

☐ **EFREMOV NIKOLAY NIKOLAEVICH**

**THE INSTITUTE OF THE HUMANITIES AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES OF THE NORTH**



**BI-PREDICATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS WITH SUBORDINATE  
VERBAL PREDICATE IN THE CONDITIONAL MOOD  
AS EXPRESSION OF EVIDENTIALITY IN YAKUT  
(AS COMPARED TO ALTAIC, TUVA, AND KHAKASS)<sup>1</sup>**

Bi-predicative constructions (BPC) in Yakut can have a mono-finite (MF) and bi-finite structure (BF) structure. Being an agglutinative language, Yakut shows the prevalence of the economy principle in using special grammatical means, thus, the core of BPC is represented by MF constructions subordinate parts of which are headed by infinite – participle, adverbial participle, and predicative – forms. The predicative parts of these BPC are connected by the following word relations: parataxis / fixed word order, izafet, government, agreement, postpositions. The fixed word order – a prepositive word (subordinate predicate) + a postpositive word (main predicate) – is the major order rule of both BPC and the whole Yakut grammar structure. BPC with the subordinate predicate expressed by verbs in the conditional mood, the verbal proper (finite) form, are considered BF structures. However, acting as asyndetic BPC, they draw closer together with MF BPC functionally.

The Yakut conditional mood of the verb has two forms: a common Turkic =*tar* (compare, the old Turkic =*sar* and modern Turkic =*sa* / =*za*) and a Yakut = *taxina* (<=*takh* + a possessive affix of the subject's person, number + affix of the ancient locative).

BPC with a subordinate predicate expressed by the first form of the conditional mood (= *tar* + a personal-predicative affix) describe conditional relations. BPC with the second form of the conditional mood express not only conditional but other ones as well: conditional-temporal, temporal, and objective. Object BPC are characterized by verbs of perception (eyesight, hearing, etc.) fulfilling the position of the subordinate predicate. They function as a means to express evidentiality that implies the reference to the source or way to obtain information.

<sup>1</sup> The paper is prepared under support of the Russian State Research Fund. Project № 16-14-14004 a(p).

In Yakut as well as in other Turkic languages, evidentiality is represented by morphological, lexical-grammatical, and syntactic means. Morphological means include the verb tenses that express it undifferentiated. The lexical-grammatical means include particles and modal words. Particles are special grammaticalized indicators of indirect evidentiality, acting as the core means of expressing it. The syntactic means - object BPC and forms of indirect speech – belong to the periphery of the functional-semantic field of evidentiality.

In this paper, we discuss structural-semantic characteristics of a means to express evidentiality, object BPC with a subordinate predicate in the second form of the conditional mood as compared to Altaic, Tuva, and Khakass. The material for comparison has been obtained from the scientific literature.

The object BPC under consideration usually expresses the joint meaning of indirect evidentiality and mirativity (subject's perception of the subordinate part of a phenomenon, a fact from the communicated information being regarded by the recipient of the speaker as unexpected), e.g.:

*Araj Kirihään bu turan kördöryñä: bili maniihit biniäpkätin biraḥan käbispitä čugas soḥus sītar äbit* (Taas 2004: 34). 'Suddenly there standing Khrisanf sees: it turns out not far away there lies a rifle that the guard left' (the situation of the main predicative unit is evidenced by the subject of the subordinate predicative unit to whom the given situation appears as unexpected).

araj	Kirihään	bu	tur=an	kör=döryñä
Suddenly	Khrisanf	there	stand=CV	see= COND.3SG
bili	maniihit	biniäpkä:ti:n	biraḥ:an	käbis=pit=ä
that	guard	rifle: POSS:3SG:ACC	throw: CV	AUX=PP=3SG: POSS.3SG
čugas	soḥus	sīt=ar	äbit	
close	PRTCL	lie= PFUT	PRTCL.3SG	

In the example mentioned above the sentence is characterized by non-coordinated subordinate predicative parts: object and subject.

The predicate of the main part is often represented by the perfect tense since Turkic perfect forms can express "unexpectedness of the second phrase (the result of action – *author*) or unreliability of the first one for the speaker" (Sravnetil'no...: 1988: 413).

*Ärgillän kördöryñä, soluurčara umajan kyydäpčilänä khalbit.* 'When he turned around, his pot was left burning in flames' (Korkina 1970: 191).

ärgill=än	kör=döryñä	soluurčara=a
turn around=CV	see= COND.3SG	pot= POSS.3SG
umajan	kyydäpčilän=ä	khal=bit
burn	flame=CV	leave= PRF.3SG

The object relations with the meaning of evidentiality and mirativity are expressed in Altaic, Tuva, and Khakass by BPC with the subordinate predicate expressed by verbs of perception in the conditional mood =sa/=za. The analysis of sentences found in investigations of evidentiality and mirativity in these languages reveals that the mentioned BPC are translated into Yakut by BPC with the subordinated predicate *kör=* in the second form of the conditional mood or in the past tense ending with =*bit* in the personal form.

The Yakut equivalents to the analyzed Altaic BPC with =sa are BPC with a subordinate predicate in the second form of the conditional mood or in the form of participle ending with =bit in the personal form. The predicate of the main clause can be expressed by the past ‘said in someone’s absence’ tense, consisting of a categorematic verb in the form of adverbial participle ending with =p and an auxiliary verb =t̄ir ‘turn out’ (Filistovich 1991: 71). Compare:

In Altaic: *Jac kelze, Kerej bir kanča bičikter sadip altir* ‘When D’as came, <it turned out that> Kerej some books bought, it appeared’ [ibid]; *Bajdij t̄yzenip jamsa aktar katap la tudup algan, shiluga aparip jatkan ämtir* ‘Bajdij sees in a dream that the White again caught him, are bringing (him) to interrogation’ (Skribnik&Ozonova 2005: 129) and the same in Yakut *Bajdij tyhäätäxinä, yryñär kinini khat tutan, doppuruostuu ild’än ihär kurduktara; Bilin kelzem, Ala-Tyynin köksine čga bartirim* ‘When (I) came to my senses, it turned out, until the middle of Ala-Tuu (mountain) had run’ [ibid] and in Yakut *Öjdöön körbytym, Ala-Tuu työhygär diäri cyyrän takhsibippin* ‘When (I) attentively looked, it turned out, to the middle of Ala-Tuu running had climbed’.

In the equivalent Altaic BPC with =sa, researchers recognize semantic ellipsis, as they implicitly involve a member eliminated in the plane of expression, the main part that includes the object subordinate clause (Filistovich 1991: 69). When the eliminated member is restored, the phrase (e.g. in Yakut) might be atypical, compare:

In Altaic: *Kontoraga kirip kelze, köp tö ulus jok, jañis gazi Köktösh lö bir solun kelin oturdı* ‘When (he) entered the office, <he saw that>, there were a few people, just brother Koktosh and an unknown woman were sitting [ibid] and in Yakut *Khontuoraxa kiirän kälbitä, kihi olokh suokh ätä, araj biraata Koktosh uonna bilbat d’akhtara olorollo / \* Khontuoraxa kiirän körbytä, kihi olokh suokh ätä araj biraata Koktosh uonna bilbat d’akhtara olorollo* (atypical phrase) ‘When (he) came into the office, he saw that (there) were no people, just his brother Koktosh and an unknown woman were sitting’.

khontuora=xa	kiir=än	kör=by=tä	kihi	olokh suokh
office=DAT	enter=CV	see=PP=3SG	man	at all not
ät=ä	araj	biraat=a	Koktosh	uonna
AUX:be IMPR=3SG	just	brother= POSS.3SG	Koktosh	and
bil=bät	d’akhtar=a	olor=olloro		
know= NEG.PFUT	woman= POSS.3SG	sit= IMPRF.3PL		

In Tuva, the verbal form =sa is characterized as “verb in the adverbial participle form” and is complicated by the marking particle *la*, when expressing the relations under consideration. One can restore the same semantic member between the subordinate and main predicative units that can be represented by the predicate *kör=* ‘see’ and that could be the main predicative unit in relation to the subordinate one (Shamina 2005: 152). BPC of this type are usually translated into Yakut by BPC with two subordinate predicative units connected by consecutive subordinating: temporal subordinate predicative unit ← object subordinate predicative unit. The predicate of the temporal subordinate predicative unit is expressed by participle in the Dative of the personal-predicative declension, with the predicate of the object subordinate predicative unit being expressed by the verb of visual perception *kör=* in the past tense ending with =bit in personal form, compare:

In Tuva: *Khenerten dirs-dars dize-le, snaryadtar inda-minda častip ägelään* ‘Suddenly it cracked, (when (he) looked, it turned out that), projectiles here and there started exploding’ (Shamina

2005: 153) and in Yakut: *Ämiskä dälbi barar mias ihillibitigär körbytä – snaryadtar onno-manna ästitälään ärällärä* ‘When very suddenly it cracked, he saw – projectiles here and there started exploding’; *Bir äzhik azhittingan deg bolza-daa, khanazı körynçyk bičezhek əräälče ulus shuuzhup kire berdi* ‘When some door opened, (it turned out that) people had come into a small room the walls of which were fully mirrored’ [ibid] and in Yakut: *Biir aan ahillibitigar körbytä: bytynnyy siäkilä ärkinnääh kira khosko d'on kiirbit ätilär* ‘When some door opened, he saw: into a fully mirrored small room people had come’; *Kelze-le, uruun ushkargan Khayazhik* ‘When come, (it turned out that) it was Khanzhik who had put a girl on the horse behind him’ [ibid] and in Yakut: *Kälbitigär körbytä – bu atigar kühin mänästibit Khayazhik ätä* ‘When come (he – the rider) saw – it was Khanzhik who had put a girl on the horse behind him’.

Khakass BPC with the form =sa / =za are compared to the Yakut BPC that are characterized by the postpositive subordinate predicate expressed by the past participle ending with =bit in the personal form. Compare, in Khakass: *Čakhsi kör körze: soskhalar* ‘Looks well: pigs’ (Baskakov 1975: 193) and in Yakut: *Yčygäjdik körbytä: sibiinn’älär äbit* ‘Having looked well: (these were) pigs’; *Sarisakh taskhar takhsa, khap-kharaski* ‘When Sarichek went outside, it had been dark’ [ibid] and in Yakut: *Sariček tahird’a takhsibita kharanabit ätä* ‘When Sarichek went out, it had been dark’.

As already shown, one of the Yakut syntactic means of expressing indirect evidentiality are analytical BPC the prepositive predicate of which is represented by the past participle ending with =bit in the personal form. The lexical base of the predicate in the prepositive part of such constructions is also represented by verbs of perception (eyesight, hearing, etc.). In the following sentence, the subject of the prepositive part is in third person singular:

*Uol körö tyspytä, sydy bäjälääh kytyr ulakhan khotoj bu tyhän ärär äbit ää* ‘The boy cast a look <and saw>, it turned out that, a huge, terribly big eagle was starting to go down (on him)’ (Bosikov 1989: 20).

uol	kör=ö	tys=pyt=ä	sydy
boy	see=CV	AUX=PP=3SG	huge
bäjälääh	kytyr	ulakhan	khotoj
PRTCL	terrible	big	eagle
bu	tyh:än	är=är	äbit ää
here	go down:CV	AUX=PFUT	PRTCL PRTCL

Such BF BPC are conjunctionless, thus, in certain circumstances, their predicative parts can appear as independent sentences. In this case the lexical grammatical representation of the syntactic position of the predicate in the prepositive sentence usually changes. In the following example such predicate is expressed not by a verb of perception but that of motion:

*Suoppuja tahird’a istanna. Araj baararaj tiit saxa kihi bu barijan turar äbit* (Taas 2004: 25) ‘Sofia **ran** outside. Suddenly there was a man as tall as a larch like a huge shadow standing in front of her’.

Suoppuja	tahird'a	istan=n=a	araj
Sofia	outside	run= PAST=3SG	suddenly
baaraɣaj	tiit	sara	kihi
huge	larch	POSTP	man
bu	barij=an	turar	äbit
here	shade=CV	stand= PFUT	PRTCL.3SG

If such sentences are formed as one communicative unit, the predicate position of the prepositive clause is taken by a verbal lexeme with the meaning of perception expressed by the past participle ending with =*bit* and a person indicator. In the reorganized construction, the predicate *istammita* is transformed into an analytical structure of adverbial participle type functioning as a modifier of time:

*Suoppuja tahird'a istannan takhsan baran körbytä, araj baaraɣaj tiit sara kihi bu barijan turar äbit* 'Sofia, **having run** outside, saw, suddenly there was a man as tall as a larch like a huge shadow standing in front of her'.

Hence, Yakut BPC with the prepositive predicate expressed by the second form of the conditional mood act as a syntactic means of expressing indirect evidentiality and mirativity in certain conditions. Along with this form, BPC with the prepositive predicate expressed by the past participle ending with =*bit* in personal-possessive form is often used. The predicate of the prepositive subordinate predicative part of such BPC is represented by verbs of perception, with the main predicate being characterized by the particle *äbit* 'it turns out' or the perfect form (= *bit* + predicative affix). In the compared languages, Altaic, Tuva, and Khakass, their equivalents are BPC with the form =*sa* that represent these relations under the mentioned above conditions. In Yakut, the first form of the conditional mood =*tar* in contrast to the conditional form =*sa* in the compared languages is in restricted use due to presence of the Yakut proper form of the conditional mood based on the participle ending with =*takh*. In turn, this fact shows that many systematic features of the Yakut language were formed during conditions of lacking contact with Turkic languages of Southern Siberia.

### Abbreviations

ACC - accusative case; AUX – auxiliary verb; CV – adverbial participle; COND – conditional mood form; DAT – dative case; IMPRF – imperfect; NEG – negative form; PAST – recent past tense; PFUT – present-past tense; PL – plural; POSS – possessive form; POSTP – postposition; PP – participle of the declarative past tense; PRF – perfect (first); PRTCL – particle; SG – singular; 1 – first person; 3 – third person.

### Sources of Examples

Bosikov, Nikolay (1989). *Tya*. Yakutsk, 144 p.

Taas, Dmitry (2004). *Syrdyk aartyk*. Yakutsk, 288 p.

### References

Baskakov, N. A. (Ed. by) (1975). *Grammatika khakasskogo yazyka*. Moskva: Nauka, 418 p.

Filistovich, T. P. (1991). *Temporal'nye polipredicativnye konstruksii altayskogo yazyka*. Novosibirsk: Izd-vo NGU, 172 p.

*Grammatika sovremennogo yakutskogo yazyka. Sintaksis* (1995). Novosibirsk: Nauka, 336 p.

Korkina, E. I. (1970). *Nakloneniya glagola v yakutskom yazyke*. Moskva: Nauka, 308 p.

Shamina, L. A. (2005). *Sredstva vyrazheniya evidentsial'nosti i mirativnosti v tuvinskom yazyke. Puti formirovaniya lingvisticheskogo landshafta Sibiri*. Novosibirsk, pp. 146-158.

Skribnik, E.K., Ozonova, A. A. (2005). *Sredstva vyrazheniya zasvidetel'ctvovannosti i mirativnosti v altaiskom yazyke. Puti formirovaniya lingvisticheskogo landshafta Sibiri*. Novosibirsk, pp. 120-146.

*Sravnitel'no-istoricheskaya grammatika tyurkskikh yazykov. Morfologiya* (1988). Moskva: Nauka, 560 p.