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Chapter 5. Complement relations

The present chapter is concerned with the coding of complement relations in the Ket language.

The chapter is organized in the following way. In section 5.1, we outline the general typology of complement relations. Section 5.2 considers the morphosyntactic properties of complement relations in Ket. In Section 5.3, we survey complement taking predicates and their semantics in the language. Section 5.4 provides a summary and conclusions to the chapter.

5.1 Typology of complement relations

In the linguistic literature, complementation is traditionally referred to as the syntactic situation in which a subordinate clause functions as an argument of the predicate in the main clause (cf. Noonan 2007: 52, Horie and Comrie 2000: 1). Consider, for example, the Russian sentences in (5.1) and (5.2).

(5.1) Russian

\textit{Ja xoču <moroženogo>}

‘I want an ice-cream.’

(5.2) Russian

\textit{Ja xoču <tebe verit’>}

‘I want to believe you.’

Both the noun \textit{<moroženogo>} ‘ice-cream’ and the infinitive clause \textit{<tebe verit’> ‘to believe you’} serve as an object argument of the transitive predicate \textit{xoču} ‘want’. In such cases, the infinitive clause in (5.2) is said to be syntactically embedded within its main (or matrix) predicate.

The traditional view on complementation has been often criticized for being strictly tied to the notion of syntactic embedding (for example, Dixon 1995, Thompson 2002, Cristofaro 2003). As typological studies have shown, embedded clauses, which are typical instances of complementation in modern Indo-European languages, are not found in many of world’s other languages. Instead, in identical conceptual situations,
many of these languages tend to employ various non-embedded structures (cf. Cristofaro 2003: 95ff). Dixon (1995) explicitly draws a distinction between complement clauses and the so-called ‘complementation strategies’. According to him, a ‘true’ complement clause is a clause that fulfills the following two grammatical criteria: a) it has the internal constituent structure of an independent clause with regard to core argument marking, and b) it functions as an argument of the main clause. Other grammatical mechanisms that can serve to express the range of semantic concepts coded by complements belong to ‘complementation strategies’. Here belong nominalization, serial verb constructions, paratactic clauses, participial constructions, etc.

Unlike Dixon, Noonan in his work on complementation subsumes both complement clauses and complementation strategies under one umbrella term ‘complement type’. He identifies a complement type by the following main criteria (1) the morphology of the predicate, (2) the expression of syntactic relations between the predicate and its arguments, and (3) the syntactic relation of the complement construction as a whole with the rest of the sentence (Noonan 2007: 54-55).

The first criterion is concerned with whether the predicate of a complement type is reduced or non-reduced, i.e. whether it is morphologically the same as the one in the main clause or in some way different with respect to argument and/or tense marking. See, for example, sentences from Lango, a Nilotic language, in (5.3) and (5.4).

(5.3) Lango

\[ \text{átin ópóyó} \ ní \ ácégò \ díggəlā] \]
\[ \text{átin ópóyó} \ ní \ ácégò \ díggəlā] \]
\[ \text{child remembered.3SG COMP closed.1SG door} \]

‘The child remembered that I closed the door.’ (Noonan 2007: 54)

(5.4) Lango

\[ \text{átin ópóyó} \ cēggə \ díggəlā} \]
\[ \text{átin ópóyó} \ cēggə \ díggəlā} \]
\[ \text{child remembered.3SG close.INF door} \]

‘The child remembered to close the door.’ (Noonan 2007: 54)
In (5.3), the predicate àcèggò ‘(I) closed’ in the complement clause is marked for tense and person in the same way as the main predicate opòyò ‘(he) remembered’, i.e. it is morphologically non-reduced. In Noonan’s terms such a complement type is called a sentence-like (or S-like) complement. The other non-reduced complement types include paratactic and verb-serialization complements. A morphologically reduced complement type is illustrated in (5.4) in which the predicate cèggò ‘to close’ is marked as an infinitive and stripped of all relevant tense/person distinction. The other reduced complement types distinguished by Noonan are nominalized and participial complements (Noonan 2007: 70-74).

In his work, Noonan also discusses a special type of reduced complements called clause union (CU). In a clause union the main and complement predicates share one set of grammatical relations, as exemplified in (5.5).

(5.5) French

Roger laissera manger les pommes à Marie

Roger laissera manger les pommes à Marie

Roger 3SG.FUT eat.INF the apples to Marie

‘Roger will let Marie eat the apples.’ (Noonan 2007: 84)

In this sentence both the main predicate laissera and the complement predicate manger are merged together, so that they share one set of arguments: Roger functions as subject, les pommes as direct object and à Marie as indirect object of the whole construction. There is also a more extreme variation of CU called lexical union (LU). In LU both predicates are merged to the extent of becoming a single lexical unit, in which the complement taking predicate (i.e. the main predicate) is reduced to an affix on the complement predicate. An example of LU is represented in (5.6) below.

(5.6) Georgian

Me mas movatanine

me mas movatanine

I him come.CAUS

‘I made him come.’ (Noonan 2007: 86)

---

72 The difference between a paratactic complement type and an S-like type is the presence of a complementizer in the latter case. Complementizers are discussed below.
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The affix representing the complement-taking predicate in LU cannot be viewed as another predicate because it cannot stand alone and take any argument/tense marking. Therefore LU cannot be considered as a complement type. Nevertheless, it will be discussed in our work, because it is a rather widespread means in Ket to express some semantic types of complement-taking predicates.

The second criterion used by Noonan to identify a complement type deals with whether the subject of a complement predicate is the same as or different from the one in the main clause. Consider the examples from Russian:

(5.7) Russian

\[ \text{Ja xoču <ego ubit'>} \]

‘I want to kill him.’

(5.8) Russian

\[ \text{Ja xoču, <čtoby ty ego ubil>} \]

‘I want you to kill him’

In (5.7), the subject of the predicate in the main clause and the subject of the predicate in the complement clause are the same (\textit{ja} ‘I’), while in (5.8) the subject of the main predicate is different from that of the complement predicate (\textit{ja} ‘I’ vs. \textit{ty} ‘you.SG’). These examples also illustrate a general tendency to reduce the subject of the predicate in complement clauses, if it coincides with the one in the main clause. If the subjects are different, they both are retained in the sentence.

The last criterion concerns the grammatical role of the complement type in the main clause. The complement type can function as either a subject or an object of the main predicate. The latter has been already mentioned in (5.2) above, in which the infinitival complement functions as an object of the predicate \textit{xoču} ‘want’. The subject function of the complement type is illustrated in the example below, in which the complement clause \textit{<čto on byl xolodnyj>} is the subject of the predicate \textit{napugalo} ‘frightened’.
(5.9) Russian

*Menja napugalo, *č*to on byl xolodnyj*

‘His being cold frightened me.’

In many languages complement types often have a special element (it can be a word, particle, affix, etc.) whose function (or one of the functions) is to identify the given entity as a complement (Noonan 2007, Givón 2001). Such elements are usually known as complementizers, for example, the Russian *čtoby* and *čto* in (5.8) and (5.9), respectively, or the particle *to* in front of the infinitive complement in ‘*I want <to kill him>*’ from example (5.7). Some complement types may have more than one complementizer associated with them, others may have no complementizer at all (Noonan 2007: 55). The latter can be seen in the Lango example (5.4) above, as well as in the Russian sentence in (5.7) and in the English translation in (5.9). Example (5.10) from Yaqui, an Uto-Aztecan language, illustrate a complement type with two complementizers:

(5.10) Yaqui

*Tuisi tuʔi ke hu hamut bwika-kai*

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{tuisi} & \text{tuʔi} & \text{ke} & \text{hu} & \text{hamut} & \text{bwika-kai} \\
\text{very} & \text{good} & \text{COMP} & \text{the} & \text{woman} & \text{sing-COMP} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘It’s very good that the woman sings.’ (Noonan 2007: 57)

In some cases, the occurrence of complementizers may also be optional or determined by the context, as in (5.11).

(5.11) Russian

*Ja znaçu, (čto) on prišël*

‘I know (that) he came.’

The use of the complementizer *čto* ‘that’ is optional in the Russian sentence, as well as in its English counterpart.

From a diachronic point of view, complementizers usually originate from various sources like pronouns, adpositions, case markers, conjunctions, or even verbs (Noonan 2007: 57). Therefore they may often coexist in a language with their sources, like, for example, the complementizer *čto* and its source, the interrogative
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pronoun čto, in Russian, or the complementizer that and the demonstrative pronoun that in English.

It is important to mention that there is a restricted set of verbs that are capable of taking complements. Such verbs are called complement-taking predicates (CTP). There are various kinds of classification of these predicates, with various degrees of elaboration, depending on the general semantics they express. For example, Givón (1990) distinguishes between three major classes of CTPs: modality, manipulative and cognition-utterance. Noonan (2007), on the other hand, provides a more detailed classification distinguishing the following semantic classes: (1) modal predicates (like must, can, may, be able, etc.), (2) phasal predicates (like start, begin, stop, continue, etc.), (3) manipulative predicates (like order, make, persuade, etc.), (4) desiderative predicates (like want, etc.), (5) immediate perception predicates (like see, hear, etc.), (6) predicates of knowledge and acquisition of knowledge (like know, understand, realize, etc.), (7) propositional attitude predicates (like think, understand, believe, etc.), (8) utterance predicates (like say, tell, etc.), (9) commentative predicates (factives) (like regret, be sorry, be sad, etc.), (10) predicates of fearing (like fear, be afraid, etc.), (11) achievement predicates (like manage, chance, try, etc.), (12) pretence predicates (like imagine, pretend, etc.), (13) negative predicates, and (14) conjunctive predicates. It is often noted that the degree of reduction found in complements used with a CTP correlates with the semantics class this CTP belongs to (Noonan 2007; Givón 2001; see also Figure 5.1 below).

5.2 Morphosyntactic properties of complement constructions in Ket

In this section we will examine complement constructions in Ket with respect to their morphosyntactic properties such as the morphology of the predicate, the syntactic relations of the predicate with its arguments and the syntactic relations of complement types with the main predicate. But before turning to the complement types, we will consider the native complementizers esaj and bila.
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5.2.1 The complementizer *esaŋ*

The complementizer *esaŋ* originates from the relational morpheme *esaŋ* with translative meaning. When used with nouns it usually indicates the “goal” of a verbal action (with verbs of becoming, transforming, producing, and the like). It may also encode the “role” of a human being (Georg 2007: 115). Examples (5.12)-(5.14) illustrate the use of this relational morpheme with nouns.

(5.12) bū ēris/esaŋ ətənsəq
    bū ed-esaŋ ə⁵-sh⁴-o⁴-n³-oq⁰
    3SG sable-TRANSL 3SG⁵-TH⁴-PST⁴-PST²-become.PST⁰
    ‘He turned into a sable.’

(5.13) āt bɪyɔn ʊləs/esaŋ
    ād bo⁵-k⁷-o⁴-({n³})-{de}n⁰
    1SG 1SG⁵-TH⁷-PST⁴-PST²-go⁰ water-TRANSL
    ‘I went for water.’

(5.14) bū persip/esaŋ daʃərəkæt
    bū persip-esaŋ daʃ⁷-bed⁷-o³-ʃ-bed⁰
    3SG doctor.RUS-TRANSL 3F⁷-work.RUS.ANOM⁷-PST²-ITER⁰
    ‘She worked as a doctor.’

The most common functional extension of this relational morpheme in Ket is that of a purposive marker used in adverbial clauses, as in (5.15).

(5.15) nanbarilgetin taviŋəj eiʃə-esaŋ
    nanbed⁷-ʃiʃ-bed⁵-im⁰
    bread.make.ANOM⁷-IMP²-ITER⁰-AN.PL⁻¹
    tabaŋəj eiʃə-esaŋ
    hunt.ANOM go.ANOM-TRANSL
    ‘Make bread in order to go for a hunt.’ (Belimov 1973: 135)

As a complementizer, *esaŋ* is used mostly with complements of desiderative predicates, like in (5.16).

(5.16) bū usqat-esaŋ duʃəʃəx
    bū usqat-esaŋ du⁶-o⁴-tus⁰
    3SG warm.ANOM-TRANSL 3⁵-3SG.SS²-intend⁰
    ‘He wants to get warm.’ (Belimov 1973: 23)
The use of *esa* in the complementizing function is not obligatory and it can, in principle, be omitted, compare, for example, (5.16) and (5.17).

(5.17) *āt ker'ā tasaq dittus*¹

ād  ked-da taqaj  di⁹=₂(į⁶)-tus⁰
1SG  person-M.POSS hit.LANOM 1⁵-1SG.SS⁴-intend⁰

‘I want to hit the man.’

5.2.2 The complementizer *bila*

The complementizer *bila* is the functional extension of the interrogative adverb *bila* ‘how’. Example (5.18) illustrates the interrogative function of this adverb.

(5.18) *bila ū kāyadaq?*

bila   ū   ku³=k⁴-a⁴-daq⁰
how  2SG  2⁵-TH⁴-NPST⁴-live⁰

‘How do you live?’

The use of *bila* in the complementizing function is illustrated in (5.19).

(5.19) *āssan=g tš/by bila āssel gya³n*

assano-s  {du¹}-t³=⁻o⁰  bila  āssel  o³=k⁴-o⁶-{n²-de}n⁰
hunt.LANOM-NMLZ  3⁵-TH⁴-PST²-see⁰  how  animal  3⁵=₂-TH⁴-PST⁴-PST²-go²

‘The hunter saw how the animal went away.’

It seems fair to assume that the complementizing use of the interrogative adverb *bila* is the calque from the Russian language, where interrogative adverbs are a common source of subordinators. It is the case, for example, with the Russian interrogative adverb *kak* ‘how’ that can be used as a complementizer with various complement taking predicates (5.20).

(5.20) Russian

*Ja videl kak on uxodil*

‘I saw him leaving (lit. how he was leaving).’

As we can see in (5.20), *kak* introduces the complement of the verb *videl* ‘saw’.
The fact of calquing in the case of *bila* is also corroborated by the existence of more obvious calques in the domain of subordinators, see, for example, *aska* (Section 6.2.2.2.1).

5.2.3 Complement types in Ket

There are two main complement types in Ket, one involving S-like clauses, the other – action nominal clauses. Both general types can be further divided into several subtypes. They will be considered in order.

5.2.3.1 S-like complement type

A sentence-like or S-like complement clause has the same syntactic form as a main clause and can in principle stand on its own as an independent sentence. This complement type can be used paratactically or in combination with the complementizers.

5.2.3.1.1 Paratactic S-like complement

The most frequent complement type in Ket is a paratactic S-like clause. In the paratactic complement construction both main clause and complement clause are juxtaposed to each other without any connecting element. Such complement clauses are rather frequent in polysynthetic languages (cf. Mithun 1984, 1988). Examples (5.18) and (5.19) illustrate this complement type in Ket.

(5.21) *āt itipem keʾt duːnɔ*

\[
\text{ād ~ if}^\prime{\text{-ba}}^\prime{\text{-d}}{\text{i}}^\prime{\text{-am}}^\prime {\text{ keʾd } du}^\prime{\text{-o}}^\prime{\text{-r}^2{\text{-q}}}^\prime {o}^\prime \\
\text{1SG ~ know}^\prime{\text{-1SG}^\prime{\text{-1SG}^\prime{\text{-r}}}^\prime {\text{ person } 3SG}^\prime{\text{-PST}^\prime{\text{-PST}^\prime{-die}}}^\prime}
\]

‘I know (that) the man died.’

(5.22) *ad dayudɔ  ab kit qutku dɔʃtɔn*

\[
\text{ād ~ d}{\text{(i)}^\prime{\text{-a}}^\prime{\text{-k}}^\prime{\text{-a}}^\prime{-do}}^\prime {\text{ āb keʾd qotka d}{\text{(u)}^\prime{\text{-o}}^\prime{\text{-f}}^\prime{\text{-a}}^\prime{-tan}}^\prime} \\
\text{1SG ~ t}^\prime{\text{-3M}^\prime{\text{-TH}^\prime{\text{-NPST}^\prime{-watch}}}^\prime {\text{ my person ahead } 3^\prime{\text{-PST}^\prime{\text{-PST}^\prime{-3SS}^\prime{-stop}}}^\prime}}
\]

‘I watched my friend stop ahead of me (lit. I watched him, my friend stopped ahead of me).’

(Ivanov et al. 1969: 217)
5.2.3.1.2 S-like complement with *esaŋ*

S-like complements can be also marked with the complementizer *esaŋ* which occurs postposed to the complement clause. Other than that, the clause remains the same as a main one. In many cases, the use of *esaŋ* is optional. Example (5.23) illustrates this complement type.

(5.23) *dīl āt dīlab ḡwəs-esaŋ dītus*

\[
\text{dīl ād} \ d\{i\}^3\text{-o}l\{a\}^5\text{-bo}^8\text{-k}^9\text{-o}^q\{o\}^6\text{-esaŋ} \ d\{i\}^3\text{-d\{i\}1\text{-tus}^9}
\]

child 1SG 1SG-outside5-1SS5-TH5-3SG.M4-take5-TRANSL 1SG-1SG.SS1-intend9

‘I want to take the child out’ (Kotorova and Nefedov, forthcoming)

5.2.3.1.3 S-like complement with *bila*

This subtype is a calque from the Russian language (cf. 5.2.2). The use of *bila* with S-like complement clauses is optional. Example (5.24) provides an illustration of this complement type.

(5.24) *qīmar āt luŋ bīla āb ōp sāq dīej*

\[
\text{qīmar da}^3\text{-t}^5\text{-o}^4\text{-l}^2\text{-o}^q\{o\}^0 \ bīla āb} \ ōb \ sāq \ d\{u\}^3\text{-q}^2\text{-e}^j^0
\]

grandma 3F8-TH5-PST4-PST2-see0 how my father squirrel 3M6-3F8-PST2-kill0

‘Grandmother saw my father killing a squirrel.’

5.2.3.2 Action nominal complement type

Action nominals represent the second general complement type in Ket. As we already mentioned in Chapter 2, action nominals are a word class in Ket that subsumes functions typical of infinitives, participles and gerunds in other languages (see Section 2.2.7 for more discussion). It is thus not surprising that they often occur as complements of various CPTs. Contrary to S-like clauses, the morphology of this complement type is heavily reduced, since these forms show no tense/aspect marking. As complements, action nominals can be used both without any special marking, and with the complementizers *esaŋ* and *bila*.

5.2.3.2.1 Bare action nominal complement

This type of complements involve an action nominal without any additional marking. The following example illustrates this complement type:
(5.25) dénya ássaná bínut

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{den-na} & \quad \text{assano} & \quad b\{\text{in}\}^2 \cdot \{\text{b}^i\} \cdot \{\text{in}\}_2 \cdot \{\text{q}\} \text{ut}^0 \\
\text{people-AN.PL.POSS} & \quad \text{hunt.ANOM} & \quad \text{self}^3 \cdot \text{3N}^3 \cdot \text{PST}^2 \cdot \text{finish}^0
\end{align*} \]

‘People finished hunting (lit. People’s hunting finished).’

As can be seen from the example, the subject of the complement clause in this type is marked as a possessor and the complement clause itself is cross-referenced on the main predicate bínut ‘(it) finished’.

5.2.3.2.2 Action nominal complement with \textit{esay}

Action nominals in complement clause can also in principle be marked with \textit{esay}. As with S-like complements, the use of the marker \textit{esay} is optional in many cases. This type of complements is illustrated in (5.26).

(5.26) hi’p daööp su:õbi/esay datpi/la

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{hi’b} & \quad \text{da-õb} & \quad \text{su:õbed-esay} & \quad d\{\text{u}\}^1 \cdot \text{c}^i \cdot \text{b}^i \cdot \text{3-a}^i \\
\text{son} & \quad \text{M.POSS-father} & \quad \text{sled.make.ANOM-TRANSL} & \quad \text{3-3M}^1 \cdot \text{TH}^4 \cdot \text{3N}^3 \cdot \text{PST}^2 \cdot \text{ask}^0
\end{align*} \]

‘The son asked his father to make sleds.’ (Zinn 2006)

5.2.3.2.3 Action nominal complement with \textit{bila}

The complementizer \textit{bila} can also be combined with an action nominal, as shown in (5.27).

(5.27) siň' bâám en'ëdirun/söŋ bila ka’j

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{siň} & \quad \text{bâám} & \quad \text{en’ëdi}^4 \cdot \text{n}^i \cdot \text{soŋ}^0 & \quad \text{bila} & \quad \text{ka’j} \\
\text{decrepit old.woman} & \quad \text{R}^3 \cdot \text{3N}^3 \cdot \text{PST}^2 \cdot \text{forget}^0 & \quad \text{how walk.ANOM}
\end{align*} \]

‘The decrepit old woman forgot how to walk.’

(Kotorova and Nefedov, forthcoming)

Note that, like in the case of the above mentioned \textit{bila} construction (cf. 5.2.3.1.3), this complement type is a calque from Russian, where the verb \textit{zabyvat’} ‘forget’ takes a functionally similar complement, i.e. ‘\textit{kak} + infinitive’ (5.28).

(5.28) Russian

\[ \text{Ja zabyl } \text{kak xodit’} \]

‘I forgot \textit{how to walk}.’
5.3 The semantics of complement taking predicates

In this section we will discuss semantic classes of complement-taking predicates in Ket. We were able to identify the following complement-taking predicates in Ket (based on Noonan 2007):

- modal
- phasal
- manipulative
- desiderative
- perception
- knowledge
- propositional attitude
- utterance
- commentative
- achievement

5.3.1 Modal predicates

Modal predicates are restricted to verbs expressing ability, obligation, permission and necessity (such as English must, can, may, be able, etc.) (Noonan 2007: 137-138). Unlike English, Russian and many other languages, Ket lacks verbs which are exclusively modal in meaning. Instead, it makes use of verbs meaning ‘to know’ and ‘to understand’ as well as some other means to express these modal concepts. Let us consider them in order.

The most common way of expressing the concept of ability in Ket is the use of the irregular verb it$^7$-[i]-am$^0$ ‘to know’. The verb has two slots filled by agreement markers, but nonetheless is morphologically intransitive, because both slots cross-reference the subject, as can be seen in (5.29).

(5.29) ēn āt türe itperem

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{ēn} & \text{ād} & \text{tu-de} & \text{it}^7-\text{ba}^0-\text{d}^0\text{n}^0-\text{am}^0 \\
\text{now} & \text{1SG} & \text{this-N} & \text{know}^0-\text{1SG}\text{-1SG}\text{-SS}\text{-I}\text{-R}^0 \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Now I know it.’
In (5.29), both -ba- in P6 and -di- in P1 refer to the 1st person singular pronoun ād, while the pronoun tude ‘this’ does not get cross-referenced on the verb at all. If it'-{l}2{-am}0 is used with an animate object, it obligatorily requires the presence of a special relational marker qoŋ < qoŋ ‘image, appearance’.

(5.30) ā tūr kētda qoŋ itperem
ād tū-d ked-da qoŋ it'-ba₃₆-d{[l]}₁{-am}₀
1SG this-M person-M.POSS image know'1SG-1SG.SS₁-R₀
‘I know this man (lit. I recognize this man’s appearance).’

When used as a modal predicate, the verb it'-{l}2{-am}0 generally takes complements in the form of action nominals, as exemplified in (5.26)

(5.31) bū dēr ištem
bū dēd it'-a₆₆{-am}₀
3SG read.ANOM know'-3M₆-PST²-R₀
‘He can (=knows how to) read.’ (Belimov 1973: 25)

It can also take a finite clause complement marked with esaj as in (5.32), although such constructions are much less frequent.

(5.32) bū italam du:bds-èsaj
bū it'-a₆₆{-l}₂{-am}₀
du₃₆₆₆₆-d{[l]}₁-esaj
3SG know'-3M₆-PST²-R₀ 3₃₆₃₆₆₆-read²-TRANSL
‘He can read.’ (Ščipunova 1975: 77)

Apart from expressing abilities which can be referred to as purely mental (like reading, speaking, etc.), the use of it'-{l}²{-am}₀ has been extended to cases where a mental ability is accompanied by a physical one, as in (5.33)-(5.35).

(5.33) bū sūj ištem
bū sūj it'-a₆₆{-l}₂{-am}₀
3SG swim.ANOM know'-3SG.M₆-PST²-R₀
‘He can swim.’
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(5.34) *dum itelem kiy*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dūm} & \quad \text{it}^1-a^6-{\text{am}}^9 \\
\text{bird} & \quad \text{know}^2-3\text{SG.M}.6-\text{PST}^2-\text{r}^9 \quad \text{fly.}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The bird can fly.’ (Belimov 1973: 25)

(5.35) *at su:l itpedem bɛ:da*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ād} & \quad \text{sūl} \quad \text{it}^7-ba^6-d\{i\}^1-{\text{am}}^9 \\
\text{1SG sled know}^2-1\text{SG.M}.6-1\text{SG.SS}1-{\text{r}}^9 \quad \text{make.ANOM}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I can make a sled.’ (Belimov 1973: 25)

The example (5.34) also shows that the action nominal complement can be placed after the matrix clause, whereas in (5.35) the matrix verb separates the parts of the complement clause.

While a verb meaning ‘to know’ is the most commonly documented lexical source for ability predicates among the world’s languages (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994: 190), the grammaticalization of a verb with the meaning ‘to understand’ seems to be rather infrequent, albeit quite acceptable logically. The sentences in (5.36)-(5.37) illustrate this case in Ket.

(5.36) *āt askatij dabātevet*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ād} & \quad \text{askatij} \quad \text{da}^8-ba^6-t^1-a^4-{\text{het}}^9 \\
\text{1SG speak.ANOM IC}^4-1\text{SG.M}.6-\text{TH}^5-\text{NPST}^4-\text{understand}^9
\end{align*}
\]

‘I can speak.’

(5.37) *āt dabātevet tìde bɛd*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ād} & \quad \text{da}^8-ba^6-t^1-a^4-{\text{het}}^9 \\
\text{1SG IC}^4-1\text{SG.M}.6-\text{TH}^5-\text{NPST}^4-\text{understand}^9 \quad \text{this-N make.ANOM}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I can make it.’ (Georg 2007: 305)

The verb *da*^8-\text{t}^4-\{n^2\}-\text{het}^9 belongs to ‘\text{da}-intransitives’ which have a petrified marker *da-* in position 8 (cf. 2.2.8.1.3.1). Interestingly, there is no way to translate sentences
like ‘I understand X’ into Ket other than as ‘I understand X’s words, speech, etc.’, see (5.38).73

\[(5.38)\] āt āk qāːn dabāːtɛvɛt
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ād āk qāːn dabāːtɛvɛt} \\
1SG 2 POSS word.PL IC8-1SG6-TH5-NPST4-understand0
\end{array}
\]
‘I understand you (lit. your words).’

Compared to ītʰ-[lʰ]-am⁰, the verb da⁸-t⁵-[n²]-bet⁰ seems to be less grammaticalized in the modal function, since it is used much more seldom and is in principle restricted to conveying the notion of mental ability, as in (5.36) above. Although Werner (2002, II: 225) provides an example similar to that in (5.39), our language consultants felt rather uncertain about it.

\[(5.39)\] āt sūj dabāːtɛvɛt
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ād sūj dabāːtɛvɛt} \\
1SG swim.ANOM IC8-1SG6-TH5-NPST4-understand0
\end{array}
\]
‘I can swim.’ (Werner 2002, II: 225)

Another possible way to express the notion of ability (or disability) in Ket is by using special non-verbal modal predicates. These predicates include itej (and its variant hitej) ‘can, may’ and qoŋan ‘not be able’. Unfortunately, our language consultants could not recognize these words; neither could we find them in the existing Ket texts. Therefore our description is based only on the examples found in the literature, mostly in Werner’s (2002) dictionary.

According to Werner (2002, I: 384) the original meaning of itej is ‘to know’ (cf. the verb ītʰ-[lʰ]-am⁰ ‘know’ above). The word form itself resembles an action nominal due to the presence of the morpheme -ej. As Belimov (1973: 65ff.) states, the action nominals formed with the help of the morpheme -aj (and its variants -ej, -ij, -oj) are one of the most common in Ket. The origin and meaning of the morpheme seems to

---

73 It should be noted that in the past tense forms the initial b of the root morpheme -bet is metathesized with the past marker -n- in position 2 creating an impression of the presence of the inanimate marker -b- in slot 3 (Edward Vajda, p.c.). For example, dabātomnet [da⁸-ba⁸-t⁸-a⁴-bet⁰ IC8-1SG6-TH5-NPST3-PST5-understand⁰]. Vajda and Žinn (2004: 94) explicitly analyze this verb as having two lexicalized markers, namely, involuntary causative markers, since they cannot change to reflect an animate class source argument. Georg (2007: 304ff.) likewise parses this verb as having -b⁷-.
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be obscure. Despite this striking resemblance, the existing examples show that the word itej can function like a real modal predicate taking an action nominal (5.40) and a paratactic clause (5.41) as its complements.

(5.40) āt turē bōn bērī itej
ād tu-de bōn bēd itej
1SG this-N NEG make.ANOM can
‘I cannot make it.’ (Werner 2002, I: 384)

(5.41) ād bōn dāddij itej
ād bōn d{i}h-a-a-di-1-dij0 itej
1SG NEG 1-NPST4-1SG.SS1-come0 can
‘I cannot come.’ (Werner 2002, I: 384)

In (5.40), the complement of itej is the action nominal bēd ‘make, do’. Note also the presence of the 1st person singular pronoun ād which, quite unexpectedly, does not trigger any relevant cross-reference in the sentence. Another interesting and a very unusual property is that according to the existing examples itej seems to derive time reference from its complement. Compare the examples (5.41) and (5.42).

(5.42) ād dōndij bōn’ itej
ad d{i}h-o-o-d-i-1-dij0 bōn itej
1SG 1SG5-PST4-PST2-1SG.SS1-come0 NEG can
‘I could not come.’ (Werner 2002, I: 384)

In both (5.41) and (5.42), itej remains unmarked, it is the verb -dij0 ‘come’ in the complement clause that bears the tense distinction transferred to the whole sentence: non-past in (5.41) and past in (5.42).

Although, in the above examples, itej does not take any additional markers, Werner (2002) lists a few examples in which itej is used with the inanimate predicative marker -am, as shown in (5.43) and (5.44).

74 In principle, it is possible to assume that the form itej is a special suppletive 1st person singular form of a finite verb. Unfortunately, this hypothesis cannot be tested, since apart from itejam, which is an inanimate predicate form, all the examples with itej in Werner (2002) are given with the 1st person singular pronoun.
(5.43) qɔs / itejam
qɔs  itej-am
take.ANOM  can-N.PRED
‘One can take (lit. Taking is possible).’ (Werner 2002, I: 384)

(5.44) diliŋ itejam
d-iliŋ  itej-am
N.POSS-eat.ANOM  can-N.PRED
‘One can eat it (lit. Its eating is possible).’ (Werner 2002, I: 384)

The next modal predicate ʰɪtej (or hitej) originates from the particle ʰi ‘yet, already’ + ʰitej (Werner (2002, I: 346). It was recorded only with the predicative markers in contexts similar to (5.43) and (5.44). No examples with contexts similar to (5.40)- (5.42) above are available.

(5.45) kɪr ʰɔs / s. ʰɪtlɛm da aspuntet hitajam
kɪ-d  ʰɔs  ʰɑn  ʰɪtl-am  da  asbunted  hɪtej-am
this-M  tree  branches  low-3N.PRED  M.POSS  climb.ANOM  already.can-N.PRED
‘This tree has branches close to the ground, it’s possible to climb it (lit. its climbing is possible).’
(Belimov 1973: 25)

This predicate can also be used to express permission:

(5.46) tu:d ɛɛl ʰidiŋ hitejam
tu-de  ɛɛl-d  iliŋ  hɪtej-am
this-N  berry-N.POSS  eat.ANOM  already.can-3N.PRED
‘One can already eat the berries (lit. These berries’ eating is already possible).’
(Werner 2002, I: 346)

As we can see, ʰɪtej is used only with action nominal complements; no examples with paratactic complements are recorded.

Finally, there is a special predicate in Ket, qoŋan ‘not to be able’, that is specifically used to express the modal meaning of inability. Its origin is likewise quite obscure. Werner (2002, II: 108) proposes the following analysis: qoŋ ‘image’ (‘soul’?) + -an (Caritive relational marker). As the recorded examples show, qoŋan requires the presence of the inanimate predicative marker. This modal predicate can be used
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with both action nominal complements and paratactic clause complements, as exemplified below.

(5.47) *ukuŋa ūŋ qoŋanam*

\[ uk-uga ūŋ qoŋan-am \]

2SG-DAT not.be.able-N.PRED

‘You cannot sit (lit. Sitting is not possible to you).’ (Werner 2002, II: 108)

(5.48) *bū ūm-aks/a:na bōnʼi dubbet qoŋanam*

\[ bū ūm-aks-a:na bōn du₃-b₁-bed⁰ qoŋan-am \]

3SG nothing NEG 3⁵-3N³-make⁰ not.be.able-3N.PRED

‘He cannot do anything (lit. It is not possible for him to do anything).’

(Werner 2002, II: 108)

In (5.47), the complement of *qoŋan* is the action nominal *ūŋ ‘sit’, while in (5.48), it is the full-fledged clause *bū ūm-aks/a:na bōnʼi dubbet* ‘he doesn’t do anything’.

It is important to mention that Werner (2002, II: 108) also lists a finite verb that has *qoŋan* in the incorporant position (P7), see the examples below.²⁵

(5.49) *bū ūŋ daqoŋandawan*

\[ bū ūŋ da-qoŋan-d⁶-a⁴-qan⁰ \]

3SG sit. ANOM 3⁶-not.be.able⁴-become⁰

‘She cannot sit (lit. She becomes being not able to sit).’

(Werner 2002, II: 108)

(5.50) *daːje tʃoŋandaksət\n
\[ daːje d[a]³-qoŋan⁵-d⁴-o⁴-kset⁰ ]

M.POSS-kill.ANOM 3⁵-not.be.able⁴-TI⁴-PST⁰-become⁰-AN.PL⁻¹

‘They could not kill him (lit. It became impossible for them to kill him)’

(Werner 2002, II: 108)²⁶

²⁵ The morphemes *qan⁰* and *(k)set⁰* are suppletive roots with a transitive meaning ‘become, turn into’. The former is used with inanimate or singular animate subjects (5.45), while the latter appears when the subject is plural animate (5.46) (Vajda and Zinn 2004: 172).

²⁶ Werner’s (2002, II: 108) translation of this sentence as being in the non-past tense (ihn töten können sie nicht ‘they cannot kill him’) does not seem to be correct, because the verb form *tʃoŋandaksət* is clearly in the past tense. This is indicated by the labialized form of the tense marker -a- in position 4, cf. also *daqoŋandaksət* ‘they get better’ [du₃-aqt{a}³-o⁴-kset⁰-in⁰ 3⁵-good⁴-PST⁰-become⁰-AN.PL⁻¹] vs. *daqoŋandaksət* ‘they got better’ [du₃-aqt[a]³-o⁴-kset⁰-in⁰ 3⁵-good⁴-PST⁰-become⁰-AN.PL⁻¹].
In both recorded examples the verb takes its complement in the form of an action nominal. Unfortunately, as in the case with the modal predicates above, these verbs were not recognized by our language consultants and only one example similar to (5.49) was found in the texts.

The next modal concept to be discussed is obligation and necessity. Ket does not have a native lexeme that would express this concept. Therefore in order to express obligation and necessity the modal predicate *náda*, a direct loan of the Russian predicate *nado* ‘need’, is used. Unlike other verbal loans from Russian that obligatorily get incorporated into the native verbal paradigms, the predicate *náda* remains unchanged and uninflected for any person / tense distinction. This modal predicate is used mostly with action nominal complements. Examples (5.51)-(5.52) illustrate *náda* with bare action nominals.

(5.51) *nan˩ ketbet nara*  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ná} & \quad \text{ned} & \quad \text{na} & \quad \text{d} \\
\text{bread} & & \text{price.make.ANOM} & \text{need}
\end{align*}
\]

‘It’s necessary to buy bread.’ (Belimov 1973: 18)

(5.52) *avëŋa lesdiŋa eŋ nara*  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ab} & \quad \text{aŋ} & \quad \text{les-diŋa} & \quad \text{ejiŋ} & \quad \text{nada} \\
\text{1-DAT} & & \text{forest-N-DAT} & \text{go.ANOM} & \text{need}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I need to go to the forest.’ (Belimov 1973: 17)

The examples also show that as in Russian, if there is no overt subject argument, as in (5.51), the sentence with *náda* receives an impersonal reading. If the subject of *náda* is expressed overtly, it takes the Dative relational morpheme, as in (5.52).

In addition to bare action nominal complements, *náda* can be used with the *esaŋ* complementizer on an action nominal as illustrated in (5.53), although such examples are rather rare in our corpus.

(5.53) *abaŋa assano-esaŋ nara*  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ab-} & \quad \text{aŋ} & \quad \text{assano-esaŋ} & \quad \text{nada} \\
\text{1POSS-DAT} & & \text{hunt.ANOM-TRANSL} & \text{need}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I have to hunt.’ (Vajda 2004: 77)
Another type of complement registered with the predicate náda is finite clauses. Example (5.54) illustrates the complement clause with the finite verb form tkájbugos ‘I take it’, while in example (5.55) náda is used with the corresponding action nominal kases ‘take.ANOM’.

(5.54) en nado ayə tkajbugos
   ēn nado aka d[i]¹-kaj¹-b³-qo²
   now need away 1⁶-limb³-3N-take³
   ‘Now it’s necessary to take it away (lit. Now it’s necessary, I will take it away).’

(5.55) sujat kases/náda
   sujad kases nada
   dress take.ANOM need
   ‘It’s necessary to buy (lit. take) the dress.’

Table 5.1 summarizes the information on the modal CTPs and the complement types they take.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>COMPLEMENT TYPE</th>
<th>lexical union⁷⁷</th>
<th>action nominal</th>
<th>S-like clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bare</td>
<td>esay</td>
<td>bila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ANOM</td>
<td>paratactic</td>
<td>esay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it¹-[t]²-am⁰ ‘can, know’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da¹-t²-[n]²-bet⁰ ‘can, understand’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itej ‘can’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bitej ‘be possible’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| gujan ‘not to be able’ | + | | | +
| nada ‘be necessary’ | + | + | | +

Table 5.1. Modal predicates

⁷⁷ Note that, as we have already stated above, LU is not a complement type. It is included in the table for the sake of the further analysis.
5.3.2 Phasal predicates

Phasal predicates (such as begin, start, continue, finish, etc.) refer to the phase of an act or state: its inception, continuation, or termination (Noonan 2007: 139). In Ket there are no predicates expressing continuation, only those of inception and termination are attested.

The concept of inception is expressed in Ket by means of causatives (mostly for transitive actions) or by inchoative “roots” (-qan~qon⁰, -saŋ⁰) (mostly for intransitive actions):

(5.56) dalŋyalqimna
\[
\text{da}³-\text{lopal}³-\text{q}³-\text{b}³-\text{n}³-\text{a}³ \\
3\text{SG.F}-\text{examine.ANOM3-CAUS3-3N3-PST2-MOM.TR0}
\]
‘She began examining it.’

(5.57) ilkuyawan
\[
\text{il}³-\text{k}³-\text{a}-\text{a}-\text{qan}⁰ \\
\text{sing2-2SG6-TH5-NPST4-INCH.NPST0}
\]
‘You start singing.’ (Vajda and Zinn 2004: 176)

(5.58) qɔ:vinsaŋ
\[
\text{qo}³-\text{b}³-\text{in}³-\text{saŋ}⁰ \\
\text{die3-3N3-PST2-INCH0}
\]
‘It started to die.’ (Vajda and Zinn 2004: 190)

Example (5.56) illustrates a transitive verb with the marker q⁵ which is traditionally regarded as a causative marker (cf. Section 2.2.8.3.1). The verb conveys the inchoative meaning of ‘begin Ving X’. The other two examples illustrate inchoatives of intransitive verbs formed with the help of the special roots -qan~qon⁰ in (5.57) and -saŋ⁰ in (5.58).

As we can see, these examples represent the case of lexical union, since in each of the examples the meaning of the complement taking predicate is conveyed by a morpheme on the verb.

Unlike inception, the concept of termination of an event is expressed in Ket by means of a separate CTP – the verb bin⁷-{n}³-qut⁰ ‘finish, stop’. This verb is used only with
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action nominals and conveys the meaning ‘X stops Ving (Y)’. The only noun that can be used with bin\textsuperscript{7}-[n\textsuperscript{2}]-qu\textsuperscript{6} is ū ‘strength’, the whole construction conveying the meaning ‘X is tired’:

(5.59) \textit{bur'ā ē binut}

\begin{verbatim}
bu-da ē b\{in\textsuperscript{3}-b\textsuperscript{1}\}-in\textsuperscript{2}-\{q\}ut\textsuperscript{0}
\end{verbatim}

3SG-M.POSS strength self\textsuperscript{3}-3N3-PST\textsuperscript{2}-finish\textsuperscript{9}

‘He is tired (lit. His strength finished).’

Examples (5.60) and (5.61) illustrate complement constructions with the predicate bin\textsuperscript{7}-[n\textsuperscript{2}]-qu\textsuperscript{6}.

(5.60) \textit{bur'ā ka'j binut}

\begin{verbatim}
bu-da ka'j b\{in\textsuperscript{7}-b\textsuperscript{3}\}-in\textsuperscript{2}-\{q\}ut\textsuperscript{0}
\end{verbatim}

3SG-M.POSS walk.ANOM self\textsuperscript{7}-3N3-PST\textsuperscript{2}-finish\textsuperscript{9}

‘He stopped walking (lit. His walking finished).’

(5.61) \textit{dena tāp tār bina'ut}

\begin{verbatim}
dena tāp tār b\{in\textsuperscript{5}-b\textsuperscript{3}\}-in\textsuperscript{2}-\{q\}ut\textsuperscript{0}
\end{verbatim}

dog.AN.PL.POSS hit.ANOM self\textsuperscript{7}-3N3-PST\textsuperscript{2}-finish\textsuperscript{9}

‘People stopped beating their dogs’ or ‘The beating of the people’s dogs finished.’

As we can see, both the noun phrase in (5.59) and the action nominal complements in (5.60) and (5.61) trigger the verb internal agreement (the inanimate marker -b- in P3) on the main predicate. Therefore the complement clauses can be considered as the subjects of the given CTP. Other complement types are not possible with this predicate.

Table 5.2 summarizes the information about phasal predicates in Ket.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>lexical union</th>
<th>COMPLEMENT TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>action nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bare ANOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{q'/qan~qon/} say\textsuperscript{8} ‘start, begin’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{bin\textsuperscript{7}-[n\textsuperscript{2}]-qu\textsuperscript{6}} ‘finish, stop’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Table 5.2. Phasal predicates}
5.3.3 Manipulative predicates

Manipulative predicates express a relation between an agent or a situation which functions as a cause, an affectee, and a resulting situation. There are two kind of manipulatives: a) expressing causation (such as *make, force*, etc.) and b) expressing request (such as *order, ask*, etc.) (Noonan 2007: 136).

The first type, causation, as we already stated in Section 2.2.8.3.1 above, can be expressed in Ket either morphologically (5.62) or analytically (5.63).

(5.62) *danánbetqirit*

\[ \text{da}^3\text{-nanbed}^7\text{-q}^1\text{-}(i)\text{-di}^i\text{-t}^0 \]
\[ 3^3\text{bread.make.ANOM}^7\text{-CAUS}^5\text{-1SG}^1\text{-MOM.TR}^0 \]

‘She makes me bake bread.’

(5.63) *būŋ ke’t éltilj derasajdan*

\[ \text{bū}^3\text{-ŋ ke’t éltilj d{u} 8\text{-eda}^7\text{-q}^5\text{-a}^4\text{-t}^0\text{-in}^i \]
\[ 3\text{-PL person berries.pick.ANOM 3^5\text{-send}^7\text{-CAUS}^5\text{-3M}^4\text{-MOM.TR}^0\text{-AN.PL}^i \]

‘They make the man pick berries.’

In (5.63), the noun *ke’d* is semantically both the object of the main predicate *eda^7-q^5-a^4-*y^]-da^0* ‘send, cause’ (note, it is marked verb-externally) and the subject of the complement clause *eltilj* ‘pick berries’. Example (5.64) shows that such a noun phrase can in principle be omitted from the complement construction without causing any change, i.e. the object of the CTP will be interpreted as the subject of the complement clause.

(5.64) *bíṣeıp isqo dēraqadda*

\[ \text{bises}^3\text{-ŋ isqo d{u} 8\text{-eda}^7\text{-q}^5\text{-a}^4\text{-d{i}^1}\text{-da}^0 \]
\[ \text{sibling fish.ANOM 3^5\text{-send}^7\text{-CAUS}^5\text{-NPST}^4\text{-1SG}^1\text{-ITER.TR}^0 \]

‘Brother makes me fish.’

As we can see in (5.63)-(5.64), the predicate *eda^7-q^5-a^4-*y^]-da^0* takes its complement as a bare action nominal. It is also possible to find examples in which the

---

78 Please note that this is the iterative form of this causative verb. There is also the momentaneous counterpart *eda^7-q^5-[n]t-a^0* (*deraqajit* ‘I send him’). In what follows, only the iterative form will be cited as CTP, since these two forms are identical, both lexically and syntactically.
action nominal is marked with *esaŋ* as in (5.65). Finite complements are not attested with this CTP.

(5.65) *bísɛ ip-esaŋ áría īraqadda*

*bíseb* *i'1-esaŋ* ād da₄-ɛdu₄-q₄-a₄-d(i)₁-da₀

*b sibling* *sing.ANOM-TRANSL 1SG 3F₈-send₄-CAUS₄-NPST₄-1SG₄-ITER.TR₀*

‘Sister makes me sing.’

The concept of request in Ket is conveyed by means of verbs of speaking. They are *t₅-a₄-[n₂]-kij₀* ‘tell’ (5.66), *t₅-b₃-[l₂]-a₀* ‘ask’ (5.67) and *t₅-b₃-[l₂]-ij₀* ‘ask’ (5.68).

(5.66) *at təvingij iς/ənis/əŋ*

ād (di)₄-t₄-a₄-b₃-ɛlj₀ is an-esaŋ

1SG 1⁻-TH₄-PST₄-3N₃-PST₄-tell₀ fish boil.ANOM-TRANSL

‘I told (someone) to cook fish.’ (Belimov 1973: 54)

(5.67) *hɨ ḥə da-obil su:bed-esaŋ d{u}₂₈-a₁-t₄-b₃-ij₀*

son M.POSS-father sled.make.ANOM-TRANSL 3⁻-3M₈-TH₄-TH₃-PST₂-ask₀

‘The son asked his father to make sleds.’ (Zinn 2006)

(5.68) *dɨᵲl anįŋ hũn ibed-esaŋ d{u}₂₈-a₁-t₄-b₃-ij₀*

child play.ANOM daughter make.ANOM-TRANSL 3⁻-3N₃-ask₀

‘The girl asks for permission that shej make a doll.’ (Zinn 2006)

As can be seen from the examples, these CTPs take complements in the form of an action nominal with *esaŋ*. However, in the case of the predicate *t₅-b₃-[l₂]-ij₀* ‘ask’, it is also possible to find examples with an *esaŋ*-marked finite clause as a complement (5.69).

(5.69) *dɨᵲl dativev anįŋ hũn di:bbetimesaŋ*

dɨᵲl da₄-t(i)-b₃-ij₀ anįŋ hu'n du₄-b₃-bed₂-in₁-esaŋ

child 3F₈-TH₄-3N₃-ask₀ play.ANOM daughter 3⁻-3N₃-make₀-AN.PL₁-TRANSL

‘The girl asks so that they make a doll.’ (Zinn 2006)
The manipulative predicates in Ket are summarized in Table 5.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>COMPLEMENT TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lexical union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q ‘cause’</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eda –q–a–[F]–da0 ‘send, cause’</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t1’-kij0 ‘tell’</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t1’-a’0 ‘ask’</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t1’-q’0 ‘ask’</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. Manipulative predicates

5.3.4 Desiderative predicates

Desiderative predicates (such as want, wish, desire, etc.) are characterized by having experiencer subjects expressing a desire that the complement proposition be realized (Noonan 2007: 132). Noonan divides them into three semantic classes – the hope-class, the wish-class and the want-class. All the desiderative predicates found in Ket correspond to the last class – Ket has no (known) predicates corresponding to the first two classes – which consists of verbs expressing a desire that a state or event may be realized (Noonan 1985: 133). In Ket these are the following predicates: [n2]-tus0 ‘intend, want’, t1’-a’-[F]-baq0 ‘intend, want’, qo’j ‘wish’ and its negative counterpart bən’-qoj0 ‘not wish’.

The verbs [n2]-tus0 and t1’-a’-[F]-baq0 seem to be dialect specific, since the first is found only in Southern Ket examples in texts, while the second – mostly in Central Ket examples (cf. Belimov 1973: 23). Our language consultants from Kellog (i.e. Southern Ket speakers) could not recognize the verb t1’-a’-[F]-baq0 too. The use of the predicate qo’j and its negative variant can be found in all the Ket dialects.

The verb [n2]-tus0 is used to express intention rather than desire. As CTP, it usually takes complements in the form of action nominal with esay, as in (5.70).
(5.70) *bu usqat-esəŋ duj:ɔtɔs/*

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{bū} \quad \text{usqat-esəŋ} \\
&\text{3SG get.warm.ANOM-TRANSL} \\
&\text{3\textsuperscript{3}SG.ss\textsuperscript{1}-intend}\end{align*}
\]

‘He wants to get warm.’ (Belimov 1973: 23)

Another type of complements that can be found with this predicate is a finite verb marked with *esəŋ*.

(5.71) *at düjɛt-esəŋ dittɔs/*

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{ād} \quad \text{dī:s-ito-esaŋ} \\
&\text{1SG 1\textsuperscript{5}-sneeze\textsuperscript{2}-TRANSL} \\
&\text{1\textsuperscript{5}SG.ss\textsuperscript{1}-intend}\end{align*}
\]

‘I want to sneeze.’ (Belimov 1973: 24)

(5.72) *bu at labɔtskŋi-esəŋ duj:ɔtɔs/*

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{bū} \quad \text{ād} \quad \{\text{du}\textsuperscript{u}1\textsuperscript{7}-lab-bro-ito-ooqə-esaŋ} \\
&\text{3SG 1\textsuperscript{5}-piece\textsuperscript{2}-1SG-ito-bite\textsuperscript{0}-TRANSL} \\
&\text{3\textsuperscript{3}SG.ss\textsuperscript{1}-intend}\end{align*}
\]

‘He wants to bite me.’ (Belimov 1973: 24)

As we can see, the complement clauses in (5.71)-(5.72) contain fully finite verbs. This type of complements is less frequent with this verb than action nominals with *esəŋ*.

Examples (5.73)-(5.74) illustrate that this CTP allows its complements to have a non-coreferential subject.

(5.73) *āt dεŋə na usqat-esəŋ dittɔs/*

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{ād} \quad \text{deŋə-na usqat-esəŋ} \\
&\text{1SG people-AN.PL.POSS get.warm.ANOM-TRANSL} \\
&\text{1\textsuperscript{5}SG.ss\textsuperscript{1}-intend}\end{align*}
\]

‘I want people to get warm.’

(5.74) *bū ɛtə dəŋəj-esəŋ dittɔs/*

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{bū} \quad \text{ed-n} \quad \{\text{du}\textsuperscript{u}1\textsuperscript{7}-ano-s\textsuperscript{2}-qə-esaŋ} \\
&\text{3SG polar.fox-PL 3\textsuperscript{3}AN.PL.NPST\textsuperscript{4}-kill\textsuperscript{0}-TRANSL} \\
&\text{1\textsuperscript{5}SG.ss\textsuperscript{1}-intend}\end{align*}
\]

‘I want him to kill polar foxes.’

As we can see, if the subject of the action nominal complement is not identical to the subject of the main clause, it is marked as a possessor (5.73). In the case of the S-like complement, the non-equi subject is signaled by the corresponding marking
on the verb in the complement clause as well as by the overt presence of the corresponding personal pronoun, as in (5.74).

The Central Ket verb "t5-a4-baq0 ‘intend, want’ behaves in many ways similar to its Southern Ket synonym. As CTP, it most frequently takes action nominal with esay complements (5.75), while finite clauses with esay, although possible, are quite rare, exemplified in (5.76).

(5.75) at iši təlqit-ešay ditebaŋ

\[
\text{ād ūs təlqat-esay di}^3\text{-t}^6\text{-a}^4\text{-baq0 }
\]

1SG fish freeze,ANOM-TRANSL 1ST-TH5-NPST4-intend0

‘I want to freeze fish.’ (Belimov 1973: 23)

(5.76) at šešl qoŋtəkšebet-ešay ditebaŋ

\[
\text{āad sēl (di}^3\text{-qoŋt}-3\text{SG-TH}^5\text{-NPST4-make0-TRANSL 1ST-TH5-NPST4-intend0})
\]

1SG reindeer 1ST-geld-3SG.M6-TH5-NPST4-make0-TRANSL 1ST-TH5-NPST4-intend0

‘I want to geld a reindeer.’ (Belimov 1973: 39)

We could not find any examples of these two CTPs using bare action nominal complements or paratactic S-like complements (i.e without the marker esay).

The most frequent way to express desire in Ket is by using the predicate qoŋ ‘wish’. As CTP, qoŋ can be found with different types of complements illustrated in (5.75)-(5.78) below.

(5.75) dīl kaj-ešay da-qoŋ

\[
\text{dīl kaj-esay da-qoŋ}
\]

child walk,ANOM-TRANSL M.POSS-wish

‘The child wants to walk.’ (Belimov 1973: 23)

(5.76) at u usperaŋ-ešay vqoŋ

\[
\text{ād ū usbedaŋ-esay b-qoŋ}
\]

1SG 2SG kiss,ANOM-TRANSL 1SG.POSS-wish

‘I want to kiss you.’ (Belimov 1973: 23)
Clause linkage in Ket

(5.77) āt ən uledo pqɔˈj
   ād ōn uledo b-qaˈj
1SG 1SG many water.drink.ANOM 1SG.POSS-wish
‘I want to drink water a lot.’

(5.78) āt arɛndiŋa boŋ-ən-esan pqɔˈj
   ād aden-diŋa bɔ̃-k’a-den-esan b-qaˈj
1SG forest-N-DAT 1SG-th-TH-NPST-go0-TRANSL 1SG.POSS-wish
‘I want to go to the forest.’

Examples (5.75) and (5.76) show that pqɔˈj can be used with complements in the form of the action nominal with esan. This type of complement is the most frequent with this CTP. We were also able to elicit examples with bare action nominal complements as in (5.77), although no such examples were found in the Ket texts. The predicate pqɔˈj can also take complements in the form of S-like clauses marked with esan, as shown in (5.78). Paratactic S-like complements with this CTP were rejected by our language consultants.

Interestingly, the subject of pqɔˈj can be expressed twice, first as a personal pronoun (it can be a noun as well) at the beginning of the sentence, then as a corresponding possessive marker on the predicate. The personal pronoun can in principle be omitted, whereas the possessive marking of pqɔˈj is obligatory. Note that this is only possible if the predicate pqɔˈj is placed after its complement, if the predicate precedes its complement only the possessive marking is retained, cf. (5.79) in which only the second variant is acceptable.

(5.79a) *āt pqɔˈj ássanə-esan
   ād b-qaˈj ássanə-esan
1SG 1SG.POSS-wish hunt.LANOM-TRANSL
‘I want to go to hunt’

(5.79b) āb qoˈj ássanə-esan
   āb qoˈj ássanə-esan
1SG.POSS wish hunt.LANOM-TRANSL
‘I want to go to hunt’

Non-equi subjects in the complement clause are also possible with this CTP.
Complement relations

(5.80) āt bāغاa lüyor-esan b-oʔj
āt  bu-n-na lōbed-esan  b-oʔj
1sg  3-PL-AN.PL.POSS work.RUS.ANOM-TRANSL 1SG.POSS-wish
‘I want them to work.’

(5.81) ū klśeravet-esan Maśad q-oʔj
ū  {ku}8-lobed7-a4-bed0-esaŋ  masa-d  qoʔj
2SG 2SG8-work.RUS.ANOM7-NPST4-ITER0-TRANSL M.-3F wish
‘Masha wants you to work.’ (Edward Vajda, p.c.)

The predicate bən̥-qoj is the negative counterpart of qoj. Historically, it seems to represent a verbalized contraction of the phrase bən POSS-qoj ‘not someone’s wish’ (cf. Werner 1997: 181). Although, only the 3rd person singular forms still contain markers reminiscent of nominal possessive forms, cf. the full paradigm given below.

bən̥-qoj ‘smn does not want’

bən̥baŋoʃ ‘I do not want’

bən̥uŋoʃ ‘you do not want’

bəndəŋoʃ ‘he does not want’

bəndiŋoʃ ‘she does not want’

As we can see, other than the markers -da- and -di- for the 3rd person masculine singular and the 3rd person feminine singular, respectively, no person agreement morphemes in the paradigm resemble the possessive nominal markers (cf. Section 2.2.1). Rather they follow a mix of two intransitive paradigms typical for habeo-verbs (see Section 2.2.8.2.2.5 for details). Another verbal feature is that the subject of this predicate remains in its sentential form (cf. (5.79) and (5.80) below). At the same time, unlike finite verbs, these forms do not contain any temporal marker. It should also be noted that this verb cannot be used without the negative morpheme bən, i.e. forms like aŋqoj ‘they want’ are ungrammatical.79 Examples (5.82)-(5.84) illustrate the use of this predicate.

---

79 Werner (2002, I: 137) provides the Yeniseian word bogoj ‘necessary’ taken from the materials recorded by Castrén. According to Werner it might originate from bəqoj ‘my wish’.
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(5.82) úxen dillat tásin-esaŋ bónanuŋ
    usen dilkad tasaaŋ-esaan bən’-aŋ³-qoj⁹
  ‘Sleeping kids do not want to get up.’

(5.83) āt bûŋna pósbat bónbuŋ
    ād bu-na posobad bən’-bo⁴-qoj⁹
  ‘I do not want to help them.’ Or ‘I do not want them to help.’

(5.84) at bûŋ boŋ⁴ itpēdēm ešaŋ
    ād bən’-bo⁴-qoj⁹ it³-ba⁴-ə-[i]¹-am³-esaan
  ‘I don’t want to know.’ (Belimov 1973: 39)

As in the case of qo’j, this CTP prefers *esaŋ*-marked action nominals (5.82), but action nominal complements without *esaŋ* are possible as well (5.80). Note that the complement in (5.83) can also have a non-equi-subject reading. Finally, this predicate is capable of taking finite clauses with *esaŋ* as complements (5.84).

Table 5.4 summarizes the desiderative predicates in Ket.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>predicate</th>
<th>complement type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[n²]-tu⁶³ ‘intend, want’</td>
<td>lexical union: bare ANOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t³-qa’-[l²]-baq⁶ ‘intend, want’</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qo’j ‘wish, want’</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bən’-qoj⁹ ‘not wish, not want’</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4. Desiderative predicates
5.3.5 Perception predicates

Perception predicates include verbs naming the sensory mode by which the subject directly perceives the event coded in the complement. Here belong predicates like see, hear, watch, and feel (Noonan 2007: 142).

There are the following perception predicates in Ket: $k^3-a^4-[F]-do^0$ ‘watch’ (5.85), $t^4-a^4-[F]-oŋ-oŋ^0$ ‘see (intr.)’ (5.86), $t^4-a^4-[F]-oŋ-ok^0$ ‘see (tr.)’ (5.87) and $k^3-a^4-[F]-da^0$ ‘hear’ (5.88). All of them favor paratactic finite clause complements, as can be seen in the examples.

(5.85) ad dayudṣ ab kit quṭka ḏjatam

\[
\begin{align*}
1SG & \text{i}^3-a^4-k^3-o^5-do^0 & & \text{my person} & & 3M8-\text{PST}^4-\text{PST}^2-\text{stop}^0 \\
\text{ke}'d & \text{qotka} & \text{d}^4[u]^3-o^4-i^2-\text{tan}^0 & & & \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘I watched my friend stop ahead of me (lit. I watched him, my friend stopped ahead of me).’

(Ivanov et al. 1969: 217)

(5.86) qim̥a'r̥a tôluŋ ţô bə'q da'seji

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{qima} & \text{d}^4[i]^3-o^4-i^2-o^3 \text{ong}^0 & & \text{my father} & & 3^4-\text{PST}^4-\text{PST}^2-\text{kill}^0 \\
\text{a}^4-b^u & \text{tsújə} & \text{d}^4[u]^3-o^4-i^2-\text{eq}^0 & & & \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Grandmother saw my father killing a squirrel.’

(5.87) āt dátuŋ bū tsújabet

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{āt} & \text{d}^4[i]^3-a^4-i^2-o^3-\text{ong}^0 & & \text{3SG} & & \text{3}^4-\text{PST}^4-\text{PST}^2-\text{make}^0 \\
\text{bū} & \text{d}^4[u]^3-su^1-\text{a}^4-\text{bed}^0 & & \text{1SG} & & \text{3}^3-\text{swim.ANOM}^7-\text{NPST}^4-\text{make}^0 \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘I see him swimming (lit. I see him, he is swimming).’

(5.88) Usap ba:t x'abîl/da bôdôm deisâlje

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{usab} & \text{báad} & \text{a}^4-[k^3]-\text{h}^3-\text{i}^2-\text{da}^6 & & \text{U. old.man} & & 3^8-\text{cry}^7-\text{PST}^4-\text{PST}^2-\text{R}^0 \\
\text{bôdôm} & \text{da}^4-\text{es}^1-o^4-i^2-\text{ij}^0 & & & & \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘The old man Usjap heard a rifle fire (lit. The old man Usjap heard it, a rifle cried).’

(Kotorova and Porotova 2001: 48)

---

80 Repeated from example (5.22) above.
The intransitive predicate \(t^3-a^4-[i^2]-o^7-ol^0\) can also be used with the complementizer \(bila\) ‘how’ (5.89), which, as we have already mentioned in Section 5.2.3.1.3, is a calque from Russian. Note that there is no difference with (5.86) above other than the presence of the complementizer.

(5.89) \(āt\ təluŋ bila bura til\)ter\(a\)bet

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ād} & \quad \text{d}^1-i^2-o^5-i^2-o^9 & \text{bila} & \quad \text{d}^1-a^1-t\tilde{u}l\tilde{e}d^1-o^5-i^2-\text{bed}^0 \\
\text{1SG} & \quad \text{1}^\text{SG}-\text{TH}^1-\text{PST}^4-\text{PST}^2-\text{see}^0 & \text{how} & \quad \text{3}^\text{SG} \quad 3^\text{SG-bathe.ANOM}^1-\text{PST}^4-\text{PST}^2-\text{ITER}^0
\end{align*}
\]

‘I saw her bathing.’

The summary for the perception predicates in Ket is presented in Table 5.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>lexical union</th>
<th>action nominal</th>
<th>S-like clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bare ANOM</td>
<td>esay</td>
<td>bila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k^4-a^4-[i^2]-do^9) ‘watch’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k^5-a^4-[i^2]-do^9) ‘watch’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(t^2-o^7) ‘see (tr.)’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k^5-da^9) ‘hear’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5. Perception predicates

5.3.6 Knowledge predicates

Knowledge predicates (such as \(\text{know}, \text{realize}, \text{forget}, \text{see}, \text{hear}, \text{etc.}\)) take experiencer subjects and describe the state or the manner of acquisition of knowledge (Noonan 2007: 129).

The predicate \(it^7-[i^2]-am^0\) ‘know’ has already been discussed in Section 5.3.1 above, since it can also be used as a modal predicate with the meaning ‘can’ taking complements in the form of bare action nominals. As a knowledge CTP, \(it^7-[i^2]-am^0\) is capable of taking only finite clause complements. This is illustrated in (5.90).

(5.90) \(āt\ tıperem ūri ke\t \)dü\n\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ād} & \quad \text{i}^2\text{-b}^4\text{a}^4\text{d}^\{\text{i}\}^2\text{-a}^9 & \text{tū-d} & \quad \text{ke}^\prime \text{t} & \quad \text{du}^4\text{-a}^2\text{-n}^2\text{-q}^9 \text{o}^9 \\
\text{1SG} & \quad \text{know}^\prime\text{-}\text{1}^\text{SG}\text{o}^\text{SG}\text{1}^\text{SG}\text{-r}^8 & \text{that-M} & \quad \text{person} & \quad \text{3}^\text{SG-PST}^4\text{PST}^2\text{die}^8
\end{align*}
\]

‘I know/knew that the man died (lit. I know, the man died).’
The predicates \( \text{sit}^7-a^4-{n}\text{-}a^0 \) (5.91) and \( \text{in}^7-k^5-a^4-b^3-[f^2]\text{-}da^0 \) (5.92), both having the meaning of ‘guess’, take only finite clauses as well:

(5.91) \( \text{qima sit}\text{dit}na \ ŏp saˀq \) da\( ^i \)je\( ^i \)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{qima} & \quad \text{sit}^7-\text{dit}^4-a^0 \\
\text{ōp} & \quad \text{saˀq} \\
\text{da}^i & \quad \text{je}^i
\end{align*}
\]
grandma guess\( ^3\)-3\text{F}4-PST\text{-}R\( ^0 \) father squirrel 3\text{M}3\text{F}4-PST\text{-}kill\( ^0 \)
‘Grandmother guessed that father had killed a squirrel.’

(5.92) \( \text{Ulg} \) \( \text{ɛ} \) \( \text{r} \) \( \text{ɛŋ} \) \( \text{da} \) \( b\text{i} \) \( s\text{eb} \) \( \text{in}^7-k^5-a^4-b^3-da^0 \) qim-dil
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ulg} & \quad \text{ɛ} \quad \text{r} \quad \text{ɛŋ} \\
\text{da} & \quad \text{b\text{i}} \quad \text{s\text{eb}} \\
\text{in}^7 & \quad \text{k}^5 \quad \text{a}^4 \quad \text{b}^3 \quad \text{da}^0 \\
\text{qim} & \quad \text{dil}
\end{align*}
\]
whirlwind\( ^3\)-3M sibling guess\( ^3\)-\text{TH}5-NPST\text{-}3N3-R\( ^0 \) female-child
tām-bila sēl da\( ^\text{a} \)\text{-aner}^7-i\text{2}-bed\( ^0 \)
somehow bad 3F\text{R}3\text{F}6-PST\text{-}make\( ^0 \)
‘Whirlwind’s sister guesses that the girl has planned something bad.’

(Kostjakov 1981: 74)

Unlike the above mentioned perception predicates, the predicate \( \text{en}^7-{n}\text{-}suk~so\text{-}ŋ\text{-}0 \) ‘forget’ can take action nominal complements with \( \text{b\text{i}la} \) (5.93), although finite clauses marked with the same complementizer are possible as well (5.94).

(5.93) \( \text{sīn} \) \( \text{bāām} \) \( \text{en}\text{di} \) \( \text{r} \) \( \text{un} \) \( \text{b\text{i}la} \) \( kāj\text{h}^1 \)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sīn} & \quad \text{bāām} \\
\text{en}^7 & \quad \text{di}^3-a^3-\text{soŋ}^0 \\
\text{b\text{i}la} & \quad \text{kāj}
\end{align*}
\]
decrepit old.woman R\( ^7\)-3\text{R}4-PST\text{-}forget\( ^0 \) how walk\_ANOM
‘The decrepit old woman forgot how to walk.’

(Kotorova and Nefedov, forthcoming)

(5.94) \( \text{bāām} \) \( \text{en}\text{di} \) \( \text{r} \) \( \text{un} \) \( \text{b\text{i}la} \) \( ā\text{t} \) \( \text{dijav} \text{e} \text{t} \)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bāām} & \quad \text{en}^7-\text{di}^3-\text{a}^3-\text{soŋ}^0 \\
\text{b\text{i}la} & \quad \text{ād} \\
\text{āt} & \quad \text{dijav}^6-a^1-\text{bed}^0
\end{align*}
\]
old.woman R\( ^7\)-3\text{R}4-PST\text{-}forget\( ^0 \) how 1SG 1\text{R}3\text{R}4-PST\text{-}make\( ^0 \)
‘The old woman forgot what I look like (lit. how I am made ).’

Indirect questions with these predicates are formed either with the help of the question particle \( \text{h\text{and}d} \) \( ū \) (5.95) or an interrogative adverb (5.96) or pronoun (5.97).

---

\(^{1}\) Repeated from example (5.27) above.
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(5.95) ū itum ōb ū diksives?

ū it’-ku6-am0 ōb ū d(u)’-ik’-s4-bes0
2SG know’-2SC6-R0 father QUEST 3’-here’-NPST4-move0
‘Do you know whether the father is coming?’

(5.96) ād ítpar bitse dé ū d{u} 8-ik7-s4-bes0

ād it’-ba4-d{i}1-am0 bitse tu-de d(u)’-b1-f-bes0
1SG know’-1SG6-1SG.SS1-R0 who.M this-NPST4-move0
‘I know where he lives.’

(5.97) ād ítpar bitse tu-de dé ū d{u} 8-ik7-s4-bes0

ād it’-ba4-d{i}1-am0 bitse tu-de d(u)’-b1-f-bes0
1SG know’-1SG6-1SG.SS1-R0 who.M this-NPST4-move0
‘I know who did it.’

The Ket knowledge predicates are summarized in Table 5.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>COMPLEMENT TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lexical union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bare ANOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| it’-[P]-am0  | ‘know’ |        | +    |        | +    |
| sit’-[n]-a4-[P]-du6 | ‘guess’ |        | +    |        | +    |
| in’-k’-a4-[P]-du6  | ‘guess’ |        | +    |        | +    |
| en’-[n]-suk~so0 | ‘forget’ | +       | +    | +       |

Table 5.6. Knowledge predicates

5.3.7 Propositional attitude predicates

Propositional attitude predicates express the speaker’s attitude or evaluation towards the propositional content of the complement clause. It can be either positive (for example, believe, think, suppose, assume, etc.), or negative (like not believe, doubt, deny, etc.) (Noonan 2007: 124). In Ket there is only one propositional attitude
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predicate attested, an(eŋ)⁷-[s⁴]-[l²]-bed-ked⁰ ‘think (intr.)’⁸² (5.98), which belongs to the positive type.

(5.98) qimar’a anlibet āb ĕp arëndina xɔt
qimadə⁴-ana⁷-bed⁰ āb ĕb aden-di-ŋa o⁴-k⁴-o⁴-d[en]⁰
grandma 3⁴-think.ANOM⁷-PST²-ITER⁰ 1SG.POSS father forest-N-DAT 3M⁷-TH⁴-NPST⁴-go⁰
‘Grandmother thought that my father would go to the forest.’

As can be seen from the example, this CTP takes a finite clause complement. No other complement types are attested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>COMPLEMENT TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lexical union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>action nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-like clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an(eŋ)⁷-[s⁴]-[l²]-bed-ked⁰ ‘think (intr.)’</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7. Propositional attitude predicate

5.3.8 Utterance predicates

Utterance predicates (such as say, tell, ask, etc.) describe a transfer of information initiated by an agentive subject towards an addressee. The addressee may be implicit or overtly expressed (Noonan 2007: 121). Utterance predicates may be used both in indirect and direct speech, although it is not relevant for Ket, since there is no special marking (apart from intonation) to differentiate between direct and indirect speech in the language (cf. Werner 1997: 369; see (5.95) below).

The following utterance predicates can be found in Ket: t⁵-⁴-[n²]-kij⁰ ‘say, tell’ in (5.99), t⁴-[l²]-ij⁰ ‘ask’ in (5.100), and b/a⁴-[n²]-d/a⁰ ‘say’⁸³ in (5.101) and (5.102). These predicates take only paratactic finite clause complements as can be seen below.

---
⁸² Werner (2002, I: 38) lists a few other verbs formed with the help of the same action nominal an(eŋ): anbedeŋ⁶-ana⁷-[l²]-bed-ked⁰ ‘think (intr.)’ anegbedeŋ⁶-na⁴-[l²]-bed-ked⁰ ‘think (intr.),’ but our language consultants did not recognize them. Also note that the transitive verb an(eŋ)-k⁴-[s⁴]-[l²]-bed-ked⁰ ‘think about’ has not been attested with any complement type.

⁸³ This is one of the irregular verbs we mentioned in Section 2.2.8.2.2.6 that is hard to analyze at the synchronic level, therefore we do not parse it into positions in our glossing.
(5.99) deynana tvingij atta ke’t qoj duldaq

\[ \text{den-na-ŋa} \{\text{du}^4\}^t\text{-o}^4\text{-b}^4\text{-n}^2\text{-ki}^0 \text{ atta ke’d qoj } \{\text{u}^4\}^t\text{-o}^4\text{-t}^0\text{-dooq}^6 \]

people-AN.PL-DAT \{3\}^t\text{-TH}^5\text{-PST}^8\text{-3N}^1\text{-PST}^2\text{-say}^8 \text{ IPL.POSS bear } 3^3\text{-3M}^8\text{-PST}^2\text{-eat}^9

‘He said to the people: A bear ate our man.’

(5.100) bū tvingi avága ke’t dimesi

\[ \text{bū} \{\text{du}^4\}^t\text{-o}^4\text{-b}^4\text{-n}^2\text{-ki}^0 \text{ ab-apa ke’d } \{\text{u}^4\}^t\text{-i}^7\text{-n}^2\text{-bes}^6 \]

3SG \{3\}^t\text{-TH}^5\text{-PST}^8\text{-3N}^1\text{-PST}^2\text{-say}^8 \text{ 1SG.POSS-DAT person } 3^3\text{-here7-PST}^2\text{-move}^9

‘He said to me (that) the man came.’ or ‘He said to me: The man came.’

(5.101) bu diaجا bada uťes kisęŋ ab deŋ duyn

\[ \text{bū} \text{ di-ŋa bada uťes kisęŋ } \text{āb deŋ } \text{du}^4\text{-k}^7\text{-daq}^8\text{-in}^1 \]

3SG F-DAT he.says/said near here 1SG.POSS people 3^3\text{-TH}^5\text{-live6-AN.PL}^3

‘He said to her: My people live near here.’ (Belimov 81:67, 23)

(5.102) bu mana bu daiksivesi

\[ \text{bū} \text{ mana bū } \text{du}^4\text{-d}^7\text{-s}^8\text{-bes}^6 \]

3SG she.says/said 3SG 3FP.here7-NPST4-move9

‘Sheš said/says sheš would/will come.’ / ‘Sheš said/says: Sheš will come.’

(Werner 1997: 369)

The Ket utterance predicates are summarized in Table 5.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>COMPLEMENT TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t^2-a^2{-n^2}-ki^0 ‘say, tell’</td>
<td>bare ANOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t^2-b^2{-l^2}-ij^0 ‘ask’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b/a^4{-n^2}-d/a^4‘say’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8. Utterance predicates

5.3.9 Commentative predicates

Commentative predicates (or ‘factives’ in more traditional terms) provide a comment on the complement proposition in the form of an emotional reaction or evaluation (regret, be sorry, be sad, etc.) or a judgement (be odd, be significant, be important, etc.) (Noonan 2007: 127).
In Ket, this class of CTPs is filled only with adjectives, which is common cross-linguistically (cf. Noonan 2007: 129). The adjectives used as commentative predicates are marked with the inanimate predicative marker -am. They take complements in the form of bare action nominals.

(5.103) ahiŋa išq aŋtam

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{1SG.POSS-DAT} & \text{fish.ANOM} & \text{good-N.PRED} \\
\end{array}
\]

'I like fishing (lit. Fishing is good to me).'

(5.104) būr a sāld sēłam

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{3-M.POSS} & \text{smoke.ANOM} & \text{bad-N.PRED} \\
\end{array}
\]

'His smoking is bad.'

(5.105) tūr kēraŋa sūl̥d tāŋ sīyam

\[
\begin{array}{lllll}
\text{this-M} & \text{person-M.POSS-DAT} & \text{sled-N.POSS} & \text{carry.ANOM} & \text{heavy-N.PRED} \\
\end{array}
\]

'It is difficult for this man to carry the sled.'

When the subject of the action nominal is present, it is expressed as a possessor, cf. (5.103) and (5.104). The overt subject of the main clause is expressed as an experiencer marked by the Dative relational morpheme, as in (5.103) and (5.105).

Table 5.9 presents a summary of the commentative predicates in Ket.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>COMPLEMENT TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lexical union</td>
<td>action nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bare ANOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aŋtam &quot;it is good&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sēlam &quot;it is bad&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sōkam &quot;it is difficult&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9. Commentative predicates
5.3.10 Achievement predicates

Achievement predicates can be divided into two general classes: positive and negative achievements. Positive achievement predicates (for example, manage, chance, remember to, happen to, etc.) refer to the manner or realization of achievement, whereas negative achievement predicates (try, forget to, fail, etc.) refer to the manner or reason for the lack of achievement in the complement predication (Noonan 2007: 139).

The only achievement predicate attested in Ket belongs to the negative class. It is the predicate *en7-*[-n2]-suk~so 'forget'. This predicate can take action nominal complements, as exemplified in (5.106).

(5.106) āt enbansuk na/n d.estij

ąd en7-ba6-n2-suk0 na/n d-estij
1SG R7-1SG6-PST2-forget0 bread N.POSS-stir.ANOM
‘I forgot to stir the dough (lit. I forgot the dough’s stirring).’

No other complement types have been attested with this CTP in Ket.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>COMPLEMENT TYPE</th>
<th>action nominal</th>
<th>S-like clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lexical union</td>
<td>bare ANOM</td>
<td>esəy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>en7-</em>[-n2]-suk~so 'forget'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.10. Achievement predicates*

5.4 Summary of Chapter 5

In the present chapter we provided an overview of complement constructions in Ket. We surveyed them from the structural and semantic point of view. From the structural point of view, we distinguished several complement types in Ket. They are the S-like clause type and action nominal type. Each of them can be further subdivided into three subtypes: unmarked and marked with the subordinators esəy and biła. The morphosyntactic properties of these types are summarized in Table 5.11 below.
As we can see, action nominal types show almost no inflectional completeness (“deranked” in Cristofaro’s (2003) terms), while the types with finite verbs remain fully inflected (“balanced” in Cristofaro’s (2003) terms).

From the semantic point of view, we distinguished ten semantic classes of complement taking predicates in Ket based on Noonan (2007).

As typological studies show, there is a certain correlation between the semantics of a complement taking predicate and the types of complements: the more semantically integrated the predicate is, the more syntactically integrated (i.e. deranked) complement it takes (Givón 1990: ch. 13). A similar idea is expressed in Cristofaro (2003). Based on correlations between the semantics of CTPs and the structural properties of complement types used with these predicates, Cristofaro (2003: 131) postulates the following hierarchy called the Complement Deranking-Argument Hierarchy:

### Table 5.11. Properties of complement types in Ket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPLEMENT TYPES IN KET</th>
<th>action nominal complement</th>
<th>S-like complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bare ANOM</td>
<td>esay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb form</td>
<td>non-finite</td>
<td>non-finite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM distinction</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person agreement</td>
<td>– verb-internal</td>
<td>– verb-internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person agreement</td>
<td>– verb-internal</td>
<td>– verb-internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement: SBJ</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person agreement</td>
<td>– verb-internal</td>
<td>– verb-internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement: OBJ</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case marking /</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adpositions</td>
<td>not expr-d / POSS / NOM</td>
<td>not expr-d / POSS / NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument coding: SBJ</td>
<td>NOM / POSS</td>
<td>NOM / POSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument coding: OBJ</td>
<td>NOM / POSS</td>
<td>NOM / POSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clause linkage in Ket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement type</th>
<th>CTP semantic class</th>
<th>Ket CTP predicates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical union</td>
<td>Phasal</td>
<td>-q5- / -qan-qon0 / -saŋ 'start, begin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>-q5- 'cause'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phasal</td>
<td>bin'-fn'i-qoŋ 'finish, stop'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action nominal</td>
<td>Modal</td>
<td>it-/F]-am0 'can, know how'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>de-/F]-beŋ 'can, understand'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iteŋ 'can'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hteŋ 'be possible'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qoŋun 'not to be able'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nada 'be necessary'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>eda-q'-[F]-aŋ 'send, cause'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t-'/F]-kif0 'say, tell'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t-/F]-aŋ 'ask'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t-/F]-iŋ 'ask'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td>qoŋ 'wish, want'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bani-qoŋ 'not wish, not want'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commentative</td>
<td>aqtam 'it is good'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>selam 'it is bad'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sakam 'it is difficult'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>en-/F]-suk-soŋ 'forget'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action nominal +bila</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>en-/F]-suk-soŋ 'forget'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modal</td>
<td>nada 'be necessary'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>t-/F]-kif0 'say, tell'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t-/F]-aŋ 'ask'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t-/F]-iŋ 'ask'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action nominal +expo</td>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td>tus0 'intend, want'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t-/F]-baŋ0 'intend, want'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qoŋ 'wish, want'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bani-qoŋ 'not wish, not want'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that Ket in general conforms to the hierarchy proposed by Cristofaro. We can see that the most semantically integrated CTPs, phasals and modals, take the most deranked complement types, while the predicates not involving semantic integration (knowledge, propositional attitude, and utterance predicates) take the balanced complement types. At the same time the table shows there are two unexpected deviations from the hierarchy. First of all, it concerns the modal predicates itej ‘can’, qoŋan ‘not to be able’, nada ‘be necessary’ which are capable of taking finite clauses as their complements (in addition to the deranked type), which also places them with the predicates without semantic integration. The second deviation is the knowledge predicate enʔ-[nʔ]-suk~sonq ‘forget’ which takes an action nominal complement marked with the complementizer bilə.

### Table 5.12. Complement types and semantic classes of CTP in Ket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement Type</th>
<th>Semantic Class</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finite clause + esay</td>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>təʔ-iʔə ‘ask’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td>tuə ‘want, intend’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qoআ ‘wish, want’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bənʔ-qoʔ ‘not wish, not want’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite clause + bilə</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>təʔ-oŋə ‘see (intr.)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>enʔ-[nʔ]-suk~sonq ‘forget’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modal</td>
<td>iteج ‘can’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qoŋan ‘not to be able’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nada ‘be necessary’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>təʔ-oŋə ‘see (intr.)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>təʔ-oŋə ‘see (tr.)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kə-daʔ ‘hear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>ifʔ-[fʔ]-amʔ ‘know’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>siʔ-aʔ-[nʔ]-aʔ ‘guess’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inʔ-kə-aʔ-bəlʔ-[fʔ]-daʔ ‘guess’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Propositional attitude</td>
<td>an(eŋ)ʔ-[aʔ]-[fʔ]-bed–keθ ‘think (intr.)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utterance</td>
<td>təʔ-aʔ-[nʔ]-kif ‘tell’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bəlʔ-[nʔ]-daʔ ‘say’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>