Verb valency classes in Evenki in the comparative perspective

Igor Nedjalkov (Institute for Linguistic Studies; St-Petersburg)

1. Introduction

The present paper presents an overview of valency patterns and valency alternations in Evenki, a North-Tungusic language, from a comparative perspective. The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides information on case paradigms in Tungusic languages (TLs) relevant to issues of valency classification. Section 3 describes main valency patterns in Evenki. Section 4 addresses uncoded argument alternations ("case alternations"), while section 5 describes verb-coded alternations ("voice alternations") in Evenki in the comparative perspective in TLs.

Evenki displays many typical properties of Altaic languages: it is an agglutinating language making use of suffixation. Evenki is a nominative-accusative language with basic word order SOV. The basic intransitive and transitive construction in Even are exemplified in (1) and (2) below:

(1) *Oron-Ø*   *bu-re-n*
       reindeer-NOM   die-NF-3SG
     'The reindeer died.'
(2) *Etyrken-Ø*   *oron-mo*   *vaa-re-n*
       old_man-NOM   reindeer-ACC kill-NF-3SG
     'The old man killed the wild reindeer.'

The subject (S/A argument) is in the nominative, while the direct object (P) is in the accusative (other forms of the direct object in Evenki are Indefinite Accusative and Designative cases or Reflexive-possession markers). Agreement is possible only with the nominative subject; there is no object agreement in Evenki.

TLs have the following valency-changing categories:

Causative in -*vkAn*- (cf. *iče*- 'see' → *iče-vken*- 'show'),
Passive in –*v*- *(va*- 'kill' → *va-v*- 'be killed'*)*,
Decausative (Mediopassive) in -*p*-/-*v*- *(sukča*- *'break' (tr.)* → *sukča-v*- 'break' (intr.),
Reciprocal in –*mAt*- *(iče*- 'see' → *iče-met*- 'see each other'*)*,
Resultative in –*ča*- (loko- 'hang' (tr.) → loku-ča- 'hang' (intr.),

The sociative suffix –ldy may express the reciprocal meaning with some verbs. Otherwise it does not change valency when it expresses the sociative meaning (it is not dealt with in this paper).

While North-Tungusic languages have typical agglutinating characteristics featuring rich morphology, South-Tungusic languages show reduced morphology and increased isolating traits (under the influence of Sinitic languages), while East-Tungusic languages show an intermediate position in this respect. The question to be addressed is what consequences of these structural differences condition valency differentiation of the verbal lexicon.

2. Case inventories in TLs.

Argument coding is accomplished through case markers. There are twelve distinct case markers in Evenki (Lebedeva et al. 1985: 44) and Even (Novikova 1960: 152). Apart from the unmarked nominative (NOM) the following case markers will be of interest here:

Table 1. Case inventories of Tungusic languages.

Table 1 summarizes case inventories in four major Tungusic languages taking into consideration only cases directly pertaining to our study:

	Even	Evenki	Nanai	Manchu
NOM (nominative)	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
ACC (accusative)	-v/-u/-m/-bu	-vA	-vA/-bA	-be
ACC 2 (designative, indefinite accusative)	-gA	-jA	-gA	-
DAT (dative)	-du	-du	-du	-de
LOC (locative)	-lA	-lA	-lA	----
ALL (allative)	-tki	-tki	-či	----
ABL (ablative)	-duk	-duk	----	-či /-ci
Instr (instrumental)	-d'i	-d'i	-d'i	----
PROL (prolative)	-li	-li	(-li)//---	----
ELAT (elative)	-gič	-git	-diAdi	-----

With respect to coding frames we expect considerable differences in Tungusic languages, as the inventory of case markers differs greatly across languages. Thus while North-Tungusic languages feature about 12 cases in East-Tungusic the system is reduced (to 8-9 cases in Nanai dialects), and it is still more reduced in Manchu which has only 5 cases (Nominative, Accusative, Genitive, Dative-locative, Ablative). Genitive case is absent in most Tungusic languages, except for Manchu, since possessive relations are head-marked. The differences between individual Tungusic languages can be summarized as follows:

1) Evenki has case system comparable to Even, except for the fact that instead of the Designative case we find Indefinite Accusative which has a somewhat different distribution, e.g.

(3)   Evenki
          Beje muu-ve   (tyge-du)   uŋku-re-n
          man   water-ACC.DEF   bowel-DAT   pour-NF-3SG
          'The man poured the water (into the glass)'
(4)   a. *Muu-je   uŋku-kel!*
             water-ACC.INDEF   pour-IMPER.2SG
          'Pour (some) water!'
Cf. (4b) Purta-ja-v   min-du   buu-kel.
             knife-DES-1SG   I-DAT   give-2SG.IMP
          'Give me a/the knife' (lit. 'Knife-for-me give to me').

2) The case system in Nanai is reduced: it distinguishes between two varieties of directional cases (cf. Locative vs. Allative), but does not distinguish between two cases related to Source (in Naikhin dialect only the cognate of Elative is found), as well as lacks a Prolative (in Naikhin dialect; some other dialects preserve the Prolative case though).

3) Manchu lacks a distinction between Allative and Locative. Moreover, it lacks a special Instrumental case: in the latter functions either the dative or the genitive is used.

The origin of these discrepancies in case systems of Tungusic languages is not totally clear. On one possible scenario North-Tungusic languages have grammaticalized more cases after the split from Proto-Tungusic about two thousand years ago. On another scenario these discrepancies result from a reduction of morphology in Manchu (presumably under the areal influence of Chinese; Doerfer 1978: 7).

3. **Valency patterns, case alternations and valency changing categories in Evenki.**

Only arguments are regarded as part of the valency frame in this section.

3.1. Avalent verbs (coding frame: <>)

This class includes meteoverbs, some of which do not combine with a subject at all, while others may optionally take a cognate subject:

(5) (*Udun)   udun-d'ere-n*
    rain   rain-PRES-3SG
    'It is raining.'

The verb in (5) counts as avalent, since it can take only a cognate (non-referential) subject, and thus can be considered as a variety of impersonal construction (Malchukov & Ogawa 2011). Avalent verbs do not form causative (with one or two exceptions), decausative, reciprocal or resultative derivatives, but marginally form passive derivatives with the adversative meaning. The adversative passive formed in Evenki, Even and Nanai from a few weather verbs implies an adverse effect on the subject of the passive form and the corresponding form increases verbal valency. There is a crucial semantic and syntactic difference between verbs of this type and their derivatives with the passive suffix -v: while the base verbs do not contain any 'animate' semantic roles in their predicate frames, the latter obligatorily include an animate patient, i.e. the person who is subject to a certain atmospheric phenomenon considered as adversative to this person. The group of weather verbs includes the following seven bases and derived passive forms:

(6) a. udun- 'rain' --> udun-mu- 'be caught by the rain',
    b. tygde- 'rain' --> tygde-v-/tygden-mu 'be caught by the rain',
    c. imanna- 'snow' --> imanna-v- 'be caught by the snow-storm',
    d. edyn- 'blow (of wind)' --> edyn-mu- 'be caught by the wind',
    e. dolbo- 'become dark', 'come (about night)' --> dolbo-v- 'be caught by darkness', 'be caught by night', 'come home late at night',
    f. tyrga- 'become light', 'come (of morning)' --> tyrga-v- 'be caught by sun-rise',

g. ingin- 'come (of frost)' --> ingin-mu- 'be caught by frost'.

(7) a. (Udun) udun-djere-n (the subject is usually omitted).
     (rain) rain-prs-3sg
     lit. 'Rain rains', i.e. 'It is raining.'
   b. Bi udun-mu-Ø-m.
     I rain-pass-nfut-1sg
     lit. 'I was rained', i.e. 'I got soaked in the rain.'

(8) a. (Edyn) edyn-djeche-n.
     (wind) blow.wind-impf-3sg
     'The wind was blowing.'
   b. Bi (edyn-du-v)   edyn-mu-djeche-v.
     I (wind-dat-1sg.poss) blow.wind-pass-impf-1sg
     lit. 'I was blown upon by my wind.'

(9) a. Dolbo-ro-n.
     come.night-nfut-3sg
     'Night came.'/'It became dark.'
   b. Bi dolbo-vu-Ø-m.
     I come.night-pass-nfut-1sg
   'I was caught by night/darkness.'/'I came home late at night.'

(10) a. Ingini-l-le-n.
     become.frosty-inch-nfut-3sg
     'It became frosty.'
   b. Ingini-v-re-n.
     become.frosty-pass-nfut-3sg
     'He began to feel cold.'
       3.2. Mono-valent verbs (coding frame: <NOM>)

       Monovalent verbs constitute a fairly heterogeneous group including verbs with both
animate/agentive and inanimate/non-agentive subjects: *evi-* 'play' is representative of the first
class, while sukča- 'break (intr)' is representative of the second group, e.g.

(11)   *Kuŋakan   evi-d'ere-n*
       child   play-NF.3SG
       'The child is playing.'
(12)   D'av   *eje-re-n.*
       boat   sink-NONFUT-3SG
       'The boat sank.'

       For different kinds of subjects the case is invariably the nominative. Mono-valent verbs
productively form causative derivatives, a few of them form reciprocal and resultative
derivatives, but do not form passive (with two exceptions) and decausative derivatives.

       3.3. Bivalent verbs

       3.3.1. The ACC pattern.

Transitive verbs may occur in four different types of transitive structures, depending on the form of the object: <NOM -- ACC.DEF//ACC.INDEF//REFL.POSS//DES> (d'u-va – d'u-ja – d'u-vi - d'u-ja-n; plus NOM = zero form in South-Tungusic languages).

The most general form of direct object marking is the accusative case (see example (2)). Evenki, as other North-Tungusic languages does not show the kind of "Differential Object Marking" familiar from Turkic languages (but also found in East and South-Tungusic languages, e.g. Nanai and Udehe), where the accusative marker can be dropped in case an object is indefinite/non-specific. Yet, Evenki and Even show another kind of alternation: where the accusative is replaced by the possessive-reflexive form (-vi // -var) or the designative case marker (-ja + possessive marker). The accusative is replaced by the reflexive possessive marker if the subject is the possessor of the object:

(13) *Etyrken*   *oron-mi*   *vaa-re-n*
       old_man   reindeer-REFL.POS.SG   kill-NF-3SG
       'The old man killed his (own) reindeer.'

Another form of direct object marking is through designative case (always in combination with the possessive markers):

(14) *Etyrken*   *d'u-ja-n*   *oo-ča-n*
       old_man   house-DES-3SG. POS   build-PAST-3SG
       'The old man built a house for him/her.'

Bivalent verbs characterized by the Accusative pattern productively form causative, passive and reciprocal derivatives (if the corresponding situations [States of Affairs] are available), a few dozens of them also form decausative and resultative derivatives.

3.3.2. Bivalent intransitives.

The following 7 valency types can be distinguished in this case:

1) Case frame <NOM, DAT> (help, tell, answer, fit, lose, envy, get used to);

2) Case frame <NOM, ALL> (answer, stick to, freeze to, look at, get offended, whisper, shout to, become angry with);

3) Case frame <NOM, INSTR> (be afraid of, play (guitar, etc.), wave (with sth), be named, fill (with sth), need, smell (with sth), feel glad/happy (about sth), feel contented (with sth), be angry (with sb), feel surprised (with sth), feel shy, be ill [with some illness]);

4) Case frame <NOM, ABL> (be afraid of, go out of, depend on, lag behind, step down from the reindeer, become angry, be different from);

5) Case frame <NOM, COMIT> (meet, be friends with, fight with, get acquainted with, speak with, agree with, quarrel with, converse with);

6) Case frame <NOM, PROL) (think of, dream of, become distressed with);

7) Case frame <NOM, LOC> (enter).

Bivalent intransitives form causative and marginally reciprocal derivatives, but do not form passive, decausative and resultative derivatives.

Verbs with spatial case frames and spatial case alternations are not discussed here for time reasons.

3.4. Trivalent verbs. Variation of Recipient Marking in Evenki (in comparison with other Tungus-Manchu languages)

There is considerable variation of Recipient marking with three-place verbs in TLs expressing the meanings GIVE, FEED / GIVE TO EAT, GIVE TO DRINK, TELL, SHOW, TEACH, EXPLAIN and SEND, that is verbs whose semantic frames include Agent, Theme (either object or information given or transferred to Recipient) and the Recipient itself (R) which can be defined as a semantic actant which receives an object as a result of such 'canonical' three-participant events like 'give' and 'send'. So, Rs are present in the semantic frames of the following Evenki verbs expressing either physical or mental transfer:

(15) alagu- 'teach', anii- 'give as a gift', buu- 'give', guun- 'tell', nuŋni- 'show', ulgučen- 'tell', ulii- 'feed', uŋ- 'send', uniye- 'sell', and also derived causatives dev-u-vken- 'feed / give to eat', um-i-vkan- 'give to drink, iče-vken- 'show', and tyl-i-vken- 'explain' (see examples in the next section).

4. Uncoded (case) alternations in Evenki and other TLs.

There are several ways of marking Recipients in Evenki:

Four cases can mark the R in Evenki: 1) Dative (see example (16)), 2) Allative (see (17)), 3) Locative (see (18)), and 4) Accusative (see (19)). Reflexive possession marker is also found (see (20)):

(16) Etyrken   **sulaki-du**   imuren-me   buu-re-n.
    old.man-NOM   **fox-DAT**   fat -DEF.ACC   give-NONFUT-3SG
          'The-old-man gave the fat **to the fox**';

(17) **Girki-tki-vi**   tara-ve   guu-kel.
    friend-ALL   that-ACC   tell-2SG.IMP
        'Tell it **to your friend**';

(18) Eni   **sin-dule**   ukumni-ve   uŋ-che-n.
    mother **you.SG-LOC**   milk-ACC   send-PAST-3SG
        'Mother sent **you** (the) milk';

(19) Atyrkan   **beyetken-me** ulle-t   dev-uvken-deče-n.
    old.woman **boy-ACC**   meat-INSTR   eat-CAUS-IMPF-3SG
        'The old woman fed **the boy** with meat';

(20) Asi   tare **edy-vi**   guun-e-n   savoda-l-vi
    woman that **husband-REFL.POSS** tell-NONFUT-3SG thing-PL-REFL.POSS
        d'ab-du   nee-t-če-de-n. (Kolesnikova 1966: 160)
        boat-DAT   put-DISTR-IMPERF-PURP.CONV-3SG
        'That woman told her husband to put their belongings into the boat.'

The major pattern of constructions with the verbs meaning 'GIVE' in TML, as in other Altaic languages, is indirective, that is Dative flagging of Rs and Accusative case marking the Theme (see Evenki example (16)). Recipients with the verbs meaning 'GIVE' in almost all TMLs – Evenki, Even, Negidal, Solon, Nanai, Ulcha, Udihe, Oroch, and Manchu (with the only exception of Uilta/Orok) are flagged by the Dative case suffix –du:

(21) Evenki: Bi hute-vi   sin-du   buu-dye-m.
            I   child-REFL.POSS you.SG   give-FUT-1SG
               'I will give you my daughter';

(22) Nanai: Mama   inda-sal-du   dalom-ba   bu-he-ni.
            old.woman   dog-PL-DAT   food-ACC   give-PAST-3SG
               'The old woman gave food to the dogs';

In Uilta the Allative case (but not the Dative) is obligatorily used with the verb buu- 'give' (Allative markers in Uilta are -tai/-takki/-takkeri; see (23). In Udihe alongside with the predominant use of Dative case marking Rs there exists also the peripheral pattern with the Allative case marker -tigi (see (24)):

(23) Uilta (Ozolinya 2001: 45)

    Bi **mapa-tai**   ulise   bu-hem-bi.
    I   **old.man-ALL**   meat   give-PAST-1SG
        'I gave the meat **to the-old-man**';

(24) Udihe (Kyalundzyuga & Simonov 1998: 178)

    Si   niŋka   **eže-tigi-ni**   baŋčau-ve   bu-li,   digana-ja
    you Chinese **emperor-ALL**-3SG ginseng-ACC give-CONV tell-IMP
    'When you give this ginseng **to the Chinese emperor**, tell him…'

Constructions with Evenki causative verb forms devu-vken- 'feed', 'make sb. eat', 'give sb. sth. to eat', umi-vken- 'give a drink', give sb. (water, tea, wine) to drink' display another interesting type of syntactic variation. In Evenki the following patterns are possible: 1) 'R-ACC (see (25a) and (26a)), 2) R-REFL.POSS (see (26b)), and 3) R-DATIVE (see (25b) and (27)). In the first two cases Themes take the Instrumental case markers (see examples (25) and (26)), whereas in the latter case Themes take the Accusative case marker (see example (27)):

(25) a. Atyrkan   **beyetken-me**   ulle-t   devu-vken-deče-n.
        old.woman **boy-DEF.ACC**   meat-INSTR   eat-CAUS-IMPF-3SG
        'The old woman fed the boy with meat.' (regularly; every day);

     b. Atyrkan   **beyetken-du** ulle-ve   devu-vken-deče-n.
        old.woman **boy-DAT**   meat-DEF.ACC   eat-CAUS-IMPF-3SG
        'The old woman fed the boy with meat.' (at that particular moment)

(26) a. Etyrken **nuŋan-man** hekupču-t   čai-t   umi-vkan-d'eča-n.
        old.man **he-ACC**   hot-INSTR   tea-INSTR   drink-CAUS-IMPF-3SG
        'The old man gave him hot tea to drink.'

     b. Asatkan **enin-mi**   mu-t   umi-vkan-d'eča-n.

girl   **mother-REFL.POSS** water-INSTR drink-CAUS-IMPF-3SG
'The girl gave her mother water to drink (and her mother drank it).'

(27) Etyrken **nuŋan-dun** hekupču-ve čai-va   umi-vkan-d'eča-n.
old.man **he-DAT**   hot-INSTR   tea-INSTR   drink-CAUS-IMPF-3SG
'The old man gave him hot tea to drink.'

Verbs of speech are characterized by the highest degree of R-marking variation in Evenki. For instance, the verb guun- 'tell' may take Rs largely depending of the particular Evenki dialect in the Dative (see (28)), Allative (see (29)), the Accusative case form (see (30)), or with the reflexive possession marker (see (20)):

(28) Alagumni **nuŋan-du-n**   er turen-me   guun-e-n.
teacher   **he-DAT**   this word-ACC say-NONFUT-3SG
'The teacher said to him this word'

(29) Tara-ve   gu-kel   **min-tyki**.
that-ACC   tell-2SG.IMP   **I-ALL**
'Tell me that'.

(30) Etyrken **omolgi-va** guun-e-n: [Direct Speech]
old.man boy-ACC   say-NONFUT-3SG
'The old man said **to the boy...**'

Let us briefly summarize the roles played by each pattern used for three-place verbs with Rs in TML. Dative case forms for Recipient marking may be used with Evenki verbs meaning GIVE (and also in other TML with the exception of Uilta), FEED (also in Even and Udihe), GIVE TO DRINK (also in Even and Udihe), TELL (also in Manchu), SHOW (also in Oroch), SEND and EXPLAIN. Allative case forms for Recipient marking may be used with Uilta and Udihe verbs meaning GIVE, with the verbs meaning TELL (in almost all TML), and SEND (in Nanai). Accusative case forms for Recipient marking may be used with Evenki verbs meaning FEED (also in Nanai), GIVE TO DRINK (also in Nanai), TELL (also in Nanai), TEACH (also in Nanai). The Accusative case may mark the Rs with Nanai verbs expressing the meanings SHOW and EXPLAIN. Locative case forms for Recipient marking may be used with Evenki verb expressing the meaning SEND. **Designative** indexing of R on Theme-nouns in TML may be of two syntactic types of this kind. The predominant type involves inanimate Themes (see (31a)), and the peripheral type involves the animate secondary Theme (see (31b)):

(31) a. **Purta-ja-n**   iče-vke-kel.
   knife-DES-3SG   see-CAUS-2SG.IMP
   'Show **him** the knife'.

   b. Bi sin-du   buu-dye-m   hute-i   **asi-ja-s.**
   I   you-DAT   give-FUT-1SG child-REFL.POSS wife-DESIG-2SG.POSS
   'I shall give you my daughter **as-a-wife-for-you**' (Kolesnikova 1966: 161).

Reflexive possession markers added to R-noun are registered with the verbs expressing the meanings FEED / GIVE TO DRINK (in Evenki and Nanai), TELL (in Evenki, Solon and Nanai), TEACH (in Evenki).

An accusative-reflexive alternation is found in all Tungusic languages which have a special possessive-reflexive form (i.e., all languages except for Manchu), under similar conditions as in Evenki. That is, a reflexive form replaces the accusative if the possessor of the object is coreferential to the subject.

It is necessary to mention the fact that Allative case forms expressing Rs with verbs of speech are quite common in all Tungusic languages – Evenki, Even, Negidal, Solon, Nanai, Oroch, Udihe, Uilta, Ul'cha (for examples of the Allative case used for marking the R role with verbs of speech see: Malchukov & Nedjalkov 2010: 322-323). [In Manchu Rs with verbs of speech are marked by the Dative case; the Allative case is lacking in Manchu.] Most probably in Tungusic languages the 'younger' Allative case penetrated in the semantic domain of the 'older' Dative case (this semantic development of the Allative took place not only with verbs of speech but also with verbs expressing the meanings SEND (in Uilta) and TEACH (in Nanai); cf. also the Allative case use with the verb bu- 'give' in Uilta.

5. Verb-coded alternations in Evenki and other TLs.

As mentioned in the Introduction, the main valency-changing markers (verbal suffixes) are: causative, passive, decausative (or mediopassive), reciprocal, and resultative. It is not always straightforward to characterize valency changing markers in terms of valency-increasing vs. valency-decreasing. Some voice-markers like causative are primarily valency increasing, and some other like decausative and reciprocal are predominantly valency-decreasing function. However, adversative passive with weather verbs in Evenki, Even and Nanai increases verbal valency, while resultative may either decrease valency or leave it unaffected.

5.1. Causative

The causative formation (the marker *-vkAn-* and its allomorphs and correspondences in TMLs) is equally possible from intransitive and transitives. In the former case the verb becomes expectedly transitive, the causee taking the accusative case.

Let us have a look at some three-place verbs. The choice of either the Accusative or the Dative for marking Recipients in Evenki, Even and Udihe depends on either the causative or permissive meaning of the causative verb respectively:

(32) Even (Malchukov & Nedjalkov 2010: 325-326)

    a. Eve-sel   Kad'd'ak-tu   mine-v   kool-ukan-Ǿ-Ǿ.

      Even-PL Kaddyak-DAT wine-ACC drink-CAUS-NONFUT-3PL
      'Evens gave Kaddyak the wine to drink' (or let him drink wine)

    b. Eve-sel   Kad'd'ak-u   mine-v   kool-ukan-Ǿ-Ǿ.
      Even-PL Kaddyak-ACC wine-ACC drink-CAUS-NONFUT-3PL
      'Evens made Kaddyak drink the wine';

(33) Udihe (Nikolaeva & Tolskaya 2001: 589)

a. Mine-ve   diga-wan-aja !
   I-ACC   eat-CAUS-IMP.2SG
'Make me eat !'

b. Min-du   diga-wan-aja !
   I-DAT   eat-CAUS-IMP.2SG
'Make me eat !'.

In Southern Tungusic languages (e.g. Nanai and Udihe) double-accusative constructions (impossible for Evenki with these verbs) may be used in this case:

(34) Nanai. a. Nioani morim-ba   pajakta-va   sia-van-di-ni.
            he   horse-ACC   hay-ACC   eat-CAUS-PRES-3SG
      'He gives hay to the horse for eating.'/
      'He feeds the horse with hay' (Avrorin 1961: 35);

      b. Nioani jengur-be   morim-ba   sia-van-di-ni.
        he   wolf-ACC   horse-ACC   eat-CAUS-PRES-3SG
      'He gives the horse to the wolf for eating.'/
      'He feeds the wolf with the horse.' (Avrorin 1961: 36);

(35) Nanai. a. Morim-ba   mue-ve   omi-vam-bori.
            horse-ACC   water-ACC   drink-CAUS-PART
      'It is necessary (time) to give water to the horse to drink' (Onenko1980: 310);
            b. Andaha-va damahi-va   omi-van-du. (Onenko 1980: 310)
             guest-ACC tobacco-ACC drink-CAUS-IMP.1SG
      'Give the guest the tobacco to smoke'.

Nanai morphological causatives d'ep-uven- 'make/let sb. eat' and omi-van' 'make/let sb. drink' allow reflexive possession suffixes for marking Rs instead of the Accusative. In this case Themes may take either the Accusative case suffix (see (37)) or the Instrumental case suffix (see (36)), e.g.

(36) Nanai. Enie   **pikte-i**   lala-di   d'ep-uven-di-ni.
        mother **child-REFL.POSS**   porridge-INSTR   eat-CAUS-PRES-3SG
      'Mother is giving porridge to her child.'

(37) Nanai.
      a. Enie   **pikte-i**   čaj-a   omi-van-ki-ni.
        mother **child-REFL.POSS** tea-ACC   drink-CAUS-PAST-3SG
      'The mother gave her child tea (to drink).'

Rs with Evenki verb iče-vken-, Even ič-uken and Udihe verb ise-ven- 'show' are marked by the Dative case (see (38)), whereas the Nanai verb iče-ven- 'show' requires the Accusative case (see (39), and in Uilta the verb ite-ven- 'show' is used with Rs in the Allative case (see (40)):

(38) Evenki.
   Nuŋan bultamni-du ilmakta-l-va   seekta-l-va   iče-vken-e-n.
   he   hunter-DAT young-PL-ACC willow-PL-ACC see-CAUS-NONFUT-3SG
      'He showed the young willows to the hunter.'

(39) Nanai.
   Alosimdi gisure-i   modan-doa-ni nučiken-d'uem-be

teacher   story-REFL.POSS   end-DAT-3SG   child-PL-ACC
kartinka-sal-ba   iče-ven-ki-ni. (Avrorin 1961: 240);
picture-PL-ACC   see-CAUS-PAST-3SG
    The teacher showed the pictures to the children towards the end of his story.'

(40) Uilta (Ozolinya 2001: 112)

Abdu-l-bari,   haj-va-da   čipali   čaa   nari-l-taj
 thing-PL-REFL.POSS   what-ACC-CLT   everything   that   man-PL-ALL
ite-ven-ži-ni.
see-CAUS-PAST-3SG

'She showed all her belongings to those people.'

With causatives of intransitives, case marking does not depend on the variety of causative involved, e.g., factitive/coercive (make-causatives), or permissive (let-causatives). Things are different with causatives of transitives. When derived from transitives, the causee in Even usually appears in the dative case (in accordance with Comrie's (1976) Causative Case Hierarchy).

(41)   *Hurken   kniga-v   hupkučimŋe-du   ič-uken-ni*
        boy   book-ACC   teacher-DAT   see-CAUS-NF.3SG
        'The boy showed the book to the teacher.'

    The causative formation through the use of the common Tungusic marker *–bu-kan-* shows less discrepancies across languages: when derived from intransitives, the causative yields a transitive frame, when derived from transitives, it normally yields a ditransitive frame with the causee either in the dative or in the accusative. Some languages (Even, Evenki, Nanai) also allow a double object construction, on similar conditions as Even, that is in cases when the factitive-coercive causation is intended (see Malchukov & Nedjalkov 2010 for exemplification). On the whole, causative formation as a valency diagnostic gives a clear distinction between intransitives and transitives in TLs.

    5.2.   Passive

The passive in *-bu-* is found in all Tungusic languages, but shows significant differences in function and distribution. In case of Personal Passive the Direct Object of the Active moves to the position of the Subject of the Passive construction.   This is the most common type of personal passive constructions in TMLs. Passive constructions differ from the corresponding active ones only in the topicalized element: active constructions involve topicalized agents expressed by subjects, whereas personal passive constructions involve topicalized patients which are also expressed by subjects. Passivization is accomplished by means of the suffix -v (or its variants -p/-b/-mu/-vuv/-muv/-mup depending on the preceding or the following consonants). Most frequently active transitive verbs are involved in the passivization, e.g. va:- 'kill' - va:-v- 'be killed', o:- 'make', 'build' - o:-v- 'be made', 'be built', misin- 'cut off' - misin-mu 'be cut off', ete- 'finish' - ete-v- 'be finished', uj- 'tie' - ui-v- 'be tied to', baka- 'find' - baka-v- 'be found', ne- 'put',

'lay' - ne-v- 'be put down', 'be laid', iche- 'see' - iche-v- 'be seen'. The direct object of the active verb appears as the subject of the derived passive verb and the subject (agent) of the active verb (if expressed at all) appears, as a rule, in the dative case in the corresponding passive construction. This agentive object is usually missing in personal passive constructions since it is either not known or pragmatically irrelevant:

(42) a. Hurkeken uluki-ve   va:-re-n   /va:-cha-n.
         boy   squirrel-ACC.DEF kill-nfut-3sg/kill-pst-3sg
      'The boy killed a squirrel.'
    b. Uluki   (hurkeken-du) va:-v-re-n   /va:-p-cha-n.
     squirrel (boy-dat)   kill-pass-nfut-3sg/kill-pass-pst-3sg
      'The squirrel was killed (by the boy).'

As noted above for Even, the passive form in –v-/-m- is primarily used as an adversative passive, although it is also found in the causative function with few intransitives. It is also used as a conventional (valency-decreasing personal) passive, yet this function seems to be derivative from the first one. In particular, the conventional passive as it is found with the same groups of verbs: primarily, verbs of adverse effect on the animate object (like *ma*- 'kill'), and is marginal elsewhere (in particular with verbs involving inanimate objects). In Evenki, the situation is more complex. The suffix is used as a conventional passive with no adversative connotation (in (43a)), as an impersonal passive (in (43b)), as well as a causative (in (43c)), decausative (in (43d)), or adversative passive (in (43e)):

(43)   Evenki: (Nedjalkov 2013+)

    (a) Er   d'u   tar beje-du   oo-v-ča.
        this house that man-DAT   make-PASS-PAST
        'This house is built by that man.'
    (b) *Tar   amut-tu   ollomo-či-v-d'aŋa.*
        that   lake-DAT   fish-IMPERF-PASS-MOD.PART
        'It is possible to catch fish in that lake.'
    (c) *Asi   hute-vi   suru-v-re-n.*
        woman   child-REFL.POS.SG go.away-CAUS-NF-3SG
        'The woman lead her child away.'
    (d) *D'av   sukča-v-ra-n*
        boat   break-PASS-NF-3SG
        'The boat broke/ got broken (by itself).'
    (e) Bi udun-mu-Ø-m
         I   rain-PASS-NF-1SG
         'I was caught by the rain (and got wet).'

In contrast to Even, in Evenki, conventional passive seems to be the basic function of the –v-/-mu- marker. The adversative function is less characteristic, but may be found, for example, with meteo-verbs (see (43e)). The causative function is predominantly found with intransitive motion verbs (like *suru*- 'go' in (43c)), but is more productive than in Even. In Even, the suffix –u-, historically cognate but synchronically distinct from the passive marker, is used in that function

(cf. Evenki *suru-v-* and Even *hör-u-* 'bring'). Similarly, Even does not use the passive *–v-/-m-* marker in the decausative function, using the mediopassive *–b-* instead. The latter suffix may be also historically related to the passive marker (Benzing (1955b: 1070), however, considers *-bu- and *-p-* suffixes as historically distinct) but cannot be identified with the passive synchronically, while in Evenki, the two markers can still be considered as allomorphs (cf. Evenki: *ula-* 'make wet' → *ula-v-* /*ula-p-* 'become wet'). Thus, a more restricted use of the Even passive as compared to Evenki is due to the fact that the passive marker split into three distinct markers (passive, decausative, and mediopassive) in Even.

In Nanai (Naikhin dialect), the picture is different insofar as the passive marker is used exclusively in the impersonal passive construction:

(44)　　Nanai (L. Zaksor; p.c)

    a. *Inda-sal-du*　　*dalom-ba*　　*bu-vu-ri.*
      dog-PL-DAT　　food-ACC　　give-PASS-PRES.PART
    'It is time (necessary) to give food to the dogs.'

    b. *Inda-sal-du*　　*dalom-ba*　　*bu-vu-hen.*

      dog-PL-DAT　　food-ACC　　give-PASS-PAST.PART
    'The dogs were fed (= were given food).'

For North-Tungusic such uses are also found (cf. (43b) from Evenki) but they are mostly restricted to particular (participial) forms (moreover, as mentioned above, for Even the mediopassive rather than the adversative passive is used).

In Manchu, the use of passive is again different in that it is productively used in the causative function when occurring with intransitives, and with a passive function when derived from transitives:

(45)　　Manchu (Nedjalkov 1991: 5)

    a. *Bata*　　*i-mbe*　　*va-ha*
      enemy　　he-ACC　　kill-PAST
    'The enemy killed him.'
    b. *Bata-be*　　*va-bu-ha*
      enemy-ACC　　kill-CAUS-PAST
    '(He) made (somebody) kill the enemy.'
    c. *Bata-de*　　*va-bu-ha*
      enemy-DAT　　kill-PASS-PAST
    '(He) was killed by the enemy.'

Adversative passive is peculiar syntactically in that it can fulfill both valency-increasing and valency-decreasing function. The common denominator of the adversative form in both uses is that the subject of the adversative form (which may but need not correspond to the P argument of the underlying verb) is adversely affected.

Its use in valency decreasing function is illustrated below; the basic P surfaces as the subject of the adversative form, while the basic A is expressed in the dative case.

(46)　Even. *Etiken*　　　*nugde-du*　　*ma-v-ra-n*
　　　　　old_man　　　bear-DAT　　kill-AD-NF-3SG
　　　　　'The old man was killed by the bear.'

The same construction need not reduce the verbal valency, as in the following example, where, the subject of the adversative form is the possessor of P, rather than P itself:

(47)　Even. *Etiken*　　　*nugde-du*　　*gia-j*　　　　　　*ma-v-ra-n*
　　　　　old_man　　　bear-DAT　　friend-REF.POS.SG　kill-AD-NF-3SG
　　　　　'The bear killed the old man's friend. (the old man was negatively affected)'

Constructions of (47) type are impossible in Evenki, but are found in Udehe folklore texts.

The passive form may even increase the argument structure, as is most clear with atmospheric verbs which are otherwise avalent syntactically:

(48) a. Hovoko nekun-in　　　　　　　　suru-re-n　　　　　Nirumnja-l-dula.
　　　　Hovoko younger.brother-3sg.poss go.away-nfut-3sg Nirumnja-pl-all
　　　　　'Hovoko's younger brother went to the Nirumnjals (kin's name).'

　　b. Hovoko nekun-in　　　　　　　　suru-v-re-n　　　　　Nirumnja-l-du.
　　　　Hovoko younger.brother-3sg.poss go.away-pass-nfut-3sg Nirumnja-pl-dat
　　　　　'Hovoko's younger brother was led away by the Nirumnjals.'

The passive form in (48b) means that Hovoko's brother went away under the influence of some other people involved in the situation of his departure.

5.3.　*Decausative*

Decausative forms denoting spontaneous situations NOT involving Agents derived by means of the suffix -v/-p/-mu (homonymous with the passive marker) are formed, for instance, from the following transitives: mana- 'finish' - mana-v-/mana-p- 'finish (intr.)', ula- 'soak' - ula-v-/ula-p- 'soak (intr.)', ni- 'open' - ni-v- 'open (intr.)', sukcha- 'break' - sukcha-v- 'break (intr.)', dasi- 'close' - dasi-v- 'close (intr.)', uchi- 'twirl', 'roll up', 'wind' - uchi-v- 'wind (intr.)', soli- 'mix (up)' - soli-p- 'become mixed up/confused', si:- put/ blow out (fire)' - si:-v- 'go out' (of fire), e.g.

(49) a. Tar beje djav-va   sukcha-ra-n.
　　　　 that man boat-accd break-nfut-3sg
　　　　'That man broke the boat.'
　　b. Djav   sukcha-v-ra-n.
　　　　 boat   break-anticaus-nfut-3sg
　　　　'The boat broke.'
　　　　With a few verbs (of negative impact) it can also perform a reflexive function (cf. v*a-* 'kill' → v*a-v-/va-p-* 'get hurt').

Mediopassive differs syntactically from the adversative passive insofar as the agent cannot be expressed: also semantically an agent can be absent (resulting in the anticausative meaning), unless the verbal meaning suggests otherwise.

5.4. Resultative

The term resultative is used here for a verbal form referring to a resultant state of a verbal action. Resultative forms in -chA are formed, for instance, from the following transitives: loko- 'hang' - loku-cha- 'be hung', 'hang (intr.)', uj- 'tie' - ui-che-/uju-che- 'be tied to', ini- ' load s.th. on one's back' - ini-che- 'be fixed to a board (used for carrying things on one's back)', dy- 'hide', 'thrust' - dy-che- 'be put into (a bag, etc.)', be:- 'put into a cradle' - be:-che- 'lie in a cradle' (of a baby), djaja- 'hide' - djaju-cha- 'be hidden', lapku- 'insert' (a branch in a tree trunk as a sign) - lapku-cha- 'stick out' (of a branch as a path marker), lo:van- 'hang (fish or meat on a special rope to cure in the sun)'- lo:van-cha- 'hang (intr.) on a rope for curing', ne:- 'put' - ne:-che- 'lie', 'be put down', elbe- 'cover (the frame of a tent)'- elbe-che- 'be covered (about a tent)', ulgun- 'hang on a hook' (about a cradle) - ulgun-che- 'be hung on a hook', udy- 'decorate' - udy-che- 'be dressed up', chakil- 'wrap up'- chakil-cha- 'be wrapped up', anga- 'open' - anga-cha- 'be open(ed)', som- 'close' - somi-cha- 'be closed', haku- 'close' - haku-cha- 'be closed', ni:- 'open' - ni:-che- 'be widely opened', dali- 'close' - dali-cha- 'be closed', kata- 'lock' - katav-che- 'be locked', tyn- 'unharness (deer)', 'let go' - tyn-che- 'graze (of deer)', chovokolot- 'grasp (with claws; of birds) - chovokolot-cho- 'be in the claws (of a bird)', sangap- 'make holes' - sangap-cha- 'have holes', 'be with holes'. Stative/resultative forms are not derived, for instance, from such transitives as o:- 'make', 'build', ule- 'cook', d'ep- 'eat', va:- 'kill', kapu- 'break', bu:- 'give', noda:- 'throw', duku- 'write' - duku-cha- 'be written', e.g.

(50) a. Asatkan dukuvun-ma duku-djara-n.
     girl   letter-accd write-prs-3sg
  'The girl is writing a letter.'
  b. Tar   dukuvun (* tar asatkan-di) ajat   duku-ča-djara-n.
     that   letter (* that girl-instr)   good write-res-prs-3sg
   'That letter is written well (* by that girl).'

In Even, the resultative form in –t-/-č- (homonymous with the aspectual marker of duration) when applied to intransitives refers to a state of the underlying subject ('S-resultative'). In this case verbal valency does not change. When applied to transitives the resultative form most usually pertains to the state of the underlying object (P-resultative or stative passive):

(51) *a. Bej   učiki-j*   *(hiakita-du/la)   ön'e-n*
     man   reindeer-REFL.POS.SG   tree-DAT/LOC   tie-NF.3SG
     'I tied the reindeer to the tree'

    b. *Učiki-u*   (*hiakita-du/la)   ön'e-t-te-n*
     reindeer-1SG.POS   tree-DAT/LOC   tie-RES-NF-3SG
     'My reindeer is tied to the tree.'

In contrast to Evenki (Nedjalkov 1992), and other Tungusic languages (e.g. Nanai and Udehe), resultatives built on transitives usually also allow a transitive A-diathesis with the

meaning 'keep P in a state V'. Malchukov (2008) suggested that preference for A-resultatives, which is more pronounced in Even as compared to Evenki, correlates with functional transitivity features. In the present context, most relevant is that A-resultatives predominate with semi-transitive verbs like *d'on-* 'recall' (cf. *doŋ-či-* 'remember') and verbs with an 'internal object' related to a body part, where the change of the state or pose of the A is at issue (cf. *nimru-t-* 'hold (eyes) shut' in (39) above).

Resultatives are semiproductive: they apply only to telic verbs, primarily verbs implying change of spatial configuration (for intransitive resultatives mostly change of pose). Beyond this group the Even form in *–č-/-t-* is also found with the different ― durative/progressive or multiplicative ― interpretation. Resultative forms with a cognate marker *-ča-* are found in North and East Tungusic (the Manchu parallels are less certain; cf. Avrorin 2000: 162-166)).

In all Tungusic languages, the resultative form shows ergative characteristics insofar as it takes an S-argument when derived from intransitives and the Patient-argument when derived from transitives (cf. Evenki: *doo-* 'land; sit down (of a bird)' → *doo-ča-* 'sit (of a bird'), and *loko-* 'hang (tr.)' → *loku-ča-* 'be hanging'. In contrast to Evenki, Even also features some A-oriented intransitives (as illustrated in (51b) above), and the same is true of Nanai (cf. Nanai: *daila-* 'take a pipe into the mouth' → *daila-ča-* 'hold the pipe in the mouth'). The use of the resultative form as diagnostic for valency classification would again yield different results depending on whether we focus on morphological distribution of a particular form or take the syntactic properties of the derived construction into account. A classification on purely morphological grounds will yield a classification, which cross-cuts transitive/intransitive dichotomy, as the resultative forms may be derived both from (telic) intransitive verbs (S-resulatives) and from (telic) transitive verbs (P-resultatives). If, however, one focuses on P-resultative as a diagnostic frame the same subgroups emerge across languages: the resultative forms are preferentially derived from transitive verbs designating a (caused) change of state (e.g. destruction, etc) as or location on the part of the Patient (see Nedjalkov & Nedjalkov 1988 on resultatives in Evenki).

5.5. *Reciprocal*

The verbal reciprocal form in *–mAt-* can be used to indicate cross-coreferentiality between the two animate arguments. The arguments may correspond to the subject and the direct object (cf. v*a-* 'kill' → v*a-mat-* 'kill each other') in a 'direct reciprocal' construction, e.g.

(52) a. Nungartyn memegilver va:-re-Ø.
    they   each.other kill-nfut-3pl
    'They killed each other.'
   b. Nungartyn (memegilver) va:-mat-te-Ø.
    they   (each.other) kill-recip-nfut-3pl
    'They killed each other.'

(53) a. Asatka-r memegilver njukan-djere-Ø.
     girl-pl each.other   kiss-prs-3pl
  'The girls are kissing each other.'
    b. Eni   hunat-nun-mi   njukani-mat-chere-Ø.
     mother daughter-com-prefl   kiss-recip-prs-3pl
  'Mother and her daughter kiss each other.'

The reciprocal formation (cognates of common Tungusic *-ma-či-* (Benzing 1955: 122 (1070); Sunik 1962: 123) is interesting insofar as this formation is not solely dependent on transitivity, but is rather sensitive to a number of animate arguments of transitive and intransitive verbs. This has been shown to be true of Even, where apart from 'direct reciprocals' (with the subject coreferential to an animate direct object; 'indirect reciprocals' (with the subject coreferential to an animate indirect object), as well as 'oblique reciprocals' (with the subject coreferential to an animate oblique object of an intransitive) are found. In other languages, the formation of indirect and oblique reciprocals is more restricted though. They are most productive in Even (Malchukov 2007), less so in Evenki (cf. *gogo-mot-* 'bark at each other'; Nedjalkov & Nedjalkov 2007: 1604), and least so in Udihe (cf. *teluŋu-masi-* 'talk to each other'; Nikolaeva 2007: 941). In Nanai, the reciprocal marker is found almost exclusively with transitives (Avrorin 1961: 42-43), while in Manchu the reciprocal formation is further lexicalized and very restricted even with transitives (Nedjalkov & Nedjalkov 2007). Thus, as we move from North-Tungusic, to East-Tungusic and further to South-Tungusic, the reciprocal formation becomes more restricted, and is determined by transitivity, rather than merely the number of animate arguments. What makes the reciprocal formation interesting for the issues of valency classification is that the impact of animacy cannot be exclusively attributed to the properties of an argument. Rather reciprocal formation depends on semantic roles associated with an argument structure of a particular verb. Thus, in all languages exempted from this alternations are the verbs of motion ('go to', etc), even for cases when the Goal is animate (see 6.5 above). Similar restrictions are found for trivalent verbs: thus, indirect reciprocals are found with ditransitives taking a Recipient and Addressee arguments (cf. Evenki *buu-met-* 'give to each other', *guu-met-* 'tell to each other'), but not with a caused motion events.

Importantly, only arguments, but not adjuncts can be coded by verbal reciprocals (Malchukov 2007). Thus, with verbs of transfer of possession (ditransitives like *bö-* 'give'), the reciprocal form can be used to cross-reference the Recipient/Beneficiary (cf. *bö-met-* 'give to each other'). With verbs of dispossession (like *ga-* 'take', *d'örmi-* 'steal'), by contrast, this form indicates cross-coreferentiality of the agent with a malefactive source argument, rather than with a benefactive adjunct (*ga-mat-* 'take from each other', but not 'take to/for each other'):

There is another variety of reciprocal derivation, which does not involve valency decrease: with 'possessive reciprocals' the Agent is coreferential to a possessor of an object rather to the object itself. This type of reciprocal formation does not affect verbal valency, but is also sensitive to the argument status of the head NP (adjunct NPs are outside the scope of reciprocal marker).

The "object deletion" alternation (of the type: *He ate the bread ~ He ate*) and "locative alternation" (*John loaded the truck with hay/ John loaded the hay on the truck*) are not productive in Evenki.

References

Avrorin, V.A. 1959. *Grammatika nanajskogo jazyka* [A Grammar of Nanai], vol.1. Moskva-Leningrad: Izd-vo AN SSSR.

Avrorin, V.A. 1961. *Grammatika nanajskogo jazyka* [A Grammar of Nanai], vol.2. Moskva-Leningrad: Izd-vo AN SSSR.

Avrorin, Valentin. 1981. Sintaksicheskiye issledovaniya po nanajskomu jazyku [Syntactic research of the Nanai language]. Leningrad.

Avrorin, V.A. 2000. *Grammatika mandžurskogo pis'mennogo jazyka* [A Grammar of Written Manchu]. St.Petersburg: Nauka.

Benzing, Johannes. 1955. *Die tungusischen Sprachen: Versuch einer vergleichenden Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Bulatova, Nadežda and Lenore Grenoble. 1999. *Evenki*. (Languages of the World/Materials 141). Munich: Lincom.

Doerfer, Gerhard. 1978. Classification Problems of Tungus. In Gerhard Doerfer & Michael Weiers (eds.), *Beiträge zur Nordasiatischen Kulturgeschichte*, 1-26. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Gorelova, Liliya. 2002. *Manchu Grammar*. Leiden: Brill.

Kazama, S. 2012. Designative case in Tungusic. In L. Whaley & A. Malchukov (eds.), *Advances in Tungusic Studies*, 123-155. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kolesnikova, V.D. 1966. Sintaksis evenkijskogo jazyka [Syntax of the Evenki Language]. Moskva-Leningrad. Nauka.

Konstantinova, O.A. 1964. *Evenkijskij jazyk* [The Evenki language]. Moskva-Leningrad: Nauka.

Kyalundzyuga, Valentina, Simonov, Mikhail. An Udehe Language Dictionary. Khor river region dialect. Volume 1. Stęszev. IIEOS. 1998.

Lebedeva, E.P., Konstantinova O.A., Monakhova I.V. 1985. Evenkijskij jazyk [Evenki language]. Leningrad.

Li Fengxiang, & Lindsay J. Whaley. 2012. The Grammaticization Cycle of Causatives in Oroqen Dialects. In L. Whaley & A. Malchukov (eds.), *Advances in Tungusic Studies*, 167-183. Wiesbaden: Harrassowits.

Malchukov, Andrej. 1993. Adversative constructions in Even in relation to passive and permissive. In Bernard Comrie, and Maria Polinsky (eds), *Causatives and Transitivity*, 369-384. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Malchukov, Andrej. 1995. *Even*. (Languages of the World/Materials, Vol. 12). München: Lincom Europa.

Malchukov, A. 2007. Reciprocal and sociative constructictions in Even. In Nedjalkov, V.P. (ed.), *Typology of reciprocal constructions*. vol. 4, 1643-1675. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Mal'čukov, A. L. 2008. *Sintaksis èvenskogo jazyka: strukturnye, semantičeskie, kommunikativnye aspekty*. [Syntax of Even: functional, structural, discourse aspects]. St. Petersburg. Nauka.

Malchukov, Andrej & Peter de Swart. 2009. Differential case marking and actancy variation. In A. Malchukov & A. Spencer (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Case*, 339-356. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Malchukov, Andrej & Nedjalkov, Igor. 2010. Ditransitive constructions in Tungusic languages. In Andrej Malchukov, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Studies in Ditransitive Constructions: A Comparative Handbook*, 316-351. Berlin: Mouton.

Malchukov, Andrej & Akio Ogawa. 2011. Towards a typology of impersonal constructions: a semantic map approach. In A. Malchukov & A. Siewierska (eds.), *Impersonal constructions: a cross-linguistic perspective*, 19-56. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Nedjalkov Igor V. 1991. Recessive-Accessive Polysemy of Verbal Suffixes. *Languages of the World*, 1: 4-31.

Nedjalkov, I. V. 1992. *Zalog, vid, vremja v tunguso-man'čžurskix jazykax*. [Voice, tense and aspect in Tungusic languages]. Unpublished doct. diss. St.-Petersburg.

Nedjalkov Igor V. 1993. Causative-Passive Polysemy of the Manchu-Tungusic –*bu/-v(u)*. *Linguistica Antverpiensia*, 27.

Nedjalkov, Igor. 1997. *Evenki*. London: Routledge.

Nedjalkov I.V. 2013 (in press). Classification of Evenki constructions with verb forms derived by means of the causative /passive /decausative suffix –*v-*. In *Problems of Functional Grammar*. St.Petersburg. Nauka.

Nedjalkov Igor V & Vladimir P. Nedjalkov. 2007. Reciprocals and sociatives in Evenki (with an appendix on Manchu). In Nedjalkov, V.P. (ed.), *Typology of reciprocal constructions*. vol. 4, 1593-1643. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. (ed.) 1988. *Typology of resulatative constructions*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. (ed.) 2007. *Reciprocal constructions*. 4 Vols. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Nikolaeva, I. 2007. Reciprocals and sociatives in Udehe. In Nedjalkov, V.P. (ed.), *Typology of reciprocal constructions*. vol. 3, 933-969. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Nikolaeva, Irina & Tolskaya, Maria. 2001. A Grammar of Udihe. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Novikova, K.A. 1960. *Očerki dialektov evenskogo jazyka* [Sketches of Even dialects]. Vol. I. Leningrad: Nauka.

Novikova, K.A. 1980. *Očerki dialektov evenskogo jazyka* [Sketches of Even dialects]. Vol. II. Leningrad: Nauka.

Ozolinya Larisa. Oroksko-russkij slovar' [The Orok-Russian Dictionary]. Novosibirsk. 2001.

Sunik, O. P. 1962. *Glagol v tunguso-man'čžurskix jazykax*. Leningrad: Nauka.