

# ON THE INNOVATIVE NATURE OF SAKHALIN AINU: FOCUSING ON NOMINALIZATION

*Anna Bugaeva*

*National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics/  
Tokyo University of Science*

This paper focuses on the innovative nature of Sakhalin Ainu with respect to nominalization. Based on a cross-dialectal comparison, I suggest that zero-nominalization [(NP...) V]<sub>NP</sub> reflects the oldest stage (I), while the strategy of adding a nominalizing word [(NP...) V NMZ]<sub>NP</sub>, which proliferates in Hokkaido Ainu, may be regarded as the next stage (II). Finally, in Sakhalin Ainu, non-finite verbal forms containing possessive-style marking [(NP...) V-POSS]<sub>NP</sub> (III), which can also be used as non-embedded (finite) structures [(NP...) V-POSS]<sub>MC</sub> (IV) in a broad range of presuppositional contexts, may be regarded as the last and most innovative stage.

Настоящая работа посвящена более позднему характеру сахалинского диалекта айнского языка в том, что касается номинализации. На основе сопоставления разных диалектов мы выдвигаем гипотезу, что нулевая номинализация [(NP...) V]<sub>NP</sub> отражает наиболее древний этап (I). Алгоритм добавления номинализирующего слова [(NP...) V NMZ]<sub>NP</sub>, распространенный в хоккайдском диалекте, рассматривается как следующий этап (II). И, наконец, в сахалинском диалекте нефинитные глагольные формы, включающие посессивные маркеры [(NP...) V-POSS]<sub>NP</sub> (III), которые также могут использоваться как невстроенные (финитные) структуры [(NP...) V-POSS]<sub>MC</sub> (IV) в широком диапазоне пресуппозиционного контекста, рассматриваются как наиболее поздняя, последняя стадия.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Ainu (lit. ‘people’) speakers, traditionally hunter-gatherers, formerly inhabited not only the Island of Hokkaido, but also the northern part of Honshu, the southern part of Sakhalin, the Kurile Islands, and very likely the southern part of Kamchatka. The three primary linguistic divisions are geographically based, and distinguish between the dialects once spoken on Hokkaido, Sakhalin, and the Kurile Islands; there are almost no data on Kurile Ainu. Today scholars generally believe the Ainu ethnic group to be descendants of a subpart of the Neolithic population of the Jōmon Culture which existed in Japan 11,000–1,000 BC and

*Studia Orientalia* 117 (2016), pp. 95–117

Licensed under Creative Commons  
Attribution 3.0 License.  
ISSN: 0039-3282

was characterized by the utilization of “cord-patterned” pottery. The Iron Age, known as the Yayoi period in mainland Japan (300 BC – AD 300) never extended to Hokkaido. According to archaeologists, a Neolithic Epi-Jōmon period persisted there until it was replaced by the Satsumon culture (from Northern Honshu) in Southwestern Hokkaido around AD 700 and by the Okhotsk culture (from the lower Amur river) in Northeastern Hokkaido around AD 500–600. Eventually, around AD 1,000, the Okhotsk culture was absorbed into the Satsumon culture, leading to the emergence of what we know as the Ainu ethnic group. These events are reflected in Ainu oral literature. Against this archaeological/historical background, it is significant that there still remain major linguistic distinctions between the Southwestern and Northeastern Hokkaido groups of Ainu dialects. The date of the arrival of the Ainu into Sakhalin (and the Kuriles) is an as yet unresolved issue. According to the archaeologist Kikuchi (1999: 50), the Ainu reached Sakhalin in the thirteenth century.

In this paper, I will use data from the Raichishka dialect of West Coast Sakhalin Ainu (Murasaki 1976; 1979) and show its innovative nature with regard to nominalization. Unlike Hokkaido Ainu, West Coast Sakhalin Ainu has developed a special clausal nominalization strategy attaching the nominal possessive suffix to the verb, which can also occur as a non-embedded (finite) form in a broad range of presuppositional contexts; in studies to date, this feature has yet to receive specific attention.

A number of better-known innovations of West Coast Sakhalin Ainu, which are not observed in Hokkaido Ainu, include merging /p t k r/ in coda position into /h/, the loss of the first person inclusive vs. exclusive distinction, as well as the development of possessive forms for all nouns and the development of plural possessive marking on nouns and third person plural marking on verbs. While all these differences clearly distinguish Hokkaido varieties and West Coast Sakhalin Ainu, most of them are less conspicuous in East Coast Sakhalin varieties (Piłsudski 1912), but this issue should be addressed separately.

## 2. BASIC PROPERTIES OF AINU

Ainu is agglutinating, polysynthetic, and incorporating. It employs more prefixation than suffixation, which is unusual for this area of the world. It is predominantly head-marking. It has postpositions, but no prepositions.

The basic constituent order is SV/AOV. Arguments in Ainu (either nouns or pronouns) are not marked for case. Adjuncts are marked by postpositions. Ainu has mixed alignment: in verbal cross-referencing, the first person singular has nominative-accusative alignment, the second and third persons neutral align-

ment, and the first person plural exclusive and indefinite tripartite alignment. Overall, it is possible to distinguish three sets of verbal cross-referencing markers (which partially overlap): for the intransitive subject (S), transitive subject (A), and object (O). The A set of markers is also used to encode the person and number of the possessor in the possessive construction (see further below).

The indefinite person (IND) is worth a special note. It has four functions: (i) the indefinite person proper (= the impersonal), (ii) the first person plural inclusive, (iii) the second person singular/plural honorific, and (iv) logophoric (person of the protagonist). The logophoric use is common in folktales because they have the structure of reported discourse with the whole story being a quote.<sup>1</sup> For convenience, the indefinite form with the logophoric function is translated as ‘I’, although it is glossed as IND, see (1) below.

As mentioned, the opposition of transitive and intransitive verbs is clear-cut, and so is the opposition of transitive verbs and nouns. However, all intransitive verbs can, in principal, function as nouns without any change in their stem morphology, for example, *uwepeker* i. ‘to tell a folktale’, ii. ‘a folktale’.

### 3. THEORETICAL PREREQUISITES

Following Genetti et al. (2008: 98), I will use the term “nominalization” to refer to a general process by which non-nominal elements become grammatical nominals, cf. Comrie & Thompson (1985: 349) who define nominalization as “turning something into a noun”. The major distinction is between clausal (= grammatical) and derivational (= lexical) nominalizations corresponding to high (CP, C<sub>nom</sub>, TP, T<sub>nom</sub>) vs. low (*v*P, *n*, VP) nominalizations in Kornfilt & Whitman (2011). Importantly, most authors recognize that there is no clear-cut distinction between the two, see scalar approach in Koptjevskaja-Tamm (1993), scalarity of finiteness in Givón (2009: 88), and nominalization/verbalization in Malchukov (2004; 2006).

In this paper, I will focus on the clausal nominalization in Ainu, which is conceived of as a syntactic process allowing a clause to function as a noun phrase within a broader syntactic context without necessarily creating a derived noun as the head.

As noted in Shibatani (2009), nominalizations are forms, which crosslinguistically often function as:

---

<sup>1</sup> Most examples in this paper are from folktales, hence the high frequency in the use of the indefinite person.

(a) modifiers of nouns (within noun phrases), resulting in relative clauses and nominal complement clauses;

(b) arguments of verbs (within clauses), resulting in verbal complement clauses; and

(c) independent clauses (in the position of main clauses).

Thus, nominalizations employed in functions (a) and (b) are essentially dependent structures, firstly, because they are embedded, and secondly because they are often non-finite, that is, they may lack TAM and person/number markers and such (Genetti 2007).

#### 4. NOMINALIZATIONS IN HOKKAIDO AINU

Henceforth, I will try to look for nominalizations in the above-mentioned syntactic contexts in Hokkaido Ainu (HA). First, I will examine (a) modifiers of nouns, namely, relative clauses as in (1), nominal complement clauses as in (2), and adverbial clauses as in (3). Note that the latter may be traced to modifiers of nouns only diachronically because the erstwhile head noun, for example, *rapok* ‘interval’ in (3), was reanalyzed as a subordinating conjunction ‘when’.

(1) (Bugaeva 2004: 187–188)

[*a=roski*            *a*]    *inaw*.  
IND.A=stand.PL    PERF    inaw.prayer.sticks

‘All the *inaw* [willow prayer sticks] (which) I had erected (fell down).’

(2) (Bugaeva 2004: 339)

[*kamuy-utar*    *nuwap kor*    *okay*]    *haw-e*.  
god-PL            groan and    exist.PL    voice-POSS

‘(I heard) the voices of fish gods’ groaning.’

Lit. ‘(I heard) the voice (that) gods groaned.’

(3) (Oda, I.)

[*a=unu-hu*            *isam*]    *rapok*,    *aca*    *ek*.  
IND.A=mother-POSS    not.exist    interval    uncle    come.SG

‘When our mother was out, an uncle came (and brought one deer foreleg).’

Lit. ‘(At) the interval of our mother’s not being (home), an uncle came.’

Since all predicates in (1)–(3) lack any special subordinating morphology on verbs and retain pronominal and aspectual marking, they cannot be regarded as nominalizations: the structures are embedded, but not non-finite.

Next, I will look at (b) arguments of verbs (within the main clause) resulting in verbal complement clauses.

(4a) (Bugueva 2004: 248)

[*ene a=kar hi ka a=ye hi ka*]  
 like.this IND.A=do NMZ even/also IND.A=sayNMZ even/also  
*a=erampewtek pe ne kusu...*  
 IND.A=not.know NMZ COP because  
 ‘I didn’t know what to do or say in this way, so...’

(4b) (Bugueva 2004: 285)

[*apun-no a=reska pirka a=reska*] *ki wa.*  
 peaceful-ADV IND.A=bring.up good IND.A=bring.up do and  
 ‘We were peacefully bringing them up, we were gently bringing them up.’  
 Lit. ‘Did peacefully our bring(ing) up, (did) well our bring(ing) up.’

Some complement-taking predicates require the use of nominalizing words such as *hi* ‘thing/place/time’ and *pe* ‘thing/person’ in (4a), but some do not, which results in zero-nominalization [(NP...) V]<sub>NP</sub>, that is, in a morphologically unmarked clause that is employed in a nominal function as in (4b). I suggest that zero-nominalization [(NP...) V]<sub>NP</sub> reflects the oldest stage of nominalization in Ainu and that a nominalizing word strategy [(NP...) V NMZ]<sub>NP</sub> appeared later as it is the case in Japanese (Shibatani 2009) and some Tibeto-Burman languages (Post 2011).

It is noteworthy that even in (4a), there are no signs of nominalization other than the use of nominalizing words; note the retention of verbal personal marking and lack of non-finite morphology in both (4a) and (4b).

As is commonly accepted, the verbal morphology of HA shows no distinction between finite vs. non-finite forms, that is, all verbs in HA exhibit finite morphology.<sup>2</sup> Yet, the term “nominalization” (J *meishika*) is often employed in Ainu studies.

2 The lack of subordinating morphology on verbs is commonly regarded as a polysynthetic feature (Mithun 1984; Baker 1996; Evans & Sasse 2002). Cf. also “extreme finite languages” in Givón (2009: 90) with reference to Iroquois (Mithun 1991), in which even lexical nominalizations look like finite clauses.

### *What is usually regarded as “nominalization” in HA?*

As shown in the previous section, neither relative clauses nor nominal or verbal complement clauses can be regarded as fully-fledged nominalizations in Ainu because verbs do not bear any subordinating morphology. Yet, the term “nominalization” (J *meishika*) is found in Ainu studies. This term is often used with the reference to syntactic constructions with the structure of “(NP...) V NMZ” in which NMZ (nominalizer) is a kind of light (= “formal”) noun, which can be traced back to the erstwhile “head”. We may distinguish between the following five types of construction:

- (i) Lexical nominalizations;
- (ii) Clausal nominalizations;
- (iii) Adverbial clauses;
- (iv) Evidential/modal/aspectual sentences with a copula;
- (v) Main clauses (sentence-final), without copula.

In the following, I will briefly describe each of these so-called nominalization types in Ainu.

(i) Lexical nominalizations [(NP...) V-NMZ]<sub>NP</sub> are derived with the following nouns as heads: *hi* ‘thing/place/time’, *pe* ‘thing/person’, *kur* ‘man’, and others. Diachronically, they originate in relative clauses with full-fledged nominal heads which gradually became reanalyzed as nominalizers: N(oun) > NMZ (nominalizing word) > -NMZ (nominalizing suffix).

- (5a) *ci=ronnu-p*  
 1PL.EXC.A=kill.PL-thing/NMZ  
 ‘a fox’, lit. ‘things (that) we kill’

- (5b) *ape-o-i*  
 fire-enter-place/NMZ  
 ‘hearth’, lit. ‘the place (where) the fire enters’

(ii) Clausal nominalizations. The same nominalizers *hi* ‘thing/place/time’ and *pe* ‘thing/person’ are commonly employed in clausal nominalizations. In (6), the clausal nominalization functions as the subject of the verb *pirka* ‘good’.

(6) (Tamura 2000: 126)

[*ku=kemeyki kor ku=itak hi*] *iyotta pirka*.  
 1SG.S=sew while 1SG.S=talk NMZ most good

‘It is the best (for me) to talk while I’m sewing.’  
 Lit. ‘My sewing while my talking is the best.’

(iii) Adverbial clauses. The erstwhile head noun *hi* ‘thing/place/time’ (7) and a few other nouns like *rapok* ‘interval’ in (3) were reanalyzed as subordinating conjunctions with various meanings.

(7) (Bugaeva 2004: 140)

[*rek a rek a kor an hi*] *ta patek*,  
 sing ITR sing ITR and exist.SG when/NMZ LOC only

‘Only when (lit. at the time) the cuckoo was singing and singing,

*a=an-te-hoku ipe ka somo ki no*.  
 IND.A=exist.SG-CAUS-husband.POSS eat even NEG do and  
 my husband didn’t eat.’

(iv) Evidential/modal/aspectual sentences with a copula. The following light nouns express evidential, modal, and aspectual meanings. In declarative sentences, they are followed by the equative copula *ne* as in (8) and (9) and, in content questions as in (10), by the existential copula *an*.

a. Evidential:

*ru-w-e* (trace/footprint-EP-POSS) ‘the trace of’ – inferential, also used as a modality marker of certainty

*haw-e* (voice-POSS) ‘the voice of’ – reportative

*sir-i* (sight-POSS) ‘the sight of’ – visual

*hum-i* (sound-POSS) ‘the sound of’ – non-visual sensory

b. Modal:

*kus-u* (reason-POSS) ‘the reason of’ – intentional

*kun-i-p* (obligation?-POSS-thing/person) ‘should’ – deontic

*pe/p* ‘thing/person’ – assertive/pragmatic imperative

*kat-u* (shape-POSS) ‘the shape/manner of’ – assertive

*hi* ‘place/time/thing’ – assertive

## c. Aspectual:

*us-ke* (place-POSS) ‘(just now) being in progress’ (Bugueva 2013: 668)

Such sentences are viewed as biclausal by Tamura (2000: 227) in her description of evidentials: “The expressive nominalizers *ruwe* eEVD, *hawe* eSAID, *siri* eSEEN, and *humi* eFELT can be placed after sentences that end with verb phrases, where they nominalize the sentence, and the copula *ne* is placed afterwards to complete the phrase”, see also the “external relative clause analysis” in Okuda (1989) and Satō (2008: 175). In Bugueva (2013: 669), I suggested that although the original construction is undoubtedly biclausal, that is, [[Clause] NP Noun-POSS]<sub>NP</sub> COP, the erstwhile nouns are considerably grammaticalized and the construction in question is in the process of turning into a monoclausal complex-predicate construction.

(8) (Bugueva 2004: 254)

*tane*      *aynu* *kotan* *hanke*      *ru-w-e*                      *ne*.  
already    Ainu    village be.close    trace-EP-POSS/INF.EV    COP

‘I infer that an Ainu village is already nearby.’

Lit. ‘It is the trace (that) the Ainu village is already close.’

(9) (Nakagawa 1995: 54)

*pirka*      *uepeker*      *ne*      *haw-e*                      *ne* *wa*.  
be.good    folktale    COP    voice-POSS/REP.EV    COP    FIN

‘It is said to be / I assume that it is a good folktale.’

Lit. ‘It is the voice (that) the folktale is good.’

(10) (Bugueva et al. 2015)

*makanak* *ne* *an*              *i*                                      *an?*  
what      as exist.SG    thing/place/time/NMZ    exist.SG

‘(Did you pay money) or what?’

Lit. ‘...What kind of thing was there?’ (assertive mood)

(v) Evidential/modal/aspectual sentences without copula, that is, main clauses. The final copula is omitted in polar questions and exclamations, so sentences end just in nouns/nominalizers, that is, nominalizations are used as non-embedded (finite) structures [(NP...) V-POSS]<sub>MC</sub>.



(11a) (Bugaeva 2004: 152)

*e=e-siknak*                      *ru-w-e?*  
 2SG.A=APPL-be.blind      trace-EP-POSS/INF.EV

'Are you blind about (your husband's adultery)?'

(11b) (Bugaeva 2004: 119)

*nep-ene-po*                      *u-itak-nu*      *ru-w-e!*  
 how-like.this-DIM      REC-word-list trace-EP-POSS/INF.EV

'Oh, how obedient they are indeed!'

(12a) (Tamura 1996: 233)

*tane*    *e=arpa*              *oasi*    *sir-i?*  
 now    2SG.S=go.SG    start    sight-POSS/VIS.EV

'Are you going now?' (e.g. 'observing someone putting on a coat')

(12b) (Tamura 1996: 249)

*e=e-askay*                      *sir-i!*  
 2SG.A=APPL-be.able    sight-POSS/VIS.EV

'You are really good/skilful!' (said while observing an activity)

(13) (Bugaeva 2004: 125)

*suy*    *ene*              *hawean*    *hi!*  
 again like.that    say.SG      thing/place/time/NMZ

'(Now) again (the uncle) said that!'

(14) (Nakagawa &amp; Bugaeva 2012: K7908032UP)

*a=hekote*                      *nispa*      *tura-no*    *an=an*              *wa ne ciki*  
 IND.A=attach.head    rich.man    COM-ADV    exist.SG=IND.S    and    COP    if

'(My child was born safely; it was a boy.) If I was with my husband,

*makanak*    *e-yaykopuntek*      *pe!*  
 what      APPL-be.happy      thing/person/ NMZ

how happy (my husband) would be!'

Sentences like those in (11)–(14) can possibly be regarded as instances of the so-called insubordination, as adduced in Evans (2007).

To summarize: verbal forms that are usually regarded as nominalizations in Hokkaido Ainu do not bear any non-finite morphology, so “nominalization” is associated solely with the use of a nominalizing word in the case of lexical nominalizations, clausal nominalizations, and in evidential/modal/aspectual sentences with or without a sentence-final copula, but not in relative clauses and nominal complement clauses.

These nominalizing words are, strictly speaking, distinct from genuine nominalizers, because they are not used for deriving adnominal forms.<sup>3</sup>

## 5. NOMINALIZATIONS IN SAKHALIN AINU

Sakhalin Ainu (SA) is noteworthy for its non-finite possessive-style marking on verbs, viz. *v*-POSS, which is not found elsewhere in Ainu. I propose to regard such forms as genuine nominalizations; they occur mostly in the same contexts as the nominalizing words (NMZ) of Hokkaido Ainu. Since the *v*-POSS forms are materially identical with the possessive forms of nouns, first I should say a few words about nouns.

### *Possessive marking on nouns*

In the possessive construction, the possessee takes the so-called possessive form with the possessive suffixes *-bV* or *-V(bV)*, which indicate the bound status of the form in question and is marked with one of the *A* prefixes for the person and number of the possessor (the 3rd person is zero-marked), so pronominal (and even nominal) possessor NPs are commonly omitted.

- |       |                        |           |            |              |
|-------|------------------------|-----------|------------|--------------|
| (15a) | <i>ku=sapa-ha</i>      | 1SG.A=    | head-POSS  | ‘my head’    |
| (15b) | <i>ci=setur-u(hu)</i>  | 1PL.A=    | back-POSS  | ‘our backs’  |
| (15c) | <i>e=haw-e(he)</i>     | 2SG.A=    | voice-POSS | ‘your voice’ |
| (15d) | <i>kamuy rus-i(bi)</i> | bear fur- | POSS       | ‘bear-skin’  |

The possessive suffixes *-bV* or *-V(bV)* often copy a root-final vowel with an epenthetic /h/ being inserted, that is, *-ha/-hu/-ho/-he/-hi* for vowel-final (15a) and *a(ha)/-u(hu)/-o(ho)/-e(he)/-i(bi)* for consonant-final roots. However, roots ending with *w/y* always trigger *-e(he)* (15c) and a few other irregular nouns take a

<sup>3</sup> Similarly, Shibatani (2009) prefers to treat the Japanese *no* (and other NMZs) not as a nominalizer but as a “noun phrase use marker” (Shibatani, pers. comm.) and distinguishes it from such “genuine nominalizers” as Western Old Japanese *-u/-uru/-ru* or Modern Korean *-neun* which are used for deriving adnominal forms.

default suffix *-i(hi)* (15d) originating in the bound noun *hi* ‘thing/place/time’ (also used as a nominalizer). The difference between “short” (e.g. *ci=setur-u* ‘our (EXC) backs’) and “long” (*ci=setur-uhu* ‘our (EXC) backs’) possessive forms is unclear. Overall, the possessive form derivation is not a straightforward process. As suggested in Shibatani (1990: 15), this phenomenon originated probably in some kind of tongue root harmony [RTR], which is regarded as a characteristic areal feature of Northeast Asia in Ko, Joseph & John Whitman (2014: 141).

In Hokkaido Ainu, not all nouns have possessive forms and the above-mentioned possessive construction is used for inalienable possession only. Alienable possession in HA is encoded by the relative clause-based periphrastic construction with *kor* ‘have sth/sb’ as the predicate and the possessor as the subject; the possessee is left unmarked as in (16).

- (16) *a=kor mosir* (HA)  
 1PL.A=have country  
 ‘our country’, lit. ‘the country (that) we (you and I) have’

Unlike in Hokkaido Ainu, in Sakhalin Ainu (17), all nouns have developed possessive forms and the possessive construction is used to encode both inalienable and alienable possessive relations, cf. (16).

- (17) (Murasaki 1979: 5)  
*an=mosir-ih* (SA)  
 1PL.A=country-POSS  
 ‘our country’

### ***Possessive marking on verbs in Sakhalin Ainu***

As mentioned above, in addition to the possessive marking for all nouns, Sakhalin Ainu has developed possessive marking on verbs, namely V-POSS, which will be regarded here as a nominalized form. The V-POSS form is employed in:

- (i) Adverbial clauses marked with adverbial conjunctions;
- (ii) Modal sentences marked with modal auxiliaries;
- (iii) Clausal nominalizations;
- (iv) Evidential/modal/aspectual sentences with a nominalizing word and a copula;
- (v) Main clauses (sentence-final), without a copula.

The V-POSS form is not employed in relative clauses, noun and verbal complement clauses or lexical nominalizations. Note that the functions (iii)–(v) are basically the same as those containing nominalizing words (NMZ) in HA, while the functions (i)–(ii) show some peculiarities.

(i) Adverbial clauses marked with adverbial conjunctions. The conjunctions used in these constructions contain synchronically or diachronically the copula *ne(e)* as the initial (or the only) component: V-POSS CONJ (< be.COP+?).

The manner conjunction *nee-no* ‘as/like’

(18) (Murasaki 1979: 139)

*ene e=ramu-hu nee-no pirka no kii wa.*  
like.this 2SG.A=think-POSS COP-ADV be.good ADV do FIN

‘Do (it) well, like you think.’

(19) (Murasaki 1979: 139)

*e=sinka-ha nee kunii-ne an=e=nukara.*  
2SG.S=be.tired-POSS COP as-COP IND.A=2SG.O=see

‘You look tired.’ Lit. ‘I see you as you are being tired.’

The cognates of these conjunctions in HA, namely *ne-no* ‘as’ and *ne kuni* ‘as (if)’, are preceded by regular (finite) verb forms.

The adversative conjunction *ne-ya* ‘but’

(20) (Murasaki 1979: 139)

*an=nukara-ha ne-ya nani hempah isam.*  
IND.A=see-POSS COP-Q soon how.many not.exist

‘I saw it, but (it) was immediately gone.’

The concessive conjunction *ne-yah* ‘although’

(21) (Murasaki 1979: 51)

*an=oyra-pe-he an=hunara kusu paye=an-ibi ne-yah*  
IND.A=forget-NMZ-POSS IND.A=search in.order go.PL=IND.S-POSS COP-if

‘Although we went to search for (what) we had left (lit. ‘our left things’),

*naata ka uk-ahci wa isam.*  
 who even/also take-PL and not.exist

some people had taken them.'

(ii) Modal sentences marked with modal auxiliaries. These auxiliaries contain synchronically or diachronically the copula *ne* as the initial component: V-POSS AUX (< be.COP+?).

The affirmative auxiliary *nee-ko* 'surely'

(22) (Murasaki 1979: 68)

*tani 'uunas an=ee-he nee-ko.*  
 now/already early IND.A=eat-POSS COP-?

'Definitely, I have just eaten.'

The dubitative auxiliaries *ne-'an* 'probably' and *nee nankor* 'probably'

(23) (Murasaki 1979: 95)

*ku=ramah-sak-ibi ne-'an kusu.*  
 1SG.S=heart-lack-POSS COP-exist.SG because

'Since I am probably not stupid.'

(24) (Murasaki 1979: 95)

*pohke-no mokoro 'anah pirika-ha nee nankor.*  
 warm-ADV sleep if be.good-POSS COP probably

'It is probably good if he sleeps (keeping ) warm.'

Some of these auxiliaries have no equivalents in HA, as, for example, *nee-ko* 'surely' and *ne-'an* 'probably', while others have equivalents that do not require the use of the copula *ne* as an initial component in HA, as, for example, *nankor* 'probably' in (25), cf. *nee nankor* 'probably' of SA in (24).

(25) (Nakagawa & Bugaeva 2012: K8010301UP.114)

*tunas e=unu-hu ka isam nankor (HA)*  
 quickly 2SG.A=mother-POSS even/also not.exist probably

'Your mother will probably die soon, so.'

(iii) Clausal nominalizations. In (26)–(27), the clausal (event) nominalization functions as the subject (s) of the main clause. In the same grammatical context

in HA, the verb is used in its regular (finite) form, but it should be followed by a nominalizing word, cf. (6).

(26) (Murasaki 1979: 141)

*isa oh-ta ku=oman keray-kusu ku=araka-ha pirka.*  
 doctor place-LOC 1SG.S=go.SG thanks-because 1SG.S=be.sick-POSS be.good

‘Because I went to the doctor, my sickness got better.’

(27) (Murasaki 1979: 95)

*ku=ye-be sunke*  
 1SG.S=say-POSS lie/be.untrue

‘(What) you said is not true.’

(iv) Evidential/modal/aspectual sentences with a nominalizing word and a copula. The nominalizing word in these cases is preceded by the equative copula *nee* and followed by the locative copula *an*: V-POSS *nee* NMZ *an*.

(28) (Murasaki 1979: 46)

*tara aynu itah-no-bo nee sir-ihí an.*  
 this Ainu/person speak-much-POSS COP sight-POSS/VIS.EV exist.SG

‘It looks that this person speaks too much.’

(29) (Murasaki 1979: 113)

*nah kanneka itah ku=wante-be nee ruu-be an.*  
 that like even/also speech 1SG.A=know-POSS COP track-POSS/INF.EV exist.SG

‘I think I remember the language so (well).’

Recall that in HA the verb is used in its regular (finite) form and followed directly by a nominalizing word without the equative copula *ne*. Also, it is the equative copula *ne* that is used in HA in declarative sentences after the nominalizing word, not the locative copula *an* as in SA, cf. (8) and (9).

(v) Main clauses (sentence-final), without a copula. [(NP...) V-POSS]<sub>MC</sub> is typically found in a broad range of presuppositional contexts, that is, assertions, polar, and content questions. Recall that in HA the sentence-final copula is similarly omitted in exclamations, as in (11a) and (12a), and polar questions, as in (11b), (12b), (13), and (14).

(30) (Murasaki 2013)

*ku'ani tani uwas ku=ek-ihii.*  
 I now only 1SG.S=come.SG-POSS  
 'I just came.' (Assertion)

(31) (Murasaki 2009: 95)

*Harumi neya otoopempe ee-be uwa.*  
 Harumi N.PRT sweets eat-POSS FIN  
 'Harumi has eaten the sweets.' (Assertion)

(32) (Murasaki 2009: 95, cf. (13) in HA)

*pirika-ha aa?*  
 be.good-POSS FIN(?)  
 'Have you recovered?' (Polar Q)

(33) (Murasaki 2013)

*siriman poro-n-no eci=tarap-ihii?*  
 last.night be.many-EP-ADV 2PL.S=dream-POSS  
 'Did you see a lot of dreams last night?' (Polar Q)

(34) (Murasaki 2013)

*hemanta kusu e=cis-ihii, tara bekaci?*  
 what reason 2SG.S=cry-POSS this boy  
 'Why are you crying, boy?' (Content Q)

(35) (Murasaki 2009: 26, cf. (10) of HA)

*atay-ehe hempah-no an-ihii?*  
 price-POSS how.much-ADV exist.SG-POSS  
 'How much is the price of (it)?' (Content Q)

### ***Searching for a common function***

Next, I would like to find out whether there is anything in common between all those versatile uses of the nominalizing form *v-POSS* occurring in: (i) adverbial clauses marked with adverbial conjunctions and (ii) modal sentences marked with modal auxiliaries, which synchronically or diachronically contain the equative

copula *ne*, (iii) clausal nominalizations which are used as arguments in the main clause, (iv) evidential/modal/aspectual sentences with a nominalizing word, and (v) main clauses (sentence-final).

My hypothesis is that the nominalizing form *v-POSS* always occurs in presuppositional contexts, so first I would like to clarify the term “presupposition” based on various sources.

Karttunen & Peters (1979: 1) define “presupposition” as contents that survive embedding under operators like negation or modals, and as “propositions which the sentences are not primarily about”; see also Simons, Tonhauser, Beaver & Roberts (2010). Similarly, Horton & Hirst (1988: 255) characterize “presupposition” as “a proposition that is conveyed by a sentence or utterance but is not part of the main point”. For Potts (2005) presuppositions are not at-issue, that is, not the main point of the utterance. Evidential implications across languages have been argued to be not at-issue (e.g. Faller 2002). Finally, according to Lambrecht (1994: 52), “Pragmatic presupposition: the set of propositions lexicogrammatically evoked in a sentence which the speaker assumes the hearer already knows or is ready to take for granted at the time the sentence is uttered.” To summarize, grammatically presuppositions can survive embedding under negation, and in combination with modals and evidentials, and pragmatically they refer to old information.

I suggest that grammatically, in uses (i)–(iv) of the nominalizing form *v-POSS*, we are dealing with presuppositions, and that crosslinguistically those contexts often refer to old information. Next, I will show that the sentence-final use (v) [(NP...) *v-POSS*]<sub>MC</sub> has also to do with the discourse flow and information structure: *v-POSS* refers to old information while finite verbal forms refer to new information. Consider the following conversational passage from Murasaki (1976: 3–5). Owing to lack of space I have excluded some parts of the original Ainu text.

F: *tan unarpe-be.*  
this aunt-POSS

‘Aunt,

*’esinnisab-ta ’e=numa yke hemata ’e=kii-hii?* [1]  
this.morning-LOC 2SG.S=wake.up then what 2SG.A=do-POSS  
what did you do this morning?’

O: *numa=’an teh suke=’an tek*  
wake.up=1SG.S and cook=1SG.S and

‘I woke up, cooked and



*yama* 'ob-ta makap='an *teb*  
 mountains place-LOC go=1SG.S and

went to the mountains and,

*niicay-teh* 'ay=se *wa* *sapa='an* *tek*  
 tree-hand 1SG.A=carry.on.back and descend=1SG.S and

carrying on my back tree branches, I came down and

*tani* 'an=tuye *hemaka.*  
 now 1SG.A=cut finish

now I finished cutting them.

F: *e=niina* *teb*  
 2SG.S=fetch.firewood and

'You have fetched firewood and

*'orowa* *e='i=wooneka* *kusu*  
 then 2SG.A=1SG.O=go.to.have.a.look.at because

then, in order to see me,

*tee-ta* 'e=san-ibi [2] *ne'-anike* 'aa!  
 here=LOC 2SG.S=descend-POSS COP-ADM PERF

you came down here!'

Since you came down to see me, let's talk. A young lady from a faraway village, from a faraway country came because she wants to hear various stories, because she wants to talk to grandmothers. Aunt, tell her something!

O: You tell her as much as you know!

F: I am telling her every day all I know. I let her listen and we are mutually very happy. So we live. You too should tell her something in the language of your village.

O: *hemata* *ay=yee-bee...* [3]  
 what 1SG.A=say/tell-POSS

'What should I tell her?'

There was a lot of salmon in our village. Salmon was in abundance and we used to go to the river, catch it and eat with children.

F: *kerasuyka keera'an ceb pateh 'e='ee-bee!* [4]  
 very delicious fish only 2SG.A=eat-POSS

'You ate only very delicious fish!'

As to me, when I lived there in my village Raychishka I also ate a lot of delicious fish. There was a lot of salmon, herring, dace etc. Tell her what kind of fish used to live in your village?

O: By Russian order, we left our village (in Sakhalin) and came to Hokkaido. And now we do not eat fish at all. Now, I am only bones (= lost a lot of weight). I want to go to my village again and eat there this delicious fish once again before I die.

F: *'e'ani ka nab'an ram 'e=kor-oho?* [5]  
 you even/also such heart/thought 2SG.S=have-POSS

'You also have such thoughts?!

*'ku'ani ka nab'an ram 'e=kor-oho.* [6]  
 I even/also such heart/thought 2SG.S=have-POSS

'I (myself) have such thoughts (too).'

(Then F switches to a new topic and there are no more V-POSS forms.)

To summarize, the form [(NP...) V-POSS]<sub>MC</sub> occurs in the text in the following contexts: assertions [6], content questions [1, 3], polar questions [5], and exclamations [2, 4].<sup>4</sup>

In previous research on SA, Murasaki (1979: 72) does not identify "*hVV*" with the possessive endings of nouns. She writes it as a separate word and does not explain why the vowel alternates. However, her description of the functions of *hVV* may serve as a useful reference: "*hVV*. Assertion. Is used when talking about events of the past or to emphatically explain facts of the present; ...*hVV*. The speaker is asking the addressee with a good understanding of his/her feelings. Compassionate question."

4 Interestingly, similar uses of non-embedded nominalizations are attested in many Tibeto-Burman languages and in Nepali (Thomas Owen-Smith, ALT 10).

## 6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, I have focused on the forms (NP...) V NMZ in HA and V-POSS in SA, which are regarded here as nominalizations. I have shown that both forms are used in similar syntactic and semantic contexts (Table 1).

Table 1 Functions of nominalizing forms in Ainu: (NP...) V NMZ in HA and V-POSS in SA

	Lexical N	Clausal N	Adverbial clauses	Evidential/ modal/aspectual sentences	Main clauses (sentence-finally)
(NP...) V NMZ	+	+	+	+	+
V-POSS	-	+	+	+	+

The actual modal and aspectual markers triggering nominalizations in HA and SA do not overlap completely, cf. (25) and (24). Thus, in SA, the form V-POSS is, in most cases, followed by forms (conjunctions/auxiliaries), which synchronically or diachronically contain the equative copula *ne(e)*. The copula is absent only when the form V-POSS occurs in clausal nominalizations and main clauses. In HA, the form (NP...) V NMZ requires the use of the copula *ne* in sentence final position only when a nominalizing word functions as a marker of evidentiality, modality or aspect.

In this concluding section, I would like to propose a tentative grammaticalization scenario for the development of nominalizations in Ainu. Based on a cross-dialectal comparison, I suggest that zero-nominalization [(NP...) V]<sub>NP</sub>, attested in HA, reflects the oldest stage (I), the strategy of adding a nominalizing word [(NP...) V NMZ]<sub>NP</sub>, which proliferates in HA, is regarded as the next stage (II). And finally, in SA, non-finite verbal forms containing a possessive style agreement [(NP...) V-POSS]<sub>NP</sub> (III), which can also be used as non-embedded (finite) structures [(NP...) V-POSS]<sub>MC</sub> (IV) in a broad range of presuppositional contexts, are regarded as the last and most innovative stage.

The emergence of V-POSS may have started from adverbial clauses, which synchronically or diachronically contain the copula *ne(e)* ‘to (be)come sth/sb’, for example, V-POSS *ne yah* ‘if...’, V-POSS *nee-no* ‘as’, and so on (V-POSS CONJ < be.COP+?). Next, the use of V-POSS was extended to sentences with evidential/modal/aspectual “heads” (NMZ), but these had previously lacked a copula, so V-POSS forms could not be directly embedded. Therefore, a copula had to be inserted: V-POSS be.COP EV.NMZ exist.COP. Finally, the main-clause use [(NP...) V-POSS]<sub>MC</sub> emerged and got fixed in a broad range of presupposition contexts (assertions, polar, and content questions, etc.) acquiring illocutionary force by itself.

The innovative form *v-POSS* in *SA* may have developed under the influence of the Tungusic languages spoken in Sakhalin (especially *Uilta?*), which, unlike *HA*, do have subordinating non-finite verbal forms, but the issue requires a detailed investigation.

*Ainu* presents a fine example of a language where the development of nominalized structures has occurred in a cycle: through embedding, independent structures gradually developed into dependent structures, and then the latter gradually turned back into independent structures again.

## ABBREVIATIONS

*HA* Hokkaido *Ainu*  
*SA* Sakhalin *Ainu*

-	derivational boundary	ITR	iterative
=	inflectional boundary	LOC	locative
1	first person	MC	main clause
2	second person	N	noun
3	third person	NEG	negation
A	transitive subject	NMZ	nominalizer
ADM	admirative	NP	noun phrase
ADV	adverbial	O	object
APPL	applicative	PERF	perfect
AUX	auxiliary verb	PL	plural
CAUS	causative	POSS	possessive
COM	comitative	PRT	particle
CONJ	conjunction	Q	question marker
COP	copula	REC	reciprocal
DIM	diminutive	REFL	reflexive
EP	epenthetic consonant	REP	reportive
EV	evidential	S	intransitive subject
EXC	exclusive	SG	singular
FIN	final particle	TAM	tense, aspect, mood
INC	inclusive	V	verb
IND	indefinite	VIS	visual
INF	inferential		

## REFERENCES

- BAKER, Mark 1996. *The Polysynthesis Parameter*. Oxford: OUP.
- BUGAEVA, Anna 2004. *Grammar and Folklore Texts of the Chitose Dialect of Ainu (Idiolect of Ito Oda)*. (ELPR Publication Series A-045) Suita: Osaka Gakuin University.
- BUGAEVA, Anna 2013. Mermaid Construction in Ainu. In: T. TSUNODA (ed.), *Adnominal Clauses and the “Mermaid Construction”: Grammaticalization of Nouns*: 667–677. (NINJAL Collaborative Research Project Reports 13-01) Tokyo: National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics.
- BUGAEVA, Anna, Shiho ENDŌ & Shiroo AKASEGAWA 2015. *A Topical Dictionary of Conversational Ainu (English HP)*. NINJAL. <ainutopic.ninjal.ac.jp/en>
- COMRIE, Bernard & Sandra A. THOMPSON 1985. Lexical Nominalization. In: T. SHOPEN (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon, III*: 349–398. Cambridge: CUP.
- EVANS, Nicholas & Hans-Jürgen SASSE 2002. Introduction: Problems of Polysynthesis. In: N. EVANS & H.-J. SASSE (eds), *Problems of Polysynthesis*: 1–14. (STUF, Studia typologica 4) Berlin: Akademie.
- EVANS, Nicholas 2007. Insubordination and Its Uses. In: I. NIKOLAEVA (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*: 366–431. Oxford: OUP.
- FALLER, Martina 2002. *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*. Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University.
- GENETTI, Carol 2007. *A Grammar of Dolakha Newar*. (Mouton Grammar Library 40) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- GENETTI, Carol, Alexander R. COUPE, Ellen BARTEE, Kristine HILDEBRANDT & You-Jing LIN 2008. Syntactic Aspects of Nominalization in Five Tibeto-Burman Languages of the Himalayan Area. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 31(2): 97–144.
- GIVÓN, Talmy 2009. Multiple Roots to Clause Union: The Diachrony of Complex Verb Phrases. In: T. GIVÓN & M. SHIBATANI (eds), *Syntactic Complexity*: 81–118. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- HORTON, Diane & Graeme HIRST 1988. Presuppositions as Beliefs. In: *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, COLING-88*: 255–260.
- KARTTUNEN, Lauri & Stanley PETERS 1979. Conventional Implicature. In: C.K. OH & D. DINEEN (eds), *Syntax and Semantics, XI: Presuppositions*: 1–56. NY: Academic Press.
- KIKUCHI, Toshihiko 1999. Ainu Tiers with Ancient Cultures of Northeast Asia. In: W.W. FITZHUGH & Ch.O. DUBREUIL (eds), *Ainu: Spirit of a Northern People*: 47–51. Washington: National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution.
- KO, Seongyeo, Andrew JOSEPH & John WHITMAN 2014. Comparative Consequences of the Tongue Root Harmony Analysis for Proto-Tungusic, Proto-Mongolic, and Proto-Korean. In: M. ROBBEETS & W. BISANG (eds), *Paradigm Change: The Transeurasian Languages and Beyond*: 141–176. (Studies in Language Companion Series 161) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- KOPTJEVSKAYA-TAMM, Maria 1993. *Nominalizations*. London: Routledge.
- KORNFILT, Jaklin & John WHITMAN 2011. Introduction: Nominalizations in Syntactic Theory. *Lingua* 121(7): 1160–1163.
- LAMBRECHT, Knud 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representation of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: CUP.
- MALCHUKOV, Andrej L. 2004. *Nominalization/Verbalization: Constraining a Typology of Transcategorical Operations*. Munich: LINCOM.
- MALCHUKOV, Andrej L. 2006. Constraining Nominalization: Function/Form Competition. *Linguistics* 44–45: 973–1009.
- MITHUN, Marianne 1984. The Evolution of Noun Incorporation. *Language* 60: 847–894.
- MITHUN, Marianne 1991. The Role of Motivation in the Emergence of Grammatical Categories: The Grammaticalization of Subjects. In: E.C. TRAUGOTT & B. HEINE (eds), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, II: 159–184. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- MURASAKI, Kyōko 1976. *Karafuto ainugo* [Sakhalin Ainu]. Tokyo: Kokushokan-kōkai.
- MURASAKI, Kyōko 1979. *Karafuto ainugo: Bunpō-ben* [Sakhalin Ainu: Grammar volume]. Tokyo: Kokushokan-kōkai.
- MURASAKI, Kyōko 2009. *Karafuto Ainugo nyūmon kaiwa* [First step for the Sakhalin Ainu language]. Kushiro: Ryokugeisha.
- MURASAKI, Kyōko 2013. *Fujiyama Haru kōjutsu: Karafuto Ainugo reibunshū* [Short sentences in Sakhalin Ainu language spoken by Fujiyama Haru], 1. Sapporo: Hokkaidō Daigaku Ainu Senjūmin Kenkyū Sentā HP. <[www11102ue.sakura.ne.jp/karahto/](http://www11102ue.sakura.ne.jp/karahto/)>
- NAKAGAWA, Hiroshi 1995. *Ainugo chitose hōgen jiten* [A Dictionary of the Chitose Dialect of Ainu]. Tokyo: Sōfūkan.
- NAKAGAWA, Hiroshi & Anna BUGAEVA 2012. *Folktales of the Saru Dialect of Ainu by Mrs. Kimi Kimura (1900–1988)* [deposit 1]. ELDP, SOAS, University of London. <[elrsoas.ac.uk/projects/0107](http://elrsoas.ac.uk/projects/0107)>
- ODA, Ito (1908–2000), informant of the Chitose dialect of Ainu.
- OKUDA, Osami 2001 (1989). Nihongo to ainugo-ni okeru rentai shūshoku to bun-no meishika [Noun-modifying and clausal nominalization in Japanese and Ainu]. In: *Waseda Daigaku Gogaku Kyōiku Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 39. Reprinted in: *Ainugo-kō, Bunpō*, 2(V): 243–256. Tokyo: Yumani Shobō.
- OWEN-SMITH, Thomas 2013. Nominalized Predicates and the Tibeto-Burmanization of Nepali. Paper presented at the Association for Linguistic Typology 10th Biennial Conference, Leipzig University, August 15–18.
- PIŁSUDSKI, Bronisław 1912. *Materials for the Study of Ainu Language and Folklore*. Cracow: Imperial Academy of Sciences.
- POST, Mark. 2011 *Nominalization-based Constructions in Tibeto-Burman Languages: Typology and Evolution*. Paper presented at the Association for Linguistic Typology 9th Biennial Conference, University of Hong Kong, July 22.
- POTTS, Christopher 2005. *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: OUP.
- SATŌ, Tomomi 2008. *Ainugo bunpō no kiso* [The basics of Ainu grammar]. Tokyo: Daigakushorin.

- SIMONS, Mandy, Judith TONHAUSER, David BEAVER & Craige ROBERTS 2010. What Projects and Why. In: N. ASHTON, A. CHERECHES & D. LUTZ (eds), *Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT)* 21: 309–327. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.
- SHIBATANI, Masayoshi 1990. *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: CUP.
- SHIBATANI, Masayoshi 2009. Elements of Syntactic Structures, Where Recursion Isn't: The Case of Relativization. In: T. GIVÓN & M. SHIBATANI (eds), *Syntactic Complexity*: 164–198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- TAMURA, Suzuko 1996. *Ainugo Saru Hōgen Jiten* [A Dictionary of the Saru dialect of Ainu]. Tokyo: Sōfūkan.
- TAMURA Suzuko 2000 [1988]. Ainugo [The Ainu language]. In: KŌJI Takashi, KŌNO Rokurō & CHINO Eiichi (eds), *Gengogaku Daijiten* [Encyclopedia of Linguistics]. English translation: The Ainu language, (ICHEL Linguistic Studies 29). Tokyo: Sanseidō.