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This paper deals with the strategies of relativization and nominalization in Kolyma Yukaghir with the focus on the functions of the suffix -je. In the present-day language this suffix is widely used as a relativizer, while examples of its use as a nominalizer are non-productive and have been regarded as lexicalized nouns based on the relativizing function. However, data from earlier periods contain a number of examples of the suffix -je in both functions, with relative clauses exhibiting a nominal property, and with the nominalizing function appearing more frequently than in the present-day data. This suggests that the relativizing function of the suffix -je developed from a primary nominalizing function.

В статье рассматриваются стратегии релятивизации и номинализации при помощи суффикса -je в колымском диалекте юкагирского языка. В современном языке этот суффикс широко употребляется как релятивизатор, в то время как примеры его употребления в качестве номинализатора являются непродуктивными и считаются лексикализованными именами, основанными на релятивизации. Однако, более ранние материалы содержат примеры суффикса -je в обеих функциях. В этих материалах номинализирующая функция встречается чаще, чем в современном языке, и примеры релятивизации имеют свойства номинализации. Можно предположить, что суффикс -je исходно служил для номинализации и только впоследствии стал показателем релятивизации.

1. INTRODUCTION

Kolyma Yukaghir is one of two languages forming, together with Tundra Yukaghir, a small unaffiliated language family in Northeast Siberia.¹ In terms of their basic typology, as Comrie (1981: 258) points out, the Yukaghir languages are close to the general type represented by the “Altaic” and Eastern Uralic languages: they exhibit agglutinating (partially fusional) and suffix-dominant morphology,

---

¹ Parts of this paper were presented at the conference on “System changes in the languages of Russia”, held in St Petersburg in October 2014. I am very grateful to the participants of this conference for helpful comments and discussions. I would also like to thank John Whitman for his insightful comments and suggestions on the earlier drafts of this paper. All remaining errors are mine.
head-final NP structure, and verb-final constituent order with dominant SOV in positioning of arguments. There is little written attestation of Yukaghir prior to the end of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, texts collected at the end of the nineteenth and at the beginning of the twentieth century by Waldemar Jochelson (1900; 1926) show notable differences from the data collected in and after the Soviet period with regard to phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon. This facilitates to some extent the internal reconstruction of the diachronic background of Yukaghir.

This paper focuses on the suffix -je, which has the allomorphs -j(e), -d’e, and -t’e. This suffix has two functions: relativization and nominalization. In the present-day language, this suffix is widely used in the former function, that is, as a relativizer, while in the latter function it is non-productive. Examples of the relativizing function cited in linguistic literature have so far been regarded as nouns resulting from the lexicalization of the nominalized forms. However, Jochelson’s data contain a number of examples of the suffix -je in both functions. This suggests an alternative view: -je-marked relative clauses may actually originate from a primary function of -je-marked clauses as nominalizations. Below, after an overview of the current uses of the suffix -je, two major differences between contemporary and earlier data will be illustrated, followed by a discussion concerning the general relationship of relativization and nominalization.

2. DATA FROM THE PRESENT-DAY LANGUAGE

As mentioned above, in present-day Kolyma Yukaghir the suffix -je normally expresses relativization. It is one of the suffixes used to form attributive forms (or “participles”) of verbs, that is, to build relative clauses (Kreinovich 1979; Maslova 2003; Nagasaki 2014). There are, however, also a number of nouns derived from verbs by the same suffix. In previous literature on Yukaghir these have been regarded as examples of lexicalized attributive forms of verbs (Kreinovich 1982: 90–93; Maslova 2003: 137–138).

Relative clauses

Relative clauses in Kolyma Yukaghir allow the relativization of a variety of syntactic positions across the Accessibility Hierarchy as proposed by Keenan and Comrie (1977). There appear to be few restrictions on the syntactic role of the

2 The final vowel /e/ of the allomorph -je is often dropped when the suffix is used in a relative clause (in the relativizing function before a head noun).
head noun within the relative clause, though it may be noted that examples of the relativization of the object of comparison have not been attested so far. Examples (1) and (2) show relativization of intransitive and transitive subjects. Note that “adjectives” in Yukaghir are a subclass of intransitive verbs. Therefore, the “adjectival” intransitive verbs that modify nouns may also be analysed as forming relative clauses, as in (1a), (5), and (6). For ease of reference, the gloss “JE” will be used for the suffix -je and its variants throughout the paper.3

(1a) \([omo-t'e] t'uge\)
be.good-JE route
’a/the good route’

(1b) \([kel-te-j] foromo\)
come-FUT-JE person
’a/the person who will come’

(1c) (Nagasaki 2015: 77)
\(tay [el=\text{en}-d'e] foromo-pul\)
that NEG=be.seen-JE person-PL
‘those invisible people’

(2) \([mit-kele zyrjanka-ge joq-to-je] foromo\)
1PL-ACC toponym-LOC arrive-CAUS-JE person
‘the person who brought us to Zyrjanka’

Examples (3), (4), and (5) show examples of objective, instrumental, and locative relative clauses, respectively.

(3) \([mit-ket min-d'e] poydo\)
1PL-ABL take-JE money
‘the money taken from us’

3 Unless otherwise indicated, the data in this paper are from the author’s unpublished field notes and were obtained by direct elicitation. As for published sources, the texts in Nagasaki (2015), Nikolaeva (1989), and Jochelson (1900; 1926) were used. In the examples taken from Nagasaki (2015) and Nikolaeva (1989), the Cyrillic transcription has been transliterated into a Roman one. The glosses and English translations are the author’s own.
As is shown in the above examples, Kolyma Yukaghir relative clauses are basically gapped: a relative clause does not contain an overt expression for the head noun referent and its function in the relative clause. However, a possessor relative clause is always accompanied by the retention of the third-person possessive suffix on the possessee noun inside the relative clause, which cross-references the head noun (i.e. possessor) (6). Furthermore, when the third-person singular/plural pronouns, or also nouns with the third-person possessive suffix, appear as the subject in a relative clause, they optionally stand in the genitive case: tudel 3sG(NOM) vs. tude 3sG:GEN, tittel 3PL(NOM) vs. titte 3PL:GEN, and -gi POSS.3(NOM) vs. -de POSS.3:GEN. Other types of nominals do not have distinct genitive forms and always appear in the nominative (zero-marked) case in the subject position of a relative clause.

With regard to the marking of verbal categories, the verb in a relative clause can take not only derivational suffixes marking the category of valency/aspect (2), but also inflectional suffixes such as tense (1b) and the proclitic of negation (1c).

**Lexical nominalizations**

Lexicalized nouns containing the suffix -je involve mainly participant or argument nominalizations (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993; Comrie & Thompson 2007). Patientive/theme nouns derived from intransitives are predominant among them (7b-1), although other types of participant/argument nominalization are also attested (7b-2, 7c).
(7a) Agentive nouns

(7a-1) From intransitive verbs

(7a-2) From transitive verbs

(7b) Patientive/theme nouns

(7b-1) From intransitive verbs

(7b-2) From transitive verbs
	nen-d’e [inform-je] ‘news’

(7c) Instrumental nouns


(7d) Others
	puge-d’e [be.hot-je] ‘sweat’

Some of the nominalized verbs contain a verbal derivational suffix, as in t’irt’ege-t-t’e [jump-caus-je] ‘gun,’ föj-l-oo-d’e [roast-RES-je] ‘roast (meat),’ see also (9a). However, unlike in relative clauses, the future tense suffix and the negative proclitic do not occur. Basically, these cases can be treated as simple deverbal nouns, which behave like common nouns both morphologically and syntactically, as illustrated in (8):

(8a) (Nikolaeva 1989/I: 94)

taat ejre-t joulud’e-j lige-je pulat-pe-get,
then walk-CVB ask-IND.INTR.3 be.aged-je old.man-PL-ABL

‘Then (he) walked and asked the aged men,

anted’aa-je-pul-get, alme-pul-get, lejdii-je-pul-get ...
conjure-je-PL-ABL shaman-PL-ABL know-je-PL-ABL

wizards, shamans, and wise men.’
mit-ek aŋsii-yile n’an’ulben-pe kudet’ii-je-pe-gi.
1PL-FOC search-PL:ME.3 devil-PL kill-JE-PL-POSS.3

‘The killers of the devils are looking for us.’

However, in the database on contemporary Yukaghir (the author’s field materials), there are two elicited examples of instrumental nouns formed from a verb phrase consisting of a verb and its object (9):

(9a) n’aiat’e juo-nu-je
face see-iPFv-JE

‘mirror’ (lit. ‘something for seeing face’)

(9b) joo-d anrii-je
head-ATTR scrape-JE

‘comb’ (lit. ‘something for scraping head’)

With regard to the marking of the objects in (9), it may be noted that (9a) appears without any suffix on the object noun, while in (9b) the object is accompanied by the nominal attributive suffix -d/-n. These two types of object marking are parallel to those observed in the marking of nominal modifiers in the N + N type of noun phrase, as shown in the contrast between (10a) and (10b).

(10a) meemee t’uge
bear track

‘track(s) of a/the bear; a/the bear’s track(s)’

(10b) meemee-n t’uge
bear-ATTR track

‘a/the bear track(s)’

The nominal attributive -d/-n is available only for common nouns and the interrogative pronoun leme ‘what’. It is optionally added when the modifying noun does not refer to a specific individual but, rather, denotes a generic kind, such as the kind of ‘bears’ in (10b), compare Maslova (2003: 117), see also the examples in (11a). The suffix -d/-n also denotes the “whole” in a whole-part relationship, as in the examples in (11b).
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3. DATA FROM EARLIER MATERIALS

In Jochelson’s data, collected at the end of nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century, the suffix -je is used for both relativization and nominalization. However, Jochelson’s data reveal two differences as compared with the present-day language. First, in relative clauses the suffix -je can be accompanied by the nominal attributive suffix -d/-n. Second, the number and variety of nominalizations from verb phrases is much larger than today.

Relative clauses with nominal attributive marker

Following are some examples illustrating the occurrence of the suffix -je in combination with the nominal attributive suffix -d/-n (12):4

(12a) (Jochelson 1900: 181)

Хоіɬ тӯдін  омӧчӓд   ӧ́нмӓгӓлӓ  тадігӓн.
qoil  tud-in   [omo-t’e]-d   ɵnme-gele  tadi-gen.
god  3sG-Dat  be.good-JE-ATTR  mind-ACC  give-IMP.3

‘May God give him a good mind!’

(12b) (Jochelson 1926: 262)

Căʹyед-   āʹcek   ta’dиîtreɬe.
[t’aa-je]-d   aat’e-k   tadi-ŋi-mele.
bе.little-JE-ATTR  reindeer-FOC  give-PL-ME.3

‘A few of the reindeer were given to them.’

4 For the data taken from Jochelson (1900; 1926), both the original notation and a normalized Roman transcription are provided in the first and second lines of each example. The hyphens between two words in the original notation have been removed in the normalized version.
It may be seen that the nominal attributive suffix -d/-n co-occurs with stative intransitive verbs, especially with “adjectival” verbs. This preference for “adjectival” verbs seems to be related to the functions of the nominal attributive suffix mentioned above, in that both nominal modifiers and “adjectival” verbs marked by -d/-n denote a timeless feature. However, the suffix -d/-n is optional for “adjectival” verbs. As may be seen from the examples in (13), verbs similar to those in the above examples can also appear without it.
(13a) (Jochelson 1900: 108)

Тіŋ мархіл'пӓгӓлӓ тамітӓŋам,  
tiŋ marqil'-pe-gle tami-te-ŋam,  
this girl-PL-ACC dress.oneself-CAUS-PL:IND.TR.3

‘They dressed the girls;

ом’очӓ  ʰӑ’пӓ  тамітӓŋам.  
[omo-t’e] n’er-e tami-te-ŋam.  
be.good-JE cloth-INS dress.oneself-CAUS-PL:IND.TR.3

they dressed them in good clothes.’

(13b) (Jochelson 1900: 81)

Аі  чӑяӑ  шорӧмo  ʰӑнӵ.  
[ai t’a-je] ʃoromo, ʰe-yi.  
also be.little-JE person exist-PL:IND.INTR.3

‘There are still a little more people.’

(13c) (Jochelson 1900: 91)

Нумо órgȧ  нӵӵиӑ  шорӧмo  уӵӵи.  
numo-get [niё-je] ʃoromo ukei-yi.  
house-ABL be.many-JE person go.out-PL:IND.INTR.3

‘A lot of people went out of the house.’

(13d) (Jochelson 1900: 76)

Јўнам –  ʰӵӵӵиԓ уӵӵиԓ  нӵмӵ;  
juo-ŋam – [iєrun n’utn’e-je] nuto-x ...
see-PL:IND.TR.3 apart stand-JE house-FOC

‘They saw that it was a house that stood in a special manner.’

On the other hand, we cannot find any examples where the nominal-attributive suffix -d/-n would co-occur with action verbs. As can be seen in (14), action verbs always occur without -d/-n. Verbs marked for tense and negation are not accompanied by the suffix -d/-n, either (15).
Nominalizations from verb phrases

Nominalizations with -je are used much more frequently in Jochelson’s data than in the present-day data. In addition to agentive, patientive/theme and instrumental nouns, there are also some examples of locative nouns. It is noteworthy that we can find relatively many examples of nouns formed from verb phrases, and that they contain not only instrumental nouns formed from object-verb phrases (16), similar in type to those in examples (9a–b), but also agentive nouns formed from object-verb phrases (17) and locative nouns formed from subject-verb phrases (18). Both the object and subject in a nominalized verb phrase appear either with or without the nominal attributive suffix -d/-n.
(16a) (Jochelson 1900: 166)

Ігӓ́јӓлӓ, ачӓн мӓінујӓгӓлӓ  н̀ӓ́ргӓ кӃдіӓңам.
igeje-le, [at’e-n mei-nu-je]-gele n’er-ge kudie-ŋam.

‘(They) put strings and lassoes (lit. those for catching reindeer) on the skins.’

(16b) (Jochelson 1900: 117)

... , пугóʤӓ пӓ’ліӓңол кӓ’іңік.
... , [pugod’e peli-e]-ŋol kei-ŋi-k.

‘... , give (it to me) to wipe sweat off (lit. as the one for wiping sweat off)’

(17a) (Jochelson 1900: 226)

Тінӓтаң аʤӯ́д– ӓ́урӓштӓ нýмоңін кóбӓҷ.
tinetay [ad’uu-d eure-f’e]-ŋol numo-ŋin kobe-t’.

‘The matchmaker (lit. the one who carries the word) went home.’

(17b) (Jochelson 1900: 19)

Мӓ́туӆ тӓҭ  мýрӓ кӓ́іlӓшчӓңол мінк.
met-ul [tet mure keil’e-f’e]-ŋol min-k.

‘Take me as the one who dries your boots!’

(18a) (Jochelson 1900: 70)

... , тóлон нӃӃӃԓӃԓ l ӃӃӃԓ ӓӃӃԓ ıxai, ...
... , [tolo-n niпе-je]-ге l’aqa-i, ...

‘... , (and he) arrived at a herd of wild reindeer (lit. a place with a lot of wild reindeer), ...’

(18b) (Jochelson 1900: 5)

НӃӃӃԓ мӧлӃԓдӃԓ ӃӃԓ Ӄԓ ӓӃӃԓ,
nume tolbo-do-vo ayt’i-m,

‘...’
‘(He) looked (for it) in the center of the house, looked (for it) behind the fireplace’ (lit. ‘the place where the fire burns’).

These nominalized verb phrases seem to follow an “ergative” pattern: the object can be expressed in nominalizations of transitive verb phrases and the subject in those of intransitive verb phrases (an observation of John Whitman, pers. comm.). In either case, only the theme argument is realized.

4. RELATIVIZATION VS. NOMINALIZATION

It was pointed out above that there are two major differences between the earlier and present-day data in the uses of the suffix -je. The first concerns the ability of the -je-marked relative clause to take the attributive suffix -d/-n. The second is the frequency of argument nominalizations, especially argument nominalizations from VPs, by -je. These differences are summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Uses of the suffix -je in earlier and present-day data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative clauses without -d/-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clauses with -d/-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of argument nominalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In view of these differences, it is plausible to assume that relative clauses marked by the suffix -je have, in fact, emerged from argument nominalizations used for noun modification. In other words, the direction of the relationship between the two is not from relative clause to nominalization, as has been assumed in previous studies of Kolyma Yukaghir, but from nominalization to relative clause. This is in agreement with the situation in many other languages in which relativization is not structurally distinct from nominalization (cf. e.g. Comrie & Thompson 2007: 378–379). What has happened in Kolyma Yukaghir is the following: the -je-marked nominalizations have gone out of use, and the -je-marked relative clauses have become incompatible with the nominal attributive -d/-n. These two processes appear to have taken place simultaneously.

As for productive argument nominalizations, their equivalents are realized by placing the bound form =bed/=ben (< =bod/=bon) of the light noun ped/pen (<
"pod/pon" 'world, nature, thing' after relative clauses. This construction is found both in contemporary (19) and earlier data (20). It might have gradually replaced the -je-marked nominalization.

(19a) (Nikolaeva 1989(1): 94)

\[
\text{[nume molbo-de-ge \hspace{1cm} le-je]=ben}
\]

\text{house inside-POSS:3-LOC exist-IE=BN}

'the people who were in the house'

(19b) (Nagasaki 2015: 103)

\[
\ldots, \text{[nugen-ge morte-nu-je]=ben-gele, \hspace{1cm} t’ie-d’e-ge \ldots,}
\]

\text{hand-LOC put-IPFV-IE=BN-ACC be.cold-LOC}

'something that is worn in hand in winter'

(20a) (Jochelson 1900: 8)

\[
\text{Mӓt ýo hoidä omóčábdäk kää’čilälälä.}
\]

\text{met uo [noi-de omo-t’e]=bod-ek ket’i-l’el-mele.}

\text{1SG child leg-POSS:3:GEN be.good-IE=BN-FOC bring-INFN-ME.3}

'My child brought one with good legs.'

(20b) (Jochelson 1900: 21)

\[
\ldots, \text{uor-pæ- ał’ktažábdäk äńçhiämä, \ldots}
\]

\text{... , [uor-pe lek-te-je]=bod-ek aŋr’i-ji-me, \ldots}

\text{child-PL eat-FUT-IE=BN-FOC look.for-go-ME.3SG}

'I’m going to look for something that my children will eat.'

It is still unclear whether clausal features such as the ability to take tense, negation and case-marked nominal arguments, were gained after the grammaticalization of nominalizations by -je as relative clauses, or nominalization by -je itself was a process extending over both the phrase and clause levels in times past. Example (12e) might be a piece of indirect evidence for the latter assumption, since the relative clause in this example takes -d/-n, a nominal feature, and at the same time it contains an instrumental argument, a clausal feature. However, neither of

5 The bound form =bod/=ben (< =bod/=bon) of the light noun pod/pen (< pod/pon) ‘world, nature, thing’ has been regarded as a “semi-suffix” forming “participles” (Kreinovich 1979: 367), or as a “nominalizer” (Maslova 2003: 148). However, in most cases when it occurs after a relative clause it may more properly be regarded as an actual head noun that refers to a participant in the event described by the relative clause.
the two assumptions is backed by any direct evidence, and further investigation from diachronic and typological perspectives will be needed.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, the two functions, relativization and nominalization, of the suffix -je in Kolyma Yukaghir have been discussed in the light of data from both the present-day language and earlier materials. The possibility of co-occurrence with the nominal attributive suffix and the productive uses of argument nominalization in the earlier period suggest that the -je-marked relative clauses in this language originally involved nominalization.

This conclusion is supported by Kazama’s (2003: 325) discussion, which shows that the same verbal forms appear in both relative clauses and nominalizations in most Tungusic and Mongolic languages. A similar situation is valid for Japanese, as well as for Old and Middle Korean (Ito 2012). In terms of areal typology, Kolyma Yukaghir once had a system of nominalization-relativization similar to these other languages of Northeast Asia. The loss of this feature in Yukaghir seems to have taken place in a not too distant past.

ABBREVIATIONS

1  first person
2  second person
3  third person
ABL ablative
ACC accusative
AN action nominal
ATTR attributive
BN bound noun
CAUS causative
COND conditional
CVB convert
DAT dative
E epenthesis
ESS essive
FOC focus
FUT future
GEN genitive
IMP imperative

IND indicative
INFR inferential
INS instrumental
INTErr interrogative
INTR intransitive
IPFV imperfective
LOC locative
ME passive attributive
NEG negative
NOM nominative
PL plural
POSS possessor
PROP proprietive
RES resultative
SEQ sequential
SG singular
TR transitive
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