

**The participial oblique, a verb mood found only in Nunivak  
Central Alaskan Yup'ik and in Siberian Yupik**  
**L'oblique participial, un mode verbal trouvé uniquement dans  
le dialecte nunivak du yup'ik central d'Alaska et dans le yupik  
sibérien**

Steven A. Jacobson

Volume 30, Number 1, 2006

Problématiques des sexes  
Gender issues

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/016154ar>  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/016154ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Association Inuksiutiit Katimajit Inc.  
Centre interuniversitaire d'études et de recherches autochtones (CIÉRA)

ISSN

0701-1008 (print)  
1708-5268 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Jacobson, S. A. (2006). The participial oblique, a verb mood found only in Nunivak Central Alaskan Yup'ik and in Siberian Yupik. *Études/Inuit/Studies*, 30(1), 135–156. <https://doi.org/10.7202/016154ar>

Article abstract

Nunivak Island has the most divergent dialect of Central Alaskan Yup'ik Eskimo, the language of southwestern Alaska. Lexical and phonological divergences have been discussed elsewhere. This paper discusses the form and function of the “participial oblique” verb mood found in Nunivak—but not in other Central Alaskan Yup'ik dialects—and in Central Siberian Yupik Eskimo, the language of St. Lawrence Island Alaska and the tip of Chukotka. Discussed also are differences between the Chukotkan form of the mood and that of St. Lawrence Island, the mood's presence in Naukan Yupik, and a probable “missing link” participial construction in other Central Alaskan Yup'ik dialects.

# The participial oblique, a verb mood found only in Nunivak Central Alaskan Yup'ik and in Siberian Yupik

Steven A. Jacobson\*

**Résumé:** L'oblique participial, un mode verbal trouvé uniquement dans le dialecte nunivak du yup'ik central d'Alaska et dans le yupik sibérien

L'île de Nunivak possède le plus divergent des dialectes de l'esquimo yup'ik central d'Alaska, langue parlée dans le sud-ouest de l'Alaska. Les divergences lexicales et phonologiques ont été examinées précédemment ailleurs. Dans le présent article, on discute de la forme et de la fonction du mode du verbe de type «oblique participial» que l'on trouve dans le yup'ik de Nunivak, mais dans aucun des autres dialectes du yup'ik central d'Alaska, et dans le yupik central sibérien, langue parlée dans l'île Saint-Laurent en Alaska et à la pointe de la Tchoukotka. On examine également les différences entre la forme tchoukotkane du mode et celle de l'île Saint-Laurent, la présence du mode dans le yupik de Naukan et un éventuel «chaînon manquant» dans la construction participiale des autres dialectes du yup'ik central d'Alaska.

**Abstract:** The participial oblique, a verb mood found only in Nunivak Central Alaskan Yup'ik and in Siberian Yupik

Nunivak Island has the most divergent dialect of Central Alaskan Yup'ik Eskimo, the language of southwestern Alaska. Lexical and phonological divergences have been discussed elsewhere. This paper discusses the form and function of the “participial oblique” verb mood found in Nunivak—but not in other Central Alaskan Yup'ik dialects—and in Central Siberian Yupik Eskimo, the language of St. Lawrence Island Alaska and the tip of Chukotka. Discussed also are differences between the Chukotkan form of the mood and that of St. Lawrence Island, the mood's presence in Naukan Yupik, and a probable “missing link” participial construction in other Central Alaskan Yup'ik dialects.

---

\* Alaska Native Language Center, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, Alaska 99775-7680, USA. ffsaj@uaf.edu.




Figure 1. Location of languages and dialects mentioned in the text (CAY = Central Alaskan Yup'ik; CSY = Central Siberian Yupik; GCY = General Central Yup'ik; HBC = Hooper Bay / Chevak; NS = Norton Sound; NUN = Nunivak; SLI = St. Lawrence Island).

## Introduction

Of the various dialects of CAY<sup>1</sup>, the NUN dialect (termed also “Cup’ig” and in the past, “Cux”), is certainly the most divergent. Louis Hammerich who conducted the pioneering linguistic research on NUN stated that:

The hunting talk which is found in the grammar of [...] Bethel (Kuskokwim), written by Hintz [*sic*], was readily understood not only at Tanunak [*sic*] (Nelson Island), but also on the Yukon (Marshall), up the Kuskokwim (Sleitmiut [*sic*]), in Bristol Bay (Dillingham) and at Lake Iliamna [...]. The Bethel tale, which is more or less willingly understood at Nunivak, is completely incomprehensible to the Eskimos of the [Alaska] Peninsula and Kodiak/Afognak [...]. The suk-dialect [Sugpiaq or Alutiiq language] and the yuk-dialect [the majority dialect of CAY] are mutually incomprehensible (or, at least, nearly incomprehensible); [...]. The yuk- and cux-dialects are, with more or less difficulty, mutually comprehensible (Hammerich 1958: 637-639).

Hammerich thus established that NUN was indeed a *dialect* of CAY in contrast to Sugpiaq which is now recognized as a different, though closely related, *language*<sup>2</sup>.

In another report, Hammerich (1954: 2-3) noted that, “before the grammar of the mainland dialects is better known, and before the grammar of Nunivak is written, it would be hazardous to declare a certain mainland suffix unknown on Nunivak or inversely.” The present writer was only dimly aware of the existence of an inflectional suffix in NUN not present on the mainland when he wrote his three descriptions of NUN in 1979, 1984 and 1995<sup>3</sup>. However, now it does indeed appear that NUN differs from mainland CAY not only in lexicon and phonology (as well noted by Hammerich, myself, and others), but also in syntax, because as it turns out NUN does have the participial oblique (PO) verb mood, which is not found in the other dialects of CAY.

That the PO mood itself almost certainly is not used today and has not been used in recent times in GCY, the majority mainland dialect of CAY, can be seen from three factors. Firstly, no instances that could be of the PO mood can be found in published collections of texts (over half of which are now digitized and thus searchable by computer). Secondly, when presented to speakers of GCY, the PO mood is not recognized or understood. Thirdly, nothing that could in fact be the PO mood itself is mentioned in any of the grammatical works on GCY including even the older works of Barnum (1970 [1901]) and Hinz (1944) based on research from several decades before publication. One could seek traces of the PO mood in those divergent CAY dialects which are closest to NUN, namely HBC and Egegik, or in the fourth divergent dialect

<sup>1</sup> Abbreviations used in this article are: CAY = Central Alaskan Yup’ik; CSY = Central Siberian Yupik; GCY = General Central Yup’ik; HBC = Hooper Bay / Chevak; NS = Norton Sound; NUN = Nunivak; PO = participial oblique; SLI = St. Lawrence Island. See Figure 1 for location of languages and dialects.

<sup>2</sup> Hammerich’s assessment of the degree to which Sugpiaq could not understand the CAY story may be somewhat too harsh. Also, the CAY areas which could readily understand the story are all part of GCY, but it is quite clear that the other divergent dialects of CAY (that is, NS, HBC, and Egegik) are all closer to GCY than NUN is. For more on CAY dialectology, see Jacobson (1998).

<sup>3</sup> See Jacobson (1979, 1984: 22-37, 1995: 440-444). De Reuse (1994: 39) notes a NUN example of the PO mood conveyed to him by the present writer in 1988, who, however, did not pursue the issue at the time.

of CAY, *i.e.* NS<sup>4</sup>. Concerning HBC, nothing like the PO mood is to be found in Woodbury (1981), no instances of it are in any of the texts in Woodbury (1984), nor is it recognized by younger, though fully competent, speakers of HBC. Concerning the nearly extinct dialect of Egegik, no instances of the PO mood appear in the admittedly tiny corpus of texts (at the Alaska Native Language Center archives) in that dialect, and similarly for evidence from NS. There is always the possibility however, that the PO mood may in fact be at least known to some speakers as archaic, even if not actively used, in HBC, Egegik, NS or even in GCY<sup>5</sup>.

As we shall see, however, the PO mood is also found in CSY and in the Naukan Yupik language of East Cape, Chukotka. Furthermore, a remnant of a link between the PO mood of CSY and that of NUN does turn out to be present in GCY after all. Comparing the form and function of the PO mood of NUN with that of CSY, it will be demonstrated that: (1) though they differ somewhat in the form and range of their person/number components, it is definitely one and the same verb mood, and (2) the differences in form for the two areas having the PO mood can be explained, to a large extent, by the differences in the function of the mood in those areas.

### The PO mood in NUN CAY

For NUN the marker of the PO mood is **-yalria**-<sup>6</sup> for intransitive, and **-yaqe-** for transitive. These consist of what is historically the postbase **-yar-** (discussed later) followed by the marker of the participial mood, **-lria-** (in some instances as **-lrii-**) for intransitive, **-ke-** for transitive. The person/number markers for 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> person subject intransitive are like ordinary (*i.e.* not oblique) *participial* mood markers. For 4<sup>th</sup> person non-singular they are like the possessed relative noun markers (**-meng** for plural, **-mek** for dual). However, for 4<sup>th</sup> person singular subject intransitive they are like the singular unpossessed relative noun ending **-m**, rather than the possessed relative noun marker **-mi**. The person/number markers for 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> person subject transitive are like ordinary *participial* markers. However, if the object is 4<sup>th</sup> person, they are like the corresponding *connective* mood markers (*i.e.* the person/number elements of the endings for the verb moods expressing “because,” “if/when [future],” etc.). For 4<sup>th</sup> person subject, they are specifically like the *conditional* connective mood (expressing “if/when [future]”) markers, *i.e.* starting with **n** rather than **m** (*e.g.*, **-niu** 4<sup>th</sup> s. - 3<sup>rd</sup> s., **-nia** 4<sup>th</sup> s. - 1<sup>st</sup> s.).

The following examples are taken from three sources: word usage examples written by two NUN speakers for the NUN dictionary (Amos and Amos 2003) and personal communications between them and the present writer in connection with his

<sup>4</sup> See Jacobson (1994) concerning CAY dialects and the relationships between them.

<sup>5</sup> In fact, a speaker from Tununak, the GCY village located nearest to Nunivak Island, has expressed familiarity with the PO mood stating that she had heard it in her own dialect (Eliza Orr, pers. comm. 2006).

<sup>6</sup> The orthography used here for NUN is the standard or practical of CAY as modified for NUN; see the introduction of Amos and Amos (2003) and Jacobson (1995). In particular, **r** represents the voiced uvular fricative (which is written **gh** in the standard or practical CSY orthography of SLI, see below), **e** represents shwa, and doubling of a fricative or nasal letter indicates voicelessness, though sometime there is (automatic) voicelessness without doubling.

editing of that dictionary; transcriptions of testimony by NUN speakers given in their language at government hearings (ANCSA Testimony n.d.); and a traditional story told by a NUN elder and printed in a recent book on Nunivak traditions (Fienup-Riordan 2000). From these examples one can see that 4<sup>th</sup> person is used in the standard way to show co-reference of the subject or object in the dependent clause (*i.e.* the clause with the PO mood) with the subject of the main clause. In these examples the “when” or “because” clause in English translates the Yupik verb or clause with the PO mood.

***Intransitive examples:***

- 1<sup>st</sup> s.: **Ellangyalrianga ella quunirwallrur**<sup>7</sup>. ‘When I became aware of things the weather was calm.’ (Amos and Amos 2003: 106) (compare ending in 1<sup>st</sup> s. example for CSY, below)
- 1<sup>st</sup> p.: **Kanani Kuigaremiuni uitalrianga anglilrianga, nut'an maa-i kiagpag 1991-irmi nut'an ullanripaalugapug aapaqa-llu. Tamaaken piyaqlegurqaanemneg ayaglua. Taumeg taukut nunaput ullagturluki taw-i Kuigaaremiuni piyalriakut taugg'am qetunrema cama-i ullaucirkamtun piksagutengciqait nunalleraaranka.** ‘I stayed and grew up down at Kuigaaremiut [...] and this is the very first year, 1991, my spouse and I did not go there this summer. I've gone there every summer since I was young. When we are at Kuigaaremiut, my son only, as I have done myself, uses the old places, my father's old places, and including the ones who came before him.’ (ANCSA Testimony n.d.: 91NUN22: 4) (compare ending in 1<sup>st</sup> p. example for CSY, below)
- 2<sup>nd</sup> s.: **Miryarrauten aqsalnguyalriaten.** ‘You vomited because you had a stomach ache.’ (Amos and Amos, pers. comm. 2000)
- 3<sup>rd</sup> s.: **Kiapa(u)ryalria unaggun una-i Pengurrlicagatgun teplinia.** ‘When it was spring it had beached on the shores of Pengurrlicaat.’ (ANCSA Testimony n.d.: 91NUN24: 1)
- 3<sup>rd</sup> p.: **Katurcalrit qanertengullruunga.** ‘When they had a meeting I was a speaker.’ (Amos and Amos 2003: 156)
- 4<sup>th</sup> s.: **Elpet-llu Lurtussiikauluten. Kwani cinginermi nakuwet [...] una atritellruyalrim cinginer una Lurtussiikaurciiqur.** ‘And you are Lurtussikar. Now if you die at the point [...] because this has no name this point will become

<sup>7</sup> NUN forms given here show explicitly the results of phonological processes specific to that dialect of CAY, including: (1) affrication of word-final *k* and *q*; (2) devoicing of geminated fricatives; (3) change of underlying *ai* not in endings to *aa*; and (4) vowel “compression.” The latter in NUN means the shortening of underlying long vowels or vowel clusters in closed or word-final syllables to the length of single vowels without the residue of extra stress as found in other Eskimo languages (such as Sugpiaq) or other CAY dialects (HBC, Egegik) that have “compression.” For more information, see introduction in Amos and Amos (2003).

Lurtussiikar.’ (ANCSA Testimony n.d.: 91NUN22: 4) (compare ending in 4<sup>th</sup> s. example for CSY, below)

4<sup>th</sup> s.: **Miryarraur aqsalnguyalrim.** ‘He vomited because (or when) he had a stomachache.’ (Amos and Amos 2003: 202). Note that for dual ‘they<sub>2</sub>,’ this sentence becomes **miryarraug aqsalnguyalghiimeg** [Amos and Amos, pers. comm. 2000], where **-meg** is like the 4<sup>th</sup> d. possessor relative case ending. For plural, it becomes **miryarraut aqsalnguyalghiimeng** [*ibid.*, see also example for 4<sup>th</sup> p. below] where **-meng** is like the 4<sup>th</sup> p. possessor relative case ending. However, for singular ‘he/she,’ proposed **\*miryarraur aqsalnguyalriimi**, where **-mi** is like the 4<sup>th</sup> s. possessed relative case ending, is firmly rejected in favour of the form given above.

4<sup>th</sup> p.: **Up'nerkaryalria nutaan qayarturyalriameng taum nengaugata ciullellinii taukut piculit.** ‘When it was spring when they went hunting by kayak that son-in-law of theirs surpassed the hunters.’ (ANCSA Testimony 91NUN22: 15) (compare ending in 4<sup>th</sup> p. example for CSY, below, and note also the 3<sup>rd</sup> s. PO **up'nerkaryalria**)

#### *Transitive examples:*

1<sup>st</sup> s. – 2<sup>nd</sup> s.: **Qanrucaqemken englarartuten.** ‘When I told you, you laughed.’ (Amos and Amos, pers. comm. 2000)

1<sup>st</sup> s. – 3<sup>rd</sup> s.: **Taqukar qinrulluku piyaqka angllurtur.** ‘When I was involved with, aiming at, the seal, it (not the seal?) dove into the water.’ (Amos and Amos 2003: 288) (compare ending in 1<sup>st</sup> s. – 3<sup>rd</sup> s. example for CSY, below)

1<sup>st</sup> s. – 4<sup>th</sup> s.: **Agtuqeryaqemni eter quulerturtur.** ‘When I touched the sea anemone it suddenly started to shrink.’ (Amos and Amos, pers. comm. 2000)

2<sup>nd</sup> s. – 3<sup>rd</sup> s.: **Imumi-qa tangerrsaqen aryuannitan?** ‘Did you not scold him when you saw him that time?’ (Amos and Amos 2003: 134)

3<sup>rd</sup> s. – 4<sup>th</sup> s.: **Tawa-i piurelun'-am tawaten piyalria, picit-am ill'itni tawa-i ellimerrsaqiini tayima tekitenritliniur.** ‘Things went on this way, and one time when she told him to go, when he went out he didn't return’ (Fienup-Riordan 2000: 199) (note also the 3<sup>rd</sup> s. PO **piyalria**, and 4<sup>th</sup> s. **ayagyalrim**)

3<sup>rd</sup> s. – 4<sup>th</sup> p.: **Ciullegyaqiteng nut'an qenqerrluteng ayalliniluteng tawa-i nunani uitavkenateng.** ‘When he surpassed them they got angry and left without staying in the village.’ (ANCSA Testimony n.d. 91NUN22: 3)

- 3<sup>rd</sup> p. – 4<sup>th</sup> s.: [...] **kaliftelliniyaqitni tamana tauna qecig bucket-ar siimameg kit'essuucirluku, etranun tut'enritliniur.** '[...] when they anchored that skin bucket weighing it down with a rock it didn't land on the bottom of it.' (ANCSA Testimony n.d. 91NUN22: 26)
- 3<sup>rd</sup> p. – 4<sup>th</sup> p.: **Qanrucaqaiceteng englarallrut.** 'When they(x) told them(y), they(y) laughed.' (Amos and Amos, pers. comm. 2000)
- 4<sup>th</sup> s. – 1<sup>st</sup> s.: **Tangerrsaqnia negurlua ayagtur.** 'When she saw me she went around and passed by.' (Amos and Amos 2003: 219)
- 4<sup>th</sup> s. – 3<sup>rd</sup> s.: **Nutaan-llu kasnguyakarngami taum at'in kilnguacaqniu qagken, una kwan' Nuniwar tangerrngamiu aterluni cakmawet Nash Harbor-armiunun yuullinia tauna panini.** 'And because he was ashamed, when that father of hers took her away from there, upon seeing Nunivak, going down he took his daughter to Nash Harbor.' (Fienup-Riordan 2000: 198) (compare ending in 4<sup>th</sup> s. – 3<sup>rd</sup> s. example for CSY, below)
- 4<sup>th</sup> p. – 1<sup>st</sup> s.: **Tangerrsaqnegtenga negurlua ayagtut.** 'When they saw me they went around and passed by.' (Amos and Amos, pers. comm. 2000) (compare ending in 4<sup>th</sup> pl. – 3<sup>rd</sup> s. example for CSY, below)

For CAY, including NUN, the verb-elaborating postbase (or postbases) **-yar-** means 'to go V-ing' or 'would V' (as in contrafactual conditionals).<sup>8</sup> Based on comparative evidence Fortescue *et al.* (1994) give the meaning of the proto-Eskimo source of this postbase as 'would V'.<sup>9</sup> However, these translations do not seem particularly helpful in understanding the present-day function of the PO mood in NUN. Rather, it appears, from the above examples and others, that the NUN PO is basically an alternative to the consequential mood (the mood expressing "because" or sometimes "when [past]"). The meaning of a NUN sentence with the PO mood such as, **neryugyalrianga nerellruunga**, 'because I wanted to eat, I ate,' in non-NUN CAY could only be expressed with the consequential mood, **neryu(gng)ama nerellruunga**, (which can also be used in NUN as an alternative to the PO mood). No doubt in NUN the PO mood has a somewhat different discourse role than the consequential<sup>10</sup>. However, as with the consequential (and other connective moods), the 4<sup>th</sup> person vs. 3<sup>rd</sup> person apparatus is used to indicate or counter-indicate coreferentiality of the subject of the PO verb with the subject of the main verb, as is clearly seen in the examples above. But, as we shall see below, this is not the way the PO works in CSY.

<sup>8</sup> See Jacobson (1984: 593, 1995: 296).

<sup>9</sup> See Fortescue *et al.* (1994: 434).

<sup>10</sup> Though it is not apparent from the context-free examples gotten from, or in connection with work on, the dictionary by Amos and Amos (2003), those from Nunivak testimony, such as the first one (starting "**Kanani** [...]") given above, suggest that for NUN, as de Reuse (1994) mentions for CSY, the PO mood implies an element of contrast or surprise.



## The PO mood in (SLI) CSY

Willem de Reuse (1994) was apparently the first person to fully describe, and name, the PO mood of CSY, although he notes that Menovshchikov (1967: 151) had already described the intransitive side of this mood. For Chukotkan CSY Vakhtin (1995: 311ff) discusses the intransitive side of the PO along with the transitive side, which, as we shall see below, is somewhat different in Chukotka than in SLI. For CSY the marker of the PO mood is **-yalghii**<sup>11</sup> for intransitive, and **-yaqe-** for transitive. These consist of what is historically the postbase **-yagh-** followed by the marker of the participial mood, **-lghii-** (underlyingly **-lghia-**) for intransitive, **-ke-** for transitive. These mood markers are followed by various person/number markers. So far, this is exactly as in NUN. For intransitive, the person/number markers are like the ordinary (*i.e.* not oblique) *participial* mood markers for 1<sup>st</sup> person, and are like the possessed *relative noun* case markers for 4<sup>th</sup> person (**-mi** for singular, **-meng** for plural, and **-mek** for dual). For 2<sup>nd</sup> person subject the situation is still unclear<sup>12</sup>. The person/number markers for the transitive are for 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> person subject like the ordinary, non PO, *participial* mood markers. For 4<sup>th</sup> person subject they are like *connective* mood markers but with the “remnant” of the localis case with singular subject as with specifically the *contemporative* (expressing “while”) mood (**-minigu** for 4<sup>th</sup> s. – 3<sup>rd</sup> s., **-mininga** for 4<sup>th</sup> s. – 1<sup>st</sup> s., but **-megteggü** for 4<sup>th</sup> p. – 3<sup>rd</sup> p., etc.)<sup>13</sup>. These are the 4<sup>th</sup> person subject transitive PO markers of SLI CSY; for Chukotkan CSY these endings are different and will be discussed later.

### *Intransitive examples:*

1<sup>st</sup> s.: **Tamaani unangsaghyagusimaghma, kaviighniightengughsimaghma akitughqaagaa. (Kii kaviighet pinaqsuwhaalghiini unakneghllugulaataamaat.) Iitek kaviighniighpaghqwaaqsalghiinga mekelghiighhaalunga, nagun aagaqat.** ‘In those days, I could already get many seals and I went trapping because the price of fox pelts was up. (When you first start out, foxes are not as easy to get as it might seem.) All right when I’d set fox traps, being a boy, somehow they’d go (around the traps).’ (Apassingok *et al.* 1987: 174) (compare ending in 1<sup>st</sup> s. example for NUN, above)

<sup>11</sup> The standard or practical orthography of CSY on SLI is used here. See Jacobson (2001: 1 ff) for details. In particular **gh** represents the voiced uvular fricative (which is represented by **r** in the standard or practical orthography used for NUN), **r** represents the voiced retroflex fricative, doubling a fricative or nasal letter indicates devoicing though not always exactly as in NUN, and “doubled” **gh** is **ghh**.

<sup>12</sup> The ordinary, non-PO, intransitive participial mood does use 2<sup>nd</sup> person (singular, anyway) endings like the indicative (as in CAY). For example, **kayngeghllak aagyuq Ilaaghan yuggayengaalghiiten itemuteqaghtikut** ‘big bear, you are certainly a would-be person; would you please undo us’ (Koonooka 2003: 109). However, our one example of a 2<sup>nd</sup> person subject transitive PO form, **maana maavek Iliighyalghiifsi quyngighqwaaghmeng maavek Iliighlusi, Ayvigteghmi nelkaghtusi?** ‘when you<sub>pl</sub> moved here for reindeer herding, did you<sub>pl</sub> build your home in Ayvigteq?’ (de Reuse 1994: 52), has **-fsi** (like a relative noun) rather than **-si** as one might expect. More research is needed to clarify this situation.

<sup>13</sup> For information on the *contemporative* and other *connective* moods in CSY and on the “remnant” of the localis mentioned here, see Jacobson (2001: 83-86, 93).

1<sup>st</sup> p.: **Esghaqunllu ukut Walungankut, ilaput whangkuta. Nallukngwaaghyalghiikut whangkuta, ellngan Uuketam ungipamsugutkaqiinkut.** ‘So the Walungas are our relatives. We didn’t know, until he, Uuketam, told us about it.’ (literally: ‘When we hadn’t known, he, Uuketam, told us.’) (Apassingok *et al.* 1987: 132) (compare ending in 1<sup>st</sup> p. example for NUN, above)

4<sup>th</sup> s.: **Kaalluni, mayuomalghii. Mayughyalghiimi, iyaakun qineghsalghiimi, aghnat iiggangllaataqeftut. Ukigluni, itghumalghii nenglumun. Iteghyalghiimi, nuliini esghaamakanga.** ‘After he arrived he climbed up. When he climbed up, when he peeked through the ventilator, the women were evidently making gloves. Climbing down he went into the sod house. When he went in, he saw his wife.’ (Rubtsova 1954: 444) (compare ending in 4<sup>th</sup> s. example for NUN, above)

4<sup>th</sup> p.: **Elgnaatall suqaa piluku Ataayaghhaankut, Aghtuqaayagenkut, Ungalaankut 1911-mi Nume-etkat. Nome-elluteng tagiyalghiimeng, sloop-engumalghii Cheechako-nguftuq aatgha anyaghpalqusighraagpak ataasimeng napaghyaqelghii.** ‘Ataayaghhaq, Aghtuqaayak, and Ungalaq took the baleen from this whale and went to Nome. When they went to Nome in a sloop, its name was evidently the “Cheechako,” a big boat with one mast.’ (Apassingok *et al.* 1989: 112) (compare ending in 4<sup>th</sup> p. example for NUN, above)

#### *Transitive examples:*

1<sup>st</sup> s. – 3<sup>rd</sup> s.: **Petugyaghtughaqa anyaghpak quutkun. Taana uuglluni [...]** **Liigiksaqegka guard-ngumalghii taana.** ‘I went down to tie the ship securely to the ice. Meanwhile, [the Russian] came aboard. [...] I realized then that he was a guard.’ (literally, ‘When I learned about him (I realized) that he was a guard’) (Apassingok *et al.* 1989: 146) (compare ending in 1<sup>st</sup> s. – 3<sup>rd</sup> s. example for NUN, above)

4<sup>th</sup> s. – 3<sup>rd</sup> s.: **Tawaten nagataqluku qiyallghakun taakwavek piluni; kaasaqminigu tughnughhaq ighninghhaq mekelghiighaauftugnguq.** She followed the sound of the crying baby; when she reached it, it turned out to be a newborn baby boy.’ (Apassingok *et al.* 1987: 244) (compare ending in 4<sup>th</sup> s. – 3<sup>rd</sup> s. example for NUN, above)

4<sup>th</sup> s. – 1<sup>st</sup> s.: **Qaamna sangwaa aqnighqiilghii pinighsaghnaluku [...]. Yughaghyaqmininga qafsikellegaan amiiraaneng ayapghaatiisqelluni piiq.** ‘The woman was praying to heal the pain I was feeling [...]. When she prayed for me, she asked to be clothed in wolverine mittens.’ (Apassingok *et al.* 1989: 156)

4<sup>th</sup> p. – 3<sup>rd</sup> s. **Tawavek tekeghagllagmun itghutkanighii ukum tungagakun. Tekeghagllak taana tughwaaghyaqmegteggu kii, sugenrighllagluni.** ‘It drew them more and more in there to the promontory, in its direction. When they got close to that point, the water got very choppy.’ (Apassingok *et al.* 1987: 120) (compare ending in 4<sup>th</sup> p. – 1<sup>st</sup> s. example for NUN, above)

An important difference from the PO of NUN is that for CSY there are no intransitive or transitive 3<sup>rd</sup> person subject PO forms, nor transitive PO forms with 4<sup>th</sup> person object<sup>14</sup>. The reason is that for the CSY PO mood, 4<sup>th</sup> person works differently in regard to reference than it normally does. In CSY the subject of the PO verb, no matter what person, is always co-referential with the subject of the verbs of the main preceding sentence(s). For a very clear illustration of this see the 4<sup>th</sup> s. intransitive example, “**Kaalluni** [...],” above. There is no room nor need for a 3<sup>rd</sup> person vs. 4<sup>th</sup> person subject distinction, and given that the subject is co-referential in this way, there is no possibility of the object also being co-referential<sup>15</sup>.

In itself the CSY verb-elaborating postbase (or postbases) **-yagh-** mean ‘to go somewhere to V’ or ‘to V without the desired results’<sup>16</sup>, and, as noted above, Fortescue *et al.* (1994) give the meaning of the proto-Eskimo source of this postbase as meaning ‘would V’<sup>17</sup>. However, these translations do not seem particularly helpful in understanding the function of the PO mood in CSY any more than in NUN, nor the differences between the PO in the two areas.

For CSY, de Reuse writes:

Like the Consequential mood, the Participial Oblique moods [intransitive and transitive] often seem to be translatable as ‘when (in the past)’; the difference between the two lies in the discourse function of the Participial Oblique. Against the background of the subordinate clause in the Participial Oblique mood, the main clause describes an event focused on because it is unexpected or contains an element of surprise. As a result, the Participial Oblique moods are more accurately translated as ‘it was the fact (in the past) that..., but...’; ‘until now...’; ‘now that...’, and the main clause often contains interjections expressing excitement, particles meaning ‘already’, or the postbase *-fte/-pete-* ‘to apparently V’ (de Reuse 1994: 50).

The present writer has described the PO of CSY as serving as the functional analogue of the *observational construction* of CAY:

[The PO] is also used to express, ‘through acting (one) sees that such and such occurs,’ *i. e.* the observational construction, [...] in fact this may be one of the principle uses of the participial oblique mood.

---

<sup>14</sup> That is, what one might expect as such forms are not seen in texts, and were rejected by speakers.

<sup>15</sup> See also the explanation in de Reuse (1994: 39-40).

<sup>16</sup> See Badten *et al.* (1987: 306).

<sup>17</sup> See Fortescue *et al.* (1994: 434).

De Reuse, in his thesis, does not analyze the participial oblique mood [...] [in this way] and he gives several examples where this cannot be the analysis since the action in question would not cause one to 'see that such and such occurs.' Thus, evidently the participial oblique mood has a somewhat broader usage. However, in the translations given in the *Lore of St. Lawrence Island Sivuqam Nangaghnegha* books (Apassingok *et al.* 1985; Apassingok *et al.* 1987; Apassingok *et al.* 1989), it appears that the participial oblique mood definitely often is used for the observational construction (Jacobson 1994: 269-270).

As de Reuse (1994) states and some of his examples illustrate, the PO mood in CSY can indeed function as an alternative to the consequential mood, though with a somewhat different role in discourse. Whether used in such a way or not, it agrees with the pattern for the *observational construction* in CAY whereby the subject of the verb expressing the "observational event," which is the PO verb in CSY (but the indicative [!] verb in CAY) is the same as that of the main preceding sentences. For the CSY PO, again as with the observational construction of CAY, the identity of subject or object of the secondary verb with the subject of the main verb is neither explicitly indicated or counter-indicated<sup>18</sup>. For the CSY PO, unlike the NUN PO, 4<sup>th</sup> person links the PO clause with preceding sentences<sup>19</sup>, not with the other clause of the sentence in which it occurs.

### Specific comparison of the PO mood form in NUN and in CSY

Taken as a whole the PO mood takes much the same form in CSY and in NUN, given that 3<sup>rd</sup> person subject forms and 4<sup>th</sup> person object transitive forms exist in NUN but not in CSY. Other than this, differences are minor. Firstly, the 4<sup>th</sup> person singular intransitive person/number marker in NUN is like the unpossessed relative noun marker **-m**, whereas in CSY the 4<sup>th</sup> person singular intransitive is like the 4<sup>th</sup> person possessed relative noun marker **-mi**, just as in both areas the 4<sup>th</sup> person plural and dual are like 4<sup>th</sup> person possessed relative noun markers, **-meng**, and **-mek**. In the opinion of the present writer the NUN form is an innovation, based on the fact that the 3<sup>rd</sup> s. intransitive person/number PO marker,  $\emptyset$ , is essentially the absolutive unpossessed noun ending so that at play is the analogy: *unpossessed absolutive* for 3<sup>rd</sup> person, so *unpossessed relative* for 4<sup>th</sup> person. This analogy cannot arise in CSY where there are no 3<sup>rd</sup> person subject forms. Nor can NUN extend it as far as to change non-singular forms 4<sup>th</sup> person intransitive forms since the unpossessed absolutive and relative non-singular are the same, and such a change would make the 3<sup>rd</sup> person vs. 4<sup>th</sup> person distinction collapse.

Secondly, for transitives, while both CSY and NUN use person/number endings like those of the *connective* moods, in (SLI) CSY they have the peculiarity of one of the connective moods, namely the *contemporative*, while in NUN they have the peculiarity of another of the connective moods, namely the *conditional*. In my opinion this is not a significant difference. No doubt the PO mood of CSY and that of NUN

---

<sup>18</sup> See Jacobson (1994: 264-265).

<sup>19</sup> This direction of reference for 4<sup>th</sup> person is very like that of 4<sup>th</sup> person subject subordinative verbs in CAY in their "autonomous" role (see Jacobson 1995: 240, 357).

CAY have a common origin in proto-Yupik Eskimo, even though at the present day they differ slightly in form, operation, and function.

### Difference between the PO mood of Chukotkan CSY and that of SLI CSY

It is appropriate here to discuss a certain difference between the endings of the PO in Chukotkan CSY and SLI CSY. In Chukotkan CSY the 4<sup>th</sup> person subject transitive PO endings are different: **-yaqenni**<sup>20</sup> is used rather than **-yaqminigu**, and **-yaqminiki**, of SLI; **-yaqegni** is used rather than **-yaqminikek** of SLI; and **-yaqeseng** is used rather than **-yaqmegtegg** of SLI. Vakhtin (1995: 312) gives other endings of this group in the form of **-yaqegteng** for 4<sup>th</sup> p. – 3<sup>rd</sup> d, (which is **-yaqmegtekek** for SLI), and **-yaqeteng** for 4<sup>th</sup> p. – 3<sup>rd</sup> p. (which is **-yaqmegteki** for SLI). In all these there is no marker for the object, though duality of an object is indicated. The present writer has not been able to ascertain the Chukotkan forms of the endings for 4<sup>th</sup> person subject with 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> person object, if indeed such forms exist.

When Adelinda Badten of St. Lawrence Island transliterated some of the Chukotkan CSY stories from Rubtsova (1954) for use by St. Lawrence Islanders, she replaced specifically Chukotkan forms (lexically different or with different endings) with the corresponding SLI form, marking the changes with superscript numbers on the changed words to refer to notes. When the book by Badten and Krauss (1971) was published, only the superscript numbers appeared with the replacement forms; the notes with Rubtsova's original forms were not included, however one can easily enough compare the words in question with the originals in Rubtsova (1954).

#### Examples:

- 4<sup>th</sup> s. – 3<sup>rd</sup> s.: **Kaanghum quilmun anagumakanga. Anaguyaqminigu ifkaghsimakanga.** 'Kaanghu beat him from above. When he beat him he let him fall.' (Badten and Krauss 1971: 42) (originally, **anaguyaqenni** in Rubtsova 1954: 225)
- 4<sup>th</sup> s. – 3<sup>rd</sup> p.: **Mekelghiiq meqsugumalghii. Nuugluni esghaghyaqminiki qaltat malghugneghet.** 'The boy evidently was thirsty. Going out when he saw the buckets, they were two in number.' (Badten and Krauss 1971: 54) (originally, **esghaghyaqenni** in Rubtsova 1954: 242)
- 4<sup>th</sup> p. – 3<sup>rd</sup> s.: **I t e g h a a l l u t e n g n a a y e n g esghaghyaqmegtegg aghnalqwaaghmalghii.** 'After they all went in when they saw their mother, she had evidently become an old woman.' (Badten and Krauss 1971: 24) (originally, **esghaghyaqeseng** in Rubtsova 1954: 26)
- 4<sup>th</sup> s. – 3<sup>rd</sup> d.: **Aghnam qaltak tugumakek. Taagken qelpeghsimakek. Qelpeghsaqminikek qaltam ilungani angyaghhaq esghhaamakanga.**

<sup>20</sup> Recall that **nn** indicates voiceless n.

‘The woman took the bucket (conventional dual for one bucket). She uncovered it (literally, them<sub>2</sub>). When she uncovered it (them<sub>2</sub>) she saw the little boat inside the bucket.’ (Badten and Krauss 1971: 55) (originally, **qelpeghsaqegni** in Rubtsova 1954: 242)

A computer search through more than 300 digitized pages of texts from SLI finds numerous occurrences of the SLI pattern for 4<sup>th</sup> person subject transitive PO endings, but not a single occurrence of the Chukotkan pattern. Conversely, a computerized search through 64 digitized pages of texts from Chukotka<sup>21</sup> finds 90 occurrences of the Chukotka pattern for these endings, and three occurrences of the SLI pattern. These three are in the one and only text by a certain individual and in that text there are no occurrences of the Chukotkan pattern. So, one can conclude that this individual is of a family group that speaks more like SLI, in this regard at least, than like other Chukotkans<sup>22</sup>.

### The PO mood in Naukan

As mentioned above, the PO mood is not to be found in CAY outside of NUN. One might ask if it is present in Sugpiaq (Alutiiq) or in Naukan, the two other Yupik Eskimo languages. A cursory examination shows no evidence of it in Sugpiaq<sup>23</sup>. It is, however found in Naukan.

#### *Examples:*

1<sup>st</sup> s.: **Anyalghianga nagnellughmeng aglutaaqut.** ‘When I came out everyone had been already working.’ (Dobrieva *et al.* 2004: 287).

3<sup>rd</sup> s.: **Kasuusalghia nangelluni qavaasimaaqw.** ‘When he came everyone had been already sleeping.’ (Dobrieva *et al.* 2004: 287).

In the second example the PO verb has a 3<sup>rd</sup> person ending, and thus appears to show that the Naukan PO pattern is more akin to that of NUN than that of CSY, but further research would be required to conclusively establish this. A cursory visual search through several Naukan stories in Menovshchikov (1987) did not turn up any instances of the PO mood, suggesting that it is less common than in CSY or NUN. A quick investigation reveals no evidence of a PO in Sirenik either. None is expected in Inupiaq/Inuit where the so-called participial is related in function only, and not form, to that of Yupik.

---

<sup>21</sup> In Koonooka (2003), transliterated (but without replacing Chukotkan forms with SLI forms) from Menovshchikov (1988).

<sup>22</sup> The individual is Wiri of the Imtugmii clan. It would be interesting to determine if other members of this clan in Chukotka also follow the SLI pattern. Also, it is remarkable that although the SLI texts searched include texts from St. Lawrence Islanders of clans said by some to be relatively recent comers to the island from Chukotka, the Chukotkan pattern nevertheless does not occur at all.

<sup>23</sup> Its absence is confirmed by Jeffery Leer (pers. comm. 2003), the acknowledged leading expert on Sugpiaq.

## Can the PO be an instance of diffusion from CSY to NUN or the reverse?

Given that, as mentioned above, the PO mood itself is not found in CAY except in NUN, one could speculate that the PO mood might be a direct diffusion from St. Lawrence Island to Nunivak or vice-versa, given that “only” open ocean separates the two islands. In my opinion this is very unlikely. It is true that coastal areas of GCY near Nunivak Is. do have a name, **Asveryagmiut** (literally, ‘people of the place with many walrus’), for St. Lawrence Islanders. This word (spelled **Asweryagmiut**) is a place name on Nunivak Island itself (although in NUN ‘walrus’ is **kaugpag**, not **aswer**—cognate to **asveq** ‘walrus’ in other parts of CAY and in CSY). So, unless quite old, the toponym does not refer to a place that just happens to have lots of walrus. However, given the vast distance between St. Lawrence Island and Nunivak Island, it seems extremely unlikely that there has ever been anything more than sporadic, accidental travel or migration from one place to the other. This would almost certainly not be enough to affect the language in such a fundamental way as to introduce a new verb mood.

Although there are many—likely ancient—Chukchi loans in CSY, there are no Chukchi loans in NUN that would only have come directly from CSY<sup>24</sup>. There are, it is true, certain lexical items found in CSY and NUN, but not in CAY, such as **eltughaq / elturar** ‘grandchild,’ **tanqig / tanqig** ‘moon,’ and **sikuq / cikur** ‘needle.’ However, these three words, and others with the same limited CSY-NUN distribution, are generally to be found also in Inuit and/or in Sugpiaq; they are conservative retentions in NUN replaced elsewhere in CAY. There is no lexicon that we know of in CSY that is also found only in NUN and nowhere else in Alaska. More likely, the PO mood was probably originally in a continuous area: in all of CAY (and perhaps Sugpiaq), in formerly Yupik but now Inupiaq Seward Peninsula, in Naukan, and in CSY, and it has all but disappeared in between the two—or rather, three, counting Naukan—places where it remains.

## Dependent use of the participial mood in GCY

A possible tie between the PO mood of CSY and that of NUN is a certain dependent use of the ordinary participial in GCY (and probably NS and HBC), not previously described in any detail. When discussing 4<sup>th</sup> person object transitive verb endings, which he, misleadingly, calls the “reciprocal form,” Hinz (1944: 53) states that there exist such forms “also in the transitive participle, but as this form is not used [...] much [...] I have not sufficient knowledge of it to give examples,” but then he goes on to give a plausible table of endings for them (Hinz 1944: 70)<sup>25</sup>. The various uses of the participial discussed in Reed *et al.* (1977: 250, 297), and Jacobson (1995: 382ff) leave no room for forms with 4<sup>th</sup> person object (or subject) endings. However, this writer has now seen that there is in fact a dependent use of the participial mood in addition to the

<sup>24</sup> NUN has only the two or three Chukchi loans found in all of CAY.

<sup>25</sup> These endings were still a mystery to the present writer in 1995. See Jacobson (1995: 385, footnote). GCY speaker and translator Sophie Shield (pers. comm. 1997) pointed out to him that at least one of them was indeed used, but was not accounted for in our grammar books.

one dependent use (in the “observational construction”) discussed in Jacobson (1994, 1995: 382ff), and that this other use can, and probably must, involve 4<sup>th</sup> person endings. It may likely just be the case that this use is the “missing link” between the PO moods of CSY and NUN!

In texts, one can find a number of examples of this dependent use of the transitive participial with 3<sup>rd</sup> s. subject and 4<sup>th</sup> s. object. When the postbase **-yaaqe-** ‘in vain’ is used with it, the meaning is ‘although.’ That construction is an alternative to the *concessive* mood.

**Examples:**

**Qaruteqtaryaaqekiini taqsugpek'nani qiamallinilria.** ‘Although he tried to console her, she would not stop crying.’ (Tennant and Bitar 1981: 20)

**Pitgaryaaqekiini urluvermek anglluq'alliniluni.** ‘Although he shot it with a bow, it suddenly dove.’ (Orr *et al.* 1997: 542)

**Tua-ll' iliit qanernaurluq, yugmek-gguq tangertuq, nangerngalriamek, tua-i-llugguq nangerngiin ullagluku qanrucaaqekiini kiuvkenani.** ‘And, one of them would say, saying that he sees a person, one standing, and they say, when he stands up, going over to him, although he talks to him, he doesn't answer.’ (Fredson *et al.* 1998: 305)

Recall that in CSY, though not in present-day CAY, one of the meanings of the postbase **-yar-/yagh-** is ‘in vain’ (hence, ‘although’), and that **-yaaqe-** may in fact be derived from **-yar-** and the postbase **-aqe-** ‘regularly, repeatedly.’ Note, however, that ‘although’ is not the meaning of the PO in either NUN or CSY.

When occurring without the postbase **-yaaqe-** the meaning is ‘when’ or ‘because.’ That construction is as an alternative to the *consequential* mood, just as the PO mood of CSY and NUN is<sup>26</sup>.

**Examples:**

**Pitgaqiini ayaluqertelliniluni.** ‘When he shot it with a bow and arrow, it staggered off.’ (Tennant and Bitar 1981: 192)

**Taum-llu curukiini cali aipiriluku nutegyaaqengraani maa-i cali tailuni nutaan keggutni tangernnaqluki uirraniluni.** ‘When that one attacked him, and even though for a second time he tried to shoot it, now again it came and making its teeth visible it growled.’ (Jacobson 1990: 63)

---

<sup>26</sup> It is interesting to note that in CSY the consequential mood is now reserved for the meaning ‘when,’ while to express a causal connection the ordinary (non-oblique) participial may be used (see de Reuse 1994: 45).



**Akageskiini akagtuq.** ‘When he rolled it, it rolled.’ (example offered by the present writer, accepted by GCY speakers)

Working from Hinz’s table, and one’s knowledge of non-4<sup>th</sup> person object transitive participial endings and of 4<sup>th</sup> person object markers, one can predict what other person and number endings would be (see Table 1). One expects endings as in sentences such as:

3<sup>rd</sup> s. – 4<sup>th</sup> pl.: **Akageskiiteng akagtut.** ‘When he rolled them, they rolled.’

3<sup>rd</sup> pl. – 4<sup>th</sup> s.: **Akageskiitni akagtuq.** ‘When they rolled it, it rolled.’

1<sup>st</sup> s. – 4<sup>th</sup> s.: **Akageskemni akagtuq.** ‘When I rolled it, it rolled.’

2<sup>nd</sup> pl. – 4<sup>th</sup> pl.: **Akageskevceteng akagtut.** ‘When you<sub>pl</sub> rolled them, they rolled.’

These proposed sentences meet with approval when offered to speakers (though they preferred to use the consequential mood instead of the participial), but it is certainly significant that absolutely none with endings like these have been found in an extensive computer search of (non-NUN) CAY texts. Perhaps it is not too surprising not to find examples with 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> person subjects in narrative texts; they might occur more in oral exchanges. However one would expect to find 3<sup>rd</sup> person – 4<sup>th</sup> person examples with non-singular subjects and/or non-singular objects in texts, yet they are apparently not to be found; only 3<sup>rd</sup> s. – 4<sup>th</sup> s. forms are found. It may well be that this dependent use of the participial mood (revealed especially when the object is 4<sup>th</sup> person) is far less common now than it was 70—or more—years ago when Hinz was doing his research.

Concerning 4<sup>th</sup> person *subject* transitive participial verb endings, which Hinz refers to (following Kleinschmidt’s terminology for Greenlandic) as “3e” forms (Hinz 1944: 51), Hinz has only question marks on his chart (Hinz 1944: 68). Searching by computer through texts for words with endings for various conceivable 4<sup>th</sup> person subject transitive participial, one finds only words ending in **-yaaqekni**, and these do indeed seem to be 4<sup>th</sup> person singular transitive participials.

### **Examples:**

**Tua-i yuaryaaqekni picimitun qanaaluni.** ‘Although he looked for it, he started speaking nonsense.’ (John 2003: 30)

[...] **uluamek taugaam cali qamiqurra pilagyaaqekni pulasciigalan, tugerluku nutaan pulauq.** ‘[...] although he tried to cut into its head with a knife, because it couldn’t plunge in, he thrust it in and only then did he plunge in.’ (Fredson *et al.* 1998: 9)

**Tang, ava-i-am aug’um [...] elakaq-am ava-i elakarteng carriryaaqekni pivilacagluku, uyangtevkenata-ll’ ava-i ayagluni.** ‘See, that one [...] cleaned out their water hole all right, but he did it so carelessly, and left without looking at us.’ (John 2003: 40)

Close consideration of these sentences shows that they are not examples of the nominalizing role of the participial morpheme with 4<sup>th</sup> person absolutive possessor (which would have the same form), since there are no transitive verbs in these sentences of which they could be the objects. The participials in these examples are clearly transitives with 3<sup>rd</sup> person objects, though there is no \***u** to mark that object. In fact, the ending here, **-kni** (in **-yaaqekni**), is very like the 4<sup>th</sup> s. subject transitive PO mood of *Chukotkan CSY*, **-yaqenni** (see above). However, examples could not be found in the GCY texts with **\*-yaaqekteng**, which would have a 4<sup>th</sup> pl. transitive participial ending similar to the *Chukotkan CSY* **-yaqeseng**.

As for the intransitive participial in this dependent use, examples from texts have been found only using the postbase **-yaaqe-**, and so meaning ‘although,’ and with 4<sup>th</sup> s. subject marked by **-m** (as in the NUN PO mood):

**Tauna-ll' im' uqilayaaqelriim nuqlitenglliniluni tua-i.** ‘Even though he was a fast runner, he started to fall behind.’ (John 2003: 426)

**Oelatuyaaqellriim ellii qaneqsaunani-llu.** ‘Even though he practiced divination he didn't speak.’ (Jacobson, ed. 2001: 29)

The 4<sup>th</sup> p. forms in **-meng** (as in the PO of NUN and CSY) were not found with a computer search. However, if 4<sup>th</sup> p. forms take **-t** (as is conceivable), they might have escaped attention, since they would look like, and could indeed be interpreted as, nouns in apposition to the subject. Indeed such forms when presented to speakers are approved. For example, **qerrucaaqellriit iteryuumiitut** ‘although they are cold, they don't want to go in.’

Putative 3<sup>rd</sup> s. forms would also be hard to spot, but when presented to speakers, were rejected. For example, **\*nenglliryaaqellria iteryuumiitua** ‘although it (weather) is cold, I don't want to go in.’ Rejected by speakers also were putative 1<sup>st</sup> s. forms; for example, **\*qerrucaaqellrianga** (or **\*qerrucaaqellriama**) **iteryuumiitua** ‘although I am cold, I don't want to go in’ is rejected.

Proposed intransitive forms without **-yaaqe-** were rejected; for example, **\*kailriim ner'uq** for ‘because he's hungry he is eating’ is rejected (the consequential **kaig(ng)ami ner'uq** being used for this instead), and **\*kailrianga nerua** for ‘because I am hungry I am eating’ is rejected (the consequential **kaig(ng)ama nerua** being used instead). Recall that GCY also rejects the NUN type PO (see above), using the consequential instead

The almost complete lack of examples other than with the two endings, 3<sup>rd</sup> s. – 4<sup>th</sup> s., and 4<sup>th</sup> s., is evidence, as Hinz suggests (for 4<sup>th</sup> person subject), that this use of the participial mood is disappearing. The forms we do see are essentially fossils. They are likely the “missing link” between the PO of CSY and the PO of NUN.

Table 1. Hinz's (1944: 70) 4<sup>th</sup> person object transitive participial endings, in modern orthography. Forms in parentheses are those that the present writer would expect.

	<i>4<sup>th</sup> s. object</i>	<i>4<sup>th</sup> pl. object</i>	<i>4<sup>th</sup> dual object</i>
<i>3<sup>rd</sup> person subject</i>	<b>-kiini</b>	<b>-kiiteng</b>	<b>-kiitek</b>
	<b>-kiitni</b>	<b>-kiiceteng</b>	<b>-kiicetek</b>
	<b>-kiigni</b>	<b>-kiicekek (kiigteng?)</b>	<b>-kiicekek (kiigkek?)</b>
<i>1<sup>st</sup> person subject</i>	<b>-kemni</b>	<b>-kemteng</b>	<b>-kemtek</b>
	<b>-kementi</b>	<b>-kemceteng</b>	<b>-kemkek (kemcetek?)</b>
	<b>-kemegni</b>	<b>-kemceteng (kiimegteng?)</b>	<b>-kemkek (kemegtek?)</b>
<i>2<sup>nd</sup> person subject</i>	<b>-kevni</b>	<b>-kevteng</b>	<b>-kevkek (kevtek ?)</b>
	<b>-kevceni</b>	<b>-kevceteng</b>	<b>-kevcetek</b>
	<b>-kevtegni</b>	<b>-kevcetek (kevtengteng?)</b>	<b>-kevcekek (kevtegtek?)</b>

## Conclusion

The PO mood does indeed seem like it has been “cobbled” together from the postbase **-yagh/-yar-** and the participial mood with additional endings borrowed from those of the connective moods to accommodate 4<sup>th</sup> person, with a new “twist” put on the meaning of the aggregate of the parts. Finding the PO mood so similar in two widely separated areas, NUN CAY and CSY, in different languages in fact, suggests that the PO mood in much its present form goes back to proto-Yupik times. The dependent use of the participial in GCY discussed above with its limited set of endings, suggests that this “missing link” is a reduced offshoot from some earlier stage in the development of the PO mood.

When one considers 4<sup>th</sup> person subject transitive PO forms, one sees that the SLI CSY pattern is virtually the same as the NUN CAY pattern, while the Chukotkan CSY pattern is different. The joint SLI and NUN pattern uses essentially the endings of the connective verb moods here, while the Chukotkan pattern uses what seems to be 4<sup>th</sup> person possessor possessed absolutive noun endings here. On the other hand, the

Chukotkan CSY pattern for these 4<sup>th</sup> person (singular) subject transitive PO forms is indeed like the pattern found of the “missing link” in GCY.

More research may (or may not) shed light on the questions of the origin of this mood, and whether the NUN CAY, SLI CSY, or Chukotkan CSY pattern of forms (and function) is nearer to the original. At this point, evidence one way or the other is still scanty and presents (to this writer) a mixed picture, but what is indisputable is that NUN has this PO verb mood represented elsewhere in CAY only in a limited remnant form, but quite present in CSY (and Naukan).

### References

- AMOS, Muriel and Howard AMOS  
2003 *Cup'ig Eskimo Dictionary*, Introduction by Steven A. Jacobson, Fairbanks, Alaska Native Language Center.
- ANCSA Testimony  
n.d. *Testimony concerning local history given in Alaskan native languages to fulfill governmental obligations of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1991*, (Those with "NUN" are from Nunivak, were transcribed from tape recordings and translated by various CAY speakers), Fairbanks, Alaska Native Language Center archives.
- APASSINGOK, Anders (Iyaaka), Willis WALUNGA (Kepelgu) and Edward TENNANT (Tengutkalek) (eds)  
1985 *Sivugam Nangaghnegha — Siivanllemta Ungipaqellghat / Lore of St. Lawrence Island — Echoes of our Eskimo Elders, Volume 1: Gambell*, Unalakleet, Bering Strait School District.
- APASSINGOK, Anders (Iyaaka), Willis WALUNGA (Kepelgu), Raymond OOZEVASEUK (Awitaq) and Edward TENNANT (Tengutkalek) (eds)  
1987 *Sivugam Nangaghnegha — Siivanllemta Ungipaqellghat / Lore of St. Lawrence Island — Echoes of our Eskimo Elders, Volume 2: Savoonga*, Unalakleet, Bering Strait School District.
- APASSINGOK, Anders (Iyaaka), Willis WALUNGA (Kepelgu), Jessie UGLOWOOK (Ayuqliq) and Edward TENNANT (Tengutkalek) (eds)  
1989 *Sivugam Nangaghnegha — Siivanllemta Ungipaqellghat / Lore of St. Lawrence Island — Echoes of our Eskimo Elders, Volume 3: Southwest Cape*, Unalakleet, Bering Strait School District.
- BADTEN, Adelinda Womkon and Michael E. KRAUSS  
1971 *Ungazighmiit Ungipaghaatangit*, Fairbanks, Alaska Native Language Center.

- BADTEN, Linda Womkon, Vera Oovi KANESHIRO and Marie OOOVI  
 1987 *A Dictionary of the St. Lawrence Island / Siberian Yupik Eskimo Language*,  
 edited by Steven A. Jacobson, Fairbanks, Alaska Native Language Center.
- BARNUM, Francis  
 1970 *Grammatical Fundamentals of the Innuït [sic] Language as spoken by the*  
 [1901] *Eskimo of the Western Coast of Alaska*, Boston, Ginn and Company  
 (reprint, Hildesheim, New York, Georg Olms Verlag).
- DE REUSE, Willem  
 1994 *Siberian Yupik Eskimo, The Language and Its Contacts with Chukchi*, Salt  
 Lake City, University of Utah Press.
- DOBRIEVA, Elizaveta A., Evgeniy V. GOLOVKO, Steven A. JACOBSON and  
 Michael E. KRAUSS (compilers)  
 2004 *Naukan Yupik Eskimo Dictionary*, edited by Steven A. Jacobson, Fairbanks,  
 Alaska Native Language Center (also published in Russian - Cyrillic  
 Naukan format).
- FIENUP-RIORDAN, Ann (ed.)  
 2000 *Where The Echo Began and other Oral Traditions from Southwestern*  
*Alaska recoded by Hans Himmelheber*, Fairbanks, University of Alaska  
 Press.
- FORTESCUE, Michael, Steven JACOBSON and Lawrence KAPLAN  
 1994 *Comparative Eskimo Dictionary with Aleut Cognates*, Fairbanks, Alaska  
 Native Language Center.
- FREDSON, Alice, Mary Jane MANN, Elena DOCK and Leisy Thornton WYMAN  
 1998 *Kipnirmiut Tiganrita Igmirtitrit / Qipnermiut Tegganrita Egmirtellrit / The*  
*Legacy of the Kipnuk Elders*, Fairbanks, Alaska Native Language Center.
- HAMMERICH, Louis L.  
 1954 *Report on my journeys of 1950 and 1953 to investigate the language of*  
*some Eskimos of Alaska*, unpublished typescript, Fairbanks, Alaska Native  
 Language Center archives.
- 1958 *The Western Eskimo dialects, Proceeding of the 32<sup>nd</sup> International*  
*Congress of Americanists*, Copenhagen, Munksgaard: 632-639.
- HINZ, John  
 1944 *Grammar and Vocabulary of the Eskimo Language as spoken by the*  
*Kuskokwim and Southwest Coast Eskimos of Alaska*, Bethlehem,  
 Pennsylvania, The Society for Propagating the Gospel, The Moravian  
 Church.

- JACOBSON, Anna  
1990 *Elnguq*, Fairbanks, Alaska Native Language Center.
- JACOBSON, Anna (ed.)  
2001 *Martha Teeluk-aam Qulirat Avullri Erinairissuutekun Agnes Hootch-aamek*, Fairbanks, Lower Kuskokwim School District and Alaska Native Language Center.
- JACOBSON, Steven A.  
1979 *Report on Nunivak dialect and orthography problems*, unpublished typescript, Fairbanks, Alaska Native Language Center Fairbanks archives.  
1984 *Yup'ik Eskimo Dictionary*, Fairbanks, Alaska Native Language Center.  
1994 The "Observational Construction" in Central (Alaskan) Yup'ik Eskimo and (Central) Siberian Yupik Eskimo, *Acta Linguistica Havniensia (International Journal of Linguistics)*, 27(2): 261-274.  
1995 *A Practical Grammar of the Central Alaskan Yup'ik Eskimo Language*, Fairbanks, Alaska Native Language Center.  
1998 *Yup'ik Dialect Atlas and Study*, Fairbanks, Alaska Native Language Center.  
2001 *A Practical Grammar of the St. Lawrence Island / Siberian Yupik Eskimo Language, second edition*, Fairbanks, Alaska Native Language Center.
- JOHN, Paul  
2003 *Qulirat Qanemcit-llu Kinguvarcimalriit / Stories for Future Generations*, Seattle, University of Washington Press.
- KOONOOKA, Christopher (Petuwaq)  
2003 *Ungipaghaghlanga. Let Me Tell a Story: Quutmiit Yupigita Unigpaghaatangit. Legends of the Siberian Eskimos, transliterated and translated from Menovshchikov 1988*, Fairbanks, Alaska Native Language Center.
- MENOVSHCHIKOV, Georgiy. A.  
1967 *Grammatika iazyka aziatskikh eskimosov, Volume 2*, Moscow and Leningrad, Izdatelst'vo Akademii Nauk SSSR.  
1987 *Materialiy i issledovaniia po iaziku i fol'kloru naukanskih eskimosov*. Leningrad, Nauka.  
1988 *Materialiy i issledovaniia po iaziku i fol'kloru chaplinskih eskimosov*. Leningrad, Nauka.

- ORR, Eliza Cingarkaq, Ben ORR, Victor KANRILAK, Jr. and Andy CHARLIE, Jr.  
 1997 *Ellangellemni / When I Became Aware*, Fairbanks, Lower Kuskokwim School District and Alaska Native Language Center.
- REED, Irene, Osahito MIYAOKA, Steven JACOBSON, Paschal AFCAN and Michael KRAUSS  
 1977 *Yup'ik Eskimo Grammar*, Fairbanks, University of Alaska, Alaska Native Language Center and the Yup'ik Language Workshop.
- RUBTISOVA, Ekaterina C.  
 1954 *Materiali po iazyku i fol'kloru eskimosov (chaplinskii dialect) Chast I*, Moscow and Leningrad, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- TENNANT, Edward A. and Joseph BITAR  
 1981 *Yuut Qanemciit – Yupiit Cayaraita Qanrutkumallrit / Yupik Lore – Oral Traditions of an Eskimo People*, Bethel, Lower Kuskokwim School District.
- VAKHTIN, Nikolay B.  
 1995 *Sintaksis iazyka aziatskikh eskimosov*. St. Petersburg: Isdatel'stvo Evropeyskogo Doma.
- WOODBURY, Anthony C.  
 1981 *Study of the Chevak Dialect of Central Yup'ik Eskimo*, Ph.D. dissertation, Berkeley, University of California.
- 1984 *Cev'armiut Qanemciit Qulirait-llu*, Fairbanks, Alaska Native Language Center.