Siegl F.

THE STRUCTURE OF NOUN PHRASES WITH REFERENTIAL PX.2P IN NORTHERN SAMOYEDIC

A characteristic feature of Northern Samoyedic is the referential, non-possessive use of second person possessive suffixes (further PX.2P) as a means of encoding topics. Although the importance of this feature for information structure is relatively well understood, the interaction of information structure with syntax has not received sufficient attention in prior research; the central aim of this study is to shed light on the structure of the noun phrase that hosts the referential PX. The investigation is a qualitative follow-up study of a prior investigation on the function and use of the PX.2P in the indigenous languages of the Taimyr Peninsula (Siegl in print). As the data of this study demonstrates, Northern Samoyedic languages display uniform structural behavior in their morphosyntactic realization of PX.2P marked noun phrases, in both verbal and non-verbal predication. Furthermore, topic marking in two languages of the same area, Dolgan and Taimyr Pidgin Russian, will be briefly examined too.

Key words: *Northern Samoyedic languages, Dolgan, Taimyr Pidgin Russian, definiteness, possessive suffixes, information structure, noun phrase.*

1. Introduction – PX and definiteness in Northern Samoyedic

Several languages within the Uralic language family are known to use second person possessive suffixes both possessively and referentially. This feature unites several Finno-Ugric languages such as Komi (Schlachter, 1960; Leinonen, 2006), Udmurt (Winkler, 2011: 66), and Northern Khanty (Nikolaeva, 1999: 84) with the Northern Samoyedic languages Tundra Nenets (TN), Forest Nenets (FN), Tundra Enets (TE), Forest Enets (FE) and Nganasan (Ng). Descriptions of varying degrees of sophistication exist for Tundra Nenets (e.g., Körtvély, 2010), Forest Enets (e.g., Siegl, 2013: 371ff) and Nganasan (e.g., Katzschmann, 2008: 379). The same feature is also readily observable in Tundra Enets and Forest Nenets, for which studies are missing so far[1].

The double function of the PX.2P (possession versus referentiality) is intriguing, as it demonstrates that certain pragmatic concepts in the field of given/new information can be marked grammatically in Northern Samoyedic[2]. Although this feature has occasionally been compared to the functions of definite articles (particularly in the older research), this interpretation needs to be discarded for a variety of reasons. First, the PX.2P is not a default means of expressing referentiality and definiteness, and it continues to be used as a marker of possession on the phrase level. This is evident in the following example from Forest Enets [uu] koru-r <[2sg] knife-px.2sg> 'your knife'. This clear form-to-function mismatch is without a doubt the most powerful argument against an interpretation that favors definiteness. Whereas the possessive function operates on the clause and sentence levels, and occasionally on a level higher than the sentence (for a detailed discussion see Siegl in print), the non-possessive anaphoric function as a means of reference tracking is bound to the level higher than the sentence. If a speaker of Forest Enets wishes to refer to a knife that has been previously mentioned in discourse, and which needs to be reactivated, (s)he he has to mark the lexical noun with a PX.2P as korur 'the knife which was talked about'.

Whereas this anaphoric behavior of possessive suffixes to single out and reintroduce an entity or a person salient in discourse is similar to the function of articles, this is nevertheless only one function of the possessive suffix. Moreover, definiteness in Northern Samoyedic can also be expressed by other

---

[1] The data on which this study is based comes from a variety of resources mentioned in the appendix. I would like to thank Valentin Gusev, Olesyia Khanina and Anna Urmanchieva for making further examples on Nganasan and Tundra Enets available to me.

[2] Occasionally, the PX.3P can also be used to express referentiality, but its use is severely constrained and clearly less frequent. Preliminary results for Forest Enets show that the functional difference between PX.2P and PX.3P lies in their accessibility. A PX.3P marked noun phrase seems to refer to an entity/person mentioned in a preceding clause. A returning entity/person marked for PX.2P is salient but not necessarily overtly mentioned in a preceding clause. The distribution resembles several arguments which Chafe subsumed under activation cost (Chafe, 1994: 71–81). A detailed investigation of the interaction of PX.2P and PX.3P in Forest Enets is currently in progress.

means, such as by PX.3P or by demonstratives. Instead, the central aim of this study is a comparative qualitative analysis of the structure of the noun phrase with a referential PX.2P. Whereas the referential use of PX.2P seems to exhibit uniform behavior concerning the grammatical encoding of topics in all Northern Samoyedic languages, the question of whether the noun phrase displays similar structural properties in the languages under discussion has not been investigated in detail. As this study is syntactically driven, verbal predication and non-verbal equative predication will be discussed separately, as the non-possessive use of the PX.2P is attested in both types of predication.

2. Definite NPs and verbal predication

When functioning referentially, PX.2P occur either on a simple noun or on a complex noun phrase with a demonstrative. Due to the anaphoric nature of the reference, the PX.2P is sensitive to number, and the number value of PX expresses the number of protagonists or entities that are referred to. The following example is from Forest Enets; similar examples are attested in the other Northern Samoyedic languages:

1) FE a. *mana=jet*   **onai ne-ŕ**   *mana*   *mań*
   say.3SG=EMPH   real   woman-PX.2SG   say.3SG say.ASS.3SG
   'So she said, <u>this Enets women</u> said...' [VNB Witсh]

   b. *eńčiʔ*   **ńiđ**   *kutuiđu*   **ńiđ**   *či*
   people.GEN.PL   child.PX.PL.2SG some   child.PX.PL.2SG   so
   onai bađaan   *nodubiʔ*
   real language.PROL   understand.PERF.3PL
   'The children of the people, some children understood Forest Enets.' [VNB Witch]

2.1. N-PX.2P

The simplest syntactic constellation is a noun phrase that consists of a simple noun and the referential PX added to it. These noun phrases serve as either S or A arguments. This is attested in all Northern Samoyedic languages:

2) a. TN   **манто-р**   *юӈгуммы*
          Tundra.Enets-PX.2SG   die.PERF.3SG
          '<u>The Tundra Enets</u> died.' [ЯЛ 134]

   b. FN   **касама-л**   *нюта*   *хомана*   *дёльше*
          man-PX.2SG   child.PX.ACC.3SG   good.PROL   very
          депсутата   *ӈаймай*
          love.AOR.SG.3SG   PTC
          '<u>The man</u> loved his daughter very much.' [НВШ 54]

   c. FE   **d'eri-r**   *d'abu-uš*   *kańi*
          day-PX.2SG   long-TRSL   go.3SG
          '<u>The days</u> are getting longer.' [LDB & NKB II 67]

   d. TE   **Кезе-ло**   *тэкарабунэдо*   *нэонэдо*
          wild.reindeer-PX.2SG   hide.CON.PX.GEN.2SG   2SG.LAT

          кэрэта   *туза*
          self.PX.GEN.3SG   come.FUT.3SG
          'If you will hide, <u>the reindeer</u> will come to you on its own.' [ЭТ 84:83]

e. Ng ***Сиги"э-рə***   *коблуа*   *диндиси*   *кона"а*
       giant-PX.2SG   girl[ACC]   speak.CON   go.PFT.AOR.3SG
       'Hearing the girl speaking, <u>the giant</u> left.' [НДТ 39:50].

As the examples above illustrate, regarding semantics, the marked noun phrase can be animate and inanimate. For both Forest Enets and Forest Nenets, even referential marked examples with personal names are attested:[3]

3) a. FE   ***Al'iko-r***   *poń*   *bađäđaš...*
           PN-PX.2SG   1SG.LAT   tell.SG.3SG.PST
           'So <u>this Al'ik</u> told me...' [LDB Clairvoyant]

    b. FN   ***Атпашелахакоде-ӆ***   *апыӈэ"*   *кадя*
           PX.DIM-PX.2SG   PTC   die.AOR.3SG
           '<u>Poor little Aptašelaxa</u> died.' [НВШ 55].

2.2. DEM + N-PX.2P

Referential PX can also occur in complex noun phrases that contain a demonstrative that precedes the referentially marked noun serving as either an S or A argument. This demonstrates that demonstrative pronouns and PX.2P can both contribute to the expression of referentiality:

4) a. TN   ***Чикы***   ***мя-ӆ***   *ненадо*   *ӈэрха*
         this   chum-PX.2SG   visible   stand.SIM.3SG
         '<u>This chum</u> seems to be standing in plain view.' [ЯЛ 11].

    b. FN   ***Чики нешадюкоде-ӆ***   *кунпёш минтаханта*
         this   person.DIM-PX.2SG   run.CON go.PTCP.IPF.LOC.GEN.PX.3SG

         пунянанта   *куӆкаӆи"*   *дя"*   *кадёвту".*
         back.GEN.PX.3SG   some.INDEF.PL   earth.PL   remain.R.3PL
         'While <u>this poor man</u> was running, some interesting places remained behind him.' [НВШ 24].

    c. FE   *čiki*   *nääčiku-r*   *ań*   *pađir?*
         this   woman.youngster-PX.2SG   FOC   spotted

         neđi-ku-đa   *tonä-bi*
         reindeer.calf-DIM-PX.3SG   exist-PERF.3SG
         '<u>This girl</u> had her own spotted little reindeer.' [NKB Auka]

    d. TE   *Энчео"*   *мона"*   ***чикэ***   ***тау-ло***
         people.PL   say.3PL   this   Nganasan-PX.2SG

         туна   *ӈу"*   *сира'*   *дябахон*   *иреби*
         still   one   winter.GEN   period.LOC.SG   live.PERF.3SG
         'And the people said, <u>this Nganasan</u> lived for one more winter.' [ЭТ 88: 38]

    e. Ng   *təti*   ***Muŋkaťi-rə*** *kobtuatu*   *təiśüə,*
         that   Munkachi-PX.2SG   girl.PX.3SG   have.PST.3SG

---

[3] Whether or not this is also possible in the other Northern Samoyedic languages needs to be investigated in the future.

ńerbiaᵔkʊ.
little.girl.DIM
'This Enets had a daughter, a little girl.' [Valentin Gusev, p.c.]

Although the following study is qualitative, it is important to mention one quantitative observation. The constellation DEM + N-PX.2P appears to be infrequent in Nganasan. While these constructions are attested even in the limited published data on Tundra Enets, the Nganasan folklore collection *НДТ* does not contain a single example for a complex NP with a referential PX.2P.

3. PX.2P and equative constructions

Apart from verbal predication, PX.2P plays an important role in non-verbal predication of the equative type 'John is a teacher' (Payne, 1997: 111, 114). In typological literature, that type of non-verbal predicate is frequently referred to simply as an identity statement (for example Stassen, 1997: 12–13; 107–120) but I will use equative as suggested by Payne. Equative statements tend to fall into the sphere of non-verbal predication because a relation of predication is absent; instead, two noun phrases that express an identity relation are juxtaposed. Stassen mentions that this special type of non-verbal predication can require an *"overt marking of functions such as topic, focus, or background"* and furthermore, that *"in languages with a unique and separate encoding of identity statements, DISCOURSE-MOTIVATED ELEMENTS such as topic-markers and focus particles are more likely to appear (and are more likely to appear obligatorily) in identity statements than in other sentence types."* (Stassen, 1997: 109). This is precisely what happens in Northern Samoyedic, and the PX.2P marker occupies a central position in this sentence type. Moreover, a necessary component of this construction is a demonstrative that hosts the PX.2P. This referentially marked demonstrative serves as the head of the construction to which the copula complement (Dixon, 2010: 159ff) is equated:

5) FE ***čiki-r*** *meju* *mäʔ*
    this-PX.2SG   new   house
    'This [house] is a new house.'   [ZNB 08.02.06]

Even though the function of PX.2P is referential, it also has a clear syntactic function. As a semantic prerequisite, the equative needs two NPs for an identity statement, but as example (5) shows, only one noun phrase is overtly realized. In example (6) both NPs are realized and consequently the demonstrative does not require a referential PX:

6) FE *čiki* *nä* *mud'* *ää-b'*
    this   woman   1SG   mother-PX.1SG
    'This woman is my mother.' [DSB V 46]

When the first noun phrase remains unexpressed, the demonstrative receives the referential PX.2SG:

7) FE ***čiki-r*** *uu* *äsi-r*
    this-PX.2SG   2SG   father-PX.2SG
    'This [man] is your father.' [NKB Childhood]

As the first noun phrase is the syntactic subject of the construction, to fulfill the subject requirement, the demonstrative needs to be nominalized through the possessive suffix, the only available strategy for nominalization in this construction. The same strategy is required when an adjective is promoted to argument position and has to serve as a subject:

8) a. FE   *ibl'eigu-r* *aga* *kasa-da* *sakra*
        little-PX.2SG   big   child-PX.ACC.3SG   bite.3SG
        'Your little (one) bit the older boy (and not your older one)!' [ZNB IV 54]

b. FE **či̇ki-r**   *meju*   *mäʔ*
   this-PX.2SG   new   house
   'This [house] is a new house.'   [ZNB 08.02.06]

Consequently, this means that this Northern Samoyedic equative construction is syntactically unusual, as only one lexical NP is overtly expressed and the only overtly expressed NP is the entity to which an identity relation is proposed. The pragmatically more salient NP remains syntactically unexpressed due to equi-deletion, but the demonstrative is promoted to subject position via the PX. Again, this construction is attested in all Northern Samoyedic languages:

9) a. TN *Ов,* **чика-р**   *харни*   *хапчеми*
     PTC   this-PX.2SG   driving.reindeer.PX.1SG   NEG.AUX.EMPH.3SG

     нив   *ңа"*
     be_LOC.CN
     'Oh, this [reindeer] is my driving reindeer.' [ЯЛ 16]

  b. FN **чики- лы**   *кахэ*   *хала'ку*
     this-PX.2SG   holy   animal.3SG
     'This [animal] is a holy animal.' [НВШ 26]

  c. FE **či̇ki-r**   *boo*   *kor-sai*   *enči?*
     this-PX.2SG   bad   knife-COM   person
     'Such a one is bad, a person with a knife.' [LDB Shaman]

  d. FE **tʃike-rɔ**   *Ajakɔ-jʔ=nʲiuʔ*
     this-PX.2SG   PN-PX.1SG=EMPH
     'This is my Ajaku.' [Olesya Khanina, p.c.]

  e. Ng **эмти-рə**   *бахя*   *кəрсу*
     this-PX.2SG   bad   thing.3SG
     'This [thing] is a bad thing.' [НДТ 47: 69]

Although the discussion above suggests that the PX.2P would maintain cataphoric reference in equative constructions, this interpretation is incorrect. From a discourse perspective, the entity to which something is equated to is present in discourse and therefore, the relation is anaphoric as it is in verbal predication. This also seems to explain the use of PX.2P in this construction. In Siegl (in print), I have attempted to demonstrate that equative constructions with referential PX.2P neatly fit into the original Prague Theme-Rheme distinction, and this would offer further support for its special role in information structure.

4. Other functions
The examples above exemplify that all Northern Samoyedic languages use the referential PX.2P in simple and complex noun phrases in both verbal and non-verbal predication in the same manner. In spontaneous Forest Enets, the PX.2P marked demonstrative *čikir* can also be found as a type of discourse marker, a placeholder, or in stretches of false starts and disfluencies[4]. In the following example,

---

[4] Anna Urmanchieva (p. c.) has made similar observations in her Tundra Enets data.

the PX-marked demonstrative occurs in the right-periphery as a type of afterthought that is separated from the noun *kebi* 'sin, misbehavior,' by a clear intonation break:

10) FE   *koru-xun*   *d'oktu-š*   *ma-ń*   *kebi*   *čiki-r*
      knife-LOC.SG   cut-CON   say-ASS.3SG   sin   this-PX.2SG
      'One says, cutting with a knife is a sin.' [LDB Taboo]

5. Areal parallels

As the discussion thus far has shown, both the function of PX.2P as well as the structure of the noun phrase match almost completely; this qualitative observation does not imply, however, that differences cannot be observed. As the Nganasan data above suggest, there is good reason to assume this.

Although it is currently unclear as to whether this feature is old, its dominant role concerning the structuring of discourse in all Northern Samoyedic languages is undeniable. A similar function of PX.2P has not been reported for the closest genetic relatives in the West and South, such as Southern Samoyedic, Eastern Khanty and Mansi. As for other genetically related Uralic languages, similar uses are known in some languages from the Finno-Ugric branch, e.g., Northern Khanty, Komi and Udmurt. As these languages are historically and geographically more distant, a historical relationship is thus far solely speculative and this possibility will not be pursued. However, even if this is not a historical feature, it shows some promise looking into the uses of the PX.2P as an areal feature. Although the possessive prefixes in the co-territorial Ket languages seem not to be used referentially (see Werner, 1997: 117–119), Dolgan, a Turkic neighbor of Tundra Enets and Ngansan, does use the PX.2P morpheme referentially. Further, Taimyr Pidgin Russian (Govorka) uses the postpositive Russian *to* abundantly, which has been reported for the Northern Russian dialects spoken in the vicinity of Komi (Leinonen, 1998, 2006).

5.1. Referential PX.2P in Dolgan

In 1998, Marek Stachowski observed that Dolgan has a similar referential use of PX.2P as Nganasan (and Northern Samoyedic) and assumed Nganasan influence (Stachowski, 1998, 2010). In a follow-up study, I have compared the use of the PX.2P in Nganasan and Dolgan to determine whether Dolgan expresses referentiality in a similar manner as its neighboring Northern Samoyedic languages, as well as whether or not the syntactic realization would indicate clear parallels (Siegl in print). In addition, I argued that the Samoyedic influence as postulated by Stachowski should be analyzed as a Nganasan/Tundra Enets substrate in Dolgan. For the present discussion, only the structural parallels are relevant, as this topic has been discussed detailed in Siegl (in print). In verbal predication, the referential PX.2P in Dolgan attaches to both simple and complex noun phrases with a demonstrative:

11) a. Dg   ***Огонньор-уҥ***   *диэбит* […]:
        old.man-PX.2SG   say.PSTII.3SG
        <u>The old man</u> said…' [ДФ 9:196]

    b. Dg   *onton*   ***iti***   ***hir-iŋ***   *honon*   *d'e*   *habıllıbıta*
        then   this   earth-PX.2SG   there   PTC   close.PASS.PSTII.3SG

        hapsiem   *kim*   *de*   *tıppataga*   *ol*   *hirni.*
        completely   who   NEG   near.NEG.PSTII.3SG   that   earth.ACC
        'Then <u>this camp</u> there was closed completely. Nobody came near that place.' [APS
Camp]

As for equative constructions, in contrast to the Northern Samoyedic, Dolgan does not use referential PX.2P. Dolgan renders these types of equative constructions as follows:

12) a. Dg *iti   kihi   min   teete-m*
          this   man   1SG   father-PX.1SG
          'This man is my father.' [AAB II 40]

    b. Dg *iti   min   teete-m*
          this   1SG   father-PX.1SG
          'This is my father.' [AAB II 40]

Finally, in contrast to Samoyedic, Dolgan uses PX.2P on discourse adverbs that express consecutivity 'after X happened Y happened':

13) Dg *emne   egel   d'i   bolnicatan*
        medicine.PART   bring.IMP.2SG PTC   hospital.ABL

        ontuŋ   *d'ogorum*   *d'iete*
        that.PX.2SG   friend.PX.1SG say.PSTI.3SG
        'Bring me some medicine from the hospital! After that, my friend said…' [NSK Boat trip]

What makes the Dolgan case interesting is that the referentiality marking now adheres to two patterns: PX.2P follows the Samoyedic pattern, whereas PX.3P preserves the Turkic pattern (Siegl in print). Furthermore, this feature was transferred successfully across the borders of the language family, which is important for the next discussion, the function of the postpositive particle *to* in Taimyr Pidgin Russian.

5.2. Taimyr Pidgin Russian and the postpositive particle *to*

Having discussed the referential function of PX.2P in Northern Samoyedic and Dolgan, a short note on Govorka or Taimyr Pidgin Russian (further TPR) is in order. This is necessary for at least two reasons. First, TPR was used in an area where PX has been used referentially. Second, TPR has an "abundant" use of the postpositive particle *to* (Stern, 2012: 439ff), a feature which TPR shares with Northern Russian dialects. In his discussion of *to* in TPR, Stern follows Leinonen's (1998) approach and observes that five out of the six functions proposed by Leinonen (1998) can be identified in Govorka: (1) marking remote topics, (2) marking aboutness, (3) tracking, (4) expressing contrasts, (5) forming right dislocation, and (6) the marking of location and inalienable possession (situational definiteness). Stern concluded: "*Damit bietet das TPR ein recht getreues Abbild seines dialektalen Lexifikator*s" (Stern, 2012: 443). This observation poses some problems. Stern assumes that the function *of* to in TPR would follow the use of *to* in the Northern Russian dialects. While Stern emphasized throughout his monograph that TPR was a pidgin and attempted to identify influences from the local languages, Nganasan and Dolgan, he merely equated the use and function of *to* in TPR with the Northern Russian dialects in this section[5]. But this simplified equation is problematic for a number of reasons. First, in contrast to the Northern Russian dialects, TPR was never acquired as an L1 and remained a pidgin throughout its short life. Second, as TPR was never acquired as a native language, one must assume substrate influence from the grammars of the local Taimyrian indigenous language speakers in accordance with the typical stages of pidgin formation (see Siegel, 2008). Third, as North-

---

[5] In Stern's defense, it must, however, be said that the standard grammars and articles he consulted on Nganasan and Dolgan had very little to say on the level beyond the sentence.

ern Samoyedic uses PX.2P referentially, and as this use was introduced into the grammar of the co-territorial Dolgan language, it is difficult to imagine that precisely in this area of the grammar of TPR, an indigenous substrate would be absent. Finally, as standard Russian and its dialectal forms did not play a significant role on the Taimyr Peninsula until the 1940s, and as this role was not evident in the more remote areas until the 1960s, the exposure to a variety of Russian resembling the Northern Russian dialects (Stern's assumed lexifier language) would have affected individuals only, not entire speech communities. All this counter evidence therefore casts serious doubt his assumption of a monogenesis of *to,* which according to Stern would only follow Northern Russian dialectal patterns. Already the short text fragment underlying Stern's analysis of *to* (Stern, 2012: 440ff) suggests that Taimyrian Samoyedic and Dolgan influence is quite likely. Several examples of function (6) [=situational definiteness] are considered problematic by Stern, as they could be analyzed as instances (1) [=marking remote topics] or (2) [=marking aboutness]. As functions (1), (2), (3) [=tracking] and (6) would trigger the use of PX.2P in Taimyrian Samoyedic and Dolgan, its degree of "problematicity" certainly decreases immediately. However, a more detailed analysis is required to determine whether it would be possible to single out clear Taimyrian Samoyedic/Dolgan instances of use. Nonetheless, already this small text fragment demonstrates that there is good reason to assume a dedicated functional overlap between Samoyedic/Dolgan PX.2P on the one side, and Northern Russian *to* on the other. While in Samoyedic and Dolgan, PX.2P can be attached to nouns, adjectives and demonstratives, *to* can not only be added to the same POS, but also to verbs, numerals, or to pro-adverbs in both TPR as well as in the aforementioned Northern Russian dialects. Whereas Stern's short text fragment contains 13 instances of *to*, only 4 of them have an unanimous Northern Russian background (*ку-шать-то, два-то, такой-то, почему-то*). For the vast majority, 9/13 (such as *парень-то*), there are potential Northern Samoyedic/Dolgan parallels to distinguish from the potential Northern Russian competitor.

6. Conclusions

The data concerning the structure of the noun phrase with referential PX.2P revealed that Northern Samoyedic languages display structural uniformity in its syntactic realization. In verbal predication, the structure of the noun phrase is either N-PX.2P or DEM + N-PX.2P. In non-verbal predication, the structure of equative constructions is DEM-PX.2P + NP. Although the data for this study was extracted qualitatively from existing sources (Forest Enets being an exception in that I can rely on my own digital materials), several frequency trends could already be observed. For example, evidence for the constellation DEM + N-PX.2P was readily observed for all languages, but not for Nganasan. In contrast, the existing data on Tundra Enets did not contain a single example of the non-verbal equative construction DEM-PX.2P. Of course, such trends would require quantitative investigations for testing, but due to the absence of larger electronic corpora of spoken Northern Samoyedic languages, this remains a desideratum for the time being. Regarding the analysis of definiteness in Northern Samoyedic, the current study demonstrates that the structure of noun phrases with referential PX.2P allows the further addition of a demonstrative. When comparing the structure of these noun phrases with referential noun phrases that host a PX.3P, a major difference emerges. In the annotated Forest Enets corpus data underlying Siegl (2013), there is not a single example of a referential NP consisting of the structure DEM + N-PX.3P. Moreover, the analysis of several dozen pages folklore texts in other Northern Samoyedic languages likewise did not reveal this construction. While referentiality can be encoded by PX.2P and PX.3P, the complex referential NP of the type DEM + N-PX are currently attested for PX.2P only. This demonstrates again that PX.2P occupies a distinct position for the encoding of topics in the information structure of Northern Samoyedic. Moreover, this offers further evidence that the conceptual differences in pragmatics rely on different syntactic realizations.

Glossing

e.g. -3SG	verbal ending subject conjugation (Samoyedic)
e.g. -SG.3SG	verbal ending objective conjugation (Samoyedic)
e.g. -R.3SG	verbal ending reflexive conjugation (Samoyedic)
e.g. [ACC]	covert case
=EMPH	emphatic clitic
PX	possessive suffix nominative series
PX.GEN	possessive suffix genitive series
PX.ACC	possessive suffix accusative series
ASS	assertative mood
PROL	prolative
PERF	perfect
AOR	aorist
PTC	particles
TRSL	essive-translative
CON	converb
FUT	future
PFT	perfective
SIM	similative
DIM	diminutive
PTCP.IPF	imperfective participle
INDEF	indefinite pronouns
FOC	focus particle
PST	past tense
NEG.AUX.EMPH	emphatic negative auxiliary
CN	connegative
PSTI	first past (Dolgan)
PSTII	second past (Dolgan)
PASS	passive voice
NEG	negative particle (Dolgan)
PART	partitive case
IMP	imperative
ABL	ablative case

Primary data

<u>Tundra Nenets</u>
[ЯЛ] = Labanauskas 2001 = Лабанаускас К. И. (ed). *Ямидхы" лаханаку" – Сказкы седной ста-рины*. М.: Русская литература (reference to page number only)

<u>Forest Nenets</u>
[НВШ] = Турутина П. Г. 2003. *Нешаӈ ванӆат шотпяӆс"*. Новосибирск: Новосибирский госу-дарственный университет (reference to page number only)

<u>Tundra Enets</u>
[ЭТ] = Sorokina & Bolina 2005 = Сорокина И. П., Болина Д. С. *Энецкие тексты*. Инсти-тут лингвистических исследований. Российская академия наук. СПб.: Наука. (reference: text, line)

Forest Enets
e.g. [LDB & NKB II 67], reference to material from elicitation
e.g. [NKB Auka], reference to transcribed and annotated narrative

Nganasan
[НДТ] = Labanauskas 2001 (ed). = Лабанаускас К. И. *Ня" дүрымы" туобтугуйся*. Фольклор народов Таймыра 6. Дудинка (reference: text, page)

Dolgan
e.g. [AAB II 40], reference to material from elicitation
e.g. [APS Camp], reference to transcribed and annotated narrative
[ДФ] = Емельянов Н. В. (ed). 2000. *Фольклор Долган*. Памятники фольклора Сибири и Дальнего Востока 19. Новосибирск: Наука (reference: text, page)

References

Chafe, Wallace. 1994. *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dixon, R. M. W. 2010. *Basic Linguistic Theory Volume II.* Oxford: OUP.

Katzschmann, Michael 2008. *Chrestomathia Nganasanica.* Norderstedt: Books on Demand GMBH.

Körtvély Erika. 2010. On the Function of Possessive Suffixes in Tundra Nenets: Possession and Semantic-Pragmatic Definiteness. *Finnische-Ugrische Mitteilungen 32/33.* 321–343.

Leinonen, Marja. 1998. The postpositive particle *-to* of Northern Russian dialects, compared with Permic languages (Komi Zyryan). *Studia Slavica Finlandensia 15.* 74–90.

Leinonen, Marja. 2006. Omistussuhteen ulokkeita: komin possessiivisuffiksin ei-possessiivisista funktioista. *JSFOu* 91. 93–114.

Nikolaeva, Irina. 1999. *Ostyak.* Languages of the World Materials 305. Munich: Lincom.

Payne, Thomas E. 1997. *Describing Morphosytnax – a guide for field linguists*. Cambridge: CUP.

Schlachter, Wolfgang. 1960. *Studien zum Possessivsuffix des Syrjänischen.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Siegl, Florian. 2013. *Materials on Forest Enets, an Indigenous Language of Northern Siberia.* MSFOu 267. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Siegl, Florian. in print. The non-possessive use of Px.2P in Nganasan and Dolgan – a Reappraisal. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 39.

Siegel, Jeff. 2008. *The Emergence of Pidgin & Creole Languages.* Oxford: OUP.

Stachowski, Marek. 1998. An example of Nganasan-Dolgan linguistic contact. *Turkic Languages* 2. 126–129.

Stachowski, Marek. 2010. On the article-like use of the Px2SG in Dolgan, Nganasan and some other languages in an areal Siberian context. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 32/33. 587–593.

Stassen, Leon. 1997. *Intransitive Predication*. Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory. Oxford: OUP.

Stern, Dieter. 2012. *Taimyr-Pidgin-Russian – Kolonialer Sprachkontakt in Nordsibirien.* Studies on Language and Culture in Central and Eastern Europe 19. München – Berlin – Washington: Verlag Otto Sauer.

Werner, Heinrich. 1997. *Die ketische Sprache.* Tunguso-Sibirica 3. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

Winkler, Eberhard. 2011. *Udmurtische Grammatik.* Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 81. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

Siegl F.
Department of Finno-Ugrian Studies.
P.O. 24, 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland.
E-mail: florian.siegl@helsinki.fi

Материал поступил в редакцию 20 января 2015.

Сигл Ф.

СТРУКТУРА ИМЕННЫХ ГРУПП С РЕФЕРЕНЦИАЛЬНЫМ МАРКИРОВАНИЕМ PX.2P В СЕВЕРНО-САМОДИЙСКИХ ЯЗЫКАХ

Характерной чертой северно-самодийских языков является референциальное непритяжательное использование посессивного суффикса второго лица множественного числа (PX.2P) в функции кодирования топика. Несмотря на то что важность этой черты в общей информационной структуре относительно бесспорна, особенности взаимосвязи информационной структуры и синтаксиса не освещены в достаточной мере. Основной целью настоящего исследования является освещение структурных особенностей именной группы, принимающей референциальное притяжательное маркирование (PX). Данная работа является квалитативным исследованием – продолжением более ранних попыток анализа функциональных характеристик маркера PX.2P в языках коренного населения Таймыра (см. Siegl в печати). Как показывают данные анализа, северно-самодийские языки демонстрируют последовательные структурные особенности морфосинтаксической реализации маркирования именных групп показателем PX.2P как при глагольной, так и при неглагольной предикации. Более того, в статье затрагиваются аспекты маркирования топика в двух языках ареала: долганском и таймырском русском пиджине.

Ключевые слова: *северно-самодийские языки, долганский, таймырский русский пиджин, определенность, притяжательные суффиксы, информационная структура, именная группа.*

Сигл Ф., старший научный сотрудник.
Департамент финно-угорских исследований, Университет Хельсинки, Финляндия.
P.O. 24, 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland.
E-mail: florian.siegl@helsinki.fi