HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Some parallels in grammar between Nivkh and Tungusic languages
Author(s)	Gusev, Valentin
Citation	北方人文研究, 8, 63-75
Issue Date	2015-03-31
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/58446
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	08_04_gusev.pdf

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

Some Parallels In Grammar Between Nivkh And Tungusic Languages [1]

Valentin GUSEV
Institute of linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences / JSPS Invited Fellow

Speakers of Nivkh, a language isolate spoken on the lower reaches of the Amur river and in several regions of Sakhalin, for a long time have been surrounded by Tungusic peoples: in the first place by Ulchas and Negidals on the continent and by Uiltas (Oroks) on the Sakhalin island. Of course, both Nivkh and the neighbouring Tungusic languages have traces of lasting and close contacts. Lexical evidence of these contacts was demonstrated as early as in Krejnovich (1934: 183); see also (Krejnovich 1955); many borrowings were noted in the Comparative vocabulary of Tungusic languages (Tsintsius 1975–1977). In 1991, Pevnov in his overview (Pevnov 1992) estimated the total of known Nivkh-Tungusic lexical correspondences at 264. More recently, they were investigated by Kazama (風間 2009: 136–141). The contacts between Nivkh and Tungusic (namely Uilta) on the Sakhalin island have been described by Yamada (2010: 63–64), and Kuleshov (2011) added to the established etymologies a number of separate borrowings from Nivkh into Uilta.

Even if we limit ourselves to those lexical correspondences that are undoubtedly a contact phenomenon, the question of remoteness of these contacts remains open. On the one hand, Pevnov (Op. cit.) notes that the borrowings are phonetically transparent and therefore relatively recent (probably dating from not earlier than XVII–XIX centuries). He also states that these borrowings have been mostly unidirectional (from Tungusic to Nivkh) and primarily related to the so-called "Manchu culture" which spread onto the Amur region and influenced the Nivkhs from the South via their Tungusic neighbours. On the other hand, however, Pevnov also mentions possible Nivkh parallels that are found not only in Negidal, Ulcha and Uilta, but also in more remote languages, such as Nanai, Oroch and Udehe, and possibly even in some dialects of Evenki, which are very far from the contemporary areal of Nivkh (Ibid.). Kuleshov (Op. cit.) cites some evidence of loanwords in Tungusic, that may have come not from Nivkh directly, but from some other languages related to it (the so-called para-Nivkh). The latter two groups of facts would be an evidence of a much more remote and oppositely directed influence, that might go back to the para-Nivkh idioms spoken in the Lower Amur area before Tunguses came there in the first half of the I millennium A.C.

Finally, the third possible explanation of the similarities between Nivkh and the Tungusic languages is a hypothesis of their common origin, see Burykin (2012) and the history of this hypothesis there.

Up to now, only lexical parallels have been considered. This paper deals with grammatical facts that are similar in Nivkh and some Tungusic languages and may be regarded as a result of the contact influence. Some of these facts are clearly of a very recent origin; another may date from more remote times.

One remark about Nivkh dialectology would be in place here. Two main dialects of Nivkh are Amur and East-Sakhalin (Krejnovich 1934: 182–183 and Shiraishi 2006: 10–11), cf. the scheme based on Shiraishi (2006: 11):

Amur dialect group:
— Continental Amur
— West-Sakhalin
— North-Sakhalin

[1] The draft of this paper greatly benefited from the comments by anonymous reviewers, and I thankfully acknowledge their contribution.

(East-)Sakhalin dialect group:
— East Sakhalin
— Southeastern

Some authors treat poorly documented Nivkh idioms on North Sakhalin (Panfilov 1962: 3) and also on South(eastern) Sakhalin (Gruzdeva 1998: 7) as separate dialectal units.

This study mostly concerns the facts of Continental Amur Nivkh. On the one hand, most of grammatical descriptions, including such comprehensive ones as Panfilov (1962, 1965) and Nedjalkov & Otaina (2013), as well as the two existing Nivkh dictionaries, were primarily based on this (sub-) dialect. However, the exact origin of the data sometimes remains unspecified and the authors often limit themselves to referring to the "Amur dialect" as a whole. On the other hand, the vast majority of the available texts originate from Eastern Sakhalin (as most of the Pilsudski's and Shternberg's collections) or from Western Sakhalin (the publications by Shiraishi and Lok 2002–2013). In fact, the only published text in Continental Amur Nivkh known to me is a story of about 700 sentences recorded by Panfilov (1965: 222–240). The scarcity of the text data has been a serious complication for this study, and thus some questions were left unresolved.

1. First person singular imperative

In Nivkh, there is a dedicated form of the first person singular imperative with the suffix *-kta*/*-xta*, attached to the Future tense marker *-nə*. Gruzdeva (1998: 34) notes that this form exists in the Amur dialect only; the East Sakhalin dialect has no separate 1SG imperative verbal form (at least had no such form until recently, see footnote 5).

Typologically, 1SG imperative is a particular sub-type of the imperative paradigm. Unlike other combinations of persons and numbers, it cannot express a plain command (because it is hardly possible to command oneself). Cross-linguistically, its typical uses are, roughly, an expression of intention (as in English *let me do something*) and "imperative questions", that is, asking for the addressee's permission or order to do something (as in Japanese *ashita kimashōka?* 'Shall I come tomorrow?' — among other uses of the *shō*-form). However, many languages (for instance, Russian) do not have any special form for these meanings. In this case, intention is most typically expressed by the future tense (as Russian *pojdu posmotr'u, chto tam sluchilos'* 'let me go and see what happened there', lit. 'I'll go and see…'), and imperative questions may contain some obligation markers (*should I?* in English etc.). For details see Gusev (2013: 217–222).

This is the case of East Sakhalin Nivkh. As concerns the intention, Gruzdeva (2000: 128) says that it is "standardly expressed by synthetic future indicative forms":

(1) East Sakhalin Nivkh
Ñi *čin* *taf-tox* *t'or-i-d-ra.*
I you.PL house-DAT carry-FUT-IND-FOC[2]
'Let me take you to your house.'

(In this example, as well as often in the texts in Shternberg's collection (Shternberg 1908), the verb form bears an focus suffix *-ra*.)

In the Amur dialect, however, there exists a specialized 1 SG imperative form that consists of the above-mentioned Future marker *-nə-* (a counterpart of East Sakhalin *-i-*) plus a dedicated ffix *-kta* or *-xta*. Its uses include the expression of intention (as in example 2) and imperative questions (example 3):[3]

[2] For Nivkh, we mostly follow the recently published book by Nedjalkov & Otaina (2013) in transcription and abbreviations in glosses.

[3] Nedjalkov & Otaina (2013: 116) describe another form with the marker *-di*, which is said to be "interrogative with the purpose of obtaining agreement or permission to perform an action", as in 'May I come to see you, please?'. This form will not be discussed here.

(2) Amur Nivkh (Continental?)
*Ñi ra-nə-**xta***
I drink-FUT-IMP:1SG
'may I drink?' (Krejnovich 1934: 211: "The *nə-xta* form expresses a request for permission to perform such and such action")

(3) Amur Nivkh (Continental?)
Ətəka! Əməka! Ñi vi-nə-kta hə ñivγ-dox əγmə-nə-kta.
father mother I go-FUT-IMP:1SG that person-DAT fight-FUT-IMP:1SG
'Father! Mother! Let me go and fight this person' (Panfilov 1965: 131)

A very similar suffix marks first person singular imperative in Negidal and Evenki; cf. an example from Negidal:

(4) Negidal
Gun-če-n: "Eńako-o! Bi mūle-kte! Āwun-mi bū-xel,
say-PST-3SG granny I fetch. water-IMP:1SG cap-REFL give-IMP.2SG
*teti-**kte** – sēm gili-si-n".*
put.on-IMP.1SG ear.1SG be.cold-PRS-3SG
(The fox) said: "Granny! Let me fetch water! Give me your cap, I'll put it on – my ears are cold" (Khasanova, Pevnov 2003: 120, 122).

It is a well-known fact that discourse patterns are easily borrowed, see Matras (2011: 227): "…the level of discourse interaction is particularly prone to convergence". As the imperative primarily expresses a sort of interaction between the speaker and addressee, its patterns are likely to be borrowed at least when they can be easily detached in the donor language[4] (cf. Aikhenvald 2010). This, of course, requires some degree of agglutinativity in the donor language; Negidal meets that requirement very well. On the other hand, the 1SG imperative has a very peculiar meaning, which many languages lack, and the speakers tend to fill up this gap whenever they find a source for it. So, as the same suffix ***-kta*** has identical meanings in two languages, it is very natural to assume that it has been borrowed from one language to another[5].

In this case, the direction of borrowing is clear: from the Tungusic languages to Nivkh. First, it seems that the use of the ***-nə-kta*** form is limited not only to the Amur Nivkh as a whole (which also includes the West Sakhalin dialects), but exclusively to the continental Nivkh idioms: there is not a single example of it in 10 volumes of West Sakhalin texts published by Hidetoshi Shiraishi and Galina D. Lok (2002–2013). Second, while in Nivkh this suffix is isolated, in Tungusic languages it forms a part of a whole paradigm, which includes imperative markers of the 1st and 3rd persons. In Negidal and Evenki this is partially obscured by phonetic and morphological changes, but in Ulcha or Nanai the structure of this paradigm is quite clear. Cf. the imperative markers in Table 1 (based on Khasanova 1986: 74–75):

[4] An example of an imperative element spread over a vast area is Turkic *hayda* 'let's' borrowed into many Finno-Ugric and Slavic languages from the Volga river region to the Balkan peninsula.
[5] Nivkh offers one more illustration in point: in East Sakhalin Nivkh, the absence of the first person singular imperative has been recently filled up with a construction, which uses the imperative of the verb 'give' – Nivkh *t'ana*. This is a partial loan of the Russian pattern containing *davaj* or *davajte*, the 2nd person (2SG and 2PL, respectively) imperative forms of the verb *davat'* 'give', as in *davaj pomogu* 'let me help (you)' (Gruzdeva 2000: 128–129).

Table 1. Markers of present (immediate) imperative
in Evenki, Negidal, Ulcha and Nanai

	Evenki	**Negidal**	**Ulcha**	**Nanai**
1Sg	-kta	-kta	-ǯi-ta	-gi-ta
2Sg	-kal	-xal	-rù	-o
3Sg	-gin	-ŋin ~ -gin	-ǯi-ni	-gi-ni
1Pl.incl	-gāt	-ŋāj (Du), -gāj (Pl.)	-ǯi-pù	-gi-to
1Pl.excl	-ktawun	-ŋiwun		
2Pl	-kallu	-xasun ~ -xan	-(r)ùsù	-(r)oso
3Pl	-ktyn	-ŋityn ~ -gityn	-ǯi-ti	-gi-t'i

As can be seen from Nanai and Ulcha, the original imperative marker of 1st and 3rd person is **-gi-*, and ***-ta*** is the personal ending of the 1SG imperative (indeed, a special marker of the 1st person singular used only in the imperative is often observed cross-linguistically). Evenki and Negidal *-kta* is obviously a contraction of **-gita* (see a detailed account of the history of the imperative in Evenki and other Tungusic languages in Khasanova 1986: 54–75).

As it is the Negidal that have now direct contact with the Nivkh, it is natural to see in Negidal the immediate source of borrowing.

We can suppose that the meaning of the 1SG imperative was originally expressed in Amur Nivkh by means of the Future tense, as it still is the case in Sakhalin Nivkh. Later the Negidal *-kta* (and not just *-ta*) was borrowed as an indivisible marker and attached to the future tense form. This combination was certainly facilitated by the lack of personal markers in this form.

The variant *-xta* obviously reflects the fricativisation of *k* before *t* in the Lower Amgun' dialect as noted in Tsintsius (1982: 17). Note, however, that the velarisation of *k* in the same position, which is typical for some Tungusic languages including Negidal (Ibid.), has not been reflected in Nivkh: in this suffix, we see the velar phonemes *k* and *x* and not uvular *q* and *χ*. This is normal for the Nivkh reflexation of Tungusic velar sounds; the same is true, for instance, for most loanwords cited in Krejnovich (1934: 183): cf. *ɻ'oxt-c* 'become drunk' < *sokto-* [soqto-]; *xota* 'town' < *xoto* [χoto] etc.

It should be also noted that of the two harmonical variants of the 1SG imperative suffix *-kta* and *-kte*, it is the first variant that was borrowed into Nivkh. This can be a pure coincidence (they had to choose one of the two variants anyway). However, it can also be a result of the broadening of *e* in non-initial syllables in Negidal (Pevnov, Khasanova 2008: 483–484), which led to merging of both *-kta* and *-kte* into *-kta*.

2. Hearsay particle

In Negidal, as well as in Southern Tungusic languages (Ulcha, Nanai, Oroch and Udehe), there exists an evidential (reportative) particle ***gune*** which marks the hearsay; cf. examples from Negidal:

(5) Negidal
Ge, elexes-elexe-esi[6] *baldi-ča-tin,* ***gune****, emen egdiŋe gasin*
well long.ago-long.ago live-PST-3PL REP one big village
bi-ča-n, ***gune****.*
be-PST-3SG REP
'Well, people say, long-long ago there lived (a people); a big village is said to have existed' (Khasanova, Pevnov 2003: 72, 73).

(6) Negidal
Tapkal budi-ji-xin emana-ǯa-n-mal, tiγde-ǯe-n-mel – taj
Tapkal die-PRS-COND snow-FUT-3SG-PTCL rain-FUT-3SG-PTCL that
soŋo-ji-nin ***gune****-eʔ.*
cry-PRS-3SG REP
'When someone of Tapkal clan dies, (then) either it snows or rains – people say it is she that cries (a girl who cries for her deceased relative)' (Khasanova, Pevnov 2003: 78).

This particle is morphologically transparent: this is simply the present tense of the verb *gun-* 'say' (cf: *beesel gune* 'people say' – Khasanova, Pevnov 2003: 61). However, its syntax is not that of a verbal form. It is placed at the end of the sentence after the main verb, and in this position it never inflects for person and number and never has a subject. So, from a syntactic point of view it is a particle and not a verbal form.

It seems that such uses of this (or a similar) stem do not exist in Evenki or Even; neither are they mentioned in a recent paper by Matić & Packendorf (2013). However, etymologically the same form of the verb 'say' is frequently used in the Nanic languages (Southern Tungusic): Ulcha (*wəndə*), Nanai (*undə* and *unə*), Oroch and Udehe (*gunə*). However, in these languages its meaning has been extended: besides the hearsay, it expresses a number of other evidential meanings having a typologically rather uncommon range of uses (see in detail Gusev 2014). According to Jiro Ikegami (池上 2001: 97), in Uilta there is a hearsay clitic *-nda*, which may go back to the same form.

Let us now turn to the facts of Nivkh. In Amur Nivkh, there is a reportative[7] particle *furu* which marks the hearsay (Panfilov 1965: 123; Nedjalkov & Otaina 127). This time it is the whole Amur dialect that is concerned. As is clear from the texts published by Shiraishi and Lok 2002–2013, *furu* is widely used not only in the Continental Nivkh, but also in the West Sakhalin subdialect of the Amur Nivkh (cf. ex. 8)

(7) Amur Nivkh (Continental)
Ətək p'rə-ḍ furu.
farther come-IND REP
'Father is said to have come.' (Nedjalkov, Otaina 2013: 127)

(8) Amur Nivkh (West Sakhalin)
Hoko-ŋan j-oγla haroř pand-r pil-ŋan p'-ətək
be.so-CV 3SG-child so grow-CV be.big-CV REFL-father
ŋala-gu-ř k'ə-la nivx mu-ḍ furu.
be.like.this-TR-CV become.skillful-PERM person become-IND REP
'People say that when the son grew up, he became a skillful hunter like his father' (Shiraishi, Lok 2002: 10).

[6] Here and below, the intonational lengthening is sometimes reflected in Negidal examples.
[7] In the domain of hearsay Aikhenvald (2006: 177) distinguishes reported speech "(stating what someone else has said without specifying the exact authorship) and quotative (introducing the exact author of the quoted report)"; it seems that the facts of Nivkh fit well into this distinction. It seems that in Negidal and Uilta, too, the particles in question are only reportative; however, additional data are needed to state this with certainty.

On the other hand, in East Sakhalin texts published by Shternberg *furu* functions only as a closing formula of a text (something like *dixi*). Examples of it can be found at the end of most texts of this collection. However, the hearsay is expressed by another particle *furuŋgra*, which apparently is the same *furu* with a focus ending[8]:

(9) East Sakhalin Nivkh
Əţixa! pal'-mil'k ţerax maʁi-ny-nd furu-ŋg-ra, patux maʁi-ny-nd;
husband mountain-evil to.you come-FUT-? REP-?-FOC tomorrow come-FUT-?
ţi ţixuil maʁi-ny-nd furu-ŋg-ra!
you kill come-FUT-? REP-?-FOC
'My husband! A mountain evil is going to come to you, people say, tomorrow is going to come; he's going to come to kill you, people say!' (Shternberg 1908: 10)

The particle *furu* is undoubtedly derived from the verb *p'ur-/fur-*, which means 'say'. Its morphological form is unclear, but the functioning in texts of the Amur Nivkh *furu* is obviously similar to that of the Negidal *gune*.

So, the overall picture is the following. A particle *furu*, expressing a reported speech and derived from the verb 'say' but having an unclear morphological structure, is used in Amur Nivkh on both sides of the Tatar Strait. A very similar, but morphologically transparent particle *gune* exists in Negidal. In Nanic languages to the South of Negidal the same particle has a broader use. As to East Sakhalin Nivkh, the hearsay particle *furuŋgra* seems to be an emphatic derivate of its counterpart on the continent; and the particle *furu* has the meaning of a closing formula of narrative texts ('so it is said').

The parallelism is obvious. However, the direction of borrowing in this case is not so clear. On the one hand, the morphological obscurity is an evidence of a more ancient age of the Nivkh particle. On the other hand, in East Sakhalin Nivkh it has another meaning, which may be the original one (if the two uses have not arisen independently): the grammaticalisation path from a separate word (in fact, a sentence on its own) that means 'it has been said' (or 'so has been said') to a reportative particle seems to be much more natural that an evolution of a particle toward a separate word.

One may conceive two possible solutions. One of them presupposes that the difference in meaning of this particle between East Sakhalin and Amur dialects is a very ancient one; in the past, when Amur Nivkh was spread on a much larger territory than now, the use of *furu* in Amur Nivkh had been imitated by Tungusic languages that were in contact with it, i.e. by Nanic languages and Negidal; later, in continental Nanic languages the reportative particle broadened its use, but this process did not affect Negidal and Nivkh.

The second possibility seems simpler and maybe a more realistic one. Under the Tungusic influence, the Nivkh *furu* 'it has been said' changed its use and became a postverbal particle. This process then should have occurred enough long ago to affect the Nivkh language on West Sakhalin. In East Sakhalin Nivkh and Uilta, on the other hand, the same particles in reportative uses became morphologically more complex.

In both cases, the facts of Ainu have also to be accounted for. It is hardly a coincidence that Ainu, at least in its Sakhalin variety, has a reportative particle *manu*, similar to that in Negidal and Amur Nivkh (高橋 2009); see a comparative account of the use of hearsay forms in the languages of Sakhalin by Yoshiko Yamada (山田 2008)

[8] However, it seems that *furuŋgra* in East Sakhalin Nivkh is used much less frequently than its counterpart *furu* in the Amur dialect.

3. Locative cases

A well-known fact is that while East Sakhalin Nivkh has two spacial cases, namely Allative (Dative) and Ablative, Amur Nivkh has three. In East Sakhalin dialect, there is a typologically rare system (see Creissels 2008: 615), where location and source of movement, as well as path, are combined in one form (so-called Ablative, with the ending *-ux*) and opposed to the destination (expressed by Allative, which has the ending *-tox*/*-rox*/*-dox*, and also serves as Dative). As to the Amur dialect, there exists a separate Locative marker -(*u*)*in*.

In this case, Panfilov describes the area of the use of Locative more precisely: it exists "only in Takhta district and a part of Lower Amur district".

The Takhta district of that time (borders and names of administrative units in the former Soviet Union were subject to a constant change) included the area around the confluence of the Amgun river and Amur[9]. It is exactly in this zone that the Lower Amgun (in Russian, *nizovskoj*) dialect of Negidal has been also spoken until recently. It is, of course, very tempting to find some parallels in the two languages and maybe attribute the Nivkh form to the Negidal influence.

The Tungusic languages, contrary to Nivkh, have elaborated systems of spacial cases with four forms for all the principal spacial meanings (location, source, destination of movement and path) or even more. So, Negidal has four cases used primarily for expressing spacial relations (so-called Allative, Locative, Prolative and Ablative) plus Dative, which marks the addressee of giving or speech, but also – in fact, in the first place – expresses some locational meanings. But, at the first sight, there seems to be no parallels between Nivkh and Negidal: the use of the Locative in Negidal has little in common with that of its Nivkh homonym.

However, the traditional case terminology used for the Tungusic languages is highly misleading. Vitually every grammar starts the description of Dative and Locative cases with the statement that Dative expresses location and Locative expresses destination of movement[10], that is, at least a part of their real uses is opposite to what their labels mean. If we try to compare Locative in Nivkh with Dative and Negidal and vice versa, some similarity will become visible.

For the sake of clarity (and only in this part of the paper) it is good to relabel both Nivkh and Negidal cases. For Negidal, the form with the ending *-du* (or *-dū*), the traditional Dative, will be labeled here as Dative-Locative, and the form in -(*du*)*lā*, the traditional Locative, – as Lative[11]. As to Nivkh, the traditional Dative (ending in *-tox*/*-rox*/*-dox*) will be called Dative-Lative; and the Nivkh Locative in -(*u*)*in* will conserve its name, which it bears by right. I will try to show below that these labels reflect at least the main uses of the corresponding forms.

First, it is necessary to say that the syntactic function of Dative, that of the addressee of giving or speech, is combined with different spacial meanings in Nivkh and Negidal, as it is already clear from the names of the cases. While in Nivkh there is a very common syncretism of Dative and Lative (Creissels 2008: 621), in Negidal, and in Tungusic languages in general, the addressee is expressed by the same form as location, which is typologically much less frequent. However, the spatial functions of these cases do exhibit some non-trivial similarity.

---

[9] The Lower Amur district concerned the localities down the Amur including the town of Nikolaevsk.

[10] In fact, many modern grammars reject the traditional terms at least as applied to the "Locative" and label it "Allative" (Nedjalkov 1997: 142ff) or "Locative II" (Ozolin'a 2013: 162–164), while "Locative I" in the latter description is used for the traditional Dative.

[11] Igor Nedjalkov in his grammar of Evenki calls the corresponding form Allative (142); however, for Negidal this term is used for another case, "*napravitel'nyj padezh*", ending with *-tkī*, and it is better to keep it, for not to differ too much from the tradition. Here and below, I will use the term "lative" to denote the final point of a movement ("to"), and "allative" for the destination of a movement which does not presuppose reaching the final point ("towards").

In the most obvious case Dative-Lative in Nivkh and Lative in Negidal express destination and Locative in Nivkh and Dative-Locative in Negidal express location. Sometimes they occur in pairs; the following contexts are particularly representative[12]:

(10) Amur Nivkh (Continental)
*hoʁoror řə erq-**tox** jajma-ŋan řə mi erq-**uin** ʈavda meqr*
then door side-DAT.LAT look-CV door inside side-LOC serpent two
p'-ŋafq-xu əŋg haz-ḍ-γu.
REFL-partner-PL mouth hold.in.teeth-IND-PL
'When he looked towards the door, (he saw) at the inside side of the door two serpents seizing each other's mouth' (Ŋəzit 163).

(11) Amur Nivkh (Continental)
*vi-ke p'-řəf-**tox** vi-ra nanak q'au-ra. hoʁor*
go-CV REFL-house-DAT.LAT come-CV sister be.absent- CV then
*p'-řəv-**uin** ʈək k'rəu-ḍ.*
REFL-house-LOC long rest-IND
'When after a long walk he came to his house, his sister was not there. So he rested for a long time in his house' (Ŋəzit 269–270).

(12) Negidal
*Taj ŋene-mī, gojopti ūtān-**dulā** esčā-wun. Taj*
that go-CV old earth.house-LAT reach-1PL.EXCL that
*ūtān-**du** bi-l-čā-wun, seγeppe bejiče-l-čā-wun.*
earth.house-DAT.LOC live-INCH-PST-1PL.EXCL sable hunt-INCH-PST-1PL.EXCL
'So going, we reached an old hunting earth-house. In this earth-house we began to live and to hunt for sable' (Tsintsius 1982: 44, 109).

(13) Negidal
*Mamŋu-**lā** alan-čā-l,*[…] *ǯal beje sajgi-čā-l – Mamŋu-**dū** bi-si*
Amur-LAT pass-PST-PL relative person know-PST-3PL Amur-DAT.LOC be-PRS
'They passed onto Amur […] (their) relatives learned (that) they are on Amur' (Tsintsius 1982: 48, 115).

The use of the locative forms seems relatively straitforward. Interestingly, however, in both languages locative and not lative cases are used for the final point of changing position or posture[13] (though it is not the only option; Lative or even Ablative are less frequent in this role, but also occur).

(14) Amur Nivkh (Continental)
*hoʁor q'a:-hemar məγ-r aiz t'iʃʈ-**uin** hur-t'əv-ḍ*
then clan-old go.down-CV gold seat-LOC there-sit-IND
'then the elder went down and sat onto the golden seat' (Ŋəzit 441).

(15) Negidal
*...īgi-čā-wun, nahan-**dū**-woj teγejgi-čā-wun, ǯeppe-wun.*
enter-PST-1PL.EXCL bed-DAT.LOC-1PL sit-PST-1PL eat.PRS-1PL.EXCL
'…we entered, sat on our bed, and ate (lit. are eating)' (Tsintsius 1982: 45, 109).

[12] All Nivkh examples in this section are taken from the same text: "Ŋəzit" (Panfilov 1965: 222–240). For each example, I indicate the number of the sentence in the text. In the original publication the sentences are not numbered. The texts published by Panfilov (1965: 222–255) have been glossed by Ruslan Idrisov and are available on corpora.iling-ran.ru.
[13] One of the reviewers pointed out to me that the same is true for Ainu.

(16) Amur Nivkh (Continental)
*hoʁo-t iñnəḍ-γu t'o-məγ-t i-ʈoŋr erq-**uin** huñḍi-ta.*
be.so-CV food-PL carry-go.down-CV 3SG-head side-LOC put-FOC
'Then they carried the food and put it near his head' (Ŋəzit 457).

(17) Negidal
Tajā-wa tukti-jī-wā-n iče-jān, ǯō-dū bi-sī-l beje-l, tājī
that-ACC go.up-PRS-ACC-3SG see-CV house-DAT.LOC be-PRS-PL person-PL there
*uśke oldōn-**dū**-n ete-wu-si-nān.*
door side-DAT.LOC-3SG catch-CAUS-PRS-CV
'Having seen him come up, those who were in the house stood up to catch him on both sides of the door' (Tsintsius 1982: 50, 118).

(18) Amur Nivkh (Continental)
*t'u-**in** ʁoñḍi-ror vəγi-ř məg-ḍ*
sledge-LOC put-CV drag-CV go-IND
'Having put (a bear's carcass) on the sledge, he dragged it down' (Ŋəzit 8).

(19) Negidal
*Omočin-tikij eme-jān amagda oŋǯan-**du**-n nōje-n.*
boat-ALL go.back-CV stern back-DAT.LOC-3SG put-3SG
'Coming back to the boat he put it (the toad) at the stern' (Khasanova, Pevnov 2003: 67, 68).

Lative forms, besides their default meaning of the movement destination point, in both languages have other, sometimes unexpected uses. At least one interesting parallel is worth noting here. In both idioms, Lative can denote place from where something is heard or felt:

(20) Amur Nivkh (Continental)
hoŋke uřk hutə-ŋan ʈ'am q'as ʈa-re lu-re if mə-ḍ.
after night middle-CV shaman drum beat-CV sing-CV he hear-IND
*t'eγraf mi-**rx** ŋama-gu-r mi-ḍ*
rock inside-DAT.LAT be.good-TR-CV hear-IND
'Then, when it was midnight, he heard a shaman beat his drum and sing. It is well heard from inside of the rock' (Ŋəzit 87–88).

(21) Amur Nivkh (Continental)
*hoʁo-ŋan ximi-**dox** pək it-ʈ.*
so.be-CV above-DAT.LAT cuckoo say-IND
'Then the cuckoo says from above' (Ŋəzit 570).

(22) Negidal
*Muu-**lee** asi-beje soŋo-ji-nin délga-nin dooldu-w-wa-n.*
water-LOC woman-person cry-PRS-3SG voice-3SG hear-PASS-PRS-3SG
'A woman cries in the water', lit. 'In the water a crying woman's voice is heard' (Khasanova, Pevnov 2003: 69, 70).

There are more uses of Lative forms in both Negidal and Amur Nivkh, and their possible similarity requires further investigation and more data. It seems that in Nivkh idioms on Sakhalin, Lative is much more restricted in its uses and more or less limited to its natural meaning of the destination point. Maybe this is an explanation of a striking difference in frequency of the *tox*-form in Continental Amur Nivkh, on the one hand, and in Sakhalin Nivkh, on the other. Table 2 shows the number of occurences of this form (a) in the Amur Nivkh tale in (Panfilov 1965); (b) in the four texts in West Sakhalin Nivkh in (Shiraishi & Lok 2002); and (c) in the three East Sakhalin Nivkh tales from (Panfilov 1965):

Table 2. Frequency of Dative-Lative case in three varieties of Nivkh

	Occurrences of Dative-Lative forms	Total number of sentences	Number of Dative-Lative forms per 10 sentences
Amur Nivkh	98	673	1,46
West Sakhalin Nivkh	36	495	0,73
East Sakhalin Nivkh	48	553	0,87

It can be seen that in Continental Amur Nivkh narratives, the *tox*-forms are used exactly two times more often than in its closest relative, West Sakhalin. Of course, we must not forget that West Sakhalin texts were recorded almost 45 years later. However, for East Sakhalin texts, recorded at the same year as the Continental Amur ones, the difference is almost the same. One may hypothesize that the increase in frequency may have been due to the uses borrowed from Negidal – though this hypothesis needs to be supported by more data.

As concerns Locative forms, in the Tungusic languages they are used everywhere. In Nivkh, the origin of *-uin* ending is unknown. However, in Panfilov's data, there is one form where *-uin* is added to the Ablative form, being attached after the Ablative affix:

(23) Amur Nivkh (Continental)
*hoŋke ximi-dox jajma-ŋan i-ʈoŋr k'i-kr-**uk-uin** ʈoz-uin pək*
then above-LAT look-CV 3-head above-place-ABL-LOC twig-LOC cuckoo
hur-t'iv-ř-um-ḍ.
sit-CV-be-IND.
'In that moment, when he looked up, there was a cuckoo on a twig above his head' (Ŋəzit 651).

If this example is correct, it shows that *-uin* formerly was a clitic which became a part of the nominal paradigm. If so, the influence of Negidal is the most probable explanation of the emergence of the Locative form in Continental Amur Nivkh.

Conclusion

Languages of Lower Amur and Sakhalin undoubtedly form a *Sprachbund*, which includes the dialects of Negidal, Amur Tungusic, Nivkh and Ainu, and in some respects may be a part of a larger area, that could embrace other idioms, such as Evenki and Even, Hokkaido Ainu, Japanese and the languages of Kamchatka.

In this paper, we have dealt with three obvious areal traits, common for Amur Nivkh and Negidal: first person singular imperative form (Negidal *-kta*/*-kte*, Nivkh *-kta*), the hearsay particle (Negidal *gune*, Nivkh *furu*); and the Locative case (Nivkh *-uin*). While the first case involves the borrowing of the morphology, in the latter two cases only the patterns are borrowed. These traits seem to be mostly due to the influence of Negidal on Nivkh, though the real picture can turn out to be much more complicated and deserves a more profound study, which would also place these facts into a broader context of other languages of this area.

Abbreviations

ABL	Ablative	EXCL	Exclusive (1 person plural)	PRS	Present
ACC	Accusative	IMP	Imperative	PST	Past
ALL	Allative	INCH	Inchoative	PTCL	particle
COND	Conditional	INCL	Inclusive (1 person plural)	REFL	Reflexive
CV	converb	IND	Indicative	REP	Reportative
DAT	Dative	LOC	Locative	SG	Singular
DAT.LAT	Dative-Lative	PASS	Passive	TR	Transitivizer
FOC	Focus marker	PERM	Permanent quality		
FUT	Future	PL	Plural		

References

池上, 二良.
2001. 樺太のウイルタ語の感嘆、疑問その他の語尾について, in: ツングース語研究. 東京: 汲古書院, 94–109.
風間, 伸次郎.
2009. ニブフ語と近隣諸言語との類型的異同・言語接触について, in: サハリンの言語世界 (津曲敏郎編, 北海道大学大学院文学研究科: 127–144).
高橋, 靖以.
2009. アイヌ語サハリン方言の証拠性表現 : 特に伝聞を表す形式 manu について, in: サハリンの言語世界 (津曲敏郎編, 北海道大学大学院文学研究科: 57–61).
山田, 祥子.
2008. ウイルタ語口頭文芸の伝聞形式 サハリンにおける言語接触の可能性, in: 北海道民族学, 4, 63–71.

Aikhenvald, A. Yu.
2010. Imperatives and commands. (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Bakker, Peter and Matras, Yaron.
2013. *Contact languages. Language Contact and Bilingualism*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
Burykin, Aleksej.
2012. Etnogenez nivkhov, mezhetnicheskie sv'azi v Priamursko-Sakhalinskom regione i problema geneticheskoj prinadlezhnosti nivkhskogo jazyka, in: *Lev Shternberg: grazhdanin, uchenyj, pegagog: k 150-letiju so dn'a rozhdenija.* Sankt-Peterburg: Kunstkamera, 275–286.
Creissels, Denis.
2008. Spacial cases, in: Andrej Malchukov, Andrew Spencer (eds.). The Oxford Handbook of Case. New York: Oxford University Press, 609–625.
Gruzdeva, Ekaterina.
1998. Nivkh. (Languages of the World / Materials 111.) München: LINCOM Europa.
Gruzdeva, Ekaterina.
2000. Aspects of Russian-Nivkh grammatical interference: The Nivkh imperative, in: Gilberts, D. G. and al. (eds.). Languages in Contact. (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 28.) Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi.
Gusev, Valentin.
2013. *Tipologija imperativa.* Moskva: Jazyki slav'anskoj kul'tury,
2014. Ot citativa k "novomu znaniju": evol'ucija citativnoj chasticy v tunguso-man'chzhurskix yazykax Nizhnego Amura, in: *Studia Typologica. Acta Linguistica Petropolitana.* Vol. V, Part 3. Sankt-Peterburg, 212–232.
Khasanova, Marina and Aleksandr Pevnov.
2003. *Mify i skazki negidal'cev.* (ELPR Publications Series A2-024) Ōsaka.
Khasanova, Marina.
1986. *Povelitel'noe naklonenie v evenkijskom jazyke*. Leningrad: Nauka.
Krejnovich, Erukhim.
1934. Nivkhskij (gil'ackij) jazyk, in: *Jazyki i pis'mennost' narodov Severa. Part 3: Jazyki i pis'mennost' paleoaziatskikh narodov*, 181–222.
Krejnovich, Erukhim.
1955. Gil'acko-tunguso-man'chzhurskie paralleli, in: *Doklady i soobschenija Instituta jazykoznanija AN SSSR*, 1955, No.8, 135–167.

Kuleshov, V'acheslav.
2011. Nivkhskie leksicheskie zaimstvovanija v orokskom jazyke, in: *Izvestija Instituta nasledija Bronislava Pilsudskogo*, No.15. Juzhno-Sakhalinsk, 196–205.
Matić, Dejan, and Brigitte Pakendorf, B.
2013. Non-canonical SAY in Siberia: Areal and genealogical patterns, in: *Studies in Language*, 37, 356–412.
Matras, Yaron.
2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Matras, Yaron.
2011. Universals of structural borrowing, in: Siemund, Peter (ed.), *Linguistic universals and language variation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 200–229.
Nedjalkov, Igor.
1997. *Evenki.* London – New York.
Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. and Galina A. Otaina.
2013. *A Syntax of the Nivkh Language: The Amur dialect.* Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Ozolin'a, Larisa.
2013. *Grammatika orokskogo jazyka.* Novosibirsk.
Panfilov, Vladimir.
1962. *Grammatika nivkhskogo jazyka.* Pt. 1. Moskva – Leningrad.
1965. *Grammatika nivkhskogo jazyka.* Pt. 2. Moskva – Leningrad.
Pevnov, Aleksandr.
1992. Nivkhskij i tunguso-man'chzhurskie jazyki: problemy kontaktov, in: *B. O. Pil-sudskij: issledovatel' narodov Sakhalina. Materialy mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferencii*, vol. II. Juzhno-Sakhalinsk, 25–29.
Shiraishi, Hidetoshi and Galina D. Lok.
2002–2013. *Sound Materials of the Nivkh Language*, Vol. 1–10.
Shiraishi, Hidetoshi.
2006. *Topics in Nivkh Phonology*. (Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics 61.)
Shternberg, Lev.
1908. *Materialy po izucheniju gil'ackogo jazyka i fol'klora*. Sankt-Peterburg.
Simonov, M. D.
Evenkijskij imperativ v funkcii modal'nogo indikativa, in: *Izuchenie jazykov Sibiri*, 137–141.
Tsintsius, Vera.
1975–1977 (ed.). *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso-man'chzhurskikh jazykov: Materialy k etimologicheskomu slovar'u.* Vol. I–II. Leningrad: Nauka.
1982. *Negidal'skij jazyk: issledovanija i materialy.* Leningrad: Nauka.
Yamada, Yoshiko.
2010. A Preliminary Study of Language Contacts around Uilta in Sakhalin, in: *Journal of the Center for Northern Humanities*, Vol. 3, 59–75.

ツングース諸語とニヴフ語の文法上の類似点

ワレンチン・グセフ
ロシア科学アカデミー言語学研究所 / 日本学術振興会外国人招へい研究者

本稿はニヴフ語（主にアムール方言）とツングース諸語（とくにネギダール語）について、言語接触による影響の観点から、文法上の類似点 3 点、すなわち (1) 1 人称単数命令法のマーカー、 (2) 伝聞の小詞、 (3) 処格について論じた。命令法のマーカーがネギダール語からニヴフ語へと借用されたことは疑いなく、処格は翻訳借用である可能性が高い。伝聞の小詞の起源は明らかではないが、この地域の言語に共通の地域的な特徴であるといえる。アムール下流域およびサハリンの諸言語には共通する特徴が多いが、それはこの地域における長年の言語接触によるものであると考えられる。