University of Maryland Libraries Document Delivery

RELATIVIZATION IN CHUKCHEE

Maria Polinsky
University of Southern California, Los Angeles

1. Introduction.[1]

1.1. Goals. The goal of this paper is to analyze Relativization in Chukchee and then to propose a set of generalized rules for it. The Chukchee data presented below are from the author's own field notes and from the existing descriptions of Chukchee by Peter Skorik, Vladimir Nedjalkov, and Bernard Comrie (in case of disagreement between the published data and the field notes, preference was given to the latter).

1.2. General. Chukchee is a Paleo-Siberian language of the Far East, closely related to Koryak and Alyutor and also to Itelmen. Though the 1979 census establishes a population of 14,000 for Chukchee, most of these people speak Russian as their first language and have a passive or semi-active knowledge of Chukchee. According to my own informal estimate, the number of people who can really speak Chukchee is now less than a thousand, and language attrition rate is very high (see Polinskaja 1988 for a brief description of semilingualism in Chukchee).

Chukchee is a predominantly agglutinating, morphologically ergative language with the word order SOV/SVO (Agent Patient Verb/Agent Verb Patient). Chukchee has no articles and no grammatical gender distinctions. In the classification of Chukchee cases, it is relevant to distinguish between those cases that can encode terms ("term cases" below) and those cases that can only encode adjuncts ("non-term cases" below).

The following abbreviations are used: ABS—Absolutive, AOR—Aorist, AP—Antipassive, DAT—Dative, DIM—Diminutive, ERG—Ergative, EV—epenthetic vowel, FUT—Future, INC—incorporated, INF—Infinitive, INTENS—Intensifier, LOC—Locative, NEG—Negation, NMLZ—Nominalizer, PART—Participle, POSS—Possessive; : indicates agreement; . separates the meanings in a portmanteau morpheme.

(1) Chukchee Case System:

ERGative (-e₁)	
ABSolutive (-Ø,-ən)	
DATive (-etə)	term cases
LOCative (-ək)	

ERGative (-e_1) ⎤
ABSolutive (-$\emptyset$,-ən) ⎟
DATive (-etə) ⎬ term cases
LOCative (-ək) ⎦

ADiTive (-gãt) ⎤
ABLative (-gəpə) ⎟
MEDiative (-u) ⎬ non-term cases
COMitative (-e_2) ⎟
SOCiative-Comitative (-ma) ⎦

Transitive verbs agree with the Subject and the Direct Object, and the subject agreement marker always precedes the object agreement marker, although there are a number of portmanteau agreement morphemes as well. Intransitive or detransitivized verbs agree with the subject only.

1.3. Framework. A brief mention of the syntactic framework is appropriate here. The approach used in this paper combines the theory of Functional Syntax (FS) with Relational Grammar (RG). Basic principles of FS are as follows:

1. Clause structures are analyzed in terms of mappings between semantic notions such as Agent, Patient, Goal, Beneficiary, Locative, Instrument and grammatical relations such as Intransitive Subject, Transitive Subject, Direct Object, Indirect Object, Oblique Object.

2. Each grammatical relation is characterized by two sets of properties:
   — a specific form/linear position assigned to it
   — form/linear position of other elements in the clause or across clauses that is determined by this grammatical relation.

3. In addition to the analysis of its grammatical structure, each clause/sentence type is analyzed in terms of its function, which includes:
   —grammatical function (e.g., disambiguation)
   — semantic function (e.g., expressing or leaving unspecified some propositional meaning)
   — communicative function which is comprised of linking grammatical relations and such entities as Topic, Focus,

Contrastive, Situational.

One of the major differences setting FS apart from other frameworks is its claim that linguistic facts, in particular linguistic variation, have notional (semantic and/or communicative) motivation.

The analysis below also relies on two essential principles of Relational Grammar (RG), namely, multistratal representations and the notions Absolutive and Ergative.

While FS recognizes implicitly multiple levels of grammatical relations, RG has a much better developed set of principles according to which a nominal can bear distinct grammatical relations to a clause at different levels; this results in the recognition of such notions as "initial" and "final" grammatical relation.[2] For instance, an element can be initial Direct Object and final Subject, which is characteristic of the Passive.

The analysis assumed here also recognizes the Absolutive as the relation subsuming the Intransitive Subject and the Direct Object, and the Ergative as the relation representing the Transitive Subject, which is different from the above two. Thus, Absolutive and Ergative are treated not only as cases but as grammatical relations.

Section 2 discusses grammatical relations in Chukchee; sections 3 and 4 outline the conditions of term Relativization, section 5 outlines the conditions of non-term Relativization, and section 6 is a discussion of both Relativization rules.

2. Grammatical Relations in Chukchee. To adequately describe Relativization, it is necessary to examine the difference between Subjects and Direct Objects in Chukchee. In fact, the syntactic properties of Subject and Direct Object are largely similar, and on the whole Chukchee should be characterized as a language with prevalent syntactic neutrality, i.e., similar syntactic behavior of Subject and Direct Object. Both terms control null copies across conjoined clauses and under Equi; they do not differ in Reflexivization properties, as they both control the reflexive pronoun. Some arguments for the subjecthood of the Agent in transitive clauses come from Agreement, but since Chukchee Agreement also involves the opposition between direct and inverse forms, it will not be considered here.

Evidence for the subjecthood of the Agent in transitive clauses comes

---

[2]The similarities between the two approaches are outlined in Perlmutter 1981: 319-320.

from clause conjunction under *ənqorə* 'and, then.' Intransitive subjects in Chukchee control the null copy across clauses conjoined by *ənqorə*, cf. (2):

> (2) yokwa-yŋ-ən yet-gʔi ənqorə Ø/ ŋinqey rəyegtelew-nin
>   loon-INTENS-ABS arrive-AOR.3SG and boy(ABS) save-
>   AOR.3SG:3SG
>   'The Great Loon came and saved the boy.'

The same holds for Transitive Subjects, while Direct Objects can only control a pronominal copy, and, in case of ambiguity, are coreferential to the full NP; cf. (3b, c):

> (3) a. yokwa-yŋ-e ŋinqey rəyegtelew-nin
>   loon-INTENS-ERG boy(ABS) save-AOR.3SG:3SG
>   'The Great Loon saved the boy.'
>
>   b. yokwa-yŋ-e ŋinqey rəyegtelew-nin ənqorə ekwet-gʔi
>   loon-INTENS-ERG boy(ABS) save-AOR.3SG:3SG Ø/ and
>   Ø[= Loon/*boy] leave-AOR.3SG
>   'The Great Loon saved the boy and Ø left.'
>
>   c. yokwa-yŋ-e ŋinqey rəyegtelew-nin ənqorə *Ø//ʔətlon/ŋinqey
>   ekwet-gʔi
>   loon-INTENS-ERG boy(ABS) save-AOR.3SG:3SG and
>   *Ø//ʔ3SG/boy(ABS) leave-AOR.3SG
>   'The Great Loon saved the boy and the boy left.'[3]

In (3b) the null copy is coindexed with 'the Great Loon' only, and in (3c) the coreference with 'the boy' is only possible if the full NP is repeated.

To recapitulate the treatment of case marking, the Intransitive Subject and the Direct Object are coded by the Absolutive, while the Transitive Subject is coded by the Ergative.

Grammatical relations other than the Subject and the Direct Object

---

[3]The use of the pronominal copy here is implausible, as Chukchee does not distinguish grammatical gender or human/non-human; therefore, *ətlon* can be coindexed both with 'the Loon' and 'the boy.'

cannot control null copies across clauses; this will be relevant for the discussion below.

3. Relativization of Subject and Direct Object. In earlier works on Chukchee, the formal aspect of Chukchee Relativization was briefly outlined in Comrie (1979) and Polinsky and Nedjalkov (1987: 242-244). Relative clauses in Chukchee invariably have the participle as predicate. Relativization strategies differ in the Declarative and Negative, which, for this reason, are analyzed separately.

3.1. Declarative Relative clauses. Intransitive Subjects relativize on the **-1?-** suffixed participle; this participle is usually described as the standard Active Participle (4b). Cf.:

(4) a. ŋinqey pəkir-gʔi
    boy(ABS) arrive-AOR.3SG.S
    'The boy arrived.'

b. pəkərə-**1?**-ən ŋinqey
    arrive-PART-ABS boy(ABS)
    'the boy who arrived/is arriving'

Direct Objects relativize on the **-yo-** participle, usually identified as the Passive Participle, cf. (5b):

(5) a. yokwa-yŋ-e ŋinqey rəyegtelew-nin
    loon-INTENS-ERG boy(ABS) save-AOR.3SG:3SG
    'The Great Loon saved the boy.' (same as (1a))

b. rəyagtalaw-**yo** (yokwa-yŋ-e) ŋinqey
    save-PART loon-INTENS-ERG boy(ABS)
    'the boy saved (by the Great Loon)'

(5b) shows that Relativization of the Direct Object is possible with the Transitive Subject retaining the Ergative case; meanwhile, Relativization of the Transitive Subject by the same strategy as the Intransitive Subject is impossible; this is shown by (5c):

(5) c. *rəyagtala-**1?**-ən (ŋinqey) yokwa-yŋ-e
    save-ACTIVE PART-ABS boy loon-ERG

'the loon that saved the boy'

As (5d) shows, it does not help if the Absolutive NP 'the boy' is left
out:

(5) d. *rəyagtala-lʔ-ən yokwa-yŋ-e
         save-ACTIVE PART-ABS loon-ERG
         'the loon that saved the boy'

The only way to relativize the Transitive Subject is via Antipassive;
cf. (5a) and (5e, f). In the Antipassive clause, the initial Direct Object
becomes a non-term, and the Subject is coded by ABS. The Antipassive
clause is illustrated by (5e) where the NP 'the loon' is in the Absolutive
case and 'the boy' is in the Locative; for more on the Chukchee
Antipassive see Kozinsky, Nedjalkov, and Polinsky 1988; and Polinsky
and Nedjalkov 1987.

(5) e. yokwa-yŋ-ən ŋinqey-ək ine-nyegtele-gʔi
        loon-INTENS-ABS boy-LOC AP-save-AOR.3SG.S
        'The Great Loon saved the boy.' (Antipassive)

f. yokwa-yŋ-ən (ŋinqey-ək) ine-nyegtelew-ə-lʔ-ən
    loon-INTENS-ABS boy-LOC AP-save-EV-PART-ABS
    'the loon that saved the boy'

(5f) shows that the subject of the Antipassive clause relativizes on the
-lʔ- participle, in the same manner as the Intransitive Subject.
   Thus, Chukchee maintains a three-way distinction in Declarative
clauses, namely between Intransitive Subjects that relativize on the
so-called Active Participle, Direct Objects that relativize on the Passive
Participle, and Transitive Subjects that relativize on the Antipassive
Participle.
   The relative clause agrees with its head in case and number, cf. (4b)
and (6), where both the participle and the NP are in the Absolutive
and Dative respectively.

(4) b. pəkərə-lʔ-ən ŋinqey
        arrive-PART-ABS boy(ABS)

'the boy who arrived/is arriving'

and:

(6) pkərə-lʔ-etə ŋenq-etə[4]
arrive-PART-DAT boy-DAT
'to the arriving boy'

3.2. Negative Relative clauses. In negative relative clauses, the accessibility to relativization is the same, i.e., only Subjects and Direct Objects can relativize. However, the formal distinction is between Intransitive Subjects and Direct Objects on the one hand, and Transitive Subjects on the other; in other words, between the relations Absolutive and Ergative. Negative participles can take only the -lʔ- suffix. Thus:

(7) loŋə-pəkərə-lʔ-ən ŋinqey
NEG-arrive-ACTIVE PART-ABS boy(ABS)
'the boy who did not arrive' (cf. (4b))

(8) luŋə-rəyegtele-lʔ-ən (yokwa-yŋ-e) ŋinqey
NEG-save-PASSIVE PART loon-INTENS-ERG boy (ABS)
'the boy who was not saved (by the Great Loon)' (cf. (5b))

As in declarative clauses, Transitive Subject is relativized via Antipassive. In both (9a, b), the NP 'the loon' is modified by the Antipassive negative clause. In the Antipassive clause, the initial Direct Object can be coded differently; thus, in (9a) the NP 'the boy' is coded by an oblique case, and in (9b) it is incorporated.

(9) a. luŋ-ine-nyegtelew-ə-lʔ-ən (ŋinqey-ək) yokwa-yŋ-ən
NEG-AP-save-EV-PART-ABS boy-LOC loon- INTENS - ABS
'the great loon that did not save the boy'

b. luŋə-ninəqə-nyegtelew-ə-lʔ-ən yokwa-yŋ-ən

---

[4]The comparison between (4b) and (6) illustrates morphophonemic changes associated with case marking; the discussion of Chukchee morphophonemic rules is beyond the scope of this paper.

NEG-boy(INC)-save-EV-PART-ABS loon-INTENS- ABS
'the great loon that did not save the boy'

As in the Declarative, negative relative participles agree with their head noun in case and number.

Thus, Chukchee maintains a two-way distinction in the Relativization of terms in the negative, namely between Intransitive Subjects and Direct Objects that relativize on the negative -I?- participle, and Transitive Subjects that relativize on the negative Antipassive Participle. The use of the -I?- participle for Relativization of Patients (Direct Objects) allows us to argue against its characterization as the Active Participle. It seems more appropriate to characterize it as the Absolutive Participle.

4. Relativization of other terms. Chukchee only allows for Relativization of main or nuclear terms, i.e., Subject and Direct Object. In order to be relativized, the Indirect Object coded by the Dative case must advance to Direct Object, by means of 3-2-Advancement (Dative Shift in a different terminology); this advancement is limited to transitive clauses only, as the DO position has to be available for it. The Oblique Object coded by the Locative case[5] advances to Direct Object only, through Oblique-2 Advancement. Cf. (10a,b,c) where (10a) illustrates a regular bitransitive clause, and (10b) illustrates the 3-2 Advancement:

(10) a. tumg-e keyŋ-ən akka-gtə təm-nen
        friend-ERG bear-ABS son-DAT kill-AOR.3SG:3SG
        'The friend killed the bear for his son.'

In (10a), the verb agrees with the NPs in the Ergative and the Absolutive, 'friend' and 'bear' respectively. In (10b), the initial Direct Object is incorporated; the initial Indirect Object advances to Direct Object and now determines agreement[6].

(10) b. tumg-e ekək kayŋə-nmə-nen

---

[5] Nominals coded by oblique cases other than Locative, are not eligible for Oblique Advancement. See (1) above for the distinction between term and non-term cases.

[6] In this example, the form of the agreement marker does not change, as it still reflects 3 person acting upon 3 person; cf., however, (11a) and (11b) below.

friend-ERG son(ABS) bear(INC)-kill-AOR.3SG:3SG
'The friend killed the bear for his son.'

The advanced Direct Object (*ekək*) can now relativize on the Passive participle:

(10) c. kayŋə-nmə-yo (tumg-e) ekək
bear(INC)-kill-PASSIVE PART friend-ERG son(ABS)
'the son for whom the bear was killed (by [my] friend)'

In clauses such as (10b), the demoted (initial) Direct Object can no longer relativize.

In intransitive clauses, the initial Indirect Object coded by the Dative case may advance to Subject by means of Goal Advancement (see also Polinsky 1990). In (11a), the Goal is Indirect Object:

(11) a. ŋinq-eg-ti ətləg-etə et-ə-lʔet-gʔe-t
child-DIM-PL.ABS father-DAT INTENS-EV-come- AOR .3
SG.S-PL
'The father has many children (lit.: Many children came to the father).'

(11b) illustrates Goal Advancement: the initial Subject ('children') incorporates, and the Goal advances to Intransitive Subject; the respective NP ('father') is now coded by the Absolutive and determines verbal agreement, which is evident because of the loss of the plural marker on the verb.

(11) b. ətləg-ən ŋinqe-et-ə-lʔet-gʔe
father-ABS child(INC)-INTENS-EV-come-AOR.3SG.S
'The father has many children.'

Now the advancee ('father') can relativize as a regular Intransitive Subject:

(11) c. ŋinq-et-ə-lʔe-lʔ-ən ətləg-ən
child(INC)-INTENS-EV-come-ACTIVE PART father- ABS
'the father who has many children'

The difference in coding strategies notwithstanding, it has been so far demonstrated that Chukchee only relativizes Absolutives. This is true for the following initial Absolutives:
— Intransitive Subject
—Direct Object.
If the target of Relativization is not an initial Absolutive, then the initial Absolutive is demoted, and the target NP advances to the final Absolutive. This happens with the following terms:
—Transitive Subjects that are initially Ergative and become final Absolutives by Antipassivization
—Indirect Objects in transitive clauses that become final Absolutives by 3-2 Advancement
—Oblique Objects in transitive clauses that become final Absolutives by Oblique-2 Advancement
—Initial Goals that become final Absolutives by Goal Advancement.
Thus, the following rule is proposed for Chukchee Relativization:

(12) In Chukchee, a final Absolutive can be relativized.

It follows from (12) that only nuclear terms are directly relativized. Since Chukchee just does not allow non-terms to be promoted to Absolutive, the restriction that this rule only apply to terms is unnecessary. To summarize, the relativized NP is always understood to function as the Absolutive of the Relative clause.

E. Keenan (1985:155) indicates that "the question of which positions in a language can be relativized is not independent of the R[elative] C[lause] forming strategy used." Indeed, Chukchee has quite a restrictive strategy of Relativization on participial clauses, as compared to finite verb relative clauses; the participles impose their inherent syntax on the relative clause. In addition, Chukchee has no relative pronoun or any other overt copy in the relative clause; the absence of such an element is always a constraint on relativizing certain positions in a clause.

Chukchee, however, has a separate rule for Relativization of adjuncts.

5. *Kin*-Relativization.

5.1. General description. In addition to the constructions shown above, Chukchee has a special strategy for relativizing adjuncts in

intransitive clauses.[7] This strategy allows Relativization of adjuncts denoting location, time, attribute, or instrument of the given action or even a person co-participating in this action (Comitative). Such adjuncts are coded either by non-term cases shown above (1) or by the Absolutive + postposition, as in (13a). The predicate of the relative clause is the verb with the suffix *-kin-;* the clause also contains the initial subject coded as Possessor.[8] It is important to note that the Relativization strategy for Indirect/Oblique Objects shown above does not work for adjuncts, since there is no independent advancement rule that could promote a non-term to a term.

(13) a. ʔorawetlʔ-an iwtelet-gʔi (rʔet-yekwe)
   man-ABS come down-AOR.3SG road(ABS)-along
   'The man came down (the road).'

b.i. iwtelet-kin ʔorawetlʔ-en rʔet
   come down-KIN man-POSS road(ABS)
   ii. ʔorawetlʔ-en iwtelet-kin rʔet
   man-POSS come down-KIN road(ABS)
   'the road by which the man came down' (Relativization into PP)

Although both orders are possible, the order shown in (13bii) is preferable and more frequent, which is probably due to two related facts: first, this order keeps the two nominals apart, which facilitates processing; second, this order is consistent with the Intransitive Subject-Predicate order of finite intransitive clauses.

---

[7]The requirement that the clause be intransitive is relevant for matrix clauses only; it does not seem to hold for Relativization of adjuncts in embedded clauses. However, apparent cases of Relativization of adjuncts (such as presented in (i), where the instrumental NP 'shoulder blade' is relativized as downstairs Direct Object) can be explained with reference to the rules of Chukchee Causativization.

(i) ekke-te lʔu-nin ənpənačg-en ketʔə-ken ʔəttəyotlʔ-at parətlon-ən
   son-ERG find-AOR.3SG:3SG old man-POSS remember-NMLZ
   ancestor-ABS.PL shoulder blade-ABS
   'The son found the shoulder blade which was to be used to make the old man remember his ancestors.' (Nedjalkov 1979: 249).

[8] For a short description and examples of *kin* forms see Skorik 1977: 175-177.

Unlike the participial relative forms, the *kin*-form does not agree with the head noun in case (14a). The suffix *kin*, therefore, can be characterized as a nominalizer. It should be noted, however, that in spoken Chukchee the head noun tends to incorporate the relative clause if this noun is in any case other than the Absolutive. Cf. (14b), where the head noun is italicized:

(14) a. ʔorawetlʔ-en iwtelet-kin rʔet-ək
      man-POSS come down-KIN road-LOC

   b. ʔorawtalʔa-wetletə-kin-e-*rʔet*-ək
      man(INC)-go down(INC)-KIN-EV-*road*-LOC
      'at/on the road by which the man came down

Terms cannot relativize on the *kin*-nominalized clause; this strategy is confined exclusively to non-terms. Cross-linguistically, nominalization seems to be a relevant strategy for extraction of adjuncts; structures, similar to (14b), are found, for instance, in Salish languages (Hukari 1977; 1979; Gerdts 1988: 70-86).

5.2. The syntax of Adjunct Relativization. Chukchee has several nominalized constructions the analysis of which is beyond the scope of this paper; it should only be noted that while some Chukchee nominalizations can function as a complete sentence, the *kin* Nominalization cannot.

5.2.1. The grammatical relation assumed by the adjunct. For the *kin* Nominalization, the following analysis is proposed. The verb marked by *kin* becomes predicate of the nominalized construction. The nominal that corresponds to the subject of the finite clause is coded as Possessor (cf. above the Absolutive nominal 'man' changing into the Possessor nominal 'man's'). The initial adjunct acquires term status in the nominalized clause, and, after it becomes a term, is eligible for extraction, Relativization in particular.

The end result of the nominalization is quite similar to nominalizations in English, cf. (15b), though with the exactly opposite word order. The relative clause is nominalized, there is no copy of the head NP, and the subject of this clause is coded as Possessor.

(15) a. we were discontent in winter

b. the winter of our discontent

The important question is what grammatical relations obtain in the clause that has the verb nominalized with *kin* as predicate. If we assume that *kin* Relativization is sensitive to the fact that only nuclear terms relativize in Chukchee (see (12) above), then following analysis could be proposed:

(16) In the nominalized clause, the adjunct becomes Subject

In other words, (13a) above may change into the unattested clause (13′) which then yields (13b):

(13) a. ʔorawetlʔ-an iwtelet-gʔi (rʔet-yekwe)
      man-ABS come down-AOR.3SG road(ABS)-along
      'The man came down (the road).'

(13′) *rʔet ʔorawetlʔ-en iwteletkin-Ø
      road man-POSS going-PRED.3SG
      'The road was man's coming down.'

(13) b. ii. ʔorawetlʔ-en iwtelet-kin rʔet
         man-POSS come down-KIN road(ABS)
      'the road by which the man came down'

5.2.2. Interaction with the initial and final Direct Object.
Advancement to Subject cannot occur over the existing Direct Object. In other words, only adjuncts in Intransitive clauses or detransitivized clauses are accessible to *kin* Relativization; i.e., the relative (nominalized) clause with *kin* has no Direct Object[9]. If the clause contains a direct object nominal, this nominal could either become Subject through the Passive, or become a non-term, through the

---

[9]This cannot be explained by a tentative general rule requiring that all nominalized clauses in Chukchee be intransitive, since nominalizations other than *kin* allow transitives, cf.:

(i) ətlǝg-ǝn resqik-wʔi aŋa-nwǝ ekǝk
    father-ABS enter-AOR.3SG praise-NMLZ[PURPOSE] son(ABS)
    'The father went in to praise his son.'

Antipassive. As was already mentioned, Chukchee has no Passive. Therefore, the only way "to get rid of" the initial Direct Object is to apply Antipassive prior to the *kin* Nominalization.

The examples above illustrated the intransitive clause; (17c) shows that the Relativization is preceded by the Antipassive (17b), with Direct Object demoted to Indirect Object in the Dative; (17a) shows that *winretək* 'help' is transitive.

(17) a. gə-nan enaal?-ən Ø-ra-winre-ŋən
2SG-ERG neighbor-ABS 2SG.FUT-FUT-help-3SG.FUT
'You help the neighbor.' (Transitive)

b. gət enaal?-etə re-winret-g?i
2SG(ABS) neighbor-DAT FUT-help-2SG.FUT
'You help the neighbor.' (Antipassive)

c. gən-en winret-kin enaal?-etə wəlpə ənŋe a-ntəyat-ka
2SG-POSS help-NMLZ neighbor-DAT spade(ABS) NEG
NEG-leave behind-NEG
'Don't forget the spade with which you will be helping the neighbor.' (Antipassive clause, Relativization into Sociative)

In (18b-c), Antipassivization results in the incorporation of the NP 'fish' into the verb.

(18) a. ərgənan ənn-ət na-ŋəttə-rkən-Ø-at
they(ERG) fish-ABS.PL INVERSE-seek-PRES-3-PL
'They are looking for fish.' (Transitive)

b. ətri ənnə-ŋəttə-rkə-Ø
-t
they(ABS) fish(INC)-seek-PRES-3-PL
'they are fishing.' (Antipassive)

c. ənkə ənnə-ŋəttə-kin gətg-ən
there fish(INC)-catch-NMLZ lake-ABS
'Over there is the lake where they fish.' (Relativization into PP)

The fact that Direct Objects are demoted in the *kin* Relative clause is easily explained by the impossibility for the adjunct to advance to Subject bypassing Direct Object. However, there is another, more interesting fact concerning Adjunct Relativization, namely, that some intransitive clauses do not allow *kin*-Relativization at all. Cf.:

(19) a. ʔorawetlʔ-an tʔəl -gʔe aykol-ək
       man-ABS be sick-AOR.3SG bed-LOC
       'The man lay sick in the bed.'

 b. *tʔələt-ken ʔorawetlʔ-en aykol
       be sick-NMLZ man-POSS bed(ABS)
       'the bed in which the man lay sick'

Syntactically, the ban on clauses such as (19b) can be explained in terms of the Unergative/Unaccusative distinction.[10] According to the Unaccusative Hypothesis, some "intransitive clauses have an initial Direct Object but no initial Subject" (Perlmutter and Postal 1983: 69). Thus, *intransitive* verbs in the lexicon can differ according to the initial grammatical relation of their nominal argument; this argument can be initial (and final) Subject, as in the verbs 'go,' 'work' (unergative verbs) or it can be an initial Direct Object that subsequently ascends to Subject (unaccusative verbs). Semantically, this rule projects into the opposition of agentive verbs denoting controllable action and non-agentive verbs denoting uncontrollable action.

Assuming that the nominal argument of the Unaccusative is the initial Direct Object rather than Subject proper, the strategy of *kin* Relativization becomes quite consistent in that it only allows Relativization of adjuncts out of the structures that have the initial Subject. The relevant syntactic constraint on *kin* Relativization, which rules out Adjunct Relativization in Unaccusative clauses, is as follows:

(20) Adjuncts relativize if they modify the clause that has

---

[10]For the Unaccusative/Unergative distinction in Chukchee and its independent semantic justification, see Polinsky 1990. For the general discussion of Unaccusatives/Unergatives, see Perlmutter 1978; see also Burzio 1986 for a similar analysis, in a different theoretical framework.

an initial Subject.

5.2.3. The status of the initial Subject. The next question in the analysis of Adjunct Relativization is the final status of the Possessor nominal which was the initial Subject. If (16) is correct, the assumption is that the initial Subject is demoted to a non-term. Indeed, it can be easily omitted: in quite a few cases, the *kin* clause has no overt Subject changed into Possessor. This occurs in those cases where:
  (i) the Subject is generic, as in (21),
  (ii) the Subject is one of the speech act participants, that is, first or second person, unambiguously recovered from the context, as in (22) and (23).

(21) teykew-kin ričit təlpʔi-gʔi
     fight-NMLZ girdle tear-3SG.AOR
     'The fighting girdle (the girdle with which to fight) got torn.'
     (Relativization into Sociative)

(22) wayəŋqen welerkəle-kin rʔet
     DEICTIC proceed-NMLZ road
     'Here is the road by which (you) should proceed.'
     (Relativization into PP; the Possessor/Agent is the addressee command)

(23) gəyiwqewet-kin tumgətum qənwer tə-nŋə-gʔan yara-gtə
     set stakes-NMLZ friend(ABS) finally 1SG-send-AOR.3
     house-DAT
     'I finally sent home the friend with whom I was setting stakes.' (Relativization into Comitative; the Possessor/Agent is the speaker)[11]

However, the Possessor nominal retains some controlling properties; cf. (24) where 'man', though marked as Possessor, still controls Equi-NP-Deletion:

---

[11] This example also shows that there are no animacy restrictions on the *kin*-Relativization. Though most adjuncts in the construction are inanimate nouns, animate nouns also occur, primarily as Comitatives.

(24) iwtelet-kin ʔorawetlʔ-en ewne-kiməltet-ke rʔet
     come down-NMLZ man-POSS NEG-be late-INF road
     'the road by which the man came down in order not to be
     late'

Cross-linguistically, the retention of subject properties by the Possessor is not very surprising; cf. a similar, if marginally possible, behavior of the Possessor nominals in English nominalizations:

(25) a. ? the time of his reading this document to please Joan
        was ill-chosen
     b.? the methods of their advertising their products are annoying

It seems that this retention of controlling properties indicates that the Possessor is no longer Subject but remains Topic; however, this is an ad hoc suggestion which requires further study.
    To summarize, the conditions on Adjunct Relativization in Chukchee can be formulated as follows:

(26) a. only adjuncts are relativized through nominalization;
     b. adjuncts are relativized if they modify the clause that has
        the initial Subject (=(20));
     c. in the nominalized clause, the adjunct becomes Subject
        (=(16));
     d. in the nominalized clause, the initial Subject becomes
        Possessor.

5.3. The semantic motivation of the Adjunct Relativization rule.
In the Adjunct Relativization rule, the ban on Relativization out of unaccusative clauses seems unusual. The following is an attempt to argue for a semantic motivation of this ban and to propose a hypothesis that could be demonstrated or refuted based on cross-linguistic facts.
    The explanation takes as the point of departure the hierarchy of semantic roles, arranged by their diminishing agentivity:

(27) Agent > Patient > Instrument > Location > Comitative[12]

---

[12]The Addressee or Beneficiary that seems to belong with the Agent, rather than Patient, is excluded from the consideration for the sake of clarity.

The essential dichotomy is that of Agent and Patient, as these are two typical roles reserved for human participants. In the opposition Agent-Patient, the former has the ability to begin/continue/terminate a certain situation, in other words, is in control of the situation. Patient is defined as the participant whose state (dramatically) changes in the event described.

It is the participant that has the control over the situation that can create, use or manipulate other participants that are less actively involved in the situation. The agentive participant is relatively stable across time. Therefore, it can be used as the standard or reference point against which other participants are classified and interpreted. The stability of the Agent, therefore, ensures the unambiguous interpretation of other participants as well. Indeed, the prototypical narrative presents a single active participant or a limited number of active participants surrounded by many more inactive "props." The active participant, who is in control of the event, determines the localization and interpretation of the whole event.[13]

The objects that the active participant creates, destroys or modifies are less essential to the interpretation of the event and depend on the Agent. Therefore, the choice of Patient as the standard/reference point would lead to potential ambiguity: on the one hand, the Patient also ranks high on the agentivity scale (27) and can potentially control the participants coded as adjuncts; on the other, this participant is less time stable as he has no control over his own condition: the control is exercised by the Agent.

This reasoning allows us to conclude, if tentatively, that the hierarchy in (27) is relevant in terms of participant contingency: it allows us to predict what nominals in the clause could be used as reference points for the semantic and/or referential interpretation of other nominals.

There exists, therefore, a conceptual relationship between the agentive participant as the controller of the action and "user" of the adjunct

---

[13]It is important to emphasize the probabilistic nature of these observations; of course, such statements as:

    (i) The infinite Logos is inaccessible to man

are legitimate, especially in languages that have a long tradition of being used as a tool for philosophical deliberations.

referent, the action itself, and the item/participant denoted by the adjunct. In other words, the interpretation of the adjunct is contingent on the information about the central, agentive, participant in the situation. The knowledge of the agentive status of the respective participant rules out the potential interpretation that there is a third party controlling both this participant, as is typical with Patients, and the adjunct referent. This might explain why there is no contingency relationship between the Patient referent and the adjunct referent.

The relationship between the two referents is either permanent or situationally established. In the examples above, the function of the adjunct referent is unambiguously recovered, based on the lexical meaning of the verb; cf. a route in (13) and (22), an instrument of the traditional fight in (21), a coparticipant in the setting of stakes in (23), an instrument in (17c), a location in (18c). Importantly, the interpretation of the adjunct is "trivial": it is based on the encyclopedic knowledge of the ways certain objects are used. (Indeed, in theory a lot of things can be done at and with the road but the interpretation for the adjunct is always the most typical and predictable one.)

To summarize this section, the syntactic properties of adjunct extraction in Chukchee may have a cognitive explanation, related to the specific status of the Agent as the ultimate controller of the situation on the whole and of the adjunct referent in particular. Other situations where Agents are treated differently than other semantic roles are known from a number of languages (cf. Keenan 1984); however, the most common examples are those that distinguish transitive Agents, on the one hand, from intransitive Agents and Patients, on the other. Further cross-linguistic studies are necessary to find out whether the rules described above are idiosyncratic of Chukchee syntax or indicate some common tendency.

6. Term and Adjunct Relativization. At this stage, the question arises whether is there any rule that would unify (12) and (26), and if there is any reason for the fact that a language which is so restricted in its Relativization strategies allows for a "Relativization island" at the far end of the accessibility hierarchy that usually has the following form (adopted from Keenan and Comrie 1977):

(28) Subject > Direct Object > Indirect Object > Oblique
    Object > adjunct

As to the first issue, it seems that both (12) and (26) can be combined as complimentary elements of the Chukchee Relativization conditions, namely:

(29) a. only nuclear terms are directly relativized;
      a´. non-nuclear terms must advance to nuclear terms and then directly relativize;
      b. only adjuncts are relativized through nominalization.[14]

The formulation of (29) resolves the issue of "Relativization islands" as (29 a´) shows that no discontinuity occurs as regards the hierarchy of grammatical relations.

Combining the specific conditions outlined above (cf. (12) and (26)) into one larger rule would lead to a loss of information, rather than a concise description. Indeed, the strategies used to relativize terms and adjuncts differ dramatically, the former being participial relativization, the latter a nominalization with Subject changing into Possessor. While it is plausible to keep the two specific rules apart, it is also important that they both indicate the relevance of the relations Absolutive and Subject for the syntax of Chukchee.

7. **Conclusion.** This paper analyzes two separate Relativization strategies, namely, Term and Adjunct Relativization.

In Chukchee, only nuclear terms (Subject and Direct Object) relativize directly. A unified rule was proposed for Term Relativization, according to which the relativized NP should be the final Absolutive of the Relative clause. The rules that allow Indirect and Oblique Objects advance to nuclear terms, therefore, precede the Relativization of the respective NPs.

Adjuncts or non-terms relativize through nominalization which involves the coding of the initial Subject as Possessor. Adjuncts relativize only out of clauses with the initial Subject, which include unergatives and antipassives. A semantic explanation for this selective rule was proposed.

Though the two relativization strategies have different syntax and do

---

[14]These conditions are the same as obtained in Halkomelem for extraction which involves there Relativization, Clefting, Pseudo-Clefting, and Wh-Questions (Gerdts 1988: 73, 59).

not seem to be governed by one rule, they are both sensitive to the grammatical relations Absolutive and Subject. With regard to Term Relativization, the latter feature is relevant in the choice of the participle; under Adjunct Relativization, only agentive Absolutive can be coded as Possessor in the Relative clause.

REFERENCES

Burzio L. 1986. Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach. Dordrecht: Foris.

Comrie B. 1979. Degrees of ergativity: Some Chukchee evidence. In F. Plank, ed. Ergativity. London: Academic Press, 219-240.

Gerdts D. 1988. Object and Absolutive in Halkomelem Salish. New York: Garland.

Hukari T. 1977. A comparison of attributive clause constructions in two Coast Salish languages. *Glossa* 11, 48-73.

Hukari T. 1979. Oblique Objects in Halkomelem. Papers from the 14th International Conference on Salish Languages. Bellingham.

Keenan E. 1984. Semantic correlates of the Ergative/Absolutive distinction. *Linguistics* 22, 212-156.

_____. 1985. Relative clauses. In T. Shopen, ed. Language Typology and Syntactic Description. V. II. Complex constructions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 141-170.

_____. and B. Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 63-99.

Kozinsky I., V. Nedjalkov, M. Polinsky. 1988. Antipassive in Chukchee. In M. Shibatani, ed. Passive and Voice. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 651-706.

Perlmutter D. 1978. Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis. Berkeley Linguistic Society. Fourth Annual Meeting. Proceedings, 157-189.

_____. 1981. Functional Grammar and Relational Grammar. Points of Convergence and Divergence. In T. Hoekstra et al., eds. Perspectives on Functional Grammar. Dordrecht: Foris, 319-352.

_____. and P. Postal. 1983. The Relational Succession Law. In D.Perlmutter, ed. Studies in Relational Grammar I. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 30-80.

Polinskaja M. 1988. Polujazyčie. In V. Belikov, ed. Vozniknovenie i funkcionirovanie kontaktnyx jazykov. Moscow: Nauka, 55-62.

Polinsky M. 1990. Subject Incorporation: Evidence from Chukchee. In K. Dziwirck et al., eds. Grammatical relations: A Cross-Theoretical Perspective. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 249-264.

_____ and V. Nedjalkov. 1987. Contrasting the Absolutive in Chukchee. In R.M.W. Dixon, ed. Studies in Ergativity. Amsterdam: North Holland, 238-269.

Skorik P. Ja. 1961. Grammatika čukotskogo jazyka. I. Moscow-Leningrad: izd. AN SSSR.

MARIA POLINSKY

_____. 1977. Grammatika čukotskogo jazyka. II. Leningrad: Nauka.