Dual Nominalisation in Yukaghir: structural ambiguity as semantic duality

Elena Maslova,
Stanford University, University of Bielefeld

1   Problem

Tundra Yukaghir has a nominalisation construction that can be used to refer both to the event signified by the nominalised clause (as in (1)) and to a participant of this event (as in (2)), more specifically, to the sole (S) participant of an intransitive event or to the patient-like (P) participant of a transitive event. In what follows, I refer to these meanings as event-oriented and participant-oriented, respectively; the nominalisation construction will be referred to as **dual nominalisation** (or DN for short); its marker (-**uol**-) is shown in boldface in the examples.[1]

(1)   *tude ekya   kelu:-nu-da-ha   n'a:t'-in'   pulge-t'*
        3SG sister   come-PROG-3SG-DS   face-DAT   come.out-3SG
        *kewe:-j-**uol**-moraw-lek*]
        [go.away-0-DNR-PRSP-INSTR]
        'As his sister was coming (back), (he) went outside, so as to leave (in order to leave) right away.'

(2)   *e,   tuŋn'eŋ tude   ugurt'e oŋunbe-j-**uol**-moraw   tiŋn'i:-mele.*
        Intj it   [3SG   leg get.wet-0-DNR-PRSP]   pity-OF:3SG
        [Context: A cow does not want to get into a river.] "Oh, that's because it is afraid that its legs are going to soak." [Lit.: 'It pities its legs, which are going to get wet.']

A DN-phrase can also refer to a shared spatial domain of the DN-event and the matrix event, as in the following example:

(3)   *nondawjeŋ pel-**uol**-moraw-ha   ejuoke   gur-t'i:-nun-i*
        [arrow   reach-DNR-PRSP-LOC] close   become-HAB-3SG
        'He would come close enough for an arrow to reach (the deer).'

This range of meanings is presumably motivated by the original resultative semantics of this suffix (Krejnovič 1958: 104-105): roughly speaking, the result of an event can be construed as a state of affairs (hence the event-oriented meaning), a change in the state of the affected (S/P) participant, or otherwise in the state of the location of the event. In the context of the constructions described in this paper, this suffix is grammaticalised as a nominalisation device, and the only synchronically visible trace of its original resultative semantics is the relative past meaning associated with the DN-form; however, the DN-form can take a prospective suffix (-*moraw*-), which, in this context, expresses relative future meaning (see (1)-(3)).

---

[1] In (2), the ambiguity is resolved by the matrix verb, which cannot take sentential complements.

The location-oriented meaning is consistently distinguished by the locative case marking on the DN-form (*-ha* in (3)),[2] so that no ambiguity can arise between location-orientation, on the one hand, and event- and participant-orientation, on the other. In contrast to this, the ambiguity between event-orientation and participant-orientation often remains unresolved, as in the following example:

(4) *qad'ir tude moŋo-pul-hane men-delek kejeteŋ ma:-m*
     now   3SG   hat-PL-ACC   take-SS:PFV in.advance wait-3SG
     *tude ekya kelu-j-**uol**-moraw-le*
     [3SG sister come-0-DNR-PRSP-ACC]
     'He took his hat in advance and waited for his sister's arrival (or: waited for his sister, who was going to arrive).'

The use of an ambiguous construction in such contexts looks intriguing because Tundra Yukaghir also has unambiguous alternatives for both event-oriented and participant-oriented meanings, which can hardly be viewed as more structurally complex. The event-oriented meaning can be rendered by means of a formally similar event-nominalisation construction (as in (5)), and the participant-oriented meaning, by means of a head-final clause (as in (6)).

(5) *mit wa:j **jaba-l-gi** ma:-nu-j*
     we   also   die-ENR-3   wait-PROG-TR:1PL
     'We are waiting for his death, too.'

(6) ***jaba:-l'el-d'e** **kode-gi** joqodile-n-deŋ neme-n'e-reŋ*
     die-INFR-ATR   person-3 horse-COM-SS:IPFV what-COM-SS:IPFV
     kelu-j
     come-3SG
     'Her husband, who had been reported to have died, came home with horses and what not.'

The question is, then, how an ambiguous construction can "win" in the competition with unambiguous alternatives if the considerations of structural markedness do not seem to play any role, and, consequently, how such a construction can survive diachronically? The answer I am going to argue for looks quite different for transitive and intransitive DN-clauses: for transitive DN-clauses, the ambiguity is always resolved by the context, so the competing meanings are consistently kept apart; in contrast to this, the function of the intransitive DN-construction is to invoke both event-oriented and participant-meanings simultaneously. Its real semantics is not the disjunction of these meanings, but their conjunction.

The paper is organized as follows. After a short grammar note intended to simplify understanding of the examples, I devote a special section to the mechanism of cross-referencing grammatical possessors, which turns out to play a pivotal role in the analysis of the DN-construction and, in particular, in understanding the striking effect of transitivity on its semantics. The next two sections describe intransitive and transitive

---

[2] In this context, the locative case marker can be said to signal the orientation of the DN-clause and the role of its referent in the matrix clause at the same time.

DN-clauses. In the last section, I summarize the findings and attempt to pinpoint the source of the difference between transitive and intransitive DN-clauses, as well as the diachronic source of the dual semantics of the intransitive DN-construction.

Before we turn to a detailed analysis of the Yukaghir DN-construction, the following note is in order. The construction under discussion belongs to the intriguing domain of typological variation that lies between relativisation and complementation (see Croft (2001: 325, 347-353) for a recent overview). It would be a tempting prospect both to explore the cross-linguistic parallels and to draw insights from analyses of similar constructions in other languages. In the present paper, however, I refrain from directly introducing a typological perspective into the analysis of dual nominalisation in Tundra Yukaghir, primarily because I believe that any language-specific quirk deserves to be described in its own right and from its own perspective, and partly, of course, because of the limitations of space. For the same reason, the reader will find here no attempts to analyse this construction in terms of any specific linguistic theory; instead, I try to stick to what came be known (following R.M.W.Dixon) as "basic linguistic theory". For the linguistic domain under discussion, this amounts to adopting the general typologically-oriented descriptive framework developed in (Lehmann 1984; Keenan 1985; Noonan 1985; Comrie 1989: 57-73, 138-154).

2 Grammar note

The paper describes one of two extant Yukaghir languages, Tundra (or Northern) Yukaghir; although the other Yukaghir language (Kolyma Yukaghir) has a formally similar and doubtlessly diachronically related nominalisation construction, the languages appear to have considerably diverged as far as the semantic range of this construction is concerned. Moreover, some types of structures to be discussed here are extremely infrequent and seem to occur consistently only in the recorded speech of a generation born in the end of the 19th or in the very beginning of the 20th century. In these circumstances, there seem to be no way to obtain data of a reasonable degree of reliability in interviews with the living speakers of Tundra Yukaghir; as a matter of fact, it is very likely that the phenomenon, in the form described here, does not exist in the modern Tundra Yukaghir language anymore. The paper is therefore based almost exclusively on authentic text data, more specifically, on the corpus of texts collected by Gavrila Kurilov in the fifties and published in (Maslova 2001). This approach involves obvious limitations, yet allows for the highest degree of empirical adequacy attainable in such cases as this.

Tundra Yukaghir is a head-final language. There is a lexical distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs, consistently reflected in inflectional morphology, with only a very small marginal class of labile verbs. The roles of NP are marked primarily by morphological case, the linear position being only limitedly relevant. The case marking of core participants is basically nominative-accusative, with the exception of focal core participants: in the position of information focus, the primary participant (A) of a transitive verb retains the unmarked nominative form, whereas the S/P-participant takes an overt case marker. Non-focal third-person P remains unmarked in the context of first or second person A and, occasionally, in non-finite clauses.

Verbal morphology plays the major role in expressing the relations between clauses in complex constructions. There are virtually no adjectives, i.e. qualitative

lexemes are mostly verbs, with the exception of some that are nouns. This means that relative clauses play a major role in discourse, since almost all qualitative modifiers formally belong to this class. With some exceptions to be discussed in Section 5, all relative clauses are head-final. Oversimplifying the matter somewhat for the purpose of the present paper, there are subject-oriented and object-oriented attributive verb forms, so that the choice of verb form signals the role of the relativized NP. Other multiclausal constructions are based on verbal nominalisations (which are used, in different case forms, both for complementation and for adverbial subordination) and on a set of specialized switch-reference verb forms for clause chaining. The nominalised verb forms have the full range of nominal inflectional morphology.

3   Grammatical possession in nominalised and relative clauses

Nominal noun modifiers are unmarked for case and precede their head nouns, which can but need not take a possessive suffix *-gi* or *-de-* (depending on the case form), which cross-references the referent of the modifier.

(7)   a.   *taŋ   kode   leml'e-gi*
           that   person boss-3
           'that person's boss'
      b.   *taŋ   kode   leml'e*
           'that person's boss'

The semantic range of this construction is much broader than the core semantic domain of grammatical possession and can be used to encode virtually any semantic relation between entities. The invariant function of the modifying noun can be best described by means of Langacker's concept of "reference point" (1993). The presence of the cross-reference suffix on the head noun in this construction depends on a combination of context-dependent properties of the reference point (RP): it is more likely to be present if the RP is an established discourse topic and/or is somehow involved in the event being described (see Maslova (2003: 296-303) for a more detailed discussion).

   The same suffix serves for pronominal reference to RPs that are not coreferent with the subject of the same clause. Its reflexive counterparts are third-person reflexive pronouns *tude-* 'his, her' and *titte-* 'their'.

(8)   a.   *leml'e-gi* 'his/her boss' (non-reflexive)
      b.   *tude leml'e* 'his/her boss' (reflexive)

If a noun with the cross-reference suffix contains the regular nominal plural marker, it can signal both the plurality of its own referent and the plurality of the RP (so that *leml'e-pul-gi* can mean 'their boss', 'his bosses' or 'their bosses').

   The consistent distinction between reflexive and non-reflexive encoding provides an interesting diagnostic for the locus of NP in the constituent structure, which gives somewhat unexpected results for internal components of DN-clauses. Since the choice of pronominal reference to the RP is always controlled by the subject of the same clause, we would expect the possessor of a constituent of a DN-clause to be referred to by the reflexive pronoun if it is coreferent with the subject of this DN-clause and by the non-

reflexive suffix otherwise. In particular, the subject of a DN-clause cannot contain a reflexive possessive pronoun. This prediction holds for A-constituents: for instance, the possessor of A in (9), which happens to be coreferent with the subject of the matrix clause, is cross-referenced by the non-reflexive possessive suffix.

(9)   *naruot-**ki***   ***tude*** *aru: el-t'aw-j-uol-han   puŋuol-er tude marqil'*
       [people-3   3SG   word   NEG-cut-0-DNR-PROL] rejoice-SS 3SG daughter
       tadi-me-le   taŋ gode-ŋin'
       give-OF:3SG that   man-DAT
       'Glad that his$_i$ people obeyed his$_i$ word, he$_i$ gave his$_i$ daughter to that man (in marriage.'

For S-constituents, however, this is not the case: if the possessor of S is coreferent with the subject of the matrix clause, it is invariably represented by the reflexive pronoun, as in (1) and (10).

(10)   *tideŋ*   ***tude***   *gorat ahuol-uol-ha   kötke-t'*
       that   3SG   town   stand-DNR-LOC   arrive-3SG
       'He arrived to the place where his town used to be.'

Similarly, the reference to possessors is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause for the P-constituent of a transitive DN-clause: in (9), for example, the possessor of P is coreferent with the possessor of A and with the subject of the matrix clause (but not with A of the DN-clause); it is cross-referenced by the non-reflexive possessive suffix on A, but by the reflexive possessive pronoun on P. In other words, the participant that **can** be referred to by the DN-phrase is consistently treated as a constituent of the matrix clause for the purpose of cross-reference of grammatical possessors, independently of whether or not the given token of DN-construction is participant-oriented. As far as I can tell at the present time, this is the only fragment of Tundra Yukaghir grammar where the case form assignment and the linear position, on the one hand, and the mechanism of cross-referencing possessors, on the other, point to different loci in the constituent structure. This unique property is doubtlessly related to the event vs. participant ambiguity of the DN-construction.
        The subjects of nominalised and relative clauses can be treated as grammatical possessors (RPs) for the purpose of pronominal cross-reference, i.e. the possessive suffix on the DN-phrase cross-references the subject of DN-clause ((11b)-(11c)) and the plural marker indicates its plurality (as in (11c)). The contrast between (11a) and (11b) demonstrates that the choice between reflexive and non-reflexive reference is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause, according to the general rules:

(11) a. *laj-hudeŋ   titte   kelu-j-uol-han   me-l'irere-j-ŋa*
        back-DIR   3PL   come-0-DNR-PROL AFF-blow-PFV-3PL
        'They$_i$ blew back along the route of their$_i$ arrival.'
     b. *el-t'ahad'e-j-uol-**de**-moraw-lek   mo:j-m   lukul.*
        NEG-move-0-DNR-3SG-PRSP-INSTR hold-3SG soil
        'The ground pressed him$_i$ so that he$_i$ could not move.'

c. *met   t'i: ki:-j-uol-**pe-gi***
   1SG   people   give-0-DNR-PL-3
   '(the thing) given to me by my relatives'

In head-final relative clauses, the possessive suffix cross-referencing the subject is attached to the head noun:

(12)   *tideŋ   kuril'i-me-le   ja:n   kazak-**gi***
        that   know-OF-3   three   Cossack-3
        'those three Cossacks he knew"

A DN-clause can also function as a prenominal noun modifier, in which case it can take no inflectional suffixes. This function reveals a sharp contrast between transitive and intransitive DN-clauses. A transitive prenominal DN-modifier is a P-oriented restrictive clause:

(13) a. *la:meduor-pe titte   köde-ŋin'   apta-j-**uol**   kiliep*
        puppy-PL   3PL   person-DAT gather-0-DNR   bread
        '(the) bread that puppies had gathered for their master.'
     b. *tideŋ   korel   n'ied'i-j-**uol**   gorat-pe*
        that   devil   talk-0-DNR   town-PL
        '(the) towns described by that devil'

As in other relative clauses, the possessive suffix on the head noun cross-references the subject of the DN-clause; if the subject of the DN-clause is coreferent with the subject of the matrix clause, the reflexive possessive pronoun is used instead:

(14) a. *tideŋ   t'ire-s-**uol**   emd'e-**pul-gi**   me-mönd'es-ie-m.*
        that   drown-CAUS-DNR brother-PL-3   AFF-wake.up-INGR-TR(3)
        'That younger brother, drowned by them, began to wake them up.'
     b. *qad'ir eguojiedaha   **titte**   uore-j-uol   lukunburebe-ha*
        DP   tomorrow   their   point-0-DNR   land-LOC
        ma:lahrut   n'i-nu:-relek   me-n'umud'e-ŋi
        from.sides   RCP-find-SS:PFV   AFF-settle-3PL
        'Next day, they met at the place they had appointed and made a camping site there.'

In other words, the possessive suffix on the head noun of a prenominal DN-clause points to the same referent as the same suffix on the DN-form in other constructions.

In contrast to this, an intransitive DN-modifier occurs only with head nouns that open a valence slot for a nominal modifier, which is filled by the DN-phrase. This construction does not involve relativisation and follows the general possession-like pattern exemplified in (7), with the DN-clause in the regular nominal position of grammatical possessor. Remarkably, the class of possible head nouns in this construction is limited to those compatible with sentential complements, even though the intended interpretation of the DN-clause can be participant-oriented (as in (15b)):

(15) a. *taŋ   t'i:-pe-gi   pot'esej-ŋu-da-ha   o:ren'e-j-**uol**   jawul-**gi***
[those people-PL-3 send-PL-3-DS   cry-0-DNR]   trace-3
'the (her) trace of her crying at the time when her people sent her away.'

 b. *tuŋ   lukunburebe ön'id'e-ŋola:-j-**uol**   kit'il-**gi** waŋt'i:-t'e-r*
[this   soil   sand-become-0-DNR]   end-3SG search-VEN-SS
kewej-te-jl'i.
go-FUT-1PL
'Let's go look for the end of the soil that has turned into sand.'

 c. *qad'ir   me-kelu-j,   med'uol-**uol**   t'ajle-**gi**   kol-da-ha*
now   AFF-come-3SG   be.born-DNR   day-3   come-3SG-DS
'Now he$_i$ came on his$_j$ birthday (when the day of his birth/his birthday arrived).'

In this construction, the possessive suffix on the head noun is obligatory. A non-trivial question, however, is what is actually cross-referenced by this suffix. If the construction conforms to the general properties of possessive constructions like in (7), it must be the referent of the modifier (i.e. of the DN-phrase). This answer is doubtful, however, since, as a rule, this suffix cannot refer to events, but only to specific topical entities. The alternative answer is that the possessive suffix cross-references the subject of the DN-event, i.e. that it has the same meaning as the possessive suffix on the DN-form itself, but must be located on the head of the noun phrase, as in other constructions with clausal modifiers (in particular, in the construction with a transitive DN-modifier). Apart from the better agreement with the overall semantics of the possessive suffix, this analysis would account for the semantic constraints on the head noun: indeed, if the possessive suffix must refer to the subject of the modifier, then the modifier must describe an event. The point is, however, that the grammar of Tundra Yukaghir is organized in such a way that there can be no direct evidence in favour of one or the other analysis, since the subject of an intransitive DN-modifier can be coreferent neither with the subject of the matrix clause nor with a participant of the speech situation. The specific locus of this construction in the overall network of grammatical constructions seems to endow its possessive suffix with dual reference, i.e. the apparent referential ambiguity can be viewed as a result of multiple inheritance (Goldberg 1995: 97-98): on the one hand, this construction instantiates the possessive-like scheme exemplified in (7) and the possessive suffix thus inherits the referential link to the modifier as a whole; on the other hand, it is an instance of the DN-construction, in which the possessive suffix points to the subject of the nominalised clause.

This ambiguity transparently mirrors the event vs. participant ambiguity, which is the major focus of the present paper. In particular, both referential links point to the same entity under the participant-oriented interpretation (as in (15b)). An essential property of the referential ambiguity of the possessive suffix is that it need not be resolved by the listener; on the contrary, both the S-participant and the DN-event serve as natural reference points for the head noun, so that both referential links are relevant for interpretation. As I will try to show in the next section, essentially the same duality of meaning (rather than ambiguity) characterizes intransitive DN-clauses in general.

4 Ambiguity revisited: the case of intransitive DN-clauses

As described in Section 3, intransitive DN-clauses differ from transitive DN-clauses in that they cannot form head-final relative clauses. This reflects a more general property of the intransitive DN-construction: the S-oriented interpretation is available only if the DN-clause contains a lexical S-constituent, e.g.:

(16) a. *ma:rquon' erime   eju:-j-uol-ek   l'e-j*
     only   [snow   fall-0-DNR-F] be-3SG
     'There was nothing but snow that had fallen.'
  b. *e,   tuŋn'eŋ tude ugurt'e oŋunbe-j-**uol**-moraw   tiŋn'i:-mele.*
     Intj it   [3SG leg get.wet-0-DNR-PRSP]   pity-OF:3SG
     [Context: A cow does not want to get into a river.] "Oh, that's because it is afraid that its legs are going to soak." [Lit.: 'It pities its legs, which are going to get wet.']

In other words, if the intransitive DN-construction is used as a relative clause, it must be internally headed. As a result, the domain of potential event vs. participant ambiguity is limited to DN-clauses with internal S. The most remarkable feature of this class of sentences is that the overwhelming majority of them are semantically compatible with both interpretations, as in the following examples:

(17) a. *met pulij-uolde   mit en'ie   jaba-j-**uol**-hane   ahal'we-reŋ*
     1SG brother.in.law-TOP [1PL mother   die-0-DNR-ACC] smile-SS:IPFV
     janduo-n'
     sleep-3SG
     'As for my brother-in-law, he slept laughing at our mother's death [or: at our mother who has died.'
  b. *band'y:t-pul ejk   me-neme-pe-leŋ   kelu-j-**uol**-moraw-pe-da-hane*
     [bandit-PL or   AFF-what-PL-F   come-0-DNR-PRSP-PL-3-ACC]
     mörd'e-s-ŋa
     hear-CAUS-3PL
     'They let us know about some bandits or whoever they were who were going to arrive. [or: about some bandits' pending arrival].'

Furthermore, the S-oriented reading and the event-oriented reading do not contradict, but rather complement each other: so, for example, the news referred to in (17b) obviously includes both the information about the bandits and the information about their pending arrival. This property is probably best demonstrated by contrasting sentences with the same matrix verb that can take both a DN-clause and an unambiguously event-oriented nominalisation as a complement, cf.:

(18) *qad'ir tude   moŋo-pul-hane   men-delek   kejeteŋ   ma:-m*
     now   3SG   hat-PL-ACC   take-SS:PFV in.advance wait-3SG
     *tude   ekya   kelu-j-**uol**-moraw-le*
     [3SG sister come-0-DNR-PRSP-ACC]

'He took his hat in advance and waited for his sister's arrival (or: for his sister, who was going to come.'

(19) *mit wa:j jaba-l-gi   ma:-nu-j*
      we   also   die-ENR-3SG wait-PROG-TR:1PL
      'We are waiting for his death, too.'

Waiting for someone's arrival is, under the most likely interpretation (which is indeed intended in (18), as can be judged from the context), essentially the same thing as waiting for someone who is going to arrive. In contrast to this, waiting for someone's death (as in (19)) can be interpreted as waiting for someone who is going to die only under most unusual circumstances (e.g. if the conversation takes place in heaven, which is certainly not the case in the example under discussion). The DN-construction seems to occur if the intended interpretation comprises both meanings, so it can be hypothesized that it is precisely this dual meaning that is expressed by this construction. An obvious corollary is that the apparent ambiguity between event-orientation and participant-orientation is not supposed to be resolved; rather, both semantic structures have to be taken into account by the listener.

In this strong form, the hypothesis of dual meaning implies that every token of the intransitive DN-construction must be compatible with both event-oriented and participant-oriented interpretation, i.e. both the DN-event and its S-participant are involved in the matrix event in the role indicated by the case form of the DN-phrase. There are two classes of counterexamples to this implication. First, there are unambiguously event-oriented intransitive DN-clauses without internal S, e.g.:

(20) a. *eguojie   juora-j-uol-moraw-lek   n'ied'i-ŋi*
        [tomorrow   play-0-DNR-PRSP-INSTR]   discuss-3PL
        'They arranged to play the next day.' ('They talked so as to play tomorrow.')
     b. *mo:rquon'   ielger   kötke-j-uol-e   kurel'i-mele*
        only   [the.other.side arrive-0-DNR-ACC]   know-OF:3SG
        'He only knew that he reached the other side.'

An obligatory property of all such sentences is that the S-participant of the DN-event also participates in the matrix event: if it is coreferent with the subject of the matrix clause, it is simply dropped (as in (13));[3] if it is coreferent with another participant of the matrix clause, it is cross-referenced by means of the possessive suffix on the DN-form (see (11b)). Otherwise, it must be referred to within the DN-clause by means of a lexical NP. Thus, the unambiguously event-oriented instances of intransitive DN-clauses occur only if the S-participant is involved in the matrix event in another role.

The second set of counterexamples comprises unambiguously participant-oriented instances. Such examples are extremely rare (as a matter of fact, sentences given in (16) are the only clear examples of this type in my corpus), so that any statements about this structure are bound to be speculative. In both attested cases, however, the DN-clause is not intended to restrict the referential domain of its S-constituent; rather, the DN-event is

---

[3] Note that the same-subject construction deviates from the general nominalisation-based pattern of possessive subject encoding (see Section 3) and conforms instead to the pattern characteristic of other event-denoting non-finite clauses (such as non-finite components of clause chains).

invoked because it constitutes an essential component of the matrix semantic structure: in (16a), the snowfall is the reason why there is nothing but snow; in (16b), the prospect of the legs getting wet is the reason why they are pitied.[4] Exactly as in the first class of counterexamples, both the DN-event and its S-participant are involved in the matrix event, but in different roles; the only difference is that here the case marking on the DN-form indicates the role of S in the matrix clause (rather than the role of the DN-event, as in the previous case).

These considerations suggest that the hypothesis of dual meaning must be reformulated in a somewhat weaker form: the intransitive DN-construction is used when both the DN-event and its S-participant constitute essential components of the matrix event. The impression of unresolved ambiguity between event-orientation and participant-orientation arises when they can be assigned identical case roles in the matrix event. Otherwise, the case marking on the DN-phrase is most likely to be motivated by the role of the DN-event in the matrix clause, but can also occasionally signal the role of the S-participant. In the former case, the S-constituent of the DN-clause is dropped; in the latter, the participant must be overtly referred to within the phrase that carries the case marker signalling its role in the matrix event, which yields the internally headed relative clause structure.

5   Ambiguity revisited: the case of transitive DN-clauses

Exactly like in the case of intransitive DN-clauses, the availability of the participant-oriented interpretation of transitive DN-clause is constrained in terms of its internal structure, and this constraint mirrors its properties in the function of noun modifier. The resulting effect, however, is quite opposite. As described in Section 3, a transitive DN-clause in the prenominal position functions as a restrictive modifier of an externally headed P-oriented relative clause and contains no internal P-constituent. The same structural constraint applies to all participant-oriented usages, i.e. a transitive DN-clause can form a headless relative clause (as in (21)), but not an internally headed one.

(21) a. *met   pun'-uol-hane   el-lew-ŋu-han*
       [1SG   kill-DNR-ACC] NEG-eat-3PL-IMP
       'Let them not eat what I have killed.'
    b. *qol-l'e   tet   qohi-j-uol?*
       Where-is   [2SG   dig-0-DNR]
       'Where is what you have dug?'

The domain of potential ambiguity is therefore reduced to DN-clauses without internal P. In contrast to what is observed for intransitive DN-clauses, however, this ambiguity is always resolved by the context. The DN-based headless P-oriented relative clause is used if the participation of the intended referent in the DN-event provides the most specific possible description of that referent; see (21). In contrast to this, the P-constituent of an event-oriented DN-clause can only be dropped if its referent is specific, highly activated and can be recovered from the immediate context. The sentence in (22) gives a good example of an appropriate context: the dropped P-participant is not only the main

---

[4] Semantic conditions of the same type seem to apply to internally headed relative clauses in Korean and Japanese (Kim 2004)

protagonist of the story, but his role in the DN-event is mentioned within the same sentence, in the restrictive clause that modifies the subject:

(22) *tideŋ   t'a:rt'eqa:n-hane pun'i:-t'e-r   kel-l'el-d'e   t'i: ma:lej-r*
      those   Ch.-ACC   kill-VEN-SS come-INFR-ATR people surprised-SS
      *titte pun'-**uol**-moraw-hane   janaspejre-ŋa.*
      [3PL kill-DNR-PRSP-ACC] forget-3PL
      'Those people who came in order to kill Charchehan~i~ were so surprised that they forgot that they were going to kill him~i~.'

This context-based condition effectively precludes the participant-oriented interpretation of an event-oriented DN-clause, insofar as the use of a headless relative clause for a highly activated referent is extremely unlikely (if possible at all). Thus, in a sharp contrast to the dual meaning of the intransitive DN-construction, the event-oriented and participant-oriented meanings of the transitive DN-construction appear in quite different contexts and are therefore consistently kept apart.

However, the distinction between event and participant orientation is neutralized in the role of prenominal restrictive modifier: in this role, a transitive DN-clause is P-oriented in the obvious sense, yet it does not refer to the P-participant. This construction is connected with the transitive DN-clause in nominal roles by two other constructions, which exhibit a mixture of "prenominal" and "nominal" properties. First, the transitive DN-modifiers differ from all other types of noun modification in terms of the linear position: whereas all other modifiers must be prenominal, a DN-clause can also function as an adjoined relative clause.

(23) a. *n'ohodahil   albe-de-han   **ul'ege-lek**   quduo-l'el-u-l,*
        bed   under-3-PROL   grass-F   lie-INFR-0-SF
        *alhan   pukol'a-ta-j   monu-r   kuderej-**uol**-gi*
        HORT   soften-FUT-3SG   say-SS   put-DNR-3
        'There was some hay under her bed, put there [by her] in order to make it softer (lit. 'saying "let it be softer"')'
     b. ***taŋ   ja:n   gode-k***   *tada: l'e-ŋu-l,   lajer-**uol**-pe-gi*
        those   three   people-F   there   exist-PL-SF   leave-DNR-PL-3
        'There were only those three people there, those left by them.'

The DN-form of this construction shares the lack of case marking with the prenominal usages discussed in Section 3, yet its subject is cross-referenced on the DN-form itself, like in the independent nominal functions.

Another unique property of transitive DN-clauses is their ability to serve as restrictors of universal pronouns, *nemeŋol-* (inanimate) and *kinuol-* (animate); these pronouns are incompatible with any other type of restrictive modifiers. The relative linear order of the DN-clause and the pronoun is free:

(24) a. *wal'be-pe, tit-ul   met legu-t-**uol**-moraw   neme-ŋol-l'elk   ew-l'e*
        friend-PL, 2PL-P 1SG eat-CAUS-DNR-PRSP what-UNV-NOM NEG-exist(3)
        'Friends, there is nothing I could feed you with.'

b. *neme-ŋol-l'elk   lew-j-**uol**-mora:w-**gi**   ew-l'e.*
   what-UNV-NOM eat-0-DNR-PRSP-3   NEG-exist(3)
   'He had nothing to eat.'

As demonstrated by (24b), the DN-form in this function can also take the possessive suffix cross-referencing the subject. The case role must be marked on the pronoun, yet the case marking on the DN-form can be absent or present, apparently depending on the intended semantics, more specifically, on the presence of the event-oriented meaning in the semantic structure of the sentence. In (25a), the DN-form takes an accusative marker, which presumably indicates that the heroine forgot not only everything she was going to do, but also the very intention of doing something. In (25b), the DN-form remains unmarked, and the context suggests that the protagonist knows that the event of appointment is going to take place (so the event-oriented meaning is ruled out).

(25) a. *apanala:-gi aq   puŋuole-r neme-ŋol-**leŋ**   wie-j-**uol**-moraw-**le***
        wife-3   only rejoice-SS what-UNV-ACC make-0-DNR-PRSP-ACC
        janaspejre-m.
        forget-3SG
        'His wife was so delighted that she forgot whatever she was going (had) to do.'
    b. *kin-uol-leŋ   ögete-j-**uol**-moraw-pe-gi   el-gurel'i:*
        who-UNV-ACC   appoint-0-DNR-PRSP-PL-3   NEG-know(3SG)
        'He did not know anyone whom they could appoint.'

From the semantic point of view, this construction comes most closely to the headless relative clause construction (as in (21)), in that the DN-clause is P-oriented (since it is its P-participant that must be linked to the universal pronoun) and provides the most specific possible description of the P-participant. On the other hand, the DN-clause itself is also event-oriented in the sense that the case marking on the DN-form can signal the role of DN-event in the matrix event. The properties of the construction with universal pronouns suggest that the transitive DN-construction, exactly like the intransitive one, can be participant-oriented and event-oriented simultaneously. The difference is that the case marker on the DN-form can signal either the role of P or the role of DN-event, but not both of them. A universal pronoun introduces an additional site for signalling the case role of the P-participant and thereby opens the possibility to mark the role of the DN-event on a participant-oriented DN-form.

6   Conclusion: Dual Nominalisation and transitivity effects
To sum up the findings presented so far, the DN-construction combines event-oriented and participant-oriented meanings independently of whether the nominalised verb is transitive or intransitive. Another shared property of transitive and intransitive DN-constructions is that the participant-oriented interpretation is ruled out if the relativisable participant is highly activated and recoverable from the context, so that it is not overtly represented within the DN-clause. In all other respects, transitive and intransitive DN-constructions behave quite differently; more specifically, there are two major distinctions. First, the intransitive DN-construction can form only internally headed relative clauses, whereas the head of a transitive relative DN-clause is either absent or external. Second,

the case marker on an intransitive DN-form can, and most often does, signal both the role of the DN-event in the matrix event and the role of its relativisable participant simultaneously, whereas the case marker on a transitive DN-form signals either the former or the latter, but never the both.

These striking distinctions seem be determined simply by the fact that the relativisable participant of an intransitive DN-clause (S) coincides with its reference point (i.e. with the potential controller of the possessive cross-reference suffix), whereas in the transitive DN-construction these properties characterize two distinct participants (P and A, respectively). To begin with, the external head of a prenominal DN-clause must take the possessive suffix that is otherwise attached directly to the DN-form and cross-references the subject (A/S); see Section 3. Yet this suffix can by no means be coreferent with the noun to which it is attached, which would necessarily have been the case for intransitive head-final DN-clauses (if they had existed). This conflict effectively blocks the possibility of regular (i.e. head-final) relativisation of S by means of the DN-construction and thus keeps the relativised S within the DN-clause. There is obviously no such conflict for transitive DN-clauses, so they naturally conform to the general (head-final) relativisation strategy.

Further, since an intransitive participant-oriented DN-clause must contain an internal S, the ambiguity between participant-orientation and event-orientation cannot be resolved by the context-dependent activation status of the relativisable participant (as it happens in the case of transitive DN-clause). As a result, the use of such DN-clauses in communication is limited by the ever-present competition with unambiguous encoding options for participant-oriented and event-oriented meanings, that is, with the head-final S-oriented relativisation, on the one hand, and with the event nominalisation, on the other (see Section 1). It seems quite likely that the ambiguous option would be likely to win in such a competition only if both interpretations conform to the intended meaning; otherwise, an unambiguous option would be preferred. Diachronically, the semantic range of the intransitive DN-construction must have been shaped by the competition with unambiguous alternatives, and the dual semantics of the construction (as described in Section 4) looks like quite a natural outcome of this process.

References

Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. 2nd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar. Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Keenan, Edward L. 1985. Relative clauses. In: Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description. Vol. II. Complex constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 141-170.

Kim, Min-Joo. 2004. *Event-structure and the internally-headed relative clause construction in Korean and Japanese*. University of Massachusetts (Amherst) Ph.D. dissertation.

Langacker, Ronald. 1993. Reference-point constructions. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4(1): 1-38.

Lehmann, Christian. 1984. *Der Relativsatz: Typologie seiner Strukturen, Theorie seiner Funktionen, Kompendium seiner Grammatik.* Language Universals Series 3. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Maslova, Elena (ed.) 2001. *Yukaghir Texts*. Tunguso-Sibirica 7. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Maslova, Elena. 2003. *A Grammar of Kolyma Yukaghir.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Noonan, Michael. 1985. Complementation. In: Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description. Vol. II. Complex constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 42-140.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 – person, ACC – accusative, AFF – affirmative, ATR – attributive, CAUS – causative, COM – comitative, DAT – dative, DIR – directional, DN – dual nominalisation, DNR – dual nominaliser, DS – different-subject, ENR – event nominaliser, F – focus, FUT – future, HAB – habitual, HORT – hortative, IMP – imperative, INFR – inferential, INGR – ingressive, INSTR – instrumental, Intj – interjection, IPFV – imperfective, LOC – locative, NEG – negative, OF – object-focus, PFV – perfective, PL – plural, PROG – progressive, PROL – prolative, PRSP – prospective, RP – reference point, SF – S-focus, SG – singular, SS – same-subject, TOP – topic, TR – transitive, UNV – universal, VEN – venitive.