

Reciprocals in Yukaghir languages

Elena Maslova

Institute for Linguistic Research, St. Petersburg
University of Bielefeld

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Grammatical notes	3
3.	Constructions with the preverbal reciprocal marker	4
4.	Constructions with syntactic reciprocal markers	9
5.	Means of expressing reciprocal arguments	13
6.	Non-prototypical use of the morphological reciprocal marker	18
7.	Means of expressing related meanings	22
8.	Notes on reciprocals in Tundra Yukaghir	24
9.	Etymological notes	27

1. Introduction

1.1 The Yukaghir languages. The Yukaghir languages are spoken in several little villages in the Yakut Republic, in the basin of the Kolyma river. These languages are considered either an isolated group or a sub-family of the Uralic-Yukaghir family. There are now approximately 150 native speakers of Tundra (Northern) Yukaghir, and less than 50 speakers of Kolyma (Southern) Yukaghir. Since the reciprocal constructions in Tundra Yukaghir have been described elsewhere (Krejnovich 1958:120; Maslova 1989), the present paper is mainly concerned with the Kolyma Yukaghir data. However, all the significant differences between these languages are summarized in Section 8, so as to give the whole picture of the Yukaghir reciprocals.

For the last several centuries the area of the Kolyma river basin has been characterized by extensive language contacts and almost obligatory polylingualism; now only the eldest generation of Yukaghirs is polylingual (most of them speak Yukaghir, Even, Yakut, and Russian). The lingua franca was Yakut till the middle of the present century. Now it is Russian. Kolyma Yukaghir is presently not spoken by people under fifty, with only few exceptions. Spontaneous Yukaghir speech contains numerous

instances of interference from Russian and Yakut and "code-switches," some specific Yukaghir grammatical patterns being regularly replaced by loan-translations from Russian. Hence there are considerable difficulties in collecting reliable data.

The present study is based mainly on a collection of texts (Nikolaeva 1989) and on texts recorded by Nicholaj Vakhtin and myself on field trips in 1987 and 1992. Some additional data were provided by my informants in response to a questionnaire on reciprocals.¹

1.2 The reciprocal marker. The Yukaghir languages have a preverbal reciprocal marker *n'(e)-* (Tundra *n'i(ŋ)-*). This marker is highly specialized, i.e., with a few exceptions (see 6.3, 6.4), it never expresses any non-reciprocal meanings. It occupies the same linear position within the verb form as the reflexive marker *met*, so that these morphemes cannot be combined within one verb form. Thus, the reciprocal and reflexive meanings are treated by Yukaghir grammar as opposed members of one category, but are not expressed by the same formal marker (which is a typologically frequent case), cf.:

- (1) a. *met tudel juö*
I he see(1SG:TR)
'I saw him.'
- b. *mit n'e-juö-ji:l'i*
we REC-see-1PL:INTR
'We saw each other.'
- c. *tudel met-juö-j*
he REFL-see-3SG:INTR
'He is looking at himself.'

Both the reciprocal and the reflexive decrease verb valency, which in the vast majority of cases results in formal shift from the transitive agreement pattern to the intransitive one (see 2.1).

This morpheme is the only means of expressing the reciprocal meaning in the Yukaghir languages; i.e., there are no pronominal expressions like *each other* or any other derivational or inflectional means. In some cases, however, this prefix is attached to postpositional stems, and the resulting words function as free syntactic reciprocal markers.

2. Grammatical notes

2.1 Syntax. Yukaghir is an SOXV language, yet the word order is rather flexible. "Pro-drop" and verb-deranking procedures are widely employed in text formation, so that a Yukaghir sentence generally looks like a chain of clauses, with only one finite verb in the end of the sentences, and often without explicit subjects and objects; non-final verb forms contain switch-reference indicators. The most extraordinary feature of the Yukaghir syntax is its focus-marking system, which involves both noun and verb inflection; in Kolyma Yukaghir only intransitive subjects and direct objects can receive grammatical focus marking (in Tundra Yukaghir, transitive subjects are involved in this system as well).

Verbs fall into two main classes, transitives and intransitives, which take different sets of agreement markers. The choice of an agreement marker is also involved in the focus marking system, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Verb agreement markers

Subject person/numbe r	Intransitive verbs		Transitive verbs	
	neutral	subject-focus	neutral	object-focus
1SG	<i>-je</i>	<i>-l</i>	<i>-∅</i>	<i>-me</i>
2SG	<i>-jek</i>	<i>-l</i>	<i>-mek</i>	<i>-me</i>
3SG	<i>-j</i>	<i>-l</i>	<i>-m</i>	<i>-mele</i>
1PL	<i>-ji:l'i/-i:l'i</i>	<i>-l</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>-l</i>
2PL	<i>-jemet</i>	<i>-l</i>	<i>-met</i>	<i>-met</i>
3PL	<i>-ŋi</i>	<i>-ŋil</i>	<i>-ŋa:</i>	<i>-ŋile</i>

The case marking is basically accusative, but with some important deviations from the "prototypical" accusative system: first, 3d person direct objects have the basic (nominative) case form if the subject of the sentence is 1st or 2d person (1st and 2d person pronouns have a special accusative form which is employed for encoding direct objects only in clauses with 1st or 2d person subject). Secondly, the focus case marker is assigned according to an ergative-like rule (to intransitive subjects and direct objects only). There are also dative, instrumental, comitative and a set of locative case forms; in addition, there is a set of postpositions employed mainly for marking locative relations.

2.2 Verb morphology

2.2.1 General notes. Yukaghir is a highly synthetic and essentially agglutinative language; suffixation prevails. The number of prefixes amounts to five (two prefixes of polarity, the reflexive and the reciprocal, and prefix of irrealis); these morphemes are characterized by a looser connection with the stem than the suffixes, so that the boundary between a prefix and its stem may be described as internal open juncture. For example, clustering of vowels on morpheme boundaries is prohibited within the postfixal part of a word, but possible on a "preverbal" boundary, cf. *n'e-aji-* 'to shoot each other'. The

prefixes thus may be viewed as a somewhat intermediate case between bound morphemes proper and free preverbs.

2.2.2 Valence-changing means. Yukaghir has the following valence-changing means:

1. Valence-increasing suffixes
 - a) several causative suffixes, cf. *a:-* 'to make' > *a:-š-* 'to cause somebody to make';
 - b) a non-productive applicative suffix *-re-/ri-*, cf. *jaqte-* 'to sing' > *jaqte-ri-* 'to sing about something/somebody'.
2. Valence-decreasing affixes:
 - a) a productive object-oriented resultative suffix *-o:(l)*, cf. *ide-* 'to sew' > *id-o:(l)-* 'to be sewn';
 - b) a few non-productive detransitive suffixes, cf. *juö-* "to see" (vt) > *juö-de-* 'to look' (vi).
 - c) the reciprocal and reflexive prefixes (see 1.2).

2.2.3 Aspect and tense. The tense/aspect system is characterized by the domination of aspect. Yukaghir has an elaborate system of various aspect/aspectoidal suffixes (ingressive, continuative, a few iterative markers with slightly different meanings, semelfactive, etc.). As for grammatical tense, only future vs. non-future opposition is expressed morphologically (the interpretation of non-future forms depends on the aspectual meaning of the stem); past tense may be marked either by periphrastic forms or by means of an evidential marker *-l'el-* 'V appears to have happened, or is said to have happened'.

3. Constructions with the preverbal reciprocal marker

3.1 "Canonical" reciprocal constructions

3.1.1 Reciprocal constructions with underlying transitive verbs²

1.1.1.1 Reciprocal constructions with underlying genuine transitives. The main formal type of reciprocal constructions is illustrated by the following examples:

- (2) a. *tudel met-kele kigiji:-m*
 he I-ACC jab-3SG:TR
 'He is jabbing me.'
- b. *uöre-p-tie juöde-t n'e-kigiji:-ŋi*
 child-PL-DIM play-SS REC-jab-3PL:INTR
 'Children are playing and jabbing each other.'
- (3) a. *tudel met-kele šešpedarjil'-ge totčoš-um*
 he I-ACC door-LOC press-3SG:TR
 'He pressed me to the door'

- b. *mit n'e-totčoš-i:l'i šešpedaŋil'-ge*
 we REC-press-1PL:INTR door-LOC
 'We pressed each other to the door.'

Here the reciprocal prefix marks cross-coreference between the subject and the direct object of a transitive verb. The verb gets an intransitive agreement marker (in most cases, plural, cf. 5.3). This type of reciprocal transformation is absolutely productive and regular, i.e., a reciprocal construction with a given verb is possible whenever the lexical meaning of this verb allows for a reasonable reciprocal interpretation.

1.1.1.2 Reciprocal constructions with underlying applicatives. Reciprocal derivation from applicatives can be viewed as a way to combine the reciprocal meaning with an intransitive verb (cf. 1.1.2, 2.2.1): a verb is first transitivized by means of the applicative suffix *-re-/-ri-*, and then the reciprocal construction is derived according to the canonical model described in 3.1.1.1, cf. the following example:

- (4) a. *tudel jaqte-j*
 he sing-3SG:INTR
 'He is singing.'
- b. *tudel met-kele jaqte-ri-m*
 he I-ACC sing-APPL-3SG:TR
 'He is singing about me.'
- c. *tiŋ šoromo-pul n'e-jaqte-ri-ŋi*
 this man-PL REC-sing-APPL-3PL:INTR
 'These men are singing about each other.'

The exact meaning of the applicative marker, i.e. the semantic role of the resulting direct object, is determined lexically, by the initial verb stem, cf. some other examples: *aja-* 'to be glad, to rejoice' > *aja-re-* 'to be glad to see somebody, to rejoice at somebody' > *n'e-aja-re-ji:l'i* 'we rejoice at each other, we are glad to see each other'; *kimdan'e-* 'to lie, to tell lies' > *kimdan'e-ri-* 'to deceive somebody' > *n'e-kimdan'e-ri-ŋi* 'they are deceiving each other'.

There exists one reciprocal verb containing the applicative suffix for which there is no initial applicative verb, i.e. the applicative functions just as a means for deriving the reciprocal, cf.:

- (5) *n'e-kebie-rej-nu-l'el-ŋi kin qaduonge modo-lo:l mieste-ge*
 REC-leave-APPL-ITER-EVID-3PL [who where live-RES place-LOC]
 'They used to leave each other and go each to his own place.'

The initial intransitive is *keb(ej)-* 'to leave'; although the resulting reciprocal verb seems to have a dispersive meaning like 'to disperse, to part', it may be taken as a "canonical" reciprocal, under the assumption that the applicative suffix promotes the

participant being left by the Actor to the direct object position (**kebie-re-* 'to leave somebody' > *n'e-kebie-re-* 'to leave each other')³.

The reciprocal constructions with underlying applicative verbs often contain an additional syntactic reciprocal marker (see 2.2.2 for examples and discussion).

1.1.2 Reciprocal constructions with underlying two-place intransitives. The reciprocal maker is easily combinable with intransitive verbs, but the resulting construction almost obligatory involves a syntactic reciprocal marker derived from a postpositional stem; this construction type is discussed Section 2. There is only one reliable example of the reciprocal construction derived from an intransitive verb without this additional marker⁴, cf.:

- (6) *tamun-pe* *n'e-erd'i-t* *n'e-juö-din* *erd'i-t* *mon-nu-l'el-ŋi*
 [this-PL REC-wish-SS] REC-see-INF wish-SS say-ITER-EVID-3PL:INTR
 'Since they wanted each other, wanted to see each other... they used to say:...'

The first clause contains a formally intransitive verb with the reciprocal marker, but no syntactic reciprocal marker, yet the reciprocal relation is further specified in the next clause by the use of the reciprocal infinitive *n'e-juö-din* 'to see each other' (< *juO-* 'to see') as a complement of the same verb. This example seems to show that a syntactic reciprocal marker is not formally obligatory with reciprocals derived from intransitives: what seems to be essential is just an additional specification of the semantic relation that undergoes the reciprocal transformation. Another sort of evidence in favor of this claim is given by the fact that the reciprocal prefix easily combines with intransitive lexical reciprocals without any additional marking (see 4.1): it implies that the reciprocal constructions under discussion are not ruled out by the grammar, but rather avoided because of their ambiguity (see 2.2.1 for further discussion and examples).

1.1.3 Reciprocal constructions with underlying bitransitive verbs. The canonical reciprocal constructions derived from bitransitive verbs are almost absent from existing Yukaghir texts. However, this seems to be implied simply by the fact that direct objects of such verbs are usually inanimate; thus, there are natural pragmatic restrictions on reciprocal referential situations, and, consequently, on reciprocal transformation. If, however, a speaker of Yukaghir is able to imagine a reciprocal situation, (s)he easily derives the corresponding reciprocal construction, which usually involves a slight shift in the lexical meaning of the verb. As demonstrated by the following set of examples with the verb *tadi-* 'to give (something to somebody)', a similar semantic shift occurs in the corresponding reflexive construction, cf.:

- (7) a. *met tud-in met legul tadi*
 I he-DAT my food give-(1SG:TR)
 'I gave my food to him.'
 b. *jen šoromo-pul nuk-telle*
 [other man-PL meet-SS:PFV]
n'e-tad-ij-a:-nu-ŋi
 REC-give-MULT-INGR-ITER-3PL:INTR

'When they meet other men, they usually begin to give each other (up), to betray each other.'

- c. *šukedie ta:t eskeri-l'ie-l'el-um*
 pike then attack-INGR-EVID-3SG:TR
tamun-ge oqill'a: el-met-tadi-l'el
 this-LOC perch NEG-REFL-give-EVID(3SG:INTR)
 'Then the pike attacked. The perch did not give up.'

Another example of a referentially rare situation which makes the reciprocal interpretation of a bitransitive verb possible is given in (8), cf.:

- (8) *ataqlo:-t n'e-kes'i-ŋi*
 be-two-SS REC-bring-3PL:INTR
 'The two of them brought each other (if, for example, one of them was blind and the other lame).'

These examples demonstrate that the restrictions on this diathesis type are semantic (or pragmatic), but not formal. Thus, the initial direct object may be involved in reciprocal transformation whenever the corresponding reciprocal situation can take place, independently of any other features of the valence pattern of the initial verb.

1.2 "Dative" reciprocal constructions. The bitransitive verbs allow also the reciprocal transformation involving subject and indirect object, cf. the following example:

- (9) a. *tude legul-get met-in qarte-m*
 his food-ABL I-DAT share-3SG:TR
 'He shared his food with me (=he gave me some of his food).'
 b. *legul-e n'e-qarte-ŋi-k*
 food-INST REC-share-PL-IMP
 'Share your food with each other!'

In this construction type, the initial direct object retains its syntactic status, so that the resulting construction is syntactically transitive. As for the formal marking of (in)transitivity, i.e. the choice of an agreement marker, both variants proved to be possible, cf. the following examples:

- (10) a. *legul-ek n'e-kes'i-l*
 food-FOC REC-bring-1PL:OF
 'We have brought food to each other.'
 b. *mit nier-pe n'e-kes'i-ji:l'i*
 our clothes-PL REC-bring-1PL:INTR
 'We brought our clothes to each other.'

In (10) the verb is marked for 1PL of the subject by means of the object-focus (hence transitive) suffix, while in (10) the intransitive agreement marker is chosen. A tentative explanation of these variations may be as follows: the canonical reciprocal (see 3.1.1), representing the main and the most productive diathesis type of the reciprocal constructions, does imply an obligatory shift from the transitive agreement paradigm to the intransitive one, and this general rule appears to be able to "override" the real syntactic transitivity in the more marginal construction type discussed here.

The transformation under discussion often involves causative verbs (with the indirect object representing the Causee), cf.:

- (11) a. *met tud-in los'il-ek čine-š-me*
 I he-DAT firewood-FOC chop-CAUS-1SG:OF
 'I asked him to chop firewood, and he chopped firewood for me.'
- b. *mit los'il-ek n'e-čine-š-ul*
 we firewood-FOC REC-chop-CAUS-1PL:OF
 'We chopped firewood for each other, according to each other's request.'

As illustrated by the translation of (11), a benefactive interpretation of the causative situation ('A asked B to do something' > 'B did something for A') usually prevails in the meaning of the corresponding reciprocal construction, so that my informants always preferred a translation like 'A and B did something for each other', rather than 'A and B did something according to each other's request/order.'

1.3 "Possessive" reciprocal constructions

1.3.1 Reciprocal constructions with possessive pronouns. There are only few examples which can be ascribed to the possessive-reciprocal type in my data. These examples fall into two formally completely different groups. In one group of such sentences the transitive verb has the reciprocal marker, while the direct object is represented by an NP with a possessive pronoun coreferent with the subject, cf.:

- (12) a. *tude nier čumu šašahat-um*
 his clothes all tear-3SG:TR
 'He has torn all his clothes.'
- b. *titte nier n'e-šašahat-ŋile*
 their clothes(FOC) REC-tear-3PL:OF
 'They have torn each other's clothes.'⁵

The resulting sentences are transitive both syntactically and formally (cf. the transitive (object-focus) agreement markers in (12)).

1.3.2 Direct object included within the scope of the reciprocal marker. There are also two examples where the nominal stem representing the initial direct object is inserted between the reciprocal marker and the verbal stem, cf.:

- (13) *zooparke-ge ob'ez'ana-pul n'e-n'as'in modo-t*
 zoo-LOC monkey-PL REC-to:face sit-SS
n'e-pöme-aŋs'i-ŋi
 REC-louse-search-3PL:INTR
 'In the Zoo monkeys are sitting face to face and looking for each other's lice' (< *aŋs'i:-* 'to search, to look for' (vt)).
- (14) *taŋ odu-pe taŋ kukujerd'i:-pe n'e-ažu-medi:-nunnu-l'el-ŋi*
 that Yukaghir-PL that Even-PL REC-word-perceive-HAB-EVID-3PL:INTR
n'e-ažu-medi:-t n'e-qamie-ŋi
 REC-word-perceive-SS REC-help-3PL:INTR
 'Those Yukaghirs and those Evens understood each other's language; since they understood each other's language, they helped each other.' (< *medi:-* 'to hear, to perceive, to understand' (vt)).

It should be stressed that these sentences cannot be described as resulting from attaching the reciprocal suffix to the direct object, since the nominal stems involved lack the accusative marker (which is obligatory with a 3d person subject, see 2.1), and the verbs get intransitive agreement markers. Thus, formally these examples represent an incorporation-like phenomenon (otherwise not characteristic of Yukaghir).

The compound form *n'e-pöme-aŋs'i-jejl'i* 'we are looking for each other's lice' (< *aŋs'i:-* 'to look for') is found in the texts collected by Jochelson (1900:47), but this is the only example of this type of his data. The correctness of this compound was confirmed by my informants in 1987 (cf. (13)). The second example is taken from a text written down by myself in 1992, but I have not managed to get any other instances of this phenomenon during my field work. It thus remains unclear whether there are strong lexical restrictions on this phenomenon, or it is a rare (perhaps marginal), but free (with respect to the lexical items involved) type of the possessive-reciprocal derivation.

2. Constructions with syntactic reciprocal markers

2.1 Syntactic reciprocal markers. Reciprocal constructions of more marginal and rare diathesis types are derived by means of what may be called syntactic reciprocal markers, which can be used either in combination with morphological reciprocal marking (see 2.2) or alone (see 2.3). These markers are derived from postpositional stems by means of the reciprocal prefix *n'e-*. The most frequent and most semantically neutral syntactic reciprocal marker is *n'e-molho-n* 'among themselves', cf.:

- (15) *ta:t n'e-molho-n mojie-d'e-t el-lejdi-ji:l'i id'i:*
 so REC-among-PROL mix-DETR-SS NEG-know-1PL:INTR now
kin qodimie omni: o:gi
 [who which kin be-POSS]
 'Having merged with each other, we do not know now who comes from which kin.'

All the syntactic reciprocal markers with the initial postpositions are listed in (16):

- (16) ***n'e-molho-n*** (REC-among-PROL) 'among our/your/themselves' < *molho* 'among, between';
n'e-arqa (REC-near) 'near each other' < *arqa* 'near';
n'e-larji, n'e-larjin (REC-DIR) 'to each other' < *larji, larjin* 'to';
n'e-n'as'-in (REC-face-DAT) 'to each other, at each other' < *n'as'-in* 'to, at, opposite to' (< *n'as'e* 'face');
n'e-al'-in (REC-at-DAT) 'to each other, near each other' < *al'a*: 'near, to, at, by';
n'e-jela: (REC-after) 'after each other, following each other' < *jela*: 'after';
n'-ijer (REC-separately) 'separately' < *ijer* 'separately from'.

Besides, there is one stem which is currently used only in combination with the reciprocal prefix and various locative postfixes: **malohu-* 'side' > ***n'e-malohu-*** 'both sides', cf.:

- (17) *tarj jalhil-ge n'e-malohu-larjden arjs'i-t kewej-l'el-ri*
 this lake-LOC REC-side-PROL search-SS go-EVID-3PL:INTR
 'They went to search (for him) on both sides of this lake.'

These compounds are also frequently used as syntactic reciprocal markers, cf.:

- (18) ***n'e-malohu-de juö-de-ri***
 REC-side-DIR look-DETR-3PL:INTR
 'They are looking at each other (in each other's direction),'

see also (22b), (23c).

2.2 Syntactic reciprocal markers combined with morphological reciprocals

2.2.1 Reciprocal constructions with underlying intransitives. As mentioned in 1.1.2, the reciprocal constructions with underlying intransitive verbs normally involve one of the syntactic reciprocal markers, cf.:

- (19) a. *tudel tude terike-riin mon-i*
 he his wife-DAT say-3SG:INTR
 'He said to his wife...'
 b. *tittel n'e-larji n'e-mon-ri*
 they REC-DIR REC-say-3PL:INTR
 'They said to each other...'
- (20) a. *met tet larjin ejme-je*
 I you DIR look-1SG:INTR
 'I am looking at you.'

- b. *n'e-n'as'in* *n'e-ejme-ŋi*
 REC-to:face REC-look-3PL:INTR
 'They are looking at each other face to face.'

(21) a. *tiŋ as'e met numö al'a: uldo:-j*
 this deer my house to be:tied-3SG:INTR
 'This deer is tied to my house.'

- b. *n'-al'-in* *n'e-uldo:-ŋi*
 REC-to-DAT REC-be:tied-3PL:INTR
 'They are tied to each other.'

As these examples show, it is not the case that one and the same postpositional stem must be employed in the initial non-reciprocal construction for marking the participant involved in the reciprocal transformation, on the one hand, and in the syntactic reciprocal marker, on the other: for example, the Addressee of the verb *moni-* 'to say' has the dative case form (see (19a)), while the reciprocal construction makes use of the directional postposition *larji* (see (19b), (20a)). This transformation thus cannot be described formally as a simple replacement of an NP governed by a postposition with the reciprocal marker (indicating its cross-coreference relation with the subject), as the pair of examples in (21) might suggest. It seems that speakers are relatively free in their choice of the postpositional stem for the syntactic reciprocal marker, to the extent that this stem must specify the exact semantic relation between the reciprocal arguments, cf. the following pair of examples where this choice determines the semantic interpretation of the reciprocal constructions:

- (22) a. *mit jo:bi: n'e-jela: n'e-ewr-i:l'i*
 we in:forest REC-after REC-go-1PL:INTR
 'We were walking around in the forest, following each other, in each other's tracks.'
- b. *ediŋ pulut-pe n'e-ma:lohu-de n'e-ewre-ŋi*
 this old:man-PL REC-side-to REC-go-3PL:INTR
 'These old men go to each other's places, hither and thither.'

These examples show that this construction type can express reciprocal relations involving not only arguments of the verb, but adverbial NPs as well (cf., for example, (22b)). As a result, an intransitive verb itself does not specify the semantic relation that undergoes the reciprocal transformation, and an additional marker of this relation proves to be necessary. However, the use of this marker is by no means grammaticalized, cf. 1.1.2.

2.2.2 Reciprocal constructions with underlying applicatives. As described in 1.1.1.2, the reciprocal constructions are derived from applicative verbs according to the canonical model. Nevertheless, these constructions often contain syntactic reciprocal markers, exactly as in the corresponding constructions with intransitives (see 2.2.1), cf.:

- (23) a. *met-ket irke-s'*
 I-ABL be:frightened-3SG:INTR
 'He was frightened by me.'
- b. *met-kele irkuo-re-m*
 I-ACC be:frightened-APPL-3SG:TR
 'He was frightened by me (direct object).'
- c. *n'e-malogu-larjde-t n'e-irkuo-r-i:l'i*
 REC-side-DIR-ABL REC-be:frightened-APPL-1PL:INTR
 'We were frightened by each other.'
- (24) *tolow-pe n'e-n'as'in oho:-t n'e-ejme-ri-ŋi*
 deer-PL REC-to:face stand-SS REC-look-APPL-3PL:INTR
 'The deer are standing opposite each other and looking at each other.'

Thus, the applicatives inherit some behavioral properties of the initial intransitives, although formally the constructions under discussion should be ascribed to the canonical type described in 3.1.1.

2.3 Syntactic reciprocal markers combined with non-reciprocal verbs

2.3.1 Oblique-reciprocal constructions with underlying transitives. The oblique-reciprocal meaning with transitives is expressed by means of the syntactic reciprocal marker *n'e-molho-de-gen* 'among themselves', derived from the postpositional stem *molho* 'among' (cf. *mit molho* "among us") in the prolativ case form, cf.:

- (25) a. *neme a:-lo:l-gele met-ket ahidi:-m*
 [what make-RES-ACC] I-ABL hide-3SG:TR
 'He is hiding from me what he has done.'
- b. *n'e-molho-de-gen mit ahidi:-j neme a:-lo:l*
 REC-among-POSS-PROL we hide-1PL:TR [what make-RES]
 'We are hiding from each other what we have done.'

Note that the verb in such a construction cannot adjoin the reciprocal marker, since this would entail a "canonical" reciprocal meaning (cf. *n'e-ahidi:-* 'to hide each other'); the verb retains its transitive agreement markers.

2.3.2 Object-oriented reciprocal constructions. The Yukaghir reciprocal prefix cannot derive object-oriented reciprocal constructions; however, a symmetrical relation expressed by means of a syntactic reciprocal marker (i.e., by the reciprocal marker attached to a postpositional stem) may take place between two (semantically and syntactically equal) objects, cf. the following examples with the verb *ulte-č-* 'to tie (many objects)':

- (26) a. *n'e-larjin ulte-č-ie-m*
 REC-DIR tie-DSTR-INGR-3SG:TR
 'He began to tie (them) to each other.'

- b. *tude touke-pul n'-ijer ulte-č-um*
 his dog-PL REC-separately tie-DSTR-3SG:TR
 'He tied his dogs separately from each other.'

As shown by these examples, the constructions of this type express a meaning like 'to cause a symmetrical relation' and usually involve lexical or morphological causatives. Note that the verb is not marked for the reciprocal meaning (see also 6.3 about causative reciprocal constructions in Tundra Yukaghir).

3. Means of expressing reciprocal arguments

3.1 Case marking. Reciprocal arguments may be expressed

1. by one NP marked for plurality (i.e. a noun or pronoun with the plural marker *-pe-/-pul-*), cf. for example, (6), (13), and (24), or a plural personal pronoun, cf. (11),
2. (19), or
3. by two (or more) distinct NPs.

An NP representing both reciprocal arguments (type 1) may either have the basic (nominative) case form (see examples above), or be case-marked for focus, cf.:

- (27) *mit-ek n'e-kigiji:-l*
 we-FOC REC-jab-SF
 'We are jabbing each other.'

If reciprocal arguments are expressed by a distinct NP each (type 2), then one of the NPs is in the nominative case form, the other one is usually marked by the comitative case marker *-n'e*, cf.:

- (28) *parna: qahiel-n'e ataqlo:-t n'e-šörileš-ut modo-ŋi*
 crow loon-COM be:two-SS REC-paint-SS sit-3PL:INTR
 'The crow and the loon, the two of them, were sitting and painting each other.'
 (Nikolaeva 1989, Text 5).

- (29) *odu-pe kukujerd'i-pe-n'e n'e-nuk-telle n'e-lejtej-ŋi*
 Yukaghir-PL even-PL-COM REC-meet-SS:PFV REC-learn-3PL:INTR
 'Yukaghirs and Evens met each other and got to know each other.'

Much less frequently, all NPs representing reciprocal arguments appear in the basic (nominative) form, cf. (14) and

- (30) *ponžube momuša: šu:kedie n'e-es'keri:-lo:-pe-gi*
 wood-grouse momusha pike REC-attack-RES-PL-POSS⁶
 'How a wood-grouse, a *momusha*⁷ and a pike attacked each other.' (Nikolaeva 1989, Text 6).

In contrast with the cases when the both reciprocal arguments are expressed by a single NP, the second construction type is intended to keep the different (although semantically equal) arguments apart, so that the relations between the reciprocal arguments and the corresponding NPs may be schematically presented as follows:

(31)

reciprocal arguments	A	B
NPs	NP ₁	NP ₂ (-n'e)

This is essential for the correct interpretation of sentences where one or both of these NPs are in the plural form (as in (14), (29)): such sentences express reciprocal relations either between two "collective" arguments (in these examples, between Yukaghirs and Evens as two peoples), or between single members of one group and single members of another group „in pairs“, but not within one group, so that formally one and the same noun form *odupe* 'Yukaghirs' names all the reciprocal arguments in a sentence like (32), but only one "collective" argument of a reciprocal relation in (14), (29).

3.2 Quantifiers. The distinction between prototypical reciprocal situations (with two reciprocal arguments) and "multiple" situations (with more than two participants involved in reciprocal relations "in pairs") is regularly expressed by lexical means, namely, a reciprocal clause may contain either of two quantifiers: *ataqlo:t* 'being two, two of them' or *čumut* 'all of them', cf. (28) and the following:

(32) *odu-pe tuda: čumut n'e-lejdi:-nunnu-l-el-ŋi*
 Yukaghir-PL that.time all REC-know-HAB-EVID-3PL:INTR
 'At that time all Yukaghirs knew each other.'

Both the quantifiers can be used anaphorically and thus function as the only means of lexical representation of the reciprocal arguments in a clause, cf.:

(33) *ataqlo:-t n'e-šörileš-ŋi*
 be:two-SS REC-paint-3PL:INTR
 'Two of them painted each other.' (Nikolaeva 1989, Text 5).

(34) *kimd'i:-t čumut n'e-leŋ-ŋi*
 fight-SS all REC-eat-3PL:INTR
 'In fighting, they all ate each other.' (Nikolaeva 1989, Text 45).

3.3 **Verb agreement.** As has already been mentioned, the subjects are often dropped in Yukaghir, so the reciprocal arguments are represented only by the verb agreement markers (cf. (9), (12),

3.4 (20)). The reciprocal verbs usually have plural agreement markers, independently of the type of lexical representation of the reciprocal arguments (cf. (28) and the (nominal) plural marker on the nominalized verb in (30)), i.e., the verb agrees with the NP expressing all the reciprocal arguments as a "unitary" object. Yet this is not obligatory when one of the reciprocal arguments is represented by a comitative NP, cf. the following example:

- (35) *irkid'e ti: modo-je lige-je pulut-n'e*
 once [there live-ATTR] [be:old-ATTR] old:man-COM
n'e-nu:-l'el
 REC-find-EVID(3SG:INTR)
 'Once he met with a very old man living there.' (< *nu(g)*- 'to find, to meet').
 (Nikolaeva 1989, Text 31).

Here an NP representing one of the participants of the reciprocal situation is dropped anaphorically, and another participant is represented by a comitative NP. The reciprocal verb form has a singular agreement marker, i.e. the agreement is controlled by the dropped NP alone, so that one of the reciprocal arguments is represented by the agreement marker, the other, by the comitative NP.

Finally, it should be mentioned that a reciprocal verb form may be used impersonally, hence without any agreement markers, cf. the following example, where the reciprocal verb is marked as an action nominal:

- (36) *olbut i:s'e-le n'e-kigiji:-l ij'l'i-s'*
 [dead:tree sharp:edge-INST REC-jab-ANR] be:terrible-3SG:INTR
 'It is terrible to jab each other with the sharp edges of a dead tree.'

3.5 Syntactic relations

3.5.1 **Alternative syntactic interpretations.** The subject of a reciprocal construction is easily identifiable when the reciprocal arguments are represented either by one NP or by a chain of NPs in the nominative form: both the case marking and the obligatorily plural verb agreement indicate that the reciprocal arguments are represented on the surface level by one subject constituent. This reciprocal diathesis may be schematically presented as follows:

- (37)
- | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| reciprocal arguments | A | B |
| NPs | S | |

As for reciprocal constructions with comitative NPs, the evidence from verb agreement is controversial, since both the whole comitative complex NP+NP-COM (cf. (28)) and the nominative NP alone (cf. (35)) may control the verb agreement. The question is thus whether these constructions represent the same reciprocal diathesis (37), or another one, with the subject expressed by the nominative NP alone, i.e. whether or not the comitative NP may be taken as an autonomous constituent (comitative object), as in the following scheme:

(38)

reciprocal arguments	A	B
NPs	S	ComO

The list of subject properties which might give additional criteria for resolution of this question is as follows:

1. The subjects express the addressee phrase of imperatives (cf. Keenan 1976:321).
2. The subjects control switch-reference indicators within non-final verb forms (cf. Keenan 1976:315).
3. The subject is the only syntactic relation in an intransitive sentence that allows morphological focus-marking.

3.5.2 Evidence from imperative sentences. The first criterion gives a piece of evidence in favor of the solution presented in (38), i.e. there do exist imperative reciprocal sentences in which one of the reciprocal arguments functions as the addressee phrase, while the other is expressed by a comitative NP, cf.:

- (39) *n'e-lejtej-k* *met numö šoromo-pul-n'e*
 REC-learn-IMP:2SG my house man-PL-COM
 'Make the acquaintance of my family.' (lit. 'Make the acquaintance of each other with my family').

Imperative sentences representing diathesis (37) exist as well, cf. (9) and

- (40) *el-n'e-kudde-ŋi-le-k*
 NEG-REC-kill-PL-PROH-IMP:2
 'Do not kill each other.'

However, such examples do not contradict the non-subject interpretation of the comitative NP: since the addressee phrase is absent from the sentence, it can hardly be taken to be expressed by a comitative complex.

3.5.3 Evidence from the switch-reference procedure. This criterion is applicable to the problem under discussion only to a limited extent, since the Yukaghir switch-reference procedure allows both same-subject and different-subject marking in case of part-whole and set-element relations between the subjects of two clauses. It is exactly this

type of relation that holds between the reciprocal arguments of one clause, on the one hand, and one of these arguments as the subject of another (non-reciprocal) clause, on the other, hence there are predictable variations in switch-reference marking.

However, there are some examples that seem to demonstrate that the reciprocal arguments may be treated by Yukaghir grammar as syntactically different constituents, cf.:

- (41) *n'e-nuk-lu-ge-ne* *met-in* *šar-ek* *kej-l'ie-nu-mle*
 [REC-find-1PL-DS-COND] I-DAT something-FOC give-INGR-ITER-3SG:OF
 'If we meet each other, he starts to give me something.'

Here the subject (*he*) and the indirect object (*me*) of the main clause represent reciprocal arguments of the subordinate (reciprocal) clause; although the agreement marker within the subordinate verb form is 1PL, i.e., it expresses both reciprocal arguments (*I + he*), the switch-reference marker indicates that the subject of the reciprocal clause is not coreferent with the subject of the main clause.

The referential situation in the next example is apparently very similar: the reciprocal arguments of a subordinate clause are coreferent with the subject (=addressee of the imperative) and the object (*this man*) of the main clause. However, the switch-reference procedure treats this situation in the opposite way, cf.:

- (42) *tiŋ* *šoromo* *čobu-n* *örd'e* *laŋin* *n'e-kenmi:-t* *joqto-ŋi-k*
 this man sea-ATTR middle DIR REC-accompany-SS lead-PL-IMP
 'Lead this man to the middle of the sea, accompanying each other.'

An explanation of the different treatment of these cases by the switch-reference procedure can be based on the general empathy hierarchy SPEAKER > HEARER > THIRD PERSON. On the basis of this hierarchy, it may be assumed that the reciprocal arguments in (41) and (42), if not dropped, would have been expressed by comitative complexes like *met tude-n'e* 'I with him' and *tit tiŋ šoromo-n'e* 'you (PL) with this man' respectively (not **tudel met-n'e* 'he with me' and **tiŋ šoromo tit-n'e* 'this man with you'). If this reconstruction is accepted, the subject of the main clause appears to be coreferent with a comitative NP in (41), but with a nominative NP in (42), and it is this distinction that is reflected by switch-reference marking.

Due to the variations in switch-reference marking mentioned in the beginning of this subsection, this piece of evidence cannot be taken as a definitive argument in favor of the objecthood of comitative NPs representing a reciprocal argument (as suggested by the scheme in (38)). What seems to be clear, however, is that the switch-reference procedure distinguishes between what may be called the primary reciprocal argument (normally expressed by a nominative phrase) and the secondary reciprocal argument (normally expressed by a comitative phrase), so that it is the former one whose coreference with the subject of another clause is likely to be marked within a dependent verb form.

3.5.4 Evidence from focus-marking. The focus-marking procedure can be applied neither to the comitative complex, nor to the nominative NP within such a

complex, so neither of the two candidates for subjecthood possesses this property (which is rather essential within the Yukaghir syntax). This criterion thus cannot be applied to the problem under discussion. However, this fact seems to be interesting in itself, insofar as it indicates that both candidates for subjecthood are far from what may be taken as the "prototypical" (intransitive) subject in Yukaghir. Note that an NP representing both reciprocal arguments does possess this property, cf. (27).

To sum up the discussion: reciprocal arguments are most frequently expressed by one (subject) constituent (see scheme (37)), which may be represented either by a single NP or by a complex containing several NPs. In some cases, however, a nominative NP and a comitative NP expressing reciprocal arguments are treated as autonomous constituents and play significantly different roles in the syntactic procedures. In order to explain these cases, the alternative diathesis (which ascribes the subject syntactic relation to the first reciprocal argument and the oblique object relation to the second one) may be suggested as one of the options for the reciprocal constructions ("discontinuous" reciprocal construction, as in (38)). Although the data presented above does not provide definitive arguments in favor of the oblique objecthood of the comitative NP, yet it clearly demonstrates that the choice of the first reciprocal argument may have syntactic consequences similar to those entailed by the choice of the subject.

4. Non-prototypical use of the morphological reciprocal marker

4.1 The reciprocal marker with lexical reciprocals. The morphological reciprocal marker can be attached to a verb expressing a symmetrical predicate, independently of its initial transitivity, cf.:

- (43) a. *čejlu*:- 'to be far' > *n'e-čejlu*:- 'to be far from each other.'
 b. *kimd'i*:- 'to fight' > *n'e-kimd'i*:- 'to fight with each other.'
 c. *titimie*- 'to be the same as X, to be like X' > *n'e-titimie*- 'to be the same, to be like each other.'
 d. *šaqal'e*- 'to gather (vi)' > *n'e-šaqal'e*- 'to gather with each other.'

The following set of examples illustrate the use of the reciprocal marker with an intransitive lexical reciprocal, cf.:

- (44) a. *lebie-n pugil'-pe čumut šaqal'e-delle mon-ŋi* [...]
 [earth-ATTR lord-PL all gather-SS:PFV] say-3PL:INTR
 'All lords of the earth gathered and said: [...]' (Nikolaeva 1989, Text 9).
 b. *n'e-šaqal'e-delle n'ied'i-t ani-pe mol-l'el-Ni*
 REC-gather-SS:PFV speak-SS fish-PL say-EVID-3PL:INTR
 'Having gathered with each other, in speaking, the fishes said:...'
 c. *čumut n'e-šaqal'e-š-telle n'ied'i-nnu-l'el-ŋi*
 all REC-gather-CAUS-SS:PFV speak-HAB-EVID-3PL
 'They used to gather and speak (with each other).'

Here the initial verb (*šaqal'e-* 'to gather'), the formally reciprocal verb (*n'e-šaqal'e-* 'to gather with each other'), and the reciprocal derived from the causative (*šaqal'e-š-* 'to gather somebody/something' > *n'e-šaqal'e-š-* 'to gather each other') are used in referentially equal situations, without any significant semantic shift. Note, however, that the latter is a case of canonical reciprocal derivation from a transitive verb, while the simple reciprocal *n'e-šaqal'e-* is an instance of the reciprocal derivation from an intransitive verb, which in the case of a non-symmetrical initial predicate should have been 'supported' by a syntactic reciprocal marker (see 2.2.1). On the basis of this distinction, the occurrence of semantically "parallel" examples like in (44) may be explained as a result of the interaction of the following two factors:

1. The intention to highlight the reciprocal nature of a referential situation, which results in adding the morphological reciprocal marker to a lexical reciprocal.
2. The grammatical preference for the S+DO type of reciprocal transformation, which leads to the employment of the causative transformation in order to match the canonical pattern.

The syntactic reciprocal markers can be employed for highlighting reciprocity as well, cf.:

- (45) *n'e-molho-de-gen* *kimd'ie-l'ie-l'el-ŋi*
 REC-among-POSS-PROL fight-INGR-EVID-3PL:INTR
 'They began to fight with each other, among themselves.'

4.2 The reciprocal marker with terms of kinship. The reciprocal prefix may be adjoined to some terms of kinship denoting relations within a generation, cf.:

- (46) a. *met emd'e-pul* *čumut amde-ŋi*
 my younger.sibling-PL all die-3PL:INTR
 'All my younger brothers and sisters died.' (Nikolaeva 1989, Text 29.)
- b. *ja:n n'-emd'e-die* *modo-l'el-ŋi*
 three REC-sibling-DIM live-EVID-3PL:INTR
 'There lived three brothers.' (Nikolaeva 1989, Text 21.)

In (46a) the noun *emd'e* 'younger sibling' denotes a set of persons by naming their relation to another person (in this case, to the speaker); in (46b) the same noun expresses the relation which holds within the set of persons denoted by this noun, and the reciprocal prefix marks this situation (lit. 'each other's siblings'). Note that the semantic component 'younger' is neutralized in this context.

In my Kolyma Yukaghir corpus, the reciprocal prefix is found only in combination with the nominal stem *emd'e* 'younger sibling'. In Tundra Yukaghir the following instances of this phenomenon are found: *n'ij-emd'e-jil'-pe* '(all) younger brothers', *n'ij-aka-jil'-pe* '(all) elder brothers', *n'ij-eki-jil'-pe* '(all) elder sisters', *n'i-n'uge-jil'-pe* '(all) cousins', *n'i-d'anmi-jil'-pe* '(all) elder brothers' (all the examples and translations are taken from (Krejnovich 1982:44)). The component *-jil'* in these forms is, according to Krejnovich (1982:43), an ancient plural marker (*-pe-* is the regular plural marker).

4.3 Non-reciprocal meanings of the reciprocal marker. The reciprocal marker in Yukagir is highly specialized, i.e. there are almost no instances of non-reciprocal use of this morpheme. However, there are some unique examples of this kind in my corpus, which are all listed below.

4.3.1 Referential chaining. The reciprocal from the intransitive verb *kebej-* 'to leave' signifies the chaining situation ('A left after B, B left after C etc.', cf. (Lichtenberk 1985; Kemmer 1993:100-101)); this interpretation is supported by the obligatory use of the syntactic reciprocal marker derived from the postposition *jela:* 'after, behind' in such clauses, cf.:

- (47) a. *tudel met jela: kewe-s'*
 he I after leave-3SG:INTR
 'He left after me.'
- b. *n'e-jela: n'e-kewe-s':l'i*
 REC-after REC-leave-1PL:INTR
 'We are leaving together, one after another.'

(compare a similar example with another verb of motion in (22a)). Note that in order to derive the reciprocal proper from this verbal stem the reciprocal + applicative derivation is employed (cf. (5)).

4.3.2 The sociative (?) meaning. In the following example the reciprocal marker seemingly expresses a sociative meaning. This example involves the verb *im-ie-* 'to put something or somebody into a boat or a sledge, or on deer- or horse-back' which is derived from the verb *ima-* 'to get into a boat or a sledge, or to mount a deer or a horse' by means of the causative suffix *-ie-* which has an additional resultative meaning: it implies that the Causee is still in the state caused by the action in the time of reference, cf.:

- (48) a. *met tudel eks'il'-ge im-ie*
 I he boat-LOC sit-CAUS(TR:1SG)
 'I have him in the boat with me.'
- b. *kin-pe-lek n'e-im-ie-ŋi-l eks'il'-ge*
 who-PL-FOC REC-sit-CAUS-3PL-SF boat-LOC
 'Who (PL) are in the boat together?'

As shown by (48a), the sociative meaning is implied by the initial verb itself; the reciprocal presented in (48b) may thus be literally translated as 'to put each other (in a boat, sledge, etc.), so that both are still there (together)'; then the reciprocal marker itself may be taken to have its basic meaning, while the sociative meaning is implied by its combination with the *-ie-* suffix.

4.3.3 The reflexive (?) meaning. There is a unique example of the possessive-reflexive meaning expressed by the reciprocal marker, cf.:

- (49) *met nojl pohoži juju:-ge tamun mided'e-le n'e-kigiji:-je*
 my leg knee hurt-DS this needle-INST REC-jab-1SG:INTR
 'My knee was hurting, and I jabbed it with a needle.'

Note that the same verb normally has the reciprocal meaning, cf. (2), (27), (36), so this is hardly a case of (pure) lexicalization.

In the following example the reciprocal prefix marks a referential situation which is somewhat intermediate between the reflexive proper and the reciprocal proper, cf.:

- (50) *titte samuj n'e-n'u:-tie-nu-l'el-ŋi*
 their self REC-name-CAUS-ITER-EVID-3PL-INTR
taŋ čomo:d'e-p-ki n'e-molho-de-gen n'ied'i-t
 [this elder-PL-POSS REC-among-POSS-PROL speak-SS]
taŋ titte omni:-n n'u:-gele n'u-tie-nu-l'el-ŋa
 this their clan-ATTR name-ACC name-GIVE-ITER-EVID-3PL:TR
 'They give names to each other (to themselves) themselves. The elders (of these clans), speaking among themselves (to each other), gave names to their clans.'

The pronoun *titte* 'their' in the first clause refers to several clans which used to live near each other; the situation expressed by the reciprocal in this clause is then described in more detail, so that it becomes clear that interpretations like 'they gave names to each other' and 'they gave names to themselves' are both possible: what is stressed in the first clause is that these names were not given by anyone outside the community; this is highlighted by the use of the reflexive particle *samuj* 'self' (which is a borrowing from Russian *sam* 'self').

4.4 Lexicalizations. There are only few clear instances of the lexicalized use of the reciprocal marker in my data, which are all listed in this subsection (about some less clear examples see 1.1.3, 1.1.1.2, and 4.2).

First, there are two cases of morphologically standard reciprocal derivation with an idiomatic meaning, cf. *n'e-mejnu-* 'to get married, to join' (lit. 'to take each other') < *mejnu-* 'to take something', and *n'e-lej-nu-l-ben* (REC-eat-ITER-ATTR-SUBST) 'predator' (< *n'e-lej-nu-l* '(regularly) eating each other') < *le(g)-* 'to eat'.

Secondly, one reciprocal verb is derived by the reciprocal prefix from a postpositional stem: *kijeje* 'before' > *n'e-kijeje-* 'to compete with each other, to race with one another', cf.:

- (51) *adi-pe n'e-kijeje-din šubend'i-nnu-l'el-ŋi*
 boy-PL REC-before-INF run-HAB-EVID-3PL:INTR
 'The boys used to race with one another.'

Finally, being adjoined to the nominal stem *kie* 'span, interval', the reciprocal prefix derives the adverb *n'e-kie* 'alternately, turn and turn about.', cf.:

- (52) *tude mon-uol+možu-gele jaqte-le n'e-kie kič-um*
 his say-RES+PRSP-ACC song-ACC REC-span learn-3SG:TR
 'He learnt (by heart) what he had to say, alternately with a song (by turn spoken and sung).'

5. Means of expressing related meanings

5.1 Comitative

5.1.1 The comitative suffix. Yukaghir has neither comitative nor sociative verb forms; the corresponding meanings are expressed either by the comitative case form or by a free comitative marker (see 5.1.2).

As shown in 3.1, the comitative case form is derived by means of the suffix *-n'e*; besides expressing one of the reciprocal arguments, the comitative case form has two basic functions:

1. It marks non-subject arguments of symmetrical predicates, cf.:

- (53) a. *titte es'ie-ŋin qamied'a:-nu-l'el-ŋi kereke-n'e kimd'i:-din*
 their father-DAT help-ITER-EVID-3PL:INTR [Koryak-COM fight-INF]
 'They used to help their father fight with the Koryaks.' (Nikolaeva 1989, Text 50.)
- b. *ann'-a:-l'el kind'e-n'e*
 speak-INGR-EVID(3SG:INTR) moon-COM
 'She began to speak with the moon.' (Nikolaeva 1989, Text 2.)

2. It marks arguments of "sociative" situations (i.e. situations involving two participants playing equal roles), cf.:

- (54) a. *gristos lebie-gen tude šoromo-pul-n'e egužu-j*
 Christ earth-PROL his man-PL-COM walk-3SG:INTR
 'Christ walked around the earth together with his men.' (Nikolaeva 1989, Text 9.)
- b. *amun-pe-n'e petr berbekin-gele pude peššej-m*
 bone-PL-COM P. B.-ACC outside throw:out-3SG:TR
 'He threw out Petr Berbekin together with the bones.' (Nikolaeva 1989, Text 31.)

If a comitative NP denotes a 'collaborator' with the actor, the verb may agree both with the nominative NP alone and with the comitative complex as a unitary whole, exactly as described for the reciprocal constructions (see 3.3), cf. (54a) and:

- (55) *alandin tude šoromo-pul-n'e kel-ŋi*
 A. his man-PL-COM come-3PL:INTR

'Alandin with/and his men came.'

Thus, the comitative case appears if a situation involves two semantically equal participants, be it participants of a symmetrical or reciprocal situation, or participants of a "sociative" situation ('A and B together'), independently of whether or not the NPs denoting semantically equal participants are treated as one syntactic constituent.

5.1.2 The free comitative marker. The free comitative marker *n'aha*: 'together (with)' may function either as a postposition or as an adverb. As a postposition, it normally governs the comitative case, cf.:

- (56) [...] *as'e-gi kurčej-n'e n'aha: amdo:-t qodo:-pe-gi*
deer-POSS crane-COM together be:dead-SS lie-PL:POSS
'...(that) his deer, together with the crane, lay dead.'

The comitative NP governed by this postposition may be dropped anaphorically, cf.:

- (57) *čarčaqan l'e-j n'aha: emd'e-p-ki l'e-ŋi*
C. be-3SG:INTR together younger:brother-PL-POSS be-3PL:INTR
'There lived Charchaqan. Together with him lived his younger brothers.' (Nikolaeva 1989, Text 29.)

As an adverb, the free comitative marker occupies the preverbal position, cf.:

- (58) *n'aha: kebej-ŋi*
together leave-3PL:INTR
'They left together.'

In some examples this marker has a meaning similar to the reciprocal one and may be used in a reciprocal construction with an intransitive verb in the function of syntactic reciprocal marker (see 2.2.1), cf.:

- (59) a. *n'aha: totto:-ŋi*
together stick-3PL:INTR
'They stuck to each other, together.'
b. *n'aha: n'e-juolod'a:-ŋi*
together REC-ask-3PL:INTR
'They asked each other.'

To sum up: in the postnominal position, the word under discussion has the comitative meaning and may also occur with an NP denoting a non-subject reciprocal argument; as an adverb (in the preverbal position), it may mark both sociative and reciprocal situations.

5.2 Reflexive. The reflexive meaning is marked by the prefix *met-* (cf. (1c), (7c)), formally equal to 1SG pronoun 'I, my'. It may be assumed that this prefix has developed from a pronominal proclitic integrated into the verb morphology. This assumption is supported by the fact that in Tundra Yukaghir the reflexive marker (in the same morphological position) agrees with the subject in person in number, so that the reflexive meaning is expressed by the stem of a personal pronoun (coreferent with the subject) incorporated in the verb form, cf.:

- (60) a. *met me-met-qaiwes-t'ej*
 I AFF-me-wound-1SG:INTR
 'I wounded myself.'
- b. *tet me-tet-qaiwes-t'ek*
 you AFF-you-wound-2SG:INTR
 'You wounded yourself.'
- c. *tittel me-titte-qaiwes-ŋi*
 they AFF-them-wound-3PL:INTR
 'They wounded themselves.'

As mentioned in 1.2, the reflexive and the reciprocal are opposed as the members of one morphological category, so that they cannot be combined within one verb form.

6. Notes on reciprocals in Tundra Yukaghir

6.1 General notes. In Tundra Yukaghir the reciprocal prefix has two phonological variants, *n'i-/n'iŋ-*; the latter is chosen before the vowel, cf.: *paj-* 'to knock' > *n'i-paj-* 'to knock each other', *ai-* 'to shoot' > *n'iŋ-ai-* 'to shoot each other'. The only significant syntactic difference between Kolyma and Tundra Yukaghir, as far as the reciprocals are concerned, has to do with reciprocal constructions with bitransitive verbs, in particular, with the relations between reciprocal and causative derivation.

6.2 Reciprocal constructions with underlying bitransitive causatives. Tundra Yukaghir does not allow dative reciprocal transformation (cf. 1.2), with the exception of reciprocal constructions with underlying bitransitive causatives, i.e., causatives derived from transitive verbs, cf.:

- (61) a. *tuŋ köde al'ha-le me-telies-um*
 this man fish-ACC AFF-dry-3SG:TR
 'This man dried the fish.'
- b. *met tuŋ köde-ŋin al'ha me-telies-t'i-ŋ*
 I this man-DAT fish AFF-dry-CAUS-(1SG:TR)
 'I asked this man to dry the fish, he dried the fish according to my request.'
- c. *mit me-n'i-telies-t'i-jel'i*
 we AFF-REC-dry-CAUS-1PL:INTR
 'We asked each other to dry; we agreed to dry.'

In a causative construction (cf. (61b)) the initial direct object normally retains its syntactic position, the Causee occupies the indirect object slot (in the dative case form). The reciprocal marker in (61c) marks cross-coreference between the subject and the indirect object (Causer and Causee), while the initial direct object is not involved in the transformation (at least semantically). Yet the resulting construction is intransitive both syntactically and morphologically: no NP expressing direct object can be present in such a construction, and the verb may take only intransitive agreement markers, cf. another example of this type:

- (62) *mit me-n'i-t'ambi-se-ji'i*
 we AFF-REC-help-CAUS-1PL:INTR
 'We asked each other (agreed) to help.'

Thus, reciprocal derivation from a bitransitive causative obligatorily entails detransitivization, although this is not implied by the semantics of this transformation.

An explanation for this phenomenon may be based on the following fact. When the initial direct object is not expressed in a causative sentence, the Causee can be encoded as direct object, cf.:

- (63) *met tuŋ köde me-telies-t'i-ŋ*
 I this man AFF-dry-CAUS-(1SG:TR)
 'I asked this man to dry.'

It may thus be suggested that the reciprocal construction as in (61c) is derived not from a canonical causative construction as in (61b), but from a construction with an unspecified Patient and the Causee shifted to the direct object position, as in (63). If this hypothesis is accepted, the absence of the initial direct object should be viewed not as a formal implication of the reciprocal transformation, but as its obligatory condition. Then the reciprocal construction in (61c) belongs to the canonical diathesis type, and thus does not contradict the general rule which prohibits the dative reciprocal transformation in Tundra Yukaghir.

6.3 Causative reciprocal constructions. Tundra Yukaghir, in contrast with Kolyma Yukaghir, has an object-oriented reciprocal construction. The subject in this construction type denotes the Causer of a reciprocal situation, cf.:

- (64) *met uör-pe me-n'i-t'ambi-se-ŋ*
 I child-PL AFF-REC-help-CAUS(1SG:TR)
 'I made the children help each other.'

The reciprocal verb in such constructions must contain a causative suffix and takes a transitive agreement marker. The reciprocal arguments can be represented either by a single NP encoded as direct object (see 2.1) or by two distinct NPs, one of which is

marked as direct object, the other has the comitative case form, cf. (64) and the following example:

- (65) *tet met-ul met könme-n'e me-n'i-juö-se-mek*
you I-ACC my friend-COM AFF-REC-see-CAUS-2SG:TR
'You showed me and my friend to each other, you helped us to see each other.'

This type of reciprocal construction can be described in terms of the causative transformation of a reciprocal construction, so that the sentence in (64) be taken as derived from (66), cf.:

- (66) *uör-pe me-n'i-t'ambi-Ni*
child-PL AFF-REC-help-3PL:INTR
'The children helped each other.'

Thus, Tundra Yukaghir can be assumed to have two options for combination of reciprocal and causative meanings:

1. Reciprocal constructions with underlying causative verbs (Causer symmetrical with Causee), in which the subject-oriented reciprocal transformation is applied to a causative clause, cf. (61c), (62), i.e. the causative marker is included within the scope of the reciprocal marker.
2. Causative (object-oriented) reciprocal constructions, in which causative transformation is applied to a canonical reciprocal clause, cf. (64), (65), and the reciprocal marker is within the scope of the causative marker.

It is interesting to note that in Even a similar distinction is reflected by the linear order of the reciprocal and causative suffixes within a verb form: V-CAUS-REC for the first construction type, and V-REC-CAUS for the second one (Malchukov, this volume). In Yukaghir this direct way of reflecting this distinction is not available because the reciprocal marker is preverbal, while the causative meaning is marked by suffixes. As a result, these construction types are morphologically opposed only by the choice of transitive vs. intransitive agreement markers, cf. (64) and (62).

6.4 Summary of distinctions between Tundra and Kolyma Yukaghir. The only significant distinction between the reciprocal constructions in Tundra and Kolyma Yukaghir may be formulated as follows: a transitive reciprocal in Kolyma Yukaghir may mark only cross-coreference between subject and indirect object (in particular, Causee in a causative construction), while in Tundra Yukaghir it may mark only cross-coreference between direct object and indirect object (Causee) in a causative construction. In other words, in both languages the opposition between transitive and intransitive agreement suffixes is employed for marking the distinction between "canonical" (intransitive) and "non-canonical" (transitive) reciprocal diathesis, but they have absolutely different types of non-canonical reciprocals (dative reciprocals in Kolyma Yukaghir and object-oriented reciprocals in Tundra-Yukaghir).

7. Etymological notes

As already shown, the comitative case marker in Kolyma Yukaghir has exactly the same phonological form as the reciprocal prefix. This coincidence is hardly accidental, given the obvious semantic similarity and the resulting regular co-occurrence of these morphemes within one clause (see 3.1). It might thus be assumed that both markers have developed from one morpheme that had been used to mark clauses denoting situations with two or more semantically equal arguments (i.e., both reciprocal and comitative/sociative situations), as is presently the case for the free comitative marker described in 5.1.2. Given the opposite linear positions of the morphemes under discussion with respect to the stem, this assumption seems to imply that the original comitative-reciprocal marker had been a free morpheme; this hypothesis is supported by the morphological evidence in favor of the relatively recent integration of the reciprocal marker into the verb morphology (see 2.2.1). On the other hand, the clear pronominal origin of the reflexive prefix (see 5.2) demonstrates that the integration of a preverbal free morpheme into the verb form was once possible in Yukaghir.

This etymological hypothesis suggests that a structure like in (67) had been employed for both reciprocal ('A and B V each other') and sociative ('A and B together') situations, cf.:

(67) A B *n'e* V

The next stage of development of this structure might have been a distinction between the postnominal (comitative) and preverbal (reciprocal) uses of *n'e*, cf.:

(68) (i) comitative: A B+*n'e* V
 (ii) reciprocal: A [B] *n'e*+V

(compare the similar behavior of the free comitative marker *n'aha*: (see 5.1.2)).

According to this hypothesis the Yukaghir morphological reciprocal has developed from an analytical reciprocal form. It seems that this claim is supported by some synchronic features of reciprocals in Yukaghir, such as the extremely high degree of specialization, the small number of lexicalized reciprocals, absence (or minimum) of lexical restrictions. Some further evidence in favour of this claim is given by the free

compatibility of the reciprocal marker with postpositional stems (see 2.1) and by the possibility of inserting a nominal stem between the reciprocal marker and the verbal stem (see 1.3.2).

In Tundra Yukaghir the reciprocal marker seems to be more deeply integrated into the verb morphology than in Kolyma Yukaghir: first, it has an additional morphological variant used to avoid clustering of vowels on the morpheme boundary, secondly, it may be included into the scope of a causative suffix.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABL - ablative, ACC- accusative, AFF -affirmative, ANR - action nominal, APPL - applicative, ATTR - attributive, CAUS - causative, COM - comitative, COND - conditional, DAT - dative, DETR - detransitive, DIM - diminutive, DIR - directional, DSTR - distributive, DS - different-subject, EVID - evidential, FOC- focus, HAB - habitual, INGR - ingressive, INST -instrumental, INTR - intransitive, ITER - iterative, LOC - locative, MULT - multiplicative, NEG - negative, OF - object-focus, REC - reciprocal, PFV - Perfective, PL - plural, PROL - prolative, REFL - reflexive, RES - resultative, SF - subject-focus, SG - singular, SS - same-subject, SUBST - substantive, TR - transitive.

REFERENCES

- JOCHELSON, WALDEMAR I. (1900) *Materialy po izucheniju jukagirskogo jazyka i folkloru*. (Materials for studies of the Yukaghir language and folklore). St.Petersburg.
- KEENAN, EDWARD L. (1976) Towards a universal definition of "subject". In: Ch.N.Li (ed.) *Subject and Topic*, Academic Press. Pp.303-334.
- KEMMER, SUZANNE. 1993. *The Middle Voice*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins [*Typological Studies in Language* 23].
- KREJNOVICH, ERUHIM A. (1958) *Jukagirskij Jazyk*. (The Yukaghir language). Moscow – Leningrad. Nauka.
- KREJNOVICH, ERUHIM A. (1982) *Issledovanija i materialy po jukagirskomu jazyku*. (The Yukaghir language: studies and materials). Leningrad. Nauka.
- LICHTENBERK, FRANTISEK. 1985. Multiple uses of reciprocal constructions. *Australian Journal of linguistics* 5: 19-41.
- MASLOVA, ELENA S. (1989) Reciprocal v jukagirskom jazyke (Reciprocal in the Yukaghir language). In: *Soviet Finno-Ugric Studies*. XXV. 1989. 2, Pp.120-127.
- NIKOLAEVA, IRINA A. (ed.) (1989) *Folklor jukagirov verhnjej Kolymy*. (Folklore of the Upper Kolyma Jukaghirs.) Jakutsk.

1. It is a pleasure to acknowledge my deepest debt to my informants from Nelemnoye (for Kolyma Yukaghir) and Andryškino (for Tundra Yukaghir) for their help and patience in answering my questions. Particular thanks are due to a friend and colleague of mine, Nickolay Vakhtin, whose help during the first field trip in my life (where most of data for this paper comes from) is hardly possible to overestimate.

I am grateful to Vladimir Nedyalkov for his detailed and helpful comments and for his constant encouragement. Acknowledgements are made to all the participants of Symposium on Reflexives and Reciprocals in University of Colorado, Boulder for their comments on a version of this paper.

2. The status of the preverbal reciprocal marker within Yukaghir morphosyntax seems controversial; to be more precise, it is not clear whether or not this morpheme should be considered as a part of verbal derivation. All the facts which could help to resolve this problem on a theory-specific basis are described in the present paper, yet on the present stage of analysis it seems to me more important to highlight the somewhat "intermediate" status of the morpheme under discussion, than to suggest one or another theory-dependent decision. That is why I have tried to avoid (whenever possible) the terms implying that the combination of a verb and the reciprocal preverb constitutes another (reciprocal) verb; terms like "underlying verb" (although theoretically not quite clear) are thus used in order to avoid terms like "initial verb", which would entail such interpretation, without any other theoretical connotations.

3. Cf. a similar situation in West Greenlandic Eskimo (Fortescue, this volume), where a semantically vague applicative suffix may be employed for reciprocal derivation from intransitives.

4. My informants sometimes say that such a sentence might be possible, but that it would be "better" to insert a syntactic marker.

5. Note that the 3d person possessive pronouns *tude* 'his/her' and *titte* 'their' are employed only if the possessor is coreferential with the subject (otherwise the 3d person possessor is expressed by means of a possessive suffix).

6. The clause is nominalized, since it is the title of a fairy tale.

7. *momuša*: - a sort of fish; the word is translated (by Yukaghirs) into Russian as *katalka*, a word which probably belongs to a local dialect of Russian and which is absent from all Russian-English dictionaries which I was able to consult with.