Jonathan David Bobaljik

Harvard University

THE CHUKOTKAN "INVERSE" FROM AN ITELMEN PERSPECTIVE

1. Introduction[1]

Comrie (1980) suggests that the Chukotkan agreement prefix inventory includes one prefix which is not a marker of person and number, but is instead an "inverse" marker, signaling that the object outranks the subject on a person/number hierarchy. This position has been adopted without challenge in much of the subsequent English-language literature [Fortescue 1997, Dunn 1999, Spencer 2000]. Comrie suggests that Itelmen, in which the corresponding element marks all and only 3PL subjects in the transitive paradigm, constitutes a reduction in the scope of the inverse marker, thus taking inverse marking to represent the older system. In this short paper, I argue for an alternative account. I suggest that a significantly more straightforward characterization of the distribution of Chukotkan *ne-* is to be had by recognizing the Itelmen pattern as being, in relevant respects, the more conserva-

tive: the Chukchi pattern represents in effect a case of generalized heteroclisis — a single paradigm whose forms are drawn from two paradigms. The distribution of *ne-* in Chukchi represents the grammaticalization of a distribution that has a direct parallel in Itelmen, but which is epiphenomenal in the latter. Arguably, the skewed distribution of transitive *ne-* may thus be part of the same process that yielded the ergative case pattern in Chukotkan, roughly along the lines suggested by Fortescue (1997).

2. Chukotko-Kamchatkan Agreement

The Chukotko-Kamchatkan languages share an intricate system of verbal agreement morphology — all express agreement via a combination of prefixes and suffixes: prefixes generally mark subjects (whether transitive or intransitive) while suffixes mark features of the subject and direct or indirect object. The vast majority of the individual affixes are clearly cognate. While Volodin argued that this shared system arose through language contact between a Chukotkan language and Itelmen [Georg, Volodin 1999: 224–41], it is clear that the agreement systems in the individual languages have developed independently from the common source, arguably suggesting instead a common ancestor [Fortescue 2005]. Resolving the question of the genetic affinity of Itelmen to the Chukotkan languages is not the main thrust of this paper, but I will present the discussion below in terms of development from a common ancestor, as this seems to me to be the most parsimonious account[1].

Basic past tense transitive paradigms for Itelmen and Chukchi are given in (1) and (2)[2]. The focus of Comrie's account, and thus of the

---

[1] Cast in terms of a Sprachbund, my arguments here would be about the nature of the system at the time of purported contact as well as the subsequent developments within Chukotkan.

[2] Itelmen forms given here are drawn mostly from the Sedanka dialect (the Northern sub-group of Western Itelmen), and thus differ in some ways from those in the literature reflecting the Khairjuzovo dialect area (Southern

alternative to be presented below, is the distribution of the *n(e)*-prefix, identified in these paradigms with a bold border. (The double border grouping other first person object forms in (2) will be clarified below).

(1) Itelmen transitive

S\O	1SG	1PL	2SG	2PL	3SG	3PL
1SG			t-__-in	t-__-sxen	t-__-čen	t-__-če?n
1PL			nt-__-in	nt-__-sxen	nt-__-čen	nt-__-če?n
2SG	__-βum	__-βu?m			__-n	__-?n
2PL	__-βum-sx	__-βu?m-sx			__-sx	__-sxi?n
3SG	__-βum	__-βu?m	__-in	__-sxen	__-nen	__-ne?n
3PL	n-__-βum	n-__-βu?m	n-__-in	n-__-sxen	n-__-nen	n-__-ne?n

sub-group). Forms are from field notes unless otherwise indicated. For further detail, see [Bobaljik, Wurmbrand 2002] and references therein.

(2) Chukchi transitive [Скорик 1977: 44–45]

S\O	1SG	1PL	2SG	2PL	3SG	3PL
1SG			t-__-γət	t-__-tək	t-__-γʔen	t-__-net
1PL			mət-__-γət	mət-__-tək	mət-__-γʔen	mət-__-net
2SG	ine-__-γʔi	__tku-γʔi			__-γʔen	__-net
2PL	ine-__-tək	__tku-tək			__-tkə	__-tkə
3SG	ine-__-γʔi	ne-__-mək	ne-__-γət	ne-__-tək	__-nin	__-nine-t
3PL	ne-__-γəm	ne-__-mək	ne-__-γət	ne-__-tək	ne-__-γʔen	ne-__-net

From an Itelmen perspective, there is nothing untoward about the *n-* prefix: it marks all and only 3PL subjects, and occupies the same morphological slot as other agreement prefixes. The only quirk to its behavior is that it, alone among the prefixes, is restricted to the transitive paradigm (3PL intransitive is zero-marked). There is no synchronic motivation to consider it an "inverse" marker. The Chukchi cognate *ne-* has a more jagged distribution, occurring with all 3PL subjects, and in half of the combinations with 3SG subjects. Comrie dubs this the 'strong inverse'. It is thus worth exploring the case for this label.

3. Inverse Marking?

The notion of **inverse marking** originates in the study of the Algonquian languages, and is intimately tied up with the notion of a Person Hierarchy, as given in (3):

(3)   1st person > 2nd person > 3rd person

A clause is INVERSE if the object outranks the subject on the person hierarchy, and is otherwise DIRECT: Thus, *I saw them* is direct, but *They saw me* is inverse. In canonical inverse-marking systems, such as Algonquian, agreement morphemes signal the person and number of the arguments, but an independent morpheme — the theme sign — indicates whether the clause is direct or inverse (see [Klaiman 1993] for an overview). Examples from Nishnaabemwin (Ojibwe) are given in (4), from [Valentine 2001: 287] (see [Oxford 2014] for a recent reassessment of the Algonquian inverse marking system).

(4)   a. *n-*   *wa:bm* *-a:*   *-g*
             1   see   DIR   3PL
             'I see them'

         b. *n-*   *wa:bm* *-igo:* *-g*
             1   see   INV   3PL
             'They see me'

Returning to Chukotkan, we see that the *ne-* prefix occurs mainly in cells that represent inverse combinations. The fit is, however, not exact. There are inverse combinations not marked by *ne-* (outlined by a double line in (2)), and in addition, the distribution of *ne-* in cells representing the interaction of 3rd person acting on 3rd person is not predicted under any definition of inverse. Note moreover that the putative Chukotkan inverse differs from Algonquian in one striking way (as recognized by Comrie): in Algonquian, the theme sign is critical to understanding who did what to whom. The theme sign itself is not an agreement marker, and instead regulates the association of agreement with grammatical function. For example, in (4), the theme sign indicates whether the 1st person *n-* prefix represents the subject or object. In Chukotkan, by contrast, the *ne-* prefix occupies the position of other person and number markers (the subject prefixes). Moreover, in terms of signaling an inverse association, it is entirely redundant: the suffixes unambiguously signal the person and number of the object and do not change function between direct and inverse. There is no

functional motivation from disambiguation (the central role of inverse marking in Algonquian) for understanding this prefix as an inverse marker. For example, in the Chukchi transitive paradigm the suffix *-γət* indicates a 2SG object, regardless of the position of the subject relative to this object on the Person Hierarchy.

By means of a brief detour (which we return to in section 5), it should be noted that the inverse cells not marked by *ne-* have a special morphosyntax. These are the cells framed by a double line in (2) (and (15), below), including, 3SG>1SG *ine-__-γʔi*. All and only these forms, despite being the forms used for the transitive person-number combinations indicated, are in fact drawn from the intransitive paradigm, more specifically, the antipassive. The prefix *ine-* and the suffix *-tku* are regular antipassive morphemes in Chukchi, and not part of the agreement morphology as such[3]. Note also that the suffixes in these forms agree (if at all) only with the subject, with morphology drawn from the intransitive paradigm, in contrast to true transitive forms in which the object controls the form of the agreement suffix. The late Ken Hale dubbed these forms the 'spurious' antipassive [Halle, Hale 1997]: the verb has an antipassive form in these contexts, but the clause has neither the syntax (case marking) nor the semantics associated with an antipassive. That *ine-* is the antipassive and not part of the system of agreement prefixes is clear in more complex forms. For example, agreement prefixes precede the future morpheme (5a–b), while the antipassive follows (5c)[4].

---

[3] There is growing evidence [Dunn 1999; Volkov, Daniel 2018] that *-ine-* is preserved in the agreement paradigms in varieties where its role as an antipassive has been lost, or where the antipassive and agreement-marking uses now diverge in their position relative to other morphemes (Rafael Abramovitz, personal communication).

[4] For formal accounts of the spurious antipassive, see [Spencer 2000; Halle, Hale 1997; Bobaljik, Branigan 2006]. Note that in the participial tenses, the spurious antipassive has a far wider distribution, and is not limited to inverse configurations.

(5) a. ***t-re-ɬʔu-rkəni-ɣət***
      1SG.SUB-FUT-see-PROG-2SG.O
      'I will be seeing you'.

  b. ***ne**-re-ɬʔu-rkəni-mək*
      ne-FUT-see-PROG-1PL.OBJ
      'He/they will see us'.

  c. *ə-nan*   *ɣəm*   *Ø-r-**ine**-ɬʔu-rkən*
      he-ERG   I (ABS)   3SG.SUB(I)-FUT-**AP**-see-PROG
      'He will be seeing me' [Скорик 1977: 57].

Moreover, in the irrealis mood (imperative), the antipassive co-occurs with the agreement prefix:

(6) *ɣəm*   *q-**in**-imti-tək*
      I (ABS)   2.SUB-**AP**-carry-2PL.SUB(I)
      'Carry me!' [Скорик 1977: 83]

Comrie suggests that the spurious antipassive (his 'weak inverse'), together with *ne-*, constitutes a non-homogenous system of inverse marking in Chukotan. Whether inverse alignment plays a role in the understanding of the spurious antipassive or not, it is clear that from a templatic perspective on the Chukotko-Kamchatkan verb, the spurious antipassive stands outside of the transitive agreement paradigm, and will be put aside for now, with further discussion in section 5.

At this point, we return to the combination of 3rd person acting on 3rd person in (2). These four cells do not constitute an inverse configuration according to the hierarchy in (3), yet in two of them, the *ne*-prefix occurs, and in two, it does not:

(7)

S \ O	3SG	3PL
3SG	__-nin	__-nine-t
3PL	ne-__-ɣʔen	ne-__-net

Comrie accounts for two of these four cells by stipulating a language-specific addendum to the person hierarchy, whereby 3SG

outranks 3PL. This ensures that 3PL subject acting on 3SG object has *ne-*, but the reverse configuration does not. This assumption is arguably ad hoc, and moreover it leaves two of the four cells still mysterious: interactions of 3SG>3SG (no *ne-*) and 3PL>3PL (*ne-*). Even with the special language-particular hierarchy, there is no issue in these cells of direct or inverse alignment.

In sum, Comrie's proposal that *n(e)-* in Chukotkan is an inverse marker is an intriguing suggestion, but on closer scrutiny does not provide a particularly compelling characterization of the Chukchi or Itelmen facts. For Itelmen in particular, it seems far simpler to consider *n(e)-* to be an agreement prefix. It behaves in almost all respects like other agreement prefixes, and is unlike the other potential markers of an inverse context (the spurious antipassive). We now turn to an expanded discussion of the Itelmen paradigm, and present an alternative account of why this prefix extends from 3PL to some, but not all, 3SG subjects in Chukchi.

4. Itelmen *n-*

As noted above, in the basic transitive indicative paradigm, Itelmen *n-* marks 3PL transitive subjects. There is, though, an additional paradigm in Itelmen, not presented above. This paradigm, presented in (8), is a species of impersonal or passive; the latter term is preferred by Volodin and will be used here.

(8) Itelmen "passive"

S^O	1SG	1PL	2SG	2PL	3SG	3PL
PASS	n-__-βum	n-__-βuʔm	n-__-in	n-__-sxen	n-__-čen	n-__-čeʔn

In Itelmen, both subjects and objects of transitive clauses are unmarked for case (unlike its northern neighbours, Itelmen is not an ergative language). In the passive, the subject agreement morpheme is replaced by *n-* and the logical subject, if expressed, bears an oblique case: locative if human (or higher animate, incl. anthropomorphized entities), and instrumental otherwise. The subject may only be third

person but may be singular or plural. Like impersonal constructions, and unlike canonical passives in other languages, there is no dedicated voice morphology in this construction, nor is the logical object promoted to subjecthood — the object continues to agree as an object, rather than as a subject. Active-passive pairs are given in (9) and (10), from [Володин 1976: 270][5].

(9) a. *sillatumx-eʔn   kəmma   n-anʲčp-miŋ*
        brother-PL   1SG   3PL-teach-1SG.OBJ
        'The brothers taught me'.

     b. *sillatumx-eʔn-k   kəmma   n-anʲčp-miŋ*
        brother-PL-LOC   1SG   PASS-teach-1SG.OBJ
        'I was taught by the brothers'.

(10) a. *χiŋ-eʔn   minʲɬ   n-ənk-γʷe-nen*
        wolf-PL   hare   3PL-catch-II-3>3SG
        'The wolves caught the hare'.

     b. *χiŋ-eʔn-k   minʲɬ   n-ənk-ki-čen*
        wolf-PL-LOC hare   PASS-catch-II-3SG.OBJ
        'The hare was caught by the wolves'.

[Fortescue 1997] suggests that the Itelmen passive provides a plausible source for the ergative construction in Chukotkan. For the majority of subject-object combinations, the passive and 3PL subject forms are identical (as already noted by Volodin). The only morphological distinction in (9) is the case marking on the agent. Pairs

---

[5] I have altered the word order to stress the morphological parallels. Volodin gives SOV in the active and OVLoc in the passive, but word order is not rigid. Nominals are freely omitted if recoverable from context and in addition, the logical subject is freely omitted in the passive construction, receiving in that case an indefinite or unspecified interpretation. Volodin's examples are from the Khairjuzovo dialect area which differs in some ways from other forms cited in this paper, notably in the use of first person object suffix *-miŋ* or *-məŋ*, corresponding to Sedanka *-βum*. The verb in (11) is from the class II conjugation — on which see Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2002).

such as (9) thus provide a plausible source for reanalysis of the passive / impersonal construction in (9) as an ergative construction, following a well-trodden route to ergativity (cf. [Garrett 1990]). In support of this, the distribution of ergative case in Chukotkan neatly tracks the distribution of agent-marking in the Itelmen passive. For nominals other than pronouns, there is no distinct ergative case in Chukotkan; instead, just as in the Itelmen passive, an ergative subject in Chukotkan bears locative case if it is a human (proper name and some kinship terms), and instrumental otherwise.

Now, if such a reanalysis is the source of ergativity in Chukotkan, the loss of the passive-active contrast must then give rise to an instance of heteroclisis: the resulting transitive paradigm in Chukotkan is the amalgam of forms from the active and passive paradigms, preserved as distinct paradigms in Itelmen. Speaking somewhat loosely, we may conceive of this problem from the perspective of a language learner who is attempting to construct a single transitive paradigm by reanalyzing ambient linguistic data that in fact contains both active and passive paradigms. The learner must, for each 'cell' in the transitive paradigm, settle on one form where the input contains two.

With this in mind, consider the relevant forms in more detail. The table in (11) represents the verb forms associated with 3PL subjects in the archaic system. That is, in the hypothetical source system, just as in contemporary Itelmen, there are two ways to express an action with a 3PL subject — the verb form may be drawn from the active or passive paradigm. By hypothesis, the learner hears these as the forms associated with 3PL subjects and will construct a single row of the transitive paradigm by merging these. I have offered the relevant forms as reconstructions in a hypothetical proto-Chukotko-Kamchatkan, to represent the source language. As our interests here are morphological, I have glossed over some matters of phonological detail in the reconstructions, for example, leaving consonantal clusters that were likely broken up by epenthesis[6].

---

[6] The Itelmen forms directly preserve the morphological structure reconstructed here, with the exception of the 1PL object forms. I have recon-

(11) Heteroclisis: 3 PLURAL subjects

s \ o	1SG	1PL	2SG	2PL	3SG	3PL
*ACT	ne-__-γəm	ne-__-mək	ne-__-γət	ne-__-tək	ne-__-nin	ne-__-nin-t
*PASS	ne-__-γəm	ne-__-mək	ne-__-γət	ne-__-tək	ne-__-Kʔe-n	ne-__-Kʔe-n-t
	⇓	⇓	⇓	⇓	⇓	⇓
3PL	ne-__-γəm	ne-__-mək	ne-__-γət	ne-__-tək	ne-__-γʔen	ne-__-net

For first and second person objects, there is no difference between active and passive, and these transparently provide the forms

---

structed the prefix with a vowel, assuming it has been lost in Itelmen. Phonologically, I have assumed (in line with prior work in this area), that the Chukotkan 1st and 2nd person object suffixes are more conservative, since they are transparently related to the pronouns: 1SG: *γəm*, 2SG *γət*, 1PL *muri*, 2PL *turi*. The changes that derive the Itelmen forms in (1) form the reconstructions in (11) are perhaps non-obvious but are (mostly) well motivated. In brief, running left to right in (11): Itelmen 1SG.OBJ *βum* <*-γəm* is regular; in the Sedanka dialect the 1PL.OBJ form combines this with the regular plural marker. As noted above, the Khairjuzovo dialect area has corresponding 1.OBJ suffixes which are built on -*miŋ* or -*məŋ*, evidently the reflex of *-*mək*. The loss of initial -*γ*- in the 2SG.OBJ forms represents a widespread process in Sedanka, and the reflex of -*γ*- is (or was) preserved in the corresponding Khairjuzovo forms [Володин 1976]; -*n* surfaces in place of -*t* in the 2SG oblique pronouns as well as in the object suffixes. Itelmen has *sx* for *tk* throughout the inflectional morphology (the final -*n* in Itelmen 2PL.OBJ is left as a curious Itelmen innovation). The element I have written "Kʔe" in the reconstructed forms surfaces in Chukotkan as -*γʔe*- and alternates with zero in somewhat unpredictable fashion. Skorik suggests that it is an aspectual suffix in Chukchi [Skorik 1977: 19]. Fortescue reconstructs this as *-*γəRæ*- [Fortescue 1997]. In Itelmen, reflexes seem to be -*č(e)*- in the object (and 1st person intransitive) suffixes, although the connection here is more tenuous. I leave aside more detailed investigation of this element. The Itelmen infixal plural -*ʔ*- corresponds systematically to Chukotkan -(*e*)*t*.

for the corresponding 3PL. For third person objects, the Itelmen active and passive paradigms have distinct suffixes; *-če(ʔ)n* is the regular third person object suffix, and *-ne(ʔ)n* is a portmanteau marker for third person acting on third person. By hypothesis, this distinction is conservative, representing the reconstructed distinction. This is the only choice point in merging these (parts of the) paradigms, and the Chukchi forms correspond to the non-portmanteau suffixes of Itelmen. Unsurprisingly, all 3PL subject forms in Chukotkan have the *ne-* prefix.

Consider now the analogous forms with a 3SG subject, presented in the table in (12). Again, we are looking from the perspective of a choice in the archaic system that must be resolved to a single form for each object in Chukotkan.

(12) Heteroclisis: 3 SINGULAR subjects

S〳O	1SG	1PL	2SG	2PL	3SG	3PL
*ACT	__-γəm	__-mək	__-γət	__-tək	__-nin	__-nin-t
*PASS	ne-__-γəm	ne-__ -mək	ne-__ -γət	ne-__ -tək	ne-__ -KʔeKʔe-n	ne-__ -Kʔe-n-t
	⇓	⇓	⇓	⇓	⇓	⇓
3SG	ANTIPASS	ne-__ -mək	ne-__ -γət	ne-__ -tək	__-nin	__-nine-t

As previously noted, the 1SG object forms fall outside of the system, requiring the (spurious) antipassive morphology (this could be a later development, unrelated to the merger of the paradigms). Taking the remaining first and second person objects, we see that the two reconstructed paradigms (active and passive) differ only in the presence or absence of the prefix *n-*. From the perspective of our hypothetical learner reanalyzing two paradigms as one, it appears for 3SG subjects as if the *ne-* prefix is optional. But for the third person object forms, the presence or absence of the prefix is correlated with whether the suffix is just the third person object suffix (modern Itelmen: *-če(ʔ)n*) or is the portmanteau suffix *-neʔn*. I contend that this is the key observation that explains the extension of the *ne-* prefix into some, but not all, cells of the 3SG subject row in Chukotkan. That is,

from the perspective of a language learner who is attempting to construct a single paradigm where the source language has two, the following statement is true:

(13)   i. The prefix *ne-* may be used with all third person subjects,
       ii. except for 3SG subjects also expressed by the portmanteau suffix *-ne(ʔ)n*.

The generalization in (13) is an accurate description of the union of the transitive active and passive paradigms. The generalization is not merely a hypothesis about reconstructed forms, but is an accurate description of the distribution of notionally transitive forms with third person subjects in contemporary Itelmen. This can be seen in part by comparing (9) and (10) with (14), which has a 3SG logical subject. The *n-* prefix is absent in (14a), which has the portmanteau affix, but present in (14b), which has the simple 3SG object suffix.

(14)   a. *χiŋe   min^i ɬ   ənk-čiŋ-nen*
          wolf   hare   catch-II-3>3SG
          'The wolf caught the hare'.

       b. *χiŋ-enk   min^i ɬ   n-ənk-ki-čen*
          wolf-LOC   hare   PASS-catch-II-3SG.OBJ
          'The hare was caught by the wolf'.

It is worth stressing that for Itelmen (and by hypothesis for the reconstructed source system), the generalization is (13) is true, but epiphenomenal. It is a contingent fact about the nature of two distinct paradigms — a product of the fact that the *n(e)-* prefix marks 3PL active subjects and also marks the passive / impersonal construction (by no means a surprising confluence cross-linguistically), and more idiosyncratically, that Itelmen has a special portmanteau suffix for third person subjects acting on third person objects, in the active paradigm.

Now, while (13) is a true characterization of the distribution of the prefix across paradigms in Itelmen, it is also exactly the distribution of the *ne-* prefix within the unique transitive paradigm of Chukotkan, for which Comrie invoked the notion of an inverse. The

statement in (13) is as much an accurate characterization of (2) in Chukchi as it is of Itelmen. The central thesis here is therefore the following: because Chukotkan resolved the choice of suffixes in (12) in favour of the portmanteau suffixes, nothing beyond (13) needs to be said to characterize the distribution of the *ne-* prefix. The distribution follows entirely as the grammaticalization of a true, but epiphenomenal, generalization, namely (13)[7]. There is no appeal to an inverse, and thus no special stipulations needed for a language-specific markedness hierarchy or for distinct resolutions of 3SG>3SG or 3PL>3PL.

Although *ne-* on this account is formally and synchronically a 3rd person (transitive) subject agreement marker, there is nevertheless one way in which Comrie's insight about inverse alignment remains: Only those forms in (2) that are unambiguously direct (i. e., in which the subject outranks the object on the hierarchy $1 > 2 > 3$) are unambiguously drawn from the archaic transitive paradigm. Unambiguously inverse forms are either drawn from the (spurious) antipassive or are the result of the collapsing together of the transitive active and passive paradigms. One might conjecture that this reflects a distributional asymmetry in the protolanguage: person of agent and patient may have played some role in influencing choices among competing grammatical constructions such as active / passive / antipassive, as, for example, in the Salish languages (see [Aissen 1999]). Synchronically, though, a formalization of (13) provides a complete description of the distribution of *ne-* in Chukchi, including the $3 > 3$ interactions which labeling it an inverse marker does not capture.

---

[7] In an approach to morphology in which overt morphemes are exponents that realize, sometimes imperfectly, an underlying morphosyntactic representation, it is trivial to formalize (13ii) as a deletion rule, deleting the features of the 3SG subject in the presence of the portmanteau suffix. Such a rule was proposed for these facts in [Bobaljik 2000] within the framework of Distributed Morphology, though no consideration of its diachronic source was given in that work.

5. Koryak

If the only paradigms to consider were Chukchi and Itelmen, then the preceding pages would have provided a historical account of the distribution of *ne-* that explains its distribution without considering it to be an inverse marker. Parsimony favours this account of the third person forms, since the inverse account requires additional ad hoc postulates to explain the distribution of 3 > 3 forms which falls out from (13) with no further synchronic assumptions.

However, Koryak (and the Khatyrka dialect of Chukchi) provide an additional layer of complexity. Here, one may see a role for an inverse pattern, acting in concert with the characterization of the 3 > 3 forms just given. The relevant transitive paradigm in these varieties is exactly like Chukchi (2), except that in place of the spurious antipassive forms with *-tku-* marking 1PL objects, we find verb forms that are syncretic with third person subject forms, as in (15):

(15) Koryak transitive [Жукова 1972: 307–308]

S \ O	1SG	1DU	2SG	2DU	3SG	3DU
1SG			t-__-γi	t-__-tək	t-__-n	t-__-net
1PL			mət-__-γi	mət-__-tək	mət-__-n	mət-__-net
2SG	ine-__-i	ne-__-mək			__-n	__-net
2PL	ine-__-tək	ne-__-mək			__-tkə	__-tkə
3SG	ine-__-i	ne-__-mək	ne-__-γi	ne-__-tək	__-nin	__-nin
3PL	ne-__-γəm	ne-__-mək	ne-__-γi	ne-__-tək	ne-__-n	ne-__-net

At first blush, these forms seem to indicate that the account in terms of (13) may be insufficient for these varieties, as the *ne-*prefixed forms include two cells with a second person subject. In fact,

there is total syncretism across all the forms with a first person non-singular object, marked by suffix *-mək*[8].

On Comrie's account, the Koryak form is the basic instantiation of *ne-* as an inverse marker, and Chukchi and Itelmen represent a reduction of the full-blown inverse system. However, from this perspective, it is in some ways curious that an inverse marker as such would be used in these cells in Koryak: exactly in the case of a first person object, special marking of the inverse is redundant. With respect to the hierarchy $1 > 2 > 3$, if the object is first person (unambiguously signaled by *-mək* in the cells in question) then the subject is necessarily lower on the hierarchy. The signal of a first person object is already sufficient to mark the form as inverse. This differs from more canonical inverse marking, as in Algonqiuan (4), where the inverse marker provides a crucial indicator of who is doing what to whom, information which is not provided by the person indices themselves (see [Klaiman 1992]).

Rather than seeing *ne-* in Koryak as an inverse marker in the canonical sense, one could instead, perhaps, see *ne-* in 2 > 1.NSG contexts in (15) as an extension of the corresponding 3 > 1.NSG forms (ultimately at least in part derived from the passive) from the same column[9]. A similar (but not identical) distribution of active versus passive forms, along a direct / inverse alignment, has been grammaticalized in Lummi [Salish, Aissen 1999]: if a third person agent acts on a first or second person patient, then the passive voice is re-

---

[8] Koryak marks a SG-PL distinction for prefixes, and a SG-DU-PL distinction for suffixes. Only forms for dual objects are indicated in table (15) as these are parallel with the plurals in the other tables. Forms for plural objects are built from the dual object forms by means of an additional plural suffix *-la* after the verb stem, before the suffixes in (15).

[9] This description assumes that the restriction of the passive to third person agents is original. Alternatively, Koryak may preserve an older passive pattern, without the third person restriction, whose distribution has become more restricted in Itelmen.

quired. Koryak on this view would go beyond Lummi, requiring the non-active form also where second person acts on first.

Koryak (15) differs from Chukchi (2) in precisely those cells where Koryak uses the *-tku* rather than the *-ine* as a spurious anti-passive. This difference is undoubtedly related to the independent differences in the distribution of *-tku-*. All the Chukotko-Kamchatkan languages have a cognate iterative marker (Chukchi / Koryak *-tku-* and Itelmen *-sxen-* [Володин 1976: 206]), but the *-tku-* spurious anti-passive is unique to Chukchi, which is (as noted by Rafael Abramovitz) also the only member of the family to use *-tku-* to mark a genuine antipassive[10]. If, however, we take the *ne-…-mək* forms to be an extension of the archaic passive into these cells, then Koryak retains with Chukchi the pattern identified at the end of the last section: the outlined cells in (15) are all deviations from the standard transitive paradigm: if the *ne-* is the passive, then all inverse cells are formally either passive or (spurious) anti-passive, marking only one argument via normal transitive agreement morphology. While this leaves some functional role for an inverse in the development of this pattern, in Koryak, like in Chukchi, labeling *ne-* "inverse" cannot be the whole story: The development of the 3 > 3 forms is — as in Chukchi — the result of heteroclisis, and not inverse patterning.

Yet even if we recognize a diachronic role for inverse marking in extending the non-active morphology to 2 > 1.NSG, the formal (e. g., synchronic) modeling of (15) needs no reference to an inverse. The extenstion of the *ne-…-mək* forms in Koryak to 2 > 1 contexts yields, as noted above, a complete syncretism of second and third person subjects (in the context of a first person non-singular object). Further impetus for this development perhaps comes from analogy to other paradigms. Syncretism of second and third person subject marking

[10] As [Nedjalkov 1979: 255] notes, it is unsurprising that the *-tku-* antipassive is used with plural objects only, since this suffix is also used to mark iterativity in verbs and in some instances plurality in nouns. Note the phonetic correspondence of Chukchi *tk* and Itelmen *sx*, and the stray *n*, replicating the correspondence also seen with 2PL agreement morphemes.

occurs elsewhere in all of the languages of the family, in contexts where a direct / inverse contrast is irrelevant, providing a potential source for analogical leveling, specifically in the intransitive paradigms given in (16–18). The intransitive (indicative) prefixes consistently mark only first person, with second and third person not distinguished (they are distinguished in the irrealis/imperative mood). Moreover, in the singular, second and third person subjects are not distinguished in the suffixes, yielding complete syncretism of these forms[11].

(16) Chukchi intransitive (Скорик 1977:20)

	SG	PL
1	t- __-(γʔe)k	mət- __-mək
2	__-γʔi	__-tək
3	__-γʔi	__-γʔe-t

(17) Itelmen intransitive (e.g., Napanskij dial.)[12]

	SG	PL
1	t- __-k(ičen)	nt- __-k(iče?n)
2	__-č	__-sx
3	__-č	__-iʔn

(18) Koryak intransitive [Жукова 1972: 233]

	SG	DU	PL
1	tə- __-k	mət- __-mək	mət- __-la-mək
2	__-i	__-tək	__-la-tək
3	__-i	__-γəħi	__-la-i

---

[11] As in fn. 7, this is readily modeled via underspecification or a feature-deletion rule prior to exponence.

[12] Cf. also [Bogoras 1922]. Most extant varieties of Itelmen do not show 2SG=3SG syncretism, having a distinct 3SG suffix here, -(w)in. [Georg, Volodin 1999] suggest that the syncretism in Napana is an Itelmen innovation under Koryak influence.

6. Conclusion

In sum, in this short paper, I have reconsidered one aspect of Chukotko-Kamchatkan transitive verbal inflection. With Nedjalkov, Fortescue, and others, I have suggested that the Chukotkan *ne-* prefix corresponds to both the Itelmen 3PL active *n-* and the passive / indefinite subject *n-*; and that the merger of the two independent paradigms leads to the odd distribution of this prefix in Chukotkan. Central in this account is the observation that the distribution of this prefix in Chukchi is, when formulated as in (13), precisely parallel to its distribution across the two paradigms in Itelmen. The historical merger of the two paradigms — a merger independently proposed as a plausible source of ergativity in Chukotkan [Fortescue 1997] — in this way provides a nearly complete diachronic account of the distribution of this prefix. Nowhere in the account does the postulation of *ne-* as an inverse marker as such play a role, contra [Comrie 1980; Fortescue 1997; Dunn 1999; Spencer 2000]. Indeed, as suggested above, while there may be some role in seeing the difference between inverse and direct patterns as one of the forces shaping the development of the Chukotkan paradigm (including the spurious antipassive), simply glossing *ne-* as inverse synchronically raises at least as many questions as it solves.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 — 1, 2, 3 person; SG — singular; DU — dual; PL — plural; NSG — nonsingular; SUB — subject; OBJ — object; 3 > 3SG — 3 person subject acting on 3 singular object (portmanteau); II — conjugation class II; ABS — absolutive; AP — antipassive; DIR — direct; ERG — ergative; FUT — future; INV — inverse; LOC — locative; PASS — passive; PROG — progressive.

Bibliography

Aissen 1999 — J. Aissen. Markedness and subject choice in Optimality Theory // Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 17. 1999. P. 673–711.
Bobaljik 2000 — J. D. Bobaljik. The ins and outs of contextual allomorphy // K. K. Grohmann, C. Struijke (eds.). Proceedings of the 1999 Maryland

Mayfest on Morphology. University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics 10. College Park, MD: University of Maryland, 2000. P. 35–71.

Bobaljik, Branigan 2006 — J. D. Bobaljik, P. Branigan. Eccentric Agreement and Multiple Case Checking // A. Johns, D. Massam, J. Ndayiragije (eds.). Ergativity: Emerging Issues. Dordrecht: Springer, 2006. P. 47–77.

Bobaljik, Wurmbrand 2002 — J. D. Bobaljik, S. Wurmbrand. Notes on Itelmen Agreement // Linguistic Discovery, 1, 1, 2002. Available at: http://linguistic-discovery.dartmouth.edu/WebObjects/Linguistics

Bogoras 1922 — W. Bogoras. Chukchi // F. Boas (ed.). Handbook of American Indian languages. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922. P. 631–903.

Comrie 1980 — B. Comrie. Inverse verb forms in Siberia: Evidence from Chukchee, Koryak, and Kamchadal // Folia Linguistica Historica, 1. 1980. P. 61–74.

Dunn 1999 — M. Dunn. A grammar of Chukchi. PhD Thesis, Australian National University, Canberra, 1999.

Fortescue 1997 — M. Fortescue. Eskimo influence on the formation of the Chukotkan ergative clause // Studies in Language. 21, 2. 1997. P. 369–409.

Fortescue 2005 — M. Fortescue. Comparative Chukotko-Kamchatkan Dictionary. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2005.

Garrett 1990 — A. Garrett. The origin of NP split ergativity // Language. 66, 2, 1990. P. 261–296.

Georg, Volodin 1999 — S. Georg, A. P. Volodin. Die itelmenische Sprache: Grammatik und Texte. Tunguso Sibirica. 5. Wiesbaden: Harassowitz Verlag, 1999.

Halle, Hale 1997 — M. Halle, K. Hale. Chukchi transitive and antipassive constructions. Ms, MIT, Cambridge: Mass, 1997.

Klaiman 1992 — M. H. Klaiman. Inverse languages // Lingua. 88, 1992. P. 227–261.

Nedjalkov 1979 — V. P. Nedjalkov. Degrees of ergativity in Chukchee // F. Plank (ed.). Ergativity: Towards a theory of grammatical relations. London; New York: Academic Press, 1979. P. 241–262.

Oxford 2014 — W. R. Oxford. Microparameters of agreement: a diachronic perspective on Algonquian verb inflection. PhD Thesis, University of Toronto, 2014.

Skorik 1977 — P. Ya. Skorik. Grammatika chukotskogo yazyka, chast II: glagol, narechiye, sluzhebnyye slova. L.: Nauka, 1977.

Spencer 2000 — A. Spencer. Agreement morphology in Chukotkan // W. U. Dressler, O. E. Pfeiffer, M. A. Pöchtrager (eds.). Morphological analysis in comparison. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000. P. 191–222.

Valentine 2001 — R. J. Valentine. Nishnaabemwin Reference Grammar. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Volkov, Daniel 2018 — O. S. Volkov, M. A. Daniel. The puzzle of Chukotko-Kamchatkan cross-reference marking // Conference on Uralic, Altaic, and Paleoasiatic languages in memory of A. P. Volodin: Saint-Petersburg, December 2018. SPb., 2018.

Volodin 1976 — A. P. Volodin. Itelmenskiy yazyk. L.: Nauka, 1976.

Zhukova 1972 — A. N. Zhukova. Grammatika koryakskogo yazyka. L.: Nauka, 1972.

Сведения об авторах

Бобалик Джонатан Дэвид — Ph.D., профессор Гарвардского университета, Гарвард. Электронная почта: bobaljik@fas.harvard.edu

Вайда Эдвард — Ph.D., профессор Университета Западного Вашингтона, Беллингхем, США. Электронная почта: edward.vajda@wwu.edu

Вахтин Николай Борисович — член-корреспондент РАН, доктор филологических наук, профессор Европейского университета в Санкт-Петербурге, главный научный сотрудник Института лингвистических исследований РАН, Санкт-Петербург. Электронная почта: nvakhtin@gmail.com

Вернер Генрих Каспарович — доктор филологических наук, профессор, преподавал в Боннском университете, Бонн. Электронная почта: henrich.werner@gmx.de

Головко Евгений Васильевич — член-корреспондент РАН, доктор филологических наук, директор Института лингвистических исследований РАН, преподаватель Европейского Университета в Санкт-Петербурге, Санкт-Петербург. Электронная почта: evgolovko@yandex.ru

Де Грааф Тьерд — Ph.D., почетный научный сотрудник Европейского исследовательского центра Меркатор по вопросам многоязычия и изучения языков, Леуварден, Нидерланды. Электронная почта: tdegraaf@fryske-akademy.nl

Груздева Екатерина Юрьевна — кандидат филологических наук, доцент, лектор Хельсинкского университета, Хельсинки, Финляндия. Электронная почта: ekaterina.gruzdeva@helsinki.fi

Кастен Эрих — Ph.D., директор Фонда культуры народов Сибири, Фюрстенберг (Хафель). Электронная почта: kasten@kulturstiftung-sibirien.de

Аннотации и ключевые слова

Дж. Д. Бобалик. Чукотский «инверсив» с точки зрения ительменского языка

В этой статье представлен новый анализ чукотской приставки *не-*, которую Комри [Comrie 1980] интерпретирует как инверсивную. Распределение этой приставки, по мнению Комри соответствующее маркировке инверсивной конструкции (при которой дополнение доминирует над подлежащим по личной иерархии), присутствует также в ительменском языке, но только эпифеноменально, при совместном рассмотрении парадигм пассивного и активного залогов переходных глаголов. Это наблюдение предполагает альтернативный диахронический источник распределения чукотской приставки, возникший в результате гетероклизиса — нейтрализации первичного активного / пассивного контраста (сохранившегося в ительменском языке) при создании единой, комбинированной парадигмы. Эта нейтрализация также представляет правдоподобный исторический источник чукотской эргативной конструкции, как аргументирует Фортэскью [Fortescue 1997].

Ключевые слова: чукотский, ительменский, инверсив, согласование, гетероклизис

Э. Вайда. Структура глагола в кетском языке

В статье дан анализ структуры финитного глагола в кетском языке. В первой части статьи рассматривается формальная структура глагола и говорится, какую информацию о нем следует помещать в словарную статью. Во второй части идет речь о системах словоизменения и лексико-семантических категориях. В заключении показано, как форма и функция кетского глагола часто не совпадают друг с другом (из-за влияния соседних языков). Статья посвящена памяти А. П. Володина — истинного первопроходца в деле изучения сложнейшей глагольной морфологии языков Северной Азии.

Ключевые слова: кетский, глагол, глагольная морфология

Summaries and keywords

Jonathan D. Bobaljik. The Chukotkan "inverse" from an Itelmen perspective

This paper presents a reanalysis of the Chukotkan prefix *ne-*, which Comrie (1980) and subsequent authors have analyzed as an "inverse" prefix. On this analysis, although *ne-* occupies a position characteristic of person markers, it is analyzed instead as signaling that the object outranks the subject on the person hierarchy first > second > third, an inverse mapping between the person hierarchy and the subject > object hierarchy. In Chukchi, the prefix *ne-* marks a subset of third person subjects (the lowest on the hierarchy), but for example, does not mark third person singular subjects acting on third person objects. It is shown in this paper that the distribution of the *ne-* prefix in Chukchi has a direct analogue with the distribution of prefixal *n-* in Itelmen (which has no inverse analysis), but in the latter, this distribution is epiphenomenal, the conjunction of 3PL *n-* and passive/impersonal *n-*. This observation suggests an alternative, diachronic source for the Chukotkan prefix's distribution, resulting from heteroclisis — the neutralization of an original active/passive distinction (maintained in Itelmen) to create a single, combined paradigm. Chukchi, on this analysis, has grammaticalized the surface distribution of Itelmen *n-* marking third person subject except for the one combination (third singular subject on third person object) in which third person subjects are marked by a portmanteau suffix, common to all Chukotko-Kamchatkan languages. This neutralization is independently argued to provide a plausible historical source for the Chukotkan ergative construction, as argued by Fortescue (1997). In contrast to Comrie, this view treats the Koryak pattern, in which there is some syncretism between second and third person subjects, as innovative, rather than conservative, and adds further support to the view that the distinct, but clearly related, inflectional morphology of Chukotko-Kamchatkan is derived from a common source, rather than imperfect borrowing into Itelmen of a Chukotkan pattern.

Keywords: Chukotkan, Itelmen, inverse, agreement, heteroclisis

Stefan Georg, *Uwe Seefloth*. Uralo-Eskimo?

This paper examines some anomalies in the verbal (subjective-objective) paradigms of Proto-Samoyedic and Yupik Eskimo and applies various steps of internal reconstructions to show that these paradigms were strikingly similar in an earlier phase of their historical development, which lends support the assumption that Uralic and Eskimo-Aleut might be divergently ("genetically") related to each other. The argumentation is based exclusively on morphological (and paradigmatic) evidence and tries to avoid the usual pitfalls of "macrocomparativist" approaches, thus lexical comparisons or etymologies play no role here. The genealogical hypothesis is presented with due caution and awareness of it preliminary nature, but it is stressed that it fulfills the often cited criterion of "polydimensional paradigmaticity".

Keywords: Language Relationship, Uralic, Eskimo-Aleut, Siberian Languages, Comparative Linguistics

Ekaterina Yu. Gruzdeva, *Juha Janhunen*. Towards an analysis of finiteness in the languages of the Transeurasian zone

The article proposes a complex approach to the analysis of the category of finiteness, based on the conception that finiteness should be treated not as a binary formal category, but as a scalar functional phenomenon which presupposes various degrees of finiteness on a hierarchical scale. The principal criterion is the syntactic function performed by a given verb form, but the proposed approach also takes into consideration the morphological marking of the forms concerned, as well as, in some cases, the relevant diachronic prosesses.

On the first level of classification three groups of verb forms can be distinguished: (1) verb forms with a prototypical function of an independent predicate (= prototypically finite forms), (2) verb forms with a prototypical function of a dependent predicate (= prototypically non-finite forms), and (3) ambivalent verb forms that do not have a clear prototypical function, i. e., that can occur as both dependent and

ОГЛАВЛЕНИЕ

Оглавление

Оглавление