



**HAL**  
open science

## Even and the Northern Tungusic languages

Brigitte Pakendorf, Natalia Aralova

► **To cite this version:**

Brigitte Pakendorf, Natalia Aralova. Even and the Northern Tungusic languages. Robbeets, Martine & Alexander Savelyev. The Oxford Guide to the Transeurasian Languages, Oxford University Press, pp.288-304, 2020. hal-02889683

**HAL Id: hal-02889683**

**<https://hal.univ-lyon2.fr/hal-02889683>**

Submitted on 4 Jul 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## Chapter 18

### **Even and the Northern Tungusic languages**

Brigitte Pakendorf and Natalia Aralova

#### **Abstract**

This chapter provides a concise structural overview of the three Northern Tungusic languages spoken in the Russian Federation, namely Even, Evenki, and Negidal. Even and Evenki are spoken by people who traditionally were fully nomadic hunters and reindeer herders, whereas Negidal is spoken by a small group who were traditionally semi-sedentary fishers and hunters. Typical features of these languages are root-based vowel harmony, large case systems, an extensive system of verbal inflection and derivation, and the widespread use of non-finite verb forms in subordination. The three languages discussed here share large amounts of cognate forms, but also have notable individual features, such as the indefinite accusative case found in Evenki and Negidal, the reflexive verb derivation that Negidal shares with other Tungusic languages of the Amur region, or the use of evaluative morphology to express (in)definiteness in Even.

**Keywords:** Even, Evenki, Negidal, Tungusic, vowel harmony, case, non-finite verbs, indefinite accusative, reflexive

#### **18.1 Introduction**

In this chapter<sup>1</sup>, we focus on the three Northern Tungusic languages spoken in the Russian Federation—Even, Evenki, and Negidal—and disregard Solon and Oroqen, very close relatives of Evenki spoken in China. Even (spelling variants Èven and Ewen) was historically known as Lamut, and some of the speakers of eastern dialects refer to themselves and their

language as Oroč (from *oron* ‘domesticated reindeer’). Evenki (spelling variant Ewenki) was historically referred to as Tungus or occasionally Orochen.

Evenki and Even used to be spoken by traditionally highly nomadic hunters and reindeer herders spread over vast expanses of North Asia, from the Yenisey river in the west to the coast of the Okhotsk Sea in the east, and from the Arctic Ocean in the north to the Amur river in the south, with Even occupying the more northeasterly regions of this territory (Figure 18.1). Negidal, in contrast, used to be spoken by semi-sedentary fishers and hunters settled in a relatively small area along the middle and lower reaches of the Amgun’ river, a tributary of the Lower Amur.

<insert Figure 18.1 here>

Figure 18.1 Map of eastern Siberia showing the approximate distribution of Evenki and Even as well as the localization of the Lamunkhin and Bystraja dialects of Even, and Upper Negidal. © DDL

All three languages (like all Tungusic languages) are highly endangered to moribund, although differences exist in the degree of endangerment of individual Even and Evenki dialects. The Russian national census of 2010 counted 37,843 Evenks, 22,383 Evens, and 513 Negidals (Nacional’nyj sostav 2010: 20, 15). Of these, 4,310 Evenks (~11%), 4,911 Evens (~22%), and 19 Negidals (~4%) claimed to speak their heritage language (Vladienie jazykami korennyx 2010: 2131, 2122). However, these official numbers are certainly overestimated: for instance, a survey conducted in 1992 estimated that only 600 Evenks settled in the Republic Sakha (Yakutia)—the region with the largest number of Evenks—still spoke the language (Grenoble and Whaley 2006: 72); by now, this number is certainly far lower. As for Negidal,

in August 2017 only seven speakers of varying proficiency remained, ranging in age from 62 to 100 years (Pakendorf and Aralova 2018).

All three languages have official writing systems based on the Cyrillic alphabet, with addition of a grapheme (<Н> or <Н̄> for Evenki, <ɣ> for Even) to represent the velar nasal, and vowel length being indicated by a macron. However, the Negidal orthography devised by Khasanova and approved by the regional authorities in 1993 was never used in publications (Khasanova 2003: 343).

While research on Even and Evenki has been quite prolific, so that we can here mention only the most important monographs, publications on Negidal are quite rare. Major publications concerning the structure of the Northern Tungusic languages are: Cincius (1947), Benzing (1955b), Novikova (1960, 1980), Malčukov (1999, 2008), and Robbek (2007) for Even, Cincius (1982) and Khasanova and Pevnov (2003) for Negidal, and Vasilevič (1948), I. Nedjalkov (1997), and Boldyrev (2007) for Evenki. In addition, there exist several dialect sketches of Even and Evenki dialects (Lebedev 1978, 1982; Dutkin 1995; Romanova and Myreeva 1962, 1964, among others). Major lexicographic works comprise the Russian-Even dictionary compiled by Cincius and Rišes (1952) (with a reverse dictionary published by Doerfer et al. 1980), the Even-Russian dictionary published by Robbek and Robbek (2005), the Negidal-Russian dictionary contained in Cincius (1982), the Russian-Evenki and Evenki-Russian dictionaries compiled by Boldyrev (1994, 2000) and the Evenki-Russian dictionary published by Myreeva (2004). In addition, the two-volume comparative dictionary of the Tungusic languages (Cincius 1975, 1977) is a major lexicographic source for these languages. With respect to language contact phenomena, Romanova et al. (1975) investigate the interactions between Evenki and Sakha (Yakut).

This chapter is based mainly on our oral corpora of the Lamunkhin and Bystraja dialects of Even (Figure 18.1), which number approximately 52,000 and 34,000 words, respectively, as

well as on our corpus of Upper Negidal (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017)<sup>2</sup>. This comprised approximately 21,000 words during the initial work on this chapter but has since grown considerably. For Evenki we relied on published sources, mainly Bulatova and Grenoble (1999) and I. Nedjalkov (1997).

## **18.2 Historical connections: genealogy and contact**

It should be noted that both authors have doubts about the genealogical unity of the Tungusic, Turkic, and Mongolic language families and are even more sceptical with respect to the genealogical relationship of the Transeurasian languages. Nevertheless, if one considers “Transeurasian” or “Altaic” languages to be an areal grouping rather than a language family, then the Northern Tungusic languages belong to this grouping.

The three languages on which we focus here belong to the Northern Tungusic subbranch<sup>3</sup> of the Tungusic family, which furthermore includes Solon and Oroqen spoken in China. Among these languages, Negidal is more closely related to Evenki than to Even. Even and Evenki are dialectally highly fragmented: 51 dialects belonging to three dialectal groups are recognized for Evenki (Bulatova and Grenoble 1999: 3), while Even comprises 13 dialects with up to 24 subdialects (*govor* in Russian terminology; Burykin 2004: 85). There used to be two dialects of Negidal, Upper Negidal (*Verxovskoj*) and Lower Negidal (*Nizovskoj*; Cincius 1982: 17); however, by now Lower Negidal is extinct (Pakendorf and Aralova 2018).

The Evenki and Even dialects spoken in the Republic Sakha (Yakutia) have been under intense contact pressure from the dominant indigenous language Sakha, culminating in copied inflectional paradigms in some dialects (Malčukov 2006; Pakendorf 2009), while Evenki dialects spoken in Buryatia have been involved in contact with Buryat (Bulatova and Grenoble 1999: 3). Negidal shows numerous copies from Evenki, some of which represent items that originally stem from Sakha. In the 20th century, like all the minority languages of

the Russian Federation, all three languages have additionally come under contact influence from Russian.

### 18.3 Phonology

#### 18.3.1 Consonants

The Northern Tungusic languages share the same consonant inventory<sup>4</sup> (Table 18.1), although one phoneme, the glottal fricative, is found only in Negidal (shaded in grey in the table).

Table 18.1 Consonants in the Northern Tungusic languages

		Bilabial	Alveolar	Palato- alveolar	Palatal	Velar	Glottal
Obstruents	Plosive	p b	t d	ʃ		k g	
	Fricative	β	s				h
	Affricate			tʃ			
Sonorants	Nasal	m	n		ɲ	ŋ	
	Trill		r				
	Approximant				j		
	Lateral		l				

In Even and Evenki, the realization of the phoneme /s/ as [s] or [h] is an important dialectal isogloss (Aralova 2015: 18; Bulatova and Grenoble 1999: 3). Among the positional variants of consonants the intervocalic fricativization of /g/ shared by all three languages is the most notable.

#### 18.3.2 Vowels

The vowel systems of the Northern Tungusic languages differ considerably, both between languages and between dialects of individual languages. For instance, Bystraja Even has 11 vowels, Lamunkhin Even has 14 vowels (Table 18.2; Aralova 2015: 205<sup>5</sup>), and for Standard (Ola) Even Novikova (1960: 34) suggested 18 vowel phonemes, comprising eight pairs of vowels opposed by length and pharyngealization (/i i<sup>ʰ</sup> e a<sup>ʰ</sup> u u<sup>ʰ</sup> ə o<sup>ʰ</sup>/ vs. /i: i:<sup>ʰ</sup> e: e:<sup>ʰ</sup> u: u:<sup>ʰ</sup> ə: ə:<sup>ʰ</sup>/) and the two diphthongoids /i<sup>ʰ</sup>e/ and /i<sup>ʰ</sup>a<sup>ʰ</sup>/<sup>6</sup>

Table 18.2 Vowels in Bystraja and Lamunkhin Even

	Bystraja			Lamunkhin		
	front	central	back	front	central	back
high	i i:		u u:	i i:		u u:
mid	e e:		o o:	e e:	ə ə:	o o:
mid-low	i <sup>ʰ</sup> a			i <sup>ʰ</sup> e i <sup>ʰ</sup> a		
low	a a:			a a:		

For Evenki, Bulatova and Grenoble (1999: 4) postulate 11 vowel phonemes (Table 18.3).

Table 18.3 Vowels in Evenki

	front	central	back
high	i i:		u u:
mid	e:	ə ə:	o o:
low	a a:		

The vowel system of Negidal requires further research, but according to our tentative analysis there are 13 vowel phonemes (Table 18.4)<sup>9</sup>.

Table 18.4 Vowels in Negidal

	front	central	back
high	i i:		u u:
mid	e e: iē	ə	o o:
low		a a:	ɑ:

It is still a question for future research whether Negidal has a phonemic short /a/. So far, we have found only one lexeme with a short /a/, and we are not aware of any minimal pairs showing the opposition /a/ vs. /a:/. Another problematic case is the status of /ə/ vs. /o/: as shown by Aralova (2018) these vowels almost fully overlap in the acoustic space. Moreover, the speakers have difficulties in discriminating between the two vowels when they listen to minimal pairs (Aralova, field data). Thus, it would be logical to propose that these vowels have merged. However, this would contradict the speakers' intuitions, because for most lexemes with /ə/ or /o/ they are able to spell the vowels consistently, and they correct the 'wrong' spelling. It is thus likely that the opposition of /ə/ and /o/ is not strictly phonemic and can be described as an "intermediate phonological relation" in terms of Hall (2013).

### 18.3.3 Syllable Structure

Syllable structure in all three languages follows the pattern (C)V(C). Consonant clusters of maximally two consonants can only be heterosyllabic. To prevent longer consonant clusters at morpheme boundaries, epenthetic vowels are inserted.

### 18.3.4 Morphophonology

In all three languages both progressive and regressive consonant assimilations are found. Due to space limitations we do not provide full lists of the assimilation processes (these can be found in Aralova 2015: 23, I. Nedjalkov 1997: 320, and Kolesnikova and Konstantinova 1968: 112). In Lamunxhin Even, there are several patterns that may have been borrowed from Sakha (cf. Aralova 2015: 26).

Like the “Altaic” languages in general, all Northern Tungusic languages have a system of root-controlled vowel harmony with two harmonizing sets of vowels. For ease of description we will refer to them as set 1 and set 2. In all three languages the high vowels /i: i/ and /u: u/ (and /o: o/ in Bystraja Even) are neutral and can occur in suffixes following the roots of both sets as well as being followed by suffixes containing both /e/ (or /ə/) and /a/.

The vowel harmony sets differ slightly between Bystraja and Lamunxhin Even (Table 18.5). Whereas in both dialects roots containing /e/ take suffixes with /e/ and roots containing /a/ take suffixes with /a/ (e.g. Bys. *ga-di-tan* [take-PST-POSS.3PL] vs. *tore-d-di-wu-ten* [speak-PROG-PRS.PTCP-ACC-POSS.3PL]), in the Bystraja dialect the set is lexicalized for all roots not containing /a/ or /e/, e.g. *mo:-la* [wood-LOC] vs. *mo:-le* [water-LOC]. In Lamunxhin Even, the set is lexicalized only for roots containing high vowels, e.g. *ih-li* [tear.away-IMP.2SG] or [reach-IMP.2SG], but *is-te-j* [tear.away-VS.PURP-PRFL.SG] vs. *is-ta-j* [reach-VS.PURP-PRFL.SG], but not for roots containing /o/ or /ə/. In Ola Even the feature underlying the vowel harmony system is pharyngealization (Novikova 1960: 52).

Table 18.5 Vowel harmony sets in Bystraja and Lamunxhin Even

	Bystraja	Lamunxhin
set 1	e e:	e e: ə ə: īe
set 2	a a:	a a: o o: īa
neutral	i i: u u: o o: īa	i i: u u:

In Evenki, /ə ə:/ is opposed to the set /a a: o o: e:/ (Table 18.6). Suffixes with /ə ə:/ follow roots containing /ə ə:/, and roots with /a a: o o: e:/ take only suffixes with /a a:/, or /o o:/ in case of labial harmony: *ər* [this]—*ər-ə* [this-ACC], but *bira* [river]—*bira-βa* [river-ACC]. The set of roots with high vowels is lexicalized: *mu:* [water]—*mu:-βə* [water-ACC], but *ju:* [house]—*ju:-βa* [house-ACC].

Table 18.6 Vowel harmony sets in Evenki and Negidal

	Evenki	Negidal
set 1	ə ə:	ə a:
set 2	a a: o o: e:	a a: o o: e e: iē
neutral	i i: u u:	i i: u u:

The system of vowel harmony in contemporary Negidal, a preliminary analysis of which is shown in Table 18.6, needs further research. The division of the vowels into sets is reminiscent of Evenki (with the phoneme /a:/ corresponding to Evenki /ə:/). There is strong evidence for /ə/ and /a:/ constituting a set, and roots containing /a a: o o: e e: iē/ tend to take suffixes with /a/, e.g. *ŋənə-jə* [go-NFUT[3PL]] vs. *jaβa-ja-n* [grab-NFUT-3SG], *iēktei-ja-βun* [close-NFUT-1PL.EXCL], *te:j-ja* [melt.fat-NFUT[3PL]]. However, it seems that this is not obligatory, since in our data we come across roots of set 2 followed by suffixes with /ə/, as well as roots of set 1 followed by suffixes with /a/: *noda-jə-n* [throw-NFUT-3SG]; *əmə-ja* [come-NFUT[3PL]].

## 18.4 Morphology

### 18.4.1 Inflectional morphology of nouns

All Northern Tungusic languages have large case systems that comprise amongst others an unmarked nominative case and several spatial cases; many case suffixes are cognate with

those in other Tungusic languages. The case complements of Even and Evenki are very large (12–14 cases, depending on dialect and analysis), while Negidal has ‘only’ nine cases, lacking several spatial cases that are also highly infrequent in Even and Evenki (Table 18.7). In Even and Evenki the comitative case has two allomorphs: *-ńun* is used with general nouns, while the other is restricted to kin terms. In Negidal, the comitative is restricted to use with kin terms, and the instrumental is generally used for coordination of joint subjects.

Table 18.7 Case suffixes in Northern Tungusic

	EVEN	NEGIDAL	EVENKI
NOMINATIVE	0	0	0
ACCUSATIVE (DEFINITE)	<i>-wA</i>	<i>-wA</i>	<i>-wA</i>
ACCUSATIVE INDEFINITE		<i>-jA</i>	<i>-jA</i>
DESTINATIVE	<i>-GA</i>		
DATIVE	<i>-du</i>	<i>-du</i>	<i>-du</i>
INSTRUMENTAL	<i>-č</i>	<i>-dʒi</i>	<i>-t</i>
COMITATIVE	<i>-ńun</i> Lam.: <i>-čAl</i> Bys.: <i>-g(A)li</i>	<i>(-čil)</i>	<i>-ńun</i> <i>-nAn</i>
LOCATIVE	<i>-(du)lA</i>	<i>-(du)lA</i>	<i>-(du)lA</i>
ABLATIVE	<i>-duk</i>	<i>-duk(i)</i>	<i>-duk</i>
ALLATIVE	<i>-t(A)ki</i>	<i>-t(i)ki</i>	<i>-t(i)ki</i>
PROLATIVE	<i>-(du)li</i>	<i>-(du)li</i>	<i>-(du)li</i>
ELATIVE	<i>-gič</i>		<i>-git</i>
ALLATIVE-LOCATIVE	<i>-klA</i>		<i>-klA</i>
ALLATIVE-PROLATIVE	<i>-kli</i>		<i>-kli</i>
SIMILATIVE	<i>-G(A)čín</i>		

The major differences between Even vs. Evenki and Negidal are the presence of the indefinite accusative case in Evenki and Negidal (a feature unique to these languages, cf. Pakendorf 2007: 158–167); in contrast, Even has a dedicated destinative case also found in other Tungusic languages. Furthermore, whereas in Even the similative clearly functions like a case, marking nominals and following the plural, but preceding possessive suffixes, in Evenki and Negidal it behaves more like an enclitic: it can attach to a wide variety of constituents, including converbs and even finite verbs (Bulatova and Grenoble 1999: 50), and can co-occur with other cases (1).

(1) Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, GIK\_shuka: 65)

*si gun-ə-m taj skazka-du-gač'in*

2SG say-NFUT-1SG that fairytale.R-DAT-SML

‘«You», I say, «are like in the fairytale».’

There is a formal distinction between unmarked singular and marked plural number. The general plural suffix is *-l*, with an allomorph *-r* in Evenki and eastern Even dialects restricted to nouns ending in *-n* (e.g. *kuŋa—kuŋal* ‘child(ren)’, *oron—oror* ‘domestic reindeer’). In addition, kinship terms take special plural markers, e.g. *amtil* ‘parents’ < *aman* ‘father’. An associative plural marker *-jA* combines with proper nouns and kin terms and refers to the base noun plus family or associates. While this is restricted to nouns in subject position in Evenki (I. Nedjalkov 1997: 142), it can occur with adjuncts in Even (2).

(2) Lam. (AEK\_childhood\_023)

*ee kuŋa bi-hiŋi-j buollar upe:-je-ŋ-čel*

eh child be-VS.IPFV-PRFL.SG DP.Y grandmother-ASSOC-ALN-COM

*bi-j-deg-im=di:*

be-CONN-ASS.Y-1SG.Y=EMPH.Y

‘When I was a child I lived with my grandmother and her family.’

In all three languages possessive suffixes are used both for nominal possession and for verbal subject agreement marking. The suffixes are basically cognate (see Table 18.11), but the Negidal verbal 1PL inclusive has grammaticalized out of the plural plus possessive suffix.

#### 18.4.2 Pronouns

The pronominal systems of the three languages are very similar and show largely cognate forms. The common distinction between 1PL inclusive and exclusive has been lost in Even and Evenki dialects spoken in Yakutia, probably due to contact with Sakha (cf. Malčukov 2006).

The free personal pronouns have different forms for the nominative and oblique case forms (Table 18.8). The onset of the 2nd person forms varies between [s], [h] or zero depending on the lect (cf. Section 18.3.1), and the 3SG form varies between *noŋan* in Even and *nuŋan* in Evenki, with Negidal showing variation between the two; the 3PL form varies between *noŋartan* in Even, *nuŋartin* in Evenki, and *noŋaltin* in Negidal. The oblique form for the 3SG pronoun is composite, with the case suffix followed by a frozen 3SG possessive suffix *-n*, e.g. DAT *noŋan-du-n*. Similarly, the 3PL pronoun is analyzable, e.g. in Even *noŋa-r-tan* [3SG-PL-POSS.3PL] for the nominative form and *noŋa-r-CASE-tan* [3SG-PL-CASE.SUFFIX-POSS.3PL] for the oblique forms, e.g. ACC *noŋa-r-bu-tan*.

Table 18.8 Free personal pronouns in the Northern Tungusic languages

	SG	PL

	NOM	OBL	NOM	OBL
1(INCL)	<i>bi:</i>	<i>min</i>	Evn.: <i>mut</i> Neg.: <i>bit(ti)</i> Evk.: <i>mit</i>	<i>mut</i> <i>bit</i> <i>mit</i>
1EXCL			<i>bu:</i>	<i>mun</i>
2	<i>Si:</i>	<i>Sin</i>	<i>Su</i>	<i>Sun</i>
3	<i>nOŋan</i>	<i>nOŋan-X-n</i>	Evn.: <i>noŋartan</i> <i>nOŋaRtin</i>	Evn. <i>noŋar-X-tan</i> <i>nOŋaR-X-tin</i>

The free personal pronouns function as possessive pronouns, with some variation: in eastern dialects of Evenki and the Lamunkhin dialect of Even (i.e. those lects that are in contact with Sakha) as well as Negidal the nominative form is used, e.g. Lam. *bi abagaw* ‘my grandfather’. In the Bystraja dialect of Even the bare oblique form is used, e.g. *min akmu* ‘my father’, while in standard Evenki the oblique form of the pronoun with an additional possessive suffix *-ŋi* functions as the possessive pronoun, e.g. *min-ŋi dʒuw* ‘my house’ (I. Nedjalkov 1997: 210).

The reflexive pronoun (*me:n* in Even and Evenki, *man* in Negidal) can have a purely reflexive meaning (3a), while with duplication it functions as a reciprocal object ‘each other’ (3b); in attributive use it emphasizes ‘one’s own’. With possessive suffixes the reflexive pronoun expresses emphasis in Negidal and Evenki (3c). This function does not occur in the Even corpus.

(3) a. Lam. (EAK\_reindeer\_herd\_410)

*at or-na me:n-ur e-he-p dʒomkat-ta*  
NEG domestic.reindeer-PRV self-PRFL.PL NEG-NFUT-1PL think-NEG.CVB

‘We cannot imagine ourselves without reindeer.’

b. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, AET\_bear: 13)

*təsi-čá-tin*    *təsi-čá-tin*    *ti-kan*    *əmə-jə*    *man*    *man-tiki-wəj*  
gather-PST-3PL    gather-PST-3PL    like.this-DIM    come-NFUT[3PL]    self    self-ALL-PRFL.PL  
*əmə-jə*  
come-NFUT[3PL]

‘They gathered and gathered and came like this towards each other.’

c. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, GIK\_rugatsja\_myjtj: 7)

*taj*    *sagdi bəjə-dži*    *inə-je-ki-s*    *man-si*  
that old    person-INS    laugh-NFUT-COND-2SG    self-2SG  
*na:n-duki-n=da*    *osa-tma*    *o:-dža-s*  
3SG-ABL-POSS.3SG=PTCL    bad-COMP    become-FUT2-2SG

‘If you laugh about an old person, you yourself will be worse than him/her.’

The Northern Tungusic languages distinguish between a proximal and a distal demonstrative pronoun with cognate forms: Evn. *erek/tarak*, Neg. *oj/taj*, Evk. *er/tar*. The case-marked forms of these demonstratives function as spatial adverbs, e.g. Evn. *edu* ‘here’, *tala* ‘there’ or as temporal adverbs, e.g. Neg. *taduk(in)* ‘then’.

The interrogative pronouns (Table 18.9) are largely cognate across the Northern Tungusic languages. The form for ‘why’ has lexicalized out of converbal forms of the interrogative verb *ia-/e:-* ‘do what’. Different case-marked forms of the general root *i-* function as interrogative pronouns, such as dative-marked *i-du* or locative-marked *i-le*, both meaning ‘where’, allative-marked *i-tki* meaning ‘where to’, and ablative-marked *i-duk* expressing ‘from where’.

Table 18.9 Interrogative pronouns in the Northern Tungusic languages

	EVEN	NEGIDAL	EVENKI
who	<i>ŋi</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>ŋi:</i>

what	<i>iak</i>	<i>e:(kun)</i>	<i>e:(kun)</i>
how many	<i>adi:, ahun/asun</i>	<i>adi, asun</i>	<i>adi:, asu:n</i>
when	<i>o:k</i>	<i>okin</i>	<i>o:kin</i>
why	<i>iami</i> <i>iadaj</i>	<i>e:daj</i>	<i>e:da</i>
how	<i>o:n</i>	<i>on</i>	<i>o:n</i>
do.what	<i>ia-</i>	<i>e:-</i>	<i>e:-</i>
general root	<i>i-</i>	<i>i-</i>	<i>i-</i>
which	<i>irek</i>	<i>e:ma</i>	<i>anty</i>

In all three languages, the interrogative pronouns form the base of the negative and indefinite pronouns. In conjunction with the enclitic =*dA* and a negative verb the reading is that of a negative pronoun (4), while the interrogative pronouns with the enclitics =*mVI*/*=wVI* or =*dA* derive indefinite pronouns (18b below).

(4) Lam. (LAT\_family\_history\_283)

*ŋi:=de e-h-ni ukčen-gere-r*

who=PTCL NEG-NFUT-3SG tell-HAB-NEG.CVB

‘Nobody tells (about that person).’

### 18.4.3 Numerals

#### 18.4.3.1 Cardinal numerals

The Northern Tungusic languages have a decimal numeral system with largely cognate forms (Table 18.10).

Table 18.10 Cardinal numerals in the Northern Tungusic languages (in the Even column, the first item is from the Bystraja dialect)

	EVEN	NEGIDAL	EVENKI		EVEN	NEGIDAL	EVENKI
1	<i>umen/omen</i>	<i>əməŋ</i>	<i>umun</i>	6	<i>ńuŋen</i>	<i>ńuŋun</i>	<i>ńuŋun</i>
2	<i>ǰu:r/ǰo:r</i>	<i>ǰu:l</i>	<i>ǰu:r</i>	7	<i>nadan</i>	<i>nadan</i>	<i>nadan</i>
3	<i>ilan</i>	<i>elan</i>	<i>ilan</i>	8	<i>ǰapkan</i>	<i>ǰapkun</i>	<i>ǰapkun</i>
4	<i>digen</i>	<i>digin</i>	<i>digin</i>	9	<i>ujun</i>	<i>ijegin</i>	<i>jegin</i>
5	<i>tunŋan</i>	<i>tonŋa</i>	<i>tunŋa</i>	10	<i>mian</i>	<i>ǰan</i>	<i>ǰa:n</i>

The numerals 20, 30, 40, etc. are multiplicative, while the numerals 11 to 19, 21 to 29, 31 to 39, etc. are additive, e.g. *ǰo:rmiar/ǰu:lǰan*<sup>11</sup>/*ǰu:rǰa:r* ‘20’, *ilanmiar/elandǰar/ilandǰa:r* ‘30’, and *mian omen/ǰan əməŋ/ǰa:n umun* ‘11’, *mian ǰo:r/ǰan ǰu:l/ǰa:n ǰu:r* ‘12’ in Even, Negidal, and Evenki, respectively. Note that the numerals from 11 to 19 in Bystraja are constructed in a different manner, adding *ńulek* ‘in addition’ to the base, e.g. *umen ńulek* ‘11’, *ǰu:r ǰulek* ‘12’, *digen ńulek* ‘14’, etc. All languages have a cognate lexeme for ‘hundred’, *ńama*; additionally, Negidal has *tanŋu*. The word for ‘thousand’ is borrowed from Russian *tysjača* in all languages.

#### 18.4.3.2 Numeral derivation

Ordinal numerals are derived from cardinal numerals via suffixation with *-(g)i* in Even, *-gu* in Negidal, and *-(g)i:* in Evenki, e.g. Evn. *il-i* ‘third’, Neg. *dig-gu* ‘fourth’, Evk. *tunŋ-i:* ‘fifth’. In Lamunkhin Even, however, the copied Sakha morpheme *-(i)s* is used far more frequently than the Even suffix, e.g. *ǰo:r-is* ‘second’, *il-is* ‘third’. All three languages have separate items for ‘first’ and ‘second’: Lam. *nəŋap* and *gie*, Bys.: *ǰuleg* and *gie*, Neg.: *ńogu* and *gie*, and Evk.: *ələkəsipti* and *ge:*.

Collective numerals for counting people are derived via a suffix *-(n)i/-ri/-ji* in all three languages. This is reinforced with the instrumental case-marked reflexive possessive suffix *-ǰur* in Even. Examples are Evn. *ǰo:r-i-ǰur* ‘two together’, Neg. *elan-i* ‘three together’, and



In Negidal and Evenki the comparative degree is formed with the suffix *-tmA(r)* e.g. Neg. *əŋəsi-tma* ‘stronger’, Evk. *hegdy-tmer* ‘bigger’ (I. Nedjalkov 1997: 278), while in Even the base form of the adjective is used. Whereas in Evenki the superlative degree is formed morphologically with the suffix *-tku/dygu*, e.g. *hegdy-tku* ‘the biggest’ (I. Nedjalkov 1997: 278), Even and Negidal have no dedicated morphological means to derive superlative constructions.

#### 18.4.5 Inflectional morphology of verbs

Like Turkic and other Tungusic languages, the Northern Tungusic languages make use of two different sets of subject agreement markers, one identical to nominal possession markers, the other restricted to verbs (Table 18.11). In Negidal, however, the formal distinction between the two sets is only retained for the 1SG, 1PL.INCL, and 3PL. The choice of subject agreement marker is determined by the TAM of the verb, and some TAM forms take mixed subject agreement markers. For instance, while the subjunctive takes possessive suffixes to index the subject, 3SG is zero-marked and the plural forms are reinforced with the plural suffix *-l*.

Table 18.11 Sets of subject agreement markers in the Northern Tungusic languages

	Possessive (e.g. past)			Verbal (e.g. non-future)		
	EVEN	NEGIDAL	EVENKI	EVEN	NEGIDAL	EVENKI
1SG	<i>-w</i>	<i>-w</i>	<i>-w</i>	<i>-m</i>	<i>-m</i>	<i>-m</i>
2SG	<i>-s(i)</i>	<i>-s</i>	<i>-s</i>	<i>-nni</i>	<i>-s</i>	<i>-nni</i>
3SG	<i>-n(i)</i>	<i>-n</i>	<i>-n</i>	<i>-n(i)</i>	<i>-n</i>	<i>-n</i>
1PL.INCL	<i>-t(i)</i>	<i>-lti</i>	<i>-t</i>	<i>-p</i>	<i>-p</i>	<i>-p</i>
1PL.EXCL	<i>-wun</i>	<i>-wun</i>	<i>-wun</i>	<i>-u</i>	<i>-wun</i>	<i>-w</i>

2PL	<i>-sAn</i>	<i>-sun</i>	<i>-sun</i>	<i>-s(i)</i>	<i>-sun</i>	<i>-s</i>
3PL	<i>-tAn</i>	<i>-tin</i>	<i>-tin</i>	0	0	0

One of the salient differences between the languages is found in the indicative future tense, which in Even and Evenki takes the verbal set of subject agreement suffixes, whereas in Negidal it takes the possessive series; furthermore, in Even the 3PL is overtly marked with the suffix *-r* while in Evenki it is zero-marked, as expected. All Northern Tungusic languages distinguish between 1PL.INCL and 1PL.EXCL, with the exception of lects that are in contact with Sakha (Yakut).

As is common in the Tungusic language family (cf. Hölzl 2015), negation is expressed with the negative auxiliary *e-*. This takes tense and subject agreement marking, while the lexical verb carries a negative converb suffix (see Table 18.15 below) and optional aspect marking (cf. example 4 above).

Aspect and aktionsart are generally morphologically marked, and the suffixes are largely cognate (Table 18.12); differences across descriptions tend to be due to different terminologies and analyses. The unmarked tense form can have a perfective reading in opposition to the marked habitual and progressive. Some aspectual suffixes are highly polysemous<sup>12</sup>, such as *-t/č/čA*, which can have a resultative meaning, a durative meaning, or a distributive meaning.

Table 18.12 Aspect/aktionsart morphology in Northern Tungusic languages

	EVEN	NEGIDAL	EVENKI
IMPERFECTIVE/PROGRESSIVE	<i>-d/-dʒid</i>		<i>-dʒA</i>
HABITUAL1	Lam.: <i>-Gr(A)</i>		<i>-ŋnA</i>
HABITUAL2/ITERATIVE	Bys.: <i>-WA:Č</i>	<i>-wa:t</i>	<i>-wA:t</i>

INCHOATIVE	<i>-l</i>	<i>-l</i>	<i>-l</i>
STATIVE/RESULTATIVE	<i>-t/č</i>	<i>-čA</i>	<i>-čA</i>
CONTINUOUS		<i>-t/č</i>	<i>-t/či</i>
ACCELERATIVE	<i>-mAlči</i>	<i>-mə(lča)</i>	<i>-mAlčA</i>
LIMITATIVE	<i>-s(A)n</i>	<i>-sin</i>	<i>-sin</i>
MULTIPLICATIVE	<i>-kAt</i>	<i>-ktA</i>	<i>-ktA</i>
DURATIVE	<i>-dʒA:n</i>	<i>(-dʒe)</i>	

Even distinguishes three synthetic tenses: a non-future (with present tense readings for stative or atelic verbs and a past tense reading for active or telic verbs), a past, and a future; the present tense is formed from the non-future with the progressive aspect. In addition, the Lamunkhin dialect distinguishes between a direct witnessed past and an indirect non-witnessed past marked by the past participle *-čA*, possibly in result of Sakha contact influence. Like Even, the Evenki non-future tends to have past tense readings, while the combination of progressive aspect with non-future gives a clear present tense reading. In contrast, in Negidal, which lacks an overt progressive aspect, the suffix cognate to the Even and Evenki non-future can carry a present tense reading by itself even with active and telic verbs.

Both Evenki and Negidal have two future tense suffixes; in Evenki, one of these is analysed as expressing an immediate future, whereas the other is called a “definite future” by Bulatova and Grenoble (1999: 7) and an “indefinite future” by I. Nedjalkov (1997: 235). Whether there is a functional difference between the two Negidal future suffixes is as yet unclear.

One of the salient differences between Even vs. Negidal and Evenki is that in the former the general direct past is formed with the present participle *-Ri*, whereas in the latter it is formed with the past participle *-čA*. In addition to the synthetic tenses there are also analytic tense constructions consisting of the lexical verb carrying the past participle *-čA* and the

auxiliary *bi-* ‘be’ in the non-future or past tense; these have past perfect and pluperfect readings, but are practically lacking in the Bystraja dialect of Even.

There is a wide variety of morphologically marked moods with surprisingly few cognate forms across Even, Negidal and Evenki (Table 18.13). None of the Northern Tungusic languages have an overtly marked indicative mood, but in the indicative a tense suffix plus subject agreement suffixes are obligatory.

Table 18.13 Mood suffixes in the Northern Tungusic languages

	EVEN	NEGIDAL	EVENKI
INDICATIVE	no special morpheme, but obligatory tense		
IMPERATIVE 1SG	<i>-dA-ku</i>	<i>-ktA</i>	<i>-ktA</i>
IMPERATIVE 3SG	<i>-dA-n</i>	<i>-gi-n</i>	<i>-gi-n</i>
IMPERATIVE 3PL	<i>-dA-tAn</i>	<i>-gi-tin</i>	<i>-k-tin</i>
IMM.IMP 2SG	<i>-li</i>	<i>-kAl</i>	<i>-kAl</i>
IMM.IMP 1PL.INCL	<i>-Gar</i>	<i>-GAj</i>	<i>-Gat</i>
IMM.IMP 1PL.EXCL	<i>-dA-kun</i>	<i>-ktA-wun</i>	<i>-kwun/-kta-wun<sup>13</sup></i>
IMM.IMP 2PL	<i>-lilla</i>	<i>-kA-sun</i>	<i>-kAllu</i>
REM.IMP 2SG	<i>-ŋA-nni</i>	<i>-dA-j</i>	<i>-dA-wi</i>
REM.IMP 1PL	Lam.: <i>-dA-wur</i> Bys.: <i>-dʒiŋA-wur</i>		
REM.IMP 2PL	<i>-ŋA-sAn</i>	<i>-dA-waj</i>	<i>-dA-wAr</i>
ADMONITIVE	<i>-dʒik(Ari)</i>		<i>-nA</i>
SUBJUNCTIVE	<i>-mčA</i>	<i>-mčA</i>	<i>-mčV</i>
PRESUMPTIVE	<i>(-mnA)</i>	<i>-nA-subj.agr=dʒAkA</i>	<i>-nA</i>
PRESUMPTIVE	Lam.: <i>-čA:dʒi</i>		<i>-rkA</i>
PRESUMPTIVE			<i>-rgu:</i>
NECESSITIVE/DEBITIVE	Lam.: <i>-jAktA:k</i>		<i>-mVč'in bi-</i>

	‘standard’: <i>-nnA</i>	<i>-ŋa:ti</i>	<i>-ŋa:t</i>
--	-------------------------	---------------	--------------

Notable features of the mood system are the distinction between an immediate future and remote future imperative (cf. Pakendorf 2007: 217–226) and the large variety of means to express presumptive meanings. These include the lexeme *koč* ‘probably’ or a conventionalized implicature in Bystraja Even (6a), the innovative bimorphemic suffix *-čA:dʒi* in Lamunxhin Even (6b), an analytic construction consisting of the past participle of the lexical verb plus future-marked auxiliary *bi-* in various Even dialects and Negidal (6c), as well as the use of a presumptive suffix *-(n)nA*, which in Negidal is reinforced with the enclitic particle *=dʒAkA* (6d).

(6) a. Bys. (EGA\_NFI\_Managič\_264)

*ti:k=ke e-se-p mudak-ra*  
 now=EMPH NEG-NFUT-1PL.INCL finish-NEG.CVB  
 ‘Now we’re probably finished.’

b. Lam. (KNK\_eksponat\_058)

*bi:=de kočuken bi-d-niken ečin ebi-čedʒi-m*  
 1SG=PTCL small be-PROG-SIM.CVB like.this play-PRES-1SG  
 ‘I probably played like this when I was small.’

c. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, DIN\_koster: 8)

*gə məjga-ja-wun lo:ča-l əmə-ča-l bi-dʒiŋa-tin*  
 DP think-NFUT-1PL.EXCL Russian-PL come-PST.PTCP-PL be-FUT1-3PL  
 ‘We think, maybe Russians have come, ...’

d. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, DIN\_dedushka\_pavel: 10)

*man-sun toksa-dgi-na-sun=dʒaka hawa-tki-waj*

self-2PL run-REP-POT-2PL=PRES work-ALL-PRFL.PL

‘(From there) you will probably (be able to) run back to work.’

As is common in the “Altaic” languages, the Northern Tungusic languages make extensive use of participles, not only as modifiers or in subordination, but also as finite predicates.

However, only the present/simultaneous and the past/anterior participles are cognate across all three languages (Table 18.14); in addition, the habitual *-wki* and the debitive *-ŋA:t* are shared between Negidal and Evenki (although these are very rare in attributive function in Negidal, where they mostly occur as finite predicates).

Table 18.14 Participles in the Northern Tungusic languages

	EVEN	NEGIDAL	EVENKI
PRESENT/SIMULTANEOUS	<i>-Ri</i>	<i>-ji</i>	<i>-Ri</i>
PAST/ANTERIOR	<i>-čA</i>	<i>-čA</i>	<i>-čA</i>
HABITUAL		<i>-wki</i>	<i>-wki</i>
FUTURE/HYPOTHETICAL	<i>(-dʒiŋA)</i>	<i>(-dʒA)</i>	<i>-dʒAŋA</i>
IMMEDIATE FUTURE			<i>-lVk</i>
REMOTE PAST	<i>-DAŋ</i>	<i>-čAki</i>	
PAST PASSIVE		<i>-pLA</i>	
PERFECT			<i>-nA</i>
DEBITIVE			<i>-mAči:n, -ŋA:t</i>
DEBITIVE-INTENTIONAL		<i>-ŋA:t</i>	<i>-ŋA:t</i>
IMPERSONAL-DEBITIVE			<i>-wkA</i>
PRETENSE	<i>-ssAn/-hmAn</i>		<i>-ksVn</i>

The present participle *-Ri* functions as a finite past tense marker in both Even dialects, while the past participle *-čA* has taken on functions as a finite unwitnessed past tense marker in Lamunkhin Even; this is the standard past tense suffix in both Negidal and Evenki (see above). The “pretense” participle (called “fictitious action” by Bulatova and Grenoble 1999: 42) occurs in analytic constructions to express active pretense (7a). In Lamunkhin Even and Evenki this co-occurs with the auxiliary *o:-* ‘become/do’; in Bystraja Even the finite auxiliary in these constructions is *bi-*. Negidal stands out among the Northern Tungusic languages in having a passive participle (7b).

(7) a. Evk. (Bulatova and Grenoble 1999: 42)

*soŋo-kson      ə-kəl      o:-ra*  
 cry-PRETENSE NEG-IMP.SG do-NEG.CVB  
 ‘Don’t pretend to cry!’

b. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, GIK\_kamushek: 39)

*tadu    e:la-məj                      ulə-či              o:-pla-wa                      e:kun-ma=da*  
 there to.light-SS.COND.PL meat-PROPR make-PASS.PTCP-ACC what-ACC=PTCL  
*ə-si-l                      dʒəgdə-je*  
 NEG-NFUT-PL burn-NEG.CVB

‘When they burn [the food] there, they do not burn that which is made with meat...’

Coordination and subordination are to a large extent expressed with converbs. All Northern Tungusic languages distinguish between converbs that occur with coreferential main clause subjects (same-subject, SS), with non-coreferential main clause subjects (different subject, DS), or with both (variable subject, VS). The DS and VS converbs take possessive suffixes to reference the subject of the subordinate clause; when the subordinate and main clause subjects

are coreferential, subject agreement on VS converbs is achieved with reflexive possessive suffixes. However, some converbs that are formally SS and do not take any subject agreement markers are syntactically VS, occurring both with coreferential and non-coreferential main clause subjects; one of these is the terminative converb *-kAn* in Even (8a). In addition, all languages have a cognate negative converb suffix that attaches to the lexical verb in negative constructions (see above). Even has a further negative modal suffix that occurs with the negative modal auxiliaries *turku-* ‘not be able’ and *ba:-* ‘not want’ (8b).

(8) a. Lam. (AXK\_svatovstvo\_099)

*ńoltin tɔ:r urekčen čawda-la-n gobo:-ken*  
 sun that[EMPH] hill back.part-LOC-POSS.3SG disappear-SS.TERM  
*hokon-gere-če-l*  
 jump-HAB-PST.PTCP-PL

‘They jumped until the sun disappeared behind thaaaaaaaat hill over there.’

b. Bys. (EIA\_kino\_012)

*noŋan turku-t-te-n taŋ-ŋa*  
 3SG not.be.able-TAM2-NFUT-3SG read-NMDL

‘He wasn't able to read.’

Interestingly, although the SS anterior converb is frequently used (at least in Even and Negidal), all three languages have separate forms for this (Table 18.15). In Even, the SS simultaneous converb *-nikAn* and the SS anterior converb *-ridʒi* agree with their subject in number. The SS conditional converb *-mi* (which in Negidal has a plural variant *-mAj*) is in complementary distribution with the DS conditional converb *-RAk/-rV:k* in Even and Evenki. In Negidal, there is a distinction between the DS present conditional *-jA-ki* and past

conditional *-čA-ki*, forms that can be analysed as consisting of the non-future and past suffixes, respectively, plus a conditional marker. This might reflect the retention of a distinction previously also found in Evenki (I. Nedjalkov 1995: 446). The VS terminal converb *-dVIV* found in Negidal and Evenki is cognate with the Even negative terminal converb *-dle*; however, while the former occurs with both affirmative verbs (9a) and the negative auxiliary *e-*, the latter occurs only with the negative auxiliary (9b).

(9) a. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, DIN\_starik\_staruha: 43)

*hugla-kal ñaka o:-dala-j*

lie-IMP.SG better become-VS.TERM-PRFL.SG

‘... lie until you get better.’

b. Bys. (RME\_Tvajjan\_005)

*tital bu tadu bi-si-wun e-dle-ten mun-u*

long.ago 1PL.EXCL there be-PST-1PL.EXCL NEG-VS.TERM-3PL 1PL.EXCL.OBL-ACC

*ewe-ski em-u-wken*

this-ADV.ALL come-VAL-CAUS[NEG.CVB]

‘It is long ago that we were (lived) there, until they sent us here.’

Table 18.15 Converbs in the Northern Tungusic languages (excluding unproductive forms and those that are restricted to individual dialects)

		EVEN	NEGIDAL	EVENKI
SS	TERMINATIVE	<i>-kAn</i>		
	SIMULTANEOUS1	<i>-nikAn/-nikAr ~ -nikAhAl</i>	<i>-nAkAn</i>	<i>-nV</i>
	SIMULTANEOUS2	<i>-mnin</i>	<i>-mnen</i>	<i>-mnVk</i>

	ANTERIOR	<i>-riɖʒi/-riɖʒur</i>	<i>-jA:n</i>	<i>-ksV:</i>
	IMMEDIATE PRECEDENCE			<i>-mme:n/-mnen</i>
	CONDITIONAL	<i>-mi</i>	<i>-mi/-mAj</i>	<i>-mi</i>
DS	CONDITIONAL	<i>-RAk</i>	<i>-jA-ki</i>	<i>-rV:k</i>
			<i>-čA-ki</i>	
VS	PURPOSE	<i>-dA</i>	<i>-dA</i>	<i>-dA</i>
	SIMULTANEOUS	<i>(-ŋsi)</i>	<i>-ŋAsA</i>	<i>-ŋVsi</i>
	NEGATIVE TERMINATIVE	<i>-dle</i>		
	TERMINATIVE		<i>-dAlA</i>	<i>-dVlV</i>
	LIMITATIVE		<i>-knAn</i>	<i>-knV(n)</i>
	BOUNDS			<i>-ɖʒVli</i>
NEG	NEGATIVE	<i>-R(A)</i>	<i>-jA</i>	<i>-RA</i>
	NEGATIVE MODAL	<i>-ŋA</i>		

#### 18.4.6 Derivational morphology

##### 18.4.6.1 Verb > Verb

All three languages have several valency-changing suffixes that are largely cognate (Table 18.16): a labial *-w/-u/-b/-p* that has various detransitivizing functions (split up in the table), deriving intransitive verbs or middle voice from transitive verbs as well as deriving an adversative passive; a homonymous or polysemous labial *-w/-u* that derives transitives from intransitives; a causative *-wkAn* (which is arguably derived from the transitivizing suffix via reinforcement with the emphatic diminutive suffix *-kAn*); a reciprocal *-mAt*; and a sociative *-ldV*. This latter, however, is barely productive anymore, occurring mainly in the form *bakalda* ‘to meet’ < *bak-* ‘find’. In addition, the resultative morpheme *-čA* in Evenki and Negidal (see Table 18.12) can have an anticausative function (cf. V. Nedjalkov 2001).

Table 18.16 Valency-changing morphology in the Northern Tungusic languages (forms in square brackets are restricted to a limited number of verbs)

	EVEN	NEGIDAL	EVENKI
(DE)TRANSITIVIZING	-w/-u	-w	-w/-mu
ADVERS.-PASSIVE	-w/u	[-w]	[-w/-mu]
MEDIO-PASSIVE	-p/-b	-p	-p/-w
CAUSATIVE	-wkAn/-ukAn	-wkAn	-wkAn
RECIPROCAL	-mAt	-mAt	-mAt
[SOCIAITIVE]	[-(A)ldA]	[-ldi]	-ldi
[ANTI-CAUSATIVE]		[-dgA]	[-rgA]

While the adversative-passive can occur with any verb in Even (10a), in Evenki and Negidal it is restricted to a few intransitive environment verbs (I. Nedjalkov 1997: 220–222; 10b-c).

(10) a. Lam. (AEK\_childhood\_091)

*təbər go:n-teken emie tore-w-gere-re-m tar ahi-du*  
 this say-SS.MULT also.Y speak-ADVRS-HAB-NFUT-1SG that woman-DAT  
 ‘...and again that woman would scold me/says bad things at me.’

b. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, GIK\_kljukva: 45)

*noŋan dʒali-n bit dəlbə-w-ča-lti*  
 3SG because.of-3SG 1PL.INCL fall(night)-ADVRS-PST-1PL.INCL  
 ‘[She slept for a long time], because of her we were caught by the night.’

c. Evk. (I. Nedjalkov 1997: 221)

*bi udun-mu-m*  
 1SG rain-ADVRS[NFUT]-1SG  
 ‘I got soaked.’ (lit. I was rained)

Like other Tungusic languages (cf. Stojnova 2016, 2017), the Northern Tungusic languages have an associated motion suffix *-nA* that expresses mainly andative meanings, but can have venitive readings as well. This adds a directional argument to the argument structure:

(11) Bys. (NIG\_legend\_Alneĵ\_062)

*nan gasĉi-na-ri-n            akan-taki-n            ašatka-m*  
 and ask.for-AM-PST-3SG    father-ALL-POSS.3SG    girl-ACC

‘And he went to the girl's father to ask for her (hand in marriage).’

The desiderative suffix *-m(u)*, which derives verbs with a meaning ‘want to do’ is cognate in all three languages, while the conative ‘try to do’ is expressed by different suffixes: *-sĉi* in Even, *-tĉA* in Negidal, and *-ksA/-ssA* in Evenki.

In Negidal there is a frequently used refractive marked by *-dgi/-gi* which has a meaning of ‘do again’ (12). This is basically absent in Even and Evenki, whereas highly productive cognate suffixes are found in Nanai (Avrorin 1961: 54–57) and Udihe (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 317–319).

(12) Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, TIN\_Jelinjeksaia\_Kusunkulmaji: 33)

*taj hona:t ŋa:lə-l-la-n            tukti-dgi-je-n*  
 that girl    to.fear-INCH-NFUT-3SG    ascend-REP-NFUT-3SG

‘That girl got a fright and climbed back up (to the settlement).’

18.4.6.2 Verb > Noun and Noun > Verb

All Northern Tungusic languages have a large number of nominalizers and verbalizers with fine-grained meanings (and limited productivity), such as the nominalizer *-lan* ‘someone who is good at V-ing’, e.g. Evn. *haŋa-lan* ‘master at sewing’, *ma:-lan* ‘good hunter’ (< *ma:-* ‘kill’), or Evk. *ikə:-lə:n* ‘master singer’ (Bulatova and Grenoble 1999: 16), or the verbalizer *-li* ‘fetch N’, e.g. Neg. *mu:-li-* ‘fetch water’, *təw-li-* ‘pick berries’. In Lamunkhin Even, the verbalizer *-la* has increased its frequency and become a generalized verbalizer, probably under Sakha influence.

#### 18.4.6.3 Noun > Noun

As is common for Tungusic, the “alienable possession” suffix *-ŋi* is found in all three languages. However, rather than being a marker merely of alienable possession, this has a wide range of meanings, highlighting the relationship between two entities (cf. Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001: 135–141), see (13).

(13) Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, TIN\_3lesson: 13)

*taj gie ineŋi-du ŋan baka-ldi-ja-n taj bajan bəjə-ŋ-ŋə-n*  
 that other day-DAT also find-SOC-NFUT-3SG that rich person-ALN-ACC-POSS.3SG  
 ‘The next day he again met that [aforementioned] rich person.’

The proprietive suffix is *-lkan* in Even and *-či* in Negidal and Evenki; it is particularly frequent in Lamunkhin Even. It can be used both attributively (14a) and predicatively (14b).

(14) a. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, GIK\_sobaka: 33)

*osa-l dʒeli-či-l otika:-səl*  
 bad-PL thought.EVK-PROPR-PL old.man-PL.HUM

‘old people with bad souls’

b. Lam. (IVK\_ memories\_141)

*amm-u egɟzen=ɲun nuŋa-lkan*

father-1SG big=RESTR gun-PROPR

‘My father had only a big gun.’

Lastly, Even stands out in having a system of (in)definiteness marking with evaluative suffixes (Pakendorf and Krivoschapkina 2014) that is not found in the other Northern Tungusic languages. The Lamunxhin dialect in particular has a very elaborate system of evaluatives, found with both nouns and verbs (Pakendorf 2017).

## 18.5 Syntax

### 18.5.1 The clause

Word order tends to be verb-final in the Northern Tungusic languages, although with variation based on discourse factors and some dialectal differences (e.g. it is freer in Bystraja Even and more consistently SOV in Lamunxhin Even). ‘Being’ is expressed with the inflected auxiliary *bi-* ‘be’. The means of expressing predicative possession (‘having’) are quite varied: in Lamunxhin Even, this is achieved with the proprietive suffix *-lkan* (15a), while in Bystraja Even this is achieved with possessed nouns and optional copula (15b). In Negidal and Evenki, constructions with a dative-marked possessor and the copula *bi-* are the most common means of expressing ‘having’ (15c).

(15) a. Lam. (KKK\_dve\_skazki\_010)

*ɟʒo:r omɔlgo-lkan bi-če*

two boy-PROPR be-PST.PTCP

‘He had two sons.’

- b. Bys. (GIK\_life\_Anavgaj\_181)

*mura-l-bu*            *bi-n-ni*

horse-PL-POSS.1SG be-NFUT-3SG

‘I have horses.’

- c. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, DIN\_babushkin\_son: 28)

*taj*   *bajə-l-du*            *hute-tin*                    *bi-ča-n*

that person-PL-DAT offspring-POSS.3PL be-PST-3SG

‘Those people had a child.’

Predicative negation of having is expressed with the lacking object carrying a possessive marker to index the person who lacks and the negative particle *ačča* (Even; 16a) or *a:čin* (Negidal). Adverbial negation of having is expressed with *ač* followed by the privative-marked lacking object in Even (16b), and with *a:čin* preceded by the lacking object carrying the indefinite accusative case in Negidal (16c).

- (16) a. Lam. (RDA\_stado\_then\_now\_090)

*oja-s*                    *ačča*

clothes-POSS.2SG NEG

‘You don’t have clothes.’

- b. Bys. (SPA\_life\_071)

*ijul-dule*    *kobalan*   *unet*   *ač*    *imse-le*    *girka-wa:či-d-đo:t-ta-n*

July.R-LOC bear       still NEG fat-PRV walk-GNR-PROG-GNR-NFUT-3SG

‘In July bears still go without fat.’

- c. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, DIN\_rite: 13)

*mu:-ja*                      *a:č̣in* *bi-si-ki-s*  
 water-INDEF.ACC NEG be-NFUT-COND-2SG

‘If you are without water...’

Yes/no and alternative questions are marked with the enclitic particle =*gu* attaching to the predicate (17a). However, in Even yes/no questions are marked mostly by intonation, with no further formal expression of their status (17b). In Negidal, the enclitic particle =*do*, which appears to be ultimately copied from the Sakha question enclitic =*duo*, is used more frequently than =*gu* to mark questions (17c).

(17) a. Lam. (beseda\_NPA\_1707)

*hup*    *hulaña-w*    *tet-č̣i-nni=gu*  
 REDUP red-ACC put.on-FUT-2SG=Q

‘Will you put on (something) very red?’

b. Bys. (SPA\_life\_064)

*bongga-w*                      *a:-nni*  
 mountain.sheep-ACC know[NFUT]-2SG

‘Do you know (the word) "bongga"?’

c. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, GIK\_shuka: 80)

*a*        *č̣to*        *gun-ə-n*        *ə-č̣ə*        *gəla:-ja=do*  
 and.R what.R say-NFUT-3SG NEG-PST ask-NEG.CVB=Q.Y

‘«And what», she says, «she didn't ask?»’

## 18.5.2 The nominal group

The case functions are generally comparable across the three languages. However, there are some notable differences, too: in Negidal and Evenki, indefinite direct objects can be marked with the indefinite accusative case (18a), although the “definite accusative” case is the default and can be used with non-specific indefinite direct objects as well (18b).

(18) a. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, DIN\_shop: 4)

*vladimir seměnyč hoda-kal min-du suksə-jə*

vladimir semenovich sell-IMP.SG 1SG-DAT shoe.lace-INDEF.ACC

‘Vladimir Semjonych, sell me (some) shoe laces.’

b. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, GIK\_shuka: 77)

*bi gun-ča-w na:ndun jemelja-gačín gəla:-kəl e:kun-ma=wal taj*

1SG say-PST-1SG 3SG.DAT jemelja-SML ask-IMP.SG what-ACC=INDEF that

*ola-duki-n*

fish-ABL-POSS.3SG

‘I told her «Ask the fish for something like Emelja did».’

The indefinite accusative is also used to mark a direct object destined for a beneficiary, and it functions as a privative (see 16c above). In Even, in contrast, no indefinite accusative exists, and direct objects intended for a beneficiary are marked with the dedicated destinative case. The locative in Negidal and Evenki does not express stative location anymore, in contrast to the Even locative, which expresses both stative location and goals. There is some variation in the marking of addressees of speech verbs, which can be expressed by the dative or the allative.

While in all three languages possessed nouns agree in person and number with the possessor, there is variation in the degree of agreement between modifiers and head nouns. In

Lamunkhin Even and Negidal, modifiers do not agree with their head noun in either case or number (19a), while in standard Evenki and Bystraĵa Even they do agree (19b). However, “in most [Evenki] dialects, adjectives agree in number only, and do not show case agreement” (Bulatova and Grenoble 1999: 57).

(19) a. Lam. (S\_AgreementBook05, elicited with video stimulus)

*ńari dʒo:r kniga-duk hulańa kniga-w ga-riĉĵi bo:-d-ni*  
 man two book.R-ABL red book.R-ACC take-SS.ANT give-NFUT-3SG  
 ‘Having taken the red book from the two books, the boy gave [it].’

b. Evk. (I. Nedjalkov 1997: 277)

*mit aja-l-du omakta-l-du dʒu-l-du bi-dʒe-re-t*  
 1PL good-PL-DAT new-PL-DAT house-PL-DAT be-IPFV-NFUT-1PL.INCL  
 ‘We live in good new houses.’

Number agreement after numerals is obligatory in Evenki (20a), variable in Lamunkhin Even and Negidal, and appears to be restricted to animate nouns in Bystraĵa Even (20b, c). In Even and Evenki, predicates take plural subject agreement when the subject carries the associative plural marker (20d).

(20) a. Evk. (Bulatova and Grenoble 1999: 57)

*tunĵa-wa omo:lgi-l-wa*  
 five-ACC boy-PL-ACC  
 ‘five boys’

b. Bys. (NAT\_vojna\_040)

*digen toren-ni bi-si-n tore-dʒe:n-ńo:t-te-n ereger*

four word-POSS.3SG be-PST-3SG speak-DUR-GNR-NFUT-3SG always

‘He had four words, and he always spoke them.’

c. Bys. (PMB\_pear\_story16)

*tabačisi tarkanunda ŋan ilan ŋari-l girka-ča-l*

then at.this.time again three boy-PL walk-PST.PTCP-PL

‘At this time three boys walked past the man ...’

d. Lam. (IVK\_memories\_070)

*Anatolij-ja emie tarakam bi-hi-tnen*

Anatolij-ASSOC also.Y in.those.days be-PST-3PL

‘Anatolij and his family were there too, ...’

### 18.5.3 The verbal group

In all three languages, verbs agree in number and person with their subjects. However, in Lamunxhin Even and Negidal there is variation in plural agreement of verbs when the subject is an NP containing a numeral: the verb agrees with plural-marked nouns (20c above), but not with singular nouns (20b above).

The overt agent of passive constructions carries dative case-marking (21), and there is variation between dative and accusative to mark the overt causee of transitive-derived causatives (22a, b). Verbs derived with the reciprocal suffix express true reciprocal functions, i.e. an action that two agents perform upon each other (23).

(21) Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, DIN\_Emeksikan: 380)

*sagdin-mi alat-mi məjga-ji bi-džiŋa-n*

grandmother-POSS.1SG wait-SS.COND think-PRS.PTCP be-FUT1-3SG

*taj=ti amban-du dʒepu-w-ča bi-dʒa-n gun-ə-n*

that=PTCL devil-DAT eat-VAL-PST.PTCP be-FUT2-3SG say-NFUT-3SG

‘«My grandmother is probably waiting and thinking “he has probably been eaten by the devil”», he said.’

(22) a. Bys. (EIA\_first\_tractor\_029)

*ia-du nan ere-w mut-u o:-č-ukan-i-tan nan taklawam*  
what-DAT and this-ACC 1PL.INCL-ACC make-TAM2-CAUS-PST-3PL and bridge-ACC  
‘Why did they make us build a bridge...?’

b. Lam. (AEK\_childhood\_093)

*me:n irbe:ti-ŋ-i min-du tet-uke-ŋne-n tar ahi*  
self old-ALN-PRFL.SG 1SG.OBL-DAT wear-CAUS-HAB[NFUT]-3SG that woman  
‘... she made me wear her old rags, that woman.’

(23) Bys. (NIG\_chimakchar\_195)

*ńan ulu-t-meči-le-d-de=ši*  
and chase-TAM2-RECP-INCH-PROG-NFUT[3PL]=PTCL  
‘And they started to chase each other.’

None of the three Northern Tungusic languages makes a politeness distinction.

#### 18.5.4 Complex sentences

##### 18.5.4.1 Coordination

In Even and Evenki, coordination of constituents and clauses is expressed by the enclitic particle =*dA* (24a); in Even, the particle *ńan* ‘also, again’ is also commonly used (24b). In Negidal, coordination is not overtly marked, but is expressed by mere juxtaposition (24c).

Furthermore, in the corpus of spontaneous oral Negidal narratives the Russian conjunctions *i* ‘and’ and *a* ‘and, but’ are frequently used.

(24) a. Lam. (AXK\_Sebjan\_history\_1\_027)

*ibgat tugini-w čilda-da:r irildu=de ibgat*

well winter-ACC survive-VS.PURP.PRFL.PL summer=PTCL well

*čilda-da:r*

survive-VS.PURP.PRFL.PL

‘...so that we will live through the winter well, and so that we will live through the summer well ...’

b. Bys. (SPA\_life\_046)

*čak-ri-wu bumaga-l-bi nan ewe-ski em-ni-wu klub-le*

gather-PST-1SG paper.R-PL-PRFL.SG and this-ADV.ALL come-PST-1SG club.R-LOC

‘I gathered my papers and came here, to the club.’

c. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, DIN\_lost\_boy: 15)

*gəla:ktə-l-la gun-ə*

look.for-INCH-NFUT[3PL] say-NFUT[3PL]

‘They start to search [and] say...’

#### 18.5.4.2 Subordination

As is common for the so-called “Altaic” languages, subordination in the Northern Tungusic languages is achieved with non-finite predicates. The predicates of complement clauses are expressed by accusative-marked participles. Temporal adverbial clauses are expressed with the temporal-conditional converbs or with locative-marked past participles (25). Note that the

latter is analysed as a converb of anteriority by Bulatova and Grenoble (1999: 45) and I. Nedjalkov (1995: 448).

(25) Lam. (ZAS\_naled\_065)

*dʒe bačikar ɲe:ri-l-če-le-n dʒe*  
PTCL.Y morning become.bright-INCH-PST.PTCP-LOC-POSS.3SG PTCL.Y  
*here-hn-e-p*  
go-TAM1-NFUT-1PL  
‘Well in the morning when it became light we left.’

Relative clauses in the Northern Tungusic languages belong to the type called ‘participle-marked’ in Pakendorf (2012). The predicate of subject relative clauses agrees in case and number with the head noun; in non-subject relative clauses the subject of the relative clause is generally cross-referenced on the participle via possessive suffixes. Lamunkhin Even constitutes an exception to both patterns, possibly due to Sakha influence. In Negidal, there is a strong tendency for a formal distinction between past tense subject and non-subject relative clauses: in the former, the past participle *-ča* is used with overwhelming frequency (26a), while in the latter, the participle *-čaki* (glossed as “remote past participle”) is mostly used (26b).

(26) a. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, GIK\_zhanna: 45)

*keka: bujun əmə-ča-wa-n gun-ə-n*  
COUNTEREXPECTATION elk come-PST.PTCP-ACC-3SG say-NFUT-3SG  
*ɲa:lə-li-wkan-ə-sun*  
to.fear-INCH-CAUS-NFUT-2PL

‘Why did you frighten off the elk that came!’

b. Neg. (Pakendorf and Aralova 2017, DIN\_podja: 5)

*əmən bəjə dʒawa-ja-n e:ma=ka dʒepkit-wa ɲənə-w-čaki-j*  
one person take-NFUT-3SG which=PTCL food-ACC go-VAL-REM.PTCP-PRFL.SG  
*togo-du podʒa-du bu:-ja-n*  
fire-DAT podja-DAT give-NFUT-3SG

‘...one man took some food that he had brought and gave it to the fire, to the spirit of the fire (podja).’

## 18.6 Lexicon

The Northern Tungusic languages share a large proportion of cognate vocabulary: for instance, Whaley et al. (1999: 298) estimate 95% cognate vocabulary between Evenki and Negidal in a basic 200-word list. Even, however, shares less cognates with Evenki and Negidal than these two share with each other. Nevertheless, there can be substantial differences even between dialects of one language, such as the words *eken* and *akan*, which in western Even dialects refer to ‘older sister’ and ‘older brother’, respectively, but in Bystraja Even have a meaning of ‘mother’ and ‘father’ (*eñin* and *aman* in Lamunkhin Even and other Northern Tungusic languages).

All the languages have copied vocabulary from Russian, especially terms referring to a modern life-style. In addition, individual lects have copied vocabulary from neighboring languages. Lamunkhin Even, for instance, has copied numerous items from Sakha. Interestingly, there are numerous words of ultimately Sakha origin in Negidal, such as *aka:ri* ‘stupid’, *awahi* ‘devil’, *emiske* ‘suddenly’, *ñirejkan* ‘baby’, or *tudgən* ‘fast’. Most of these are likely to have entered Negidal via Evenki dialects that adopted them from Sakha.

---

<sup>1</sup> Natalia Aralova compiled information on phonology and on numerals and wrote the section on phonology, while Brigitte Pakendorf compiled the remaining information and wrote all the other sections of the chapter.

<sup>2</sup> We are grateful to the Max Planck Society, the Volkswagen Foundation, and the Endangered Languages Documentation Programme (ELDP) for funding our work, and to all the Even and Negidal individuals who contributed to our research. We are furthermore grateful to the LABEX ASLAN (ANR-10-LABX-0081) of Université de Lyon for its financial support within the program "Investissements d'Avenir" (ANR-11-IDEX-0007) of the French government operated by the National Research Agency (ANR).

<sup>3</sup> Note that some classifications distinguish between a Northeastern group (comprising Even and extinct Arman) and a Northwestern group (comprising Evenki, Negidal, Solon, Oroqen, and even Orok; cf. Li and Whaley 2009: 525).

<sup>4</sup> In this section, we use IPA symbols for transcription, but in the rest of the chapter we use the transcription accepted in this volume, resulting in the following differences: β~w, tɛ~č, ʃ~dʒ, ɲ~ń, ɵ~o and Lam. o~o, iê~ie and iâ~ia.

<sup>5</sup> Note the table includes long vowels, which are not specified in Aralova (2015: 205).

<sup>6</sup> Novikova (1960) uses only the symbol <æ> to denote to this diphthongoid vowel, but in her description of this sound she specifies an i-element in the beginning and a slight pharyngealization which is reflected in our notation.

<sup>9</sup> Note that in the font chosen for the volume, italicized <a> is indistinguishable from <ɑ>

<sup>11</sup> There is variation in the Negidal oral data in the form for '20', with one speaker pronouncing it [ʃurʃan] and another [ju:lʃan].

<sup>12</sup> Or several aspects are marked with homonymous suffixes, depending on one's analysis.

---

<sup>13</sup> Note that the form *-kwun* is that shown in Bulatova and Grenoble (1999: 36), whereas *-kta-wun* is the form given by I. Nedjalkov (1997: 262).