The most productive suffixes are exemplified below.

- (72) suffix base word resulting verb example  
 -(a)m- adjectives inchoative purš-am- 'get older' (purəš 'old')  
 -(a)š- nouns intransitive sij-aš- 'make noise' (sij 'sound')  
 -(a)t- nouns transitive rasi-t- 'provide with a fringe' (rasi 'fringe')

### 2.2.4.2. Valence-changing affixes

Apart from the regular Passive addressed in 2.2.4.3, the verbal valence is affected by certain derivational processes. The valence-changing affixes are listed in (73).

(73) affix	resulting verb	example
-(a)l-	intransitive, anticausative	ke:r-l- 'turn' (INTR)
-(a)s-, -(a)š-	intransitive, anticausative	suk-aš- 'suffer' (cf. su:k-at- 'torture')
-(a)l-	transitive, causative	ńax-ə-l- 'make laugh' (ńax- 'laugh')
-(a)t-	transitive, causative	ke:r-ə-t- 'turn' (TR)
-(a)pt-, -(a)lt-	transitive, causative	jox-t-ə-pt- 'bring' (joxət- 'come')

Most of the affixes in (73) co-occur only with a certain class of verbs, and for this reason are not considered grammaticized. However, the causative in *-(a)t-* or *-(a)pt-/-(a)lt-* is fully productive; it derives causatives from both transitive and intransitive verbs. On the causative construction, see 3.1.1. Note that the causative in *-(a)lt-* may have an applicative meaning if derived from transitive verbs, that is, it may signify the promotion of the indirect or oblique object to the direct object role.

(74) a.	oxsam-na scarf-LOC	pon-lt-ə-s-li put-CAUS-EP-PAST-SG.3SG		
				'He put a scarf (on her).'
b.	ma I	luw-e:l he-ACC	ne:pək-na letter-LOC	xas-s-e:m write-PAST-SG.1SG
				'I wrote a letter (of complaint) about him.'

### 2.2.4.3. Passive

In addition to the morphologically unmarked active voice Ostyak has a regular morphological Passive. The Passive is formed with the affix *-a:j/-a* which follows the tense marker. The Passive verb takes subjective conjugation affixes. The Passive conjugation is presented below for the verb *we:r-* 'do, make' in the Non-Past tense.

TABLE 10. PASSIVE CONJUGATION

	SG	DU	PL
1.	we:r-l-a:j-ə-m	we:r-l-a:j-mən	we:r-l-a:j-uw
2.	we:r-l-a:j-ə-n	we:r-l-a:j-tən	we:r-l-a:j-ti
3.	we:r-l-a	we-l-a:j-ŋən	we:r-l-a:j-ə-t

Examples of the passive forms in the Past and the Future for the 3<sup>rd</sup> person Singular are: *we:r-s-a* 'was made, done' and *we:r-ti pit-l-a* 'will be made, done', respectively.

The Passive has several major functions. Most importantly, it indicates that the agent argument does not correspond to the topic role. As will be shown in section 5.2, there is a strong requirement in Ostyak grammar for the topic to be encoded as the subject. The passive construction aims to maintain this relationship. In the Passive the non-topic agent argument does not correspond to the subject but is encoded by the Locative NP, while some other verbal argument bears the grammatical relation of the subject. The following arguments can be topicalized and encoded as the subject of the passive construction: patient/theme, recipient/benefactive (example (75a)), causee (75b), location (75c), goal (75d), and, according to the data presented in Kulonen (1989), on rare occasions, temporal. Passivization applies to certain intransitives as well as to transitive verbs (see, for example, (75d)).

(75) a.	pe:tra:j-e:n Peter-2SG	xo:p-na boat-LOC	mo:jl-ə-s-a give-EP-PAST-PAS.3SG	
				'(He) was given a boat by Peter.'
b.	wo:rona:j-na crow-LOC	šikəŋša so	ittam that	wo:lək-ə-l wolf-EP-3SG
				xo:ll-ə-pt-ə-l-a cry-EP-CAUS-EP-NPAST-PAS.3SG
				'So the crow made this wolf cry.'
c.	nare:l bench	ńoxəs-na sable-LOC	xu:j-l-a lie-NPAST-PAS.3SG	
				'His bench is (full of) lying sables.'
d.	kul'-na devil-LOC	joxət-s-a come-PAST-PAS.3SG		
				'A devil came to him.'

The contexts that are likely to trigger detopicalization of the agent and passivization are questions to the agent and answers to them (see 5.2), the conjoined clause if its agent is not coreferential with the agent of the first clause (see 3.4 and 6.1), and the cases where the agent is newly introduced into the discourse and therefore less topical than another argument. The latter case is illustrated in (76).

(76)	ja:j-ə-l brother-EP-3SG	je:we:l sister-3SG	ke:si-na knife-PAST-EP-SG.3SG
	e:wət-s-ə-lli cut-PAST-EP-SG.3SG	a and	aše:l-na father-3SG
			ke:si jel knife ahead
			lask-ə-s-a throw-EP-PAST-PAS.3SG

'The brother cut his sister with the knife and his father threw the knife away.'

Personal pronouns cannot act as the passive agent, and the passive construction is altogether banned in the corresponding cases (see 6.1).

The second major function of the Passive is semantic eliminating of the agent. In this type the agent has a generic or indefinite interpretation and cannot be overtly expressed in the clause. The subject corresponds to the non-agent argument of the transitive or intransitive verb.

(77) a.	la:jəm ta:kan axe fast	se:wər-m-ə-s-a cut-MOM-EP-PAST-PAS.3SG	jux xoša tree to
			'They put the axe fast in the tree.'
b.	ši j FOC	oxət-s-a:j-uw come-PAST-PAS-1PL	
			'(Somebody) came to us.'

Furthermore, a number of verbs which take the only experiencer argument are used solely in the Passive. Their single argument corresponds to the grammatical subject while the agent is altogether absent from the semantic representation of the clause. These are the following verbs:

(78)	muwət-	'get covered with earth'	kirəpt-	'be covered with scabs'
	a:mət-	'become happy'	a:mət-	'become happy, rejoice'
	pe:j-	'get frozen'	wo:t-	'become white-haired'
	xuwl-	'be flooded with water'	muwət-	'be covered with earth'
	kijart-	'be covered with hoar-frost'	no:pəl-	'float'
	jammi we:r-	'recover'	nikt-	'become worm-eaten'
	po:s-	'get wet'	se:ri-	'soiled by flies'
	jilpət-	'revive'	jesal-	'become concious'
	pilət-	'get mad'	karnit-	'be covered with first ice of the year (of the river)'

The same concerns certain lexicalized expressions consisting of the verb and the Locative NP which does not bear a separate argument status. Such expressions typically exhibit non-compositional idiomatic semantics, for example:

- (79) a. tut-na li-s-a  
fire-LOC eat-PAST-PAS.3SG  
'got burnt (literally: was eaten by fire)'
- b. puwləpsi-na e:t-s-a  
tumor-LOC enter-PAST-PAS.3SG  
'a tumor appeared (literally: was entered by the tumor)'

Another group of single argument verbs can be used in the Passive and in the active interchangeably without any apparent difference in meaning; these are cited in (80).

(80)	jeləm-	'be ashamed'	po:t-	'get frozen'
	mər-	'get wet'	raxən-	'choke'
	lit-	'want'	kutś-	'get drunk'
	purśam-	'get old'	wo:li-	'shine'
	xu:j-	'lie'		

Examples of this type of passive constructions are presented below in (81), while (82) demonstrates that the single-argument copula verb within the Stative construction may also take the passive form.

- (81) a. niml-ə-ŋ ju:s xu:j-l-a  
ski-EP-PROPR road lie-NPAST-PAS.3SG  
'A ski-track is seen (literally: lying).'
- b. sax kij-e:n xu:l-ije:l wo:li-l-a  
fur.coat lace-2SG hole-DIM-3SG shine-NPAST-PAS.3SG  
'The holes between the laces of his fur-coat are shining.'
- (82) tam uw tu:xər-man u:l-l-a  
this door close-CONV be-NPAST-PAS.3SG  
'This door is closed.'

For some of the verbs in (80) the active is preferred when the subject participant denotes a natural object and the Passive is preferred when the subject participant is a person, cf.:

- (83) a. ma po:t-s-a:j-ə-m  
I get.frozen-PAST-PAS-EP-1SG  
'I froze.'
- b. ju:nk po:t-ə-s  
ice get.frozen-EP-PAST.3SG  
'The ice froze.'

Finally, intransitive verbs may be passivized resulting in the impersonal passive construction. The passive verb takes 3<sup>rd</sup> person Singular agreement affixes, cf.:

- (84) a. l'a:l'əs-ti pit-s-a.  
make.war-INF stare-PAST-PAS.3SG  
'They started making war.'
- b. u:t'śa xoti u:l-l-a?  
alone how be-NPAST-PAS.3SG  
'How to live alone?'

It is worth noting that in certain cases the Passive is formed solely by syntactic means, while the verbal form does not contain any overt Passive markers. These are constructions based on the non-finite participial forms which are neutral with respect to voice, namely the Evidential (see section 8) and all participial embedded clauses (see sections 3.3.2.2 and 7.1).

#### 2.2.5. Verbal modifiers

Verbal modifiers (non-finite verbal forms) are the Converb, the Infinitive, and participles. The Converb is a morphologically unchangeable verbal form derived from the verbal stem with the affix *-man*, for example: *na:wər-man* 'jumping, *we:r-man* 'making, doing'. It has three major functions: first, it participates in the analytical Stative (see 2.2.2.3); second, it forms the embedded adverbial clause of manner or concomitant action, and third, it forms secondary resultatives (see 3.3.2.2).

The Infinitive is formed with the suffix *-ti(ji)*, for example: *we:r-ti(ji)* 'to make, to do'. The suffix *-ti* is homonymous with the marker of the Non-Past participle and goes back to it historically. The component *-ji* represents a frozen Translative case affix. However, in the modern language the Infinitive differs from the Non-Past participle both formally and functionally. As distinct from the participles, the Infinitive is morphologically unchangeable: it does not take agreement affixes and cannot be combined with case markers (for example, the Locative) or postpositions. The Infinitive acts in certain adverbial and complement clauses and typically indicate the coreference between the matrix and the embedded clause subjects, see (3.3.2.2). As was discussed in 2.2.2.2, it also participate in the analytical Future.

Ostyak has two participles that express the category of relative tense: the Non-Past participle in *-ti* and the Past participle in *-m*, as well as the Negative participle. Participles have a variety of functions. The Non-Past and Past participles serve as pronominal modifiers (see section 7), as a predicate in complement and adverbial dependent clauses (see 3.3.2.2), and as a final predicate in the Evidential (see section 8). In the latter two functions they take subject agreement affixes which go back to the possessive affixes but differ from them phonologically. Below I present the conjugation of the Past participle of the verb *we:r-* 'make, do'; Non-Past participles inflect for person/number in a similar way.

TABLE 11. CONJUGATION OF PARTICIPLES

	SG	DU	PL
1.	we:r-m-e:m	we:r-m-e:møn	we:r-m-e:w
2.	we:r-m-e:n	we:r-m-an	we:r-m-an
3.	we:r-m-al	we:r-m-an	we:r-m-el

Within the adverbial clause participles take case (the Locative) or postpositional marking. The Non-Past and Past participles can be nominalized with the formant *-t* (see 2.1.6) in which case they form a headless relative clause.

Non-Past and Past participles are not oriented semantically towards one particular grammatical relation and therefore can modify basically any element (see section 7). They are morphologically neutral with respect to voice, and express voice distinctions only within particular syntactic constructions. Thus, the participial form itself may have both an active and passive meaning: *we:r-ø-m* 'made, done' and 'who made, did', *we:r-ti* 'being made, done' and 'who makes, does'.

The Negative participles are derived with the affix *-li*, for example: *we:r-li* 'not made, not done', *na:wør-li* 'who did not jump'. Derived from transitive verbs they are oriented towards the object, while derived from the intransitive verbs they modify the subject. Negative participles are used in the modifier function within a relative clause (85) or within a copular construction (see 3.1.2). They do not inflect.

- (85) a. jo:nt-li      je:mas sú:ŋ-na      xu:j-ø-l  
 sew-NEGP    dress corner-LOC    lie-EP-NPAST.3SG  
 'A dress which someone did not finish sewing lies in the corner.'
- b. pe:jal-ti      xo:s-li      ña:wre:m      il  
 swim-INF    can-NEGP    child down  
 su:wil-ø-ti      pit-ø-s  
 drown-EP-INF    start-EP-PAST.3SG  
 'A child who could not swim started drowning.'
- c. pe:ŋk xan-li      ke:w      wulli      juw-m-al  
 tooth grip-NEGP    stone already    come-PP-3SG  
 'A stone which teeth cannot grip has already appeared.'

### 2.2.6. Verbal derivation

Verbs are formed by means of suffixation, zero derivation, and prefixation. Suffixes of denominal derivation of verbs are addressed in 2.2.4.1, and derivational suffixes with voice-related meanings are discussed in 2.2.4.2. Other suffixes that derive verbs from verbs normally have various aspectual or *Aktionsart* meanings. The most productive of them are shown below.

- (86)
- |          |                         | u:l-m-      | example              |                  |
|----------|-------------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------|
| -m(t)-   | momentative, inchoative |             | 'start living'       | < u:l- 'live'    |
| -j-, -i- | frequentative           | wo:li-j-    | 'be shining'         | < wo:li- 'shine' |
| -(a)t-   | multiplicative          | uw-at-      | 'shout several time' | < uw- 'shout'    |
| -(t)li-  | imperfective            | su:m-ø-tli- | 'dress'              | < s:um- 'put on' |

When the voice and *Aktionsart* suffix are combined within one word, the former always precedes the latter: *ka:tl-ø-pt-i-* 'frequently give to somebody' (keep + EP + CAUS + FREQ). Several *Aktionsart* affixes are compatible within one verbal form, for example, the

frequentative *-i-* and the imperfective *-li-* often co-occur: *la:w-i-li-j-* 'be saying' < *la:w-* 'say' + EP + FREQ + IMPF.

Zero derivation forms verbs from nouns, examples are: *xuli-* 'to soil' < *xuli* 'dirt', *xos-* 'to urinate' < *xos-* 'urine'.

Verbal prefixes (preverbs) typically go back to directional adverbs. Most of them have a locational or directional meaning and derive new lexical verbs, for example: *wu-* 'take' > *nox wu-* 'take up', *kim wu-* 'take out', and *joxi wu-* 'take home'. The list of preverbs is presented below.

(87) lap	'down, closed'	wuti	'up from the river'
nox	'up'	joxi	'home'
il	'down'	su:ppi	'across'
kim	'out'	e:liti	'to, from top down'
lukki	'in different directions'	xoś	'from, away'
nik	'down to the river'	je:l	'farther, ahead'

In certain cases preverbs have a purely aspectual meaning, and express perfectiveness. This is especially typical of the preverbs *nox*, and, to a lesser extent, *il* and *lap*. Examples of aspectual preverbs are:

- (88)
- |         |                      |   |             |                             |
|---------|----------------------|---|-------------|-----------------------------|
| tini-   | 'sell'               | > | nox tini-   | 'have something sold'       |
| ka:wør- | 'cook'               | > | nox ka:wør- | 'have something cooked'     |
| re:sk-  | 'hit'                | > | lap re:sk-  | 'kill'                      |
| ramøl-  | 'calm somebody down' | > | il ramøl-   | 'have somebody calmed down' |

Preverbs do not constitute a single phonological word with the verb, that is, they bear a separate stress. The combination of the preverb and the verb can be considered a category that is transitional between lexical compounds and syntactic phrases. Although most such complexes are lexicalized, preverbs do not have a fixed position with respect to the verb. They may be separated from the verb by a focus particle and certain adverbs (89) because the focus elements must be immediately preverbal, according to an important word order constraint of Ostyak (see 5.3).

- (89) a. il      pa      śi      pa:jət-s-ø-lli  
 down again FOC drop-PAST-EP-SG.3SG  
 'He dropped (it) again.'
- b. nox      śiti      a:ləm-s-ø-lli  
 up so lift-PAST-EP-SG.3SG  
 'He lifted it up in this way.'

The contrast in (90) illustrates that the focus particle *tup* 'only' follows the preverb when it takes scope over the predicate, while the homonymous conjunction 'as soon as' must precede the preverb.

- (90) a. il      tup      pa:jət-s-ø-lli  
 down only drop-PAST-EP-SG.3SG  
 'he only dropped (it) down (and did nothing else)'
- b. tup      il      pa:jət-s-ø-lli  
 as.soon down drop-PAST-EP-SG.3SG  
 'as soon as he dropped (it) down ....'

Likewise, preverbs may be separated from the verb by certain grammatical elements, such as negative or prohibitive particles.

- (91) uw lap an tu:xr-a  
 door down NEG close-IMP.2SG  
 'Don't close the door.'

In certain emphatic contexts preverbs (perhaps fully adverbialized) are located after the verb (92a), while in the context of clause-union constructions (see 3.3.2.2) they may climb from the embedded clause to the matrix clause (92b).

- (92) a. man-a kim  
 go-IMP.2SG out  
 'Go out.'
- b. wo:j a:l-tiji kim ño:t-a  
 animal carry outside help-IMP.2SG  
 'Help (me) carry animals outside.'

It is unknown whether all these properties are characteristics of all preverbs and preverbal constructions. Generally speaking, the semantics, distribution, and grammatical behavior of preverbs remains largely undescribed, and presents one of the most intriguing problems of Ostyak grammar.

### 2.3. Other grammatical classes

The class of functional words comprises postpositions, particles, and conjunctions. Interjections and ideophones form a class of their own.

#### 2.3.1. Postpositions

Postpositions head a postpositional phrase and express a great variety of locational and non-locational meanings. The object of the postposition is a noun (93a) or a pronoun (93b) in the Nominative. If the object of the postposition corresponds to the personal pronoun, most postpositions take agreement affixes identical to the personal affixes of nouns. The pronoun must be overtly present in this case.

- (93) a. a:še-m xoša  
 father-1SG to  
 'to my father'
- b. ma xoša:j-e:m  
 I to-1SG  
 'to me'

The personal inflection of postpositions follows one of the following two patterns.

- (94) a. stem + personal affix + Locative affix *-na*  
 b. stem + personal inflection

Pattern (94a) is clearly related to nominal inflection and indicates that the postpositional stem represents a grammaticalized noun. On the other hand, postpositions in (94b) go back to old adverbial stems which do not inflect for case. Examples for (94a) and (94b) are given in (95a) and (95b), correspondingly.

- (95) a. u:rj-e:m-na 'for me' juka:n-e:m-na 'instead of me'  
 taxa:j-e:m-na 'being myself' śir-e:m-na 'in my way, like me'
- b. pul'an-e:m 'in front of me' e:wəlt-e:m 'from me'  
 pe:la:j-e:m 'about me' ite:-m 'like me'

There are a few compound postpositions derived from two postpositions, or a combination of a noun and a postposition. In compound postpositions only the second component is inflected for person and number, for example, *xoša e:wəlt-em* 'by me' (*xoša* 'to', *e:wəlt* 'from'). If the object of a postposition heads a possessive NP on its own, the possessive inflection can be attached either to the noun itself or to the postposition, cf.:

- (96) a. muŋ xo:t-e:w xoša  
 we house-1PL to
- b. muŋ xo:t xošŋ-e:w-na  
 we house to-1PL-LOC  
 'to our house'

Some postpositions never co-occur with personal pronouns for semantic reasons and correspondingly do not take personal inflections, for example: *xuwat* 'along', *silna* 'at the edge', *lukki* 'in different directions', *kimpina* 'outside', *tampina* 'on the other side', *lipina* 'inside', *sa:jna* 'across', *wutpina* 'at the back side', *ku:ssi* 'for (of time)', *moxti* 'through', and *kutna* 'between'.

A number of postpositions are used to form adverbial participial clauses (see 3.3.2.2).

#### 2.3.2. Particles and conjunctions

On functional grounds, particles can be divided into grammatical particles, logical items, and extra-clausal discourse particles. Grammatical particles participate in derivational and inflectional processes. These are the comparative clitic *-sək*, the superlative particle *me:t* (see 2.1.4), particles which form the free-choice indefinite pronouns *a:tul* and *kus* (see 2.1.2.5), particles which form the oblique verbal moods *a:t* and *lu:lən* (see 2.2.2.1), as well as negative particles (see 2.2.3). Note that the particle *me:t* can have a spatial noun or an ordinal numeral in its scope:

- (97) me:t o:ləŋ 'the very beginning'  
 me:t la:pət-mət 'the very last seventh'

Logical particles express various logical relationships and can sometimes have adverbial force, that is, function as degree adverbs. The most frequent logical particles are: *wus* 'already', *xolna* 'also, too, more', *pa* 'and, again; another; also', *a:l* 'very much', *šax* 'completely', *išipa* 'in any case', *ši* 'finally, still; also, too', *xoš* 'almost', and *iši* 'same'. If a logical particle takes scope over the predicate it is typically immediately adjacent to it and precedes it (98a), while if it takes scope over an NP it typically follows it (98b).

- (98) a. luw poskan-na ma:n-e:m xoš an o:rət-s-ə-lli  
 he gun-LOC I-ACC almost NEG reach-PAST-EP-SG.3SG  
 'He almost reached me from the gun.'
- b. ma iši a:n-e:m pa:jət-s-e:m  
 I also cup-1SG drop-PAST-SG.1SG  
 'I also dropped my cup.'

The additive focus particle *-pa* is a clitic and does not bear a separate phonological stress. In this it differs from the stressed particle *pa* 'again; another' and the stressed conjunction *pa* 'and, but', cf.:

- (99) a. *luw-pa man-ə-s*  
 he-FOC go-EP-PAST.3SG  
 'He also went.'
- b. *luw pa man-ə-s*  
 he again go-EP-PAST.3SG  
 'He went again.'
- c. *pa wo:s-na man-ə-s*  
 another city-LOC go-EP-PAST.3SG  
 'He went to another city.'

Some other particles also exhibit a difference in meanings depending on whether they are stressed or unstressed: the stressed *ši* is a very frequent preverbal participle which typically serves as a perfectivizer or an indicator of focus on the verb, while the unstressed *ši* takes scope over an NP and means 'also, too'; the stressed *tup* has a predicate in its scope and means 'just', while the unstressed *tup* means 'only'.

Discourse particles express various modal and emphatic meanings, or deal with the organization of the utterance. They are extremely frequent in colloquial speech, and are located fairly freely in the sentence. They can only be given an approximate translation. Examples are: *mo:səŋ* 'perhaps', *(i)la:mpa* 'perhaps, indeed', *atti ~ anti* 'well, so to say', *a:tul* 'OK', *šikəŋša* 'so to say', *matti* 'they say', *la:wəl* 'they say', *itta* 'well, now', *xoti* 'you see', *wa:nti* 'you see', *mola* 'isn't it', *xun(ti)* 'isn't it', *šu:rt* 'on earth', *pe:li* 'isn't it', as well as the Adhortative clitic *-sa*.

Conjunctions are not widespread in Ostyak. Several conjunctions have been borrowed from Russian and are now used mostly in the language of the younger generation (*i* 'and', *no* 'but'); some other conjunction-like expressions have developed from various forms of original anaphoric pronouns (*šitna* 'that is why', *ši kus* 'although', *šikəŋša* 'but on the other hand', *šalta* 'and then', *šitna* 'that is why'). Other native conjunctions are *pa* 'and, but', *ke:pa* 'although', *(a)mola* 'or', *tup* 'as soon as', and *ki* 'if' (see the examples in 3.3).

### 2.3.3. Interjections

Interjections and ideophones may contain sounds and sound combinations that are not otherwise typical of the phonemic system, such as *h, f*, and word-edge clusters. Examples of interjections are: *kaj* (amazement), *a-na-na* (pain), *ij-ij-ij* (threatening), *uxti-na* (amazement), *l'a-l'a* (calling a dog), *hej-hej* (driving a reindeer), *kit-kat* (calling a bird), and *t'o* (amazement). Examples of ideophonic words are: *xo:r-xo:r* (the barking of a dog), *war-war* (the noise made by a crow), and *go-go-gok* (the noise made by a wild goose). Russian interjections are also widely used.

### 3. Basic syntax

Like most Uralic languages, Ostyak exhibits the typological features of a head-final SOV language. However, the actual word order is largely influenced by information structure, especially in an independent clause. Word order is addressed in detail in section 5. Noun-phrases and postpositional phrases are rigidly head-final. Major grammatical relations, such as the subject, direct object, and indirect object, are rather easily identified by a cluster of grammatical properties. The case marking is based on the Accusative pattern for personal pronouns, while for lexical NPs it can be characterized as neutral, since they lack an overt Accusative marker.

### 3.1. Sentence types

The predicative center of the finite clause is either the finite verb (3.1.1) or the copula which can be omitted under certain conditions (3.1.2). Both the finite verb and the overt copula exhibit agreement with the grammatical subject, while the transitive verb may also inflect for object agreement (see section 6). Formal agreement in person is obligatory, while number agreement may be based on semantic rather than formal considerations. In other words, a Singular subject may trigger the Plural agreement affixes on the verb if it has multiple reference, cf. (100a). On the other hand, a formally Plural subject may trigger Singular agreement on the verb (100b).

- (100) a. *joxan tata jax-l-ə-t*  
 river here walk-NPAST-EP-3PL  
 'Here run rivers.'
- b. *ši sa:wi-ti ne:ŋxe-t la:w-ə-l*  
 that guard-NPP man-PL say-EP-NPAST.3SG  
 'Those shepherds spoke.'

A head of a quantified NP is typically in the Singular and triggers Singular agreement on the verb (see 3.5.2). In the absence of a grammatical subject the verb usually takes the 3<sup>rd</sup> person Singular agreement affix (see 3.2).

#### 3.1.1. Verbal clauses

In the intransitive clause the verb either does not take any arguments except for the subject (one-place verbs), or it takes oblique object arguments. Oblique objects are typically encoded as postpositional phrases, and only occasionally correspond to the Locative NP. Data in (101) presents the three most frequent postpositions that serve to introduce oblique objects together with the co-occurring verbs.

(101) postposition	verbs	
xoša	e:wəl-	'believe in'
	a:mət-	'rejoice about'
	u:nlti-	'study'
	we:rit-	'need'
	kašas-	'agree with'
pela	nu:məs-	'think about'
	likaš-	'be angry with'
	wa:nt-	'look at'
e:wəlt	pal-	'be afraid of'
	u:š-	'know about'
	šarəm-	'get frightened of'

Oblique objects are not obligatory constituents. They may license a referential null, that is, be present in the semantic representation of the clause only implicitly.

Transitive verbs take at least two arguments: a subject and a direct object. The direct object is encoded by the Nominative for lexical NPs, or the Accusative for the personal pronouns. As will be discussed in section 6 below, the grammatical relation of the direct object in Ostyak is split into two syntactic units with different grammatical properties depending on whether the object triggers agreement on the verb. The object that triggers agreement may be omitted under coreference with the previously mentioned element, while the object that does not trigger agreement must be overtly present in the clause.

The class of ditransitive verbs includes three place transitive verbs such as *ma-* 'give', *tu-* 'bring', *mo:jləpt-* 'give as a present', and *tini-* 'sell' which take the agent, patient and recipient arguments, as well as two place transitive verbs like *ka:wərt-* 'cook', *xans-* 'write' and *lešat-* 'prepare' which take agent, patient, and optional benefactive. Syntactically these two groups behave identically in Ostyak, so in what follows both recipient and benefactive will be referred to as recipient. Ditransitive verbs allow two regular alternative constructions that have basically the same truth-conditional meaning but differ in the distribution of semantic roles between grammatical relations.

- (102) a. (ma) a:n juwan e:lti ma-s-e:m  
I cup John to give-PAST-SG.1SG  
'I gave the cup to John.'
- b. (ma) juwan e:lti a:n ma-s-ə-m  
I John to cup give-PAST-EP-1SG  
'I gave John a cup.'
- (103) (ma) juwan a:n-na ma-s-e:m/\*ma-s-ə-m  
I John cup-LOC give-PAST-SG.1SG/give-PAST-EP-1SG  
'I gave John a cup.'

In (102), the patient is encoded as the direct object, and the recipient as an indirect object, marked with the lative postposition *e:lti*. In (103), the patient is encoded as an oblique object marked with the Locative case, while the recipient bears the grammatical relation of the direct object. Importantly, these constructions differ in terms of object agreement. The patient direct object either triggers agreement or not, as shown in (102); the recipient direct object obligatorily triggers agreement, as illustrated in (103). On the communicative role of the alternative ditransitive constructions see 3.4.

Other important operations that change verbal valence and/or grammatical relations are passivization (see 2.2.4.3) and causativization. Causatives in Ostyak have not been studied in detail, so the syntax of the causative construction is largely unknown. Transitive causatives are possible but very rare in the available material, see some examples in 2.2.4.2. In intransitive causative clauses the causee argument is similar to the recipient in that it is encoded as the direct object and must trigger object agreement.

- (104) muŋ naŋ-e:n mo:jl-ə-pt-ə-s-l-uw  
we you-ACC visit-EP-CAUS-EP-PAST-PL-1PL  
/\*mo:jl-ə-pt-ə-s-uw  
/\*visit-EP-CAUS-EP-PAST-1PL  
'We received you (as guests).'

Yes/no questions and imperative sentences have basically the same word order, morphology, and syntax as affirmative sentences, and are only marked by intonational means. On negation see (2.2.3), on wh-questions see (5.3).

### 3.1.2. Copular clauses

Copular verbs that inflect for subject agreement are *u:(l)-* 'be' and *ji-* 'become'. The copula 'be' used in identificational sentences is typically absent in the Non-Past tense, but must be overtly present in the Past and Future. The predicative element in the Nominative precedes the copula and may agree with the subject in number.

- (105) a. tam a:mp-ə-t jam-ə-t  
this d og-EP-3PL nice-EP-PL  
'These dogs are nice.'
- b. tam a:mp-ə-t j am-ə-t u:s-ə-t  
this dog-EP-3PL nice-EP-PL be-PAST-EP-3PL  
'These dogs were nice.'

However, in constructions with the copula 'become' the predicative element takes the Translative case and always remains in the Singular:

- (106) ŋa:wre:m-ə-ŋ-ŋi ji-l-ŋən  
child-EP-PROPR-TRANS become-NPAST-3DU  
'They had children.'

The predicative element in copular constructions may be represented by nouns, adjectives, pro-nouns, participles, numerals, some adverbs and postpositional phrases. The latter two case are illustrated in (107).

- (107) a. tam le:tit ma-ne:m nur murt  
this food I-ACC quite enough  
'This food is quite enough for me.'
- b. luw ŋa:wre:m xo:rpi  
he child like  
'He is like a child.'

Non-Past and Past participles when used in copular constructions with the copula 'be' are substantivized with the nominalizer *-t* (108a), while negative participles remain uninflected (108b). The substantivized participle takes a personal affix that refers to the subject of the participial action.

- (108) a. tam xir a:še-l jir-ə-m-ə-t-l  
this sack father-3SG tie-EP-PP-EP-NOM-3SG  
'This sack is tied by his father.'
- b. ma je:rmas-e:m j o:nt-li u:l  
I dress-1SG sew-NEG.PART be-NPAST.3SG  
'My dress is not sewn (yet).'

As shown in (109), in existential constructions the copula *tajl* 'there is/are' is used (from *taj-* 'to have' and the 3<sup>rd</sup> person Singular Non-Past tense inflection), although the copula *u:(l)-* is also possible. The negative existential copula is *antam* 'there is/are no' (see 2.2.3). Agreement in number with the existential copulas is suppressed, and the copula cannot be omitted under any circumstances.

- (109) se:ŋk su:kəŋ mutra taj-l  
very difficult miracle have-NPAST.3SG  
'There is a very difficult miracle.'

Subjectless copular constructions are formed with experiential adjectives such as those presented in (110) and the copulas 'be' or 'become'. In such constructions the experiencer either has a generic interpretation or corresponds to the non-subject argument expressed with the Locative case or the postpositional NP (see 3.2). Experiential adjectives can govern a sentential complement (see 3.3.2.2).

(110)	xo:səm	'warm'	iški	'cold'
	jam	'nice'	a:təm	'bad'
	šu:kət	'difficult'	patlam	'dark'
	ka:wɾəm	'hot'	ša:l	'sorry'
	me:ta	'seems'		

In some cases experiential adjectives co-occur with the existential impersonal copula *taj-l*, cf.:

(111)	luɣən	se:ɲk	patlam	taj-l
	in.summer	very	dark	have-NPAST.3SG
	'It is very dark in summer.'			

Unlike most Uralic languages which lack a *habeo*-verb, Ostyak has the regular predicative possessive construction formed with the transitive verb *taj*- 'have'. However, the locative possessive construction is also acceptable (112a), as well as the construction where the possessed noun takes possessive affixes (112b).

(112) a.	luw	u:nlta-ti-t-l	xoša	ne:pək	u:l
	he	teach-NPP-NOM-3SG	to	book	be-NPAST.3SG
	'His teacher has a book.'				
b.	xwo:st-e:n	ant	u:l		
	tail-2SG	NEG	be-NPAST.3SG		
	'You don't have a tail.'				

### 3.2. Grammatical relations

A most important notion in Ostyak grammar is the notion of subject. The subject is a grammatical element associated with the highest syntactic activity and a main controller of coreferential relations, both within the clause and clause-externally. The subject is identified as the clausal element which has a certain cluster of grammatical properties. Two properties addressed in this section are characteristic exclusively of the subject, while in section 6.1 I will also address the subject properties that are shared by some types of direct objects.

First, the subject controls adverbial embedded clauses based on the Converb and the purpose infinitival clause, see 3.3.2.2. In such sentences coreferentiality of subjects is obligatory, with one exception. If the two subjects stand in the relation of inalienable possession coreferentiality may be violated, at least in the converbial clause, cf.:

(113)	[sam-ə-l	man-man]	Ø	je:ləš	wa:nt-ilij-ə-s
	heart-EP-3SG	go-CONV		ahead	see-IMP-EP-PAST.3SG
	'She <sub>i</sub> looked ahead being afraid (literally: her, heart being left).'				

Second, the subject controls zero anaphora across a conjoined clause, as shown in (114). Coreference with grammatical relations other than the subject is established through the repetition of the full NP in the conjoined clause, or its substitution for the anaphoric pronouns *sital*, *tume:l* 'that one, the latter'. Compare (114a) and (114b).

(114) a.	o:xsar	so:wər	mu:sməlt-ə-s	pa	man-ə-s
	fox	hare	wound-EP-PAST.3SG	and	go-EP-PAST.3SG
	'The fox wounded the hare and left.'				

b.	o:xsar	so:wər	mu:sməlt-ə-s	pa	tu:me:l
	fox	hare	wound-EP-PAST.3SG	and	that-3SG
	man-ə-s				
	go-EP-PAST.3SG				

'The fox wounded the hare and he left.'

See more on coreferential relations in the conjoined clause in section 6.1.

Most but not all sentences have a subject, as identified above. A surface subject is absent in the following cases:

(i) Constructions based on experiential adjectives (3.1.2). Such constructions may have a generic interpretation in which case the experiencer argument remains unexpressed (115). In personal experiential constructions the experiencer argument takes the Locative form if it corresponds to the personal pronoun (115a), or is otherwise expressed by the postpositional phrase with the postposition *e:liti* (115b).

(115) a.	a:təm	u:l-ti	pit-l		
	bad	be-INF	fall-NPAST.3SG		
	'It will be bad.'				
b.	ma:n-e:mna	iški			
	me-LOC	cold			
	'I am cold.'				
c.	xu:j-ə-m	a:mp-ə-t	e:liti	ka:wɾəm	u:l-m-al
	sleep-EP-PP	dog-EP-3PL	to	hot	be-PP-3SG
	'Sleeping dogs were hot.'				

A similar construction is used for the expression of age (in this case it is probably borrowed from Russian), as shown in (116), and is also employed with certain impersonal verbs (see 3.3.2.2).

(116)	ma:ne:m	xu:s	ta:l		
	me-ACC	twenty	year		
	'I am twenty years old.'				

Note that in the personal experiential construction the experiencer argument has some subject properties, in particular, it can control the dependent clause with the Infinitive in *-ti*, cf.:

(117)	naɲ-e:n	tam	muw-na	u:l-ti	a:təm
	you-ACC	that	land-LOC	live-INF	bad
	'It is bad for you to live in this land.'				

(ii) For impersonal passive constructions, see 2.2.4.3.

(iii) The single argument of the intransitive verbs may sometimes be encoded as the Locative NP while the verb is either active (118a) or more rarely passive (118b). This construction is very marginal and is mainly used in the archaic language of folklore.

(118) a.	so:rni-na	pos-ij-ə-l			
	gold-LOC	flow-IMP-EP-NPAST.3SG			
	'Gold is floating down.'				



- b.    śarəs        ta:ś   jam-i-je:-l        ku:śa mit  
 thousand herd good-EP-DIM-3SG master salary  
 xu:j-i-je:-l-na        joxi śi   larŋəlt-i-j-l-a  
 man-EP-DIM-3SG-LOC home FOC drive-EP-IMP-NPAST-PAS.3SG

'The servant of the master of the thousand (head) herd is driving home.'

Other grammatical relations relevant for the Ostyak clause are the direct object, the indirect object, the oblique object, and the adjuncts. The grammatical relation of the direct object is addressed in detail in section 6. The indirect object is encoded by the postpositional phrase with the postposition *e:lti*, see 3.1.2. Oblique objects exhibit the Locative or the postpositional marking, see 2.1.1.2. Adjuncts express various adverbial meanings and are represented by adverbs, Locative NPs, and postpositional phrases. On the extracausal topic see 5.2.

### 3.3. Complex sentences

#### 3.3.1. Coordination

As mentioned in 2.3.2, coordinating conjunctions are fairly rarely used. The most common coordinative conjunction is *pa* 'and, but' used as a clausal coordinator, as shown in (119). As a constituent coordinator it is present only in the language of the younger generation influenced by Russian.

- (119)   joxan owəŋ mal pa nare:m        we:r-ti mo:s-l  
 river stream deep and bridge do-INF need-NPAST.3SG  
 'The stream of the river is deep, and one should make a bridge.'

In most cases coordination between clauses (120a) as well as constituent coordination (120b) has no overt marker. Constituent coordination can also be expressed by the repetition of the clause, as in (121), and verbal coordination by converbial constructions (see 3.3.2.2).

- (120) a.   śe:mja:j-ə-l        wul-li        ji-s        muŋ  
 family-EP-3SG big-TRANS become-PAST.3SG we  
 e:nm-ə-li-s-uw  
 grow.up-EP-IMPF-PAST-IPL  
 'His family became big, we grew up.'
- b.    śi wo:s-na   man-l-ə-ŋən        śi o:xti wo:j        muw  
 that city-LOC go-NPAST-EP-3DU that snake animal earth  
 xo:r        iki        xośa  
 reindeer old.man to

'They are going to that city, to (see) the snake and the mammoth.'

- (121)   lo:ś-ə-n        parkat-l-ə-ŋən,        ju:ŋk-ə-n  
 snow-EP-3DU shake-NPAST-EP-3DU ice-EP-3DU  
 parkat-l-ə-ŋən  
 shake-NPAST-EP-3DU

'They are shaking off the snow and the ice (from themselves).'

In addition, two NPs can be coordinated by means of the Dual if they denote two animate participants related by a close (typically, family) relationship. The regular Dual

marker *-ŋən* or the possessive Dual marker *-ŋil-* attaches either to both conjuncts (122a), or to the second conjunct only (122b), or to the first conjunct while the second is omitted (123). In the latter case the construction rather has an associative meaning. The coordinative NP triggers Dual agreement on the verb in the subject role.

- (122) a.   a:śe:-ŋən   jik-ŋən        man-s-ə-ŋən  
 father-DU son-DU go-PAST-EP-3DU  
 b.    a:śi   jik-ŋən  
 father son-DU
- (123) a.   a:śe:-ŋən  
 father-DU  
 'The father and his son left'.  
 b.    ke:se:-m   ma aśe:-ŋil-am        e:lti   ma-s-e:m.  
 knife-1SG I father-DU-1SG to give-PAST-SG.1SG  
 'I gave the knife to my father and his son.'

Disjunction is expressed by the element (*a:*)*mola* 'or', cf.:

- (124)   ńa:r sari liw-ə-m-na        e:pləŋ u:-s  
 raw salmon eat-EP-PP-LOC tasty be-PAST.3SG  
 mola e:pəlli u:-s?  
 or untasty be-PAST.3SG

'When you ate raw salmon, was it tasty or untasty?'

### 3.3.2. Subordination

#### 3.3.2.1. Finite clauses

Like coordination, clausal subordination can sometimes be expressed by mere juxtaposition. An embedded question additionally contains a wh-question word (125b).

- (125) a.   ant u:ś-l-e:m        [tam u:r-na a:psije:-t  
 NEG know-NPAST-SG.1SG this forest-LOC bear-PL  
 u:l-l-ə-t]  
 be-NPAST-EP-3PL  
 'I don't know if there are bears in this forest.'
- b.    ma u:ś-l-e:m        [naŋ molaji joxət-s-ə-n]  
 I know-NPAST-SG.1SG you why come-PAST-EP-2SG  
 'I know why you came.'

In the language of the younger generation, under the influence of Russian the finite embedded clause may be introduced by anaphoric elements (126) or conjunctions (127). The conjunction *ki* 'if' (sometimes also *ke:pa* 'although') tends to be clause-final (127a); other conjunctions are usually placed after the subject (127b).

- (126)   naŋ wa:n-s-e:n        śi   ńa:wre:m   [xoj e:lti   xo:p-e:n  
 you see-PAST-SG.2SG that child who to boat-2SG  
 ma-s-e:n?]  
 give -PAST-SG.2SG

'Did you see that fellow to whom you gave your boat?'

- (127) a. [man-l ki] xoti me:t a:təm xolna  
 go-NPAST.3SG if well SUPER bad more  
 'If he escapes it will be even worse.'
- b. [luw ši kus jox̣t-ə-s] ne:mosa an  
 he FOC although come-EP-PAST.3SG nothing NEG  
 tu:-s  
 bring-PAST.3SG  
 'Although he came he did not bring anything.'

### 3.3.2.2. Non-finite clauses

The most frequent strategy for the embedded clause is based on non-finite verbal forms, the Converb, the Infinitive, and participles. The Converb typically forms an adverbial clause of manner or simultaneous concomitant action (128a) but may also merely express verbal coordination. In some cases the converbial clause refers to the moment previous in time with respect to the situation described by the matrix clause (128b). As mentioned in 3.2, the only possible controller of converbial clauses is the matrix clause subject (for some exceptions see 4.1).

- (128) a. jo:ntəs-l [Ø pasan e:lti o:məs-man]  
 sew-NPAST.3SG table to sit-CONV  
 'She is sewing sitting by the table.'
- b. [Ø xo:ll-ə-man] u:r-na man-ə-s  
 cry-EP-CONV forest-LOC go-EP-PAST.3SG  
 'After having cried he went to the forest.'

In addition, the Converb expresses secondary predication in the resultative construction. In this case the subjects of the two predications do not have to be coreferential, as in the following examples:

- (129) a. u:xəl [Ø il jir-man] lo:j-l  
 sledge down tie-CONV stand-NPAST.3SG  
 'The sledge is tied down.'
- b. luw u:w-ə-l [Ø lap tu:xər-man] taj-l-ə-lli.  
 he door-EP-3SG down close-CONV have-NPAST-EP-SG.3SG  
 'He keeps the door closed.'

The Infinitive forms the same-subject purpose clause or the complement clause. Two variants of the Infinitive suffix *-ti* and *-tiji* are basically used interchangeably, although *-tiji* is somewhat preferred in purposive constructions. The purpose clause is exemplified in (130).

- (130) luw xaš-ə-s [Ø naŋ-e:n wa:n-tiji]  
 he stay-EP-PAST.3SG you-ACC see-INF  
 'He stayed to see you.'

The subject-controlled infinitival complement clause is triggered by experiential adjectives (see 3.1.2) as well as by some aspectual and modal verbs, such as *we:rit-* 'can', *xo:s-* 'can', *pajət-* or *pit-* 'begin', *lit-* 'want', *kašas-* 'agree to do something', *numəs-* 'think about doing something', and *je:ləm-* 'be ashamed', see example (131a). With the impersonal verbs *rax-* 'it is possible', and *mo:s-* 'it is needed' the infinitival clause either exhibits arbitrary control

(131b) or is controlled by the Locative experiencer argument (131c). Finally, at least two verbs exhibit object control, these are *no:r-* 'help' and *e:sl-* 'let' (example (131d)).

- (131) a. ma we:rit-l-e:m [Ø naŋ-e:n jo:nt-ti je:rnas]  
 I can-NPAST-SG.1SG you-ACC sew-INF dress  
 'I can sew a dress for you.'
- b. ši:ti an rax-l [Ø we:r-tiji]  
 so NEG possible-NPAST.3SG do-INF  
 'One mustn't do so.'
- c. luw-e:l [Ø man-ti] mo:s-l  
 he-ACC go-INF need-NPAST.3SG  
 'He has to leave.'
- d. e:sl-a ma:n-e:m [Ø jax-tiji wo:s-na]  
 let-IMP.2SG I-ACC walk-INF city-LOC  
 'Let me go to the city.'

As demonstrated by (131a), object agreement may 'climb' from the subject-controlled infinitival clause into the matrix clause, which provides an argument in favor of the monoclausal (or the so-called clause-union) status of such constructions.

Participles form complement clauses, adverbial clauses, and relative clauses. Relative clauses are addressed in section 7 in detail and are not dealt with in this section. For participial adverbial clauses the semantic type of the clause is indicated by the Locative case (132a) or postpositional marking (132a) on the participle.

- (132) a. [as no:pət-ti-na] ne:ŋxe:t nik  
 Ob float-NPP-LOC man-PL to.riverbank  
 jax-l-ə-t  
 walk-NPAST-EP-3PL  
 'When the Ob has ice in it people go to the riverbank.'
- b. [kase:m man-ti jupina] li-ti pit-l-ə-m  
 pain-1SG go-NPP after eat-INF start-NPAST-EP-1SG  
 'I will start eating after my pain stops.'

The most frequent postpositions employed in the adverbial clauses are: *jupina* 'after', *e:wəlt* 'because', *u:rəŋna* 'because', *ku:ssi* 'for', *mu:sna* 'instead', *xuwat* 'during', *tu:mpina* 'except that', *širna* 'in the way, like', *kišša* 'compared to', *iti* 'like', *ke:mna* 'while', *juka:na ~ jukanni* 'pretending that', *taxa:jna* 'being', *sis* 'while', *mosa* 'until', *xo:rpi* 'like', *o:ləŋna* 'about', and *pora:jna* 'when'.

Participial complement clauses fall into sentential subjects and sentential objects. In both cases the participle bears case or postpositional marking. Sentential subjects are especially common with the matrix verbs *ša:t-* 'be heard, be felt' and *ni-* 'be seen' (133a). Sentential objects can be triggered by verbs of perception such as *wa:nt-* 'see', *la:jləs-* 'wait', *sija:ləs-* 'notice', *wa:n-man taj-* 'see', and *xu:l-* 'hear' (133b).

- (133) a. [Ø noxəs ta:lli-ti] šat-l  
 up pull-NPP heard-NPAST.3SG  
 'It is felt that somebody is pulling (him) up.'
- b. [pornij imi juw-ə-m] wa:n-man taj-l-ə-lli  
 Por woman come-EP-PP see-CONV have-NPAST-EP-SG.3SG  
 'She saw that Por woman came.'

As distinct from the infinitival complement clause, participial embedded clauses (both the adverbial and the complement clauses) need not be controlled by the matrix clause subject. For this reason, the participle may take an agreement affix which cross-references the embedded clause subject. On agreement affixes of the participles see 2.2.5. This agreement is optional and basically depends on the information structure status of the embedded subject: the topicalized subject triggers agreement. This occurs under the following conditions.

(i) The subject corresponds to the personal pronoun or zero pronoun.

- (134) [naŋ o:l-t-e:n /\*o:l-ti e:lti] ma u:r-na  
 you sleep-NPP-2SG/\*sleep-NPP to me forest-LOC  
 jax-s-ə-m  
 walk-PART-EP-1SG

'While you were sleeping I went to the forest.'

In same-subject sentences the embedded subject is typically omitted under coreference with the matrix clause subject, therefore the participle takes agreement, cf.:

- (135) a. o:pe:-m [Ø<sub>i</sub> xo:ll-E-t-al-na /\*xo:ll-ə-ti-na]  
 sister-1SG cry-EP-NPP-3SG-LOC/\*cry-EP-NPP-LOC  
 nu:ms-ə-s  
 think-EP-PAST.3SG

'My sister was thinking when crying.'

- b. pox<sub>i</sub> [Ø<sub>i</sub> a:n il pa:jət-m-al /\*pa:jt-ə-m u:rəŋna]  
 boy cup down drop-PP-3SG/\*drop-EP-PP because  
 a:ŋke:-l-na nu:rməl-s-a  
 mother-3SG-LOC curse-PAST- PAS.3SG

'The mother cursed the boy because he dropped the cup.'

(ii) The subject corresponds to a lexical NP which is topicalized. In this case it typically occurs in the previous discourse and is under discussion at the time of the utterance in question.

- (136) mašina:j-e:w a:tməs ru:pit-ə-s  
 car-1PL badly work-EP-PAST.3SG  
 [mašina:j-e:w suka:l-m-al/\*suka:l-ə-m u:rəŋna] joxi  
 car-1PL break-PP-3SG/\*break-EP-PP because home  
 xiš-s-uw  
 stay-PAST-1PL

'Our car worked badly. Because our car broke down, we were late.'

By contrast, the non-topicalized embedded subject does not trigger agreement on the participle, cf. (136) and (137).

- (137) mola:ji joxi xiš-s-ə-ti?  
 why home stay-PAST-EP-2PL  
 mašina:j-e:w suka:l-ə-m/\*suka:l-m-al u:rəŋna joxi xiš-s-uw  
 car-1PL break-EP-PP/\*break-PP-3SG because home stay-PAST-1PL

'Why were you late? We were late because our car broke down.'

(iii) The embedded clause is controlled by the object that triggers agreement in the matrix clause. As will be discussed later in section 6.4, the object that triggers agreement has a number of topical properties and can be identified as a secondary topic.

- (138) [xul<sub>i</sub> un ul-m-al /\*ul-ə-m pata] xul/Ø<sub>i</sub> nox  
 fish large be-PP-3SG/\*be-EP-PP because fish up  
 an ta:l-s-e:m  
 NEG carry-PAST-SG.1SG

'I didn't take out the fish because the fish/it was large.'

Adverbial embedded clauses may express irrealis modality if introduced by the postpositions *u:rəŋna* 'in order to', *ku:ssi* '(in order) to', *jukanni* 'instead', and *tumipna* 'in addition to'. As shown in (139), agreement on the participle then fails even in same-subject sentences.

- (139) luw joxt-ə-s [Ø<sub>i</sub> naŋ a:mp-e:n wu-ti  
 he come-EP-PAST.3SG you dog-2SG take-NPP  
 /\*wu-t-al ku:ssi]  
 /\*take-NPP-3SG to  
 'He came to take your dog.'

Subject agreement is also absent when the embedded subject has an indefinite or generic interpretation and is not overtly indicated in the clause, cf.:

- (140) ma o:məs-ti śirna śi o:məs-l-ə-m  
 I sit-NPP like so sit-NPAST-EP-1SG  
 'I am sitting in the way one (usually) sits.'

As mentioned in 2.2.4.3, in constructions based on participles the passive relationship is encoded merely by syntactic means. The verb (participle) does not bear any passive marker, so the only formal indicator of the Passive meaning is the Locative form of the agent argument.

- (141) [Ø tu:ta xoj-na ji-te:-mən] śa:t-l  
 here who-LOC come-NPP-1DU be.heard-NPAST.3SG  
 'It is heard that somebody is coming to us.' (literally: we are heard to be visited by somebody).

### 3.4. Discourse phenomena

A referential relationship between sentences is usually maintained through coreferentiality of the clause-internal topic elements. As will be shown in section 5.2, the primary clause-internal topic in Ostyak is grammaticalized as the subject, while the secondary clause-internal topic is typically represented by the direct object that triggers agreement (see

6.4). However, while the subject primary topic is present in the overwhelming majority of clauses with the exception of subjectless sentences (3.2) and topicless presentational constructions (5.1), the direct object with the secondary topic role is obviously less frequent. It is restricted only to certain transitive clauses.

In both cases the topic element is cross-referenced by agreement morphology on the verb, but does not need to be overtly present in the clause. So Ostyak exhibits pro-drop both in subject and direct object positions. Personal pronouns in the subject and direct object roles are typically overt only if they are under explicit or implicit contrast or have a reflexive reading, otherwise they are usually represented by zero pronouns. In other grammatical roles personal pronouns are typically overtly used.

As mentioned in section 2.2.4.3, the mechanism of passivization applies to maintain topic (subject) coreference. For example, if the subject of the first clause corresponds to the non-agent argument in the conjoined clause (with patient, recipient, or some other roles), the conjoined clause is passivized, as in (142). Basically the same strategy is used in non-conjoined clauses.

- (142) a. o:xsar so:wər we:l-ə-s                      ša:lta ∅                      mojpar-na xul-na  
fox hare kill-EP-PAST.3SG                      then                      bear-LOC fish-LOC  
ma-s-a  
give-PAST-PAS.3SG
- ‘The fox<sub>i</sub> killed the hare<sub>j</sub>, then the bear gave it<sub>i/\*j</sub> some fish.’
- b. ja:j-e:m                      a:t joxət-l                      o:me:-m-na                      xo:se:ŋk-na  
brother-1SG                      let come-NPAST.3SG                      mother-1SG-LOC                      fish.soup-LOC  
ma-l-a  
give-NPAST-PAS.3SG

‘Let my brother come, mother will give him some fish soup.’

The personal pronouns with the agent role seem to be inherently topical, so they are always encoded as the subject. In other words, the Locative forms of the personal pronouns cannot function as the passive agent, and the corresponding active construction is used instead. The next example shows that if the agent argument within the conjoined clause is a personal pronoun, passivization does not apply, but the first clause subject controls the null copy in the object position (143a). As in the case of the null copy in the subject position addressed in 3.2, coreference with the object is established through its repetition or substitution for the anaphoric element (143b).

- (143) a. juwan pe:tra re:sk-ə-s-li                      šitna                      ma ∅  
John Peter hit-EP-PAST-SG.3SG therefore                      I  
wo:st-ə-s-e:m  
throw.out-EP-PAST-SG.1SG
- ‘John<sub>i</sub> hit Peter<sub>j</sub>, therefore I threw him<sub>i/\*j</sub> out.’
- b. juwan pe:tra re:sk-ə-s-li                      šitna                      ma                      tume:-l  
John Peter hit-EP-PAST-SG.3SG                      therefore                      I                      that-3SG  
wo:st-E-s-em  
throw.out-EP-PAST-SG.1SG

‘John<sub>i</sub> hit Peter<sub>j</sub>, therefore I threw him<sub>j/\*i</sub> out.’

Like passivization, the ditransitive construction serves to maintain topic coreferentiality, in this case that of secondary topic. Alternative ditransitive constructions described in section 3.1.1 are associated with different information structures. According to the approach taken in this paper, the focus is identified as the target of the wh-question (see 5.3), while the secondary topic function is associated with the previously mentioned elements “less important” than the primary (subject) topic (6.4). Example (102a) above is the answer to the question ‘To whom did you give the cup?’, that is, the indirect object recipient is in focus, while the patient argument bears the secondary topic status. Example (102b) is the answer to the question ‘What did you do’, that is, both the patient and the recipient are equally in focus. Example (103) is the answer to the question ‘What did you give to John?’, that is, the patient is in focus, while the recipient corresponds to the secondary topic. The dependency between semantic roles, information structure functions, and grammatical relations in three ditransitive constructions exemplified in (144) is schematized below.

(144)	semantic roles	information structure	grammatical relations
a.	patient recipient	secondary topic focus	direct object indirect object
b.	patient recipient	focus focus	direct object indirect object
c.	patient recipient	secondary topic focus	oblique object direct object

This shows a certain asymmetry in the accessibility of the patient and the recipient to the direct object role. If the recipient and the patient have different statuses in the information structure, the direct object role is taken by the secondary topic element, either the patient (144a) or the recipient in (144c). If the patient and the recipient have equal information structure status, both in focus as in (144b), the patient takes priority over the recipient and is encoded as the direct object. As will be shown in section 6.4, the object agreement marks the secondary topic object. Under the analysis developed here, this immediately accounts for the fact that the recipient direct object must trigger agreement.

Thus, the encoding of the patient as the direct object is a grammatical default. It can be overridden by certain information structure considerations: the recipient is encoded as the direct object if it more topical than the patient. Example (145) illustrates the secondary topic recipient argument which corresponds to the null pronoun in the direct object position and is cross-referenced by object agreement.

- (145) a:ŋke:-m                      joxət-ə-s                      pa                      ma                      ke:si-na  
mother-1SG                      come-EP-PAST.3SG and                      I                      knife-LOC  
ma-s-e:m  
give-PAST-SG.1SG

‘My mother came and I gave her a knife.’

On controllers and targets of omission in embedded clauses see 3.3.2.2 and section 7.

### 3.5. Noun phrase

A noun phrase consists of a head and an optional modifier. The following grammatical classes function as nominal heads: nouns, pro-nouns, and nominalized elements. Pro-nouns cannot take a modifier, with the exception of the relative clause. The following classes of modifiers are available: nouns (which function as possessive and non-possessive modifiers), pro-nouns, adjectives, pro-adjectives, numerals, postpositional phrases, and the relative

clause. Typically, nouns cannot be modified by a simple adverbial or an oblique-case NP. The relative clause is discussed in section 7. Articles are missing, definiteness may be expressed by means of the possessive affixes (see 7.3 for more details).

The noun phrase is strictly head-final, although in archaic poetic folklore adjectives may sometimes be postposed after the head. No discontinuous noun phrase is allowed; the only lexical material that may be inserted between the head and the modifier are certain focus particles or other modifiers. The syntactic relationship between the head and the modifier is encoded morphologically only within a possessive noun phrase of certain types. Otherwise the modifier is merely juxtaposed to the head noun and does not show agreement with it.

### 3.5.1. Possessive NPs

Possessive NPs form two types of constructions, the neutral construction and the head-marked construction. When the possessor corresponds to a personal pronoun the dependency relation is marked on the head noun by means of person/number affixes (on them see 2.1.1.3), whereas the possessor remains unmarked and may be omitted (146a). Thus, within the personal possessive construction the possessive marker encodes the internal constructional relationship, while the external syntax is encoded by the case or postpositional marking on the head noun. On the other hand, the lexical possessor is merely juxtaposed to the head, which does not bear any morphological marking of the possessive relationship (146b).

- (146) a. (ma) xo:t-e:m-na  
me house-1SG-LOC  
'in my house'  
b. Juwan xo:t-na  
John house-LOC  
'in John's house'

The same split—head-marking with the pronominal possessor vs. neutral marking with the lexical possessor—is typical of most Uralic languages (Nichols 1986b: 76–77). On topicalization of the possessor see section 5.2.

In constructions with multiple possessors, if the leftmost possessor corresponds to the personal pronoun and the second and the third components of the construction stand in an inalienable possession relationship to each other, the person/number affix may attach either to the lower or to the higher head.

- (147) a. ma xo:p-e:m ñul  
I boat-1SG nose  
b. ma xo:p ñul-e:m  
I boat nose-1SG  
'the nose of my boat'

A similar variation is attested within postpositional phrases (see 2.3.1).

### 3.5.2. Non-possessive NPs

Adjectives, pro-adjectives, ordinal numerals, and unmarked nouns in the attributive function are non-possessive modifiers. As discussed in section 7.3, the construction with attributive nouns can be structurally analyzed as a subtype of the possessive construction, although its semantics deviates from the expression of possession. Like possessive modifiers, non-possessive modifiers precede the head, for example: *jam woj* 'nice bird', *so:rñii woj* 'golden (literally: gold) bird', *xu:l-mət iki* 'third husband', *tam xir* 'this sack'. To this type also belong those NPs in which the head noun is semantically subservient to another concept, so it cannot be used independently and requires modification. These are spatial nouns such as

*kutəp* 'middle', *wol* 'place where something used to be', *xar* 'place of something', *pe:lək* 'side' (148); nouns *tel* and *xo:rpi* both meaning something like 'likeness'; as well as parametric words derived with the suffix *-at* (see 2.1.1.4). The latter head their own NP and express the equative meaning (149).

- (148) uw xar 'place where there is a door'  
jus kutəp 'middle of the road'
- (149) a. se:ŋk pal-at jux-ə-t  
very tall-NOM tree-EP-PL  
'very tall trees'  
b. ma kul-a:t-e:m niŋ  
I fat-NOM-1SG woman  
'a woman fat like me, of my size'

Attributive agreement in case and number is absent. The external syntactic role of the noun phrase is encoded by (case) markers on the head noun, cf.:

- (150) jam xo:t-ə-t-na u:l-l-ə-t  
nice house-EP-PL-LOC be-NPAST-EP-3PL  
'They live in nice houses.'

Quantifiers of various types also precede the head which is typically in the Singular: *la:pət laraš* 'seven chests', *asa wo:s* 'all the cities', *a:r e:wi* 'many girls', *litra jiyk* 'liter of water'. However, the Plural on the head is not ungrammatical and can be used if plurality of referents is emphasized: *xu:ləm kala:ŋ-ə-t* 'three reindeer'. As discussed in 6.1 below, universal quantifiers (as well as certain scalar quantifiers, for example *a:rtan* 'a lot, many', see example (168a)) can float in the postnominal position.

In the comitative NP the head noun is modified by the postpositional phrase headed by the postposition *pil'na* 'with'. Such a postpositional phrase usually follows the head, so head finality here is violated. In the subject position the comitative NP triggers Dual agreement on the main verb (151a). Note that the postpositional phrase headed by the postposition *pil'na* may also have an adverbial function. In the latter case the main verbs take the Singular agreement (151b).

- (151) a. juwan pe:tra pil'na l uw luks-ə-l xoša man-s-ə-ŋən  
John Peter with he friend-EP-3SG to go-PAST-EP-3DU  
'John<sub>i</sub> with Peter<sub>j</sub> went to his<sub>j</sub> friend.'  
b. aše-m a:mp pil'na u:r-na man-ə-s  
father-1SG dog with forest-LOC go-EP-PAST.3SG  
'My father went to the forest with the dog.'

Adjectives, Non-Past and Past participles, and some pro-adjectives, if they are nominalized with the nominalizer *-t* (2.1.6), as well as the possessive pronouns and cardinal numerals, form headless noun phrases (or a headless relative clause in the case of nominalized participles). In this instance they take regular inflections typical of nouns (case, number, and possessive) or co-occur with the postposition which marks their external syntactic role.

- (152) a. luw ka:t wo:s-na u:l ma xu:ləm-na.  
he two city-LOC be-NPAST.3SG I three-LOC  
'He has been in two cities, and I in three.'

- b. naŋ ma ńa:wre:m-e:m u:rəŋna je:mas jo:t-s-ə-n ma  
 you I child-1SG for dress sew-PAST-EP-2SG I  
 naŋe:-ŋil-an u:rəŋna  
 you-DU-2SG for

'You have sewn a dress for my child and I for your two.'

- c. ma wo:x-ə-m-ə-t-e:m luw ma-ne:m ma-s-li  
 I ask-EP-PP-EP-NOMN-1SG he I-ACC give-PAST-SG.3SG  
 'He gave me what I was asking for.'

#### 4. Sample text

The text was recorded in 1990 in the settlement Katravozh from a local resident Anna Pavlovna Seraskhova. It is followed by a free translation.

1. u:-s-ŋəŋ o:pe:-ŋəŋ j e:we:-ŋəŋ.  
 be-PAST-3DU sister-DU brother-DU
2. jaj-ə-l ka:səŋ xatl xul we:l-ti jaŋx-ə-l joxi  
 brother-EP-3SG each day fish kill-INF walk-EP-NPAST.3SG home  
 joxət-l pa šikəńša o:pi-je:-l pe:la la:w-ə-l  
 come-EP-NPAST.3SG and well sister-DIM-3SG to say-EP-3SG  
 xul-e:n e:wət-lij-i ox-ə-l ma  
 fish-2SG cut-IMP-IMP.SG.2SG head-EP-3SG I  
 li-l-e:m puse:-l naŋ liw-i kutpe:-ŋ  
 eat-NPAST-SG.2SG tail-3SG you eat-IMP.SG.2SG middle-PROPR  
 su:p-ə-l naŋ liw-i.  
 piece-EP-3SG you eat-IMP.SG.2SG
3. pa xatl-li ji-l pa man-l.  
 again day-TRANS become-PERS.3SG again go-NPAST.3SG
4. u:r-na man-l o:pi-je:-l pa xul  
 forest-LOC go-NPAST.3SG sister-DIM-3SG again fish  
 tu:-l.  
 bring-NPAST.3SG
5. o:pi-je:-l pe:la la:w-ə-l naŋ atti kutpe:-ŋ  
 sister-DIM-3SG to say-EP-NPAST.3SG you well middle-PROPR  
 su:p-ə-l naŋ liw-i ox-ə-l ma  
 piece-EP-3SG you eat-IMP.SG.2SG head-EP-3SG I  
 li-l-e:m puse:-l ma li-l-e:m atti  
 eat-NPAST-SG.1SG tail-3SG I eat-NPAST-SG.1SG well  
 puse:-l ma li-l-e:m.  
 tail-3SG I eat-NPAST-SG.1SG
6. naŋ kutpe:-l liw-a.  
 you middle-3SG eat-IMP.2SG
7. o:pi-je:-l la:w-ə-l mola naŋ kutpe:-l ši iwe:nŋa  
 sister-DIM-3SG say-EP-3SG what you middle-3SG FOC always  
 ma:n-e:m la:pət-l-e:n pa naŋ mola atna.  
 I-ACC feed-NPAST-SG.2SG and you what well
8. pa puse:-l ma li-l-e:m ox-ə-l naŋ  
 again tail-3SG I eat-NPAST.SG.1SG head-EP-3SG you  
 li-l-e:n la:w-ə-l antam.  
 eat-NPAST-SG.2SG say-EP-NPAST.3SG no
9. xu:lm-at xatl ji-s pa man-ə-s.

- three-ORD day become-PAST.3SG again go-EP-PAST.3SG  
 10. pa man-ə-s šikəńša pa xul we:l-ə-s  
 again go-EP-PAST.3SG well again fish kill-EP-PAST.3SG  
 joxt-ə-s pa o:pi-je:-l pe:la la:w-ə-l  
 come-EP-PAST.3SG again sister-DIM-3SG to say-EP-NPAST.3SG  
 o:pi-je:-m pa ka:wər-l-e:mən kutpe:-l naŋ  
 sister-DIM-1SG again cook-NPAST-SG.1DU middle-3SG you  
 liw-i ox-ə-l ma li-l-e:m.  
 eat-IMP.SG.2SG head-EP-3SG I eat-NPAST-SG.1SG
11. o:pi-je:-l l'ika:š-ə-s.  
 sister-DIM-3SG get.angry-EP-PAST.3SG
12. o:pi-je:-l l'ika:š-ə-s.  
 sister-DIM-3SG get.angry-EP-PAST.3SG
13. še:wi-še:wi-še:wi-še:wi.  
 INTERJECTION
14. šiti ši man-ə-s.  
 so FOC go-EP-PAST.3SG
15. man-ə-s šikəńša atna pu:rl-ə-s.  
 go-EP-PAST.3SG well well fly-EP-PAST.3SG
16. l'ika:š-ə-s u:r-na man-ə-s.  
 get.angry-EP-PAST.3SG forest-LOC go-EP-PAST.3SG
17. xu:ləm xatl šiti man-ə-s xu:ləm xatl šiti pu:rl-ə-s  
 three day so leave-EP-PAST.3SG three day so fly-EP-PAST.3SG  
 pu:rl-ə-s imosa:jna joxt-ə-s jux xoša mosa  
 fly-EP-PAST.3SG once come-EP-PAST.3SG tree to what  
 a:j wus-i-ji u:l-m-al pa toxi laŋ-em-ə-s.  
 small hole-EP-DIM be-PP-3SG and there enter-MOM-EP-PAST.3SG
18. toxi laŋ-e:m-ə-s šikəńša šiti ši  
 there enter-MOM-EP-PAST.3SG well so FOC  
 xo:ll-ə-l.  
 cry-EP-NPAST.3SG
19. a:t-l xo:ll-ə-l xatl xo:ll-ə-l ja:j-ə-l  
 night-3SG cry-EP-NPAST.3SG day cry-EP-NPAST.3SG brother-EP-3SG  
 antam xijš-ə-s.  
 no stay-EP-PAST.3SG
20. jaj-ə-l-na ši kas-l-a ši  
 brother-EP-3SG-LOC FOC search-NPAST.PAS.3SG FOC  
 kas-l-a o:pi-je:-m xolta taxa man-ə-s  
 search-NPAST-PAS.3SG sister-DIM-1SG where place go-EP-PAST.3SG  
 o:pi-je:-m xata jaŋx-ə-l?  
 sister-DIM-1SG where walk-EP-NPAST.3SG
21. šikəńša ši jaŋx-ə-s jaŋx-ə-s j a o:pi-je:-l  
 well FOC walk-EP-PAST.3SG walk-EP-PAST.3SG and sister-DIM-3SG  
 u:š-s-ə-lli ŋoxaj-ə-l pit-m-al low-ə-l  
 find-PAST-EP-SG.3SG meat-EP-3SG start-PP-3SG bone-EP-3SG  
 pit-m-al.  
 start-PP-3SG
22. ŋoxaj-ə-l pit-m-al tal low-i-l-al xaš-m-e:l.  
 meat-EP-3SG start-PP-3SG pure bone-EP-PL-3SG stay-PP-3PL
23. o:pi-e:-l joxi wo:x-l-ə-lli o:pi-ji

- sister-DIM-3SG home call-NPAST-EP-SG.3SG sister-DIM  
juw-a juw-a juw-a kat-kit-še:wi-še:wi.  
come-IMP.2SG come-IMP.2SG come-IMP.2SG INTERJECTION
24. ma itta naŋ-e:n la:w-ə-l atti joxi  
I well you-ACC ay-EP-NPAST.3SG so home  
tu:l-e:m.  
bring-NPAST-SG.1SG
25. ši po:jka:š-ə-s ši po:jka:š-ə-s.  
FOC make.up-EP-PAST.3SG FOC make.up-EP-PAST.3SG
26. ši itta o:pi-je:-l ši pu:rl-ə-s-ŋən ši joxi  
FOC that sister-DIM-3SG FOC fly-EP-PAST-3DU FOC home ši  
man-s-ə-ŋən.  
FOC go-PAST-EP-3DU
27. ja xul we:l-ti jaŋx-ə-s la:w-ilij-ə-l itta talta  
and fish kill-INF walk-EP-PAST.3SG say-IMP-EP-NPAST.3SG well here  
o:lŋəs la:w-ə-l o:pi-je:-l la:w-ə-l a:pši-ji  
further say-EP-NPAST.3SG sister-DIM-3SG say-EP-NPAST.3SG brother-DIM  
i xul ki we:l-l-ə-mən la:w-ə-l atti i  
one fish if kill-NPAST-EP-1DU say-EP-NPAST.3SG well one  
su:p-ə-l naŋ liw-i i su:p-ə-l ma  
piece-EP-3SG you eat-IMP.SG.2SG one piece-EP-3SG I  
li:l-e:m.  
eat-NPAST-SG.1SG
28. po:jkaš-s-ə-ŋən šikəňša itta tam xatl mosa jaxa  
make.up-PAST-EP-3DU well well this day till together  
u:l-l-ə-ŋən.  
be-NPAST-EP-3DU

There lived a sister and brother. The brother went fishing every day. He came home and said to his sister: "Cut the fish. I'll eat the head, you eat the tail, you eat the middle." The next day he got up, went off again, went to the forest, brought his sister a fish again and said to his sister: "You eat the middle, I will eat the head, I will eat the tail, I will eat the tail, you eat the middle." His sister said: "Why do you always feed me the middle? Why? The next time I will eat the tail, you eat the head. No." The third day he got up and went out again. He went out again, caught fish again, came back and said to his sister: "Sister, we will cook again. You will eat the middle, I will eat the head." The sister became angry. The sister became angry. "Sewi, sewi, sewi." And she went out. She went out and flew off. She was angry and went into the forest. She went for three days, she flew and flew for three days. Then she came to a tree, there was a sort of small hole, she went in. She went in and cried. She cried by night, she cried by day. There was no brother, he had stayed. Her brother looked for her, looked for her. "Where did my sister go? Where is she wandering?" He went and went and found his sister. Skin and bones remained. Skin and bones remained. He called his sister to come home: "Sister, come, come, chirp-chirp-chirp. I will take you home now," he said. He made up to her, made up to her, and he and his sister flew off and came home. Again he went fishing and said: "Now if we catch a fish, you eat one half and I will eat one half." They made up and still live like that.

## PART 2: Topics in syntax and semantics

Part II addresses selected topics in the syntax and semantics of Ostyak in more detail. The discussion in this part is largely based on my other works on corresponding topics: sections 5 and 6 are revised versions of Nikolaeva (1999a) and Nikolaeva (forth.), section 7 is based on Ackerman and Nikolaeva (1997) and Ackerman and Nikolaeva (in prep.), and section 8 on Nikolaeva (1999b).

### 5. Word order and information structure

As mentioned above, Ostyak exhibits the typological features of a SOV language, and the SOV word order is indeed the most frequent. However, it seems to be composed of several independent word order requirements, each of which can be violated under certain conditions. So the seemingly exceptional word orders that deviate from SOV can be accounted for in terms of competing constraints. The word order constraints in Ostyak are motivated by both grammatical relations and information structure, so the word order that results is an interaction of syntactic and communicative information. The syntactic requirements on word order are verb finality, subject initiality and direct object adjacency to the verb. The information structure driven word order constraints are topic initiality and the preverbal position of the focus. Normally, the syntactic and the information structure word order constraints work in parallel, but when they conflict information structure seems to override the syntactic information. When the information structure status cannot make a choice between potential orders the resulting word order is determined by the syntax.

#### 5.1. Verb finality

The most important word-order requirement is that of verb finality. Verb finality is fairly rigid in the non-finite embedded clause (see the examples in 3.3.2.2) but less strict in the matrix clause. There are at least two reasons for this. First, Ostyak exhibits afterthought constructions where afterthought is represented by an element added after the completion of the sentence to clarify either another word or the content of the whole sentence. The afterthought element is extraposed after the verb, and is arguably clause-external. Examples of afterthought are:

- (153) a. pa su:sm-ə-s joxəs xo:t-ə-l u:l-ə-m  
again walk-EP-PAST.3SG back house-EP-3SG be-EP-PP  
taxa pela itta maxim  
place to that Maxim  
'Again he walked back to the place where his house was, this Maxim.'
- b. luw siməl ru:pit-l u:ləpsi xoša  
he little work-NP.3SG life to  
'He earns little, for life.'

Second, verb finality can be violated in the language of the younger generation under the influence of Russian. In particular, this occurs in presentational constructions where the subject is inverted after the verb.

- (154) u:-s-ŋən ime:-ŋən ike:-ŋən  
live-PAST-3DU old.woman-DU old.man-DU  
'There lived an old woman and an old man.'

However, inversion in presentational constructions is not typical of the Ostyak of the older generation, which is not influenced by Russian. Presentation contexts are marked by a special intonational pattern, but do not influence word order.

### 5.2. Subject and topic initiality

The overwhelming majority of clauses in Ostyak are subject-initial. Crucially, the subject in Ostyak systematically corresponds to the topic function, in conformance with the well-known cross-linguistic tendency. The following arguments support this claim. First, as was already mentioned in 2.2.4.3, topicalization of an element other than the agent requires passivization, that is, its promotion to the subject. The examples in (155) demonstrate that the passive construction arises when the topic identified as the element that bears the aboutness relationship to the proposition does not correspond to the semantic role of agent. I assume here that the context "What happened to x?" is basically sufficient to set the topical status of x in the answer. The use of the active construction in (155b) and (155c) in the present context would be strictly ungrammatical, unlike the English.

- (155) What happened to Peter?
- a. (luw) juwan re:sk-ə-s  
he John hit-EP-PAST.3SG  
'He hit John.'
- b. (luw) juwan-na re:sk-ə-s-a  
he John-LOC hit-EP-PAST-PAS.3SG  
'He was hit by John.'
- c. (luw) juwan-na ke:si-na ma-s-a  
he John-LOC knife-LOC give-PAST- PAS.3SG.  
'He was given a knife by John.'

An additional argument for the topichood of the subject is provided by sentences with a contrastive agent argument and wh-questions to the agent. As shown in (156) and (157), passivization is obligatory in such contexts.

- (156) a. juwan xoj-na re:sk-ə-s-a?  
John who-LOC hit-EP-PAST-PAS.3SG  
'Who hit John?'
- b. \*xoj juwan re:sk-ə-s/re:sk-ə-s-li?  
who John hit-EP-PAST.3SG/hit-EP-PAST-SG.3SG
- (157) a. kalaŋ juwan-na we:l-s-a anta pe:tra:j-na  
reindeer John-LOC kill-PAST-PAS.3SG. not Peter-LOC  
'It was John who killed the reindeer, not Peter.'
- b. \*juwan kalaŋ we:l-ə-s/we:l-s-ə-lli  
John reindeer kill-EP-PAST.3SG/kill-PAST-EP-SG.3SG  
anta pe:tra  
NEG Peter

The relevant observation here is that the contrastive element and the wh-word bear the inherent focus status. The ungrammaticality of (156b) and (157b) immediately follows from the requirement for the subject to be associated with the information structure function of the topic. Thus passivization is conditioned by the situation when an element other than the agent corresponds to the topic and/or when the agent bears the focus.

Finally, topic can be defined as an element under a pragmatic presupposition. In particular it bears the presupposition of an independent existence in the universe of discourse at

the time of the utterance. The existential presupposition as a property of topics is usually associated with the specificity effect; non-specific NPs do not bear the presupposition of existence and cannot function as topics (Strawson 1964; Schachter 1976; McCawley 1976; Reinhart 1982; Gundel 1988; Lambrecht 1994: 150–60). In Ostyak, non-specific quantified expressions such as *anybody* or *nobody* do not occur as subjects. As (16) demonstrates, when they correspond to the agent-like argument, the clause is necessarily passivized. This again shows that there is a strong correlation between the grammatical relation of subject and the topic information structure status in Ostyak grammar.

- (158) a. tam xu:j xoj-na an wa:n-s-a  
this man who-LOC NEG see-PAST- PAS.3SG  
'Nobody saw this man.'
- b. \*xoj tam xu:j an wa:nt-ə-s/wa:nt-ə-s-li  
who this man NEG see-EP-PAST.3SG/see-EP-PAST-SG.3SG  
'Nobody saw this man.'

Given that subject systematically corresponds to the topic function, subject initiality in principle can be formulated either as subject or as topic initiality. An argument in favor of topic initiality is provided by constructions with clause-external topics. One instance of clause-external topics is the topicalized possessor fronted before other elements of the clause. A topicalized possessor can be separated from the possessed NP by other constituents, which is absolutely impossible with the regular possessive construction (see 3.5.1). Since discontinuous constituents are not otherwise present in Ostyak, we might expect that the possessive relationship should be marked locally. Indeed, even if the fronted possessor is a lexical NP, the possessed noun obligatorily takes a possessive affix which anaphorically refers to the possessor. Thus, in (159), the 3rd person Singular possessive affix on *jɪŋk-ə-l* 'her water' is obligatory and refers to the topicalized possessor *imi* 'woman' separated from the possessed element by the adjunct *imosajna* 'once'.

- (159) ittam imi imosa:jna jɪŋk-ə-l xol-ə-s  
that woman once water-EP-3SG finish-EP-PAST.3SG  
'Once this woman's water was finished.'

The same is observed with other clause-external topics, namely adverbial scene-setting expressions, including the adverbial embedded clause. These elements are left-dislocated and precede the clause-internal subject topic, for example:

- (160) a. pasan ilpina a:mp o:məs-l  
table under dog sit-NPAST.3SG  
'Under the table a dog is sitting.'
- b. ma uw lap tu:xər-m-e:m e:wəlt luw man-ə-s  
I door down close-PP-1SG from he go-EP-PAST.3SG  
'While I was closing the door he left.'

Given that the non-subject topic precedes the subject, we might conclude that Ostyak grammar contains an independent requirement for the sentence-initial position of the topic. In most cases subject initiality works in agreement with topic initiality and conditions the clause-initial position of the subject. When the subject cannot correspond to the topic for grammatical reasons—as in the case of the possessor or certain adverbial elements—it is the topic rather than the subject that is expected to be sentence-initial.



### 5.3. Focus position

Another constraint that motivates the SOV order is that on the immediately preverbal position of the focus (on the definition of focus adopted in this paper see 6.4). This is possibly the most important requirement of Ostyak word order, and it is also largely attested among other verb-final languages (Kim 1988; É. Kiss 1995). It will be referred to hereafter as the Focus Constraint. The Focus Constraint states that the non-focus elements must precede the focus element in the linear representation of the clause. This, together with rigid verb-finality, will account for the immediately preverbal position of the focus, the last linear position available for non-verbal elements.

The following pieces of evidence support the Focus Constraint. First, the *wh*-questions (with the notable exceptions of *mola:ji* 'why' and sometimes *xoti* 'how') and answers to them must be placed in adjacency to the verb, for example:

- (161) a. kur-na muŋ xol man-l-uw?  
foot-LOC we where go-NP-1PL  
'Where shall we go by foot?'  
b. ma xoša:j-e:m mola we:r taj-l-ə-ti?  
I to-1SG what business have-NP-EP-2DU  
'What sort of business do you have with me?'

*Wh*-questions are universally known to exhibit a strong functional and syntactic association with focus, so (161) supports the Focus Constraint. It is worth noting that in the case of multiple *wh*-questions, one of them is located strictly preverbally, while the other is clause-initial. This indicates that the focus position in the clause is unique, that is, it accommodates only one constituent.

- (162) xunsi naŋ muŋ-i-luw xalša wa:nt-l-ə-l-an?  
when you we-EP-ACC where see-NPAST-EP-PL-2SG  
'When will you see us, and where?' (Pápay 1906-1908)

Second, focus items, that is, focus particles and most preverbs, are also located immediately before the verb (163), as well as elements under explicit or implicit contrast (164).

- (163) a. tam ru:pita:j-e:m ma xolna we:r-l-e:m  
this work-1SG I still do-NP-1SG  
'I will still do (finish) the work.'  
b. to:rəm ma:n-e:m mosa ši part-ə-s  
god I-ACC something FOC order-PAST-EP-3SG  
'God has ordered me (to do) something.' (Pápay 1906-1908)
- (164) a. tam a:n sa:j-na ma pon-s-e:m  
this cup tea-LOC I put-PAST-SG.1SG  
'It was me who filled this cup with tea.'  
b. (ma) tam a:n sa:j-na pon-s-e:m  
I this cup tea-LOC put-PAST-SG.1SG  
'I filled this cup with tea.'

Finally, in section 6.4 I will argue that the object that does not trigger agreement corresponds to the focus function. Importantly, such an object must be adjacent to the verb, as shown in (165). By contrast, the object that triggers agreement has the topical status (the

secondary topic). It is located relatively freely in the sentence, but most typically is separated from the verb by some oblique constituent (166).

- (165) a. šiti wo:j wel-l-ə-t  
so animal kill-NP-EP-3PL  
'So they kill animals.'  
b. \*wo:j šiti wel-l-ə-t  
animal so kill-NP-EP-3PL
- (166) taxti naŋ ilpe:n e:wəlt wu-s-li  
skin you beneath-2SG from take-PAST-SG.3SG  
'He took out the skin from beneath you.'

Thus, the representation of the Ostyak clause must include the unique immediately preverbal focus position, in accordance with the Focus Constraint. This position can in principle be analyzed either as VP-internal, or perhaps as representing a special functional focus node, as has been suggested for the so-called discourse-configurational languages (É. Kiss 1995). I will conventionally follow the first alternative here. In the next section I will explore whether the Focus Constraint is exceptionless.

### 5.4. Complex predicates

The lexical material that can intervene between the focus constituent and the verb comprises, first, some grammatical elements, and second, the reduced complements of a complex predicate.

The grammatical elements that can intervene between the focus element and the verb are parentheticals *la:wəl* 'they say', *xoti* 'you see', *šikəŋsa*, *atti*, *anti* 'well, so to say'; *xun(ti)*, *mola* 'isn't it', *to:ɾxa*, *mola:jna*, *(i)la:mpa*, *mo:səŋ* 'perhaps, indeed', *xoti*, *wa:nti* 'you see', and functional elements such as *ki* 'if' and negative particles *an(t)*, *a:l*, *anta(m)*. Parentheticals can fairly easily float in the sentence, although they do not normally interrupt such constituents as the adjectival phrase, postpositional phrase, or NP. The focus element can be separated from the verb by a parenthetical (167a) or a functional word (167b), or sometimes both.

- (167) a. ox-ə-n se:m-ə-n to:ɾxa jowər-l-ə-ŋən  
head-EP-3DU eye-EP-3DU perhaps wrap-NPAST-EP-3DU  
'Perhaps they wrap their heads and eyes.'  
b. ne:mosa a:l nu:məs-a  
nothing NEG think-IMP.2SG  
'Don't think anything.'

The complex predicates are transitional between the lexical compound and the syntactic phrase. They have not been studied in detail for Ostyak (see, however, the analysis of a similar phenomenon in Hungarian, with some discussion of the Ostyak data, in Ackerman 1987), so here I introduce their basic classification.

With respect to their semantics and formal expression, two types of complex predicates in Ostyak are observed: conventionally speaking, the adverbial and the nominal. The left component of the adverbial complex predicate is expressed by preverbs that bear a separate phonological stress and usually contribute additional locational or directional semantics to the verb (2.2.6), as well as by certain non-directional adverbials elaborating on the meaning of the verb, such as *talaŋti*, *te:lna* 'wholly', *ja:nəs* 'separately', *a:rtan* 'many, a lot', and others.

- (168) a. soxa a:rtan we:l-s-ə-ŋən  
partridge many kill-PAST-EP-3DU  
'They killed a lot of partridges.' (Pápay 1906-1908)
- b. so:x talaŋti ka:wər-s-ə-m  
sturgeon wholly cook-PAST-EP-1SG  
'I cooked the whole sturgeon.'

In Ostyak, as in Hungarian, the adverbial components of the complex predicate can be separated from the verb under certain syntactic conditions (see 2.2.6 on preverbs), but in general the order is more stable than in Hungarian and they tend to be strictly preverbal. In (168) they intervene between the focus object and the verbs.

The nominal type of complex predicates involves semantically light nouns with a directional or object-like meaning marked with the Locative in *-na* or, less frequently, the Translative in *-ji*. They do not bear a separate argument status and are usually referred to as 'reduced complements'. This type of complex predicate is very restricted lexically; sometimes it exhibits non-compositional semantics and involves idiomatic (as in (169a)) or cognate objects (as in (169b)). Unlike the adverbial components of a complex predicate, reduced complements never leave the immediately preverbal position.

- (169) a. ma naŋ-e:n ne:m-na pon-l-ə-m  
I you-ACC name-LOC put-PAST-EP-1SG  
'I will give you a name.' (Pápay 1906-1908)
- b. jɪŋk-e:m noməs-na nu:məs-i-l-ə-m  
water-1SG mind-LOC think-FREQ-NPAST-EP-1SG  
'I am thinking about my water.'

Importantly, certain syntactic properties are only limited to reduced complements, which means they should be classified differently to other grammatical relations. First, reduced complements cannot be passivized. Example (170a) demonstrates the passivization of the construction with the Locative non-term. Example (170b), however, is ungrammatical, which shows that passivization of the reduced complement is not allowed.

- (170) a. a:r wo:j tam jux-na o:m-ə-s →  
many bird this tree sit-EP-PAST.3G  
'Many birds sat on this tree.'  
tam jux a:r wo:j-na o:m-s-a  
this tree many bird-LOC sit-PAST-PAS.3SG  
'This tree was sat on by many birds.'
- b. ma naŋ-e:n ne:m-na pon-l-ə-m →  
I you-ACC name-LOC put-NPAST-EP-1SG  
'I will give you a name.'  
\*ne:m naŋ-e:n pon-l-a  
name you-ACC put-NPAST-PAS 3SG  
'A name is given to you.'

Second, the reduced complement cannot be questioned separately from the verb (171a). Third, the reduced complement does not act as a head of its own phrase, i.e. it cannot be modified by an adjective or a relative clause and cannot be the head of a possessive phrase (171b).

- (171) a. \*jɪŋk-e:n mola:j-na nu:məs-l-ə-n?  
water-2SG what-LOC think-PAST-EP-2SG  
'With what are you thinking about your water?'
- b. \*ma naŋ-e:n to:rum part-ə-m ne:m-na  
I you-ACC god order-EP-PP name-LOC  
pon-l-ə-m  
put-NPAST-EP-1SG

'I will give you a name ordered by god.'

In sum, reduced complements are characterized by syntactic fusion with the verb and an apparent grammatical inertness. Unlike most other nominals, they are not accessible to passivization and relativization, cannot be questioned, and do not have any controlling properties. All these properties make reduced complements good candidates for incorporation analysis. Based on their distribution and semantics, they may be analyzed as instances of 'compound' noun incorporation (in the sense of Rosen 1989), i.e. incorporation that changes the argument structure of the verb (no assumption is made here regarding the argument structure of adverbial complex predicates).

The data discussed in this section demonstrates that certain elements can intervene between the focus constituent and the verb. These elements are extracausal parentheticals, certain grammatical particles, and incorporated nouns. However, they do not bear an independent information structure status, and for this reason do not present an exception for the Focus Constraint which states that the non-focus element must precede the focus element.

### 5.5. Object position

As was shown in previous sections, the majority of Ostyak clauses exhibit subject (topic) initiality and clause-final position of the predicate. This section deals with the relative order of other constituents, mostly, that of the direct object.

The element that does not bear either the (primary) topic or the focus function is typically situated between the topic and the focus, that is, it follows the subject but precedes the focus element. As will be shown in 6.4, in transitive clauses without object agreement the focus function is associated with the direct object. In this case the object is adjacent to the verb, and an oblique constituent precedes it (see example (165a)). By oblique constituent I here mean the indirect object, oblique object, or adjunct. On the other hand, if the focus function is associated with the oblique constituent, it is located immediately before the verb and is preceded by the object that triggers agreement (see example (166)).

These cases are easily accounted for by the Focus Constraint because the information structure statuses of the object and the oblique differ. When both the oblique and the object are either in focus or are non-focus, the Focus Constraint cannot apply to non-verbal constituents. Two pieces of evidence show that in this case the object must be adjacent to the verb. Both cases involve some special communicative task. First, this is observed in sentences with contrastive verbs. In (172) the focus extends over the verb alone while all non-verbal constituents are equally not in focus.

- (172) o:me:-m pe:tra e:li kalaŋ ma-s-li  
mother-1SG Peter to reindeer give-PAST-SG.3SG  
'My mother DID give Peter a reindeer.'

In (172) the object precedes the verb, so this example challenges the previous claim that the object triggering agreement typically precedes the oblique. However, in this case the Focus Constraint is inapplicable to non-verbal elements because none of them is in focus. So the Focus Constraint here works in agreement with verb-finality. The mutual position of the oblique and

the direct object is determined by the purely syntactic requirement that the direct object be preverbal.

A second piece of evidence for the fact that, in addition to information structure motivated word order constraints, Ostyak grammar contains a syntactic requirement for the object to be preverbal is provided by the following data. In so-called sentences-focus sentences, in the sense of Lambrecht (1994), the domain of new information extends over the entire proposition, so the whole sentence is under the scope of assertion (is in focus). As illustrated by example (173), the object must be immediately preverbal, although both the oblique and the object have an identical focus status.

- (173) What happened?  
 pe:tra.jik-ə-l pilna xo:p we:r-s-ə-nən/\*wer-s-ə-llən  
 Peter son-3SG with boat make-PAST-EP-3DU/make-PAST-EP-SG.3DU  
 'Peter made a boat together with his son.'

As (173) indicates, the object in the sentence-focus sentences does not trigger agreement and is adjacent to the verb. The oblique, if present in the clause, is normally accommodated between the subject and the object. As in (172), the word order in this case cannot be explained with the Focus Constraint because of the identical information structure status of the object and the oblique.

To summarize, the object that triggers agreement, being a non-focus object, is usually separated from the verb by a focus constituent, in accordance with the Focus Constraint, but follows a topic (subject) element in accordance with the topic initiality requirement. There are no conditions under which the focus object that does not trigger agreement can be separated from the verb. The non-focus object that does not trigger agreement typically precedes the oblique focus element. When the choice between word orders cannot be made by information structure, it is done by the syntactic requirement that the object is preverbal.

## 6. Object agreement

As mentioned in section 2.2.1, transitive verbs can agree with the subject alone (the so called subjective conjugation, example (174a)), or with the subject and the object (the so called objective conjugation, examples (174b-c)).

- (174) a. ma tam kalaŋ we:l-s-ə-m  
 I this reindeer kill-PAST-EP-1SG  
 'I killed this reindeer.'
- b. ma tam kalaŋ wel-s-Ø-e:m  
 I this reindeer kill-PAST-SG-1SG  
 'I killed this reindeer.'
- c. ma tam kalaŋ we:l-s-ə-l-am  
 I these r eindeer kill-PAST-EP-PL-1SG  
 'I killed these reindeer.'

Similarly to subject agreement (see 3.2), object agreement may be based on semantic rather than grammatical considerations, cf. the following example where the grammatically Singular object that denotes a mass notion triggers Plural object agreement on the verb.

- (175) imi-xili ta:š sija:l-ə-l-l-al  
 Imi-Xili herd see-EP-NP-PL-3PL  
 'They saw the Imi-Xili's herd.'

In previous descriptions of Ostyak the presence of object agreement (the objective conjugation) has been stated to be conditioned by the definiteness of the direct object (Rédei 1965; Honti 1984, and many others). The term 'definite', in its turn, is taken to denote the formal properties of object NPs. According to Honti (1984: 99–100), the definite objects that trigger agreement in Ostyak are: a possessive NP, a personal pronoun, an embedded complement clause, and a null object. This list (sometimes augmented by nouns modified by a demonstrative pronoun) is traditionally repeated in almost all descriptions of Ostyak. But, as Honti himself notices, although the aforementioned types of definite objects can indeed trigger agreement, this is not necessarily the case. All of them (except for the null object) are compatible with the subjective conjugation as well. As demonstrated in (174a) and (174b), a direct object modified by the demonstrative *tam* 'this' may or may not trigger agreement. The same is true for pronominal objects or possessive NPs: in (176a) the verb is not marked for object agreement, while in (176b) the objects are formally the same as in (176a), but they trigger agreement.

- (176) a. ma naŋ-e:n wa:n-s-ə-m  
 I you-ACC see-PAST-1SG  
 'I saw you.'
- b. ma naŋ-e:n wa:n-s-e:m  
 I you-ACC see-PAST-SG.1SG  
 'I saw you.'

On the other hand, object types other than those listed above can also trigger agreement, such as the nouns modified by a weak quantifier in example (177).

- (177) a. luw a:mola kalaŋ nu:xəl-s-ə-lli pa an  
 he what reindeer follow-PAST-EP-SG.3SG and NEG  
 we:l-s-ə-lli  
 kill-PAST-EP-SG.3SG  
 'He followed a/some reindeer but did not kill it/them.'
- b. luw ka:t kalaŋ nu:xəl-s-ə-lli  
 he two reindeer follow-PAST-EP-SG.3SG  
 'He followed two reindeer.'

So in Ostyak, objects identical in their formal expression may trigger agreement, or they may not. A purely semantic account based on the notion of definiteness, although well supported cross-linguistically, is unsatisfactory: in both cases objects may be definite and indefinite, and sentences that minimally differ in the presence of object agreement have the same (truth-conditional) meaning. Neither does specificity affect object agreement (at least in a direct way): although non-specific objects never trigger agreement, specific objects may either trigger agreement, or they may not (see the examples above). All this led some researchers to the conclusion that strict rules of object agreement are altogether lacking in Ostyak and can be formulated at best as a tendency (Honti 1984, 1987; Gulya 1967; Bese et al. 1970; Wickman 1970; Ganschow 1972; Szalacsek 1984).

### 6.1. Syntactic properties of the object

In this section I will study the syntactic aspect of object agreement, completely ignored in previous studies. The crucial problems for me are the grammatical relations borne by the two types of direct objects (the object that does not trigger agreement, and the object that triggers agreement), together with the syntactic structures represented by the corresponding constructions. I will examine the syntactic properties that characterize the two

types of object. Crucially, there is a systematic behavioral difference between them, which can be demonstrated by a number of syntactic tests.

The first test concerns reflexivization. In Ostyak, ordinary personal pronouns function as reflexive pronouns, and reflexive possessive affixes are phonologically identical to non-reflexive possessive affixes. Reflexivization is controlled by the subject or the object that triggers agreement (178a). Unlike these elements, the object that does not trigger agreement cannot control reflexivization, so in (178b) the object *pox-ə-l* cannot be interpreted as being referred to by the possessive affix in *xo:t-ə-l-na*.

- (178) a. a:ši pox-ə-l xo:t-ə-l-na wa:n-s-ə-lli  
 father son-3SG house-EP-3SG-LOC see-PAST-EP-SG.3SG  
 'The father<sub>i</sub> saw his<sub>i</sub> son<sub>j</sub> in his<sub>i/j</sub> house.'
- b. a:ši xo:t-ə-l-na pox-ə-l wa:nt-ə-s  
 father house-EP-3SG-LOC son-3EP-SG see-PAST.3SG  
 'The father<sub>i</sub> saw his<sub>i</sub> son<sub>j</sub> in his<sub>i/j</sub> house.'

Note that reflexivization is not ruled out in (178b), because of the absence of a precedence relationship between the object and the possessive NP *xo:t-ə-l-na*. The subject and object that triggers agreement can control a reflexive element even if they follow it in the linear representation of the clause, as shown in (179a) and (179b) respectively:

- (179) a. a:še:l pox-ə-l re:sk-ə-s-li  
 father-3SG son-EP-3SG hit-EP-PAST-SG.3SG  
 'The father (literally: his<sub>i</sub> father<sub>j</sub>) hit his<sub>j</sub> son<sub>i</sub>.'
- b. [pox-ə-l-na wo:s-na tuw-ə-m u:nti] luw kolxoz-na  
 son-EP-3SG-LOC city-LOC take-EP-PP until she farm-LOC  
 ru:pit-ə-s  
 work-EP-PAST.3SG  
 'Until her<sub>i</sub> son took her<sub>i</sub> to the city, she<sub>i</sub> had worked on the farm.'

Second, both the subject and the object that triggers agreement condition the quantifier float. The universal quantifiers *ilji* and *asa* 'all, every' which are typically prenominal can be floated to the immediately postnominal position (as far as my material shows, no other constituents can intervene between the nominal and the quantifier).

- (180) a. (asa) ńa:wre:m (asa) u:r-na man-ə-s  
 all child all forest-LOC go-EP-PAST-3SG  
 'All the children went to the forest.'
- b. luw (asa) a:n-ə-t (asa) il pa:jət-s-ə-lli  
 he all cup-EP-PL all down drop-PAST-EP-SG.3SG  
 'He dropped all the cups.'

On the other hand, the object that does not trigger agreement does not have this property. As is shown by (181), the universal quantifier occurs only pre-nominally with such an object.

- (181) luw asa a:n-ə-t (\*asa) il pa:jt-ə-s  
 he all cup-EP-PL all down drop-EP-PAST.3SG  
 'He dropped all the cups.'

Thirdly, as was shown in section 3.3.2.2, the subject and the object that trigger agreement in the matrix clauses condition the obligatory agreement affix on the embedded participle when they control the participial embedded clause. The agreement affix indicates the topicalization of the embedded clause subject. Crucially, as opposed to the subject and the object that triggers agreement, the object that does not trigger agreement cannot control the participial embedded clause at all. Thus (182) is ungrammatical with any form of the embedded predicate, whether it take the agreement affix or not.

- (182) \* [Ø / xul u:n u:l-m-al/u:l-ə-m u:rəŋna] xul / Ø nox  
 fish large be-PP-3SG/be-PP because fish up  
 an ta:l-s-ə-m  
 not carry-PAST-EP-1SG  
 'I didn't take out the fish because it was large.'

Finally, as argued in section 5.2, the possessor can be topicalized as located in the leftmost clause-external position. Possessor topicalization occurs if the possessed noun bears the grammatical relation of the subject, as in example (159), or of the direct object that triggers agreement, as shown in (183).

- (183) juwan motta xo:t-ə-l kaša:l-ə-s-e:m  
 John before house-EP-3SG s ee-EP-PAST-SG.1SG  
 'I saw John's house before.'

Alternatively, the object that does not trigger agreement cannot license possessor topicalization. Compare (183) with the ungrammatical example (184a), where object agreement is not present. Example (184b) illustrates that this property of the object that does not trigger agreement is shared by other grammatical relations, the locative oblique object in this case.

- (184) a. \*juwan motta xo:t-ə-l kaša:l-ə-s-ə-m  
 John before house-EP-3SG see-EP-PAST-EP-1SG  
 'I saw John's house before.'
- b. \*ja:j-e:m juwa:n-e:n xo:t-ə-l-na laŋ-ə-s  
 brother-1SG John-2SG house-EP-3SG-LOC enter-EP-PAST.3SG  
 'My brother entered John's house.'

To summarize, the direct object in Ostyak demonstrates a remarkable split in behavioral properties depending on whether or not it triggers agreement. The object that does not trigger agreement is syntactically inert. On the other hand, the object that triggers agreement shares a number of syntactic properties with the subject: in addition to triggering agreement on the matrix verb, it controls subject agreement in the participial embedded cause, quantifier float, possessor topicalization, and reflexivization.

## 6.2. Constituent structure

Object agreement correlates in a particular way not only with the behavioral properties of the object, but also with word order. In section 6.2 I mentioned that the object that does not trigger agreement must be strictly preverbal. It can be separated from the verb only by grammatical particles, parenthetical words, and reduced complements, and in this sense it behaves like the focus constituents. On the other hand, the object that triggers agreement lacks a fixed linear position. It can be separated from the verb by other elements, and—less frequently—can be preposed to the subject or postposed after the verb. Furthermore, the object that does not trigger agreement must be overtly present in the clause, while the object

that does trigger agreement need not. In fact, in almost half of the clauses with the objective conjugation the overt object is absent, cf.:

- (185) a. il šaməl-s-ə-lli šikəńša  
 down bury-PAST-EP-SG.3SG so  
 'So he buried (him).'  
 b. \*il šaml-ə-s šikəńša  
 down bury-EP-PAST.3SG so

So the object that triggers agreement is independent of the verb in its position. In fact, no phenomenon in Ostyak is known that treats this object and the verb as a constituent, but the constituency of the object that does not trigger agreement and the verb is supported by the following tests.

(i) The sequence 'object + subjective verb' can be questioned, while 'object + objective verb' cannot. Compare (186b) and the ungrammatical (186c), both being a potential answer to the question in (186a).

- (186) a. pe:tra mola we:r-ə-s?  
 Peter what do-EP-PAST.3SG  
 'What did Peter do?'  
 b. luw tam ke:si wošk-ə-s  
 he this knife throw-EP-PAST.3SG  
 'He threw this knife.'  
 c. \*luw tam ke:si wošk-ə-s-li  
 he this knife throw-EP-PAST-SG.3SG

(ii) Verbs in the subjective form cannot coordinate, leaving the object stranded (as in (187a)), while verbs in the objective form can (as in (187b)).

- (187) a. \*nij wu-l-ə-t pa lo:t-l-ə-t  
 woman take-NPAST-EP-3PL and sell-NPAST-EP-3PL  
 'They take a woman and sell her.'  
 b. nij wu-l-e:l pa lo:t-l-e:l  
 woman take-NPAST-PL.3PL and sell-NPAST-PL.3PL  
 'They take a woman and sell her.'

(iii) The sequence 'object + objective verb' cannot be coordinated, while 'object + subjective verb' can. In (188a) two verbal constituents are coordinated and the manner adverb takes scope over the two conjuncts; alternatively, (188b) demonstrates that the two objective verbs do not coordinate at all.

- (188) a. jaməš woj we:l-ə-l pa xul  
 well animal kill-EP-NPAST.3SG and fish  
 we:l-ə-l  
 kill-EP-NPAST.3SG  
 'He kills animals and fish well.'  
 b. \*jaməš woj we:l-l-ə-lli pa xul  
 well animal kill-NPAST-EP-SG.3SG and fish  
 we:l-l-ə-lli  
 kill-NPAST-EP-SG.3SG

(iv) Since the object that does not trigger agreement must be overtly present in the clause, it cannot be deleted in the stripping structures, as indicated by (189c). It can only be deleted together with the verb, as in (189b).

- (189) a. pe:tra woj we:l-ə-l pa juwan woj  
 Peter animal kill-EP-NPAST.3SG and John animal  
 we:l-ə-l  
 kill-EP-NPAST.3SG  
 'Peter kills animals, and John kills animals.'  
 → b. pe:tra woj we:l-ə-l pa juwan ši  
 Peter animal kill-EP-NPAST.3SG and John too  
 'Peter kills animals, and John too.'  
 c. \*pe:tra woj we:l-ə-l pa juwan ši  
 Peter animal kill-EP-NPAST.3SG and John too  
 we:l-ə-l  
 kill-EP-NPAST.3SG

Alternatively, the object that triggers agreement can be deleted in the same structure:

- (190) pe:tra woj wa:n-s-ə-lli pa juwan ši  
 Peter animal see-PAST-EP-SG.3SG and John too  
 wa:n-s-ə-lli  
 see-PAST-EP-SG.3SG  
 'Peter saw the animal and John saw it too.'

Modern syntactic theories usually link object agreement with structural position: the object that does not trigger agreement is analyzed as VP-internal, and the object that triggers agreement as VP-external. The VP-external status of the object is accounted for by various syntactic mechanisms associated with semantic effects (Mahajan 1989, 1991; Diesing 1992; Georgopoulos 1991, 1992; Diesing and Jelinek 1993; Woolford 1995; among others). Certain semantic features of the object (such as specificity, definiteness, humanness, and animacy) condition its lack of abstract Case (De Hoop 1992), its particular phrasal scope properties (Diesing 1992; Runner 1995), or, under the minimalist assumptions, a strong Case feature in the agreement phrase (Chomsky 1995). In some languages this forces the object to be overtly excluded from the VP and be moved to (or generated in) the VP-external position. In languages without object agreement this merely results in the so-called 'scrambling' or object shift (Webelhuth 1992; de Hoop 1992; Holmberg and Platzack 1995; Vikner 1995: 97–100, and references therein), while in languages with overt agreement morphology the object triggers agreement from that position. As we have seen, Ostyak conforms to the cross-linguistic data in that the object that does not trigger agreement forms a constituent with the verb. This object will be further referred to as VP-internal, and the object that triggers agreement as VP-external.

The next question then is, which syntactic position is associated with the object that triggers agreement. Current syntactic theories provide different positions for the VP-external object, either Spec of VP (Georgopoulos) or under the more recent approach Spec of AgrO (Woolford; Mahajan; Chomsky). However, the object that does not trigger agreement is located fairly freely in Ostyak, so the approach which relies on movement to a particular position would have to make additional claims explaining the difference between various word orders. The free position of the VP-external object in some languages is captured through the mechanism of (topic)-adjunction to any maximal projection outside the VP, rather

than placement to a particular category (Bresnan and Mchombo 1987; Choi 1996). This mechanism seems to account for the word order facts in Ostyak as well.

### 6.3. Argument structure

This section explores whether two types of objects differ in their argument relationship to the predicate.

Since the object that does not trigger agreement is apparently syntactically inert, it might be thought to be identified with the non-terms (adjuncts) which are known to have limited syntactic activity. However, an important, perhaps definitional, feature of adjuncts is that they are not subcategorized for by a lexical head, and therefore can in principle be removed without being anaphorically controlled and without affecting well-formedness. In other words, adjuncts cross-linguistically license the non-specific null word with an existential or universal interpretation. For example, as in a large family of languages, in Ostyak the passive agent adjuncts license non-specific null words, see examples (77). Crucially, unlike regular non-terms, the object that does not trigger agreement must be overtly present in the clause. As shown by (185b), sentences with the subjective transitive verb without an overt object are strictly ungrammatical. This immediately qualifies the object that does not trigger agreement as different from regular adjuncts.

As was shown above, the object that does not trigger agreement has limited term properties. Furthermore, it demonstrates a great degree of fusion with the verb, in the sense that it must follow the adjacency requirement and cannot be suppressed in clause structure (in that it differs from adjuncts). This may suggest an incorporation analysis for them. Although not every syntactically inert element presents an instance of noun incorporation, every incorporated element is characterized by the absence or at least the reduction of syntactic activity. The description of the object that does not trigger agreement as an incorporated noun is indirectly confirmed by the fact that the co-occurring subjective verb has fewer surface transitive features than the objective verb, because the object is not marked on the verbal form, so does not differ formally from an intransitive verb. This, in principle, might suggest an analysis whereby the object undergoes incorporation altering the argument structure (detransitivization).

However, in section 5.4 I have analyzed the reduced complements. They were shown to have syntactic properties that make them different from other elements, including the object that does not trigger agreement. In particular, unlike the object, they do not passivize, do not relativize, cannot be modified and questioned separately from the verb. This suggests that reduced complements are characterized by greater fusion with the verb and more apparent syntactic inertness than the object that does not trigger agreement. Notice also that in complex predicates the 'objecthood' of a reduced complement is suppressed, which is overtly expressed by its Locative marking as opposed to the Nominative/Accusative marking of the object that does not trigger agreement. These syntactic properties make reduced complements better candidates for incorporation analysis than the object. Consequently, an object that does not trigger agreement cannot be analyzed either as an adjunct or as an incorporated element, and must be identified as an argument.

A further question is the argument status of the object that triggers agreement. Since it is anaphorically referred to by the verb and can be absent from the clause, one might expect that the object marker itself bears an argument function, while the object is in fact some kind of adjunct. Such a situation has been reported, for example, for the Bantu language Chicheŵa, analyzed within the Lexical-Functional grammar (LFG) framework by Bresnan and Mchombo (1987), which has revealed numerous similarities to Ostyak.

As in Ostyak, in Chicheŵa object agreement is optional. Inside the VP the object NP and the object marker are distributed complementarily. In the presence of the object marker the object must be generated VP-externally in an adjoined topic position, while the VP-internal object does not trigger agreement. The crucial distinction is further made between two object types with respect to their argument relationship to the predicate. The basic suggestion is that the object marker is an incorporated pronoun that has a referential function

and therefore satisfies the argument structure of the verb. When the overt object is present in addition to the object marker, it cannot bear the argument function due to the LFG functional uniqueness principle, which prohibits the same function being assigned twice. The occurrence of such an object inside the VP is blocked by the object marker because only arguments can appear in the local domain of the verb, so the object that triggers agreement must be generated VP-externally. The anaphoric relationship between the object marker and such an object is identified as anaphoric agreement. Thus, the minimal difference between the anaphoric and grammatical agreement lies in the argument value of the agreement morpheme: the grammatical agreement marker, unlike the anaphoric agreement marker, does not bear an argument relationship to the predicate.

The anaphoric vs. the grammatical status of agreement can be revealed by a number of syntactic tests. Remarkably, the predictions Bresnan and Mchombo make with respect to the anaphoric object agreement turn out to be wrong for Ostyak, suggesting that Ostyak object agreement is of a grammatical character.

As Bresnan and Mchombo argue, verbal case government is completely inconsistent with the object marker being an incorporated argument anaphorically linked to topic. Since the topical object NP is related to the verb not by government but by anaphora with the object marker, the verb cannot assign it a case (Bresnan and Mchombo 1987: 765). If the object case and the anaphoric object marker coexist in a language, they are predicted to be in complementary distribution (as attested, for example, in Arabic). But in Ostyak, at least personal pronouns in the object function bear the morphologically overt Accusative regardless of object agreement (see 2.1.2.1) and there is no reason to think that the case is not governed by the verb. And, although lexical objects do not have an overt Accusative marker, they can be reasonably assumed to have a zero-marked Accusative.

The second property predicted for languages with anaphoric object agreement is the functional complementary distribution between the object marker and the independent object pronouns (Bresnan and Mchombo 1987: 752). The anaphoric agreement marker refers only to an established discourse topic, while the contrastive (replaced) topic must be introduced by other means, namely, by independent pronouns, morphologically different from agreement markers. In Chicheŵa independent pronouns in the object position are only interpreted contrastively (as replaced topics), and a discourse-old topic in an object function is referred to by the anaphoric object marker. In Ostyak independent personal pronouns also tend to be used contrastively, but sometimes serve for non-contrastive anaphora. In example (191) the 3rd person object pronoun *luw-el* in the last clause does not seem to bear the contrastive function since its controller can be established without ambiguity in the relevant discourse.

- (191)      *śiti*    *woj-l-al*                      *u:mśa:-l-ə-lli.*                      *wa:n*  
           so    animal-PL-3PL                      caress-NPAST-EP-SG.3SG short  
           *u:mśa:-l-ə-lli*                      *xuw u:mśa:-l-ə-lli,*                      *asat*  
           caress-NPAST-EP-SG.3SG    long caress-NPAST-EP-SG.3SG    all  
           *luw-e:l*    *we:k*                      *wa:nna taj-ti*                      *pit-s-e:l*  
           he-ACC always                      close have-INF                      start-PAST-SG.3PL

'So he was caressing his animals. He was caressing them for a while, they all started being close to him forever.'

Furthermore, the 3rd person pronoun is required when used reflexively, compare (192a) and (192b):

- (192) a.    *pe:tra* *luw-e:l* *re:sk-ə-s-li*  
           Peter he-ACC                      hit-EP-PAST-SG.3SG  
           'Peter hit him/himself.'

- b. pe:tra re:sk-ə-s-li  
 Peter hit-EP-PAST-SG.3SG  
 'Peter hit him/it/\*himself.'

The topic-anaphoric role of independent pronouns is inconsistent with anaphoric agreement under the theory suggested by Bresnan and Mchombo, and indicates the grammatical character of object agreement in Ostyak.

Even more important is that anaphoric agreement as distinct from grammatical agreement is predicted to be non-local, i.e. it can carry over between elements of distinct simple clauses. The reasoning supporting this claim is that the arguments must be expressed within the phrase structures headed by the predicate, be marked on the predicate itself, or otherwise remain unexpressed and be anaphorically controlled by non-local elements (Bresnan and Mchombo 1987: 752). Verbs agree grammatically only with their governable arguments, so grammatical agreement must be structurally local. In contrast, the antecedent of the anaphoric relationship is not related to the argument position by government, therefore there is no requirement for it to be structurally local to the verb, as is the case in Chicheŵa object agreement.

The situation in Ostyak is different. Object agreement cannot cross over the clause boundary, as is illustrated in (193).

- (193) \*ma:w-l-al      a:ŋke:l      wa:nt-ə-s      [pox-ə-l  
 candy-PL-3SG      mother-3SG see-EP-PAST.3SG      boy-EP-3SG  
 Ø li-s-lij  
 eat-PAST-SG.3SG

'The candy, the mother saw that the boy ate them.'

A possible exception to the locality of object agreement is provided by 'agreement climbing' mentioned in 3.3.2.2. As typical of all Uralic languages with object agreement, in Ostyak the agreement with the object of the subordinate clause is encoded on certain auxiliary-like matrix verbs (for a similar phenomenon in Hungarian see Ackerman 1987: 341–50; Farkas and Sadock 1989: 326–27). However, this does not constitute a strong argument in favor of anaphoric agreement, as it is not entirely obvious whether relevant constructions are monoclausal or multiclausal. On the former analysis, they are monoclausal multipredicate constructions as analyzed by Davies and Rosen (1988). But even in the latter case, under some assumptions they might be viewed as the surface realization as a single clause of what consists underlyingly of two separate clauses (the 'clause union' approach going back to Aissen and Perlmutter (1983)). Independent of the approach taken, these cases do not apparently present a regular instance of non-local object agreement in the sense suggested by Bresnan and Mchombo.

Next, according to Bresnan and Mchombo, anaphoric agreement is present when the agreement marker bears a fully specified set of features, which cannot be duplicated by the overt NP with the same set of features. This explains the complementary distribution of the agreement and the overt object in Chicheŵa, where the object marker bears all the noun features relevant in the language. The Ostyak object marker, although it marks the number of the object, does not specify its person (as independent pronouns do). Because the object marker does not supply all the necessary referential features of the object, they must be specified elsewhere. This conditions the presence of the overt object NP, which is not incompatible with the object marker in Ostyak. So Ostyak is different from Chicheŵa and, if this argument of Bresnan and Mchombo is valid, exhibits grammatical rather than anaphoric object agreement.

Finally, languages with pronominal incorporation are predicted to have anaphoric deletion in the object position as a natural consequence of the fact that the object marker bears the object function (Bresnan and Mchombo 1987: 765). However, this property by itself does

not constitute a piece of evidence for the presence of anaphoric object agreement. Cross-linguistically empty pronouns or implicit arguments are quite commonly independent of agreement (cf. Rizzi 1986). Null objects are found in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, Quechua, informal German (Huang 1984, 1991), Italian (Rizzi 1986), Turkish (Kornfilt 1987: 637), and are possible in Russian under certain discourse conditions. None of these languages have object agreement. Thus, although languages with pronominal incorporation are expected to have a null object, the presence of anaphoric object deletion cannot be an argument in favor of the anaphoric character of object agreement.

In sum, Ostyak does not display the clustering of properties predicted by Bresnan and Mchombo for languages with anaphoric object agreement: it exhibits case government of the object, agreement is local, independent pronouns are used topic-anaphorically, and the object marker does not bear the fully specified set of noun features. Object ellipsis does not seem to be a decisive argument in supporting or opposing anaphoric agreement. This implies that the object marker in Ostyak lacks pronominal reference and argument function, and can be characterized as a simple grammatical agreement morpheme. Consequently, the object that triggers agreement must be analyzed as a verbal argument.

The tests used in this section reveal the absence of difference in argument relationship to the verb between the object that triggers agreement and the object that does not. Although the object that does not trigger agreement fails to retain some term properties, it cannot be identified as a non-term because, unlike clear non-terms, it is not optional. On the other hand, in a number of syntactic effects the object that does not trigger agreement differs from incorporated elements or at least demonstrates a lower degree of fusion with the verb than the undoubtedly incorporated nouns. This leads to the conclusion that the object that does not trigger agreement is a verbal argument and does not form a compound predicate with the verb, but rather a higher level constituent, arguably a VP. On the other hand, in constructions with object agreement, the object marker cannot be viewed as an incorporated pronoun, so the object itself must bear an argument function.

#### 6.4. Information structure

We are left with the conclusion that object properties in Ostyak can split between the VP-internal and VP-external positions without affecting the truth-conditional meaning of the sentence and the argument structure of the predicate. This situation argues for an information structure motivation of object agreement. The principal claim of this section is that agreement is motivated by information structure rather than semantic considerations.

An object that does not trigger agreement is associated with the information structure relation of focus. Focus is defined here as the "the semantic component of a pragmatically structured proposition whereby the assertion differs from the presupposition" (Lambrecht 1994: 213). Focus serves to add new information to already existing knowledge, and therefore makes an utterance into an assertion. The focus status of an object that does not trigger agreement is supported by the following considerations.

(i) The linear position of the object that does not trigger agreement is the same as of the other focus elements (5.3), that is, it must be strictly preverbal. The only lexical material that can intervene between the object and the verb in this case are elements that do not represent a separate information structure constituent (see 6.2).

(ii) In questions and answers to the object the verb must be in the subjective conjugation, i.e., object agreement is absent, cf.:

- (194) mati kalaŋ we:l-ə-s? tam kalaŋ we:l-ə-s  
 which reindeer kill-EP-PAST.3SG this reindeer kill-EP-PAST.3SG  
 / \*we:l-s-ə-lli  
 / \*kill-PAST-EP-SG.3SG

'Which reindeer did he kill? He killed THIS reindeer.'

Since the *wh*-question words are known to exhibit a universal syntactic and functional association with focus, this supports the focus analysis of the object of the subjective verb.

(iii) The definition of focus cited above suggests that focus is associated with new information, therefore the relation between the focus referent and the proposition is unpredictable. For this reason, focus, unlike topic, must be overtly expressed in a sentence. This is true with respect to the object that does not trigger agreement which cannot be omitted from the clause under any conditions (see 6.2).

(iv) Objects under the scope of the focus items, as well as contrastive objects, never trigger agreement, cf.:

- (195) a. luw jir-ə-s ma:-ne:m anta naŋ-e:n  
 he tie.down-EP-3SG I-ACC NEG you-ACC  
 'He tied down me, not you.'  
 b. ma iši a:n il pa:jət-s-ə-m  
 I same cup down drop-PAST-EP-1SG  
 'I dropped the same cup.'

By contrast, the object that triggers agreement lacks focus properties: it does not have to be strictly preverbal, it can be absent from the clause, and is not associated with focus items and *wh*-questions. The latter point is illustrated by example (196). When the focus extends over a non-object constituent of a transitive clause, the object obligatorily triggers agreement. In this case the oblique focus element occupies the VP-internal focus position and forces the object to move to (to be generated in) the position outside the VP. This mechanism is marked by object agreement.

- (196) ta:s-mən xol tu:l-e:mən?/\*tu:l-mən  
 herd-1DU where take-NPAST-SG.1DU/\*take-NPAST-1DU  
 'Where shall we take our herd to?' (Pápay 1906–1908)

Importantly, the two types of objects also differ with respect to the discourse status of the corresponding referent. The analysis of folklore texts reveals that in 89% of transitive clauses with the verb in the subjective conjugation, the object referent is newly introduced into the discourse. And in 83% of transitive clauses with the objective conjugation verb the object is discourse-old (for full statistics see Nikolaeva, *forth.*). Thus, there is a correlation between the discourse status of the object, the agreement, and the information structure status of the object (focus vs. non-focus). This correlation reflects a well-known universal tendency for new concepts to correspond to focus (Lambrecht 1994 and references therein). Typically, a discourse-new concept is realized as a full NP associated with prosodic prominence (Chafe 1976: 31), just as is the case with an object that does not trigger agreement. Note that transitive clauses without object agreement do not typically contain any other constituents, except for the subject, the object, and the verb (81% of clauses in the text). The reason for this is that they are informationally unnecessary: the main communicative function of such a clause is to introduce a new object participant into the discourse. Therefore information structure is fully satisfied by the SOV syntactic structure, with the subject being a topic and the object being a focus.

On the other hand, discourse-old concepts are usually realized as an unstressed pronoun, an anaphoric affix, or a zero anaphora (Givón 1983; Ariel 1988; Gundel et al. 1993), although they may be referred to by a lexical NP as well. The object that triggers agreement tends to be discourse-old; and, as was argued above, it does not need to be overtly present in the clause, that is, it may correspond to the anaphoric null. Furthermore, inherently old objects, such as, for example, reflexive objects, always trigger agreement. Recall from section 2.1.2.1 that Ostyak lacks reflexive pronouns and reflexive possessive affixes, while ordinary personal pronouns and possessive affixes may have a reflexive function. The contrast presented in (197) demonstrates that object agreement can be the only formal marker of reflexivity: example (197a), as distinct from (197b), has a reflexive reading.

- (197) a. pe:tra luw kala:ŋ-ə-l wel-s-ə-lli  
 Peter he reindeer kill-PAST-EP-SG.3SG  
 'Peteri killed hisi reindeer.'  
 b. pe:tra luw kala:ŋ-ə-l wel-ə-s  
 Peter he reindeer kill-EP-PAST.3SG  
 'Peteri killed hisj reindeer.'

Finally, object agreement is obligatory with the so-called inferable objects. Inferability (Prince 1981, 1992; Gundel et al. 1993) or semi-activeness (Chafe 1987) is understood here as a special discourse status. According to Prince, inferables is a category that is technically new, but can be identified and activated by an addressee through its relationship to an element already activated in the discourse or to another inferable. Thus, referents of the inferable expressions, although not actively present in the addressee's consciousness at the moment of utterance, are pragmatically accessible and easier to activate than referents of non-inferable new elements. In example (198), the object NPs *o:xəl* 'its head' and *pajəl* 'its tail' represent discourse-new concepts. However, the discourse existence of their referents can be inferred from the possessive relationship using the previously introduced concept 'his horse'. Such objects, identified here as inferables, must trigger agreement.

- (198) lo:w-ə-l wu-s-li pa o:x-ə-l joxəs  
 horse-EP-3SG take-PAST-SG.3SG and head-EP-3SG backwards  
 kir-s-ə-lli pa paj-ə-l o:lŋəl  
 harness-PAST-SG.3SG and tail-EP-3SG forwards  
 kir-s-ə-lli  
 harness-PAST-SG.3SG

'He took his horse and harnessed its HEAD backwards and its TAIL forwards.'

In constructions with the topicalized possessor (see 5.2), the possessed NP which bears an anaphoric possessive affix must trigger agreement when it corresponds to the grammatical relation of the direct object. Although the possessed NP here is not necessarily discourse-old, it stands in a possessive relationship with the previously mentioned topical element and is therefore interpretable as a type of inferable. The subjective conjugation would be ungrammatical in this case, as is shown in (199).

- (199) a. juwan xo:t-ə-l kaša:l-ə-s-li  
 John house-EP-3SG see-EP-PAST-SG.3SG  
 'He saw John's house.'  
 b. \*juwan xo:t-ə-l kaša:l-ə-s  
 John house-EP-3SG see-EP-PAST-3SG



To sum up, various types of evidence suggest that the object that does not trigger agreement bears the focus status in the information structure, while the object that triggers agreement is not in focus. Crucially, the latter is characterized by certain properties typical of topical elements: it is normally discourse-old, it often corresponds to anaphoric elements including zero anaphora, and it triggers agreement and controls coreferential relationships across clauses or clause-internally (see section 6.1). In section 5.2 I have argued that the topic information structure function is systematically associated with the grammatical relation of subject in Ostyak grammar. This leads to the conclusion that the object that triggers agreement is not a (primary) topic; however, it can be identified as a secondary topic. I will not discuss the notion of secondary topic in detail here, this is done in length elsewhere (Nikolaeva, *forth.*). The relevant point is that the secondary topic is an element of the clause that is characterized by certain topic properties but is less “important” for the speaker than the primary topic (cf. Givón 1984). The corresponding utterance conveys information about the relation which holds between the referents of the primary and the secondary topic. This analysis seem to be true for Ostyak: the clause with object agreement basically asserts a certain relationship between the two referents activated in the discourse or in the situation of speech at the time of the utterance, that of the subject (the primary topic) and the direct object (the secondary topic).

### 7. Relative clauses

As mentioned in section 3.3.2.2, Ostyak makes use of prenominal participial relative clauses. They are based on the so-called gap relativization strategy (Comrie 1989: 151–53), i.e. the grammatical role of the relativized noun is not overtly indicated within the relative clause. The relative clause itself, therefore, may be ambiguous, and its meaning may only be recoverable through the context. Thus,

- (200) a:še:-m potərt-ə-m xatl  
father-1SG talk-EP-NPP day

means both ‘the day my father was talking about’ and ‘the day when my father was talking’. As far as my material shows, more or less every syntactic position is accessible to relativization. This section addresses the unusual agreement pattern found in Ostyak relative clauses (7.1), a motivation for it (7.2 and 7.3), and its possible diachronic development (7.3).

#### 7.1. Agreement within the relative clause

Subject agreement patterns within relative clauses in Ostyak fall into two major types. First, agreement may be altogether absent. As demonstrated by (201) relative clauses with a subject gap do not exhibit agreement. In particular, since in passive relative clauses only the subject can be relativized, agreement fails. This is shown in (201b) where the Locative case on the NP which corresponds to the agent argument indicates that the relative clause is passive.

- (201) a. [ei tam xo:t-na u:l-ti] ne:ŋxe:-ti u:r-na  
this house be-NPP man-PL forest-LOC  
man-s-ə-t  
go-PAST-EP-3PL  
‘People who live in this house went to the forest.’  
b. [ei loŋkər-na xir-ə-m] o:ŋxi xoša muwle:r u:l  
mouse-LOC dig-EP-PP hole at snake be-NP.3SG  
‘In the hole dug by the mouse lives a snake.’

The same pattern is observed with the relativized possessor. In this case the possessed noun is present within the relative clause and bears the possessive affix cross-referencing the possessor (*ña:wre:m-l-al* in example (202), cf. the original possessive construction *ike:t ña:wre:m-l-al* ‘the children of the old men’). However, the relative clause subject does not trigger any agreement itself.

- (202) [ei ña:wre:m-l-al wo:s-na man-ə-m] purəš ike:-ti  
child-PL-3SG city-LOC go-EP-PP old man-PL  
‘the old men whose children went to the city’

The second class of relative clauses exhibits agreement with the relative clause subject; this is the major pattern dealt with in this section. Subject agreement relative clauses have a non-subject gap, i.e. an element other than the subject is relativized. When the relative clause subject corresponds to the personal pronoun or zero pronoun, it triggers agreement on the head of the relative. Agreement morphemes are represented by regular possessive affixes (see section 2.1.1.3) and refer to the person/number of the subject. In (203a) the head noun corresponds to the direct object, in (203b) to the indirect object, and in (203c) to the locative adjunct. The semantic interpretation of the person/number markers on the head nouns is quite restricted: they do not bear a possessive interpretation, but are semantically construed as the relation borne by the subject argument of the of the participle.

- (203) a. (luw) jo:s-na u:š-ə-m mir-ə-l  
he road-LOC meet-EP-PP people-3SG  
‘the people he met on the road’  
b. (naŋ) a:n mij-ə-m pox-e:n e:wəlt  
he cup give-EP-PP boy-3SG about  
‘about the boy to whom you gave the cup’  
c. (ma) tapəlt-ə-m u:r-e:m  
me get.lost-EP-PP forest-1SG  
‘the forest where I got lost’

This agreement pattern is restricted to the relative clause with the pronominal subject. When the embedded clause subject corresponds to the lexical noun, subject agreement on the head noun fails.

- (204) muŋ a:še:-w o:mt-ə-m xo:t-na  
we father-1PL put-EP-PP house-LOC  
‘in the house built by our father’

If the head noun bears a possessive affix in this case, it has a possessive and non subject-agreement interpretation, as in (205). The 2nd person Singular possessive affix can also function as a disambiguator between reflexive and non-reflexive reading of the relative clause, cf. (206a) and (206b).

- (205) jaj-e:w le:ša:t-ə-m u:xl-e:w  
brother-1PL repair-EP-PP sledge-1PL  
‘our sledge which our brother has repaired’  
(206) a. luw-e:l we:l-ə-m ne:ŋxi  
he-ACC kill-EP-NPP man  
‘the man who killed him’

- b.   luw-e:l       we:l-ə-m     ne:ŋxe:-n  
      he-ACC       kill-EP-NPP   man-2SG  
      'the man who killed himself'

Subject agreement in non-subject relatives is equally impossible when the relative clause subject has an indefinite or generic interpretation and is not overtly indicated in the clause. For this reason, agreement is always absent in relative clauses formed with Negative participles. Such relative clauses typically contain either a non-referential null subject (see example (85a) in section 2.2.5) or—less frequently—a lexical subject (example (85c)).

In what follows, I will only concentrate on the subject agreement with pronominal subjects illustrated in (203). This type of agreement presents certain theoretical challenges, namely, the locality problem. The phenomenon of grammatical agreement is usually assumed to be constrained by locality conditions: it occurs between elements co-occurring within a single local domain, rather than between elements within separate domains. In other words, the head and the agreeing phrase must be in the same clause at some level of representation. In a number of formal syntactic theories, this reflects the local specifier-head syntactic configuration (Mahajan 1989; Koopman and Sportiche 1991; Chomsky and Lasnik 1993; Chomsky 1995), while other approaches justify locality in semantic terms (Keenan 1978; Gazdar et al 1985). Crucially, the head nominal is not a constituent of the relative. This is most readily apparent in the fact that it bears the case or postpositional marking appropriate to its role in a domain external to the relative and participates in the form of predicate agreement ordinarily associated with a simple nominal bearing the same relation within a clause. It follows from this that the person/number marker is likewise external to the relative. Examples (207a) and (207b) illustrate the subject and the object agreement triggered by the head nominal in the matrix clause, while (207c) shows case marking on the head nouns.

- (207) a.   naŋ mo:sməlt-ə-m   o:xsa:r-e:n   jel   an   man-l  
           you wound-EP-PP   fox-2SG   far   not   go-NPAST.3SG  
           'The fox you wounded will not go far.'
- b.   so:rət-ti xul-e:n   ma   ka:tl-s-e:m  
      dry-NPP fish-2SG   I   catch-PAST-SG.1SG  
      'I caught the fish you are drying.'
- c.   naŋ ma:ne:m je:rnas   mo:jl-ə-m   wo:s-e:n-na ma  
      you I-ACC dress   give-EP-PP   city-2SG-LOC I  
      man-l-ə-m  
      go-NPAST-1SG

'I am going to the city where you gave me the dress.'

Given an apparent violation of locality in (203), an alternative analysis may appeal to the notion of anaphoric rather than grammatical agreement. As discussed in section 6.3. above, the important terminological distinction between anaphoric and grammatical agreement was made by Bresnan and Mchombo (1987) and maintained in other works within the LFG framework (though this is not universally accepted, cf. Barlow (1992) and Corbett (1998)). Anaphoric agreement, as distinct from grammatical agreement, is an instance of long distance dependencies and is therefore non-local by definition. It refers to the feature-matching relationship between an incorporated pronoun serving to satisfy an argument function directly governed by the head, and a coreferential free-standing element, typically in the adjoined position. On this analysis, the possessive affixes on the head nouns in (203) have a pronominal interpretation and satisfy the relative clause subject function, while the subject pronoun within the relative clause is some kind of adjunct and as such is optional.

It may be therefore reasonable to argue that the possessive affix on the head noun is an incorporated pronominal. However, although the anaphoric relationship does not need to be local, the pronominal use of affixes is constrained by locality in the same way as grammatical agreement. This follows because all argument satisfaction is hypothesized to be local, and pronominal argument satisfaction is simply a subtype of argument satisfaction. So the person/number marker, depending on one's analysis, is either agreeing with an optional, covert pronominal within the relative clause, or functioning itself as the pronominal argument of the participle heading a relative clause. But on either interpretation a locality issue is raised: why is an agreement marker or an affixed pronominal obligatorily appearing outside of its apparent local domain? This situation seems particularly odd because in a number of languages which exhibit pronominal participial relative subject agreement the morpheme appears on the embedded predicate (participle) rather than on the head noun, and thus, respects locality. This alternative pattern is, for example, typical of the closely related Eastern Ostyak, cf.

- (208)       [(mä) tini-m-äm]   loy  
           I       sell-PP-1SG   horse  
           'the horse I sold' (Csepregi 1978: 51)

It should be noted that within the literature devoted to the typology of agreement patterns (Lehmann 1982; Lapointe 1985; Anderson 1992; Ferguson and Barlow 1988; Corbett 1998) as well as in the existing typologies of relative clauses (Blake and Mallison 1981; Lehmann 1984; Keenan 1985; Comrie 1989.) the pattern exhibited by (203) is overlooked. However, apart from Ostyak, it is represented by a large variety of the languages of Eurasia, namely in other Uralic languages Vogul (Skribnik and Kovgan 1991) and Samojedic (Ubrjatova and Litvin 1986); in a number of Turkic languages, especially of the Northern and Eastern groups (Ubrjatova and Litvin 1986; Poceluevskij 1967; Kononov 1960; Ubrjatova 1976); Western Armenian (Ackerman and Nikolaeva 1997); the Mongolian languages Buriat, Kalmyk and Dagur (Ubrjatova and Litvin 1986; Hale and Ning 1996); and occasionally in Tungus (Ubrjatova and Litvin 1986). As far as I know, this pattern has not been attested elsewhere, so it seems to be restricted to one geographical area, though a large one. Formal accounts of this pattern can be found in Hale and Ning (1996) and Ackerman and Nikolaeva (1997). I will not address them here, but note that although both accounts provide reasonable representations for describing the central properties of the relevant constructions, neither as presently formulated would seem to provide insight into why these structures are the way they are. This is the question to which I will turn in the next section.

## 7.2. Relative clauses and possessives

As was mentioned in section 7.1, the subject agreement pattern is restricted to relative clauses in which the subject corresponds to a pronominal NP. Thus, agreement in relative clauses demonstrates the same split in marking as does the possessive construction. This is illustrated again below. As in the case of the pronominal possessor, the pronominal subject triggers person/number agreement on the head noun (209), and similarly to the lexical possessor, the lexical subject does not trigger agreement (210).

- (209) a.   (luw) xo:t-ə-l  
           I       house-EP-3SG  
           'his house'
- b.   (luw) wa:ns-ə-m xo:t-ə-l  
      I       see-EP-PP house-EP-3SG  
      'the house he saw'

- (210) a. juwan xo:t  
 John house  
 'John's house'
- b. juwan wa:ns-ø-m xo:t  
 John see-EP-PP house  
 'the house John saw'

Remarkably, in other languages exhibiting this relative clause construction, it is also strikingly similar to the possessive NP. These similarities are summarized below.

(i) In all languages in question the possessive NP is strictly head-final, and so is the relative clause which exhibits subject agreement on the head noun. The corresponding construction is not available for postnominal relatives, even if they are present in a language, as for example, in Evenki and Samoedic.

(ii) The case marking of the possessor and the embedded subject is always identical. Both constructions employ either only the Nominative (Vogul, and Yakut), or only the Genitive (Mongolian languages and Western Armenian). In Turkic, Evenki and Samoedic the Genitive and the Nominative occur with equal frequency in both constructions, the latter being restricted to certain special contexts.

(iii) Both possessive NPs and the relative clauses in question allow variations in head-marking, and the distribution of variants is similar. For some languages (Yakut, Evenki) both constructions are always strictly head-marked. In most Turkic languages possessive affixes may be optionally absent both on the head of the possessive NP and on the head of the relative clause. Other languages exhibit complementary distribution of the following type: head-marking with the pronominal possessor/embedded subject vs. neutral or dependent marking with the lexical possessor/embedded subject. Apart from Ostyak, this split is observed in Western Armenian, Vogul, Samoedic, and marginally in Mongolian and Uzbek.

(iv) For all languages head-marking is strictly obligatory with the zero-pronominal as possessor/embedded subject.

Given this apparent parallelism between two constructions, the question arises as to why certain relative clauses should resemble possessives, especially since this appears to lead to a violation concerning the locality of agreement/pronominal incorporation. The brief cross-linguistic comparison presented above shows that formal similarity between the possessive construction and the relative clause with subject agreement attested in Ostyak does not represent an accidental homonymy. The recurrent parallelism in form is likely to represent some semantic and/or pragmatic similarity between two forms (cf. Haiman 1985). In order to understand what is going on here it is important to discuss the categoriality, structure, and semantics of ordinary possessive constructions.

### 7.3. Semantics of the possessive construction in Ostyak

The semantics of the possessive construction remains a rather debatable question in linguistics. It has long been noticed (Jackendoff 1977; Hawkins 1981) that possessives are used to convey a wide variety of meanings, of which possession or ownership is but one type. In many cases an interpretation of possessives depends on contextual factors; thus the expression *John's house* may refer not only to the house John owns, but also to the house John is looking at, is going to buy, or is always talking about. Apparent ambiguity of possessives has led some scholars to propose that the possessive construction is semantically indeterminate and can express any kind of relationship between two entities (Kempson 1977: 125; Williams 1982: 283; Sperber and Wilson 1986: 188; Sinclair and Winckler 1991, among others). Since the construction is semantically incomplete, the list of possible interpretations can be extended indefinitely. Kay and Zimmer (1976) argue that the possessive (in their terms, Genitive) NP is simply a metalinguistic instruction to the hearer that there is some kind

of relation between the modified and the modifier. The hearer supplies an appropriate interpretation within a given context.

Several problems with this approach have been addressed in Nikiforidou (1991) and Taylor (1996). First, it ignores the fact that possible possessive meanings do not have the same status. In many cases the possessive proper relation seems to be the only or at least the default interpretation of the possessive NPs. Second, this approach cannot explain why the grouping of possessive meanings is the way it is, and why it is similar across languages. Finally, there are certain constraints on the acceptability and interpretation of possessives. On the one hand, not all the relations between two nominals may be encoded by the possessive construction, cf. the impossible possessive phrases *\*the fish's chips* or *\*the chips' fish* (Taylor 1996: 9). As argued in Langacker (1993, 1995) the relationship between the possessor and the possessee is highly asymmetrical and cannot be reversed: thus, normally we have *cat's fleas* but not *\*fleas' cat*. On his "reference-point" account, all possessives reflect the ability to invoke the conception of one entity for purpose of establishing mental contact with another. The possessor serves as a conceptual reference-point for mental access to the possessee; for example, a part can only be conceived in relation to the whole, while a kin term can only be identified via its connection to a genealogical reference point. On the other hand, Seiler (1977: 200) notes that the semantic relation expressed by possessives is not open to all imaginable interpretations. For example, the German possessive NP *Karls Haus* 'Charles' house' is in many ways ambiguous, but does not allow an interpretation with a semantic component of negation (that is, it cannot refer to the house Charles hates or the house Charles did not see).

Given these insights, the prototype approach suggests that the semantics of possessives is not amorphous but has an internal structure determined by the prototypical properties of the possession. Typically, permanent or inalienable possession is regarded as prototypical, while distinctions between different kinds of possessive notions, deviating in one way or another from the prototype, have been described with reference to various structured parameters, such as control and time (Heine 1997; Taylor 1989, 1995, 1996). Under Taylor's account, due to their internal semantic structure, relational nouns, such as body parts or kinship terms, represent permanent or inalienable possession which exhibits the whole cluster of independent possessive properties. Therefore they receive a default possessive interpretation within the possessive construction. On the other hand, possessive constructions involving non-relational nouns are open to multiple interpretations. When all the prototypical properties are present, the construction has the ownership interpretation, for example, *John's house* in the meaning 'the house that John owns'. But since the prototype is a complex cluster of properties, it allows various deviations, and that is how contextually determined meanings arise. *That John's house* is semantically indeterminate, in contrast to *John's wife*, is due to the fact that *house*, unlike *wife*, is not intrinsically relational. Its semantic structure is such that there is no exclusive candidate for elaboration by the possessor nominal.

For my purpose it is enough to assume here a fairly general semantic classification of possessives. The classification given below is partly based on Barker (1995). Barker's main insight, going back to Chomsky (1972), is that the semantic and syntactic behavior of possessives is largely determined by the nature of the possessed noun. This stands in agreement with Taylor's account mentioned above. Barker distinguished between "lexical possession" where the semantic interpretation is determined by the meaning associated with a relational head noun (understood as such both grammatically, as two-place predicates, and conceptually), on the one hand, and "extrinsic possession" involving non-relational nouns (one-place predicates), on the other hand. In the latter case the possessive relation does not depend on any inherent semantic properties of the possessed noun and allows for various readings. I will further refine Barker's classification and speak about two basic realizations of

extrinsic possession, the ownership meaning and the non-ownership or "associative" meaning. The three-fold classification is presented below.

- (211) (i) lexical possessives (involve relational nouns)  
 (ii) extrinsic possessives (involve non-relational nouns)  
 a. ownership possessives  
 b. non-ownership possessives (associative possessives)

The ownership extrinsic possessives are open to a paraphrase with the verb "own"; this is the case of *John's house* in the meaning the 'house that John owns'. The ownership possessives basically exhibit the cluster of prototypical possessive properties, in line with the suggestion of Taylor. On the other hand, the associative extrinsic possessives typically deviate in one respect or another from the prototype. They indicate a kind of associative relationship between two entities and are represented by examples such as *John's house* in the meaning 'the house which John is looking at, is talking about, etc', *the secretary's typewriter* in the meaning 'the typewriter that has been assigned to the secretary', and *the year's work* (the latter two examples are borrowed from Taylor (1995: 202–3)).

The notion of associative possessives as introduced is crucial for my analysis of the semantics of possessives in Ostyak and its relationship with relative clauses. Given classification in (211), I will look here at the role of possessives in Ostyak. The claim is that, while lexical and ownership possessives are comparable in frequency with those in English and other European languages, the associative possessives are unusually frequent. This is confirmed by the following statistics. Taylor (1991) has analyzed the corpus of English texts of a total length of some 13,000 words where 240 possessive expressions (of the genitive type) occurred. This is equivalent, on average, to one possessive genitive every 54 words. For comparison, the analysis of three Ostyak folklore texts from a total length of 3,500 words has revealed 270 occurrences of possessive NPs, that is, every thirteenth word functions as the possessor within the possessive construction. Possessives, thus, are four times more frequent in Ostyak than in English. Furthermore, in Taylor's corpus only 16% of possessives have an associative meaning, see Taylor (1996: 346–47). In Ostyak this percentage is as high as 39% for the corpus analyzed.

The unusually high frequency of (associative) possessives in Ostyak is due to the fact that associative possessives are in fact the only way to express the relationship between two nouns. The possible relationships reflect all the various ways in which (inanimate) objects are typically associated with other inanimate objects, such as purpose, source, place, and modification. The exact interpretation of the relationship being conveyed is largely determined by the nature of the entities involved, and therefore by the semantics of the corresponding nouns. In European languages the corresponding relationships can be rendered through the prepositional phrase with the preposition 'for' (212a), by modification by other postpositional phrases (212b), by juxtaposition (212c), or by relational adjectives (212d).

- (212) a. *ńa:ń laraś*  
 bread chest  
 'the chest for (keeping) bread'  
 b. *kalaŋ sox sax*  
 reindeer skin coat  
 'the coat (made) of reindeer skin'  
 c. *ku:rt jo:x*  
 village people  
 'village people'

- d. *jux ke:si*  
 tree knife  
 'the wooden knife'

Examples (212) represent a paradigmatic type, in the sense that the possessive construction is here strictly obligatory. By contrast, in the following group of examples the possessive construction is optional. The use of the possessive affix here is not required by any grammatical considerations; its removal would not lead to ungrammaticality and seems not to imply the change in the (truth-conditional) meaning of the sentence. Associative possessives illustrated in (213) express a situational relationship between two entities. They are present when the speaker chooses to emphasize this relationship and are therefore conditioned pragmatically. "Pragmatic" associative possessives normally involve animate specific "possessors", including personal pronouns and zero-pronouns. They do not have a possessive equivalent in English or other European languages.

- (213) a. *ma iši taxa:j-e:m-na il ko:ri-s-ə-m*  
 me same place-1SG-LOC down fall-PAST-EP-1SG  
 'I fell down in the same place (literally: at the same my place).'  
 b. *u:r-na pa:lše:m sij-ə-l we:r-l-ə-ŋən*  
 forest-LOC big noise-EP-3SG make-NPAST-EP-3DU  
 'They make a lot of noise (literally: their noise) in the forest.'  
 c. *o:pje:-l lo:ś-l parkat-l ju:ŋk-ə-l*  
 sister-3SG snow-3SG shake.down-NPAST.3SG ice-EP-3SG  
*parkat-l*  
 shake.down-NPAST.3SG  
 'He shakes the snow and the ice (literally: her snow and her ice) down on his sister.'  
 d. *tam xu:j-e:m xal'ša jox-t-ə-s?*  
 this man-1SG where come-EP-PAST.3SG  
 'Where did this man (literally: my man) come from (to me)?'  
 e. *man-s-ə-ŋən ka:t a:mp. wul a:mp pare:m-ə-s-li*  
 go-PAST-EP-3DU two dog big dog bite-EP-PAST-3SG  
*a:j a:mp-ə-l*  
 small dog-EP-3SG

'Two dogs were walking. The big dog bit the small dog (literally: its small dog).'

In the traditional literature on Ostyak (Honti 1984, among others) the possessive affixes in (213) are said to express the definiteness of the corresponding NP. This seems partly true, since its referent is usually identifiable through the possessive relationship with another entity, typically definite as well. However, definiteness as such cannot predict the choice among various possessive affixes (1st person vs. 2nd person vs. 3rd person). In addition, it does not explain why possessive affixes may be absent on definite nouns. For example, in (213e) both 'the big dog' and 'the small dog' are arguably equally definite, however only the second NP "the small dog" is marked as possessive. Finally, indefinite and non-specific NPs can also be marked as possessive, as *wo:j-ə-l* 'animal' in (214).

- (214) ittam wo:lək śi nu:məs-ti pit-ə -s ... tu:p su:mləŋ  
 this wolf so think-INF start-EP-PAST.3SG only stripy  
 wo:j-ə-l u:-l ... tigər  
 animal-EP-3SG be-NPAST.3SG tiger

'This wolf started thinking like this. There is one stripy animal (literally: this stripy animal), a tiger.'

Under the associative possessive analysis, the above mentioned problems are avoided. The possessive constructions in (213) express an associative relation between the head nominal and the "possessor". The latter typically (though not always) coincides with the subject of the same clause or of the previous clause, as a natural reference-point. The relation does not involve any kind of ownership, including temporally ownership, and strongly deviates from the possessive prototype. Importantly, the relation between the two entities is situational. It receives a semantic interpretation only within the particular context of the basis of the knowledge of typical situations involving the entity in question, and only in this sense is it restricted by the meaning of the possessed noun. For example, in (213c) the possessive expression 'her snow and her ice' refers to the snow and the ice that cover the coat; in (213a) 'my place' means 'the place where I fell down earlier', in (213e) the relationship is explicitly described in the previous context: 'its small dog' means 'the dog with which the big dog was walking', and so on. The pragmatic associative possessives are especially frequent in colloquial speech, which typically presupposes a high degree of actualization of the utterance. In dialogues or in a story addressed to a particular person the 2nd person possessive may encode the situational relationship between the entity and the listener. For example, (215) can be produced when looking at several moving cars. The car is "yours" because I am talking to you about it, although you do not own it and are not associated with it in any other ways.

- (215) wa:nt-a tam masina:j-e:n je:wra man-ə-s  
 look-IMP.2SG this car-2SG aside go-EP-PAST.3SG  
 'Look, that car (literally: that your car) went aside.'

Similar facts have been reported for Samojedic (Tereščenko 1973).

In sum, I have demonstrated that Ostyak makes excessive use of associative possessives, i.e. possessive constructions which indicate some kind of situationally determined relationship between two entities. This is also true of other languages which exhibit relative clause subject agreement of the type exemplified in (203). In the next section I will discuss how this correlates with the Ostyak relative clause pattern.

#### 7.4. Motivating relative clause constructions

As was shown in the previous section, the existence of the relative clauses in question requires that a language have certain forms of expression for various grammatical phenomena. In particular, it must exhibit a head-marking strategy for its nominal possessive constructions and a high frequency of associative possessives. This implicational relation provides a clue concerning the motivation for these comparatively unusual relative constructions. I suggest here that head-marked associative possessives represent a semantic constructional source for relative clauses in Ostyak.

Relative clauses in general exhibit a functional similarity to possessive constructions. From a gross semantic perspective it is obviously the case that both constructions express modification. Taylor (1989, 1995) convincingly argues that possessive constructions serve to identify one entity by invoking some kind of relation with another entity, see also Langacker (1993) and the discussion in the previous section. This follows from the fact that the most important property of the prototypical possessive relation is its exclusivity: at a given time a

possessed can have only one possessor. Therefore the possessive relation is a natural means to exclusively identify an entity. Similarly, (restrictive) relative clauses are known to identify a head noun by delimiting a set of its potential referents through additional predication which typically contains a subject on its own (Comrie 1989: 143). On functional and formal parallelism between the possessor and the subject see Keenan (1974), Seiler (1983), and Langacker (1993), among others.

From a formal point of view it is immediately evident that one important difference between the standard possessive construction and the relative clause is that the former does not contain an explicit expression of relation between the possessor and the possessum, while in the latter the additional information about the actual referent of the head noun is overt. This has a semantic and a morphosyntactic consequence. The semantic consequence is that, as mentioned above, the nature of the relation between the possessee and the possessor in the possessive construction is lexically indeterminate, and often supplied by the context. The morphosyntactic consequence is that since the relation between two entities is not lexically expressed the person/number marking cannot appear on it: instead, it appears on the nominal head of the construction. The person/number markers here serve as markers of a construction-internal relation mediated through a covert predicate of which the possessor is the subject. In contrast, in relative clauses the relation between the subject and the head noun is expressed overtly by a verbal form, namely, the participle. The latter effectively provides a lexical restriction on the sort of relation which exists between the arguments expressed by the head nominal and its subject argument. The participle supplies a lexical specification of relation and is an overt relational element which can in principle serve as host for an agreement morpheme. As was mentioned in section 7.1, in some languages it does in fact host the possessive affix. However, in Northern Ostyak and some other languages the possessive affix rather appears on the head nominal.

Seen from this perspective, it is possible to interpret the relative clauses in question as a type of possessive construction, specifically, one in which the morphosyntax of possessive constructions remains intact, while the somewhat indeterminate relational semantics intrinsic to possessive constructions is lexically specified by the participle. Convergence between the possessive construction and the relative clause is based on their functional parallelism. From the formal point of view, it represents an example of constructional syncretism or homonymy motivated by economy considerations, namely, paradigmatic economy in the sense of Haiman (1985). The purpose of the paradigmatic-economic motivation is to minimize the inventory of signs within a system through subsuming several related meanings under a single form.

Taking into account constructional similarity, the emergence of the relative clauses in question can be represented diachronically through the following three hypothetical stages.

- (216) a. stage I (ma) ne:pək-e:m  
 me book-1SG  
 'my book (meaning: the book I wrote/sold/etc.)'
- b. stage II [(ma) [xans-ə-m/tinj-ə-m] ne:pək-e:m]  
 my write-EP-PP/sell-EP-PP book-1SG  
 'my book of writing/selling etc.'  
 or: 'my written/sold etc. book'
- c. stage III [(ma) xans-ə-m/tinj-ə-m] nepək-e:m  
 my write-EP-PP/sell-EP-PAST book-1SG  
 'the book I wrote/sold/etc.'

Stage I represents an example of a canonical associative possessive. The noun 'book' is not intrinsically relational, therefore when it heads the possessive phrase the relation

receives an extrinsic interpretation. As mentioned in section 7.2, the default extrinsic interpretation is that of ownership, however in an appropriate context alternative interpretations, such as those in (216a), may arise. They are characterized as associative because they express some kind of association between 'book' and its 'possessor'. In section 7.2 I have argued that such associative possessives are widely used in Ostyak.

As was argued above, the meaning of the associative relation between two entities is not expressed within the possessive construction, which is open to multiple interpretations depending on context and pragmatic factors. The possessive phrase in (216a) entails some kind of situational relation between the possessor and the possessed, without specifying it lexically. So, some predicate of relation is necessarily involved in the interpretation of associative possessives (cf. Seiler 1983a: 40) and the possessor functions as its subject. The predicate remains covert within the possessive constructions. However, this relation is entailed by the possessive construction, and can therefore in principle be expressed within a separate predication. Stage II, as represented in (216b), is a lexical elaboration of such a predication. It is carried out through insertion of a verb that explicitly describes the relationship between two nouns, cf. Seiler (1983b: 91): "If a verb intervenes between the two [nouns], its only purpose is to make explicit the particular mode of the possessive relationship." At this stage the relation between the possessor/subject and head noun is mediated overtly by a verbal form, namely, the participle which effectively provides a lexical restriction on the sort of relation between them. Thus, the change from stage I to stage II represents a lexical disambiguation of the relationship that holds between the components of the associative possessive construction.

A question that arises at this point is why the verb that intervenes between two nouns and describes the nature of the associative relation between them takes the participial form. This seems to follow from the status of the participle as a mixed category and the nature of the modificational construction. Participles in Ostyak behave as verbs with respect to their internal syntax. As shown below, they can be modified by VP adverbs (217a), retain the argument structure of the base verbs (217b), and co-occur with clausal adjuncts (217c).

- (217) a. *naŋ a:tməš pon-ə-m tutjux-e:n*  
 you badly place-EP-PP firewood-2SG  
 'the firewood you placed badly'
- b. *luw pox e:lti mij-ə-m a:n-ə-l*  
 he boy to give-EP-PP cup-EP-3SG  
 'the cup he gave to the boy'
- c. *jo:s-na u:š-ə-m mir-ə-l*  
 road meet-EP-PP people-EP-3SG  
 'the people he met on the road'

On the other hand, nouns in Ostyak are modified by other nouns or adjectives (see 3.5.2), the border between the two in the attributive function not always being clear-cut. This entails that as modifiers participles are either deverbal nouns (gerunds) or deverbal adjectives, as suggested in the translation in (216b). Recall that, like nouns, participles can take a possessive and case marking when they form a complement or adverbial embedded clause, and like adjectives, they can be nominalized with the nominalizer *-t*. Being a mixed category, participles are the best candidates for a lexical elaboration of the associative relation between two nouns within the possessive construction: on the one hand, they retain the argument structure and the cooccurrence abilities of the verb; on the other hand, they can serve as modifiers for a noun.

The constituent structure I am assuming at stage II is reflected in the bracketing in (216b). The participle here functions as a regular non-clausal adnominal modifier. This

structure formally parallels the constituent structure representation of the possessive construction, where the head nominal is modified by an adjective or a noun, as in (218).

- (218) a. *(ma) pureš ne:pək-e:m*  
 my old book-1SG  
 'my old book'
- b. *naŋ ŋa:ŋ lara:š-e:n*  
 you bread chest-2SG  
 'your chest for (keeping) bread'

Notice that simple modifiers such as 'old' and 'bread' in (218) are crucially one-place. For this reason they do not disambiguate the relationship between the components of the possessive construction in the sense described above. Participles, by contrast, do, since they express a minimally two-place relation independently encoded by possessive morphology. As suggested in Ackerman and Nikolaeva (1997), this motivates the reinterpretation of the possessive affix as marking subject agreement rather than a possessive relationship and, consequently, the reinterpretation of the modified possessive construction as a relative clause, that is, the change from stage II to stage III,

This change is accompanied by a change in the constituent structure. The participle is reanalyzed as a single constituent with the subject of the relative clause. This is revealed by the fact that the regular possessive NP, such as (219), easily allows the insertion of another attribute between the possessor and the head, cf.:

- (219) a. *(ma) xoraspi pureš ne:pək-e:m*  
 I beautiful old book-1SG  
 'my beautiful old book'
- b. *naŋ xoraspi ŋa:ŋ lara:š-e:n*  
 you beautiful bread box-2SG  
 'your beautiful box for (keeping) bread'

By contrast, the relative clause forbids inserting another attribute between the embedded subject and the participle:

- (220) \**ma pureš xans-ə-m ne:pək-e:m*  
 me old write-EP-PP book-1SG  
 'the old book that I wrote'

The attribute may be located either before the embedded subject, that is, arguably before the relative clause if it is a demonstrative (221), or immediately before the head noun and after the participle, that is, arguably after the relative clause (222). This shows that the relative clause constitutes a single syntactic constituent, unlike the combination of possessor and modifier within the possessive construction.

- (221) *tam ma xans-ə-m ne:pək-e:m*  
 this I write-EP-PP book-1SG  
 'this book I wrote'
- (222) a. *ma we:l-ə-m lo:w-ə-ŋ ox-pi a:r s o:x-e:m*  
 me kill-EP-PP bone-EP-PROPR head-PROPR many salmon-1SG  
 'many salmon with bony heads which I killed' (Pápay 1906–1908)

- b. il se:wr-ə-m u:n jux-e:m e:wəlt  
 down cut-EP-PP big tree-1SG from  
 'from the big tree I cut down'

Going back to the locality issue raised in section 7.1, it should be noticed that the existing typologies do make a place for the agreement pattern exhibited by the head-marking possessive constructions. As I argued in this section, the structure of the Ostyak relative clauses is motivated by a constructional similarity and diachronic relationship to head-marked associative possessives. Given this, relative clauses in questions can be interpreted as a variant of the same pattern. Rather than exhibiting a different kind of agreement, they are simply a marked instances of grammatical agreement/pronominal incorporation found in regular possessive constructions containing incorporated pronouns. Their markedness consists in their violating the usual locality condition on grammatical agreement/pronominal incorporation. The details of formal analysis of non-local agreement of the kind addressed here still have to be worked out; such an analysis may ultimately lead to a reconsideration of the usual syntactic assumptions concerning locality of agreement. My purpose here was to provide a functional motivation for the relevant phenomena, that is, to justify why the relative clause constructions in Ostyak appear the way they do.

### 8. Evidentials

Ostyak exhibits a grammaticalized system of Evidentials. Evidentials are formed with Past (-*m*) or Non-Past (-*ti*) participles in the finite position inflected for subject agreement (on agreement affixes of participles see 2.2.5). Accordingly, the Evidential shows a temporal distinction between Past and Non-Past similar to that in the Indicative. The Analytical Future Evidential is possible but extremely rare; it is formed with the Infinitive of the content verb followed by Non-Past Evidential form of the auxiliary verb *pit-* 'fall; start'.

- (223) a. man-t-al  
 go-NPP-3SG  
 'he goes (apparently)'  
 b. man-m-al  
 go-PP-3SG  
 'he went (apparently)'  
 c. man-ti pit-t-al  
 go-INF start-NPP-3SG  
 'he will go (apparently)'

The Evidential passive is formed with the corresponding participle not inflected with regular subject agreement morphemes. Instead it takes nominal number affixes indicating the number of the subject, namely, -*ŋən* for the Dual and -*t* for the Plural. The Evidential passive seems only to be possible for the 3rd person subject and mostly for the Past tense, for example: *we:r-ə-m* 'has been made', *we:r-ə-m-ŋən* 'have been made' (DU), *we:r-m-ə-t* 'have been made' (PL). As in regular passives, the agent argument in the Evidential passive construction may be encoded by the Locative NP, cf.:

- (224) luw jiləp je:nas jo:nt-ə-s. o:pe:l-na sija:ləs-ə-m  
 she new dress sew-EP-PAST.3SG sister-3SG notice-EP-PP  
 'She sewed a new dress. Her sister noticed it.'

Non-Past passive Evidentials are available but extremely rare. I only have examples for the Singular subject at my disposal, cf.:

- (225) pusi an ni-ti  
 tail NEG see-NPP  
 'Apparently the tail is not seen.'

Evidentials have only recently been recognized as such. Most descriptive grammars of Ostyak (for example, Rédei 1965: 74; Honti 1984: 58) do not deal with the semantics of -*t* and -*m* forms and concentrate only on the formal aspect—namely the fact that these forms are actually participles used in the position of finite predicate. Some relevant semantic observations can be found in A.Jaszó 1976. Evidential forms were first referred to as a modal category in the works of the Novosibirsk school (Čeremisina and Kovgan 1989; Kaksin 1994), which also provided the first informal description of their semantics. According to this tradition, the basic meaning of the Evidential can be formulated in a general way as "and I didn't know/notice" (Kaksin 1994: 12). There are two realizations of this basic meaning: (i) Evidentials used to denote a situation which becomes evident from the speaker's personal experience, and (ii) hearsay use, i.e. the event becomes evident from somebody else's speech.

Under the approach adopted in the present paper, the Evidential does not express the main predication of the clause, but rather "a specification added to a factual claim about something else" (Anderson 1986: 274; for a similar approach see Kozinceva 1994). With such an understanding, the Evidential marker can be regarded as a sentential operator which takes scope over the tensed sentence. When it applies to the Non-Past sentence this yields -*t*- verbal forms, and when it applies to the Past sentence this yields -*m*- verbal forms. The Evidential operator does not change the truth conditions of the tensed sentence because it functions on a level higher than the proposition, which simply makes an assertion about the event. However, it brings a new semantic content to the whole sentence.

All the authors agree that Evidentials have something to do with the source of the information that forms the basis for the assertion (see Willett 1988 for a cross-linguistic survey). The main parameter that allows us to distinguish Evidentials from other verbal forms is the opposition of direct and indirect evidence (Bybee 1985: 184–185; Givón 1982), i.e. whether the source of information is of a primary or secondary nature. Evidentials indicate that the information about the event was received in an indirect way. I believe that in Ostyak, as in many languages, Evidentials denote an indirect source of information, rather than convey the meaning "and I did not know/notice", as suggested by Kaksin. Various realizations of this basic meaning are described in sections 8.1 through 8.4, while section 8.5 deals with Evidentials in the context of other verbal categories.

#### 8.1. Hearsay use

As was mentioned above, Evidentials indicate that the source of information for the assertion is indirect, that is, that the assertion is based on something other than speaker's direct experience of the situation. One realization of this meaning is the hearsay use of Evidentials. Hearsay use indicates that the speaker could not directly perceive the event and must have used second-hand or third-hand information. So the event was reported to the speaker by somebody else.

The Hearsay Evidential is possible in the Past or the Non-Past. In fact, the Non-Past Evidential can only have the hearsay reading (some exceptions will be discussed in section 8.4). Similar facts have been reported for Turkish (Aksu and Slobin 1986: 161), where the Evidentials are restricted to an accomplished event, except for the hearsay Evidentials, which can also pertain to imperfectives. The following examples illustrate the Non-Past and Past hearsay Evidential in Ostyak:

- (226) a. la:w-l-ə-t tam ke:m xoša kul u:l-t-al  
 say-NPAST-EP-3PL this mountain at devil live-NPP-3SG  
 'They say that the devil lives on that mountain.'
- b. jik-e:m la:w-ə-l ja:j-ə-l-na matti  
 son-1SG say-EP-NPAST.3SG brother-3SG-LOC say  
 jikmølt-ə-m  
 offend-EP-NPP

'My son says that his brother offended him.'

Note that in examples (226) the components *la:wlat* 'they say' or *la:wəl* 'he says' explicitly describe how the information was received, that is, they overtly indicate the type of evidence the speaker has for his claim. The Evidential verbal form itself also denotes an indirect source of information, so it may seem to be redundant. However, the use of the Indicative verbal forms in the present contexts would be ungrammatical. This shows that Evidentials in Ostyak comprise a special grammatical category, one which has to be used under certain conditions even in the case of grammatical redundancy (in the same way as, for example, the Past Tense in English has to be redundantly used in a sentence with Past Tense adverbs).

As in many other languages, hearsay Evidentials in the Past tense are preferred in folklore tradition. In poetic genres they are practically the only possible verbal forms, irrespective of the situation described.

### 8.2. Resultative use

The Resultative use of the Evidential emerges when the speaker could not witness the situation and inferred it through another event; this is conventionally referred to as its result. If the time of the reported event coincides with the moment of speech, such an event cannot have a result from the point of view of the speaker because the situation of result presupposes at least a minimal time difference between it and the event that caused it. So if the verb is in the Non-Past tense the speaker cannot witness the result of the corresponding situation. For this reason, the resultative Evidential is not possible in the Non-Past tense in Ostyak, but is extremely frequent for the Past tense.

Crucially, I will say that this result can be either trivial or non-trivial, borrowing the terminology of Nedjalkov (1988: 500). A trivial result is a component of the lexicographical descriptions of a verb (mostly, telic verbs like *open*, *come*, *put*, *stand up*, etc.), but is absent in the semantics of atelic verbs (like *stand*, *sing*, *hang*, *walk*, etc.). Thus, a trivial result is unique for each event and predictable from it. It shares at least one participant with the event itself. For example, a trivial result of the situation of "opening" is some object being opened, etc. Non-trivial results will be addressed in section 8.3.

The resultative use the Past Evidential involves the trivial result. Examples of this follow. Clearly, in (227b) the speaker can see (has evidence about) the rotten knife as a trivial result of the event "the knife was getting rotten", which took place in the past. In (227a) the speaker apparently can see the cut down tree, which is the trivial result of the situation that his father was cutting down the tree, etc.

- (227) a. ma we:rl-ə-m-e-m-na a:še:-m tam jux  
 I wake.up-EP-PP-1SG-LOC father-1SG this tree  
 e:wət-m-al  
 cut.down-PP-3SG

'When I woke up, my father had already cut down that tree.'

- b. ma ke:se:-m xarja:jət-m-al  
 I knife-1SG get.rotten-PP-3SG  
 'My knife got rotten.'

In fact, a number of verbs are practically always used in the Evidential form with the meaning in question, since because of their semantics it is practically impossible to have direct evidence of the process itself, but it is much more convenient to have direct evidence of the trivial result which is internally present in the lexical meaning of these verbs. These are verbs like *tiw-* 'be born', *xarja:jət-* 'become rotten', *potk-* 'become frozen', *so:r-* 'become dry', etc.

On the other hand, when the speaker has direct evidence both of the event itself and of its result, the Indicative is used, cf. (227a) and (228).

- (228) a:s-e:m we:rl-ə-m-al-na ma tam jux  
 father-1SG wake.up-EP-PP-3SG-LOC I this tree  
 e:wət-s-e:m  
 cut.down-PAST-SG.1SG

'When my father woke up, I had (already) cut down that tree.'

Examples (229a) and (229b) present an interesting contrast. In (229a) the speaker appears not to have been directly witnessing the event "give" (this follows from the use of the indefinite pronoun "somebody"), which is expressed by an Evidential form. However, in (229b) the same verb is used in the Indicative because the speaker apparently had direct evidence of the situation of giving the mug to John.

- (229) a. tam a:n a:še:-m e:lti tu:tli-s-a luw pa  
 this mug father-1SG to bring-PAST- PAS.3SG he and  
 a:xoj e:lti mij-m-al  
 somebody to give-PP-3SG

'That mug was brought to my father, but he gave it to somebody.'

- b. tam a:n juwa:n-e:n-na a:še:-m e:lti tu:tli-s-a  
 this mug John-2SG-LOC father-1SG to bring-PAST-PAS.3SG  
 luw pa joxli luw-e:l ma-s-li  
 he and back he-ACC give-PAST-SG.3SG

'That mug was brought to my father by John, but he (the father) gave it back to him (John).'

A resultative Evidential can be negated in two formally different ways. First, both the event itself and its result can be negated. This situation is common and occurs both for trivial and non-trivial results, both for hearsay and direct evidence readings. The speaker has evidence of the absence of result, and on this ground he asserts the absence of the event in the past. And in the case of the hearsay reading, the speaker simply obtains second-hand information about the absence of the event. Formally this type of negation is rendered with the negative particle *anta* which follows the evidential verb.

- (230) kasa ka:wər-m-al anta  
 porridge cook-PP-3SG NEG  
 'The porridge hasn't been cooked (apparently).'



The event is not asserted here; (230) cannot be produced if there was ever a moment in the past when the porridge had been cooked. Second, the resultative evidential, as distinct from the hearsay evidential, employs the regular negation also available for non-evidential verbs, namely, the negative particle *an* (often but not necessarily followed by the Comparative marker *-sək*) which precedes the verb.

- (231) kasa an-sək ka:wər-m-al  
porridge NEG-COMP cook-PP-3SG  
'The porridge hasn't finished being cooked (apparently).'

Sentence (231) entails that in some moment of the past the porridge was being cooked. What is negated here is the situation of the result, that is, the statement that the porridge was cooked till it was ready. In this case the speaker has evidence not of the complete result of the event, but of the fact that the action is in progress but has not reached its end. On these grounds the speaker makes an inference about situation which has occurred previously. In sum, the contrast between (230) and (231) suggests that the resultative Evidential conveys the reference to at least two situations, the described event and its result.

### 8.3. Inferential use

As in the resultative use, the inferential use of the Evidential pertains only to the Past tense, since it also involves a result of the main situation. However, this result can be characterized as non-trivial. A non-trivial result is context-dependent and not included in the semantics of the verb. It does not have to characterize directly the participants of main situation (as the trivial result does). All situations can have a non-trivial result (and possibly more than one) in the sense that every situation may change something in the actual world from the point of view of the speaker. Thus, a non-trivial result is highly dependent on subjective factors. Clearly, the speaker had to make some logical deduction to reach his conclusion based on a non-trivial result. Therefore this use of the Evidential is here referred to as inferential. Inference arises from the need to assign causes to observed situations, when the speaker infers that the action took place by seeing its non-trivial result. At the moment of speech there exist (visible) signs which indicate that the situation had taken place earlier. The exact characteristics of the visible final state cannot be predicted on the grounds of the semantics of the verb since the non-trivial result is not unique for each concrete predicate. However, the two situations are connected by some causal relation, and the speaker makes a judgment about it through inference.

The following example illustrates the non-trivial result (inferential use of the Evidential):

- (232) wur lo:ś e:lti u:l-ti u:rəŋna ma moslt-ə-s-ə-m  
blood snow on be-NPP because I understand-EP-PAST-EP-1SG  
kalaŋ mo:sməl-m-e:m  
reindeer wound-PP-1SG

'Because of the blood on the snow I understood that I had wounded the reindeer.'

Remarkably, in the case of trivial result the situation of result is not usually expressed in the context (see examples (227)), since it is unambiguously predictable from the verbal semantics itself. In the case of non-trivial result it often becomes overt, because this may be necessary for the understanding of the text, and for the use of the Evidential in particular. For example, in (232) a non-trivial result of wounding the reindeer is the fact that the blood is on the snow.

Thus, if the result remains unspecified, it is always a trivial result (which is therefore the default case).

### 8.4. Mirative use

As was mentioned above, the prototypical function of Evidentials is to indicate that the speaker does not have direct evidence of the reported event. This function realizes itself through hearsay, resultative and inferential use. However, this important semantic requirement can be violated in the case of what I here refer to as mirative Evidentials. Mirative Evidentials indicate that the speaker has obtained information about the event through direct evidence, but is somehow "psychologically distant" from it. In other words, the speaker is in some way surprised at the event, is not expecting it, and/or the event happens in some uncontrolled way. Aksu and Slobin (1982) describe the same phenomenon in Turkish using the notion of the "unprepared mind". Indeed, as in Turkish, mirative Evidentials in Ostyak are very common in the context of coming to a new place, entering the house, or discovering something unexpected. The effect of "psychological distance" or "unpreparedness" results from indirect perception of the event by the speaker who witnessed it; in this sense it substitutes for indirect evidence. Note that the speaker can be psychologically distant from the event that happened to himself. Therefore the mirative meaning easily allows the use of 1st person Evidentials which are otherwise very unusual, if not altogether ruled out.

The mirative reading pertains both to the Non-Past and Past tense. These cases are illustrated in (233a) and (233b), respectively. In the Present tense, the speaker receives direct evidence of an event which does not itself have any result. However, the event is unexpected for the speaker, for example:

- (233) a. nox we:re:m-ə-s śi pa la:w-ə-l  
up wake.up-EP-PAST.3SG so and say-EP-NPAST.3SG  
takan wojəmp-t-e:w  
deeply sleep-NPP-1PL  
  
'He woke up and said: (Apparently) we have been sleeping deeply.'  
b. pa ju:r xoti śi taj-m-e:m  
and strength though so have-PP-1SG  
'It turns out that I used to have so much strength!'

The mirative Evidentials are easily combined with the particle *śi e:wəlt, ne:s* 'apparently, it seems that, it turns out that' (in the same way as the hearsay Evidentials are often combined with the hearsay particle *matti* 'reportedly, they say' (as in (226b)), although these particles seem to be redundant).

Example (234) is taken from a folklore text. It describes an occasion when the protagonist *Imi-Xili* follows a wizard into a realm of magic. On the road parts of both their bodies gradually start to disappear. The same verbs are used, but when it concerns *Imi-Xili* himself the verbal form is the Indicative, and when the same applies to the wizard walking in front of him, the Evidential forms are used (they are underlined in the translation):

- (234) imosa taxa:j-na joxət-s-ə-ŋən pa o:lŋəs man-ə-m  
one place-LOC come-PAST-EP-3DU and first go-EP-PP  
ne:ŋxe:l ... i lox-ə-l xa:ś-m-al luw iśi  
man-3SG one ski-EP-3SG remain-PP-3SG he same  
lo:t-na joxt-ə-s i ox-ə-l pa xo:ś  
place-LOC come-EP-PAST.3SG one ski-EP-3SG again off

pit-ə-s	pa	xa:š-ə-s ...	pa	je:sa
fell-EP-PAST.3SG	again	remain-EP-PAST.3SG	again	little
man-ə-s	i	lox-ə-l tum o:lŋəš		
go-EP-PAST.3SG	one	ski-EP-3SG that first		
man-ə-m-ə-t-l		pa xa:š-m-al.	luw	i
go-EP-PP-EP-NOMN-3SG	again	remain-PP-3SG	he	one
lox-ə-l	pa	xa:š-ə-s ....	wa:n	xuw
ski-EP-3SG	again	remain-EP-PAST.3SG	long	short
man-s-ə-ŋən		o:lŋəš man-ə-m ne:ŋxe:-l	i	kur-ə-l
walk-PAST-EP-3DU	first	go-EP-PP man-3SG	one	leg-EP-3SG
piš	pe:l-k-ə-l	xa:š-m-al.	luw	i
thigh	half-EP-3SG	remain-PP-3SG	he	one
pe:l-k-ə-l	pa	xa:š-ə-s		
half-EP-3SG	again	remain-EP-PAST.3SG		

'They came to some place and one ski of the man who was walking in front ... fell off. He [Imi-Xili] reached the same place, and one of his skis also fell off... They went a little further, and the other ski of the man who was walking in front fell off. His [of Imi-Xili] other ski also fell off. ... They walked further, and one of the legs of the man who was walking in front fell off. One of his legs [of Imi-Xili] also fell off.' etc.

It seems that (234) should also be analyzed in terms of "psychological distance". It demonstrates that this distance can be generated not only by the speaker, but also by the main character (of the folklore text, at least). For the teller of the tale, events that happen to the main character and to another character (the wizard in this case) are equally distant, so the use of the Evidential vs. Indicative is rather motivated by the point of view of the character *Imi-Xili* himself. Further research is needed in this direction.

### 8.5. Evidential and other verbal categories

The Evidential plays an important role in the Ostyak grammar because it can function in contexts in which other languages use other verbal categories; namely, the resultative, the Perfect, and the epistemic modals. There is a clear overlap between the Evidential and these categories. However, under the approach taken in this paper, the Evidential merely indicates an indirect ground for the assertion. No temporal, modal or aspectual meaning as such is part of the evidential meaning, although they may be in one way or another implied by the Evidential verb.

Importantly, the Evidential operator does not change the time at which the proposition is true, but only adds some "metacomments" about the grounds for the assertion. The following observation supports this claim. With Past tense Evidentials the sentence refers to the moment of the event itself, and not to the moment of its result. This can be seen from the collocation with time adverbs and adverbial temporal clauses. For example, (235) suggests that the situation of cooking happened when the speaker was sleeping. Naturally, he obtained evidence of this event when he woke up, but the sentence as a whole refers to the time of the cooking:

(235)	ma xu:j-t-e:m	e:wəlt xo:se:ŋk	o:m-e:m-na
	I sleep-NPP-1SG	from fish.soup	mother-1SG-LOC
	ka:wərt-ə-m		
	cook-EV-PP		

'The fish soup was cooked by my mother while I was sleeping.'

This property crucially makes the Evidential (even in its resultative use) different from the Resultative as a special aspectual category, which refers to the time of the state resulting from the previous event (Dahl 1985; Nedjalkov 1988). Note that in Northern Ostyak the Evidential (just like the Indicative) can form a Stative construction which clearly refers to the state and not to the process (on the Stative construction see 2.2.2.3). The reference of all Stative constructions is the time after the event (the time when the state obtains). For example, in (236a) the referred time is indicated by the expression "When I woke up".

(236) a.	xunti nox	werl-ə-s-ə-m	ja:j-e:m	il	jir-man
	when up	wake.up-EP-PAST-EP-1SG	brother-1SG	down	tie-CONV
	u:l-m-al				
	be-PP-3SG				

'When I woke up, my brother was tied up.'

b.	molxatl	ja:j-e:m	il	jir-ə-m
	yesterday	brother-1SG	down	tie-EP-PP

'Yesterday my brother was tied up.'

Example (236a) denotes that at the time when the speaker woke up his brother had already been tied up, but the sentence says nothing about the time when the event of the tying up occurred. This contrasts with (236b) which lacks the stative construction and refers to the time when the tying up happened (yesterday). The reason the Evidential is used is in both cases the same: the speaker has not witnessed the event of the tying up directly. A comparison of stative with non-stative Evidentials shows that the Evidential (unlike the stative) does not convey any temporal or aspectual meaning, and indirectly supports the semantics suggested in the previous sections.

For many languages there exists a formal (and/or historical) connection between the Evidential and the Perfect. The category of Perfect is often considered to be the initial point for the development of inferential Evidentials, and, later, hearsay Evidentials as contextual variants of the same category (Slobin and Aksu 1982; Comrie 1976: 109–110; Nedjalkov 1988: 491; Friedman 1979; Nichols 1986a: 254; Bybee et al. 1994: 96–97; Dahl 1985: 153, and others). The same development is observed in the history of other Finno-Ugrian languages (Serebrennikov 1960: 66). Ostyak Evidentials seem to have developed from the Perfect as well. Formally the Evidentials present the usual Perfect pattern, since the forms of *-t-* and *-m-* are participles used in the finite position. The semantic similarities between the Evidential and Perfect lie in the fact that both present an event not by itself but in connection with its result (cf. Comrie 1976: 110). However, there is also a systematic semantic difference between them.

As is well known, the Perfect expresses the reference to the past and implies the "current relevance" of the event in the present. At least in some of its meanings it implies a result relevant in the Present. This elucidates out the difference between (237a) and (237b).

(237) a.	John has come,
b.	John came.

Both refer to a moment in the past and are identical truth-conditionally but (237b) does not contain the implication that John is still there, while (237a), according to some authors, does. However, the actual result is not a part of the meaning of the English Perfect but rather a conversational implicature which does not have a fixed semantic content but depends greatly on the context (for example, Inoue 1979; McCoard 1978: 31–64 and many others). As has been noted by Anderson (1982: 232), the Perfect implicature can be canceled or denied:

(238) He has left three times already - why is he still here?

As Anderson argues, the Perfect can be used to convey the message that John is not here, since *He has left* will normally be used (unless there are conflicting cues) as the answer to the question: *Is John here yet?* (cf. also Comrie 1976: 56). However, the Perfect only implies but does not necessarily entail the proposition, by describing the result.

By contrast, the Past Evidential in its resultative use entails the situation of result. With the semantics suggested above, the truth-value of the Evidential sentence (239) should be calculated as the conjunction of the truth-values of the statements in (240).

(239) lo:š lal-m-al  
snow melt-PP-3SG  
'The snow has melted.'

- (240) a. The snow has melted  
b. The snow is melted  
c. The speaker has evidence that the snow is melted.

In Ostyak there is no possible situation in which (239) is true and any of the sentences in (240) is not. Importantly, the statements (240a), (240b) and (240c) cannot be canceled: any attempt to cancel them leads to contradiction which in Ostyak would correspond to the following statements.

- (241) a. The snow has melted (EV), why isn't it melted?  
b. The snow has melted (EV), why didn't it melt?  
c. The snow has melted (EV), why don't I have evidence that it is melted?

This immediately shows that the resultative Evidential is different from the Perfect: for the Perfect the situation of result is only implied and can easily be cancelled; for the Evidential it is part of its entailed meaning.

The matter is more complicated in the case of the inferential Evidential. Consider the Ostyak correlate of (237a).

(242) Juwan joxət-m-al  
John come-PP-3SG  
'John has come.'

In the case of the inferential Evidential the speaker makes his statement on the basis of a logical conclusion from a non-trivial result (for example, when he sees John's coat in the room). Clearly, John's coat can be in a room even if John has not come, so the situation (242) does not entail its non-trivial result. This follows from the fact that the non-trivial result is not predicted from the event itself, and might be explained otherwise. Each event can have more than one non-trivial result at the same time, and the speaker can have evidence of one of them while doubting the second. In this sense the inferential Evidential is very close to the Perfect. However, there is also a crucial difference between them. The Perfect does not contain a reference to the situation of

evidence. This means, first, that the speaker can produce (237a) if he does not actually have any special evidence that John is there, and doubts it, cf.:

- (243) a. I am not sure that John has come.  
b. If John has come, I will leave.

For the Evidential, the necessary component of its semantics is the situation of having evidence of an event, therefore it is not appropriate in contexts (243). Evidentials do not call for the consideration of sets of circumstances other than those existing in the actual world. That is why, for instance, they are never used in conditional sentences which "invite" one to evaluate a certain hypothesis and to consider its consequences. The same has been reported for Bulgarian and Macedonian Evidentials (Kozinceva 1994: 99). Furthermore, the Perfect can be used when the speaker has direct evidence of the event itself, but not of its result, cf. (244), produced in a situation when the speaker sees John coming.

(244) I can see that John has come.

The Evidential is usually impossible in such contexts because (244) presupposes that the speaker witnesses the reported event. In this respect Ostyak is again similar to Turkish, where, according to Slobin and Aksu (1982), an evidential sentence such as (242) cannot be produced in the situation where the speaker, for example, can hear the sound of John's steps or can simply see John coming. In sum, both the Perfect and the Evidential imply a non-trivial result that can be cancelled (the trivial result is entailed by the Evidential). The difference between them lies in the fact that the Perfect does not have any reference to the situation of gaining evidence, while the Evidential necessarily contains this component in its semantics.

Taking into account all that has been said about evidential meanings, it can be argued that the development of Evidentials in Ostyak occurred through the grammaticalization (the so-called "pragmatic strengthening") of the conversational implicature (for a similar explanation see Traugott 1989; Dahl 1985: 11). This means that the references often implied by the Perfect to the resultant state, and probably also to the speaker's source of evidence, were generalized, and became a part of the meaning of the Evidential marker. As was shown by Traugott (1989), the strengthening of the pragmatic inference to relevance is the most important (if not the only) source of (epistemic) modals in the languages of the world. If we allow that mentioning the source of information about an event is a modal category, the development of Evidentials can be regarded as an example of the same process.

Finally, Evidentials in Ostyak may be used to convey epistemic meanings. In fact, it is traditional to classify Evidentials with epistemic modalities. According to the classic definition of Lyons (1977: 793), the epistemic modality is concerned with the nature and source of knowledge and qualifies the speaker's commitment to the truth of the proposition. Lyons sees it as primarily evidential in nature. A similar understanding can be found in Bybee (1985), Chafe (1986), Traugott (1989), Hopper and Traugott (1993: 145), and Bybee and Fleischman (1995: 4). Indeed, the data from different languages shows the overlap between Evidentials and epistemic meanings (Willett 1988: 55), and indicates they may have a common origin (Anderson 1986: 308–311; Traugott 1989, and others). Palmer (1986) also suggested that evidentials and epistemics may be in a complementary distribution across languages. Some languages, such as English, emphasize the judgmental system (the expression of possibility and necessity); others emphasize the purely evidential system (as do many native American languages); some languages combine both (such as German). This account seems to be supported by the Uralic languages. Note that Ostyak has very little—if any—grammaticalized means to express epistemics other than by the use of the Evidential itself. This also applies to most other Uralic languages for which Evidentials have been reported, such as Vogul, Zyryen, Cheremis,

Votyak, Nenets (Serebrennikov 1960: 58–66, 80–82, 118–120, 122, 126, 132, 160–167, 171–172, 176–178), as well as Yukaghir.

However, the semantics I have described here indicate one important difference between Evidentials and epistemics (cf. Chung and Timberlake 1986; Oswald 1986: 43). As was said above, Epistemics deal with the degree to which the speaker is convinced that the proposition is true. Evidentials, on the other hand, have nothing to do with the commitment of the speaker to the truth of the proposition but merely indicate the grounds for the assertion. With such an understanding, Evidentials do not evaluate the truth-value of the proposition with the notion of possible worlds, as do epistemics. The propositions asserted in the Evidential are asserted as necessarily true from the point of view of the speaker and as referring to the actual world. In a sense they are even "more" true than the propositions asserted with the Indicative, cf. their use in oral folklore which was traditionally treated as presenting knowledge of the world that was absolutely true. This makes the Evidential a category which strictly speaking stands outside the field of epistemic modality.

### Bibliography

- Ackerman, Farrell. 1987. *Miscreant morphemes: Phrasal predicate in Ugric*. PhD Diss., University of California, Berkeley.
- Ackerman, Farrell, and Irina Nikolaeva. 1997. Similar forms and different functions: The person/number paradigm in Western Armenian and Northern Ostyak. *Proceedings of the LFG97 Conference*, Butt, Miriam, and Tracy Holloway-King (eds). CSLI Publications: Stanford, California.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (in preparation) Descriptive typology and grammatical theory: A study in morphosyntax.
- Aissen, Judith, and David Perlmutter. 1983. Clause reduction in Spanish. *Studies in Relational Grammar*, Perlmutter, David (ed.), 1, 360–403. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aksu, Ayhan A., and Dan I. Slobin, 1986. A psychological account of the development and use of Evidentials in Turkish. Chafe and Nichols 1986. 159–167.
- Anderson, Lloyd B. 1982. The "Perfect" as a universal and a language-specific category. *Tense Aspect. Between semantics and pragmatics*, Hopper, Paul (ed.), 228–264. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986. Evidentials, path of change, and mental maps: Typologically regular asymmetries. Chafe and Nichols 1986. 273–312.
- Anderson, Stephen. 1992. *A-morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ariel, Mira. 1988. Referring and accessibility. *Journal of Linguistics* 24: 67–87.
- Barker, Chris. 1995. *Possessive descriptions*. CSLI Publications. Stanford, California: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Barlow, Michael. 1992. *A situated theory of agreement*. New York, London: Garland Publishing.
- Barlow, Michael, and Charles A. Ferguson. 1988. (eds.) *Agreement in natural languages: Approaches, Theories, Description*. Stanford, California: Stanford University.
- Bese, László, László Dezső, and János Gulya. 1970. On syntactic typology of the Uralic and Altaic languages. *Theoretical problems of typology and the northern Eurasian languages*, Dezső, László, and Péter Hajdú (eds), 113–28. Amsterdam: B. R. Gruner.
- Blake, Barry J., and Graham Mallison. 1981. *Linguistic typology: cross-linguistic studies in syntax*. Amsterdam, New York: Noth-Holland Publishing Company.
- Bresnan, Joan; and Sam Mchombo. 1987. Topic, Pronoun, and Agreement in Chicheŵa. *Language* 63: 741–83.
- Bybee, Joan L. 1985. *Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form*. Typological Studies in Languages, 9. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bybee, Joan L., and Fleischman, Suzanne 1995. *Modality in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bybee, Joan L., Perkins, Revere D., and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Čeremisina, Maja, and Natal'ja Koškarëva. 1991. *Složnoe i osložnënoe predloženie v xantyjskom jazyke* [Complex sentences in Ostyak]. Novosibirsk: NGU.
- Čeremisina, Maja, and Elena Kovgan. 1989. *Xantyjskij glagol* [The Ostyak verb]. Novosibirsk: NGU.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. *Subject and topic*, Li, Charles N. (ed.), 22–55. New York: Academic Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986. Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. Chafe and Nichols 1986. 261–272.
- Chafe, Wallace, and Nichols, Johanna 1986. (eds.) *Evidentiality. The linguistic coding of epistemology*. Advances in Discourse Processes. XX. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987. Cognitive constraints and information flow. *Coherence and grounding in*

- discourse, Tomlin, Russel S. (ed.), 21-51. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Choi, Hye-Won. 1996. Optimizing structure in context: Scrambling and information structure. PhD Diss., Stanford University.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1972. Remarks on nominalization. *Studies on semantics in generative grammar*, Chomsky, Noam, 11-61. The Hague: Mouton.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam; and Lasnik, Howard. 1993. The Theory of Principles and Parameters, *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, J. Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, W. Sternefeld, and T. Vennemann (eds.), Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chung, Sandra and Timberlake, Alan. 1985. Tense, aspect, and mood. *Grammatical categories and the lexicon*. Timothy Shopen (ed.), 202-257. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect. An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. \_\_\_\_\_, 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology. Syntax and morphology*. 2nd edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Corbett, Greville G. 1998. Morphology and agreement. *The handbook of morphology*, Spencer, Andrew; and Arnold Zwicky (eds.), 191-205. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Csepregi, Márta. 1978-1979. Keleti osztják igeneves szerkezetek [Constructions with deverbal nouns in Eastern Ostyak]. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 80-81: 273-300.
- Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Bath: The Bath Press.
- Davies, William, and Carol Rosen. 1988. Unions as multi-predicate clauses. *Language* 64: 52-88.
- De Hoop, Helen. 1992. *Case configuration and noun phrase interpretation*. PhD Diss., University of Groningen.
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 20. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Diesing, Molly, and Eloise Jelinek. 1993. The syntax and semantics of object shift. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 51.
- Ganschow, Gerhard. 1965. *Die Verbalbildung im Ostjakischen*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972. Az osztják tárgyias igeragozás használatának kérdéséhez [On the usage of the Ostyak verbal conjugation]. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 74: 183-185.
- Gazdar, Gerald, E. Klein, Pullum, Geoffrey, and Ivan Sag. 1985. *Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Georgopoulos, Carol. 1991. On A- and A'-agreement. *Lingua* 85: 135-69.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992. Another look at object agreement. *Proceedings of NELS* 22: 165-77. GLSA, Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Givón, Talmy. 1982. Evidentiality and epistemic space. *Studies in Language* 6: 23-49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983. Introduction. *Topic continuity in discourse: A quantitative cross-linguistic study*, Talmy Givón (ed.), 1-42. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1984. Direct object and dative shifting: Semantic and pragmatic case. *Objects: Towards a theory of grammatical relations*, Plank, Frans (ed.), 151-82. London, Orlando: Academic Press.
- Gulya, János. 1966. *Eastern Ostyak chrestomathy*. The Hague-Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1967. A tárgyias ragozás az Osztyákban (a vahi nyelvjárás alapján) [Objective conjugation in Ostyak (the dialect of Vach)]. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 69: 389-94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970. Aktiv, Ergativ und Passiv im Vach-Ostjakischen. *Symposium über Syntax der uralischen Sprachen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Gundel, Jeanette K. 1988. *The role of topic and comment in linguistic theory*. New York, London: Garland.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., Nancy Hedberg, and Ron Zacharski. 1993. Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language* 69: 274-308.

- Farkas, Donka F., and Jerrold M. Sadock. 1989. Preverb climbing in Hungarian. *Language* 65: 318-38.
- Futaki, István. 1975. *Tungusische Lehnwörter des Ostjakischen*. Veröffentlichungen der societates Uralo-Altaica. 10. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Haiman, John. 1985. *Natural syntax. Iconicity and erosion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hale, Ken; and Ning, Chunyan. 1996. Raising in Dagur relative clauses. *UCI Working Papers* 1: 35-8.
- Hawkins, R. 1981. Towards an account of the possessive constructions: NPsN and the N of NP'. *Journal of Linguistics* 17: 247-269.
- Heine, Bernd. 1997. *Possession. Cognitive sources, forces, and grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Honti, László. 1982. *Geschichte des obugrischen Vokalismus der ersten Silbe*. Budapest: Académiai Kiadó.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1984. *Chrestomathia ostiatica*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987. K probleme vznikovenija ob'ektnogo sprjaženija ugorskix jazykov [On the origin of the objective conjugation in Ob-Ugric languages]. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 85: 341-46.
- Holmberg, Anders; and Christer Platzack. 1995. *The role of inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hopper, Paul and Elizabeth Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huang, James C.-T. 1984. On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 531-74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. Remarks on the status of the null object. *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, Freidin, Robert (ed.), 56-76. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Inoue, K. 1979. An analysis of the English Present Perfect. *Linguistic Studies* 17: 561-589.
- Itô, Junko. 1989. A prosodic theory of epenthesis. *Natural languages and linguistic theory* 7: 217-59.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1977. *X' syntax: A study of phrase structure*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- A. Jászó, Anna. 1976. Megjegyzések a particípiumból alakult verbum finitumok mondatanához az északi osztjákban [On the syntax of participles used as finite verbs formed Northern Ostyak]. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 78: 353-58.
- Kaksin, Andrej. 1993. *Kategorija vremena i naklonenija v xantyjskom jazyke* [The category of tense and mood in Ostyak]. PhD Diss., Novosibirsk: NGU.
- Karjalainen, Kustaa F. 1948. *Ostjakisches Wörterbuch. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Y. H. Toivonen*. Lexica Societatis Fennougricae. Helsinki.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1976. *Südostjakisches Textsammlungen, neu transkribiert, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Edith Vértes*. Soumalais Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia. Helsinki.
- Kay, Paul and Karl Zimmer. 1976. On the Semantics of compounds and Genitives in English. *Proceedings of the Sixth California Linguistics Association Conference*. San Diego State University. 29-35.
- Keenan, Edward. 1974. Generalizing the notion of 'Subject of'. *CLS* 10: 298-309.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1978. On surface form and logical form. *Linguistics in the 70ies: Directions and prospects*, Kachru, Braj B. (ed.), 163-204.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. Relative clause. *Language typology and syntactic description*, Shopen, Timothy (ed.), Vol. 2. Complex constructions, 141-70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kempson, Ruth. 1977. *Semantic theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kenstowicz, Michael. 1979. Chukchee vowel harmony and epenthesis. *CLS* 15: 402-12.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. Phonology in generative grammar. Cambridge, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kim, Alan. 1988. Preverbal focus position in type XIII languages. *Studies in syntactic typology*, Hammond, Michael, Edith Moravcsik, and Jessica Wirth (eds), 148–71. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1988. Phonological change. *Linguistics: The Cambridge survey*. Newmeyer, Frederick (ed.), 1, 363–415. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 1995. (ed.) *Discourse configurational languages*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klemm, Antal. 1928–1930. A vogul és osztják tárgyas ragozás [The Vogul and Ostyak objective conjugation]. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 47: 85–114.
- Kononov, Andrej. 1960. *Grammatika uzbezkogo literaturnogo jazyka*. [The grammar of the Uzbek literary language]. Moscow, Leningrad: Akademija Nauk.
- Koopman, Hilda, and Sportiche, Dominique. 1991. The Position of Subjects. *Lingua* 85: 211–58.
- Korényi, Éva. 1972. *Iranische Lehnwörter in den obugrischen Sprachen*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1987. Turkish and the Turkic languages. *The world's major languages*, Comrie, Bernard (ed.), 619–44. London, Sydney: Croom Helm.
- Koškareva, Natal'ja. 1991. *Konstrukcii s infinitivnymi formami glagola v xantyjskom jazyke* [Constructions with non-finite verbal forms in Ostyak]. PhD Diss., Novosibirsk: NGU.
- Kovgan, Elena. 1991. *Pričasno-opredelitel'nye konstrukcii v severnyx dialektax xantyjskogo jazyka* [Participial relative constructions in northern dialects of Ostyak]. PhD Diss., Novosibirsk: NGU.
- Kozintseva, Natal'ja. 1994. Kategorija evidencialnosti (problemy tipologičeskogo analiza [Category of evidentiality (problems of typological analysis)]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 3: 92–104.
- Kulonen, Ulla-Maja. 1989. *The Passive in Ob-Ugrian*. Suomalais Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia. Helsinki.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald. 1993. Reference-point constructions. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4: 1–38.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. Possession and possessive constructions. *Language and the cognitive consual of the world*, Taylor, John, R.; and Robert E. MacLayry (eds.). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lapointe, Steven. 1985. *A theory of grammatical agreement*. New York, London: Garland Publishing.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1982. Universal and typological aspects of agreement. *Apprehension: Das sprachliche Erfassen von Einzelsprachen*, Seiler, Hansjakob; and Stachowiak, F.J. (eds.). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1984. *Der Relativsatz: Typologie seiner Strukturen, Theorie seiner Funktionen, Kompendium seiner Grammatik*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahajan, Arnoop. 1989. Agreement and agreement phrases. *Functional heads and clause structure. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 10, Laka, Itziar; and Mahajan, Arnoop (eds), 217–52. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. Clitic doubling, object agreement and specificity. *Proceedings of NELS* 21: 263–77.
- McCawley, James D. 1976. *Grammar and meaning. Papers on syntactic and semantic topics*. New York, San Francisco, London: Academic Press.
- McCoard, Robert W. 1978. *The English Perfect: tense-choice and pragmatic inferences*. Amsterdam, New York, Oxford: North-Holland Publishing Company.

- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. (ed.) 1988. *Typology of Resultative constructions*. Typological Studies in Languages, 12. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1986a. The Bottom Line: Chinese Pidgin Russian. In Chafe and Nichols 1986. 239–260.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986b. *Head-marking and dependent-marking grammar*. *Language* 62: 56–119.
- Nikiforidou, Kiki. 1991. The meaning of the genitive: A case study in semantic structure and semantic change. *Cognitive Linguistics* 2: 149–205.
- Nikolaeva, Irina, Elena Kovgan, and Natal'ja Koškarëva. 1993. Communicative roles in the Ostyak Syntax. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 51: 125–67.
- Nikolaeva, Irina. 1995. *Obdorskij dialekt xantyjskogo jazyka* [The Obdorsk dialect of Ostyak]. *Mitteilungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica* 15. Hamburg.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999a. Object agreement, grammatical relations, and information structure. *Studies in Language* 23: 341–86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999b. The semantics of Northern Ostyak Evidentials. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 88: 131–59.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (forthcoming) Secondary topic as a relation in information structure.
- Oswalt Robert L. 1986. The Evidential system of Kashaya. In Chafe and Nichols 1986. 28–45.
- Paasonen, Heikki. 1965. *Ostjakische grammatikalische Aufzeichnungen nach den Dialekten an der Konda und am Jugan, bearbeitet, neu transkribiert und herausgegeben von Edith Vértes*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980. *Štadostjaksische Textsammlungen, neu transkribiert, bearbeitet, übersetzt und herausgegeben von Edith Vértes*. Suomalais Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Palmer, Frank Robert. 1986. *Mood and modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pápay, József. 1905. *Ostják népköltési gyűjtemény* [The collection of Ostyak folk poetry]. Budapest.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1906–1908. Északi-osztják nyelvtanulmányok [Northern Ostyak studies]. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 36–38: 345–98, 52–79, 164–95, 258–75, 111–50, 313–29.
- Poceluevskij, Evgenij A. 1967. *Tjurkskij trëxčlen* [Three-component construction in Turkic]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Prince, Ellen. 1981. Toward a taxonomy of given/new information. *Radical Pragmatics*, Cole, Peter (ed.), 213–55. New York: Academic Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992. Subject, definiteness, and information-status. *Discourse description: Diverse linguistic analysis of a fund-raising text*, Mann, William C., and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), 295–325. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Rédei, Károly. 1965. *The Northern Ostyak chrestomathy*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. Zu den syrjänischen Lehnwörtern der obugrischen Sprachen. *Finnisch-ugrischen Forschungen* 40: 177–84.
- Reguly Antal, József Pápay, and Miklos Zsirai. 1944–1951. *Ostják hőseinek* [Ostyak heroic songs]. 1–2. Budapest.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1982. Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics. *Philosophica* 27: 53–94.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. Null objects in Italian and the theory of *pro*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 501–57.
- Rosen, Sara. 1989. Two types of noun incorporation: a lexical analysis. *Language* 65: 294–317.
- Runner, Jeffrey T. 1995. *Noun phrase licensing and interpretation*. PhD Diss., University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Salovar, Valentina. 1991. *Strukturno-semantičeskie tipy prostogo predloženiya v xantyjskom jazyke* [Structural-semantic types of the Ostyak simple sentence]. PhD Diss., Novosibirsk: NGU.
- Sauer, Gert. 1967. *Die Nominalbildung im Ostjakischen*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

- Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine Languages: Topic, Actor, Actor-Topic, or None of the Above. *Subject and topic*, Li, Charles N. (ed.), 491–518. New York, San Francisco, London: Academic Press.
- Schiefer, Erhard. 1985. Kriterien zur Klassifizierung der Dialekte des Ostjakischen. *Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica* 20.
- Seiler, Hansjakob. 1977. Zum Problem der sprachlichen Possessivität. *Sprache und Sprachen. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Seiler, Hans-Jakob, 187–206. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983a. Possessivity, subject and object. *Studies in language* 7: 89–117.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983b. *Possession as an operational dimension of language*. Language Universals Series 2. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Serebrennikov, Boris A. 1960. *Kategorii vremeni i vida v finno-ugorskix jazykax permskoj i volžskoj grupp* [The category of tense and aspect in the Finno-Ugric languages of the Permian and Volgaic groups]. Moscow: Akademija Nauk.
- Sinclair, M. and Winckler, W.K. 1991. Relevance Theory: Explaining verbal communication. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics PLUS* 18:1–97.
- Skribnik, Elena, and Elena Kovgan. 1991. Sistema pričastnyx opredelitel'nyx konstrukcij v obsko-ugorskix jazykax. [The system of the participial relative constructions in the ob-Ugric languages]. *Jazyki narodov Sibiri. Grammatičeskie issledovanija*. [Languages of Siberia. Grammatical studies]. Ubrjatova, Elizaveta, and Maja Čeremisina (eds.). 84–106. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Sperber, Dan, and Wilson, Deirdre. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Steinitz, Wolfgang. 1966–1989. *Dialektologisches und etymologisches Wörterbuch der ostjakischen Sprache*. Vol. 1–15. Berlin.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1937. Xantyjskij (ostjackij) jazyk [Ostyak language]. *Jazyki i pismennost' narodov Severa*. 1, 193–227. Leningrad: Učpedgiz.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1944. *Geschichte des finnisch-ugrischen Vokalismus*. Stockholm.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1975–1980. Ostjakologische Arbeiten. Vol. 1–4. Budapest, Berlin, Den Hague: Mouton.
- Steriade, Donka. 1990. *Greek prosodies and the nature of syllabification*. New York: Garland Press.
- Strawson, Paul. 1964. Identifying reference and truth-values. *Semantics: an interdisciplinary reader*, Danny D. Steinberg and Leon A. Jakobovitz (eds.), 86–99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Szalacsek, Margit. 1984. The problem of the definite and indefinite conjugational forms in the Northern-Ostyak language. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 21: 426–30.
- Taylor, John. 1989. Possessive genitives in English. *Linguistics* 27: 663–686.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. *Linguistic categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. Possessive genitives in English: a discourse perspective. *South African Journal of Linguistics* 9: 59–63.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. *Possessives in English. An exploration in cognitive grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tereščenko, Natalja 1973. Sintaksis samodijskix jazykov. [The syntax of the Samojedic languages]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Tereškin, Nikolaj. 1961. *Očerki dialektov xantyjskogo jazyka. Čast' pervaja. Vaxovskij dialekt* [Dialects of Ostyak. Part one. The dialect of Vach]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Traugott, Elizabeth. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meaning in English: an example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65: 31–55.
- Ubrjatova, Elizaveta. 1976. *Issledovanija po sintaksisu jakutskogo jazyka. Složnoe predloženie*. [Studies in the Yakut syntax. Complex sentence], Vol. 1–2. Novosibirsk: Nauka.

- Ubrjatova, Elizaveta, and Fedor Litvin (eds.). 1986. *Strukturnye tipy sintetičeskix polipredikativnyx konstrukcij v jazykax raznyx sistem*. [Structural types of the polipredicative constructions with synthetic verbal form in the languages of different typology]. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Vértes, Edit. 1967. *Die ostjakischen Pronomina*. Budapest: Academia Kiado.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. Groups of Ostyak dialects. *Congressus sextus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum*. 2. Syktyvkar.
- Vikner, Sten. 1995. *Verb movement and expletive subjects in Germanic languages*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Webelhuth, Gert. 1992. *Principles and parameters of syntactic saturation*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wickman, Bo. 1970. Über die Verwendung der objektiven Konjugation. *Symposion über Syntax der uralischen Sprachen*, Schlachter, Wolfgang (ed.) 216–35. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, Ruprecht.
- Willett, Thomas. 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12: 51–97.
- Williams, E. S. 1982. The NP cycle. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 277–95.
- Woolford, Ellen. 1995. Object Agreement in Palauan: Specificity, Humanness, Economy and Optimality. *Papers in Optimality Theory. University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 18, Beckman, Jill N.; Walsh, Laura, and Suzanne Urbanczyk (eds), 655–700. Cambridge, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press.

## Abbreviations

ABL - Ablative, ACC - Accusative-Dative, C - consonant, CAUS - Causative, COMP - Comparative, CONV - Converb, DIM - Diminutive, DU - Dual, EP - Epenthetic element, FOC - focus, FREQ - Frequentative, IMP - Imperative, IMPF - Imperfective, INF - Infinitive, INTR - intransitive verb, LOC - Locative, MOM - Momentative, NEG - Negation, NEGP - Negative participle, NOM - Nominative, NOMN - nominalizer, NP - noun phrase, NPAST - Non-Past, PAS - Passive, PL - Plural, NPP - Non-Past Participle, PP - Past Participle, PROPR - Propriative, SG - Singular, SUPER - Superlative, TR - transitive verb, TRANS - Translative, V - vowel, VP - verbal phrase

## Languages of the World/Materials

### LINCOM's Descriptive Grammar series

- 01 **Ge'ez** (Classical Ethiopic) St. Weninger\*
- 02 **Kwamera** (Polynesian) L. Lindstrom & J. Lynch\*
- 03 **Mbalanhu** (Wambo, Namibia) D. Fourie\*
- 05 **Ukrainian** A. Danylenko & S. Vakulenko\*
- 06 **Cantonese** S.-Y. Killingley\*
- 07 **Koptisch** R. Schulz & A. Eberle
- 08 **Laz** (Kartvelian) U.J. Lüders
- 10 **Koiari** (Papuan) T.E. Dutton\*
- 11 **Gunin/Kwini** (non-Pama-Nyungan) W. McGregor\*
- 12 **Even** (Tungusic) A.L. Malchukov\*
- 16 **Middle Egyptian** R. Schulz et al.
- 18 **Sanskrit** D. Killingley & S.-Y. Killingley\*
- 19 **Ixtenco Otomi** (Otomanguean) Y. Lastra\*
- 20 **Maori** R. Harlow\*
- 21 **Chadian Arabic** S. Abu-Absi\*
- 22 **(Modern Eastern) Armenian** N.A. Kozintseva\*
- 25 **Khoekhoe** W. Haacke
- 27 **Passamaquoddy-Maliseet** (Algonquian) R. Leavitt\*
- 28 **Rural Palestinian Arabic** (Abu Shusha dial.) K.N. Shahin\*
- 30 **Northern Sotho** L.J. Louwrens, I.M. Kosch & A.E. Kotzé\*
- 31 **Saliba** (Western Oceanic) U. Mosel\*
- 33 **Wiyot** (Algic) K.V. Teeter
- 34 **Sinhala** J.W. Gair & J. Paolillo\*
- 47 **Tamanaco** (Carib, extinct) Sp. Gildea & S. Méira
- 50 **Zulu** S.E. Bosch & G. Poulos\*
- 57 **Comorien** (Bantu) Ahmed-Chamaga
- 58 **Tokelauan** (Polynesian) R. Hooper\*
- 59 **Kunama** M.L. Bender\*
- 62 **Belarussian** A.Ja. Suprun & U. Doleschal
- 63 **Maldivian/Divehi** J.W. Gair & B. Cain
- 64 **Dogon** V. Plungian\*
- 65 **Corse** M. Giacomo-Marcellesi\*
- 66 **Bulgare** J. Feuillet\*
- 68 **Sumerian** J.L. Hayes\*
- 69 **Basilicatense** (Ital. dial.) R. Bigalke\*
- 70 **El Gallego** J.A. Pérez Bouza\*
- 71 **Pima Bajo** (Uto-Aztecan) Z. Estrada Fernández\*
- 73 **Kalderaš** (Romani) L.N. Tcherenkov & M.F. Heinschink
- 74 **Abruzzese** (Ital. dial.) R. Bigalke\*
- 77 **Lhasa Tibetan** S. DeLancey
- 78 **Ladin dta Val Badia** L. Craffonara
- 79 **Souletin** (Basque dial.) U.J. Lüders
- 80 **Creolese** (Guyanese Creole) H. Devonish
- 81 **Akkadian** Sh. Izre'el
- 82 **Canaano-Akkadian** Sh. Izre'el\*
- 83 **Papiamentu** (Creole) S. Kouwenberg & E. Murray\*
- 84 **Berbice Dutch Creole** S. Kouwenberg
- 85 **Rabaul Creole German** (Papua New Guinea) C. Volker
- 86 **Nalik** (Austronesian) C. Volker
- 88 **Nyulnyul** (non-Pama-Nyungan) W. McGregor\*
- 89 **Warrwa** (non-Pama-Nyungan) W. McGregor\*
- 92 **Icari** (Dargwa) N.R. Sumbatova & R.O. Mutalov
- 93 **Daur** (Mongolic) Chaolu Wu (Üjijedin Chuluu)\*
- 100 **Bare** (Arawak) Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald\*
- 101 **Acadian French** D. Jory & V. Motapanyane\*
- 102 **Polabian** (Slavic) W. Suprun & U. Doleschal
- 103 **Chamling** K. Ebert\*
- 104 **Kodava** (Dravidian) K. Ebert\*
- 105 **Romanes** (Sinti) D. Holzinger\*
- 106 **Sepeccides-Romani** P. Cech & M.F. Heinschink\*
- 107 **Roman** (Romani) D.W. Halwachs et. al.
- 109 **Karachay** (Turkic) St. Seegmiller\*
- 111 **Nivkh** E. Gruzdeva\*
- 114 **Hittite** S. Luraghi\*
- 115 **Lower Sorbian** (Slavic) G. Spieß
- 116 **Songhay** R. Nicolai & P. Zima\*
- 117 **Macedonian** V.A. Friedman
- 120 **Ainu** J.C. Maher
- 121 **Adyge** R. Smeets
- 122 **Tuki** (Niger Kordofan) E. Biloa
- 123 **Hindi Mahendra** K. Verma
- 124 **Q'eqchi'** (Mayan) J. DeChicchis
- 125 **Czech** L. Janda & Ch.E. Townsend
- 127 **Modern Hebrew** O. Schwarzwald
- 128 **Turin Piedmontese** D. Ricca
- 129 **Siciliano** R. Bigalke\*
- 130 **Ratahan** N.P. Himmelmann & J.U. Wolff\*
- 131 **El náhuatl de Tezcoco** Valentín Peralta
- 133 **Tsakhur** W. Schulze\*
- 135 **Late Cornish** I. Wmffre\*
- 136 **Fyem** D. Nettle\*
- 137 **Yingkarta** A. Dench\*
- 138 **Jurruru** A. Dench
- 139 **Svan** K. Tuite\*
- 141 **Evenki** N. Bulatova & L. Grenoble\*
- 142 **Modern Hebrew** O. Schwarzwald
- 143 **Old Armenian** N. Kozintseva
- 145 **Russian** E. Andrews
- 146 **Uzbek** I.D. Cirtautas
- 147 **Georgian** M. Cherchi\*
- 148 **Serbo-Croatian** S. Kordic\*
- 150 **Azeri** A. Bodrogligeti
- 151 **Tagalog** L. Shkarban
- 152 **Central Breton** I. Wmffre\*
- 153 **Demotic** St. Vinson
- 154 **Polci** R. Cosper
- 155 **Bashkiri** A. Bodrogligeti
- 158 **Vogul** T. Riese
- 159 **Mandan** (Siouan) Mauricio Mixco\*
- 160 **Upper Sorbian** G. Schaarschmidt
- 161 **Toura** (Mandé) Th. Bearth
- 162 **West Greenlandic** J.M. Sadock
- 165 **Dagaare** (Gur) A. Bodomo
- 166 **Yuchi** M.S. Linn
- 167 **Itelmen** J. Bobaljic
- 168 **Apache** W.de Reuse
- 169 **Modern Greek** B.D. Joseph
- 170 **Tol** Dennis Holt\*
- 171 **Secret Language of Chinese** Yanbin Qu
- 172 **Lummi** (Salish) R. Demers
- 173 **Khamnigan Mongol** Juha Janhunen
- 174 **Nepali** Balthasar Bickel & J. Peterson
- 175 **Comecrudo** R.C. Troike
- 176 **Panamint** (Central Numic, Uto-Aztecan) J. McLaughlin
- 179 **Toba** H.E. Manelis Klein
- 180 **Degema** E.E. Kari\*
- 181 **Kupeño** J. Hill
- 182 **Cayuga** H.-J. Sasse
- 183 **Jaqaru** M.J. Hardman
- 184 **Madurese** W. D. Davies\*
- 185 **Kamass** A. Künnap\*
- 186 **Enets** A. Künnap\*
- 187 **Guajiro** J. Alvarez
- 188 **Kurdish** G. Haig
- 189 **Salar** A.M. Dwyer
- 190 **Esperanto** Ch. Gledhill\*
- 191 **Bonan** Chen Nai-Xiong
- 192 **Maipure** (Arawak) Raoul Zamponi
- 193 **Kiliwa** (Siouan) M. Mixco
- 199 **Miluk Coos** (Coosan) Anthony Grant
- 200 **Karbardian** (East Circassian) John Colarusso
- 201 **Irish Aidian** Doyle
- 202 **Qae** Evelyn Todd
- 203 **Bilua** Evelyn Todd
- 204 **Ket** Edward J. Vajda
- 205 **Finnish** Borje Vähämäki
- 206 **Ancashino Quechua** S. Hernán Aguilar
- 207 **Damana** (Chibcha) María Trillos Amaya\*
- 208 **Embera** (Chocó) Daniel Aguirre\*
- 209 **Hiligaynon / Ilonggo** Walter L. Spitz
- 210 **Lobire** Moses Kwado-Kambou
- 211 **Fering** (Northfrisian, Germanic) Karen Ebert
- 212 **Udmurt** (Finno-Ugric) Erberhard

\* = already published



Winkler  
 213 **Ancient Greek** Silvia Luraghi  
 214 **Chiwere** Siouan N. Louanna Furbee & Jill D. Davidson  
 215 **Chuckchee** (Paleosiberian) Alexander Volodin  
 216 **Chiriguano** Wolf Dietrich  
 217 **Latvian** Nicole Nau\*  
 222 **Tyvan** G. Anderson & D. Harrision\*  
 225 **Slovenian** Ch. Gribble  
 227 **Malayalam** Rodney Moag  
 242 **Modern Scots** Alexander T. Bergs  
 251 **Xakas** Gregory Anderson\*  
 252 **Old Saxon** James E. Cathey  
 254 **Saho** (East Cushitic) Giorgio Banti  
 255 **Udege** (Tungus-Manchu) Albina H. Girfanova  
 256 **Newari/Newar** E. Austin Hale  
 257 **Tyvan** (Turkic) Gregory Anderson  
 258 **Biri** (Pama-Nyungan) Angela Terrill\*  
 261 **Lingala** Michael Meeuwis\*  
 262 **Klallam** Timothy Montler  
 263 **Manchu** Carsten Naecher  
 266 **Chuj** Judith Maxwell  
 267 **Kaqchikel** Judith Maxwell  
 268 **Urak Lawoi'** David Hogan\*  
 273 **Bubbure** Andrew Haruna  
 274 **Romanian** Cynthia M. Vakareliyska  
 275 **Aragonés** Carlos Inchaurrealde  
 276 **Chagatay** A. Bodrogligeti  
 277 **Turkish** A. Bodrogligeti  
 278 **Isleño Spanish** Felice Coles\*  
 298 **Gheg** Pandeli Pani  
 300 **Nuu-chah-nulth** (Nootka) T. Nakayama  
 301 **Oneida** C. Abbott  
 302 **Sapuan** P. Jacq & P. Sidwell\*  
 303 **Oi** P. Jacq & P. Sidwell  
 304 **Talieng** P. Jacq & P. Sidwell  
 305 **Ostyak** I. Nikolaeva\*  
 306 **Ottoman** A. Bodrogligeti  
 307 **Faetar** Naomi Nagy  
 308 **Choctow** P. Kwachka  
 311 **Juang** Manideepa Patnaik  
 312 **Karitiana** L. Raccanello Storto  
 320 **Kawesqar** Oscar Aguilar F.  
 321 **Turkish** A. Bodrogligeti  
 322 **Shanghai** Sean Zhu  
 323 **Santali** Lukas Neukom  
 324 **Karaj** K. David Harrison  
 325 **Pileni** Åshild Naess  
 326 **Echie Ozo-Mekuri** Ndimele  
 327 **Judeo-Arabic** Benjamin Hary  
 328 **Tobelo** Gary Holton  
 329 **Ogbronuagum** E. Kari  
 330 **Old Nubian** Gerald M. Browne  
 331 **Taiwanese** Lilly L. Chen  
 332 **Kiswahili** Sakari B. Salone  
 333 **Wolof** Fallou Ngom  
 334 **Karao** Sherri Brainard  
 335 **Japanese** Yoshihiko Ikegami  
 336 **East Friesland** Yaron Matras &

Gertrud Reershemius  
 337 **Selayarese** Hasan Basri  
 338 **Old Church Slavonic** Boris Gasparov  
 339 **Malagasy** Charles Randriamasimanana  
 340 **Knming Chinese** Ming Chao Gui  
 341 **Warembori** Mark Donohue\*  
 342 **Honduran Spanish** Amanda Castro  
 343 **Santiagoño Quichua** Gerardo A. Lorenzino  
 344 **Mandarin Chinese** Hua Lin  
 345 **Chichewa** Mayrene Bentley  
 346 **Kimbundu** Emilio Bonvini  
 347 **Iranian Azari** Yavar Dehghani  
 348 **Persian** Yavar Dehghani  
 349 **Aljamiado Spanish** Vincent Hachard  
 350 **Chinook Jargon** Barbara Harris  
 351 **Judeo-Italian** Seth Jerchow  
 352 **Corfiote Judeo-Italian** Seth Jerchow  
 353 **Marwari** L.V. Khoklova  
 354 **Sudanese** Franz Müller-Gotama  
 355 **Neapolitan** Alberto Nocentini  
 356 **Italian** Alessandro Parenti  
 357 **Khmer** Tamara G. Pogibenko  
 358 **Somali** Annarita Puglielle  
 359 **Abkhaz** Bert Vaux  
 360 **Moroccan Arabic** Nasser Berjaoui  
 361 **Akan** Samuel Obeng  
 362 **Pre-Classical Chinese** Ken Takashima  
 363 **Korean** Sungeun Cho  
 364 **Tulu** D.N.S. Bhat  
 365 **Chuman Turkish** Timur Kocaoglu  
 366 **Pech** Dennis Holt\*  
 367 **Kuna** Joel F. Sherzer\*  
 368 **Dargwa** Sergei Taterosov

### Languages of the World/Text Library:

01 **Minhe Mangghuer Folktales** Zhu Yongzhong, Wang Xianzheng, Keith Slater & Kevin Stuart  
 02 **Xunhua Salar Folklore** Ma Wie, Ma Jianzhong & Kevin Stuart  
 03 **Huzhu Mongghul Folklore** Limushishiden & Kevin Stuart  
 04 **Huzhu Folklore Selections** Limushishiden & Kevin Stuart (eds.)  
 05 **Die udischen Evangelien der Gebrüder Bejanov (1893)** Wolfgang Schulze  
 06 **Anthology of Menominee Sayings** Timothy Guile  
 07 **Kawesqar Texts** Oscar Aguilar F.

### Languages of the World/Dictionaries:

01 **Minhe Mangghuer - English**

**Dictionary** Wang Xianzheng (*Qinghai Medical College*), Zhu Yongzhong (*Zhongchuan Junior Middle School*), Keith Slater (*Qinghai Junior Teachers' College*), & Kevin Stuart (*University of California, Santa Barbara*)  
 03 **Dictionary of Mbay** John Keegan\*  
 05 **Dictionary of Sango** Bradford & Bradford  
 06 **A Dictionary of Negerhollands** Robin Sabino & Anne-Katrin Gramberg  
 07 **Degema - English Dictionary** Ethelbert Kari  
 08 **Eudebe Dictionary** David Shaul  
 09 **A Short Bonan-English Dictionary** Chen Nai-Xiong  
 10 **A Short Dongsiang-English Dictionary** Chen Nai-Xiong  
 11 **A Short Mongour-English Dictionary** Chen Nai-Xiong  
 12 **A Short East Yugour-English Dictionary** Chen Nai-Xiong  
 13 **A Short Dagour-English Dictionary** Chen Nai-Xiong  
 14 **Tyvan dictionary** Gregory Anderson  
 15 **Xakas dictionary** Gregory Anderson  
 16 **Nhaheun - French - English Lexicon** Michel Ferlus (ed. by P. Jacq & P. Sidwell)  
 21 **Comparative West Bahnaric Dictionary** P. Jacq & P. Sidwell  
 22 **Palestinian Arabic-English / English-Palestinian Arabic Dictionary** Kimary Shahin  
 23 **Loven (Jruq) Consolidated Lexicon** Pascale Jacq & Paul Sidwell  
 24 **Boko/English Dictionary** Ross Jones  
 25 **Madi-English Dictionary** Mairi Blackings

### Languages of the World/Text Collections:

01 **Even- Texts** Andrej Malchukov  
 05 **Palestinian Arabic Texts** Kimary N. Shahin  
 07 **Tariana Texts** (North Arawak) Alexandra Aikhenvald\*  
 08 **Chinook Jargon** Zvezdana Vrzic  
 09 **Western Apache Texts** W.de Reuse  
 11 **Camling -Texts** Karen Ebert  
 12 **Itelmen - Texts** Jonathan David Bobaljik  
 14 **A Collection of Laz Spoken Texts (+CD-ROM)** Silvia Kutscher & Nuran Sevim Genç\*  
 15 **Saho Texts** Giorgio Banti  
 16 **Mbay Texts** John M. Keegan  
 17 **Der Ostfränkische Basisdialekt von**

## An Introduction to the Study of Morphology

VIT BUBENIK

*Memorial University of Newfoundland*

Each chapter (with the exception of the last one) is provided with pertinent exercises. Its data are taken from languages the author has been researching over the last twenty years (Latin, Greek, Turkish, Arabic, Hebrew, Sanskrit, Russian). Its argumentation is built around the major turning points in the history of morphology linked with scholars such as Hockett (1954), Matthews (1974), Bybee (1985), Dressler (1985), Bauer (1988), Spencer (1991), Carstairs-McCarthy (1992) and Aronoff (1993). In the last chapter the author explicates a cognitively conceived subdiscipline of Morphology in its relation to Formal Syntax, Generative Phonology, Functional Grammar, so-called Natural Morphology, Universal Grammar, and Typology.

**Contents:** Introduction, Grammatical Units, Paradigmatic and Syntagmatic Relations, Inflectional and Derivational Morphology, Inflectional Categories Associated with Nominal Elements, Inflectional Categories Associated with Verbal Elements, Morphosyntactic Properties and their Exponents, Morpheme and Allomorph, Derivational Morphology, Theoretical Models of Morphology, References.

ISBN 3 89586 570 2.

LINCOM Coursebooks in Linguistics 07.

Ca. 220 pp. USD 48 / DM 72 / £ 28.

## Structure and Interpretation in Natural Language

MARC AUTHIER & LISA REED

*The Pennsylvania State University*

The central objective of this book is to present an integrated theory of the syntax-semantic interface, one which combines the most recent advances in the generative framework with the basic tenets of model-theoretic semantics. The three opening chapters develop, in a step-by-step and highly accessible fashion, an approach to structure and meaning in these terms.

The remaining chapters show how this approach sheds light on three long-standing issues in formal grammar: the treatment of "syntactically-triggered" presuppositions, the treatment of some notable exceptions to the generative binding conditions, and the issue of the relative autonomy of syntax and semantics. With respect to the first issue, it is argued that a compositional treatment of syntactically-triggered presuppositions can be formulated as a condition which ties presuppositional triggers to a specific class of syntactic configurations definable in terms of devices found in Minimalist syntax. A subsequent chapter demonstrates that the empirical coverage of so-called Bare-Output Conditions in generative syntax can be increased if such conditions are made sensitive to the two types of semantic information which have sometimes been recognized in model-theoretic semantics; that is, extension expressions and implicature expressions. Finally, empirical evidence is adduced which supports the view that there are two distinct types of semantic constraints and that those which make reference to features of tree geometry can, under specific circumstances defined by representational Economy conditions, override those which do not.

**Audience:** Linguists, philosophers, computational and psycho-linguists, cognitive scientists; advanced undergraduates, graduate students and researchers in these fields.

ISBN 3 89586 603 2.

LINCOM Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 14.

210pp. USD 70 / DM 112 / £ 42.