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1. Introduction
In the present paper I examine which construction in Koryak corresponds to Japanese Mermaid Construction (MMC, hereafter) and in what points they are similar and in what points they differ. Japanese MMC is known to be used with a variety of nouns occurring in the slot ‘Noun’, while no Koryak form which has the same syntactic construction as MMC has been observed. However, there are a few forms which have morphological and syntactic similarity to MMC despite the structural differences. Here I will take up one of those forms, that is the agent/patient nominal formed by a complex suffix 
-jo-lqol (JQ, hereafter) whose original meaning is ‘agent or patient of future action’ and further examine if there is any connection between JQ and MMC based on my previous description on this form (Kurebito 2011a, 2011b).

2. Outline of the language
The Koryak language is mainly spoken in the northern part of the Kamchatka Oblast and in the Magadan Oblast along the sea of Okhotsk in Russia. It is a member of the Chukchi-Kamchatkan language family together with the neighboring Chukchi, Kerek, Alutor, and Itelmen. According to the official 2002 Russian census, 2,369 people (27.1% of the total Koryak population) regard Koryak as their native language (http://www.raipon.org/). Koryak is characterized by marked dialectal diversity: besides the main dialects, Chawchovan and Palana, the presence of a number of other dialects, including Paren, Itkan, Kamenskoe, Apuka, and Karaga, has been reported (Zhukova 1968:271). All the examples demonstrated in the present paper are those of the Chawchovan dialect.
The Koryak phonemic inventory set up by Kurebito (2004) is as follows: Consonants: $p$, $t$, $t'$, $k$, $q$, $v$, $y$, $l'$, $c$, $m$, $n$, $n'$, $\eta$, $l$, $l'$, $j$, $w$; Vowels: $i$, $e$, $a$, $o$, $u$, $\partial$. Voicing is not a contrastive feature and all the stops are voiceless. The symbol $[\text{'}]$ denotes palatalization of the dentals. $c$ is used as a symbol of the affricate $[\text{tʃ}]$. Pitch and stress are not distinctive.

Koryak is a polysynthetic language guaranteed by incorporation and a variety of affixes including suffixes, prefixes, and circumfixes. Therefore Koryak can quite easily create a ‘word’ which would correspond to a ‘sentence’ in other less synthetic languages. This might be one of the reasons for the constructional difference between JQ and MMC.

(1a) $t'-'\partial-ktep-nal\partial-y-\partial-t'-ic\partial-'\partial-\eta-\partial-k-\emptyset$

1SG.S-E-wild.sheep-skin-E-make-fur.coat-E-make-E-1SG.S-PF
‘I made a coat with a wild sheep skin.’

(1b) $k-ena-mal-'\partial-n-kemet\partial-\partial-jp-an-'\partial-\eta-\emptyset$

IPF-1SG.O-well-E-CAUS-clothes-E-put.on-CAUS-E-IPF-3SG.S
‘He/She is dressing me with clothes.’

Koryak is also agglutinating; double-marking; and non-configurational. Nouns are marked for both case and number. There are twelve major cases: absolutive, locative, instrumental, dative, allative, prolation, ablative, contactive, causal, equative, comitative, and associative. There are three number markers: singular, dual, and plural, which are distinguished only in the absolutive case. But proper nouns and human nouns in a higher position of the animacy hierarchy distinguish between singular and plural even in oblique cases.

Case-marking in the syntax follows an ergative pattern. However, there is no special form for the ergative except in the personal pronouns. Either the locative or the instrumental is substituted for the ergative according to the animacy hierarchy (Kurebito 2002).

Relative order of the A (=transitive subject), the O (transitive object) and the V is not fixed. The relative order of a noun and its modifier is in the main not fixed.
Koryak has no traditional alphabet of its own. Although a Cyrillic based orthographic system was introduced in 1930s, it is currently not widespread. All the data presented in the present paper were obtained from the spoken language.

3. Adnominal clause
Koryak employs two main strategies for the formation of adnominal clauses (ACs hereafter), that is, the infinite participial strategy and the finite subordinate strategy. They differ from each other with regard to the NP positions they can modify. Thus, the infinite participial clause modifies the intransitive subject or the transitive direct object of the clause only, whereas the finite subordinate clause modifies oblique NPs and possessor nouns with the help of relativizers, such as relative adverbs and a relative pronoun. The use of these two strategies is not random: it reflects their complementary distribution as per the Accessibility Hierarchy (Keenan and Comrie 1977). Specifically, NPs in a higher position of the hierarchy are modified by a less explicit strategy, namely participles, and NPs in a lower position are modified by a more explicit strategy, namely relativizers.

The Koryak adnominal clause falls into the *Uti no kankee* (‘internal relationship’) type and the *Soto no kankee* (‘external relationship’) type is unattested.

3.1. Infinite participial clause
Koryak mainly employs two nominalizing suffixes to form adnominal clauses, that is, -lʃ (LH hereafter) and JQ (Kurebito 2008a, 2008b). It should be noted that LH is a single suffix, while JQ is actually a complex suffix which can be further analyzed into two components -jo and -lqəl. -jo is a nominalizing suffix attached to verbal stems and denotes the intransitive subject or the transitive object (*jeŋa*-jo-n ‘one that flies’, *təm*-jo-n ‘one that [someone] killed=carcass’)(The word-final -n is the marker of the absolutive singular). -lqəl is suffixed to a nominal stem and denotes the meaning of ‘one for future ~, material for making ~, one that should become ~’ (*ja*-lqəl-Ø ‘material for building house=post’, *cawat*-ə-lqəl-Ø ‘material for making rope’)(The word-final -Ø is the marker of the absolutive singular).
LH and JQ behave similarly both morphologically and syntactically, showing an ergative pattern and occurring only in the absolutive case. The major difference is that they function complementarily, each taking on a share of the tense marking, LH for the present and past tense as in (2a) and (2b), and JQ for the future tense as in (3a) and (3b).

(2a)  
\[ \text{el'} \text{ʃa-Ø, } [\text{ʃamin} \ wucin \ yiviv-k} \]
woman-ABS.SG INTRJ this year-LOC
\[ \text{ienen yəjuləv-ə-lʃ-ə-n} \ kaleja-k]. \ \etaanko \ ku-lev-ə-ŋ-Ø. \]
teach-E-NML-E-ABS.SG school-LOC there IPF-walk-E-IPF-3SG.S
‘The woman who teaches at school this year is walking there.’

(2b)  
\[ \text{kali kal}, \ [\text{ʃamin} \ ajyəve \ qajəkmiŋ-a} \]
book (ABS.SG) INTRJ yesterday boy-INSTR(ERG)
\[ jəlŋ-ə-lʃ-ə-n] \ read-E-NML-E-ABS.SG
‘the book which the boy read yesterday’

(3a)  
\[ \text{qajəkmiŋ-ə-n, } [\text{ʃamin} \ mitiw \ lajv-ə-jo-lqəl-Ø} \]
boy-E-ABS.SG INTRJ tomorrow go-E-NML-to.be\(^1\)-ABS.SG
\[ tənop-ɛtəŋ] \ mountain-ALL
‘the boy who will walk to the hill tomorrow’

(3b)  
\[ \text{kali kal}, \ [\text{ʃamin} \ mitiw \ γəmnan} \]
book (ABS.SG) INTRJ tomorrow I (ERG)
\[ akmec-co-lqəl-Ø\(^2\)] \ buy-NML-to.be-ABS.SG

\(^1\) It means ‘future~, one meant to be~’. Generally it is spelled ‘to-be’ with a hyphen between ‘to’ and ‘be’, but here for descriptive purposes I have used a period to avoid confusion with the hyphen used to indicate a morphological boundary.

\(^2\) *akmec-co-lqəl-Ø* is the surface form of the underlying *ekmit-jolqəl* realized by assimilation of t and j into cc at the morpheme boundary.
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‘the book which I will buy tomorrow’

3.2. Finite subordinate clause

3.2.1. Relative adverbs

Relative adverbs such as miği ‘where’, meŋqo ‘from where’, tite ‘when’ are employed when oblique nouns denoting place or time are modified.

(4a) en’pic-Ø qɔtt-i-Ø wajam-tajn-etŋ. [miği ŋamin father-ABS.SG go-PF-3SG.S river-shore-ALL where INTRJ ajyɔve yɔcci k-ejeʃoŋ-ŋ-Ø]. yesterday you(ABS) IPF-fish-IPF-3SG.S ‘Father went to the river where you fished yesterday.’

(4b) wejem-Ø, [ŋamin meŋqo ano-k river-ABS.SG INTRJ from.where spring-LOC gellə-Ø mɔt-ajtala-n-Ø] wotqo reindeer.herd-ABS.SG 1PL.S-drive-3SG.O-PF from.here ojava-k ko-tvaŋ-ŋ-Ø remote.place-LOC IPF-be-IPF-3SG.S ‘The river from where we drove the reindeer herd is far away from here.’

3.2.2. Relative pronoun

Possessive nouns are modified by *mikən* 'whose', the genitive relative pronoun.

(5) *yəmnən ye-juyle-lin-Ø el'ya, [ʃamin qun
I(ERG) RES-know-RES+1SG.S-3SG.O woman-ABS.S INTRJ INTRJ
*mikən* ɡavakək-Ø malawja-k ko-vetat-ə-ŋ-Ø
whose daughter-ABS.SG hospital-LOC IPF-work-E-IPF-3SG.S doktor-ø].
doctor-EQ

'I know the woman whose daughter works at the hospital as a doctor.'

4. Grammatical functions of JQ and degree of nominalization

JQ actually has the following three different functions in a sentence:

(a) argument
(b) adnominal phrase/clause
(c) predicate in the main clause

The degree of nominalization of JQ varies according to this functional difference. That is, the degree decreases in the order of (a) > (b) > (c). In other words, of the three functions, (c) retains the most verbal features both semantically and syntactically. In the present paper the following will be the main criteria by which the degree of nominalization of JQ is measured:

(A) To what extent can JQ take case/number marking?
(B) Does JQ differ from a finite verb in the way it takes arguments and adjuncts?
(C) Does JQ have the tense-aspect-modal categories inherent in verbs?
Results are shown in the following table:

(6) Degree of nominalization of JQ and its morphological, syntactic, and semantic features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>high</th>
<th>JQ argument</th>
<th>JQ adnominal</th>
<th>JQ predicate</th>
<th>finite verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case/number marking</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 (ABS/LOC)</td>
<td>1 (ABS)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case of transitive subject</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>GEN/ERG</td>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ERG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>oblique nouns</td>
<td>oblique nouns, adverbs</td>
<td>oblique nouns, adverbs</td>
<td>oblique nouns, adverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>relative</td>
<td>relative</td>
<td>relative</td>
<td>absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal category</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Obligation</td>
<td>Indicative, Imperative, Optative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several points should be highlighted:

1) Case/number marking of JQ increases in restriction (a) → (b) → (c) accordingly. However, even in (a), case marking is much more restricted than that of the typical noun.

2) Case/number marking of the transitive becomes increasingly more similar to that of a verb in the order (a) → (b) → (c).

3) Adjuncts appear more freely as finite verb in the order of (a) → (b) → (c).

4) Predicative JQ is grammaticalized in terms of semantics and acquires a modal meaning, obligation.

4.1. JQ as an argument

JQ follows an ergative pattern. When attached to an intransitive verb stem, it codes the subject with the meaning ‘one that is (was) supposed to be the agent of certain action’ as in (7a). When attached to a transitive verb
stem, it codes the object with the meaning ‘one that is (was) supposed to be the patient of certain action’ as in (7b).

(7a) \textit{va-jo-lqəl-Ø} ‘one who should stay (should have stayed)’
\textit{jeŋa-jo-lqəl-Ø} ‘one who should fly (should have flown)’

(7b) \textit{saŋgaw-jo-lqəl-Ø} ‘one whom [someone] should call (should have called)’
\textit{təm-jo-lqəl-Ø} ‘one whom [someone] should kill (should have killed)’

4.1.1. Case/Number marking

The case/number marking of the JQ argument is restricted to only two cases. JQ cannot take any case markers other than the absolutive and locative. For example, JQ in the instrumental (=ergative) case is not permissible.

(8a) is an example of JQ used as an intransitive subject. (8b) is an example of JQ used as a transitive object. Each of them takes the absolutive case. (8c) is an example of JQ in the locative case. While (9), in the instrumental case, is not permitted.

(8a) \textit{taŋataw-jo-lqəl-Ø} \textit{jeppə ku-jəlqət-ə-ŋ-Ø}
\textit{get.dressed-NML-to.be-ABS.SG} \textit{yet IPF-sleep-E-IPF-3SG.S}
‘The one who is supposed to dress himself is still sleeping.’

(8b) \textit{yəmnan təne-jo-lqəl-Ø} \textit{t-ə-ntəmŋeə-ə-n-Ø}
\textit{I(ERG) sew-NML-to.be-ABS.SG} \textit{1SG.S-E-lose-E-3SG.O-PF}
‘I lost the one which I was supposed to sew.’

(8c) \textit{jeŋa-jo-lqəl-ə-k} \textit{mitiw ye-minnine-te}
\textit{fly-NML-to.be-E-LOC} \textit{tomorrow IMPR-join-IMPR}
‘Join the one who is supposed to fly tomorrow.’

(9) *\textit{jeŋa-jo-lqəl-a} \textit{na-k-enajeq-ye}
\textit{fly-NML-to.be-INSTR(ERG)} \textit{INV-IPF-look.for-2SG.O}
‘The one who is supposed to fly is looking for you.’

4.1.2. Arguments and adjuncts

A JQ argument used as a subject of the transitive appears either in the ergative or in the genitive as in (10). This fact coincides with Givón’s
stipulation (2001:25) that subject and/or object acquires genitive case-marking through nominalization.

(10) \( y\text{m-nin-}\emptyset \)  \( Saj\text{gaw-jo-lq}\text{\ awl-}\emptyset \)  \( mi\text{gkoje amu} \)
    1SG-GEN-ABS.SG call-NML-to.be-ABS.SG where probably
    ye-lq-\-\text{\ ø-lin\ }
    RES-leave-E-RES+3SG.S
    ‘The one who was supposed to be called by me has probably gone somewhere.’

As for adjuncts, JQ can take the oblique noun just as a finite verb can, as in (11), but adverbs such as the temporal adverb in (12) are not permitted.

(11) \( magadan-\text{et}\emptyset \)  \( je\text{\ ɡa-jo-lq}\text{\ awl-}\emptyset \)  \( jepp\emptyset \)  \( ko-tva-\emptyset \)
    Magadan-ALL fly-NML-to.be-ABS.SG yet IPF-be-IPF-3SG.S
    \( ɡ\text{\ øl\ øl-}\text{\ ø-k\ }
    reindeer.herd-E-LOC
    ‘The one who was supposed to fly to Magadan is still in the reindeer herd.’

(12) \( \text{*mitiw \ v}\text{-jо-lq}\text{\ øl-}\emptyset \)  \( jaja\text{-k} \)  \( ec\text{\ ɡi} \)
    tomorrow be-NML-to.be-ABS.SG house-LOC now
    \( ye\text{eqev-}\emptyset \)  \( ɡ\text{\ øl\ øl-}\text{\ ø-k\ }
    leave-PF-3SG.S reindeer.herd-E-LOC
    ‘The one who was supposed to stay home tomorrow has flown to Magadan today.’

4.1.3. TAM
Finite verbs have future/non-future tense and perfect/imperfect aspect. In this case tense is the absolute with the present as the reference point. On the other hand, the JQ argument has relative tense whose reference point is decided by context. Perfect/imperfect aspectual difference is neutralized in JQ. Modal differences are not overtly marked on JQ.
4.2. JQ as an adnominal phrase or clause
4.2.1. Case/number marking
A JQ adnominal phrase or clause takes only the subject of an intransitive verb or the object of a transitive verb as a head noun (Kurebito 2008a, Kurebito 2008b). Therefore, the one case that adnominal JQ can take, the absolutive, is more restricted than argument JQ seen above in 4.1. Examples for this will be shown in 4.2.2.

4.2.2. Arguments and adjuncts
Unlike the JQ argument, adnominal JQ takes the subject not in the genitive but the ergative like a finite verb. Also it can not only take oblique nouns but also adverbs, and can also be accompanied by a converb.

(15a) below is adnominal JQ derived from the intransitive verb \( nąq \text{tva} \) ‘clean’. It can be expanded into a noun modifying clause by taking oblique nouns and adverbs as in (15b) and (15c). In the examples below, the head nouns are underlined and the noun modifying clauses are in brackets.

(13) \( je\,nja-jo-lq\,əl-Ø \quad jeppə \quad jaja-k \quad ku-jəlqet-ə-ŋ-Ø \)
fly-NML-to.be-ABS.SG yet house-LOC IPF-sleep-E-IPF-3SG.S
‘The one who is (was) supposed to fly is still sleeping at home.’

(14) \( əm-nin-Ø \quad Sajgaw-jo-lq\,əl-Ø \quad miŋkəje \quad amu \)
1SG-GEN-ABS.SG call-NML-to.be-ABS.SG where probably
\( ye-lg-ə-lin \)
RES-leave-E-RES+3SG.S
‘The one who is (was) supposed to be called by me has probably gone somewhere.’

\( 4.2. \) JQ as an adnominal phrase or clause

4.2.1. Case/number marking
A JQ adnominal phrase or clause takes only the subject of an intransitive verb or the object of a transitive verb as a head noun (Kurebito 2008a, Kurebito 2008b). Therefore, the one case that adnominal JQ can take, the absolutive, is more restricted than argument JQ seen above in 4.1. Examples for this will be shown in 4.2.2.

4.2.2. Arguments and adjuncts
Unlike the JQ argument, adnominal JQ takes the subject not in the genitive but the ergative like a finite verb. Also it can not only take oblique nouns but also adverbs, and can also be accompanied by a converb.

(15a) below is adnominal JQ derived from the intransitive verb \( nąq \text{tva} \) ‘clean’. It can be expanded into a noun modifying clause by taking oblique nouns and adverbs as in (15b) and (15c). In the examples below, the head nouns are underlined and the noun modifying clauses are in brackets.

(15a) \( əccaj-Ø \quad [najq\,ətva-jo-lq\,əl-Ø] \quad pece \)
ant-ABS.SG clean-NML-to.be-ABS.SG first
\( ajm-e-Ø \)
go.to.fetch.water-PF-3SG.S
‘The ant who is supposed to clean has gone for water at first.’

(15b) \( əccaj-Ø \quad [jaja-k \quad nąq\,ətva-jo-lq\,əl-Ø] \quad pece \)
ant-ABS.SG house-LOC clean-NML-to.be-ABS.SG first
ajm-e-Ø
go.to.fetch.water-PF-3SG.S
'The ant who is supposed to clean at home has gone for water.'

(15c) occaj-Ø, [Samin ec yi jaja-
ant-ABS.SG INTRJ today house-LOC
ŋajq əvva-jo-lq əl-Ø] pəce  ajm-e-Ø
clean-NML-to.be-ABS.SG first go.to.fetch.water-PF-3SG.S
'The ant who is supposed to clean at home today has gone for water.'

(16) qajəkminŋ-ə-n, [Samin mitiw jamk-ə-nqo
boy-E-ABS.SG INTRJ tomorrow neighboring.brigade-E-ABL
jac-co-lq əl-Ø ye-tumy-e]
come-NML-to.be-ABS.SG COM-friend-COM
ko-nccomaw-ŋ-ə-ne-n ujetik-Ø
IPF-prepare-IPF-E-3SG.S-3SG.O sledge-ABS.SG
'The boy who is supposed to come from the neighboring brigade with
his friend is preparing the sledge.'

The following examples are those of adnominal JQ derived from a
transitive verb. The head noun is the object of the verb. (17a) is an
adnominal phrase, while (17b) is an adnominal clause in which the subject
of the transitive verb is marked in the ergative. Also note the interjection
Samin, a marker showing the boundary of the adnominal clause and
reminding the hearer of a previously known statement, is inserted between
the head noun and the clause as the clause is expanded.

(17a) kalikal [akmec-co-lq əl-Ø]
book(ABS.SG) buy-NML-to.be-ABS.SG
'the book which [someone] intends to buy.'

(17b) kalikal, [Samin ɣəmnən mitiw
book(ABS.SG) INTRJ I(ERG) tomorrow
akmec-co-lq əl-Ø]
buy-NML-to.be-ABS.SG
'the book which I should buy tomorrow'
In (18) below, JQ derived from transitive verb forms an adnominal clause together with the core argument, the subject in the ergative, a temporal adverb, and a converb.

(18) \text{wala-Ø, [Şamin mitiw Şojacek-a} \\
\text{knife-ABS.SG INTRJ tomorrow man-INSTR(ERG)} \\
\text{java-jo-lqəl-Ø qojə-nm-at-ə-k].} \\
\text{use-NML-to.be-ABS.SG reindeer-kill-AP-E-CONV} \\
\text{qi nən ya-ntəməw-lən-Ø en'pici-te} \\
likely \text{RES-lose-RES+3SG.S-3SG.O father-INSTR(ERG)} \\
\text{‘Father is likely to have lost the knife which the herder should use tomorrow when he kills reindeer’}

At the same time, examples taking the genitive may also be found as in (19).

(19) \text{[yəm-nin-Ø τəne-jo-lqəl-Ø] icə-ə-n} \\
\text{1SG-GEN-ABS.SG sew-NML-to.be-ABS.SG fur.coat-E-ABS.SG} \\
\text{t-ə-ntəməv-ə-n-Ø} \\
\text{1SG.S-E-lose-E-3SG.O-PF} \\
\text{‘I have lost the fur coat which I should have sewn.’}

4.2.3. TAM
The JQ adnominal phrase or clause has relative tense as well as the JQ argument. At the same time, mood is also not overtly coded as a JQ argument.

(20a) \text{Şojacek-Ø, [Şamin mitiw jeŋə-jo-lqəl-Ø} \\
\text{man-ABS.SG INTRJ tomorrow fly-NML-to.be-ABS.SG} \\
\text{magadan-etəŋ]} \\
Magadan-ALL \\
\text{‘the guy who should fly to Magadan tomorrow’}

(20b) \text{Şojacek-Ø, [Şamin ayəve jeŋə-jo-lqəl-Ø} \\
\text{man-ABS.SG INTRJ yesterday fly-NML-to.be-ABS.SG} \\
\text{magadan-etəŋ]} \\
Magadan-ALL
‘the man who should have flown to Magadan yesterday’

4.3. Predicative JQ

Predicative JQ is grammaticalized in terms of semantics because its meaning is not the same as that of argument JQ: the former denotes the modal meaning of obligation, ‘should (should have)’, while the latter denotes ‘agent or patient of certain future action’.

Predicative JQ, like an ordinary nominal predicate, takes person/number markers at the final position of the word. That is, the person/number markers code the subject of the intransitive verb or the object of the transitive verb as shown in paradigm (21).

(21) Paradigm of JQ predicate derived from the intransitive va ‘be, stay’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person/Number</th>
<th>JQ Predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG.S</td>
<td>va-jolqoldt-iym ‘I should stay (should have stayed).’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1DU.S</td>
<td>va-jolqoldt-muji ‘We (DU) should stay (should have stayed).’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.S</td>
<td>va-jolqoldt-muju ‘We (PL) should stay (should have stayed).’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG.S</td>
<td>va-jolqoldt-iyi ‘You (SG) should stay (should have stayed).’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2DU.S</td>
<td>va-jolqoldt-tuji ‘You (DU) should stay (should have stayed).’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL.S</td>
<td>va-jolqoldt-muju ‘You (PL) should stay (should have stayed).’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.S</td>
<td>va-jolqoldt-O ‘He should stay (should have stayed).’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3DU.S</td>
<td>va-jolqoldt-te ‘They (DU) should stay (should have stayed).’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL.S</td>
<td>va-jolqoldt-o ‘They (PL) should stay (should have stayed).’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1. Case/number marking

Naturally, predicative JQ does not take any case marking.

4.3.2. Arguments and adjuncts

Predicative JQ can take core arguments and adjuncts just as the corresponding finite verb does. That is, the subject of the transitive verb appears in the ergative case and ergative/genitive conversion seen in the adnominal phrase or clause is not observed in predicative JQ. Additionally,
predicative JQ not only occurs with oblique nouns but also with temporal adverbs.

Examples (22a) and (22b) below are predicative JQs derived from intransitives, and (23a) and (23b) are predicative JQs derived from transitives.

(22a) \( \text{y} \cdot \text{ccci} \quad \text{ec} \cdot \text{yi} \quad \text{va-jo-}lq\cdot\text{e} \cdot \text{ye} \quad \text{y-en} \cdot \text{pici-te} \)
\( \text{you(ABS.SG) today be-NML-to.be-2SG.S COM-father-COM} \)
\( \text{jaja-}k \quad \text{house-LOC} \)
\text{‘You (SG) should stay home with your father today.’}

(22b) \( \text{occu} \quad \text{awje-}jo-\text{}lq\cdot\text{o} \quad \text{awje-ja-}k \)
\( \text{they(ABS) eat-NML-to.be-3PL.S eat-house-LOC} \)
\text{‘They (PL) should eat at the buffet’}

(23a) \( \text{y} \cdot \text{ mnemonic in} \cdot \text{le sajgaw-}jo-lq\cdot\text{o} \cdot \text{Ø qajokmi} \cdot \text{n} \cdot \text{a} \cdot \text{n} \)
\( \text{I(ERG) soon call-NML-to.be-3SG.O boy-E-ABS.SG} \)
\text{‘I should immediately call the boy.’}

(23b) \( \text{mitiw} \quad \text{y} \cdot \text{nan} \quad \eta \cdot \text{olvo} \cdot \text{Ø-γqo} \)
\( \text{tomorrow you(SG.ERG) reindeer.herd-E-ABL} \)
\( \text{jole-jo-}lq\cdot\text{o} \cdot \text{Ø temjo} \cdot \text{n} \)
\( \text{bring-NML-to.be-3SG.O kill-NML-ABS.SG} \)
\text{‘You (SG) should bring the killed reindeer from the herd tomorrow.’}

4.3.3. TAM

The tense of predicative JQ is relative, as it also is with the argument, adnominal phrase and clause. The reference point can be the present or the past according to the context. In (24a) the reference point is the present and in (24b) the reference point is the past.

(24a) \( \text{y} \cdot \text{mmo mitiw an} \cdot \text{pec-Ø γolvo} \cdot \text{Ø-κ} \)
\( \text{I(ABS) tomorrow father-E-DAT reindeer.herd-E-LOC} \)
\( \text{wenn} \cdot \text{a-co-lq\cdote} \cdot \text{γom} \)
\( \text{help-NML-to.be-1SG.S} \)
\text{‘Tomorrow I should help my father in the reindeer herd.’}
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(24b) \(\text{̆nno ajyōve janot}\) he/she(ABS) yesterday first
\(\text{qoja-nm-ac-co-lqət-Ø}\) reindeer-kill-AP-NML-to.be-3SG.S
‘Yesterday he should have first killed reindeer.’

At the same time, there is no overt mood marking, although, as mentioned above, it has the modal meaning of obligation.

5. Is predicative JQ similar to MMC?

We have so far investigated the semantic, morphological and syntactic features of the predicative JQ and clarified that it is grammaticalized in terms of semantics, and that it is in part both morphologically and syntactically more like a finite verb than are the other functional units in a sentence, for example, arguments.

Now let us examine how predicate JQ relates to MMC. As Tsunoda (2010) formulates, Japanese MMC (e.g. Taro=wa asu kuru hazu=da. Taro=wa ima dekake-ru tokoro=da.) has the following structure.

(25) Noun-concluding construction, or mermaid construction

[Clause] +Noun+ Copula.

Tsunoda (2010) investigates the meaning of the noun used in MMC and morphological and syntactic features of MMC. He compares other constructions such as 1) internal AC, 2) external AC, 3) adverbial clause of time, 4) subordinate clause with =yoo, 5) main clause with =yoo, 6) verb clause, 7) i-adjective clause, 8) na-adjective clause, and 9) noun clause from both morphological and syntactic points of view. He concludes that there is strong evidence to identify MMC not with 1-4 but rather with those mono-clausal constructions in 5-9 above. In other words, MMC is apparently like adnominal constructions, but morphologically and syntactically more like an adjective or verb.

It seems that MMC, with its intermediate character, shares features in common with the predicative JQ. For the sake of clarification, we should sort out the differences and similarities between predicative JQ and MMC.
Below, using the sentence, ‘Taro should come tomorrow’, I shall show correspondences between JQ and MMC. ‘+’ indicates a word boundary, ‘-’ a suffix, and ‘=’ an enclitic.

(26) How does ‘Taro should come tomorrow’ show correspondence between JQ and MMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JQ</th>
<th>Arguments/Adjuncts</th>
<th>verbal stem</th>
<th>suffix</th>
<th>person marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taro-na-k mitiw</td>
<td>+ jac</td>
<td>-co-lqøl</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments/Adjuncts</th>
<th>Adnominal Form of Verb</th>
<th>Copula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taro=wa asu</td>
<td>+ kur-u</td>
<td>+ hazu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this table we can see the following similarities and differences between JQ and MMC:

(27) Similarities
1) Both JQ and MMC can take arguments and adjuncts just like a finite verb.
2) The nominal elements, that is, -co-lqøl in Koryak and hazu in Japanese occurring in the slot ‘Noun’ are both grammaticalized in terms of semantics.

(28) Differences
1) The verbal forms of JQ and MMC are morphologically different. That is, in JQ the verb appears as a stem, while in MMC it appears as an adnominal form which is more independent than JQ stem.
2) The nominal elements are morphologically different. That is, -co-lqøl in Koryak is a suffix, while hazu in Japanese is a word. In Koryak there is no evidence that JQ is a suffix that etymologically originates in a noun as does the Japanese modal propositions =dake ‘only’ from the noun take ‘extent, limit’ and =bakari ‘only’ from the noun hakari ‘instrument for measuring weight’ (Tsunoda 2010). Therefore, JQ should be regarded as a ‘pure’ suffix.
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3) The sentence final forms are different. That is, JQ requires a person marker which agrees either with the subject or the object, while MMC requires a copula which shows no agreement.

At this point in time the reasons for these differences have not been fully investigated. Here I will tentatively point out a few points for future investigation.

(a) Difference 2 above may be due to the degree of synthesis of each language. Koryak is a highly polysynthetic language which can often express the concrete meanings of nouns and verbs not by words but by affixes.

(b) Difference 3 may be due to the fact that Koryak does not have Soto no kankee ‘external relationship’, while Japanese does. Koryak is a double marking language which generally requires rigid agreement between arguments (subject and object) and verb. Therefore, it does not have Soto no kankee (‘external relationship’).

Abbreviations

| ABL=ablative | ABS=absolutive | ALL=allative | ANM=animate |
| AP=antipassive | CAUS=causative | COM=comitative | CONV=converb |
| DAT=dative | DU=dual | E=epenthesis | ERG=ergative |
| FUT=future | GEN=genitive | IMPR=imperative | INSTR=instrumental |
| INTRJ=interjection | INV=inverse | IPF=imperfective | LOC=locative |
| NML=nominalizer | O=object | PF=perfective | PL=plural |
| RES=resultative | S=subject | SG=singular | l=first person |
| 2=second person | 3=third person |
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