



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Clause Linkage In Ket

Nefedov, A.

Citation

Nefedov, A. (2015, October 8). *Clause Linkage In Ket*. LOT dissertation series. LOT, Utrecht.
Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/35891>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/35891>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/35891> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Nefedov, Andrey
Title: Clause linkage in Ket
Issue Date: 2015-10-08

Chapter 4. Coordination relations

In this chapter, we consider clause-combining strategies employed in Ket to code coordination relations. Ket lacks native coordinators whose function could be restricted to coordination only. Rather we deal with various parts-of-speech (like adverbs, particles) that extended their functions to interclausal relations. Overtly marked coordination of clauses, in general, is rather infrequent in Ket. This fact is not surprising given the lack of written tradition in the language.

The chapter is structured as follows. Section 4.1 provides a short overview of morphosyntactic and semantic aspects of coordination relations from a typological perspective. Section 4.2 discusses morphosyntactic types of coordination relations in Ket, while section 4.3 considers strategies used for coding different semantic types of coordination. Section 4.4 summarizes the chapter.

4.1 Typology of coordination relations

In Chapter 3, we defined coordination relations as relations established between two or more functionally equivalent units that are combined into a larger construction and show the same semantic and syntactic relationship with other surrounding elements (cf. Haspelmath 2007: 1). Although means of coding coordination relations vary cross-linguistically, they can be rather uniformly analyzed with respect to the following morphosyntactic parameters.

First of all, coordinating constructions can be syndetic or asyndetic. The latter is also often called ‘juxtaposition’. It implies that the coordination relations in a given construction are lacking any overt marking. In asyndesis, the only means indicating the coordinated structure is intonation. This morphosyntactic parameter is illustrated by an example from Russian in (4.1).

(4.1) Russian

Ja prišël, uvidel, pobedil

‘I came, (I) saw, (I) conquered.’

Syndetic coordination is signaled by the presence of an overt marker that connects two or more elements together. Following Haspelmath (2004), we will use the term

‘coordinator’ to refer to such a marker⁵⁶ and the term ‘coordinand’ to refer to each of the elements it connects.

Mauri (2008: 64) notices that a coordinator can be either a free or a bound morpheme. This distinction is exemplified in (4.2) with the Russian coordinator *i* ‘and’ and in (4.3) with the Hebrew coordinator *ve* ‘and’, respectively.

(4.2) Russian

On uvidel menja i ulybnulsja

‘He saw me and smiled.’

(4.3) Hebrew

Harbè studentim lomdim bemèshech hayòm veovdim baèrev

harbè studentim lomdim bemèshech hayòm ve=ovdim baèrev
 many student:PL study:3PL during day COORD=work:3PL at.night

‘Many students study during the day and work at night.’ (Mauri 2008: 64)

Depending on the number of coordinators involved in coding of coordination, it can be either monosyndetic or bisyndetic. Monosyndetic coordination has one single coordinator that can either precede or follow one of the coordinands. Both (4.2) and (4.3) above are instances of monosyndetic coordination with the coordinators preceding the second coordinand. Example (4.4) is an instance of bisyndetic coordination, since it involves the use of two coordinators, cf. the Russian pair of coordinators *ili...ili* ‘either...or’ both preceding its coordinands.

(4.4) Russian

Večerom on ili čitaet, ili slušaet muzyku

‘In the evening he either reads, or listens to the music.’

It should be noted that the division into monosyndetic or bisyndetic types is valid for binary (i.e. with two coordinands) coordinations only (Haspelmath 2007: 2).

As many cross-linguistic studies (e.g. Haspelmath 2004, Mauri 2008) show, the choice of a particular morphosyntactic means of coding is connected with the

⁵⁶ In Haspelmath (2004) the term ‘coordinator’ replaces the traditional term ‘conjunction’ which is reserved to indicate one of the semantic types of coordination relations.

semantics expressed by coordination relations. From the semantic point of view, there are three general types of coordination: conjunctive, disjunctive, and adversative type (Haspelmath 2004: 5), or, in Mauri's (2008) terms, combination, alternative, and contrast relations, respectively. Conjunctive coordination or conjunction is also known as 'and'-coordination. This type refers to constructions in which two or more coordinands are simply added together. Mauri (2008: 82-85) divides this type of coordinate relations into further semantic sub-types: temporal sequential (4.5), temporal simultaneous (4.6) and atemporal (4.7), illustrated below with the Russian and English examples.

(4.5) Russian

On zašel i zakryl okno

'He came in and shut the window.'

(4.6) Russian

On tanceval i pel pesni.

'He was dancing and singing songs.'

(4.7) Russian

On umnyj, i ona ne glupaja tože

'He is smart and she is not stupid, too.'

Disjunction, or 'or'-coordination, conveys the necessity to make a choice between the available alternatives (Mauri 2008:159). It can be either choice-aimed (4.8), or simple (4.9).⁵⁷

(4.8) Russian

My idëm tuda peškom ili voz'mëm taksi?

'Are we going there on foot or are we taking a taxi?'

(4.9) Russian

Doma ja prosto splju ili smotrju televizor

'When at home, I simply sleep or watch TV.'

⁵⁷ Interrogative and standard in Haspelmath's (2007) terms.

Choice-aimed disjunction usually occurs in alternative (or disjunctive) questions in which the addressee has to specify one of the alternatives in his/her answer. Simple disjunction, on the contrary, is declarative.⁵⁸ It presents a list of alternatives without any necessity to choose one of them.

The semantics of the adversative type, or ‘*but*’-coordination, usually implies some sort of conflicting expectations between the coordinands. Depending on the origin of the conflict, this type can be divided into oppositive (4.10), corrective (4.11) and counterexpectative (4.12) semantic sub-types (Mauri 2008: 122ff).

(4.10) Russian

On pošel na rabotu, a ona pošla domoj
‘He went to work whereas she went home.’

(4.11) Russian

On ne pošel na rabotu, a pošel domoj
‘He didn’t go to work, but went home.’

(4.12) Russian

On vygljadit sil’nym, no on slabyj
‘He looks strong, but he is weak.’

The oppositive sub-type refers to situations in which there is some sort of contrast, but no conflicting expectations (Haspelmath 2007: 28). The semantics of corrective contrast relations imply that the first coordinand is negated and successively substituted with the second one (cf. Rudolph 1996). The third sub-type of adversative relations is often discussed in the linguistic literature. It can be characterized by a conflict originated because of the denial of certain expectations. Finally, it should be mentioned that unlike the other coordination types, adversative relations are always binary, i.e. they involve only two coordinands.

In what follows we will provide a description of the semantic types of coordination constructions in Ket and what morphosyntactic means are employed to code them.

⁵⁸ According to Haspelmath (2007), it is not always the case, and there are languages in which simple disjunction can occur in interrogative contexts. However, it is not the case with Ket.

4.2 Morphosyntactic properties of coordinating constructions

Before proceeding to the description of the semantic types of coordination relations in Ket, let us first consider the morphosyntactic properties exhibited by coordinating constructions in the language. Where relevant, we will also provide description of the nominal coordination strategies in Ket.

4.2.1 Asyndetic constructions

The most frequent way of combining two elements together in Ket is simply by juxtaposition without any overt coordinating marker (i.e. asyndetically). This strategy can be quite commonly found in many of the world's languages, especially in those which, like Ket, have no developed written tradition (cf. Payne 1985; Mithun 1988). As we already mentioned in section 4.1, in the case of juxtaposition, coordination is usually signaled by means of intonation. There are two ways in which it can be done: either (1) without an intonation break between the juxtaposed constituents, or (2) with the so-called 'comma intonation', i.e. a pause or a non-final pitch contour, that separates the coordinands (Mithun 1988: 332). Examples (4.13)-(4.15) illustrate asyndetic coordination at the level of noun phrases in Ket.

(4.13) *kim avéŋten ob am bənsaŋ*

kim āb-aŋten ōb ām bənsaŋ
 then 1SG.POSS-ADESS father mother not.be.present

'At that time I have no mother and father.' (Belimov 1980: 37)

(4.14) *uk am, uk op at dil'tusin*

ūk ām ūk ōb ād d{u}⁸-l²-tos⁰-in⁻¹
 2SG.POSS mother 2SG.POSS father 1SG 3⁸-PST²-raise⁰-PL⁻¹

'Your mother and your father raised me.' (Belimov 1980: 37)

(4.15) *āt ən īs' daŋgajayin, qukŋ, tətən, kolgitn, totl'gitn*

āt ən īs d{i}⁸-aŋ⁶-q²-ej⁰-in⁻¹ quk-ŋ tətə-n kolgit-n totl'git-n
 1PL many fish 1⁸-3AN.PL⁶-PST²-kill⁰-PL⁻¹ pike-PL bass-PL ide-PL pollan-PL

'We caught many fish: pike, bass, ide, pollan.'

In (4.13) the nominal coordinands *ōb* ‘father’ and *ām* ‘mother’ are pronounced without intonation break. This is manifested by the voicing of the final consonant in the noun *ōb*. Normally, the sound [b] in phonological words undergoes devoicing to [p] in word-final position (Vajda 2003: 7). It retains its original quality, however, when occurring in intervocalic position within the same phonological word, as, for example, in the word *obaj* [*ob-aj* father-PL] ‘parents’. Therefore, the sequence [ob am] in (4.13) can be regarded as one phonological unit, rather than two separate words.⁵⁹ The absence of intonation break between the juxtaposed constituents in (4.13) may imply that the speaker is treating them as one conceptual unit, i.e. ‘parents’. Cross-linguistically, such conjunctive constructions tend to become highly lexicalized (cf. *išu-obu* ‘parents’ (lit. mother-father) in Khwarshi⁶⁰) and constitute the source for the so-called ‘co-compounds’ (Wälchli 2005).⁶¹ The conceptual closeness of the two nouns in (4.13) is likewise indicated by the fact that the negative existential predicate *bānsaj* has scope over both coordinands (cf. (4.16) below in which each nominal coordinand is negated separately).

(4.16) *aveŋten əp bāns'aj, am bāns'aj*

ab-aŋten	ōb	bānsaj	ām	bānsaj
1SG.POSS-ADESS	father	not.be.present	mother	not.be.present

‘I have no mother and no father.’ (Belimov 1980: 37)

When the speaker considers the combined constituents to be conceptually distinct, the so-called ‘comma intonation’ is used. This is exemplified by (4.14) and (4.15). In (4.14), the speaker refers to the hearer’s mother and father as separate persons, therefore they are separated by the comma intonation. In addition, each coordinand is modified by a separate possessive pronoun. Nevertheless, the coordinands trigger plural agreement on the verb *a^t-[l²]-tos⁰* ‘raise’, which provides morphosyntactic evidence that the construction we are dealing with is an instance of coordination (cf. Haspelmath 2004: 18). Example (4.15) illustrates the case of enumeration.

⁵⁹ Compare also example (4.14), in which such [b > p] devoicing occurs in the noun *ōb* that precedes the vowel-initial pronoun *ād*.

⁶⁰ Zaira Khalilova, p.c. Khwarshi is a Tsezic language of the Caucasus.

⁶¹ In Ket, however, this is not the case (cf. the native lexemes used to convey the meaning ‘parents’: *obaj* [*ob-aj* father-PL] and *amaj* [*am-aj* mother-PL]).

The enumerated items are right-dislocated with respect to the verb, which is typical of “heavy” constituents and afterthought constructions.

While the use of asyndetic coordination to conjoin two coordinands at the level of noun phrases does not pose any problem, it is not the case with asyndetic coordination at the interclausal level. As we already mentioned in Chapter 2, due to its polysynthetic morphology, Ket verbs can stand on their own as independent sentences. Therefore, it is difficult to know whether two clauses are combined into a complex construction or rather constitute two standalone sentences linked in discourse. The criterion of intonation does not really seem to be of much help here. For example, Werner (1997: 343) provides the piece of discourse illustrated in (4.17) that can be interpreted in two ways: either as a coordinate construction or simply two separate sentences.

(4.17) *at t-tajga qotbes' ap bisnimin ses'bes' ɔŋɔtn*

ād d{i}⁸-t'a⁴-ka⁰ qod-bes āb bisnimin ses-bes ɔŋ⁶-k⁵-o⁴-tn⁰
 1SG 1^S-AT/NPST⁴-walk⁰ way-PROS 1SG.POSS siblings river-PROS 3PL⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-go⁰

‘I walk along the way, (and) my brothers and sisters go up the river.’

Or ‘I walk along the way. My brothers and sisters go up the river.’

(Werner 1997: 343)

Werner explicitly states that there are no specific rules that can help to distinguish between the two readings, and that even the intonation can hardly play a crucial role in this distinction. A somewhat similar conclusion can be found in Zaxarov and Kazakevič (2006). The authors conducted a special study devoted to the problem of sentence boundaries in languages without written tradition on the basis of Selkup and Ket. After the analysis of the Ket spoken texts, they arrived at the conclusion that the role of intonation in division of Ket oral discourse into sentences is not really evident. Nevertheless, they note that the final syntagma in an utterance generally receives a more prominent falling intonation.

4.2.2 Monosyndetic constructions

Apart from the asyndetic coordination, Ket exhibits coordinating constructions that are overtly marked with native coordinating markers. They can be monosyndetic and bisyndetic. The monosyndetic markers include the prepositive coordinator *hāj* as well as the postpositive coordinator *-as*. The latter is applicable only to nouns and pronouns, so we will not discuss it separately. All the coordinators are still at the early stages of the grammaticalization process, and therefore the sources of their origin are quite transparent (cf. Belimov 1980). In addition, Ket speakers often used coordinators borrowed from the Russian language. We will consider them as well.

4.2.2.1 The *hāj* construction

The prepositive coordinator *hāj* represents a functional extension of the adverb *hāj* (often reduced to *āj*⁶²) ‘more, also, again’. Its original adverbial meaning can be illustrated by the following examples (cf. also (4.19)):

(4.18) *āt haj kənesʔket*

ād hāj kənes-ked
1SG also light-person

‘I am also a man of this world.’ (Werner 2002, I: 292)

(4.18) *haj diʔmbesʔ*

hāj d{u}ʔ⁸-ik⁷-n²-bes⁰
again 3⁸-here⁷-PST²-move⁰

‘(He) came again.’ (Werner 2002, I: 292)

As a coordinator, *hāj* can be used to combine the majority of parts-of-speech in Ket, which is illustrated in the examples below: nouns in (4.19), adjectives in (4.20) and (4.21), adverbs in (4.22), action nominals in (4.23) and verbs in (4.24).

⁶² There is a striking similarity between the Ket *haj* and the Selkup *aj* ‘and’ that likewise originates from the adverb meaning ‘again’ (cf. Kazakevič 2006). Given the intense language contact between the two peoples, it might be plausible to say that one of the languages borrowed the marker. While we do not want to make any far reaching conclusions, it should be mentioned that at least the Ket *haj* can be reconstructed to the Proto-Yeniseian stage (Werner 2002, I: 292).

(4.19) *ātn, assano deʔŋ haj isqo deʔŋ, haj kiʔ daʔq dibbetin*

ātn assano deʔŋ hāj isqo deʔŋ
 1PL hunt.ANOM people and fish.ANOM people
 hāj kiʔ daʔq dī⁸-b³-bed⁰-in¹
 also new live.ANOM 1⁸-3N³-make⁰-PL¹

‘We, hunters and fishermen, also build a new life.’

(Kotorova and Nefedov, forthcoming)

(4.20) *həna haj qēŋ dilʔgat kɔladiŋa ɔŋɔtn*

həna hāj qē-ŋ dīkad kola-di-ŋa oŋ⁶-o⁴-{n²}-tn⁰
 small and big-PL children school-N-DAT 3AN.PL⁶-PST⁴-PST²-go⁰

‘Small and big children go to school.’ (Werner 1997: 321)

(4.21) *jel qaŋam haj axtam*

éel qa-ŋ-am hāj aqta-{a}m
 berries big-PL-N.PRED and good-N.PRED

‘The berries are big and tasty.’ (Dulʔzon 1970: 99)

(4.22) *būŋ aqta haj daqte t-ṽoveravetin*

bū-ŋ aqta hāj daqta d{u}⁸-lobed⁷-a⁴-bed⁰-in¹
 3-PL good and fast 3⁸-work.RUS.ANOM⁷-NPST⁴-ITER⁰-AN.PL¹

‘They work well and fast.’ (Werner 1997: 321)

(4.23) *ar isqo haj assano itparem*

ād isqo hāj assano it⁷-ba⁶-d{i}¹-am⁰
 1SG fish.ANOM and hunt.ANOM know⁷-1SG⁶-1SG¹-R⁰

‘I can fish and hunt.’ (Werner 1997: 368)

(4.24) *dīlʔ duŋaŋɔkɔn hāj qɔravɔn*

dīl duk⁷-a⁶-k⁵-o⁴-qon⁰ hāj qod⁷-a⁶-k⁵-o⁴-{qo}n⁰
 child shout.ANON⁷-3M⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-INCH.PST⁰ and cry.ANON⁷-3M⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-INCH.PST⁰

‘The child began shouting and (began) crying.’

In (4.19) we can see two different instances of *hāj* functioning in one sentence. The first *hāj* is clearly used as a coordinator that connects the noun phrases *assano deʔŋ* ‘hunters’ and *isqo deʔŋ* ‘fishermen’. The second *hāj* is used in its original adverbial meaning translatable as ‘also’.

It is in general possible to find examples in which *hāj* can be used to connect more than two coordinands as in (4.25).

(4.25) *tɛː, anuksʲ dɔŋɔn bɛːb aj ɔqə aj čijanaə*

te: anuks daŋ⁶-o⁴-{n²}-{t}n⁰ beʔb āj oqə āj čijanaə
well tomorrow 2PL⁶-PST⁴-PST²-go⁰ son.in.law and O. and Č.

‘Well, tomorrow we went: son-in-law, and Anna⁶³, and Tasja’

(Kotorova and Porotova 2001: 35)

It should be mentioned, though, that the use of *hāj* in cases like in (4.25) tends to be quite rare. Much more often it is used when the speaker wants either to conjoin two coordinands as in the above examples, or to specify that the enumeration is closed or complete. In the latter case we have a co-occurrence of syndetical and asyndetical means in one construction, cf. (4.26) and (4.27).

(4.26) *bɔyasʲ dejaŋavetin qāq, ʋamejgɪn haj bīk hənɛ ɪsʲ*

bok-as d{u}⁸-ej⁷-aŋ⁶-a⁴-bed⁰-in⁻¹ qāq
morda-COM 3⁸-kill.ANOM⁷-3AN.PL⁶-NPST⁴-ITER⁰-AN.PL⁻¹ dace.PL
lamejgit-n hāj bīk hənɛ ɪs
roach-PL and other small fish

‘With a morda (a.k.o. fish trap) they catch dace, roach and other small fish.’

(Kotorova and Porotova 2001: 121)

(4.27) *qariya būŋ usʲka t-halimnɛn, t-qusʲsilʲbetin haj dɔqəŋɔkɔn*

qarika bū-ŋ uska d{u}⁸-hal⁷-b³-n²-a⁰-n⁻¹ d{u}⁸-qussej⁷-l²-bed⁰-in⁻¹
after 3-PL back 3⁸-R⁷-TH³-PST²-MOM⁰-AN.PL⁻¹ 3⁸-tent.place⁷-PST²-make⁰-AN.PL⁻¹
hāj dəq⁷-aŋ⁶-k⁵-o⁴-qon⁰
and live.ANOM⁷-AN.PL⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-INCH.PST⁰

‘After that they returned, put up a tent, and started to live.’ (Werner 1997: 321)

In (4.26), we can see the enumeration of noun phrases, in which the first two coordinands are conjoined asyndetically. The coordinator appears only before the last noun phrase *bīk hənɛ ɪs* ‘other small fish’, thereby “closing” the enumeration. A similar construction but involving a sequence of verbal coordinands is illustrated

⁶³ It is often the case that the corresponding Russian translation provides the official Russian name of a person mentioned in the text, rather than the original Ket one.

in (4.27). In this example, the first two verbs are simply juxtaposed, and only the last one is conjoined with the help of the coordinator *hāj*. In this case, the use of *hāj* assigns some resultant meaning to the last coordinand.

As we mentioned in the beginning, there is also another coordinating strategy involving the coordinator *-as*. It is a bound morpheme originating from the comitative/instrumental relational morpheme. Like the comitative marker it attaches to the second constituent only. Consider the following examples:

(4.28) *ōp hibas' is'iqo ýγɔn*

<i>ōb</i>	<i>hiʔb-as</i>	<i>isqo</i>	<i>o⁶-k⁵-o⁴-{n²}-{t}n⁰</i>
father	son-COM	fish.ANON	3M ⁶ -TH ⁵ -PST ⁴ -PST ² -go ⁰

‘Father with (his) son went fishing.’

(4.29) *bár'a bá:mas' duyín*

<i>báád-da</i>	<i>báám-as</i>	<i>du⁸-k⁵-{daq⁰}-in⁻¹</i>
old.man-M.POSS	old.woman-COM	3 ⁸ -TH ⁵ -live ⁰ -AN.PL ⁻¹

‘Old man and his wife (lit. old woman) live.’

In (4.28), the singular agreement on the verb suggests that *ōb* ‘father’ is the core participant, while *hibas* ‘with son’ is a comitative oblique phrase. In (4.29), however, the verb shows plural agreement, thereby indicating that the phrase *báda bá:mas* ‘old man with his wife’ is treated as coordinated. This is one of the basic distinctions distinguishing a coordinated structure from a comitative phrase (cf. Haspelmath 2007). Moreover, while the comitative oblique phrase can be easily placed postverbally (4.30), it is not the case with the coordinand (4.31).

(4.30) *ōp is'iqo ýγɔn hibas*

<i>ōb</i>	<i>isqo</i>	<i>o⁶-k⁵-o⁴-{n²}-{t}n⁰</i>	<i>hiʔb-as</i>
father	fish.ANOM	3M ⁶ -TH ⁵ -PST ⁴ -PST ² -go ⁰	son-COM

‘Father went fishing with (his) son.’

(4.31) **báàd duyín dabá:mas*

báàd du⁸-k⁵-{daq⁰}-in⁻¹ da-báàm-as
 old.man 3⁸-TH⁵-live⁰-AN.PL⁻¹ M.POSS-old.woman-COM

Intended: ‘Old man and his wife live.’⁶⁴

The *-as* strategy is of more limited applicability than the *hāj* strategy. This is obviously due to its postpositional origin. First, it can only be used to combine two items (cf. 4.29). Second, it is confined to nouns and pronouns only. Finally, with respect to nouns, this strategy is relevant only to those belonging to the animate class, since the only way to distinguish it from a comitative phrase is the plural agreement on the verb. In the case of the inanimate class nouns the agreement marker is always the same in both singular and plural (cf. Chapter 2, Section 2.2.8.1.3.1), which makes it impossible to distinguish between the coordinate structure and the oblique phrase. Combining two noun phrases belonging to different animacy classes (i.e. animate and inanimate) in a sentence seems to be ungrammatical in general, no matter what coordination strategy is used.

Both *hāj* and *-as* coordinators⁶⁵ can be used together within one sentence, as exemplified in (4.32).

(4.32) *bat da bamas^j haj buŋna dɔʔŋ kʌʔt dɔli:n*

báàd da báàm-as hāj bu-ŋ-na
 old.man M.POSS old.woman-COM and 3-AN.PL-AN.PL.POSS
 dɔʔŋ kəʔd d{u}⁸-o⁴-l²-{daq⁰}-in⁻¹
 three children 3⁸-PST⁴-PST²-live⁰-AN.PL⁻¹

‘There lived an old man and his wife, and their three children.’

(Belimov 1991: 51)

It seems rather surprising that the coordinator *-as* cannot be used to combine clauses, given that most Ket postpositional markers can attach to verbs and thereby form various types of subordinate constructions (see Chapter 5 and Chapter 6). Nevertheless

⁶⁴ Note that neither is it grammatical in the sense ‘The old man lives with his wife’, since the verb does not agree with the core participant *báàd* in number.

⁶⁵ It should be noted, however, that it is impossible to tell whether *báàd da ba:m-as* is an instance of comitative coordination or an oblique comitative phrase in this sentence.

we were not able to elicit such examples with the coordinator *-as* from our language consultants.⁶⁶

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the paths of grammaticalization involving an adverb with the meaning ‘also’ and a comitative marker into a coordination marker are very frequent cross-linguistically (Mithun 1988: 339-340).

4.2.2.2 Constructions with the borrowed Russian monosyndetic coordinators *i, a, no, ili*

Apart from the emerging native monosyndetic coordinator, many cases of overt marking of coordination in Ket involve several borrowed Russian monosyndetic coordinators, which is not surprising, given the massive Russian interference. These coordinators are *i* ‘and’, *a* ‘and/but’, *ili* ‘or’ and *no* ‘but’. Examples (4.33)-(4.38) illustrate the use of these coordinators.

(4.33) *di:embisin əp i hi:p*

d{u}⁸-ik⁷-n²-bes⁰-in¹ ðb i hi⁷b
 3⁸-here⁷-PST²-move⁰-AN.PL¹ father and.RUS son
 ‘Father and son came.’ (Dul’zon 1970: 82)

(4.34) *ām uyəɔn bān turuxanskdiŋa a krasnojarskdiŋa*

ām u⁶-k⁵-o⁴-{n²-de}n⁰ bān turuxansk-di-ŋa a krasnojarsk-di-ŋa
 mother 3F⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-go⁰ NEG T.-N-DAT but.RUS K.-N-DAT
 ‘Mother went not to Turuxansk, but to Krasnojarsk.’

(4.35) *aksⁱ to²nⁱ ili banⁱ to²nⁱ sijetaq*

aks to²n ili bān to²n si⁷-Ø⁶-t⁵-aq⁰
 what so or.RUS NEG so R⁷-3N⁶-TH⁵-become⁰
 ‘It will be like this or not like this.’ (Dul’zon 1970: 120)

⁶⁶ The marker *-as* is sometimes confused with a somewhat similar looking postposition *ās / ās* ‘like, similar’ which is actually capable of being attached to verbs and forming subordinate structures. Unlike the comitative marker, however, the postposition requires a possessive augment when attached to its host (cf. Chapter 6, Section 6.2.1.1.8). Note that Dul’zon (1974: 208) nonetheless argues that the comitative marker is used to form constructions resembling the Russian simultaneity converb (*deepričastie*). However, the examples provided in his article do not seem convincing, some of them clearly being instances of subordinate structures with the aforementioned *ās / ās* and the postpositional marker *-bes*. No other existing descriptions of Ket subordination (e.g. Kostjakov 1976, Werner 1997) mention the comitative marker *-as* in the function of a subordinator.

(4.36) *qariya tajəbən, i dil'gat suyəhənden*

qadika taj⁷-o⁴-b³-{q}on⁰ i dilkad suk oŋ⁶-{k⁵}-o⁴-n²-den⁰
 after cold⁷-PST⁴-3N³-INCH.PST⁰ and.RUS children back 3AN.PL⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-go⁰
 ‘After that it became cold, and the children went back.’ (Werner 1997: 343)

(4.37) *at qā t-sesəlte, a bisep kəladina uyən*

ād qā d{i}⁸-ses⁷-o⁴-l²-ta⁰
 1SG home 1⁸-place⁷-PST⁴-PST²-be.in.position⁰
 a bisep kola-di-ŋa u⁶-k⁵-o⁴-{n²-t}n⁰
 and.RUS sibling school-N-DAT 3F⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-go⁰
 ‘I sat home, and the sister went to school’ (Werner 1997: 343)

(4.38) *majqi p ejinayəbən, nə bən usaban*

maj-qīb ejin⁷-a⁶-th⁵-o⁴-qon⁰ no bən us⁷-a⁴-b³-{q}an⁰
 may-month go.ANOM⁷-3M⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-INCH.PST⁰ but.RUS NEG warm⁷-NPST⁴-3N³-INCH.NPST⁰
 ‘The month of May has come, but it is not becoming warm.’
 (Werner 1997: 343)

4.2.3 Bisyndetic constructions

In addition to the native monosyndetic coordinator, Ket has the bisyndetic coordinator *tām...tām* ‘either...or’ which also appears to be native.⁶⁷ This coordinator is likewise at the early stage of its grammaticalization. Apart from *tām...tām*, a similar function can be fulfilled with the help of another bisyndetic marker *qōd...qōd* ‘whether...or’. The latter is likely a borrowing from the Russian language. Both bisyndetic coordinators are prepositional.

4.2.3.1 The *tām...tām* construction

The coordinator *tām...tām* is a functional extension of the indefinite particle *tām* which can be conventionally translated as ‘some’. As we already mentioned in Chapter 2, this particle is used extensively in formation of indefinite pronouns and adverbs, for example, *tām-ána* ‘someone’, *tām-ákus* ‘something’, *tām-bila* ‘somehow’, *tām-áska* ‘someday’, etc. It also can be used in adverbial function, translatable as ‘probably, perhaps’, cf. (4.39) below.

⁶⁷ Werner (2002, II: 233) provides a comparison with the Turkic word *tam* ‘(even) more’.

(4.39) *báàm tām dadijiyɔɔɔn*

báàm tām dadij⁷-i⁶-k⁵-o⁴-qon⁰
 old.woman INDEF be.crazy.ANOM⁷-3F⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-INCH.PST⁰
 ‘The old woman has probably gone crazy.’

As a coordinator, *tām* appears preposed to each of the coordinands. Example (4.40) illustrates the use of *tām...tām* with noun phrases, while (4.41) and (4.42) exemplify this particle combining adjectives in the predicative form and finite verbs, respectively.

(4.40) *bān in doli:n, tam qus sa:l, tam in sa:lin, bis naŋa qim da qaujok*

bān in d{u}⁸-o⁴-l²-{daq⁰}-in⁻¹ tām qūs sáál tām ĩn sa:l-in
 NEG long 3⁸-PST⁴-PST²-live⁰-AN.PL⁻¹ INDEF one night INDEF two night-PL
 bīs na-ŋa qīm da⁸-qa⁷-u⁴-j²-oq⁰
 evening 3AN.PL-DAT woman 3F⁸-inside⁷-PST⁴-PST²-R⁰
 ‘Not long they lived, either one night or two nights, in the evening a woman came to them.’

(Dul’zon 1962: 155)

(4.41) *tām áqtam díŋa tām bān áqtam, bān ítperem*

tām aqta-m di-ŋa tām bān aqta-m bān it⁷-ba⁶-d{i}¹-am⁰
 INDEF good-N.PRED 3F.POSS-DAT INDEF NEG good-N.PRED NEG know⁷-1SG⁶-1SG.SS¹-R⁰
 ‘Is it either good to her or not good, I don’t know.’

(4.42) *eje qaniŋa kupka tam temen assen ne kossenejbetten, tam deŋ na sorejbetten*

ēje qanaŋa kub-ka tām tem-en assen na
 island there.side end-LOC INDEF goose-PL animal.PL AN.PL.POSS
 kossenej⁷-b³-a¹-ta⁰ tām de^ŋ na sodej⁷-b³-a¹-ta⁰
 buzz.ANOM⁷-3N³-RES¹-extend⁰ INDEF people AN.PL.POSS trickle.ANOM⁷-3N³-RES¹-extend⁰
 ‘At the other end of the island it’s either geese buzzing or people trickling.’

(Dul’zon 1962: 179)

If both coordinands conjoined in the *tām...tām* construction are identical, it is often possible to omit the part of the second coordinand that is identical to the first one, as in (4.43).

(4.43) *kini iʔ otta deʔŋ sarkovəriŋal tam datɔjaŋgɔtn, tam baŋ, ture baŋ ɛ:tparam*

kinij iʔ ət-na deʔŋ sarkovo-di-ŋal tām du⁸-t⁵-a⁴-aŋ¹-qutn⁰
 today day 2PL-AN.PL.POSS people S-N-ABL INDEF 3⁸-TH⁵-NPST⁴-3AN.PL.SS¹-many.walk⁰
 tām bān tu-de bān it⁷-ba⁶-d{i}¹-am⁰
 INDEF NEG this-N NEG know⁷-1SG⁶-1SG.SS¹-R⁰

‘Whether our people come from Serkovo today or not, I don’t know it.’

(Dul’zon 1970: 106)

In (4.43), the verb *t⁵-a⁴-[l²]-ka~qutn⁰* is omitted from the second coordinand, since it can be logically inferred from the context.

Finally, we should mention that it is possible to find examples of subordinated structures in which the indefinite particle is used monosyndetically. Most notably in this case, it appears on the first coordinand, while the second coordinand is simply juxtaposed.

(4.44) *tam in tɔq dɔŋ tɔq bi:levet*

tām in toq-{}ŋ doʔŋ toq-{}ŋ {du⁸}-b³-l²-bed⁰
 INDEF two step-PL three step-PL 3⁸-3N³-PST²-make⁰

‘(He) made two or three steps.’ (Dul’zon 1962: 159)

(4.45) *buŋ tam i:n qɔmet taŋuɔlbetin*

bū-ŋ tām in qomat {du⁸}-taŋ⁷-u⁶-k⁵-o⁴-l²-bed⁰-in⁻¹
 3-PL INDEF long little 3⁸-drag.ANOM⁷-3N⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-ITER⁰-AN.PL⁻¹

‘They were dragging it for a while (lit. either long or shortly).’

(Dul’zon 1965: 101)

In (4.44), for example, we can see the particle *tām* preposed to the first noun phrase *in toqŋ* ‘two steps’, while the second noun phrase *doʔŋ toqŋ* ‘three steps’ is attached asyndetically. This strategy can also be found with adverbs as shown in (4.45). It should be noted that this construction is often used in Ket story-telling as a set phrase, alongside a similar one *tām in hoʔl* ‘either long or shortly’.⁶⁸

⁶⁸ Interestingly, monosyndetic coordinate constructions in which only one coordinator is preposed to the first coordinand (co-A B, in Haspelmath’s (2007) terms) seem to be extremely rare cross-linguistically. At least, there are no attested examples of this type with coordinators coding conjunctive relations (Haspelmath 2007: 10)

Since we could neither elicit nor find similar constructions (i.e. with *tām* occurring on the first coordinand only) for verbs, we will not consider them any further.

4.2.3.2 The construction with the borrowed Russian bisyndetic coordinator *qōd...qōd*

The bisyndetic coordinator *qōd...qōd* ‘either...or’ is based on the indefinite particle *qōd*. As we mentioned earlier, this particle most likely originates from the borrowed Russian intensive particle *xot*. It seems fair to assume that *qōd* was adopted at an earlier stage of the contact with the Russian language, since its form has been phonetically changed and assimilated with respect to the Ket phonological system (for example, it has acquired a tonemic distinction⁶⁹). It has also developed an additional meaning of ‘already’ that is quite different from the original one, cf. (4.46).

(4.46) *bilda deʔŋ qōt dímbešín*

bilde deʔŋ qōd d{u}⁸-i{k}⁷-n²-bes⁰-in¹
 all people already 3⁸-here⁷-PST²-move⁰-AN.PL¹
 ‘All the people have already come.’ (Werner 2002, II: 128)

Like the native indefinite particle, *qōd* is often used in formation of indefinite pronouns and adverbials (cf. Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2).

When used as a bisyndetic coordinator, *qōd* appears preposed to the coordinands. Examples (4.47) and (4.48) illustrates the use of *qōd...qōd*.

(4.47) *kasʔnem qōt doʔnʲ qōt bəgdəm*

kas⁷-n²-am⁰ qōd doʔn qōd bokdom
 limb⁷-IMP²-take⁰ INDEF knife INDEF rifle
 ‘Take either a knife or a rifle!’

(4.48) *kirʲ diʔʲi beʔk qōt duren qōt désij*

kī-d diʔʲi beʔk qōd du⁸-den⁰ qōd d{u}⁸-es⁷-{a⁴}-ij⁰
 this-M child always INDEF 3⁸-weep⁰ INDEF 3⁸-shout⁷-NPST⁴-ACTIVE⁰
 ‘This child always either cries or shouts.’

⁶⁹ Edward Vajda (p.c.) notes that Russian words with palatalized codas normally take high-even tone when borrowed into Ket (cf., *kōn* ‘horse’ < Russian *kon* ‘steed’), which makes the Russian origin of *qōd* even more plausible.

4.3 Semantic types of coordination relations

In this section, we will consider semantic types of coordination relations between two (or more) functionally parallel clauses and what morphosyntactic means are employed to code them in the Ket language. As we already mentioned in Section 4.1, there are three general semantic types: conjunction, disjunction and adversative coordination. They will be treated in this order.

4.3.1 Conjunctive coordination

Conjunctive coordination relations occur between two or more conjoined clauses denoting related states of affair. It can be either temporal or atemporal. The temporal type can be further subdivided into sequential and simultaneous (Mauri 2008: 82ff). We will consider them respectively.

Longacre (2007: 380) defines the sequential relations ('succession' in his terms) as 'and then' relations. They indicate that the two states of affairs are "located along the same time axis at successive points" and "interconnected as part of the same overall sequence of events" (Mauri 2008: 84). The simultaneous relations (or 'overlap' in Longacre's terms) can be defined as 'meanwhile' or 'at the same time' relations (Longacre 2007: 379). They occur between two states of affairs that are "located at the same point along the time axis and can be characterized by the temporal overlap" (Mauri 2008: 84).

Both types of temporal conjunctive coordination in Ket are most frequently expressed by simple juxtaposition of fully finite verbs, as illustrated in the examples below.

(4.49) *bū qāj d qáqdeqǎna dákaǰ*

bū qāj d{u}⁸-qakde⁷-q⁵-o⁴-n²-a⁰ d{u}⁸-a⁶-q²-eǰ⁰
 3SG elk 3⁸-chase.ANOM⁷-CAUS⁵-3M⁴-PST²-MOM.TR⁰ 3⁸-3M⁶-PST²-kill⁰
 'He hunted an elk down (and) killed him.'

(4.50) *āt dimes' āt sájdǎ̀lβetin*

āt d{i}⁸-i{k}⁷-n²-bes⁰ āt {di}⁸-sajdo⁷-o⁴-l²-bed⁰-in⁻¹
 1SG 1⁸-here⁷-PST²-move⁰ 1PL 1⁸-drink.tea.ANOM⁷-PST⁴-PST²-ITER⁰-AN.PL⁻¹
 'I came (and) we drank tea.'

(4.51) *dīʔl̩ dūkka:n duren*

dīʔl̩ du⁸-k⁵-hən⁰ du⁸-den⁰
 child 3⁸-TH⁵-stand⁰ 3⁸-weep⁰
 ‘The child is standing (and) crying.’

(4.52) *hīydil̩ dūkka:n qimdil̩ duren*

hik-dil du⁸-k⁵-hən⁰ qim-dil da⁸-den⁰
 male-child 3⁸-TH⁵-stand⁰ female-child 3F⁸-weep⁰
 ‘The boy is standing (and) the girl is crying.’

The examples (4.49) and (4.50) represent instances of the sequential relations, while the sentences in (4.51) and (4.52) are instances of the simultaneous relations. There is no formal difference between the sentences indicating which type they belong to, therefore the interpretation is mostly contextual. Belimov (1980: 41) notes that if the conjoined verbs are in the past tense form, then they usually denote a succession of events, while the non-past verb forms favor simultaneous interpretation.

If one needs to emphasize the sequential nature of events in a sentence, the habitual particle *bā*⁷⁰ is used. It occurs obligatorily before each verb in a sentence. The verbs are always in the past tense form, as in (4.53).

(4.53) *tənej qusⁱ dela kama ba ra dbintet, bat qaujaq qusⁱdina, usin deŋ bat daŋgaj,*

tulⁱ ba əyænden

tənej qu^s d-ella kəma bā d{u}⁸-b³-n²-ted⁰ bā d{u}⁸-qa⁷-u⁴-j²-aq⁰ qus-di-ŋa
 T. tent N.POSS-door away HAB 3⁸-3N³-PST²-hit⁰ HAB 3⁸-inside⁷-PST⁴-PST²-move⁰ tent-N-DAT
 usin de^ŋ bā d{u}⁸-aŋ⁶-q²-ej⁰ tul bā o⁶-k⁵-o⁴-n²-den⁰
 sleep.ANOM people 3⁸-3PL⁶-PST²-kill⁰ then 3M⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-go⁰

‘Tynej removed the birch bark tent’s door, entered the tent, killed the sleeping people, then left.’

(Belimov 1980: 43)

⁷⁰ In many examples from the Ket texts, sometimes even in the literature on Ket (for example, Berillo 1971), the habitual particle *bā* appears as *bat*. The reason for that is purely phonological: position 8 (the leftmost one) which hosts personal agreement markers of the so-called D-series (di-/da-/du-) has a tendency to get encliticized to the preceding word.

As we can see, in this case, the particle *bā* is devoid of its original habitual semantics which can be regarded as a sign of its grammaticalization into a conjunction. Nevertheless it is still at an early stage (Belimov 1980: 43).

Another way to mark the temporal conjunctive relations in Ket is by using the coordinator *hāj*. Nevertheless, due to its adverbial nature, it is hard to find clear-cut examples in the texts. Still we were able to elicit instances of *hāj* used to conjoin clauses from our language consultants (cf. also 4.24 above):

(4.54) *sīn' inaām áriangól'an' hāj dənɔ*

sin ina-ām adan⁷-{i⁶}-k⁵-o⁴-l²-{d}en⁰ hāj də⁸-n²-{q}o⁰
 one.time AN.PL.POSS-mother ill⁷-3F⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-go⁰ and 3F⁸-PST²-die⁰
 'One day their mother got ill and died.'

(4.55) *dīʔl' dúkkΛ:n hāj dúren*

dīʔl' du⁸-k⁵-hən⁰ hāj du⁸-den⁰
 child 3⁸-TH⁵-stand⁰ and 3⁸-weep⁰
 'The child is standing and crying.'

The sentence in (4.54) is a clear example of the sequential relation, since one cannot get ill and die simultaneously. Example (4.55) is an instance of the simultaneous relation. It is a variant of (4.51) above. It is important to mention that both examples of the *hāj* coordination involve clauses with the same subjects. Our informants felt it difficult to elicit different subject clauses coordinated by *hāj*.

Finally, we cannot but mention one specific construction that is frequently used in Ket to convey the meaning of simultaneity and is often translated into Russian by a coordinated sentence. It is formed with the help of the subordinator *bes* which is added directly to a finite verb form, as in (4.56).

(4.56) *dīʔl' dúkkΛ:n dúren-besʲ*

dīʔl' du⁸-k⁵-hən⁰ du⁸-den⁰-bes
 child 3⁸-TH⁵-stand⁰ 3⁸-weep⁰-while.ss
 'The child is standing (and) crying.'

Since this construction belongs to the domain of adverbial clauses, it will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

The second type of conjunctive coordination is atemporal relations. According to Mauri (2008: 84), they are different from the temporal counterparts in that they either combine “states of affairs outside the time axis, establishing a relation that is expected to be always valid”, or “combine two states of affairs within the time axis regardless of their respective location”.

Since there is no dedicated conjunction or marker in Ket that can overtly signal the atemporal relation, it is usually inferred from a juxtaposition of clauses, as in (4.57).

(4.57) *Vásja sél'd kíttol'bet, Máša ku'si daqiuγùl'bet*

Vasja sel d{u}⁸-kid⁷-t⁵-o⁴-l²-bed⁰ Maša ku's da⁸-qi⁷-u⁶-k⁵-o⁴-l²-bed⁰
 V. deer 3^s-price⁷-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-make⁰ M. cow 3F^s-sell.ANOM⁷-3F⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-ITER⁰
 ‘Vasja bought a reindeer and Maša sold the cow.’

It is often not easy to decide whether the two combined states of affairs belong to the atemporal type or it is an instance of some type of the temporal relations.

4.3.2 Disjunctive coordination

As we already mentioned in section 4.1, disjunctive coordination expresses an ‘or’ relation and can either be simple or choice-aimed. Simple disjunction of clauses in Ket is formed with the help of the bisyndetic coordinator *tām...tām*. Examples (4.58)-(4.59) illustrate this type of disjunction.

(4.58) *kīri di?li beʔk tām dúren tām déssij*

kī-d diʔl beʔk tām du⁸-den⁰ tām d{u}⁸-es⁷-{a⁴}-ij⁰
 this-M child always INDEF 3^s-weep⁰ INDEF 3^s-shout⁷-NPST⁴-ACTIVE⁰
 ‘This child always either cries or shouts.’

(4.59) *āt bān íperem s'aʔj āt tām kájnem, bān tām tkájnem*

ād bān it⁷-ba⁶-d{i}¹-am⁰ saj ād tām {di⁸}-kaj⁷-n²-am⁰
 1SG NEG know⁷-1SG⁶-1SG¹-R⁰ tea.RUS 1SG INDEF 1^s-limb⁷-PST²-take⁰
 bān tām {di⁸}-kaj⁷-n²-am⁰
 NEG INDEF 1^s-limb⁷-PST²-take⁰
 ‘I don’t know whether I took the tea or I didn’t (take it).’

A disjunctive construction with the coordinator *qōd...qōd* is provided in (4.60), cf. also (4.48) above.

(4.60) *árvendiŋa kóòŋ qōt tīp kás'anem qōt bógdəm kás'nem*

aden-di-ŋa kóòŋ qōd tīb kas⁷-a⁴-n²-am⁰ qōd bokdom kas⁷-n²-am⁰
 forest-N-DAT go.IMP INDEF dog limb⁷-3M⁴-IMP²-take⁰ INDEF rifle limb⁷-IMP²-take⁰
 ‘Go to the forest tomorrow, take either a dog or a rifle.’

Unlike simple disjunction, choice-aimed disjunction implies asking for a choice, therefore it is expressed in Ket by juxtaposition of two clauses containing the focus question particle *ū* and its variant *bəndu* described in Section 2.4.3. When used in choice-aimed disjunction, these particles are added to each one of the juxtaposed clauses, as exemplified in (4.61) and (4.62).

(4.61) *ū āt pəməγátbəγəbet, ū kúγutn?*

ū ād {ku⁸}-pomokad⁷-bo⁶-k⁵-a⁴-bed⁰ ū ku⁶-k⁵-a⁴-t{n}⁰
 QUEST 1SG {2⁸}-help.RUS.ANOM⁷-1SG⁶-TH⁵-NPST⁴-ITER⁰ QUEST 2SG⁶-TH⁵-NPST⁴-go⁰
 ‘Will you help me or will you leave (lit. go)?’

(4.62) *āt bəndu kóletdiŋa dəŋátn, bəndu ássano dəŋátn?*

āt bəndu koled-di-ŋa doŋ⁶-a⁴-den⁰ bəndu assano doŋ⁶-a⁴-de⁰
 2PL QUEST town-N-DAT 2PL⁶-NPST⁴-go⁰ QUEST hunt.ANOM 2PL⁶-NPST⁴-go⁰
 ‘Are we going to the town or are we going hunting?’

The presence of a dedicated marker for expressing simple disjunction and its absence for the choice-aimed type can be accounted for by the fact that it is easier to infer a disjunctive relation from the juxtaposition of two interrogative clauses, than from the juxtaposition of two declarative ones (Mauri 2008: 185).

4.3.3 Adversative coordination

Adversative coordination expresses ‘*but*’ relations between two clauses (cf. Longacre 2007: 378). As already stated in Section 4.1, it can be divided into oppositive, corrective and couterexpectative. The examples below illustrate the three types of adversative coordination in Ket, respectively.

(4.63) *díʔl bájdiŋta dasés'ita, bájbéʔaŋ ál'am*

díʔl ba^ʔŋ-di-ŋta da⁸-ses⁷-ta⁰ bájbel-aŋ əl-am
 child earth-N-ADESS 3F⁸-place⁷-be.in.position⁰ braid-PL outside-N.PRED
 ‘The girl sits in the ground (whereas) (her) braids are outside.’

(4.64) *āt árʻendiŋa bān bəγón, kólēdiŋa bəγón*

ād aden-di-ŋa bān bo⁶-k⁵-o⁴-{n²-t}n⁰ koled-di-ŋa bo⁶-k⁵-o⁴-{n²-t}n⁰
 1SG forest-N-DAT NEG 1SG⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-go⁰ town-N-DAT 1SG⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-go⁰
 ‘I didn’t go to the forest, (but) I went to the town.’

(4.65) *imdeŋulsin, mánmaŋ, árʻeniŋa du:γín, deʻŋ bān dáŋtəlvəγin*

imdeŋuls-in manmaŋ aden-ka du⁸-{a⁴}-{daq⁰}-in⁻¹
 dwarf-PL they.say/said forest-LOC 3⁸-NPST⁴-live⁰-AN.PL⁻¹
 deʻŋ bān d{u}⁸-aŋ⁶-t⁵-o⁴-l²-ok⁰-in⁻¹
 people NEG 3⁸-3AN.PL⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-see⁰-AN.PL⁻¹
 ‘Dwarfs, they say, live in the forest, (but) people haven’t seen them.’

(Kotorova and Nefedov, forthcoming)

As we can see, like the majority of other coordination relations in Ket, adversative relations are not overtly signaled in the language. They can only be inferred from the combination of two juxtaposed clauses.

While all the three examples are structurally similar, they still differ in one respect: unlike the sentence in (4.63), the other two examples, (4.64) and (4.65), contain a clause with negative value, i.e. with the negative particle *bān*. This is can be accounted for by the fact that both corrective and couterexpectative imply the presence of some conflicting expectations.

Apart from the juxtapositive strategy, Ket speakers often make use of the Russian coordinators dedicated to expressing adversative relations like *a* ‘and/but’ and *no* ‘but’. The former can be found with instances of the oppositive type (4.66), while the latter is used to mark couterexpectative relations (4.67).

(4.66) *dīlʻ bāŋdiŋta dasésʻta, a bəjbeləŋ əlʻam*

dīlʻ bəŋ-di-ŋta da⁸-ses⁷-ta⁰ a bəjbel-aŋ əl-am
 child earth-N-ADESS 3F⁸-place⁷-be.in.position⁰ and/but.RUS braid-PL outside-N.PRED
 ‘The girl sits in the ground, whereas (her) braids are outside.’

(4.67) *ad inam tabletkaŋ qaj tbi:li, no aqtadiŋ ni tam aks^j bān setəncəq*

ād in-am tabletka-ŋ qaj d{i}⁸-b³-l²-a⁰
 1SG two-PRED pill-PL PART 1⁸-3N³-PST²-eat⁰
 no aqta di-ŋa}l ni tām-aks bān si⁷-t⁵-o⁴-n²-oq⁰
 but.RUS good N-ADESS no.RUS something NEG R⁷-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-become.PST⁰
 ‘I took two pills, but it didn’t get better from this.’ (Dul’zon 1972: 166)

4.4 Summary of Chapter 4

In this chapter we considered how various types of coordination can be expressed in the Ket language. Like many other languages with no written tradition, the most frequent strategy employed to code coordination relations in Ket is juxtaposition (cf. Mithun 1988). The existing native conjunctions like the monosyndetic *hāj* ‘and’ and the bisyndetic *tām...tām* ‘either...or’ are still at an early stage of grammaticalization, therefore they are very limited in use, especially with respect to clausal coordination. It also seems plausible to say that the habitual particle *bā* is undergoing grammaticalization as a clausal coordinator expressing the temporal sequential relations. Given the scarcity of native means to signal coordination, Ket often makes use of conjunctions borrowed from the Russian language.

Table 4.1 summarizes the findings about the native strategies used to express various coordination relations in Ket.

<u>Coordination strategy</u> → ↓ <u>Type of coordinate relations</u>		<i>hāj</i>	<i>tām...tām</i>	juxtaposition		
				-	<i>bā</i>	(<i>bānd</i>) <i>u</i>
CONJUNCTIVE	<i>Temporal sequential</i>	+ (SS)		+	+ (SS)	
	<i>Temporal simultaneous</i>	+ (SS)		+		
	<i>Atemporal</i>			+		
DISJUNCTIVE	<i>Simple</i>		+			
	<i>Choice-aimed</i>					+
ADVERSATIVE	<i>Oppositive</i>			+		
	<i>Corrective</i>			+		
	<i>Couterexpectative</i>			+		

Table 4.1 Coordinating strategies in Ket

As we can see, the juxtapositive strategy can be used for coding virtually all types of coordination in Ket, except for simple disjunction, while the other strategies remain very limited being applicable to only one or two types of coordination.

In general, the data from Ket offer support to the typological implications proposed in Mauri's (2008) cross-linguistic study of coordination relations. First of all, the Ket data conform to the conjunctive-adversative⁷¹ coding implication. It implies that if in a given language, simple counterexpectative relations are normally expressed asyndetically, then asyndesis can also be used to express both temporal and atemporal conjunctive relations, as well as oppositive and corrective adversative relations. As we can see in Table 4.1, this is attested in Ket.

⁷¹ In Mauri's terms it is 'combination-contrast'. We adjusted it to our terminology.

