



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 7. Relative Relations

The present chapter offers an overview of constructions coding relative relations and their characteristics in Ket. In the chapter we consider structural properties of Ket relative constructions as well as describe what syntactic-semantic roles are accessible to them. The notion of the relative relations we employ here is defined as relations between two states of affairs, in which the dependent one provides some kind of specification about a participant ('head noun' in traditional terms) in the main one (Cristofaro 2003: 195).

The chapter is structured in the following way. Section 7.1 provides classification and parameters of relative clauses from a typological point of view. Section 7.2 considers relative constructions in Ket with respect to their structural characteristics and defines the types of relativization strategies in the language. Section 7.3 is focused on the accessibility of syntactic-semantic roles in Ket and what strategies are used in each case. In section 7.4 we summarize the chapter and provide a conclusion.

7.1 Typological classification and parameters of relative clauses

From the typological point of view, relative clauses can be classified into different types according to different parameters. Most typological studies distinguish the following four parameters used to classify relative clauses:

- position of head noun
- linear order of relative clause and head noun
- relativization strategies based on the encoding of the notional head in the relative clause
- syntactic-semantic roles of relativized nouns in relative clauses

7.1.1 Position of head noun

According to the positional parameter, relative clauses can be divided into two subtypes. The first type is called external or headed in which a head noun occurs outside the relative clause, as in (7.1).

(7.1) Russian

kniga, [kotoruju ona kupila]
 ‘the book [that she bought]’

The second type is called an internal relative clause. In this type, the head noun occurs inside the relative clause, as illustrated in (7.2).

(7.2) Mesa Grande Diegueño

[’ehatt gaat akewii]vech chepam
 [’ehatt gaat akewii]=ve=ch chepam
 [dog cat chase]=DEF=SBJ get.away
 ‘The cat that the dog chased got away.’ (Couro and Langdon 1975: 187)

7.1.2 Order of relative clause and head noun

The next parameter takes into account the linear order of relative clauses and head nouns. There are three respective subtypes: prenominal, postnominal and circumnominal.

In the prenominal subtype, relative clauses precede their head nouns, as is the case, for example, with the relative clause in (7.3).

(7.3) Alambhak

[ni hikrfě] yimar
 [ni hik-r-fě] yima-r
 [2SG follow-IRREAL-IMMED.PST] person-3SG.M
 ‘A man who would have followed you’ (Bruce 1984: 109)

Relative clauses that follow their head nouns are called postnominal relative clauses. This subtype can be illustrated by the Russian example and its respective English translation in (7.1) above.

The last subtype of relative clauses is circumnominal relative clause (Comrie and Kuteva 2005: 494) in which a head noun is surrounded by a relative clause. In other words, the head noun is inside the relative clause, like in the Mesa Grande Diegueño example (7.2) above.

7.1.3 Relativization strategies

There are several strategies in which relative clauses can be formed in the languages of the world. They are usually defined by the following parameters: presence/absence of the head noun and presence/absence of the relative pronoun. According to these parameters, there are four general relativization strategies. They are gap strategy, relative pronoun strategy, pronoun retention strategy, and non-reduction strategy.

Relative clauses that are formed by the gap strategy have no overt element coreferent to the head noun within the relative clause (Keenan 1985, Comrie 1989, 1998, Comrie and Kuteva 2005). The English sentence in below is an example of this strategy.

(7.4) *I see the house [he built].*

Since the verb *built* is transitive, it requires the presence of an object argument. There is no such argument in the relative clause *he built* in (7.4), that is, there is a gap corresponding to the missing object noun phrase. The gap in the example is coreferential with the head noun *house*.

With the relative pronoun strategy, the head noun is indicated by means of a relative pronoun that is a part of the initial constituent in the relative clause. The pronoun can be marked by case or by adposition in order to indicate the role of the relativized noun within the relative clause (Keenan 1985, Comrie 1989, 1998, Comrie and Kuteva 2005). (7.5) is an example of a relative clause formed by this strategy.

(7.5) Russian

Človek, [kotorogo ty iščeš'], uže tut.

‘The man whom you are looking for is already here.’

The relativized noun *človek* ‘man’ is the object noun of the verb *look for* in the relative clause. It is indicated by the presence of the case-marked relative pronoun *kotorogo* ‘whom’.

The third strategy is the so-called pronoun retention strategy. Relative clauses formed by this strategy contain a resumptive pronoun which is coreferential with the head noun. In such a relative clause the pronoun normally occurs in the position it would

occupy in a simple declarative clause (Keenan 1985; Comrie 1989, 1998; Comrie and Kuteva 2005), cf. (7.6).

(7.6) Persian

man zanirā [ke Hasan be u sibe zameni dād] mišenāsam

man zan-i-rā [ke Hasan be u sibe zameni dād] mišenāsam

I woman-ACC [that H. to her potato gave] I-know

‘I know the woman to whom Hasan gave the potato.’ (Comrie 1989: 148)

In the above example, the relative clause *ke Hasan be u sibe zameni dād* ‘to whom Hasan gave the potato’ contains the resumptive pronoun *u* glossed as ‘her’ which is coreferential with the head noun *zanirā* ‘woman’ in the main clause. The pronoun occurs in the indirect object position of the clause.

The fourth strategy is the non-reduction strategy. It is characterized by the presence of the head noun (or its modified form) as a full noun phrase within the relative clause (Comrie and Kuteva 2005: 495). There are three subtypes of this strategy: correlative clauses, internally headed relative clauses, and paratactic relative clauses.

A correlative clause is a clause in which the head noun appears in a full-fledged form within the relative clause and is also taken up in the form of a pronominal or a non-pronominal element in the main clause. In some languages, the relative clause contains a special correlative marker. The example (7.7) from Hindi illustrates this type of the non-reduction strategy.

(7.7) Hindi

[jo larḱii karīi hai] vo lambii hai

[jo larḱii karīi hai] vo lambii hai

WH girl standing is DEM tall is

‘The girl who is standing is tall.’ (Srivastav 1991: 653)

In that example, the head noun *larḱii* ‘girl’ appears as a full-fledged noun phrase within the relative clause *jo larḱii karīi hai* ‘who is standing’ and appears again in the main clause as a pronominal element *vo*.

In the internally headed subtype of the non-reduction strategy, the head noun occurs inside the relative clause but there is no repetition of it in the main clause.

This was already illustrated by the Diegueño example in (7.2) in which the head noun *gaat* ‘cat’ appears inside the relative clause *'ehatt gaat akewii* ‘that the dog chased’ without element referring to it in the main clause.

The third subtype, paratactic relative clauses, is also characterized by containing the full-fledged head noun within the relative clause which looks the same as a simple declarative clause. The head noun may be or may not be referred to in the main clause; the relative clause and the main clause are only loosely joined together, see, for instance, the example (7.8) below.

(7.8) Amele

mel mala heje on ((mel) eu) busali nuia
 mel mala heje on
 boy chicken illicit take.3SG.SBJ-REM.PST
 ((mel) eu) busali nu-i-a
 boy that run.away go-3SG.SUBJ-TOD.PST

‘The boy that stole the chicken ran away.’ (Comrie and Kuteva 2013)

A language can use more than one strategy to form relative clauses (Keenan and Comrie 1977), for example, English can use both the relative pronoun strategy and gap strategy. Moreover, in some specific cases like relativization of certain embedded structures, it can even allow for the pronoun-retention strategy (McKee and McDaniel 2001).

7.1.4 Syntactic-semantic roles of relativized nouns in relative clauses

The last parameter that plays an important part in typological studies of relative clauses concerns the syntactic-semantic roles of a head noun in a relative clause. As the examples above show, the head noun can be a subject (7.3) or an object (7.1) of the relative clause. Other roles like indirect objects, obliques, etc. are possible as well.

From a cross-linguistic perspective, as shown in Keenan and Comrie (1977), all the syntactic-semantic roles can be organized into a certain hierarchy reflecting their accessibility to relativization. The Accessibility Hierarchy looks as follows:

SUBJECT>DIRECT OBJECT>INDIRECT OBJECT>OBLIQUE>GENITIVE>OBJECT OF COMPARISON
--

This hierarchy implies that some roles are more accessible or easier to relativize than the others. The accessibility decreases from left to right, from subjects to objects of comparison, which means that subjects are more accessible to relativization than direct objects, direct objects are more accessible to relativization than indirect objects, and so on.

According to this parameter, the world's languages differ with respect to what roles they can relativize. There are languages that can relativize only subjects such as Malagasy, others can relativize both subjects and direct objects such as Luganda and so on. Only a few languages like English can allow relativization for all kinds of syntactic-semantic roles. It is important to mention that the hierarchy implies that if a language has a means to relativize on a given syntactic-semantic role, it should be able to relativize on all the other roles to the left of it.

The relativization strategies described above in Section 7.1.3 often differ with respect to what part of the hierarchy they can apply to. For example, the relative pronoun strategy in English can be used to relativize on all the roles on the Accessibility Hierarchy. At the same time, the gap strategy in the language is more restricted and cannot be applied to genitives and objects of comparison.

7.2 General types of relative clauses

In this section, we examine relative constructions in Ket with respect to their structural parameters such as linear order of the relative clause and the head noun, presence/absence of the head noun, presence/absence of the relativizer. We also consider the finiteness of the relative clause which is an important property for the typology of complex clauses in general (cf. the “deranked” vs. “balanced” distinction in Cristofaro 2003).

7.2.1 Prenominal relative clauses

In this type of relative constructions the relative clause occurs before the head noun. This is the major strategy for forming relative clauses in Ket (cf. Georg 2007: 173). It bears a functional resemblance to the prenominal participial relative clauses which are very common among the languages of Siberia (see Chapter 8). The main difference

here is that instead of participles, prenominal relatives in Ket employ either finite verbs or action nominals.

Example (7.9) illustrates a prenominal relative clause built on the finite verb.

(7.9a) *hīy qīm díɛej*

hīk qīm d{u}⁸-i⁴-q²-ej⁰
 male woman 3⁸-3F⁴-PST²-kill⁰
 ‘The man killed the woman.’

(7.9b) *qīm díɛej hīy*

[qīm d{u}⁸-i⁴-q²-ej⁰] hīk
 [woman 3⁸-3F⁴-PST²-kill⁰] male
 ‘the man who killed the woman’

(7.9c) *hīy díɛej qīm*

[hīk d{u}⁸-i⁴-q²-ej⁰] qīm
 [male 3⁸-3F⁴-PST²-kill⁰] woman
 ‘the woman who the man killed’

As can be seen from the examples, the relativized noun is placed right after the relative clause, which does not contain any relative pronoun or any other kind of relativizer. Neither is the relative clause nominalized: the verb [*q²]-ej⁰* ‘kill’ in (7.9b,c) remains as finite as it is in the base construction in (7.9a), i.e. it preserves the agreement markers *du-* in P8 referring to the subject and *-i-* in P4 referring to the object. The past tense marker *-q-* in P2 is preserved as well. Furthermore, the arguments of the relative clauses in (7.9b,c) remain in their sentential form, i.e. unmarked.

As there is no explicit morphological provision within the relative clause for recovering the role of the missing noun phrase, this type of relative constructions can be regarded as an instance of the gap strategy (cf. Givón 1990: 658; Comrie and Kuteva 2005: 495). The only clue which helps to recover the syntactic-semantic role of the head noun is the agreement affixes: if the head noun agrees with the affix in the subject slot of a given verb, then we deal with the subject relativization as in (7.9b). The same rule applies for the object relativization, exemplified in (7.9c). In ambiguous cases, when both subject and object are of the same class and number, the

interpretation of the head noun depends on its semantics or can be retrieved from the context. If the head noun does not have any agreement on the verb (in case of obliques), then the necessary information is in practice recovered either through the argument structure of the subordinate verb or through the presence of the resumptive pronoun¹⁰⁶ (see Section 7.3.1.3 for details and examples).

It is important to mention that, as auditory observation suggests, the potential ambiguity between finite prenominal relatives and sentences with postposed core arguments is resolved by means of stress: in the first case, stress falls on the predicate, while in the second case, it falls on the core argument itself.

The following examples provide illustration of prenominal relative clauses employing action nominals.

(7.10a) *kiséŋ keʔt dúyaraq*

kisəŋ keʔd du⁸-k⁵-a⁴-daq⁰
 here person 3⁸-TH⁵-NPST⁴-live⁰
 ‘The man lives here.’

(7.10b) *kiséŋ daʔq keʔt*

[kisəŋ daʔq] keʔd
 [here live.ANOM] person
 ‘a man (constantly) living here’

(7.11a) *keʔt datīp dúsuγɔvilʔet*¹⁰⁷

keʔd da-tīb du⁸-us⁷-u⁶-k⁵-o⁴-b³-il²-ted⁰
 person 3M.POSS-dog 3⁸-R⁷-3F⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-TH³-PST²-hit⁰
 ‘The man beat his dog (F) (with a stick).’

(7.11b) *kerʔa tarʔ tīp*

ked-da [tād] tīb
 person-M.POSS [hit.ANOM] dog
 ‘a dog beaten by the man’

¹⁰⁶ Note that the presence of the marker cross-referencing the head noun cannot be regarded as a case of pronoun retention as this marker is obligatorily present in the corresponding simple declarative clause (Comrie 1981: 221).

¹⁰⁷ Repeated from example (2.15a) above.

(7.11c) *tàrʲ tīb*

[tád] tīb
 [hit.ANOM] dog
 ‘a beaten dog’

(7.11d) *tīb tàrʲ kɛʔt*

tīb [tád] kɛʔd
 dog [hit.ANOM] person
 ‘a man who was beating a dog’

(7.11e) *tàrʲ kɛʔt*

[tád] kɛʔd
 [hit.ANOM] person
 ‘a beaten man’ or ‘a man who is/was beating’

As expected, relative clauses built on action nominals are highly nominalized and, in case of non-subject relativization, require their subjects to have possessive marking, as in (7.11b).¹⁰⁸

In this variant of the prenominal gap strategy, the role identification of the head noun depends on the argument structure inherent to the corresponding action nominal. Thus, with action nominals corresponding to intransitive verbs, the head noun is interpreted as Subject (7.10b), while with those corresponding to monotransitive verbs, the default interpretation of the head noun would be Object (Patient), although Subject (Agent) interpretation is also possible, see (7.11e). The latter largely depends on the semantics of the head noun itself as can be seen in (7.11c), where *tīb* ‘dog’ cannot be interpreted as Subject (Agent) of ‘beating’. If the relative clause built on a ‘monotransitive’ action nominal contains a zero-marked argument, it is invariably interpreted as Object, and the head noun receives Subject interpretation accordingly (7.11d). The same interpretation holds true for action nominals with incorporated objects (Patients) as in (7.12b).

¹⁰⁸ In general the object interpretation of the possessively marked noun phrase is also possible, but only if the head noun is semantically appropriate.

(7.12a) *qīm danánberəl'bet*

qīm da⁸-nanbed⁷-o⁴-l²-bed⁰
 woman 3F⁸-bread.make.ANOM⁷-PST⁴-PST²-ITER⁰
 'The woman was making bread.'

(7.12b) *nanbet qīm*

[nanbed] qīm
 [bread.make.ANOM] woman
 'a bread-making woman'

In practice, if the semantic valence of the corresponding verb permits, the head noun can also be interpreted as Instrument (see Section 7.3.1.2 for examples).

Due to the absence of the tense markers, non-finite relatives show some ambiguity with respect to the temporal reference. The general tendency is that non-finite subject relatives usually receive a 'present tense' reading, whereas for object relatives the time reference is usually past (cf. Belimov 1973: 136-137).

Although both types of prenominal relative clauses appear to be functioning as ordinary adjectival modifiers, finite prenominal relatives show some difference with respect to their positional properties. While non-finite clauses and ordinary adjectives immediately precede their heads, in the case of the finite prenominal type, it seems possible to insert some additional elements between the relative clause and the head noun. Consider example (7.13), in which the finite relative clause precedes the head noun marked with a possessive marker. It is not possible to insert such a pronominal marker between the non-finite relative clause and the head noun as exemplified in (7.14).

(7.13) *ε:n bede ad buyot qodes da:ηkaj bi:s'naηa di:jaq*

ēn bada ād bo⁶-k⁵-a⁴-d{en}⁰
 now he.says/said 1SG 1SG⁶-TH⁵-NPST⁴-go⁰
 [qodes d{i}⁸-aη⁶-q²-ej⁰] b-is-na-ηa d{i}⁸-aq⁰
 yesterday 1⁸-3AN.PL⁶-PST²-kill⁰] 1SG.POSS-fish-AN.PL-DAT 1⁸-go⁰
 'Now, he said, I will go. I will go to my fish caught yesterday (lit. I-killed-them my-fish).'

(Dul'zon 1964b: 184)

(7.14) * *èj b̄ĩs'*

èj b-ĩs
 kill.ANOM 1SG.POSS-fish
 Intended: 'my caught fish'

This seems to correlate with the general tendency in the world's languages pointed out in Andrews (2007: 212) that the unreduced (i.e. full clause-like) relative clauses usually appear further from the head noun than the reduced (i.e. nominalized) ones and adjectival modifiers.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that subject relative clauses formed with the help of action nominals usually convey a more generic or habitual meaning than their finite counterparts; cf. examples in (7.15) below.

(7.15a) *qoʔj deʔŋ dáŋgej*

qoʔj deʔŋ d{u}ʰ-ɑŋʰ-qʰ-ej⁰
 bear people 3⁸-3AN.PL⁶-PST²-kill⁰
 'The bear killed (the) people.'

(7.15b) *deʔŋ dáŋgej qoʔj*

[deʔŋ d{u}ʰ-ɑŋʰ-qʰ-ej⁰] qoʔj
 [people 3⁸-3AN.PL⁶-PST²-kill⁰] bear
 'the bear who killed the people'

(7.15c) *deʔŋ èj qoʔj*

[deʔŋ èj] qoʔj
 [people kill.ANOM] bear
 'a people-killing bear'

While the relative clause in (7.15b) refers to a specific bear that killed some specific people, the non-finite relative in (7.15c) refers to some bear that habitually kills people. This tendency is also reflected in the fact that relative constructions with action nominals denoting Kets' habitual activities often become highly lexicalized, especially when they are headed by the noun *keʔd* 'person' as in *isqo keʔd* 'fisherman (lit. fish-killing person)', *assano keʔd* 'hunter (lit. animals-killing person)', *itikaj keʔd* 'guest (lit. visiting person)', etc.

7.2.2 Headless relative clauses.

The next type of relative constructions to be considered is formed with the help of the nominalizing suffix *-s* (PL *-sin*). These relative clauses are parallel in many respects to the pronominal relatives, except that they lack an expressed head noun.

The suffix *-s* has received various treatments in the Ket literature. For example, it has been regarded as a formative of adjectives, a formative of participles, a predicative suffix, etc. (cf. Dul'zon 1968, Werner 1997, Knyr' 1997). But as shown in Georg (2007: 122-124), *-s* is better analyzed as a general device converting other parts of speech to noun phrases (cf. example (2.8) in Chapter 2 in which we had the adjective *aqta* 'nice' converted into *aqtas* 'nice one' by this suffix). The converted part of speech acquires all the general morpho-syntactic properties of Ket nouns.

The nominalizing suffix *-s* can be attached both to finite verbs (7.16)-(7.17) and action nominals (7.18)-(7.19).

(7.16a) *keʔt dilaq*

keʔd d{u}ʰ-i²-aq⁰
 person 3⁸-PST²-come⁰
 'The man came.'

(7.16b) *dilaqsʲ*

[d{u}ʰ-i²-aq⁰]-s
 [3⁸-PST²-come⁰]-NMLZ
 'the one (M) who came'

(7.17a) *káλn kápkán dakástitnam*

káðn kapkan da⁸-kas⁷-tit⁴-n²-am⁰
 fox trap 3N⁸-limb⁷-3F⁴-PST²-take⁰
 'The trap caught the fox.'

(7.17b) *kápkán dakástitnamsʲ*

[kapkan da⁸-kas⁷-tit⁴-n²-am⁰]-s
 [trap 3N⁸-limb⁷-3F⁴-PST²-take⁰]-NMLZ
 'the one (F) that the trap caught'

(7.18a) *keʔt jehhuyga dýçraq*

keʔd eηquŋ-ka du⁸-k⁵-a⁴-daq⁰
 person houses-LOC 3⁸-TH⁵-NPST⁴-live⁰
 ‘The man lives in the village.’

(7.18b) *jéhhuyga dýqsʲ*

[eηquŋ-ka dəq]-s
 [houses-LOC live.ANOM]-NMLZ
 ‘the one who (constantly) lives in the village’

(7.19a) *hīy daqīm dúsuyçvilitet*

hīk da-qīm du⁸-us⁷-u⁶-k⁵-o⁴-b³-il²-ted⁰
 man M.POSS-woman 3⁸-R⁷-3F⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-TH³-PST²-hit⁰
 ‘The man beat his wife (with a stick).’

(7.19b) *kérʲa tárʲsʲ*

[ked-da tad]-s
 [person-M.POSS hit.ANOM]-NMLZ
 ‘the one who is beaten by the man’ or ‘the one who beat the man’ or
 ‘something the man was beaten with’

(7.19b) *tīp tárʲsʲ*

[tīb tad]-s
 [dog hit.ANOM]-NMLZ
 ‘the one who beat the dog’

(7.19b) *tárʲsʲ*

[tad]-s
 [hit.ANOM]-NMLZ
 ‘the one who is beaten by someone’ or ‘the one who beat someone’ or
 ‘something someone was beaten with’

As we can see in (7.16b), even nominalized with -s, the verb preserves its finite syntax: verb-internal agreement, tense marker, and a zero-marked core argument (*kapkan* as the subject in (7.17b)). Headless relatives with action nominals also behave similar to their headed counterparts.

With respect to the case-recoverability issues, the headless type of relative clauses generally conforms to what has been said above about the prenominal relatives (cf. Georg 2007: 122-124). The main difference is that the absence of the head rules out the impact of the head noun's semantics on the interpretation of the relative clause. Thus, for example, the non-finite relative clauses in (7.18b,d) can have three possible readings: that of subject relative, object relative and instrumental relative. On the other hand, the Instrumental reading is not possible in the case of headless relatives built on the corresponding finite verbs, cf. (7.51) (for further discussion related to oblique relativization see Section 7.3.1.3).

The close parallelism between the prenominal type and the headless type of relative clauses is further manifested in the fact that the above mentioned lexicalized non-finite relatives have equally frequent headless synonyms, cf. *isqos* 'fisherman (lit. fish-killing one)', *assonos* 'hunter (lit. animals-killing one)', *itikajs* 'guest (lit. visiting one)', etc.

Finally, it should be mentioned that Knyr' (1997) provides a couple of examples taken from old field notes¹⁰⁹ with the nominalized verbs (and action nominals) preceding the head noun, as in (7.20), in support for her claim that *-s* is a participial marker.

(7.20) *nan daqqabr'ias' qim*

naʔn	{da ⁸ }-daq ⁷ -q ⁵ -a ⁴ -b ³ -da ⁰ -s	qīm
bread	3F ⁸ -grill.ANOM ⁷ -CAUS ⁵ -NPST ⁴ -3N ³ -ITER.TR ⁰ -NMLZ	woman

'the woman that is baking pie' (Knyr' 1997: 67)

Our language consultants considered such examples ungrammatical. This is also corroborated by the fact that nominalized adjectives are ungrammatical in the position before the noun they modify. We could not find any example similar to (7.20) in texts either.

¹⁰⁹ These are the data gathered by Prof. Andrej Dul'zon and his students during 1950s-70s of the 20th century.

7.2.3 Postnominal relative clauses.

In addition to the major prenominal strategy, Ket also has postnominal relative constructions, which seem to be a relatively recent innovation developed under the influence of the Russian language. In postnominal relatives, the relative clause occurs after the head noun and is introduced by a relativizer. On formal grounds, postnominal relatives in Ket can be divided into two types depending on the kind of relativizer used.

The first type of postnominal relative clauses bears the strongest resemblance to Russian relative clauses as it is formed with the help of various *wh*-words. These include interrogatives used to question animate constituents only (noun-class differentiating *bitse* ‘who.M’, *besa* ‘who.F’ (PL *bilajsan*) and noun-class neutral *ana/anet* ‘who’ (PL *anetaŋ*)), both animate and inanimate constituents (*ases/ās* ‘what kind of’), and location (*biseŋ* ‘where’). Interestingly, we have not found relative clauses formed with help of the pronoun *ak(u)s* ‘what’ which is used for questioning inanimate constituents only. The verb in the postnominal relatives preserves its fully finite syntax; action nominals are not allowed.

Examples (7.21) and (7.22) below illustrate some of these relative clauses in Ket.

(7.21a) *qóresʲ āt hīy dátulɔŋ*

qodes ād hīk d{i}⁸-a⁶-t⁵-o⁴-l²-oŋ⁰
 yesterday 1SG male 1SG⁸-3M⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-see⁰
 ‘I saw a man yesterday.’

(7.21b) *hīy ána/bitse/asesʲ qóresʲ āt dátulɔŋ*

hīk ana/bitse/ases qodes ād d{i}⁸-a⁶-t⁵-o⁴-l²-oŋ⁰
 male who/who.M/what.kind.of yesterday 1SG 1SG⁸-3M⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-see⁰
 ‘man who I saw yesterday’

(7.22a) *āt dímesʲ qímasʲ*

ād d{i}⁸-i{k}⁷-n²-bes⁰ qim-as
 1SG 1SG⁸-here⁷-PST²-move⁰ woman-COM
 ‘I came with the woman.’

(7.22b) *qīm án'a s'i/bésa s/áses'as'j āt d'i mes'j*

qīm	ana-as/besa-as/ases-as	ād	d{i}⁸-i{k}⁷-n²-bes⁰
woman	who-COM/who.F-COM/what.kind.of-COM	1SG	1SG⁸-here⁷-PST²-move⁰

‘the woman I came with’

As can be seen, interrogatives appear in a fixed position at the beginning of the relative clause. In *wh*-questions, however, the position of the interrogative word is much more flexible (Belimov 1976: 18).

It should be noted that we have not observed any apparent syntactic or semantic difference between relative clauses introduced by the noun-class differentiating pronouns or by the noun-class neutral one (cf. Belimov 1976: 18). Moreover, as our informants report, they are easily interchangeable. The interrogative *ases* ‘what kind of’ can be used instead of them as well; cf. examples (7.21)-(7.22).

It should be noted that interrogative words in Ket are capable of taking virtually all case markers and postpositions, and therefore they can easily recover the syntactic-semantic role of the corresponding head noun, as, for instance, in (7.22b) with the instrumental oblique. Thus, it is a clear example of the relative pronoun strategy (cf. Givón 1990: 658; Comrie and Kuteva 2005: 495).

The second type of postnominal clauses involves a special relativizer. The relativizer consists of the stem *qo* and the element reflecting class/number distinctions of the corresponding head noun: *qōd* (M), *qode* (F/N), *qone* (AN.PL). Thus, structurally, it is distinct from the interrogative pronouns discussed above. It should also be mentioned that some Ketologists consider *qod(e)*¹¹⁰ as a relative pronoun (Dul’zon 1968: 122; Werner 1997: 140). As we will see below, this does not involve the relative pronoun strategy,¹¹¹ since this relativizer does not indicate the role of the coreferent head noun.

Examples (7.23)-(7.24) illustrate relative constructions with the relativizer *qod(e)*.

¹¹⁰ As there is only one instance of the uninflected stem *qo* found in texts, we will refer to this relativizer in its inflected form.

¹¹¹ In Comrie and Kuteva’s (2005) terms.

(7.23a) *keʔt kisʔéŋ dólʔdaq*

keʔd	kisʔéŋ	d{u}ʔ ⁸ -o ⁴ -l ² -daq ⁰
person	here	3 ⁸ -PST ⁴ -PST ² -live ⁰

‘The man lived here.’

(7.23b) *keʔt qoʔi kisʔéŋ dólʔdaq*

keʔd	qo-d	kisʔéŋ	d{u}ʔ ⁸ -o ⁴ -l ² -daq ⁰
person	REL-M	here	3 ⁸ -PST ⁴ -PST ² -live ⁰

‘the man who lived here.’

(7.24a) *keʔt qīm ōksʔ dībijaq*

keʔd	qīm	ōks	d{u}ʔ ⁸ -i ⁴ -b ³ -ij ² -aq ⁰
person	woman	stick	3 ⁸ -3F ⁴ -TH ³ -PST ² -give ⁰

‘The man gave the woman a stick.’

(7.24b) *qīm qóʔe keʔt ōksʔ dībijaq*

qīm	qo-de	keʔd	ōks	d{u}ʔ ⁸ -i ⁴ -b ³ -ij ² -aq ⁰
woman	REL-F	person	stick	3 ⁸ -3F ⁴ -TH ³ -PST ² -give ⁰

‘the woman the man gave a stick to’

The origin of the relativizer remains an open question. For example, Georg (2007: 173) assumes that it is “a relatively recent functional specialization” of the particle *qod(e)* ‘like, as’ (ex. 7.25).

(7.25) *bū tumdu qode kīlʔ*

bū	tum-du	qode	kīlʔ
3SG	black-M.PRED	like	raven

‘He is as black as a raven.’ (Werner 2002, II: 93)

Belimov (1985: 40), on the other hand, classifies *qod(e)* as a demonstrative pronoun with the anaphoric meaning ‘the one already mentioned’. It seems to be a rather plausible claim if we consider the demonstrative pronoun system in Ket. As we pointed out in Chapter 2, it has been traditionally described as having a three-way distinction reflecting different degrees of deictic distance (for the sake of convenience we repeat Table 2.6 as Table 7.1 here).

Neutral deictic stem <i>tu-</i>	Near-deictic stem <i>ki-</i>	Far-deictic stem <i>qa-</i>
<i>tu-d</i> (M)	<i>ki-d</i> (M)	<i>qa-d</i> (M)
<i>tu-de</i> (F/N)	<i>ki-de</i> (F/N)	<i>qa-de</i> (F/N)
<i>tu-ne</i> (AN.PL)	<i>ki-ne</i> (AN.PL)	<i>qa-ne</i> (AN.PL)

Table 7.1. *Demonstrative pronouns in Ket*

As one can see, the demonstratives are structurally similar to the relativizer in having a stem enlarged with the augment showing class/number agreement. Moreover, it is possible to find examples in texts where *qod(e)* is used as a demonstrative (anaphoric) determiner:

(7.26) *qora ajsa egdugbindoq*

qo-de ajsa egd⁷-u⁶-k⁵-b³-n²-doq⁰
 REL-F A. R⁷-3F⁶-TH⁵-TH³-PST²-fall⁰

‘the one who is (before-mentioned) Ajsa fainted.’ (Kostjakov 1981: 74)

Thus, it seems fair to conclude that the relativizer *qod(e)* is a functional extension of the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun. Moreover, such a grammaticalization path is quite common cross-linguistically (Givón 1990: 656). The particle *qod(e)* ‘like, as’ might be, in turn, a functional specialization of the demonstrative *qod(e)* as well.¹¹²

It should be mentioned that both Belimov (1985) and Georg (2007) notice a general tendency to use the form *qode* for all the classes and numbers.¹¹³ Our consultants, however, were quite consistent in the use of the noun-class differentiating forms of *qod(e)*, although they have difficulties with the plural form of the relativizer.¹¹⁴

Unlike the interrogative pronouns, the relativizer *qod(e)* is not attested with case-marking or postpositions. Nevertheless, it seems to be capable of relativizing

¹¹² Notably, Yugh, the closest relative of Ket, does not seem to have anything corresponding to *qod(e)* in Ket (Belimov 1985: 39)

¹¹³ Georg (2007: 166) also points out a similar tendency for the demonstrative pronouns, where the form *tude* tends to be used for all the gender classes.

¹¹⁴ This probably can be attributed to a dialectal difference. All the examples cited in Belimov (1985) belong to the Central Ket dialect and Georg’s fieldwork was mostly conducted in Central Ket villages as well, while our consultants are speakers of Southern Ket. In what follows, we gloss *qod(e)* in the elicited examples according to the noun class it indicates, while in the examples from text sources it is simply glossed as REL.

constituents that would be marked by means of case or a postposition in the base construction, as in (7.27b).

(7.27a) *híydi'l'at qójdaŋal' bān qósəŋatn*

hik-dilkad qoj-da-ŋal bān qos⁷-aŋ⁶-a⁴-tn⁰
 male-children bear-M-ABL NEG fear⁷-3AN.PL⁶-NPST⁴-go⁰
 'The boys are not afraid of the bear.'

(7.27b) *qoʔj qō-d híydi'l'at bān qósəŋatn*

qoʔj qō-d hik-dilkad bān qos⁷-aŋ⁶-a⁴-tn⁰
 bear REL-M male-children NEG fear⁷-3AN.PL⁶-NPST⁴-go⁰
 'the bear that the boys are not afraid of'

As we can see, *qod(e)* remains unmarked for Ablative and only shows agreement in class/number with the head noun. Thus, given that *qod(e)* does not indicate the role of the corresponding noun phrase within the relative clause, we may conclude that it should be regarded as another instance of the gap strategy.

In contrast to prenominal relative constructions where the relative clause almost always immediately precedes the head noun, postnominal relative clauses can be easily extraposed (or right-dislocated), cf. (7.28)-(7.29) and (7.22)-(7.24).

(7.28) *bu ker'asj uŋəni, as'esj qor'esj di-mbesj*

bū ked-as u⁶-k⁵-o⁴-{n²-t}n⁰ ases qodes d{u}⁸-i{k}⁷-n²-bes⁰
 3SG person-COM 3F⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-go⁰ what.k.o yesterday 3⁸-here⁷-PST²-move⁰
 'She went with the man, who came yesterday.' (Werner 1997: 347)

(7.29) *āt kinij īs bil'ia qór'ia qór'esj dáqqimna*

āt kinij īs {di⁸}-b³-l²-a⁰ [qo-de qodes {di⁸}-daq⁷-q⁵-b³-n²-a⁰]
 1SG today fish {1⁸}-3N³-PST²-eat⁰ [REL-N yesterday {1⁸}-grill.ANOM⁷-TH⁵-3N³-PST²-R⁰]
 'Today I eat the fish that I grilled yesterday.'

In (7.28), the extraposed relative clause introduced by *ases* is detached from the head noun *keʔd* and placed right after the verb. The internal structure of extraposed relatives in Ket remains the same as in corresponding postnominal relatives. The extraposition does not seem to be connected with the pragmatics of the sentence; rather it reflects

the frequent tendency in Ket to place “heavy” constituents in the postverbal position without any effect on the information structure (cf. Section 2.3.5).

7.2.4 Correlative relative clauses

Another type of relative clauses in Ket that likewise employs *wh*-words is a correlative clause construction. The correlative constructions consist of two separate (non-embedded) clauses: the one is a *wh*-clause containing the head noun and the other is the main clause with an anaphoric element referring to the head noun in the *wh*-clause, as in (7.30).

(7.30) *as'esj ke't tliu'verɔvɛt tunbesj abaŋa diks'ivesj*

ases	ke'td	d{i}⁸-lubed⁷-o⁶-k⁵-a⁴-bed⁰
what.kind.of	person	1⁸-love.RUS.ANOM⁷-3M⁶-TH⁵-NPST⁴-ITER⁰
tunbes	aba-ŋa	d{u}⁸-ik⁷-s⁴-bes⁰
such	1SG.POSS-DAT	3⁸-here⁷-NPST²-move⁰

‘What kind of man I love, such (man) comes to me (i.e. The man I love will come to me.).’

(Werner 1997: 349)

There is also a headless variant of the correlative construction, illustrated in (7.31).

(7.31) *ana aqta tli'verabet turj aqta duyaraq*

[ana	aqta	d{u}⁸-lobed⁷-a⁴-bed⁰]	tū-d	aqta	du⁸-k⁵-a⁴-daq⁰
who	good	3⁸-work.RUS.ANOM⁷-NPST⁴-ITER⁰	this-M	good	3⁸-TH⁵-NPST⁴-live⁰

‘Who works well, that one lives well.’ (Werner 1997: 349)

Beside the apparent structural difference (presence vs. absence of the head noun), these two constructions are also distinct in the kind of interrogatives they use. The headed correlatives are formed with the help of the interrogative *ases*, while the headless variant makes use of the rest of the *wh*-words. In fact, this is quite expected since *ases* is an adjectival interrogative pronoun, i.e. it functions as an ordinary adjective and obligatorily requires the presence of the noun phrase in *wh*-questions. Interrogatives like *ana*, *bitse*, *besa*, etc. are nominal in nature, and thus always occur in argument positions; compare (7.32)-(7.34).

(7.32) *ás'esj ke't kl'úverɔavet?*

ases ke'td k{u}⁸-lubed⁷-o⁶-a⁴-bed⁰
 what.kind.of person 2⁸-love.RUS.ANOM⁷-3SG.M⁶-NPST⁴-ITER⁰
 'Which man do you love?'

(7.33) **ás'esj tl'úverɔavet?*

ases k{u}⁸-lubed⁷-o⁶-a⁴-bed⁰
 what.k.o 2⁸-love.RUS.ANOM⁷-3SG.M⁶-NPST⁴-ITER⁰
 Intended: 'Which (one) do you love?'

(7.34) *ána/bitse kl'úverɔavet?*

ána/bitse k{u}⁸-lubed⁷-o⁶-a⁴-bed⁰
 who/who.M 2⁸-love.ANOM⁷-3SG.M⁶-NPST⁴-ITER⁰
 'Who do you love?'

In addition to interrogative words, headless correlative relative clauses in Ket may also employ the relativizer *qod(e)*, as in (7.35).

(7.35) *qode at tɔsɔɔlɔq tudi ketdaja at tɔs'e bɔyátn*

qode ād {di⁸}-tosa⁷-o⁴-l²-oq⁰
 REL 1SG 1SG⁸-up⁷-PST⁴-PST²-lift⁰
 tudi ked-da-ŋa ād tosa bo⁶-k⁵-a⁴-den⁰
 this person-M.POSS-DAT 1SG up 1SG⁸-TH⁵-NPST⁴-go⁰
 'I will go up to that man I lifted up (lit. That which I lifted up, to that man up I will go.)'

(Dul'zon 1964: 192)

It should be mentioned that correlative (and postnominal) constructions with the relativizer *qod(e)* are much more frequent in texts than those with interrogative pronouns.

7.3 Relativization strategies and accessibility.

In the previous section we discussed morpho-syntactic properties of relative constructions as well as the mechanisms they employ in order to identify the syntactic-semantic role of the head noun within the relative clause, i.e. relativization strategies.

In this section, we focus in more detail on another important characteristic of relative

constructions, namely, what syntactic-semantic roles of the head noun are accessible to these relativizing strategies.

It should be noted that with respect to postnominal and correlative relatives, we limit our further discussion only to postnominal ones employing the relativizer *qod(e)*.

7.3.1 The Accessibility Hierarchy.

Before starting our discussion of the syntactic-semantic roles accessible to the existing relativization strategies in Ket, it is important to note that the hierarchy does not imply that any given language must distinguish all the given positions on the hierarchy. For example, Hindi treats objects of comparison as ordinary oblique complements, therefore there is no need to distinguish the object of comparison position on the hierarchy for this language (Keenan and Comrie 1977: 66). A similar situation can be observed in Ket with respect to Indirect objects and Objects of comparison.

Marking of Indirect objects (or Recipients) in Ket depends on the type of ditransitive construction we deal with. If the verb belongs to the double object ditransitives, the indirect object receives the same marking as the direct object of verbs from Transitive Configuration I; compare (7.36)-(7.37).

(7.36) *keʔt qīm tīp dīvijaq*

keʔd	qīm	tīb	d{u}⁸-i⁴-b³-ij²-aq⁰
person	woman	dog	3⁸-3F⁴-TH³-PST²-give⁰

‘The man gave (his) wife a dog.’ (Nefedov, Vajda and Malchukov 2010: 358)

(7.37) *keʔt qīm dītnivak*

keʔd	qīm	d{u}⁸-it⁴-n²-byk⁰
person	woman	3⁸-3F⁴-PST⁵-find⁰

‘The man found the woman.’

In both examples, the noun *qīm* ‘woman’ is cross-referenced with the 3rd person feminine marker in the same position on the verb, namely, in slot P4.

If the verb belongs to the indirective type of ditransitive constructions, the indirect object takes the Dative case marker (7.38), which marks oblique complements as well (7.39).¹¹⁵

(7.38) *āt hántip kédana tqáruksibet*

ād haŋ-tib ked-da-ŋa d{i}⁸-qəd⁷-u⁶-k⁵-s⁴-i/bed⁰
1SG female-dog person-M-DAT 1SG⁸-gift⁷-3F⁶-TH⁵-NPST⁴-make⁰

‘I give a dog to the man.’ (Nefedov, Vajda and Malchukov 2010: 357)

(7.39) *āt na²n¹ desʹómdaq ájdiŋa*

ād na²n d{i}⁸-es⁷-o⁴-b³-n²-daq⁰ aj-di-ŋa
1SG bread 1⁸-up⁷-PST⁴-3N³-PST²-throw⁰ bag-N-DAT

‘I put the bread in the bag.’

Objects of comparison are likewise treated as Obliques and require Ablative case-marking; compare (7.40)-(7.41).

(7.40) *be²sʹi qójdanaʹi hánun¹da*

be²s qoj-da-ŋal hánun-da
hare bear-N-ABL small-3F.PRED

‘The hare (F) is smaller than the bear.’

(7.41) *ájdiŋaʹi talín tkájnem*

aj-di-ŋal talín d{i}⁸-kaj⁷-{}b³}-n²-am⁰
bag-N-ABL flour 1⁸-limb⁷-3N³-PST²-take⁰

‘I took the flour from the bag.’

Thus, the Indirect object and Object of comparison positions of the Accessibility Hierarchy remain unrealized in Ket.

7.3.1.1 Subject

As can be seen from the examples cited above, this syntactic-semantic role is easily relativizable by all types of relative clauses in Ket, although relativization on subjects of monotransitive verbs is very rare in texts according to our research (but it was

¹¹⁵ There is a minor subtype of the indirective construction which requires the Adessive case marker. This case marker is also widely used with oblique complements (see Nefedov, Vajda and Malchukov 2010 for more details).

readily obtained in elicitation). In this section, we illustrate (where possible) both kinds of subject relativization with examples from Ket texts and various grammatical descriptions of Ket.

Examples in (a) represent relativization on intransitive subjects, while those in (b) – on subjects of monotransitive verbs. The finite prenominal strategy is represented in (7.42), non-finite prenominal in (7.43), and the postnominal strategy with *qod(e)* is shown in (7.44).

(7.42a) *ɔʎátn keʔtɪda qoŋ a bʌn itpɛdem*

[o⁶-k⁵-a⁴-tn⁰] keʔd-da qoŋ ād bān it⁷-ba⁶-d{i}¹-am⁰
 [3M⁸-TH⁵-NPST⁴-go⁰] person-M.POSS image 1SG NEG know⁷-1SG⁶-1SG¹-R⁰
 ‘I don’t know the man who is walking.’ (Dulzon 1971b: 122)

(7.42b) *aŋin thasa ket*

[áə̀n d{u}⁸-ha⁷-s⁴-a⁰] keʔd
 [branch.PL 3M⁸-PERPENDICULAR⁷-NPST⁴-cut.off⁰] person
 ‘a man cutting branches’ (Knyr’ 1997: 68)¹¹⁶

(7.43a) *ad bada hoʎúmde i:sʲ keʔt*

ād bada hoʎúm-da [ɪs] keʔd
 1SG he.says/said H.-3N.POSS [row.ANOM] person
 ‘I (am), he says, Hokum’s rowing person.’ (Dul’zon 1965: 95)

(7.43b) *qáje tūrʲ úddijin dīlʲ qóte ɔʎón*

qaje tu-d [uddijin] dīl qote o⁶-k⁵-o⁴-{n²-t}n⁰
 then this-M [steal.ANOM] child ahead 3M⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-go⁰
 ‘Then this stealing boy went ahead.’

(7.44a) *budə bisép qoda uyet baŋ du:nu*

bu-de biseb [qoda u⁶-k⁵-a⁴-t{n}⁰] baŋ du⁸-o⁴-n²-{q}o⁰
 3SG-F sibling [REL 3F⁶-TH⁵-NPST⁴-go⁰] place 3M³-PST⁴-PST²-die⁰
 ‘Her brother, who died while she was walking.’ (Dul’zon 1966: 94)

¹¹⁶ Note that Knyr’ (1997: 68) incorrectly interprets *thasa* as having the nominalizer *-s*. It should also be pointed out that the word *aŋin* looks more like *aŋen*, the plural form of the word *aŋ* ‘rope’, rather than *áə̀n* ‘branches’. In our glossing we stuck to the translation provided by the author.

(7.44b) *hīy qōrⁱ daqīm dīkej áriendiŋa oγón*

hīk [qō-d da-qīm d{u}⁸-i⁴-q²-ej⁰] aden-di-ŋa o⁶-k⁵-o⁴-{n²-t}n⁰
 male [REL-M 3M.POSS-woman 3M⁸-3F⁴-PST²-kill⁰] forest-N-DAT 3M⁸-TH⁵-NPST⁴-go⁰
 ‘The man who killed his wife went to the forest.’

7.3.1.2 Direct Object

The absolute majority of relative clauses built on monotransitive verbs and corresponding action nominals in Ket texts are instances of direct object relativization. This is illustrated in example (7.45) for the finite prenominal strategy, in example (7.46) for the non-finite prenominal strategy, and in example (7.47) for the postnominal strategy with *qod(e)*.

(7.45) *ap sa²q bida silike qōj di:vaaj sa²q*

āp sa²q bida [silike qōj d{u}⁸-i⁶-q²-ej⁰] sa²q
 1SG.POSS squirrel where [S. uncle 1⁸-3F⁶-PST²-kill⁰] squirrel
 ‘Where is my squirrel? The squirrel that my uncle Silike killed.’

(Belimov 1981: 61)

(7.46) *bə:m kupkə ujbət tudə ilbet s'ik*

baam kupka uj⁷-b³-qut⁰ tu-de [ilbed] si²k
 old.woman in.front.of R⁷-3N³-lie⁰ this-N [small.make.ANOM] trough
 ‘In front of the old woman there lies this broken trough.’

(Kotorova and Porotova 2001: 23)

(7.47) *un'andiŋta ī:s bānsaŋ a kajgan qōre bāt bānⁱ dbil'*

unaŋ-di-ŋta īs bānsaŋ
 net-3N.POSS-ADES fish not.be.present
 a kajga-n [qo-de bāad bān d{u}⁸-b³-l²-{a⁰}]
 but.RUS head-PL [REL-N old.man NEG 3⁸-3N³-PST²-eat⁰]

‘There was no fish in the net, but only (fish) heads, which the old man didn’t eat.’

(Dul’zon 1962: 147)

7.3.1.3 Oblique

Relativization on oblique arguments are quite rare in texts (except for relativization on the adverbial argument *ba²ŋ* ‘place’, see below). In general, obliques can be divided into two groups depending on whether they are marked by a ‘primary’ case marker or

by a ‘secondary’ one.¹¹⁷ As we have already mentioned, noun phrases marked by some of the ‘primary’ cases can be relativized using the prenominal gap strategy, while those marked by ‘secondary’ cases require obligatory presence of a coreferent resumptive pronoun.

Example (7.48) illustrates relativization of a noun marked with the Comitative-Instrumental suffix by the finite prenominal strategy.

(7.48a) *ā́t qoʔj dáʁaj attósasʝ*

ā́d qoʔj d{i}ʰ⁸-a⁶-q²-ej⁰ attós-as
1SG bear 1SG⁸-3M⁶-PST²-kill⁰ spear-COM

‘I killed the bear with a spear.’

(7.48b) *qoʔj dáʁaj attós*

[qoʔj d{i}ʰ⁸-a⁶-q²-ej⁰] attós
[bear 1SG⁸-3M⁶-PST²-kill⁰] spear

‘the spear the bear was killed with’

Similarly, we can relativize this role with the help of the non-finite and headless strategies; cf. (7.49)-(7.50).

(7.49) *qoʔj èj attós*

[qoʔj èj] attós
[bear kill.ANOM] spear

‘the spear the bear was killed with’

(7.50) *qoʔj éjsʝ*

[qoʔj ej]-s
[bear kill.ANOM]-s

‘the one who killed the bear’ or ‘the thing the bear was killed with’

Note that in the case of finite headless relatives, the Instrumental interpretation is not available, as is illustrated in (7.51).

¹¹⁷ The latter also includes postpositions, which usually require the possessive linker on its object.

(7.51) *qoʻj dáxajsʲ*

[qoʻj d{u}ʲ⁸-a⁶-q²-ej⁰]-s
 [bear 3M⁸-3M⁶-PST²-kill⁰]-s

‘the one who killed the bear’ Not: ‘something the bear was killed with’

When the suffix *-as* is used to convey a comitative meaning, as in (7.22a) above, the relativization by gapping is not possible:

(7.52) **āt dí mēsʲ qīm*

[ād d{i}ʲ⁸-i{k}ʲ⁷-n²-bes⁰] qīm
 [1SG 1SG⁸-here⁷-PST²-move⁰] woman

Intended: ‘the woman I came with’

Likewise it is not possible to relativize on noun phrases marked with the other ‘primary’ case markers such as the Prosecutive *-bes* and the Caritive *-an*.

Relativization on the locative complements marked by the suffix *-ka* is not available for headless relatives, whereas prenominal relatives can relativize on this role, as in (7.53).

(7.53a) *āt qúsʲka díyaraq*

ād qus-ka di⁸-k⁵-a⁴-daq⁰
 1SG tent-LOC 1⁸-TH⁵-NPST⁴-live⁰

‘I live in a birch-bark tent.’

(7.53b) *āt díyaraq quʲsʲ*

[ād di⁸-k⁵-a⁴-daq⁰] quʲs
 [1SG 1⁸-TH⁵-NPST⁴-live⁰] tent

‘the birch-bark tent in which/where I live’

(7.53c) *dλʲq quʲs*

[dəʲq] quʲs
 [live.ANOM] tent

‘a birch-bark tent where someone lives’

The difference in accessibility of ‘primary’ case marked obliques to relativization by the prenominal gap strategy might be the result of restrictions imposed by the subordinate verb’s argument structure. As pointed out in Mal’čukov (2008), if we deal

with a *-case* relativizing strategy (in terms of Keenan and Comrie 1977), then relativization on complements which are not part of the argument structure of a given verb would violate the principle of “case-recoverability” formulated in Givón (1990: 650-651).¹¹⁸

Nevertheless, this principle can be violated when the head noun indicates its own semantic role through its lexical meaning (cf. Givón 1990: 679). Therefore, the pronominal gap strategy can be used with nouns such as *iʔ* ‘day’, *sɨ* ‘year’, etc., which function as temporal adjuncts. In addition, relativization on temporal and (non-argumental) locative adjuncts can be achieved with the help of the noun *baʔŋ* ‘place’, cf. (7.54a) and (7.54b), respectively. In this case, such oblique relatives belong to the domain of locative adverbial clauses (see Chapter 6).

(7.54a) **āb il'eŋ quʔs*

āb ileŋ quʔs
1SG.POSS eat.ANOM tent

Intended: ‘The birch-bark tent where I eat.’

(7.54b) *qaj de dɔli:γət ʔi:leŋ baŋ*

qaj da dɔlikit ileŋ baʔŋ
elk M.POSS willow eat.ANOM place

‘The place where the elk eats willow.’ (Dulʔzon 1962: 171)

When the relativized noun is marked by one of the ‘secondary’ cases, it triggers the occurrence of an anaphoric pronoun within the relative clause, as in (7.55b).

(7.55a) *āt dimesʃ kɛtɔŋa*

ād d{i}ʃ⁸-ik⁷-n²-bes⁰ ked-da-ŋa
1SG 1⁸-here⁷-PST²-move⁰ person-3M.POSS-DAT

‘I came to the man.’

(7.55b) *āt ɔŋa dimesʃ keʔt*

[ād da-ŋa d{i}ʃ⁸-ik⁷-n²-bes⁰] keʔd
[1SG 3M.POSS-DAT 1⁸-here⁷-PST²-move⁰] person

‘the man I came to’

¹¹⁸ In his work, Malʔčukov (2008) uses relativization as one of the main criteria in determining a verb’s valence in Even.

This anaphoric pronoun represents a ‘floating’ relational marker which occurs without its pronominal host. As noted in Georg (2007: 117), these ‘headless’ occurrences are restricted to anaphoric situations when it is possible to retrieve the necessary information from the earlier context, as in (7.56).

(7.56) *ad bade əbiηna qəq hip əbil'ida. ād naηál' bəyɔnden*

ād	bade	ob-aŋ-na	qoʔq	hiʔb	obilda
1SG	he.says/said	father-PL-AN.PL.POSS	one.AN	son	was
ād	na-ηal	bo ⁶ -k ⁵ -o ⁴ -n ² -den ⁰			
1SG	AN.PL.POSS-DAT	1SG ⁶ -TH ⁵ -PST ⁴ -PST ² -go ⁰			

‘I, he said, was (my) parents’ only son. I went away from them.’

(Dul’zon 1965: 104)

The ability of the floating case marker to retrieve the information about its referent is due to the presence of the possessive linker which differentiates class and number. If the speaker wants to put emphasis on the referent, then the pronominal host is normally retained (Vajda 2008b: 192). In this case, the anaphoric pronoun in (7.56) would have been in its full form *bū-η-na-ηal* [3-PL-AN.PL-ABL]. Note that anaphoric pronouns used in the resumptive function never occur in their full form.

It should be mentioned that the occurrence of a resumptive pronoun in prenominal relative clauses is rather rare cross-linguistically. This seems to be connected with the fact that the preferred order in interclausal anaphoric situations is ‘antecedent noun-anaphoric pronoun’ and not vice versa (Givón 1990: 656). The languages that are known to have such constructions (often very rare and limited in use) include Chinese, Korean (Keenan and Comrie 1977), Japanese (Bernard Comrie, p.c.), Nama (Vries 2002: 37), Shipibo-Konibo (Valenzuela 2002). The occurrence of the resumptive pronoun in Ket finite prenominal relatives can be attributed to the fact that they preserve fully finite syntax (Lehmann 1992: 344). This is also corroborated by the fact that this strategy is not found with non-finite prenominal relatives clauses in Ket.

The headless relatives are likewise not capable of relativizing on the obliques marked by secondary cases. A possible explanation for this is that the anaphoric reference cannot be established due to the absence of the antecedent noun.

The non-availability of the anaphoric pronoun strategy for non-argumental noun phrases marked with primary cases seems to be connected with the fact that primary case markers lack a possessive linker and rarely occur with pronouns in general.

Interestingly, the postnominal strategy with *qod(e)* is capable of relativizing on secondary case arguments without any resumptive pronoun, as can be seen in (7.27b). A similar situation is found with headless correlative relative clauses, cf.:

(7.57) *qɔrɛ kuŋa qaj bat dasa:nilit ture rənnerej*

[qode ku-ŋa qaj bāt d{i}⁸-asan⁷-l²-bed⁰] tu-de da⁸-o⁴-n²-a¹-dij⁰
 [REL 2SG.POSS-DAT PART PART 1⁸-speak⁷-PST²-make⁰] this-F 3F⁸-PST⁴-PST²-3SS¹-reach⁰
 ‘That (woman) I was about to tell you about (just) showed up (lit. Which I was about to tell you about, that (just) showed up).’

(Dul’zon 1962: 176)

The verb *asan⁷-[l²]-bed⁰* ‘tell’ in (7.57) requires its oblique complement to take the Ablative case marker. Nevertheless, the relativizer *qod(e)* remains unchanged and there is no anaphoric pronoun (in this particular case it would be *di-ŋal* [F.POSS-ABL]) within the relative clause.

7.3.1.4 Possessor

As for Possessors, they like Obliques require the presence of a resumptive element, cf. (7.56).

(7.58a) *hīy qim-d iŋqus’ dītuy*

hīk qim-d iŋqus d{u}⁸-i⁶-t⁵-oŋ⁰
 male woman-F.POSS house 3⁸-3N⁶-TH⁵-see⁰
 ‘The man sees the woman’s house.’

(7.58b) *hīy dīŋqus’ dītuy qīm*

hīk d-iŋqus d{u}⁸-i⁶-t⁵-oŋ⁰ qīm
 male F.POSS-house 3⁸-3N⁶-TH⁵-see⁰ woman
 ‘the woman whose house the man sees’

Relative strategies formed with the help of *wh*-words can be used to relativize on Possessors too. In this case, the role of Possessor is indicated by a *wh*-pronoun in the

possessive form. Both postnominal (7.59b) and correlative (7.59c) relative clause types are available.

(7.59a) *tūrⁱ hīyda qu^ʔsi bɔ^ʔk dəbīlⁱ*

tū-d hik-da qu^ʔs bo^ʔk də⁸-b³-l²-{a⁰}
 this-M male-M.POSS tent fire 3N⁸-3N³-PST²-eat⁰

‘This man’s birch bark tent burned down (lit. fire ate it).’

(7.59b) *tūrⁱ hīy ásesⁱda/ánⁱda/bítsera qu^ʔsi bɔ^ʔk dəbīlⁱ árⁱendiŋa ɔyón*

tū-d hīk ases-da/an-da/bitse-da qu^ʔs bo^ʔk də⁸-b³-l²-{a⁰}
 this-M male what.k.o-M.POSS/who-M.POSS/who.M-M.POSS tent fire 3N⁸-3N³-PST²-eat⁰
 aden-di-ŋa o⁶-k⁵-o⁴-{n²-de}n⁰
 forest-N-DAT 3M⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-go⁰

‘This man, whose birch bark tent burned down, went to the forest.’

(7.59c) *ásesⁱda/ánⁱda/bítsera qu^ʔsi bɔ^ʔk dəbīlⁱ tūrⁱ hīy árⁱendiŋa ɔyón*

ases-da/an-da/bitse-da qu^ʔs bo^ʔk də⁸-b³-l²-{a⁰}
 what.k.o-M.POSS/who-M.POSS/who.M-M.POSS tent fire 3N⁸-3N³-PST²-eat⁰
 tū-d hīk aden-di-ŋa o⁶-k⁵-o⁴-{n²-de}n⁰
 this-M male forest-N-DAT 3M⁶-TH⁵-PST⁴-PST²-go⁰

‘Whose birch bark tent burned down, this man, went to the forest.’

Other types of relative clauses are not attested with Possessors.

7.4 Summary of Chapter 7

In this chapter we provided a typologically-oriented overview of relative constructions in Ket. We surveyed them with respect to their structural properties as well as the ability to relativize on different syntactic-semantic roles. With respect to the position of the head noun, all the types of relative clause constructions in Ket are externally-headed with the obvious exception of the headless type. In terms of positional characteristics, the major strategy in Ket is the prenominal strategy. It may employ both finite verbs and action nominals. The prenominal strategy has a headless variant formed with the help of the nominalizing suffix *-s*. The headless and prenominal types are parallel in many respects, but show some variation in their ability to relativize on certain syntactic-semantic roles. In addition, Ket has a postnominal type of relative clause which can be further subdivided into those marked

with the relativizer *qod(e)* and those marked by *wh*-words. The latter can be clearly attributed to the massive influence of Russian in which it represents the main relativization strategy. It seems fair to assume that the *qod(e)* strategy in Ket is probably a calque. Correlative clauses both headed and headless are also attested in Ket.

The Table 7.2 below summarizes the findings concerning the accessibility of certain syntactic-semantic roles and strategies involved in each case in accordance with Keenan and Comrie's Accessibility Hierarchy. Note that Indirect objects in Ket are treated either as Directs objects or as Obliques depending on the verb type. Objects of comparison are also subsumed under Obliques due to the identical marking. Therefore, the Accessibility Hierarchy for Ket looks as follows:

SUBJECT>DIRECT OBJECT>OBLIQUE>GENITIVE

↓Strategy		Roles→		OBL				GEN
		SU	DO	Primary		Secondary		
				COM	LOC		PROS/ CAR	
GAP	Finite pronominal	+	+	+/- ¹¹⁹	+/-	-	-	-
	Non-finite pronominal	+	+	+/-	+/-	-	-	-
	Finite headless	+	+	-	-	-	-	-
	Non-finite headless	+	+	+/-	-	-	-	-
	Postnominal with <i>qod(e)</i>	+	+	NA ¹²⁰	NA	NA	+	-
RETENTION PRONOUN	Finite Prenominal	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
NON REDUCTION	Correlative with <i>qod(e)</i>	+	+	NA	NA	NA	+	-
	Correlative with <i>wh</i> -words	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
RELATIVE PRONOUN	Postnominal with <i>wh</i> -words	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Table 7.2. Accessibility in Ket

¹¹⁹ '+/-' stands for cases where relativizability depends on the inherent argument structure of the corresponding verb.

¹²⁰ 'n/a' means that we were unable to obtain examples of primary case marked obliques from our informants, whereas texts and grammatical descriptions provide examples of a secondary case marked oblique relativized by the same strategy.

As can be seen, there is a significant difference in relativizability by the gap strategy among oblique complements. On the one hand, this difference can be attributed to restrictions imposed by the verb's argument structure, on the other hand; it also depends on the morphological marking of the oblique complement. Thus, relativization on secondary case marked complements requires the occurrence of the corresponding anaphoric pronoun. The use of anaphoric pronouns in prenominal relative clauses is a quite rare typological feature. In Ket, this can be attributed to the fact that prenominal relatives employ verbs with fully finite syntax (which is also rather uncommon typologically).

From the areal point of view, Ket follows the same prenominal positional pattern found in the languages of neighboring peoples, although the existence of finite prenominal relatives clearly distinguishes it from the rest of Siberia (see Chapter 8 for more discussion).

