The Focus Construction in Early Modern Kolyma Yukaghir

Iku Nagasaki

National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics

Abstract: This paper examines the focus construction in early modern Kolyma Yukaghir. The examination of materials from the end of the nineteenth century suggests that the syntactic restrictions observed in the focus construction in the language as spoken at present did not exist in the earlier period. Unlike the present-day language, which allows only intransitive subjects and objects as targets of focus, early modern Kolyma Yukaghir shows a wider range of focus constituent. The earlier language also allowed transitive subjects and oblique arguments/adjuncts as targets of focus. This provides additional evidence for the hypothesis that the focus construction is related to relative clauses, since the verbal endings used in the focus construction are also used for relativization, and the targets of focus and those of relativization exhibit strong similarities. Another notable distinction between the present-day and earlier stages of the language is in the use of the pseudocleft-like construction, which is observed only in the earlier language. This construction might be the source of the focus construction.*

Key words: Kolyma Yukaghir, the focus construction, relative clauses

1. Introduction

Kolyma Yukaghir is one of only two languages (the other being Tundra Yukaghir) forming a small, unaffiliated language family spoken in Northeastern Siberia. As regards its basic morphological and syntactic properties, Kolyma Yukaghir has agglutinating, partially fusional morphology and head-final syntax with predominantly SOV order. It has been known since Krejnovič (1958, 1979, 1982) that Kolyma Yukaghir has a particular construction that is employed when a non-

verbal constituent in a sentence is in focus (henceforth, the "focus construction"); subsequently, a more detailed analysis of this construction was provided mainly by Maslova (1997, 2003). Both these researchers mention two types of construction: the intransitive-subject focus type, where the intransitive subject that is in focus is marked by the suffix *-(LE)K/-EK*, while the verb appears in the so-called subject-focus form (SF-form), as in (1); and the object focus type, where the object that is in focus is marked by the same suffix as for the intransitive subject above, while the verb appears in the object-focus form (OF-form), as in (2). In each example, the focus constituent and the verb ending are in boldface; the portion that is in focus is indicated by small capitals in the English translation.[1]

(1)   tāt   **touke-lek**   jedej-**l**.
       then   dog-FOC   appear-SF
       'Then A/THE DOG appeared.'   (Maslova 1997: 460)

(2)   **lot'il-ek**   tī-tā   piedet-nu-l'el-**mele**.
       fire-FOC   here-there   kindle-IPFV-INFR-OF.3SG
       '(She) made CAMP-FIRES here and there.'   (Maslova 1997: 460)

Furthermore, Krejnovič (1982) mentions a third type of construction: the transitive-subject focus type, where the verb appears in the SF-form but the focus transitive subject is not marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*, as in (3).

(3)   **tudel**   t'olhoro   qaŋi-**l**.
       3SG   hare   chase-SF
       'HE chased a hare.'   (Krejnovič 1982: 177)

However, Maslova (1997, 2003) claims that the transitive-subject focus type does not exist, that is, transitive subjects are never marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*, and transitive verbs do not have the SF-form. She further points out that focus on a transitive subject is instead expressed in a neutral sentence in which the subject is positioned in preverbal position, following the object, as in (4).

---

[1] The transcription used in this paper basically follows Maslova's (2001) Roman one. In the examples taken from published sources, the Cyrillic transcriptions in Jochelson (1900), Nikolaeva (1989), and Nagasaki (2015) have been transliterated into Roman letters, and some Roman letters used in Maslova (1997, 2003) and Nagasaki (2014) have been changed according to Maslova (2001). The glosses and English translations belong to the author.

The following abbreviations are used in glosses: 1: first person; 2: second person; 3: third person; ACC: accusative; AN: action nominal; COM: comitative; COP: copula; CVB: converb; DAT: dative; DIM: diminutive; DS: different-subject converb; E: epenthesis; ES: expletive subject; ESS: essive; FOC: focus; FUT: future; GEN: genitive; IMP: imperative; INCH: inchoative; IND: indicative; INDF: indefinite; INFR: inferential; INS: instrumental; INTERR: interrogative; INTJ: interjection; INTR: intransitive; IPFV: imperfective; ITER: iterative; LOC: locative; NEG: negative; OF: object focus; PFV: perfective; PL: plural; POSS: possessive; PRED: predicative; PRN: proper noun; PROH: prohibitive; PROL: prolative; PROP: proprietive; PRSP: prospective; PTCP: participle; Q: question; RN: result nominal; SF: subject focus; SG: singular; STAT: stative; TR: transitive; TRANS: translative.

(4)   tabun-gele   mošolupkā   mid'-ej-m.
      that.one-ACC   owl   take-PFV-IND.TR.3SG
      'He was grasped by THE OWL.'   (Maslova 2003: 344)

Krejnovič and Maslova, thus, concur that the Kolyma Yukaghir focus construction is available to indicate that either the intransitive subject or the object is in focus, but differ as to whether it can be employed to indicate that the transitive subject is in focus. I will suggest that the reason for this difference seems to lie in the periods of data collection for the respective studies, since Krejnovič's (1982) examples, such as (3), were obtained in 1959 as he himself notes (Krejnovič 1982: 6), whereas Maslova's (1997, 2003) analysis largely utilized data from around 1990 (Maslova 2003: 16).

In this paper, I use Jochelson (1900), materials from early modern Kolyma Yukaghir, collected at the end of the nineteenth century, to show that the syntactic restrictions observed in the present-day language might have arisen as a kind of strong constraint in the not-too-distant past. In these materials, we can find examples in which the focus construction is employed not only for the three core arguments mentioned above but also for oblique arguments or adjuncts. We can also find a few examples of a pseudocleft-like pattern that is not attested in the present-day language. These facts, which have not been observed in the previous literature, support the view that the focus construction originated from a cleft-like construction, and offer the possibility of understanding its diachronic development in more detail. After providing an overview of the focus construction in the present-day language in section 2, its use and related constructions in the early modern language are discussed in section 3 and 4.

2. Overview of the focus construction in the present-day language
2.1. The two components of focus construction

The Kolyma Yukaghir focus construction is a linguistic realization of focus as a category of information structure in this language.[2] One of the two characteristic features of this construction is the use of two special verb forms, the SF- and OF-forms described in section 1. They are chosen depending on whether the suffix -(LE)K/-EK attaches to the subject or object, as mentioned, and are distinct from the indicative form, which is neutral with respect to focus marking. Compare the verb forms in the neutral indicative sentences in (5) and (6) with those in the

---

[2] Maslova (1997) also identifies two grammatical means of marking focus, in addition to the focus construction under discussion in this paper: (i) placing the "affirmative" clitic *me* (treated as a prefix in Maslova (1997)) before the verb in an indicative sentence, and (ii) using the result nominal clause marked by the suffix *-ōl* as the predicate of a sentence. Maslova (2003: 144–145, 443–444) describes that the former is used in order to emphasize the assertion expressed by the verb, while the latter can be, but not always, used to indicate that the subject of the clause is a part of the assertion. However, an in-depth discussion on their functions is not possible due to insufficient data. Therefore, this paper is concerned only with the focus construction.

examples of the focus construction in (1) and (2). Note that the verb forms without overt tense marking receive either past or present interpretation.

(5)   irgud'ieje   jedej-ŋi.
       star   appear-IND.INTR.3PL
       'The stars came out.'

(6)   tudel lot'il-e   piedet-nu-m.
       3SG   fire-INS   kindle-IPFV-IND.TR.3SG
       'He made fire.'

Table 1 below illustrates the paradigms of indicative (intransitive and transitive), SF-form, and OF-form endings. As can be seen in this table, the SF-form exhibits partial agreement with the subject in person and number. In fact, only the plurality of the third-person subject is indicated by the suffix -ŋi, while the OF-form has a full agreement paradigm as the indicative form does.

Table 1.   The endings of indicative, SF-, and OF-forms

| | Indicative form | | SF-form | OF-form |
	Intransitive	Transitive		
1SG	-je/-d'e/-t'e	-Ø	-l	-me
1PL	-jīli/-jli/-d'īli/-t'īli	-j/-i/-t'	-l	-l
2SG	-jek/-d'ek/-t'ek	-mek	-l	-me
2PL	-jemet/-jmet/-d'emet/-t'emet	-met	-l	-met
3SG	-j/-i/-t'	-m	-l	-mele/-mle
3PL	-ŋi	-ŋā (-ŋam)	-ŋi-l	-ŋile

Another peculiar feature of the focus construction is the marking of the focused non-verbal constituent in a sentence by the suffix -(LE)K/-EK, which is realized as -(le)k or -(lo)q after a vowel, and as -ek or -oq after a consonant.[3] This suffix does not co-occur with the case suffix in an NP. Compare the object marked by the instrumental -le/-e in (6) with the object marked only by -(LE)K/-EK in (2).[4] The variants -(lo)q and -oq are used by some speakers when the preceding syl-

---

[3] This suffix also has two distinctive variants: -dik and -tek for the interrogative pronouns *leme* 'what' and *kin* 'who,' respectively.

[4] In terms of case marking of core arguments, Kolyma Yukaghir is a language that has differential object marking (DOM) with both global and local distinguishability (Malchukov and de Swart 2009). The subject always appears in the nominative (unmarked) case, while the object can be marked by the nominative (unmarked), accusative (-gele/-kele, -ul), or instrumental (-le/-e). The choice between the nominative (unmarked) case, on the one hand, and the accusative or instrumental case, on the other, is determined by the relationship between subject and object. When the subject is in the first or second person and the object is in the third person, the object appears in the nominative case just as the subject does; when both subject and object are in the first or second person, the object is marked by the accusative -ul; and when the subject is in the third person, the object is marked by the accusative -gele/-kele or the instrumental -le/-e, where the choice between the accusative and instru-

lable contains /o/ or /ō/. As for the distinction between the variants for vowel-final stems, that is, the long variants *-lek* and *-loq*, on the one hand, and the short ones *-k* and *-q*, on the other, the former tends to appear when an NP consists of a single noun, while the latter appears irrespective of whether an NP branches or not.[5] Only a few types of NPs, namely proper nouns and the third-person pronouns, as well as possessed NPs with a definite possessor, appear without *-(LE)K/-EK* in the focus construction. Here, I assume that these types of NPs take the zero variant of *-(LE)K/-EK* and will gloss it as FOC within brackets, as in (7) and (8).

(7)   a.   **Nikolaj**   kelu-**l**.
           PRN(FOC) come-SF
           'Nikolaj came.'
     b.   **tudel**   kelu-**l**.
           3SG(FOC) come-SF
           'He came.'
     c.   **met pulut**   kelu-**l**.
           1SG husband(FOC) come-SF
           'My husband came.'

(8)   a.   **Ol'a**   nie-**mele**.
           PRN(FOC) call-OF.3SG
           '(He) called Olya.'
     b.   **tudel**   nie-**mele**.
           3SG(FOC) call-OF.3SG
           '(He) called him.'
     c.   **met pulut**   nie-**mele**.
           1SG husband(FOC) call-OF.3SG
           '(He) called my husband.'

     With regard to the syntactic restrictions, my data from fieldwork (in 1997 and 2002–2008) confirm Maslova's (1997, 2003) account: All my attested examples are of the intransitive-subject focus or object focus type; examples such as (3) provided by Krejnovič (1982) are regarded as being inappropriate by my language consultants.

     It has been pointed out that the combination of the special verb forms and the marking of the non-verbal constituent with the suffix *-(LE)K/-EK* suggests that the focus construction can be traced back to a kind of cleft construction (Maslova 1997, 2003, 2009; Nikolaeva and Helimski 1997; Malchukov 2013). The

---

mental tends to be determined by the definiteness of the object NP.
[5] Krejnovič (1982: 185, 255, 257) states that *-lek/-loq* and *-k/-q* are decided depending on the presence or absence of a modifier. Maslova (2003: 91) further describes the functional distinction between the two variants; for instance, that *-k/-q* is used if the narrow focus falls on a modifier, rather than on the NP as a whole. However, this does not hold for all cases (see, for example, (36)). Therefore, it is plausible to understand that the long variants are sensitive to the internal structure of NPs, while the short variants are not.

first proposed evidence of the cleft-like construction being the origin of the focus construction is the fact that both SF- and OF-forms are also used as participles and form relative clauses, as in (9).[6] The SF- and OF-forms used as participles are glossed as PTCP. Here, the OF-form agrees with the subject of a relative clause.

(9)   a.   [kelu-**l**]   šoromo
              come-PTCP   person
              'the person who came'
       b.   [lejdī-**me**]   šoromo
              know-PTCP.1SG   person
              'the person that (I) know'

The second piece of proposed evidence is that the suffix -*(LE)K*/-*EK* also attaches to predicate nominals in verbless sentences when the subject is in the third person, as in (10). Note that the NP types that take the zero variant of -*(LE)K*/-*EK* in the focus construction appear without overt -*(LE)K*/-*EK* in verbless sentences as well.

(10)   a.   tudel   **odul-ek**.
              3SG   Yukaghir-PRED
              'He is Yukaghir.'
       b.   tuön   **mit**   **nume**.
              this.one   1PL   house(PRED)
              'This is our house.'
       c.   tabun   n'ū-gi   **Tebegej**.
              that.one   name-POSS.3   PRN(PRED)
              'His name is Tebegei.'   (Nikolaeva 1989: I-86)

When the subject is in the first or second person, the copular verb appears in a statement similar to (10), as in (11). It follows that -*(LE)K*/-*EK* attached to predicate nominals can be considered to be equivalent to the copular verb in the indicative form, in that -*(LE)K*/-*EK* links a subject to a predicate nominal, asserting a proposition.

(11)   met   odul   ō-d'e.
       1SG   Yukaghir   COP-IND.INTR.1SG
       'I am Yukaghir.'

The idea that the cleft-like construction is the origin of the Kolyma Yukaghir focus construction seems compelling, since similar diachronic sources of the focus construction have been discussed cross-linguistically (Harris and Campbell 1995: 151–155; Givón 2001: 238–240). However, the issue of what kind(s) of clefts might be the concrete origin of the Kolyma Yukaghir focus construction still remains uncertain. Maslova (1997: 466) considers that the source is likely to be the

---

6 Kamei et al. (1996: 198–199) point out the cross-linguistic parallel between the Focus concord construction in Old and early Middle Japanese (called "Kakari-musubi" in Japanese linguistics) and the Yukaghir focus construction, as suggested by one of the reviewers.

kind analogous to the English *it*-cleft. Malchukov (2013) argues that the origin of the intransitive-subject focus type is the kind analogous to the English *it*-cleft and the origin of the object focus type is the kind analogous to the English pseudocleft.

2.2. Uses of the focus construction
2.2.1. *Wh*-questions and information focus
As previous researchers have recognized, the focus construction in Kolyma Yukaghir is associated with certain linguistic environments, contexts, or items (Krejnovič 1982; Maslova 1997, 2003). One such association is the formation of *wh*-questions. When the *wh*-phrase in a *wh*-question is an intransitive subject or object, it is always marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* accompanying the verb in the SF- or OF-form. Similarly, in answer sentences that are appropriate replies to *wh*-questions, the constituent that corresponds to the *wh*-phrase is always marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*. That is, *-(LE)K/-EK* indicates both *wh*-question focus and information focus.

(12) a. **kin-tek**   kelu-**l**?
         who-FOC   come-SF
         'Who came?'

     b. **met pulut**   kelu-**l**.
         1SG   husband(FOC) come-SF
         'My HUSBAND came.'

(13) a. **lem-dik**   tā   ohō-**l**?
         what-FOC   there   stand-SF
         'What stands there?'

     b. **šā-pe-lek**   tā   ohō-**ŋi-l**.
         tree-PL-FOC   there   stand-PL-SF
         'There stand TREES.'

(14) a. tet-ke   **lem-dik**   ijū-**l**?[7]
         2SG-LOC   what-FOC   hurt-SF
         'What part of you hurts?'

     b. met-ke   **jō-lek**   ijū-**l**.
         1SG-LOC   head-FOC   hurt-SF
         'My HEAD hurts.'

(15) a. **qodimie**   **töuke-k**   tet juö-**me**?[8]
         what.kind.of   dog-FOC   2SG see-OF.2SG
         'What dog did you see?'

---

[7] In both of (14a) and (14b), the possessor is expressed in the locative NP external to the possessum NP. Nagasaki (2009: 114) points out that this type of external possessor construction is possible with verbs of bodily state and that the possessor NP, which is always positioned sentence-initially, is interpreted as topic.

[8] Maslova (2003: 452–454) claims that transitive subjects never intervene between the object marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* and verb in the focus construction. However, (15a) contradicts her claim, as do (22a), (24b) and (28).

b. met **embe-j**   **töuke-k** juö-**me**.[9]
   1sɢ be.black-ᴘᴛᴄᴘ   dog-ꜰᴏᴄ see-ᴏꜰ.1sɢ
   'I saw a BLACK dog.'

(16) a. tet   met-in   **lem-dik**   kej-te-**me**?
        2sɢ 1sɢ-ᴅᴀᴛ what-ꜰᴏᴄ   give-ꜰᴜᴛ-ᴏꜰ.2sɢ
        'What will you give me?'

    b. tet-in   **n'ǎžube-lek**   kej-te-**me**.
       2sɢ-ᴅᴀᴛ shawl-ꜰᴏᴄ   give-ꜰᴜᴛ-ᴏꜰ.1sɢ
       '(I) will give you A SHAWL.'

When the *wh*-phrase is not an intransitive subject or object, it is not marked by -*(LE)K/-EK*, resulting in neutral sentences. The same holds for answer sentences to this type of *wh*-question.

(17) a. kin   nume-le   ā?[10]
        who house-ɪɴs   make:ɪɴᴛᴇʀʀ.3sɢ
        'Who built the house?'

    b. met   ā.
       1sɢ   make:ɪɴᴅ.ᴛʀ.1sɢ
       'I built (it).'

(18) a. tit-kele   kin   ket'ī-m?
        2ᴘʟ-ᴀᴄᴄ who   bring-ɪɴᴅ.ᴛʀ.3sɢ
        'Who brought you (here)?'

    b. mit-kele   Afon'a   ket'ī-m.
       1ᴘʟ-ᴀᴄᴄ ᴘʀɴ   bring-ɪɴᴅ.ᴛʀ.3sɢ
       'AFONYA brought us (here).'

(19) a. qamun   pod'erqo-ho   l'e-t-t'emet?
        how.many   day-ʟᴏᴄ   exist-ꜰᴜᴛ-ɪɴᴅ.ɪɴᴛʀ.2ᴘʟ
        'How many days will (you) stay (here)?'

    b. mit   jān   pod'erqo-ho   l'e-t-t'īli.
       1ᴘʟ three day-ʟᴏᴄ   exist-ꜰᴜᴛ-ɪɴᴅ.ɪɴᴛʀ.1ᴘʟ
       'We will stay (here) for THREE DAYS.'

(20) a. kin-in   tet tadi-te-mek,   tiŋ kinige?
        who-ᴅᴀᴛ 2sɢ give-ꜰᴜᴛ-ɪɴᴅ.ᴛʀ.2sɢ this book
        'Who will you give this book to?'

    b. tiŋ   kinige tet-in   tadi-t.
       this book 2sɢ-ᴅᴀᴛ   give-ꜰᴜᴛ:ɪɴᴅ.ᴛʀ.1sɢ
       '(I) will give this book to YOU.'

---

[9] Note that, although -*(LE)K/-EK* attaches the head noun of the object NP in this example, the focus is not on the entire NP, but only on the modifier within the NP.

[10] The verb in a *wh*-question may appear in the interrogative form, which is distinct from any of the indicative, SF-, and OF-forms. See Maslova (2003: 143, 481) for the use of the interrogative form.

(21) a. tittel qamlō-ŋi?
          3PL   be.how.many-IND.INTR.3PL
          'How many people are they?'
      b. tittel ataqlō-ŋi.
          3PL   be.two-IND.INTR.3PL
          'They are TWO.'

It has also been mentioned that the focus domain in the focus construction can be extended to the VP or to the entire sentence (Maslova 1997, 2003). In fact, utterances with one of the two types of broad focus, that is, predicate focus, which excludes the topical subject from the focus domain, and sentence focus, which includes the non-topical subject within the focus domain (Lambrecht 1994), are expressed in the same way as those with narrow focus (also called argument focus), exemplified above in the b-examples of (12)–(16). However, the use of the focus construction for predicate focus or sentence focus is optional, as neutral sentences can also be employed. A set of examples for predicate focus is shown below in (22). One answer to the question in (22a) is realized in the focus construction (22b), in which the object is marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* and the predicate, which is also in focus, appears in the OF-form. Another answer to the same question is realized in the neutral sentence in (22c).

(22) a. tā   **lem-dik**   tet uö   ā-**mele**?
          there   what-FOC   2SG child do-OF.3SG
          'What does your child do there?'
      b. tudel   **anil-ek**   ikt'ī-**mele**.
          3SG   fish-FOC   catch-OF.3SG
          'He CATCHES FISH.'
      c. tudel   anil-e   ikt'ī-m.
          3SG   fish-INS   catch-IND.TR.3SG
          'He CATCHES FISH.'

Two sets of examples for sentence focus are shown in (23) and (24). In each of these sets, the b-example is an answer realized in the focus construction, while the c-example is an answer realized in the neutral sentence.

(23) a. qodo   kude-l'el?
          how   become-INFR:INTERR.3SG
          'What has happened?'
      b. **t'āška-lek**   löudū-**l**.
          cup-FOC   fall-SF
          'A CUP FELL OFF.'
      c. t'āška   löudi-t'.
          cup   fall-IND.INTR.3SG
          'A CUP FELL OFF.'

(24) a. qodo   kude-l'el?
How   become-INFR:INTERR.3SG
'What has happened?'

  b. **n'ātlibie-lek**   et'ie ket'ī-**mele**.
ptarmigan-FOC   father bring-OF.3SG
'FATHER BROUGHT A PTARMIGAN.'

  c. et'ie   n'ātlibie-le   ket'ī-m.
father ptarmigan-INS   bring-IND.TR.3SG
'FATHER BROUGHT A PTARMIGAN.'

A detailed account of conditions for the use of the focus construction in the case of broad information focus is beyond the scope of this paper.[11] However, it is clear that the focus construction is quite frequently employed in non-answer contexts as well, to introduce a new referent into discourse or to report a new event or situation. These are said to be the two central functions of sentence focus construction (also called thetic sentences) (Sasse 1987; Lambrecht 1994). The following examples are typical uses of the focus construction of the intransitive-subject focus type in non-answer contexts. (25) is an excerpt from a narrative text, with the previous context presented within brackets. In this example, the intransitive subject *irkin t'orqo* 'a plain' is introduced as a new referent with the verb *nutne-* 'be located' and *l'e-* 'exist.' (26) is extracted from a conversation between two speakers. One of them is willing to move to the kitchen to drink tea and is stating the reason why.

(25) [He made a dugout with the tree. He left. He sat on the dugout and then went along the river. He went for a while, abandoned the dugout and walked.]
tāt   juö-de-ge   **irkin t'orqo-k**   nutne-**l**.   **t'orqo-k** l'e-**l**.
then see-POSS.3-DS one   plain-FOC be.located-SF   plain-FOC exist-SF
'When (he) looked, THERE SPREAD A PLAIN. THERE WAS A PLAIN.'
(Nagasaki 2015: 64)

(26) īt'   modo-ŋide **nojl-ek** ijū-**l**.
for.a.long.time sit-CVB   leg-FOC hurt-SF
'As I sat a long time, (my) LEGS HURT.'

Here, (27) and (28) are examples of the object focus type in which the foci are interpreted over the entire sentences. That is, (27) is used text-initially to introduce two referents, *tenn'e-je šoromo* 'a rich man' and *anil* 'fish,' which will play important further roles in the discourse. Next, (28) is used after a scene change has occurred. The speaker had been relating a fond memory of her family, but suddenly began talking about the difficult situation of her mother.

---

[11] This requires further, detailed examination of the texts. See also Maslova (2005) and Schmalz (2011), who discuss the focus construction in Tundra Yukaghir. Krejnovič (1982: 214) tries to capture the function of the focus construction using the notion of *neožidonnost'* 'unexpectedness.'

(27) tenn'e-je   šoromo **anil-ek** iksī-**mele**, …
      be.rich-PTCP person   fish-FOC catch-OF.3SG
      'A RICH MAN caught a fish, ….'   (Nikolaeva 1989: II-26)

(28) [We had three people in our family, father, mother, and me. We slept to-
      gether until I was thirteen years old.]
      nār   **lot'il-ek**   emej   t'ine-te-**mle**, …
      always   firewood-FOC mother   chop-FUT-OF.3SG
      'MOTHER ALWAYS chopped WOOD.'   (Nagasaki 2015: 75)

The two communicative functions above are recognized in predicate focus as
well. However, unlike sentence focus, predicate focus is always accompanied by a
topical subject, either overtly realized or not, that links the sentence to the previous
discourse. The next two examples are also excerpts from narrative texts.

(29) [An old man and old woman wanted to eat a hare they kept. They did not
      have plates and spoons to eat. The old man took an axe and went to the birch
      forest.]
      tāt   **šobohorā-k**, **loškarā-k**   kesī-**mele**.
      then plate-FOC   spoon-FOC bring-OF.3SG
      'Then (he) BROUGHT PLATES AND SPOONS.'   (Nikolaeva 1989: I-52)

(30) [An old man threw a cow's sternum out of the house. The hero had been
      hiding inside it. He rejoiced.]
      d'e   tintaŋ   pulut   **n'umud'ī-k**   peššej-**mele**.
      INTJ aforementioned old.man axe-FOC   throw-OF.3SG
      'Then the old man THREW AN AXE (at him).'   (Nagasaki 2015: 48)

With regard to the positioning of the constituent marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*
in the focus construction, there are four possibilities, as represented in Table 2.
The numbers of the examples shown in this section are indicated for each pos-
sibility ((25) is indicated twice, since it has two examples). "X-FOC", "Y"/"Z", and
"V-SF/-OF" stand for constituent marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*, other constituent, and
verb in the SF- or OF-form, respectively. "Y"/"Z" may occur multiple times.

Table 2.   Possibilities for positioning of focus constituent

	Narrow focus		Broad focus	
	Answers to *wh*-questions	*Wh*-questions	Predicate focus	Sentence focus
X-FOC V-SF/-OF	(12b)	(12a)		(23b) (25)
Y X-FOC V-SF/-OF	(14b) (15b) (16b)	(14a) (16a)	(22b) (29) (30)	(25) (26) (27)
X-FOC Z V-SF/-OF	(13b)	(13a) (15a)		(24b)
Y X-FOC Z V-SF/-OF		(22a)		(28)

If we set aside the first possibility, where a constituent marked by
-(LE)K/-EK solely occurs before a verb, and consider the position of a constitu-
ent marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* relative to other constituents in the case of narrow

focus, it can be preverbal, following another constituent; sentence-initial, preceding another constituent; or medial, between other constituents. It should be noted that the preferable position seems to be preverbal, since it is much more frequently found in the entire data than sentence-initial and medial positions. Regarding broad focus, the position of the constituent marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* is in general the left-edge of the focus domain; in other words, the constituent preceding the constituent marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* is excluded from the focus domain. In most cases, this preceding constituent is topical. See the examples for predicate focus in (22b) and (30), in which topical subjects precede constituents marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*, as well as the examples for sentence focus in (25) and (26), in which sentence-initial elements link the sentences to the previous discourses. However, there are also cases where a non-topical element precedes a constituent marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*. See the subject *tenn'e-je šoromo* 'a rich man' in (27) and the adverb *nār* 'always' in (28), which appear sentence-initially. In view of the fact that the subject in (27) is indefinite and that the adverb in (28) is an adverb of frequency, it is plausible to assume that an inherently non-topical element can occupy the left-edge of the focus domain by itself, followed by the constituent marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*. Consider the following example of an answer to the question 'What has happened?' as well, in which the indefinite subject *kin ere* 'someone' precedes the object marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*.

(31) kin   ere   **met-ek**   ediet'-**mele**.
      who   INDF   1sg-foc   call-of.3sg
      'Someone is calling me.'

2.2.2. Contrastive focus
The suffix *-(LE)K/-EK* also indicates contrastive focus. Examples of the clearest cases, replacing and restricting focus, as well as parallel focus are shown below. All of these are proposed to be subtypes of contrastive focus by Dik et al. (1981).

Replacing focus entails explicit or implicit rejection of a proposition, and correction of information assumed to be incorrect. Contrast is conceived as the opposition between the incorrect and correct information. In (32b), the rejected information is 'your child,' while the corrected information is 'neighbors,' expressed by the subject marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*. In (33b), the rejected information is the action 'drinking tea,' while the corrected information is 'eating soup.' Here, the focus is extended from the object marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* to the VP.

(32) a. **kin-tek**   kelu-**l**?   tet uö   dū?
          who-foc   come-sf   2sg child(PRED)   Q
          'Who came? (Is it) your child?'

      b. ell'ē, **soset-pe-lek**   kel-**ŋi-l**.
          No   neighbor-pl-foc   come-pl-sf
          'No, neighbors came.'

(33) a. met **t'āj-ek**   ōže-t-**me**.
         1SG tea-FOC   drink-FUT-OF.1SG
         'I WILL DRINK TEA.'
     b. net, **sup-tek**[12]   lek-te-**me**.
         No soup-FOC   eat-FUT-OF.2SG
         'No, you WILL EAT SOUP.'

Restricting focus is associated with the adverbs *molin* and *moldo* 'only.'[13] Contrast is conceived as the opposition between the solely selected alternative and the remaining alternatives, which are excluded as incorrect information. As in (34) and (35), when *molin* or *moldo* scopes over the intransitive subject or object in a sentence, it is marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*.

(34) moldo **irkin köjpe-k**   modo-**l**.
         only   one   man-FOC   sit-SF
         'Only A MAN was sitting.'
(35) tudel **kejlebejdī-k**   molin ā-**mele**.
         3SG cranberry-FOC   only gather-OF.3SG
         'She gathers only CRANBERRIES.'

In parallel focus a contrast is made between differences in two predications (rather than between a predication and some presupposed state of affairs). When the intransitive subject or object is included in the focal portion of the sentence, it is marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*. The referent under comparison with another referent is located before the focal portion, and is interpreted as a contrastive topic. In (36) and (37) below, the contrastive topic is shown within brackets.

(36) [īle   mieste-ge] **jukō-d'e**   **n'anme-k** uk-ō-nu-**l**,   [īle
         some place-LOC be.small-PTCP osier-FOC go.out-STAT-IPFV-SF some
         mieste-ge]   **šalienšā-k** uk-t'i-nu-l'el-u-**l**.
         place-LOC   shrub-FOC go.out-ITER-IPFV-INFR-E-SF
         'At one place, there was A SMALL OSIER growing, (and) at another place, there
         were SHRUBS growing.'   (Maslova 2001: 136)

(37) [met] **ōžī-lek**   ket'ī-**me**,   [tudel] **lot'il-ek**   piedet-**mele**.
         1SG water-FOC   bring-OF.1SG 3SG   fire-FOC   kindle-OF.3SG
         'I BROUGHT WATER, (and) he MADE FIRE.'

3. Data from earlier materials
3.1. The data
As earlier materials, I referred to Jochelson (1900), which contains about a hun-

---

[12] The suffix *-tek* that appears on the subject in (33b) is considered to be an idiosyncratic variant of the suffix *-(LE)K/-EK*.
[13] According to Maslova (2003: 499), *moldo* occurs only in sentences with existential semantics, while *molin* does not have such a semantic restriction.

dred narrative texts of early modern Kolyma Yukaghir (№ 1–100, 102[14]; consisting of about 23,000 words). These texts were collected from native speakers in 1895–1897, at the time of his expedition in the upper Kolyma region. Since Jochelson also researched the language and left a short grammatical sketch (Jochelson 1905, 1934) that presents an accurate record in terms of basic morphological description, I regard the data in Jochelson (1900) as being reliable for the purpose of this paper and assume that it reflects the linguistic reality of Kolyma Yukahgir at the end of the nineteenth century. However, as per my knowledge, false starts and incomplete sentences found in any spontaneous speech production are quite rare in Jochelson (1900), which leads to the consideration that the texts were cleaned up in this respect during the recording, or before the publication. Furthermore, we should be aware that there are a number of possible transcription errors that cannot be checked since there is no audio recording of the texts. For the discussion of the focus construction in Jochelson (1900), I examined the use of the sentences in which the SF- or OF-form appears in sentence-final position (henceforth, SF-form and OF-form sentences, respectively).[15]

3.2. Intransitive-subject and object focus

In Jochelson (1900), I found 292 SF-form sentences and 386 OF-form sentences. In most cases, SF-form sentences contain intransitive subjects marked by the suffix *-(LE)K/-EK*, while OF-form sentences contain objects marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*.[16] The use of these patterns does not differ from that of the intransitive-subject focus and object focus types in the present-day language.

First, *-(LE)K/-EK* regularly marks *wh*-phrases in *wh*-questions and their corresponding phrases in answers, as in (38) and (39).

(38) a. ťenmuo-l-taŋ-ele   lut'i   jouloš-ŋam,   mon-ŋi:
        be.big-PTCP-one-ACC   Russian   ask-IND.TR.3PL   say-IND.INTR.3PL
        "et'ie-n'e   **qadi-k**   kuded'e-**l**?"
        father-COM   which-FOC   fight-SF
        'Russians asked the elder one. (They) said: "Which (of you) fought (against him) with (your) father?"'

---

[14]Text № 101, which is of Tundra Yukaghir, and texts № 103–107, which were collected before Jochelson's expedition and modified by him, are excluded from consideration.

[15]In the transliteration of Jochelson's (1900) data, the hyphens indicating word boundaries are replaced by spaces, and the vowel modifiers for stress are omitted. The consonant modifiers indicating aspiration are also omitted because the distinction between aspirated and non-aspirated consonants is phonologically non-distinctive. Some inconsistencies in transcription, such as those with respect to vowel length and geminacy, are not corrected. For the interpretation, I consulted not only the Russian translations and commentaries on the texts but also Nikolaeva (2006), a historical dictionary of Yukaghir languages.

[16]In his short grammatical sketch of Kolyma Yukaghir (Jochelson 1900, 1934), Jochelson describes the suffix *-(LE)K/-EK* as a case suffix distributed to the intransitive subject and object and co-occurring with particular conjugations, that is, the intransitive definite conjugation (SF-form) and the transitive definite conjugation (OF-form).

    b. t'enmuo-l-taŋ   monn-i: **"met-ek** kuded'e-**l**, …"
       be.big-PTCP-one say-IND.INTR.3SG 1SG-FOC fight-SF
       'The elder one said: "I fought."'   (Jochelson 1900: 154)

(39) a. tude   t'omo-l   terike-ŋin monn-i: "met-in
        3SG:GEN be.big-PTCP wife-DAT say-IND.INTR.3SG 1SG-DAT
        lem-dik   amdi-te-**me**?"
        what-FOC   prepare-FUT-OF.2SG
        '(He) said to his older wife: "What will (you) prepare for me?"'
    b. "**n'er-ek**,   monn-i,   amdi-te-**me**."
       clothes-FOC say-IND.INTR.3SG prepare-FUT-OF.1SG
       '"(I) will prepare CLOTHES," (she) said.'   (Jochelson 1900: 40)

    Second, cases of extension of the focus domain from the object to the VP, as well as from the intransitive subject to the entire sentence, are also found. The last sentence in (40b) is a direct answer to the preceding question 'what are you doing in the sack?' in (40a), while (41b) is an answer to the question 'what happened?' in (41a).

(40) a. … "Debegei,   **lem-dik**   a-**me**   šogi   molho?"
            PRN   what-FOC do-OF.2SG sack   in
       '(He said:) "Debegei, what are (you) doing in the sack?"'
    b. Debegei monn-i: "met-ul el'e uše-ŋi-lek,   **aŋd'e-lek**
       PRN   say-IND.INTR.3SG 1SG-ACC NEG touch-PL-PROH eye-FOC
       omolot'-**me**."
       cure-OF.1SG
       'Debegei said: "Don't bother me, (I) AM TREATING (MY) EYES."'
                                      (Jochelson 1900: 36)

(41) a. mit t'omod'el monn-i: "lemde-dik,   qodo   l'e-l?"[17]
        1PL leader   say-IND.INTR.3SG what-PRED   how   exist-SF
       'Our leader said: "What, what happened?"'
    b. mit mo-d'eil'i: "**jūl-ek**   egie-**l**!"
       1PL say-IND.INTR.1PL smoke-FOC   stand-SF
       'We said: "SMOKE HAS ARISEN!"'   (Jochelson 1900: 80)

    These patterns are quite frequently employed in non-answer contexts as well. For instance, (42) shown below contains one SF-form sentence in (42a) and one OF-form sentence in (42c). Since both of them function to report a new event into a discourse, the foci are interpreted as falling on the entire sentence. Interestingly, the subject *terikie-die* '(an) old woman,' which is indefinite, precedes the object marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* in (42c). This [Y X-FOC V-OF] order for sentence focus is just what we have observed for indefinite subject in (27) and (31) in section 2.

---

[17]The SF-form in this last sentence does not co-occur with the subject marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*, rather it is considered to be used with the *wh*-phrase *qodo* 'how.' See the discussion in section 3.4.

(42) [The younger brother was celebrated by the elder brother and left. (He) left
      and came up with his second elder brother on his way. They went together.]
      a. qon-ŋi-de-ge   **t'ined'e-l-ek**   medu-**l**.
          go-PL-POSS.3-DS chop-AN-FOC   be.heard-SF
          'When (they) went, CHOPPING WAS HEARD.'
      b. arid'-ā-ŋam:
          steal.a.look.at-INCH-IND.TR.3PL
          '(They) began looking stealthily:'
      c. terikie-die   **koikil'-ek**   koŋiji-**mle**.
          old.woman-DIM   log-FOC   split-OF.3SG
          'AN OLD WOMAN WAS SPLITTING A LOG.'   (Jochelson 1900: 103)

Another set of examples is shown in (43), which contains three OF-form
sentences in (43a), (43b) and (43d). The foci of the first and second OF-form sen-
tences are interpreted as falling on the VP. They describe new events caused by the
two previously established referents, the mother and the child, in turn. In the last
OF-form sentence, (43d), the entire sentence is interpreted as being the focus. The
subject *t'omo-terike-gi* 'his older wife' is definite and is a previously established ref-
erent: however, it is reintroduced as being involved in the new event. It seems that
t'omo-terike-gi had been deactivated by the scene change. The preceding sentence
(43c) conveys that a certain period of time had passed after the previous scene.
Note that in (43d) the subject follows the object marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*; that
is, the object marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* is positioned at the left-edge of the focus
domain. This [X-FOC Z V-OF] order for sentence focus is in accordance with that
for a definite subject observed in (24b) and (28) in section 2.

(43) [The girl went to his mother. She arrived at the house. When she arrived, the
      older wife of her father prepared a meal. The girl did not eat what she had
      prepared.]
      a. uo-die   emei-gi   **t'a-je-bon-die-lek**   pan-**mele**,
          child-DIM   mother-POSS.3   be.little-PTCP-thing-DIM-FOC boil-OF.3SG
          'The mother of the child PREPARED A LITTLE.'
      b. **tabud-ek**   leu-**mele**.
          that.one-FOC   eat-OF.3SG
          '(She) ATE THAT.'
      c. pon   juole-t'.
          ES   get.dark-IND.INTR.3SG
          'It became dark.'
      d. **omo-t'e**   **ponbur-ek** t'omo-terike-gi   šeure-**mle**.
          be.good-PTCP   bed-FOC   big-wife-POSS.3   bring.into-OF.3SG
          'HIS OLDER WIFE BROUGHT A NICE BED INTO (the house).'
                                                                (Jochelson 1900: 40)

Third, similarly to the present-day language, *-(LE)K/-EK* indicates contras-
tive focus in some cases. Examples of replacing focus, restricting focus, and parallel

focus are shown below in (44), (45), and (46), respectively.

(44) … er-t'e   toboko-gele el'e kudet'i-ŋi,   **omo-t'e**
      be.bad-PTCP   dog-ACC   NEG kill-IND.INTR.3PL be.good-PTCP
      toboko-q kudet'i-**ŋi-mele**.
      dog-FOC   kill-PL-OF.3
      '(They) did not kill bad dogs, (they) killed GOOD dogs.' (Jochelson 1900: 110)

(45) tinetaŋ   ataqud odul   molin **t'obine-lek** moi-**ŋi-mele**.
      aforementioned two   Yukaghir only   spear-FOC   hold-PL-OF.3
      'Those two Yukaghirs were holding only SPEARS. (They did not have arrows.)'
                                                                 (Jochelson 1900: 139)

(46) [tude   terike lek-te-je-bod-ŋol]   **pied'e-lek** modigeje-ge
      3SG:GEN wife   eat-FUT-PTCP-thing-ESS elk-FOC   lace.on.a.coat-LOC
      uledi-t ket'i-nu-**mle**.   [tude   lek-te-je-bod-ŋol]   **šoromo-lok**
      tie-CVB bring-IPFV-OF.3SG 3SG:GEN eat-FUT-PTCP-thing-ESS person-FOC
      ket'i-nu-**mle**.
      bring-IPFV-OF.3SG
      'As his wife's food, (he) used to bring ELK, tying it to the lace on (his) coat.
      As his own food, (he) used to bring MAN.'   (Jochelson 1900: 29)

3.3. Transitive-subject focus

As stated in section 3.2, the great majority of SF-form and OF-form sentences in Jochelson (1900) is of the intransitive-subject focus or object focus type. Nevertheless, although used quite rarely, certainly far from regularly, there exist 5 (out of 292) SF-form sentences containing transitive subjects marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*. The transitive subjects are positioned sentence-initially, followed by the objects, in all examples. The objects, except for the first- and second-person pronominal ones, appear in the nominative (i.e., the zero) case in these examples, which will be discussed in section 4.2.

The first example in (47) is a *wh*-question where the *wh*-phrase is the transitive subject.

(47) **lem-dik** kode[18] ed'ite-**l**?
      what-FOC person   rescue-SF
      'Who rescued me?'   (Jochelson 1900: 142)

The second to fourth examples, in (48)–(50), are employed to introduce a new event into a discourse as a scene that the protagonist sees or that the receiver of the message should recognize. Thus the focus in these examples is interpreted as falling on the entire sentence.

---

[18]The word *kode*, cognate with *köde* 'person' in Tundra Yukaghir, is always used instead of the first-person accusative *met-ul* or *met-kele* in Jochelson (1900). This word seems to have become obsolete now, since there are no attested instances in the present-day language data.

(48) [The young girl and the ogre had a meal and went to sleep together. She fell asleep and slept long. She woke up. A big whirlwind was heard. She looked toward the ogre, but he was nowhere to be seen. She stood up, went out and looked:]

jel'od'e titeme-d'e   adil-eq   at'e   tonno-**l** …
sun   be.like-PTCP youth-FOC reindeer drive-SF
'A YOUTH LIKE THE SUN WAS DRIVING REINDEER.'   (Jochelson 1900: 72)

(49) [The sisters escaped from the ogre that was entering into their house. The elder one fell behind. The younger one left her. She left her elder sister, looked behind and said:]

t'uol'ed'i-polud-ek mit-ul   qaŋi-**l**!
tale-old.man-FOC   1PL-ACC chase-SF
'THE OGRE (lit. tale old man) IS CHASING US!'   (Jochelson 1900: 70)

(50) [Addressing the spirit of smallpox, a shaman says: "Mother who came from the land of the Russian people! Have pity on your children. Warm yourself. Get full. Don't listen."]

el   **ouje** **irkeje-k**   juole-n   kit'il   medu-ni-**l**.
NEG   real   shaman-FOC evening-GEN end   hear-IPFV-SF
'A FALSE SHAMAN HEARS THE END OF EVENING.'   (Jochelson 1900: 120)

In the last example in (51b), *-(LE)K/-EK* indicates that the contrastive (specifically, replacing) focus falls narrowly on the transitive subject. (51) is part of an appeal to a dead bear whereby the Yukaghir who killed it tries to deceive its soul, refuting the idea that Yukaghirs were responsible and insisting that the killers were Yakuts, a neighboring people.

(51) a. tet-ul   el'e mit tite   ā-jeil'i.[19]
       2SG-ACC   NEG 1PL like.this do-IND.INTR.1PL
       'It is not us who treated you this way.'
     b. **jaqal-ek**   tet-ul   tāt ā-**l**.
       Yakut-FOC 2SG-ACC so   do-SF
       'It is YAKUTS who treated you this way.'   (Jochelson 1900: 122)

These 5 examples show that the transitive-subject focus type obviously existed at the end of the nineteenth century. Taking these results together with those in Krejnovič (1982), it seems that this pattern was lost around the middle of the twentieth century, after the period when the data of Krejnovič (1982) were collected (not a little before 1982 but in 1959, as noted in section 1). In addition to the example cited as (3) in section 1, Krejnovič (1982) presents a set of examples of transitive-subject focus type with the verb *jad-* 'send' in the SF-form accompanying various combinations of pronominal subject and object. Some of them are shown below in (52).

---

[19] Transitive verbs always appear in the intransitive indicative form in negative sentences.

(52) a. **mit** tet-ul   jad-u-**l**.
          1PL   2SG-ACC send-E-SF
          'WE sent you.'   (Krejnovič 1982: 207)

     b. **tit**   met-ul   jad-u-**l**.
          2PL   1SG-ACC send-E-SF
          'YOU sent me.'   (Krejnovič 1982: 207)

We observe that the data from the two different periods differ in terms of whether the transitive subject is marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* or not. With regard to Krejnovič's (1982) examples, none of the transitive subject is marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*. The reason for this absence of *-(LE)K/-EK* is unclear. However, we see that the distribution of *-(LE)K/-EK* was obviously not restricted to intransitive subjects and objects in early modern Kolyma Yukaghir, but included transitive subjects as well.

It should be emphasized that the transitive-subject focus type is likely to have already been in decline at the end of the nineteenth century. Unlike the intransitive-subject focus and object focus types, transitive-subject focus type is not regularly associated with *wh*-questions in Jochelson (1900). As can be seen in (53) below, transitive-subject *wh*-questions can also result in neutral sentences.

(53) tiŋ   mit šoromo-gele leme tite   ogurpeš-u-m?
       this   1PL person-ACC   what like.this torment-E-IND.TR.3SG
       'Who is tormenting this our man in this way?'   (Jochelson 1900: 116)

3.4. Oblique-argument/adjunct focus

Jochelson (1900) also contains 12 (out of 292) SF-form sentences and 17 (out of 386) OF-form sentences lacking constituents marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* but with oblique arguments or adjuncts. Here, I suggest that this pattern signals that the oblique argument or adjunct in a sentence is in focus or in the focus domain, although, like the transitive-subject focus type, this is also an infrequent type. The corroborative evidence is the environments or contexts with which this pattern is associated, as shown below. As for the positioning of the oblique arguments or adjuncts in these SF-form and OF-form sentences, it can be either a sole appearance before a verb (without other constituents), in the preverbal position (following another constituent), or in the sentence-initial position (preceding another constituent). However, the last case is quite rare (see (64) below). The choice between the SF- and OF-form tends to be made depending on the transitivity of the verb, although there are exceptional cases where the intransitive verbs *l'e-* 'exist' and *modo-* 'sit' appear in the OF-form (see (65) and (66) below).

First, there are 2 examples used for *wh*-questions, as in the last sentences in (54) and (55) ((55) repeats (41a)).

(54) t'emei-delle, emd'e   monn-i: "met **qaŋide**
     finish-CVB   younger.sibling say-IND.INTR.3SG 1SG where
     qon-te-**l**?"
     go-FUT-SF
     'Having finished (preparing himself), the younger brother said: "Where
     should I go?"'   (Jochelson 1900: 56)

(55) mit   t'omod'el   monn-i: "lemde-dik, **qodo** l'e-**l**?"
     1PL   leader   say-IND.INTR.3SG what-PRED   how   exist-SF
     'Our leader said: "What, what happened?"'   (Jochelson 1900: 80)

Second, there are 5 examples that serve to answer to the *wh*-question pro-
vided in the previous discourse. Some of these are shown below in (56)–(58). Note
that the answer sentence in (58) does not contain any constituent that directly
corresponds to the *wh*-phrase in the question. The focal portion of this sentence is
instead interpreted by the information it conveys.

(56) [Q: Where is the smoke coming from?]
     tindī l'e-**l**,   juo-k,   **tindī** l'ū-n'e-**l**.
     here   exist-SF   look-IMP.2SG here   smoke-PROP-SF
     '(It) is RIGHT HERE. Look. (It) is smoking RIGHT HERE.' (Jochelson 1900: 80)

(57) [Q: What did you do to me?]
     met   tet-ul   **t'obul-ŋin**   pet'ešei-**me**.
     1SG   2SG-ACC sea-DAT   throw-OF.1SG
     'I THREW you TO THE SEA.'   (Jochelson 1900: 37)

(58) [Q: When will the leader of Yakut come?]
     kel-uo-de   mod'ū   **jan**   **pod'erqo-ho** pon'ŏ-**l**.
     come-RN-POSS.3:GEN   PRSP   three day-LOC   remain-SF
     'THREE DAYS ARE LEFT until his arrival (lit. His arrival IN THREE DAYS RE-
     MAINS).'   (Jochelson 1900: 181)

However, there are also examples of *wh*-question and answer resulting in
neutral sentences, as shown in (59) below.

(59) a. qaŋide qonn-i?
        where   go-IND.INTR.3SG
        'Where is (he) going?'
     b. odu-n   meste-ŋin   qonn-i.
        Yukaghir-GEN place-DAT   go-IND.INTR.3SG
        '(He) is going to THE PLACE OF YUKAGHIR PEOPLE.' (Jochelson 1900: 181)

Third, there are 10 examples that function to report a new situation caused by
the previously established referent. For instance, (60) below is used at the begin-
ning of a new scene.

(60) [The shaman together with his mate flew away with the swan bevy. They flew
      with the birds. They arrived at the bird colony.]
      tā   l'aqa-delle **šoromo-ŋot**   kude-**ŋi-l**.
      there arrive-CVB person-TRANS   become-PL-SF
      'Having arrived, (they) TRANSFORMED INTO MAN.'   (Jochelson 1900: 141)

Below, (61) contains three sentences of the pattern in question, in (61b)–
(61d). According to the commentary attached to the text, they are an excerpt from
offensive words directed by a woman to a man who jested at her husband. A series
of revenge acts against the man is expressed in sequence.

(61) a. tet   erulbo-d'ek.
          2SG   get.worse-IND.INTR.2SG
          'You are exasperating.'
      b. tet-ul   **önmun-t'ebil-gen**   kaudei-te-**me**,
          2SG-ACC   Kolyma-tundra-PROL drag.around-FUT-OF.1SG
          od'i-ne-je   polbiel-gen,
          water-PROP-PTCP   hummock-PROL
          '(I) WILL DRAG YOU AROUND THE KOLYMA TUNDRA, around marshy hum-
          mocks.'
      c. **šolhune-je**   **igeje-le**   igeješ-te-**me**,
          be.hard-PTCP rope-INS   tie-FUT-OF.1SG
          '(I) WILL TIE (you) UP WITH A HARD ROPE.'
      d. julohulaŋdet   **t'ahiti-n'anme-le**   koude-t-**me**.
          from.behind   dyes-willow-INS   beat-FUT-OF.1SG
          '(I) WILL BEAT (you) WITH A TWIG OF ALDER TREE (lit. dyes-willow) from
          behind.'   (Jochelson 1900: 192)

Fourth, there are 2 examples used in a context of contrastive focus. One, (62),
is a continuation of the appeal to the dead bear, shown in (51). Here, the two kinds
of body parts compared are presented as objects of the two transitive clauses, while
the different treatments for them are described in the following focal portions.

(62) [tet jonqode] **tendi** šeure-**l**,   [tet onor] **tendi** ā-**l**.
      2SG brain   here   put.in-OF.1PL 2SG tongue here   make-OF.1PL
      'As for your brain, (we) PUT (it) RIGHT HERE, as for your tongue, (we) CRE-
      ATED (it) RIGHT HERE.'   (Jochelson 1900: 122)

Last, there are 10 examples used to confirm a situation described previously
or to confirm the location of a referent. In these examples, the adjunct is realized
by a demonstrative adverb, as in (63)–(66).

(63) [Q: Will we be jealous of each other, if we will live well and marry one hus-
      band?]
      pā,   **tāt** l'e-**l**,   qaŋide   qonn-u-t!
      elder.sister so   exist-SF where   go-E-FUT:INTERR.3SG
      'Elder sister, so it is. What else would it be?'   (Jochelson 1900: 5)

(64) [When you set a net, and if it is caught in a tree, don't break it. Listen!]
tendī   tet-ul   kit'-**me**
like.this   2sg-acc   teach-of.1sg
'(I) TEACH YOU THIS WAY.'   (Jochelson 1900: 169)

(65) [A girl is telling a true story about herself as if it were a tale to a man and
     his two wives. She was conceived between the man and his younger wife, but
     they do not know that. "… The older wife threw the baby conceived between
     her husband and his younger wife into the water. An old woman caught her
     in her fish trap."]
     id'i   **tendi** l'e-**me**!
     now   here   exist-of.1sg
     'Now, (I) AM HERE!'   (Jochelson 1900: 40)

(66) [The Ewen chief said: "I will kill you."]
     odu-d   anid'e monn-i: "**tendi** modo-**mo**, kudede-k!"
     Yukaghir-gen   chief   say-ind.intr.3sg   here   sit-of.1sg   kill-imp.2sg
     'The Yukaghir chief said: "(I) SIT RIGHT HERE. Kill (me)!"' (Jochelson 1900: 132)

Since the pattern discussed in this section has never been considered in terms
of a particular question in previous studies, it appears possible that examples like
(54)–(58) and (60)–(66) are results of wrong or atypical usage of the verb forms by
the native speakers or mistakes in recording by the researcher. However, in view
of the similarity to the types of core argument focus in its typical use, it is likely
that this pattern was actually used when these data were collected, although it also
seems to have been in decline as in the case of transitive-subject focus.

In addition, the pattern is not used productively in the present-day language,
but there are some examples in texts in which a demonstrative adverb such as *tendī*
'here/like this' or *endī* 'there/here/like this' co-occurs with the existential verb *l'e-*
in the SF-form. These are likely to be fixed expressions used to inform about the
location of a referent. Below, (67) is extracted from a text collected in 1997. The
line is an utterance by a hero, addressed to the protagonist, who came to a big plain
where the hero was lying on the ground with another hero.

(67) "mit **endi**   l'e-**l**,   mon-i,   t'īle   ulumu-ge
     1pl   here   exist-sf   say-ind.intr.3sg   strength   be.exhausted-loc
     abudā-jīli."
     lie.oneself.down-ind.intr.1pl
     "'We are HERE, we exhausted our strength and laid ourselves down (on the
     ground)," (he) said.'   (Nagasaki 2015: 43)

4. Historical development of the focus construction
4.1. Types of focus construction in earlier materials
Thus far, I have described the use of SF-form and OF-form sentences in earlier
materials from a stage of the language that showed a wider range of possibilities in
terms of focus constituents. Unlike the present-day language, which has only the

intransitive-subject focus and object focus types, early modern Kolyma Yukaghir had the transitive-subject focus and oblique-argument/adjunct focus types as well. As mentioned, the last two types seem to have already been in decline at the end of the nineteenth century. The marking of the focus constituent and the verb forms used, as well as availability in the present-day language, are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Focus marking and verb form in early modern Kolyma Yukaghir

Focus constituent	Focus marking	Verb form	Availability in the present-day language
Intransitive subject	*-(LE)K/-EK*	SF	Available
Object	*-(LE)K/-EK*	OF	Available
Transitive subject	*-(LE)K/-EK*	SF	Not available
Obl. argument/Adjunct	—	SF or OF	Not available

It follows that the syntactic restrictions on the focus construction in the present-day language have arisen in the not-too-distant past, as the result of the demise of the transitive-subject focus and oblique-argument/adjunct focus types. The reason for the loss of these two types is not clear. As for the oblique-argument/adjunct focus type, however, the lack of *-(LE)K/-EK* marking might trigger the use of the neutral (e.g., indicative) form instead of SF-/OF-form. That is, the oblique-argument/adjunct focus type was unstable due to the lack of morphological correlation between the focused constituent and verb form.

4.2. Bi-clausal characteristic of the focus construction

The fact that the focus construction was available to a wide variety of constituent types in the earlier period further supports a connection between the focus construction and relative-clause constructions that has been suggested by previous studies (cf. section 2.1), since the focus constituent in the focus construction, on the one hand, and the target of relativization in the relative-clause construction, on the other, show strong similarity. In relative clauses, the SF-form is used for (both intransitive and transitive) subject relativization and object relativization, as well as for the relativization of the oblique argument, whereas the OF-form is used for object and oblique-argument relativization but not for subject relativization. This is illustrated in the examples below, (68) and (69), taken from Nagasaki (2014) and attested in the present-day language.[20] Here, the SF- and OF-forms used as participles are glossed as PTCP.

(68) a. [mit-n'e   kelu-**l**]   šoromo
          1PL-COM   come-PTCP person
          'the person who came with us'   (Nagasaki 2014: 87)

---

[20]Nagasaki (2014) also claims that relative clauses headed by verb forms identical to the SF- or OF-form always convey a presupposition; that is, the events expressed by such relative clauses are familiar to the hearer, and as a result, the SF-form and OF-form only modify definite NPs. The same is also observed in Jochelson (1900).

b. [mit-kele Zyrjanka-ge   joqto-**l**]   šoromo
   1PL-ACC Zyryanka-LOC   bring-PTCP person
   'the person who brought us to Zyryanka'   (Nagasaki 2014: 87)

c. [tit   īde-**l**]   ani-pe   ket'ī-ŋi-k.
   2PL catch-PTCP fish-PL   bring-PL-IMP.2
   'Bring the fish you caught.'   (Nagasaki 2014: 87)

d. [titte   modo-**l**]   gorot-ke   jaqa-jīli.
   3PL:GEN live-PTCP   town-LOC   arrive-IND.INTR.1PL
   '(We) arrived in the town where they live.'   (Nagasaki 2014: 89)

e. kiše-k   [tet lot'il   t'ine-**l**]   n'umud'ī.
   show-IMP.2SG 2SG firewood chop-PTCP axe
   'Show (me) the axe which you chopped wood with.' (Nagasaki 2014: 89)

(69) a. *[mit-n'e   kel-**mele**]   šoromo
        1PL-COM come-PTCP.3SG person
        'the person who came with us'   (Nagasaki 2014: 87)

b. *[mit-kele Zyrjanka-ge   joqto-**mle**] šoromo
   1PL-ACC Zyryanka-LOC   bring-PTCP.3SG person
   'the person who brought us to Zyryanka'   (Nagasaki 2014: 87)

c. [tit   īde-**met**]   ani-pe   ket'ī-ŋi-k.
   2PL catch-PTCP.2PL fish-PL   bring-PL-IMP.2
   'Bring the fish you caught.'   (Nagasaki 2014: 88)

d. [tittel   modo-**ŋile**]   gorot-ŋin   kebej-ŋi.
   3PL   live-PTCP.3PL town-DAT   go.away-IND.INTR.3PL
   'They went away to the town where they live.'   (Nagasaki 2014: 89)

e. kiše-k   [tet lot'il   t'ine-**me**]   n'umud'ī.
   show-IMP.2SG 2SG firewood chop-PTCP.2SG axe
   'Show (me) the axe which you chopped wood with.' (Nagasaki 2014: 89)

Moreover, in the examples of the transitive-subject focus type, in which the subjects marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* are always positioned sentence-initially, the object marking also suggests that the portion of the object itself and the verb is related to the relative clause. Consider that the objects appear in the nominative (that is, the zero) case in (48) and (50), repeated below as (70) and (71), respectively. As Maslova (2003: 328) describes, in non-finite clauses, including relative clauses, the nominative object is compatible with the third-person subject, as in (72), while in finite main clauses with a third-person subject, the object is instead marked by either the accusative *-gele/-kele*, as in (73), or the instrumental *-le/-e*, (cf. fn. 4).

(70) **jel'od'e titeme-d'e   adil-eq**   [at'e   tonno-**l**] …
     sun   be.like-PTCP youth-FOC   reindeer drive-SF
     'A youth like the sun was driving reindeer.'   (Jochelson 1900: 72)

(71) **el   ouje   irkeje-k**   [juole-n   kit'il   medu-ni-**l**].
     NEG   real   shaman-FOC evening-GEN end   hear-IPFV-SF
     'A false shaman hears the end of evening.'   (Jochelson 1900: 120)

(72) [tabāk   ōd'e-**l**]   šoromo   imumu-i.
      tobacco drink-PTCP   person   get.drunk-IND.INTR.3SG
      'The person who smoked tobacco got intoxicated.'   (Jochelson 1900: 148)

(73) irkil'e taŋ   taba-kele   od'-ā-m
      one   that   tobacco-ACC   drink-INCH-IND.TR.3SG
      'One (of them) began to smoke the tobacco.   (Jochelson 1900: 92)

Recall that predicate nominals take *-(LE)K/-EK*. It is, then, possible that examples of the focus constructions, such as (70) and (71), are bi-clausal if they are analyzed as containing a predicate nominal marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* followed by a relative clause. The bi-clausal analysis can be further applied to the sentences of other types of focus construction that contain a sentence-initial constituent marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*. Consider the example of the object focus type in (43d), repeated below as (74).

(74) **omo-t'e**   **ponbur-ek** [t'omo-terike-gi šeure-**mle**].
      be.good-PTCP   bed-FOC   big-wife-POSS.3 bring.into-OF.3SG
      'His older wife brought a nice bed into (the house).' (Jochelson 1900: 40)

However, when the constituent marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* does not appear sentence-initially, it is impossible to analyze it as a separate predicate; rather, such sentences are analyzed as mono-clausal, containing a clause-internal focus constituent. Furthermore, if a sentence contains only a constituent marked by *-(LE)K/-EK* and a verb in the SF- or OF-form, it is ambiguous between a bi-clausal and a mono-clausal sentence.

Regarding the focus construction in the present-day language that has lost the transitive-subject focus and oblique-argument/adjunct focus types, the bi-clausal analysis is dubious, irrespective of the positioning of the constituent marked by *-(LE)K/-EK*; this is because the portion following the focus constituent does not have a strong relationship with relative clauses, as observed in the earlier language. Thus, it is inferred that the SF- and OF-forms in the focus construction have been gradually reanalyzed from participle forms to finite forms, accompanying the re-analysis of *-(LE)K/-EK* from the predicate-nominal marker to the focus marker. As a result, the focus construction in the present-day language can be described as a type of finite clause (Maslova 1997, 2003).

4.3. Pseudocleft-like sentences
Jochelson (1900) further contains 2 examples of verbless sentences reminiscent of English pseudoclefts. Consider the b-examples in (75) and (76).

(75) [An old woman found a baby girl in a fish-trap. She raised the baby girl. The
      girl grew and started speaking. She asked to her mother where her father
      lives. The mother said: "Your father lives in the upper reach of the river. Go
      to him. When you will get to his house, his older wife will give you some-
      thing to eat. Don't eat it."]
      a. tet   emei   ľod'u-gi,
         2sg   mother   the.younger.wife-poss.3(pred)
         'Your mother is his younger wife.'
      b. [tendi   ľe-l]   tet emei.
         like.this   exist-ptcp   2sg mother(pred)
         'The one who is like this is your mother.'   (Jochelson 1900: 40)

(76) [The hare married the younger daughter of the old man. The next morning
      he went to hunting. He tricked black foxes and grey foxes into entering the
      old man's barn. He said to the old man:]
      a. met   āt'e   tendi ľe-l,
         1sg   reindeer here   exist-sf
         'My reindeer is here.'
      b. [ket'i-me],   tet   marqľuo   eime-gi.
         bring-ptcp.1sg   2sg   daughter   engagement-poss.3(pred)
         'What (I) brought is the engagement of your daughter.'
                                                              (Jochelson 1900: 15)

     The examples (75b) and (76b) above appear to contain relative clauses fol-
lowed by NPs marked by (the zero variant of) *-(LE)K/-EK*. Maslova (1997: 465)
mentions that the analogous pattern in the present-day language is interpreted
only as a verbless sentence containing a predicate nominal modified by a relative
clause, as in (77).

(77) [oži-ge   egužu-l] end'ōd-ek
      water-loc   go-ptcp   animal-pred
      '(It) is an animal living in water.'   (Maslova 1997: 465)

Two examples similar to (77) found in Jochelson (1900) are also shown in (78) and
(79).

(78) tuben   [tudā mit irkeje   mon-u-l]   šoromo-loq.
      this.one before 1pl shaman   say-e-ptcp   person-pred
      'This is the person whom our shaman mentioned before.' (Jochelson 1900: 75)

(79) kie,   [pulun-die   ogo-ho   laqil   padie-t   igde-me]
      friend   old.man-dim   fish.trap-loc tail   put-cvb   catch-ptcp.1sg
      n'atn'ebujā-q.
      burbot-pred
      'My dear, (this) is a burbot that I caught by hanging my tail into the old
      man's trap.'   (Jochelson 1900: 69)

     However, if we interpret (75b) like the examples (77)–(79), that is, as '(This)

is your mother being here,' the interpretation is inappropriate, as can be inferred from the discourse flow. The same can be said for (76b) as well: The interpretation '(This) is the engagement of your daughter which I brought' is inappropriate. Rather, (75b) and (76b) should be regarded as pseudoclefts, which in other words are verbless sentences containing headless relative clauses as subjects in the nominative case along with predicate nominals.

   This pattern can be hypothesized to be the source of the focus construction, since sentences analyzed to be bi-clausal, such as (70), (71), and (74), shown in section 4.2, are structurally analogous to (75b) and (76b); however, the former have an inverted word-order. Note that verbless sentences with inversion between the predicate nominal and its subject, or containing the sentence-final subject as an afterthought, sometimes occur both in the early modern and present-day language. In (80) and (81) shown below, the a-examples are non-inverted verbless sentences, while the b-examples are inverted.

(80) a. irkid odul   l'e-i.   niu-gi   Kriborot.
          one Yukaghir   exist-IND.INTR.3SG   name-POSS.3 PRN(PRED)
          'There lived a Yukaghir. His name was Kriborot.'
      b. irkid alme-n'-ŋi.   T'eškene   niu-gi.
          one shaman-PROP-IND.INTR.3PL PRN(PRED) name-POSS.3
          '(They) had a shaman. His name was Cheshkene.' (Jochelson 1900: 207)

(81) a. tuön   lem-dik?
          this.one   what-PRED
          'What is this?'
      b. lem-dik   tuön?
          what-PRED   this.one
          'What is this?'

   Since there are no historical materials available to prove that pseudoclefts were frequently used formerly, the hypothesis of pseudoclefts being the source of the focus construction remains speculative. If we consider this hypothesis to be true, we have to then seek the reason why non-inverted pseudoclefts became obsolete and inverted ones were established as a common pattern. I suppose that this change eliminated the structural ambiguity between non-inverted pseudoclefts and predicate nominals modified by relative clauses; in other words, inverted pseudoclefts gradually became common to avoid the modified-nominal interpretation.

   Problems that require further consideration are the two differences between pseudoclefts and the focus construction. First, pseudoclefts and the focus construction do not always have a pragmatically equivalent function. The former has a similarity with the latter's narrow-focus use, as the constituent marked by -(LE)K/-EK identifies a member of a set in the presupposition expressed by the portion headed by the SF- or OF-form. Compare (75b) and (76b) shown above with examples (38b), (39b) and (51b), repeated as (82)–(84) below. However, the focus construction also has broad-focus use: the focus domain can be extended to

the VP or to the entire sentence.

(82) t'enmuo-l-taŋ   monn-i: **"met-ek**   kuded'e-**l**, …"
be.big-PTCP-one   say-IND.INTR.3SG   1SG-FOC   fight-SF
'The elder one said: "I fought."'   (Jochelson 1900: 154)
→ '(The one) who fought is me.'

(83) "**n'er-ek**,   monn-i,   amdi-te-**me**."
clothes-FOC   say-IND.INTR.3SG   prepare-FUT-OF.1SG
'"(I) will prepare CLOTHES," (she) said.'   (Jochelson 1900: 40)
→ '"What I will prepare are clothes," (she) said.'

(84) **jaqal-ek**   tet-ul   tāt   ā-**l**.
Yakut-FOC   2SG-ACC   so   do-SF
'It is YAKUTS who treated you this way.'   (Jochelson 1900: 122)
→ '(The ones) who treated you this way are Yakuts.'

    Second, instances of the focus construction are not always treated as inverted pseudoclefts; they also permit some constituent other than that marked by -*(LE)K/-EK* to be positioned sentence-initially. Moreover, as discussed in section 2.2.1, the preferable position of the constituent marked by -*(LE)K/-EK* is prever-bal in the case of narrow focus and is the left-edge of the focus domain in the case of broad focus (except for an inherently non-topical element, such as an indefinite subject). If, therefore, the hypothesis of pseudocleft-origin of the focus construc-tion is valid, it is, then, possible to posit that after the stage where inverted pseudo-clefts have been conventionalized to a considerable extent, the broad-focus use as well as left-dislocated non-focus constituent have emerged subsequently.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I have focused on the focus construction in early modern Kolyma Yukaghir. I have shown that the syntactic restrictions observed in the focus con-struction as it exists in the present-day language did not exist, or at least was only quite loose, in the early modern language, and that the focus construction had a wider range of possibilities in terms of focus constituents, including intransi-tive subjects, objects, transitive subjects and oblique arguments/adjuncts. I have also pointed out that the focus construction in the earlier language exhibits both bi- and mono-clausability. In the former case, sentences contain a predicate nomi-nal marked by the suffix -*(LE)K/-EK* positioned sentence-initially along with a genuine relative clause. In addition, I have discussed another marked pattern, the pseudocleft-like pattern. In view of the structural similarity between pseudoclefts and the bi-clausal focus construction, it can be hypothesized that the former was the source of the latter. Although the hypthesis might be speculative owing to the lack of sufficient materials, I supposed that pseudoclefts with inverted word-order became common sometime before the period of the early modern Kolyma Yukaghir to, perhaps, eliminate the ambiguity between non-inverted pseudoclefts and predicate nominals modified by relative clauses. Furthermore, I also pointed

out some subsequent changes, which are summarized in (85). (85a) and (85b) are assumed to have occurred by the period of the early modern Kolyma Yukaghir, whereas (85c) and (85d) are assumed to belong to the period from the earlier to the present-day language.

(85) a. inversion of the predicate nominal and headless relative clause;
b. emergence of the broad-focus use and left-dislocated non-focus constituent;
c. emergence of the restrictions whereby only intransitive subjects and objects can be marked as focused (resulted from the loss of the possibility of transitive subjects and oblique arguments/adjuncts as targets of focus);
d. reanalysis of the SF-/OF-form from participle forms to finite forms and of *-(LE)K/-EK* from the predicate-nominal marker to the focus marker.

References

Dik, Simon, Maria E. Hoffmann, Jan R. de Jong, Sie Ing Djiang, Harry Stroomer, and Lourencs de Vries (1981) On the typology of focus phenomena. In: Teun Hoekstra (ed.) *Perspectives on functional grammer*, 41–74. Dordrecht: Forris.

Givón, Talmy (2001) *Syntax: An introduction*, vol. II. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Harris, Alice C. and Lyle Campbell (1995) *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jochelson, Waldemar (1900) *Materialy po izučeniju jukagirskogo jazyka i fol'klora, sobrannye v Kolymskom okruge*. St Petersburg. (Reprinted by Bichik in Yakutsk, 2005).

Jochelson, Waldemar (1905) Essay on the grammar of the Yukaghir language. *American Anthropologist* 7: 369–424.

Jochelson, Waldemar (1934) Oduľskij (Jukagirskij) jazyk. In: Eruxim A. Krejnovič (ed.) *Jazyki i pis'mennost' narodov severa*, vol. 3, 149–180. Moscow/Leningrad: Uchpedgiz.

Kamei, Takashi, Rokuro Kono, and Eiichi Chino (eds.) (1996) *Gengogaku daiziten* [The Sanseido encyclopedia of linguistics], vol. 6. Tokyo: Sanseido.

Krejnovič, Eruxim A. (1958) *Jukagirskij jazyk*. Moscow: Nauka.

Krejnovič, Eruxim A. (1979) Jukagirskij jazyk. In: Garma D. Sanžeev (ed.) *Jazyki Azii i Afriki*, vol. 3, 348–382. Moscow: Nauka.

Krejnovič, Eruxim A. (1982) *Issledovanija i materialy po jukagirskomu jazyku*. Leningrad: Nauka.

Lambrecht, Knud (1994) *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Malchukov, Andrej (2013) Verbalization and insubordination in Siberian languages. In: Martine Robbeets and Hubert Cuyckens (eds.) *Shared grammaticalization: With special focus on the Transeurasian languages*, 177–208. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Malchukov, Andrej and Peter de Swart (2009) Differential case marking and actancy variations. In: Andrej Malchukov and Andrew Spencer (eds.) *The Oxford handbook of case*, 339–335. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maslova, Elena (1997) Yukagir focus system in a typological perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 27: 457–475.

Maslova, Elena (ed.) (2001) *Yukaghir texts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Maslova, Elena (2003) *A grammar of Kolyma Yukaghir*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Maslova, Elena (2005) Information structure in Tundra Yukaghir and typology of focus structures. In: Jocelyne Fernandez-Vest (ed.) *Les langues ouraliennes aujourd'hui: Approche linguistique et cognitive*, 599–610. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Maslova, Elena (2009) Case in Yukaghir languages. In: Andrej Malchukov and Andrew Spencer (eds.) *The Oxford handbook of case*, 789–796. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nagasaki, Iku (2009) Korima Yukagīrugo no mēsikugaisyoyūkōbun ni tuite [On external possession constructions in Kolyma Yukaghir]. *Nihon Gengo Gakkai dai-hyaku-sanzyūkyū-kai taikai yokōsyū* [The 139th LSJ meeting handbook]: 110–115.

Nagasaki, Iku (2014) Relative clauses in Kolyma Yukaghir. *Asian and African languages and linguistics* 8: 79–98.

Nagasaki, Iku (ed.) (2015) *Materialy po jazyku jukagirov verxnej Kolymy*. Tachikawa.

Nikolaeva, Irina (ed.) (1989) *Fol'klor jukagirov verxnej Kolymy*, vol. I–II. Yakutsk: Yakut State University Press.

Nikolaeva, Irina (ed.) (2006) *A historical dictionary of Yukaghir*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nikolaeva, Irina and Eugene Helimski (1997) Jukagirskij jazyk. In: Aleksandr P. Volodin, Nikolaj B. Vaxtin, and Andrej A. Kibrik (eds.) *Jazyki mira: Paleoaziackie jazyki*, 155–168. Moscow: INDRIK.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen (1987) The thetic/categorical distinction revisited. *Linguistics* 25: 511–580.

Schmalz, Mark (2011) Towards a full description of the focus system in Tundra Yukaghir. *Linguistic discovery* 10(2): 347–385.

Author's contact information:
National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics
10-2 Midori-cho, Tachikawa City, Tokyo, 190-8561, Japan
e-mail: inagasaki@free.fr

【要　旨】
初期現代コリマ・ユカギール語における焦点構文

長崎　　郁
国立国語研究所

　本稿では，初期現代コリマ・ユカギール語における焦点構文を取り上げる。19世紀末に収集されたテキスト資料を調べると，現在話されているコリマ・ユカギール語の焦点構文に見られる統語的な制約がかつては存在しなかったことが分かる。現在話されている言語では，焦点構文において焦点化が可能なのは自動詞主語と目的語に限られるが，初期現代コリマ・ユカギール語ではより広い範囲の構成素の焦点化が可能であり，自動詞主語と目的語のみならず，他動詞主語や斜格項／付加詞を焦点化のターゲットとした例が見出される。このことは，この言語の焦点構文が関係節と関連を持つとする仮説へのさらなる根拠となる。なぜなら，焦点構文で用いられる動詞語尾は関係節形成にも用いられ，また，焦点化と関係節化のターゲットは強い類似性を示すからである。現在話されている言語と初期現代語とのもうひとつの特筆すべき違いは，後者にのみ擬似分裂文的な構造が確認されることである。この構造は焦点構文の起源と仮定することができる。