COORDINATION IN UPPER KUSKOKWIM ATHABASKAN

Andrej A. Kibrik

(Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow)

1. Introduction

Upper Kuskokwim Athabaskan (henceforth: UKA) is an indigenous language of interior Alaska, spoken by a few dozen people, primarily in the villages of Nikolai, Telida, and McGrath on the Kuskokwim river. UKA is spoken mostly by people over 50, and is a highly endangered language (see Kibrik 1998). This article is based on my field work in Nikolai in 1997 and 2001. There is just a couple dozen fluent speakers of UKA, and I have worked with most of them. The data cited in this article comes mostly from natural discourses recorded from fluent speakers, but some examples were elicited specifically for this project.

UKA is grammatically fairly close to other neighboring Athabaskan languages, and what is suggested in this paper would largely hold for the neighboring Alaskan Athabaskan languages as well. Some Alaskan languages are very well documented lexically (cf. especially the recent fundamental Koyukon dictionary Jetté and Jones 2000), and some have partial grammatical accounts (Tenenbaum 1978 for Dena'ina, Kari 1990 for Ahtna, Thompson 1989 and Jetté and Jones 2000 for Koyukon, Tuttle 1998 for Tanana, Holton 2000 for Tanacross, Collins and Petruska 1979 for UKA), but there is very little information available on the syntax of these languages, and, to the best of my knowledge, no published accounts of coordination in any of the Alaskan Athabaskan languages exist. Some non-Alaskan Athabaskan languages are described in terms of syntax in much greater detail, especially Navajo (see e.g. Fernald and Hale eds. 2000 and references therein) and Slave (Rice 1989).

There is much reason for the emphasis on morphology in the descriptive work on Athabaskan languages, since these languages can be generally characterized as much more morphological than syntactic languages. The functions rendered in many languages by syntactic constructions are mostly expressed in Athabaskan by verb-internal morphology, which does not leave much space for syntactic concerns. But some syntactic problems still remain, among them coordination, even though the syntax

of this domain is relatively impoverished in Athabaskan compared to the "typological average". Since the main emphasis of this paper is not on verbal morphology, in order to avoid unnecessary complications I will not introduce morphological intricacies here and will not provide detailed morphemic analysis and glosses.

In this paper I first consider the grammar of conjunction as the central semantic type of coordinate constructions (see Haspelmath 2001): nominal conjunction (§2) and clause conjunction (§3). The internal structure of each of these sections will be as follows:

- The main formal device
- Other functions of the main formal device
- Minor formal devices, if any

After that I will consider other semantic types of coordination, that is disjunction and adversative coordination (§§ 4 and 5, respectively), and provide some typologically-oriented conclusions (§6).

2. NP conjunction

2.1. The main pattern

The main (in fact, the only) way to express **conjunctive NP coordination** in UKA is through a bisyndetic postpositive construction "X *ʔił* Y *ʔił*", where *ʔił* is the coordinator. The following is a full utterance that was used as a reply to a question of what kinds of meat one used to eat in the old days:

(1) dineje   ʔił   midzish   ʔił   (LP[1])
     moose   with   caribou   with
     'Moose and caribou.'

The postposition *ʔił* is glossed 'with' in the examples since its original function is the comitative (see §2.2). Its usage as an *and*-coordinator is, however, relatively independent. In the following two examples the coordinate NP as a whole is a core clause participant (rather than being a comitative oblique participant):

(2) TIMOTHY[2] ʔił   se   ʔił   kayih ts'ideghilts'eʔ   (SN)
     T   with me   with   house we.stayed
     'Timothy and I stayed at home.'

Conjunctive constructions such as in (2) are one of the few contexts where independent personal pronouns are used in UKA.

(3) maladija   ʔił   jamena ʔił   denk'a ʔił   łeka   mamaʔ   ʔił   hwtł   ye
     tent   with stove with gun   with dog   food   with   sled   in

---

[2] In the text of the examples, I use caps to indicate English words inserted into UKA speech.

ch'ighisdlo   ts'eʔ   (BE)
I.put.them   Ptcl
'I put a tent, a stove, a gun, and dog food in the sled.'

The latter example demonstrates multiple coordination and shows that *ʔił* must be attached to each of the conjoined NPs.

Under different orthographic conventions the postposition *ʔił* could be written together with the noun it follows since phonetically it attaches to the noun very closely. However, since *ʔił* can attach to a whole NP it is more adequate to write it as a separate word. When attached to pronouns, the conjunctive *ʔił* requires the preceding pronoun to appear as an independent word, cf. *se ʔił*, lit. 'myself with' in (2) above. This is one of the very few contexts where free independent pronouns are used in UKA (another context is contrastive emphasis). Normally pronouns appear as bound morphemes attached to verbs or postpositions. When used in its original comitative function (see §2.2) *ʔił* combines with pronominal prefixes only, cf. *siʔił*, lit. 'me-with' in (8) below.

However, even in the conjunctive usage *ʔił* merges in one word with one of pronominal morphemes, namely, the areal pronoun *hw-/hi-* 'in a place, in an area'. The result of this combination is the very frequent word *hiʔił* that usually translates as 'also' or 'still'. The collocation of the structure "X *ʔił* *hiʔił*" means 'X and other things', 'X and all that'. The following phrase appeared at the end of a list of entertainments that people used to enjoy at Christmas time:

(4)   yaldzudle   ʔił   hiʔił   CHRISTMAS TIME   (LP)
         ball   with   also
         '… and ball game and all that on Christmas time.'

Sometimes the meaning 'also' can be inferred even from a single occurrence of *ʔił*, cf.:

(5)   jone nin'   ʔił   sritohutoził   (LP)
         this   earth   with   it.will.be.ruined
         'This earth will be ruined, too.'

Apparently a phrase of the structure 'X *ʔił*' can mean 'something unmentioned and X'[3]. This brings us immediately to the comitative usage of *ʔił*.

2.2. Other functions of ʔił

---

[3] This phenomenon is not unique – cf. Russian conjunctive *i*, most frequently used in symmetric constructions, but also usable in a similar fashion:

(i) *Masha i Ivan priexali* 'Masha and Ivan arrived'
(ii) *I Ivan priexal* 'Ivan arrived, too', lit. 'And Ivan arrived'

In the latter case the other person(s) who arrived are supposed to be known anaphorically.

The conjunctive function of ʔiɬ certainly is not the most frequent, and in fact is quite peripheral in natural UKA discourse, among other usages of ʔiɬ. This postposition has a whole gamut of different other functions, the most fundamental of which apparently is the **comitative**, for example:

(6)   zido   didisnaka   ʔiɬ   (DE)
            she.stays   her.parents   with
            'She stays with her parents.'

(7)   ch'ididit'oze ʔiɬ   hwts'eʔ   ts'aneyo   (PE)
            saw   with   to.area   she.left
            'She left with a saw.'

The following example is interesting in showing two occurrences of ʔiɬ. There is a relative clause in this example that contains a comitative, and the relative clause itself is a comitative participant of the main clause.

(8)   [nut si-ʔiɬ   ton   dalts'enh-na]   ʔiɬ   diʔist'anh   ts'eʔ (JG)
            here me-with   town they.stay-those.people   with   I.do   Ptcl
            'I do things with the people who live in town with me.'

The following example is interesting in showing **both a conjunctive** (first and second entries of ʔiɬ) and **a comitative** (third entry) usages:

(9)   ch'onh   ʔiɬ   diyotsiʔa   ʔiɬ   neɬ-ʔiɬ   hidalts'enh   (LP)
            mother   with   her.daughter with   each.other-with   they.stayed
            'A mother and her daughter were living together.'

These two usages render essentially the same meaning of a referentially compositional clause participant: *neɬʔiɬ* 'with each other' = *X ʔiɬ Y ʔiɬ* 'X and Y'. This example demonstrates the connection between the comitative and the conjunctive usages.

The postposition ʔiɬ can also be used as an **instrumental**, although there are other instrumental postpositions as well:

(10)   dzah ʔiɬ   dichinh   niɬtɬwh   (SN)
            pitch with wood   I.paint
            'I am painting the piece of wood with pitch.'

The instrumental use of the comitative is of course very common cross-linguistically. There is also a range of uses that combine the comitative meaning with another semantic role, such as **patient** (11) or **destination** (12):

(11)   ɬegoya   ʔiɬ   sruditisjiʔoɬ   (LP)
               puppy   with   I.will.play

'I will play with the puppy.'

(12)   dinedigoch   ts'ine   mi-ʔiɬ   nedanijininh   (LP)
        he.got.grey.hair   it.is.so   him-with   I.arrived
        'He already got grey hair when I came to stay with him.'

There is a very large and common group of usages of ʔiɬ that can be generally identified as a **non-core (non-actant) participant** of the clause playing the role similar to an experiencer or benefactive[4].

(13)   k'odet   hiʔiɬ   ʔin   si-ʔiɬ   huzrunh   (LP)
        now   still   it.is me-with   it.is.good
        'I am still happy now.'

(14)   ʔede chu   ch'itiy   SUGAR   yan'   si-ʔiɬ   (DE)
        that Ptcl   too.much   only   me-with
        'That one (a bun) contains too much sugar for me.'

(15)   yada ʔeko   dina-ʔiɬ   k'oy'nalʔesh   (PE)
        what for   us-with   he.is.hiding
        'What for is he hiding from us?'

(16)   si-ʔiɬ   noy'tazʔonh   ts'eʔ   (BE)
        me-with   the.sun.is.starting.to.set   Ptcl
        'The sun was starting to set as I was going.'

Note that in all of these examples it is the first person pronoun that is used with the comitative, and that probably indicates that this usage is closely connected to the speaker's perception of the situation.

Finally, there are some usages of ʔiɬ in which it is harder to see a connection with the comitative. The comitative postposition is lexicalized to render the semantic role of **destination** with the verb meaning 'to shoot':

(17)   mi-ʔiɬ   ch'idazeɬtwtɬ'
        it-with   you.shot.something
        'You shot at it.', lit. 'You shot something (=bullet) with it.'

In the following example what is rendered with ʔiɬ is a **location** of the patient:

(18)   ɬeka ʔiɬ   ch'idoy'disdlo   ts'eʔ   (BE)
        dogs with   I.hooked.something.up   Ptcl
        'I harnessed the dogs.'

---

[4] This type of usage is reminiscent of English phrases such as *It's OK with me.*

Of course, given such polyfunctionality of the element ʔiɬ, the question arises as to whether the postpositional and the conjunctive uses are the same or belong to different parts of speech. This question has been discussed for other Northern Athabaskan languages: see Cook 1984: 93 ff. for Sarcee and especially Rice 1989: 1073-79 for Slave. In UKA there are two main differences between the postpositional and the conjunctive uses:

(i)   in the conjunctive usage, there are at least two instances of a ʔiɬ-phrase while in the postpositional usage there is always just one

(ii)   in the postpositional usage the nominal in question is necessarily an oblique participant of the clause while the conjoined nominals form a single NP that can be used as any clause participant, for example as the subject participant in (2); notice that in this example the first person plural subject pronoun is used on the verb.

Thus the coordinating use of ʔiɬ is relatively specialized in UKA but bears features of a close semantic connection with the central comitative usage, and there are syntactically intermediate usages, as discussed above for (9). So my suggestion for UKA is that we should not force the language data into deciding unequivocally on whether two kinds of ʔiɬ are the same or different. They are relatively separate but clearly related.

2.3. No other formal markers of NP conjunction

There are no other devices found in UKA that can possibly be used to render NP conjunction. In particular, the English *and* has never been attested in my text corpus to connect native UKA words. This is particularly striking given that there is a lot of code switching in modern UKA speech. This is different from clause-conjoining usages of *and*, as will be discussed below.

3. Clause conjunction

3.1. The main pattern

The most typical kind of conjoined clause constructions in natural UKA discourse can be characterized as follows:

(i)   conjoined clauses are finite

(ii)   the equivalent of a conjoining connector between clauses is the clause-final particle *ts'eʔ* appearing in all conjoined clauses except for the last one

(iii) conjunctive constructions render the meaning of a list of events or of a temporal sequence, sometimes with a causal-resultative nuance to it

(iv)   the *ts'eʔ*-strategy is formation of clause chains, frequently very long

Scollon and Scollon (1981: 108) referred to particles such as *ts'eʔ* as "morphemes of continuation". In their terms, *ts'eʔ* marks that the current line does not end the verse, and the verse will be continued in the next line.

One simple example of a conjunctive clause is provided in (19):

(19)   "hondenh   ghwlaʔ   sidadzaʔ"   yinezinh   **ts'eʔ**
       whereunknown   my.sister   he.thought   and

       hwts'its'ay'nełghwt   (LP)
       he.took.off.pulling.a.sled
       'He wondered where was his sister and took off with a sled.'

Apparently there is a temporal sequence between the events in the first and second lines of (19), the clause order iconically representing the order of events. At the same time, the cause-result interpretation is quite salient in this example, the first clause representing the cause, and the second the result: the protagonist left to search for his sister. Sometimes the *ts'eʔ*-conjunction is used when the cause clause is provided after the result clause[5]:

(20)   nongw   donaʔ   totis   łeka   ʔisdlal   ts'eʔ   (LP)
       from.river   upriver   portage   dogs   I.did.not.take and

       ch'itsan'   ch'itey   nichoh   ts'eʔ <...>
       grass   too much   tall   and
       'I did not take the dogs to the upriver portage because the grass was too tall, and <...>'

Example (21), appearing at the very beginning of a long personal story, demonstrates a much longer chain of clauses.

(21)   siyih   nenodanjininh   BOAT ye   hwts'inh   ts'eʔ
       my.house   I.came.back.to   boat   on   from.area   and
       'I came back to my house by boat AND

       MEDFRA   chuʔda   k'odanjizesh   ts'eʔ
       M.   again   I.travel.to   and
       I traveled again to Medfra AND

       dichinanek' donaʔ   dineje ʔeko   sriłtodihwłʔanh-na   ts'idanijininh   ts'eʔ
       North.Fork   upriver   moose for   hunt-those.people   I.joined.them   and
       upriver at the North Fork I joined those who were hunting moose AND

       nonaʔ   hwyeʔił   dina-ʔił   ghełyots   ts'eʔ
       upriver   then   us-with   it.snowed   and
       upriver it was snowing AND

---

[5] The *ts'eʔ* at the end of the first line of example (20) may be due to a different reason than conjunction, that is, negation, see §3.2 below. I assume, however, that *ts'eʔ* in this case has the conjunction function as well since there is no other marker of causal connection between the lines in (20).

```
gheɫyots        ts'eʔ    hwyeʔiɫ
it.snowed       and      then
it was snowing AND then


tats'uts'a    ʔiɫ    yadach'elanh  diyats'    ch'ik'i hwlanh    ts'eʔ
mink          with   everything    really     tracks  there.are  and
there were lots of tracks of mink and other animals AND


hwnghiɫʔan'  nehwdalninh.           (BE)
I.saw.them    it.got.to.be.like.that
I saw them, so it happened.'
```

(21) is certainly not the longest example of a *ts'eʔ*-sequence: there are many cases of a dozen of *ts'eʔ*-clauses or more in narratives. In (21), one can probably always interpret the *ts'eʔ*-conjunction as temporal sequencing, although often the specificity of the semantic connection is very low, as between the two last lines of (21).

Clauses concluded with *ts'eʔ* are usually followed by a fairly long pause. For example, in the narrative discourse by Bobby Esai (the speaker who authored example 21), almost every *ts'eʔ*-clause is followed by a pause 2 or 3 seconds long, and sometimes as long as 5 seconds. Pauses of such length almost exclusively appear only after finite clauses. The *ts'eʔ*-clauses have a falling final intonation contour which is probably the UKA equivalent of the comma (non-sentence-final) intonation. Finite clauses not concluded by *ts'eʔ* or any other connective also have falling intonation, but with a greater range of tone fall, and a still longer pause following them. These patterns of pausing and intonation seem to suggest that *ts'eʔ*-clauses are coordinate clauses constituting parts of greater sentences.

3.2. Other functions of ts'eʔ

The particle *ts'eʔ* is not exclusively specialized as a continuation marker in conjunctive constructions. It has at least two other major functions:

(i)   it is a complementizer with some matrix predicates
(ii)   it is a conventional third marker of negation

The particle *ts'eʔ* is used as a **complementizer** with such matrix predicates as 'want', 'learn', 'forget', and sometimes 'not know', for example:

```
(22)   tu       ʔedinunh     ts'eʔ          nwgh       hik'adiʔist'a         (WP)
       water    you.drink    Complzr        about.you  I.want
       'I want you to drink water.'


(23)   jilejik  ʔuzre        ts'eʔ          hik'aʔelnech          (Collins and Petruska 1979: 71)
       paper    he.reads     Complzr        he.learned
       'He learned to read books.'
```

8

The commonality of this usage of *ts'eʔ* with the conjunctive usage is that in both cases it links two clauses. The next usage of *ts'eʔ* is not related to clause combining at all. *Ts'eʔ* conventionally, although not obligatorily, appears in **negative** clauses, for example:

(24)   a.   Ɂi-ø-s-trih
                Peg-Impf-1Sg-cry
                'I cry.'

        b.   zi-s-trigh   ts'eʔ
                Neg.Impf-1Sg-cry.Neg   Neg
                'I don't cry.'

(24b) demonstrates the typical way of marking negativity in UKA. The basic grammatical marking of negativity is twofold: there is voicing of the stem-final consonant compared to the positive form (*h* > *gh*), and there is a change in tense marker; it is zero in positive imperfective (24a), and *zi-* in negative imperfective (24b). This twofold synthetic marking is grammatical negative marking per se, and the most linguistically gifted native speakers can identify the form *zistrigh* as the direct equivalent of the English 'I don't cry'. However, conventionally people use a third marker in negative clauses, and that is the particle *ts'eʔ* following the negative-inflected verb form. For most speakers, negative forms are very hard to process without *ts'eʔ*, both in production and in understanding.

These facts probably indicate that:

(i)   *ts'eʔ* does not fundamentally mean 'and'
(ii)   it is a particle of a very general meaning; if it can be captured at all, it might be something like 'incompleteness, entropy'
(iii)   the continuation function of *ts'eʔ* is apparently contextually inferred from its fundamental meaning in the context of clause conjunction

3.3. Other formal devices of clause conjunction

More rarely, the equivalent of clause conjunction (or at least sequential events) can be rendered through the **comitative** construction. In such a case just two clauses would be normally conjoined, the verb of the linearly first one would be nominalized, and the *Ɂił* postposition would be added to it. For example:

(25)   nona Ɂ   ywgh k'wda łeka   ghisdlal-e   Ɂił
        [upriver   there   soon dogs   I.am.taking-Nomzr] with/and

        hwndine-Ɂił   chu   sighwdlaɁ   todoltsitł'   ts'eʔ <…>   (BE)
        suddenly-with   it.happened   my.sled   it.broke.through.ice and
        'As I was taking the dogs upriver, suddenly my sled broke through the ice, and <…>'

(26)   nona Ɂ   hwnełɁan-e   Ɂił   łochu

[upriver he.looks-Nomzr] with Ptcl

ch'igadzaʔ łochu nonets' todoʔoł   (MD)
drift.log   Ptcl from.upriver it.is.floating
  'As he looked upriver, there was a drift log floating downriver.'

The same postposition *ʔił* that is used in NP conjunction can be seen in (25), (26). Note, however, that the *ʔił*-clause conjunction is different from *ʔił*-NP conjunction. The NP conjunctive construction is bisyndetic, that is, each nominal has a postpositional *ʔił*. In constructions such as in (25), (26) only the first clause is nominalized and has a *ʔił* postposition. This construction is thus independently derived from the comitative construction and is not an extension of NP conjunction.

The following example has a number of occurrences of the postposition *ʔił* in various functions:

(27) SHE TOOK SAW ʔił
          and

  mi-ʔił=
  it-with=

  ch'ididit'oze ʔił   hwts'its'aneyo (PE)
  saw   with   she.left
  'She took the saw and left with it.'

In the first line, *ʔił* is attached to an English clause that the speaker does not find necessary to nominalize. The second line is a false start that the speaker drops, and makes another attempt in the third line where *ʔił* is used as a simple comitative marker.

Logically, most examples of the clause-conjoining use of *ʔił* can be interpreted as temporal sequence. However, more adequately its meaning can be described as follows: an *ʔił*-marked clause renders a concomitant circumstance of the event represented in the main clause, and translates into English as an *as*-clause.

4. Disjunction

Linguistic and logical discussions of disjunction, exemplified by the English coordinator *or*, often implicitly presuppose that the concept of disjunction and lingustic devices expressing it are universal for human language and cognition (see e.g. Jennings 1994). I am going to suggest that the idea itself may well be universal, but the existence of a corresponding device not necessarily so. In UKA, there does not seem to exist any native way to express disjunction, only the English borrowing *o* is sometimes used.

In the available corpus of natural discourse, very few instances of a **disjunctive construction** have been found, and almost all of them should better be interpreted as code switching, for example consider the following question from a table conversation:

(28) tsent'ogh   k'onedinesh   OR WHAT?   (OP)
      secretly   you.work
      'You work in secret or what?'

An example that allows an ambivalent intepretation (using English OR by way of code-switching vs. using the borrowing *o*) was found in a narrative in which the speaker was telling how he was drowning in a river. In this sentence he was describing that the rescuers found him by hearing either him or his dogs:

(29)   HELP   k'a   ʔiszrił   o   sileka   dilghwsr   (BE)
                  want   I.am.yelling or   my.dogs   they.howl
       'I was calling for help or my dogs were howling.'

All available examples of anything like disjunction in UKA are clause disjunction rather than NP disjunction. This extends to those constructions that I got through elicitation, for example:

(30)   tsaye   k'at   o   COFFEE   k'at?   (VD)
       tea   want   or   want
       'Do you want tea or coffee?'

The only marginal example of an apparent NP coordination is the following occasional elicited question:

(31)   o   tsaye   o   tu   k'at   heʔ   (LP)
       or   tea   or   water want   Qu
       'Do you want tea or water?'

Perhaps the structure in (31) is due to calquing the English "either X or Y" construction. This structure seems very exceptional for UKA since the language does not have prepositional constructions at all, not to mention bisyndetic prepositional constructions.

It is safe to claim that UKA does not have a native disjunctive construction, and acquired such only after the extensive contact with English. As the logical-philosophical monograph treating disjunction in natural language (Jennings 1994) suggests, the philosophers often think of disjunction as of a "free choice permission". This idea, essentially correct, has been echoed by one of my UKA consultants, Willie Petruska, who said after my repeated attempts to get him to translate a sentence such as "Do you want tea or coffee?": "They did not offer you a choice in the old days". I believe that Willie is exactly right. The very situation of choice was highly culturally unlikely in the difficult natural and economic environment in which UKA evolved, and the language did not develop any formal device to code this situation. The idea, however, may be universally easy to understand, and as soon as the speakers of UKA got in touch with the modern society offering multiple choices, they borrowed the English

coordinator into their language. The ease with which this idea can be picked up is clear from the fact that UKA certainly has general questions, such as "Do you want tea?" This already offers a choice of drinking or not drinking tea, but there was not much more diversity of choices than that "in the old days".

Of course, Willie's explanation cannot be taken as the ultimate scientific truth. He was simply intuitively reacting to the semantic content I was offering him. But his explanation hints to a more general fact that the idea of option or alternative may be quite foreign and atypical to the Alaskan Athabaskan culture. In order to prove this point, a larger body of native discourse must be analyzed, perhaps in conjunction with independent cultural anthropological research.

Koyukon, a language very closely related to UKA, is represented in a very large and detailed dictionary Jetté and Jones 2000. In this dictionary the English to Koyukon index usually refers to multiple Koyukon entries, because there is no one-to-one correspondence between Koyukon and English concepts. For example, AND in the index is represented by twelve references to different Koyukon entries. In contrast to that, OR is represented by a single reference: the "conjunction" *hʉnek'e* 'or perhaps, alternatively' (used in choosing) (Jetté and Jones 2000: 311) that is used in sentences such as 'I will buy this one or perhaps you should buy this one'; 'maybe ducks will be cooked or perhaps fish'. This particle apparently is employed as clause coordinator only and is not of high frequency.

5. Adversative coordination

Adversative relations between clauses in UKA discourse are rendered by the particles *ʔedinh ~ ʔen, chuʔ* or *chuʔda,* and *deno.* I will discuss these particles in turn.

The particles *ʔedinh* and *ʔen* 'but, though' are perhaps one and the same word, the second being a reduced form of the first. I will refer to both collectively as *ʔedinh. ʔedinh* is by far the most frequent particle appearing in constructions of an adversative meaning. It covers a broad range of adversative meanings, including those of denied expectations/concession, substitution, and opposition (terms from Haspelmath 2001). These three types are illustrated by (32), (33), and (34), respectively.

(32)　　<…> tsetł'　hulanh　　nin'　　koʔ　ts'eʔ
　　　　　　　　snow　there is　　ground　on　　and

　　　　ʔedinh　　ch'itsan'　dechoh　ts'eʔ　hwldon'　　hw　　　(BE)
　　　　but　　　　grass　　　tall　　　Ptcl　some.places　place
　　　　'There was snow on the ground, but there was tall grass in some places.'

Note an occurrence of a clause-final *ts'eʔ* in the first line of (32): if we treat the *ts'eʔ*-construction as clause conjunction, then we have to admit that there is both conjunctive and adversative coordination in (32).

(33)　　hiyoko　　　tsiłdilghwsr,

for.her   they.are.sobbing

ʔedinh   mikwl   (LP)
but   she.is.gone
'The are bemoaning her but she is gone.'

(34)   sileka   ch'ildon'   nich'i   toghedak   ʔedinh,
         my.dogs   part   too   they.fell.in.water   but

         ch'ildon'   chuʔda   tinh   k'its'   ʔohighet'a   ts'eʔ <…>   (BE)
         part   still   ice   on   they.are.there   and
         'Though some of my dogs fell into the water, the others still stayed on the ice, and <…>'

ʔedinh tends to appear at the clause boundary, but in terms of intonation and pausing it may belong either to the first (34) or to the second (32, 33) coordinate clause. Variable clause membership of *ʔedinh* resembles the nearly synonymous English particles *though* and *but*, the first of which usually appears in a linearly first (and also subordinate) clause, and the second in the second clause. More frequently *ʔedinh* appears in the second clause. No connection between the semantic type of adversative coordination and the location of *ʔedinh* has been detected.

ʔedinh is often accompanied by another particle of a related meaning, *chuʔ(da)*. The meaning of *chuʔ* is comparable to that of English *still* – it ranges from 'also' to 'but'. Example (34) above demonstrates how *ʔedinh* and *chuʔ* can appear in two different clauses; in such usage they are quite comparable to the pair of English particles "*though* P – *still* Q". A mirror-image example of the same pair of particles, taken from dialogic speech, is shown in (35). When *ʔedinh* and *chuʔ* appear in one and the same clause, they resemble the typical English collocation *but still*; cf. (36).

(35)   ʔidenh   chuʔ   sik'i,
         she   still   behind.me

         ʔedinh   SLO-OW   ts'eʔ <…>   (LP)
         but   and
         'She [went] after me too, but slowly, and<…>'

(36)   NO CHRISTMAS TREE   daʔ   ch'iyaghle   disne,
                              if   OK   I.said

         ʔen   MIRANDA   chuʔ   yonsits'   heyash   (BP)
         but   M.   still   over.here   she.talks
         'I said it's OK not to have a Christmas tree, but Miranda still wants it over here.'

When *chuʔ(da)* appears alone, without *ʔedinh*, it usually just means 'also' and does not produce an adversative-type meaning. A relatively rare example that translates into an adversative construction is reported in Collins and Petruska 1979: 114:

(37) mimo   maldu ʔughiskat   heye   chuʔ yik'adiʔet'aʔ
      for.himcoat I.bought   that.one   still he.does.not.want.it
      'I bought a coat for him but he doesn't want it.'

One more adversative particle is *deno* that is essentially a temporal clause connector. The meaning of *deno* is comparable to that of English *while* – it ranges from 'when' to 'but'. Rather infrequently, *deno* is used in an adversative meaning (Collins and Petruska 1979: 79):

(38) ʔetchuʔ   ziʔonh   deno
      right.there   it.is   while

      nenɬʔan   ts'eʔ
      you.don't.see.it   Neg
      'It's right there but you don't see it.'

All occurrences of *deno* have the denied expectations meaning of the adversative construction.

6. Conclusions

Athabaskan languages are strikingly unusual and typologically exceptional in many respects (see Kibrik 2002). The exceptionality of Athabaskan, to put it simply, is related to how much information they pack in the tight morphological structure of the verb form, and how they pack it. In the realm of syntax Athabaskan languages are much more "normal" and even sterile. As the material presented in this article shows, a typical Athabaskan language is also a typical, somewhat impoverished, human language in the way it renders coordination.

Conjunctive NP coordination is performed in UKA exclusively through a bisyndetic postpositive construction "X *ʔiɬ* Y *ʔiɬ*", where *ʔiɬ* is a comitative postposition. *ʔiɬ* has a variety of other functions, such as instrumental, destination, beneficiary, etc. There is a continuum of functions of *ʔiɬ*, from its prototypical comitative function to conjunction and other uses.

Conjunctive clause coordination is performed primarily through clause chaining, each clause but the last one marked by the clause-final particle *ts'eʔ*. Conjoined clauses are finite and represent listed or temporally sequenced events. *Ts'eʔ* is a marker of continuation, it signals that the speaker is going to conjoin the following clause with the current one. *Ts'eʔ* also has other uses, especially complementizer and conventional negation marker. Its fundamental meaning can thus be formulated as 'incompleteness'. Clause conjunction can also be expressed through a technique reminding NP conjunction: the linearly first clause can be nominalized, and marked with the postposition comitative *ʔiɬ*. Unlike NP conjunction, however, this type of clause conjunction is a monosyndetic construction.

Disjunction is almost absent from UKA. Even though the idea of choice between two or more options that is central to the meaning of disjunction is familiar to the modern speakers of UKA, the language apparently has not developed any conventional way to express it. The only existing device is the English borrowing *o* that is difficult to interpret as either the borrowed but established lexical item or as a case in code switching. Most speakers use *o* calquing the English monosyndetic construction, but one bisyndetic prepositional usage has been registered. Only clause disjunction and no NP disjunction has been found in UKA.

Adversative coordination is marked in UKA by particles *ʔedinh (~ ʔen), chuʔ(da),* and *deno.* The connector *ʔedinh* 'by, though' may have a variety of adversative meanings and can appear in both first and second coordinate clauses. *ʔedinh* is often accompanied by the particle *chuʔ(da)* 'still' that can appear both in the same and in the different clause as *ʔedinh.* The particle *deno* 'while' appears at the end of the first and subordinate clause and its adversative meaning is an extension of a temporal meaning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LIST OF CONSULTANTS

BE – Bobby Esai
BP – Betty Petruska
DE – Dora Esai
JG – Junior Gregory
LP – Lena Petruska
MD – Miska Deaphon

OP – Oline Petruska
PE – Philip Esai
SN – Steven Nikolai
VD – Verdrisia Dennis
WP – Willie Petruska

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS IN GLOSSES

Complzr – complementizer
Impf – imperfective
Neg – negation
Nomzr – nominalizer
Peg – semantically empty morpheme that is
    conditioned morphophonemically

Ptcl – a particle whose function is not specified
    because it is irrelevant in the current
    discussion
Sg – singular
Qu – question particle

REFERENCES

Collins, Ray, and Betty Petruska. 1979. *Dinak'i (Our words). Upper Kuskokwim Athabaskan Junior Dictionary*. Anchorage: NBMDC.

Cook, Eung-Do. 1984. *A Sarcee grammar*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Fernald, Theodore, andKenneth Hale (eds.) 2000. *Diné Bizaad Naalkaah: Navajo Language Investigations*. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2001. "Coordination". To appear in: Timpothy Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and linguistic description*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: CUP.

Holton, Gary. 2000. *The phonology and morphology of the Tanacross Athabaskan language*. University of California at Santa Barbara Ph.D. dissertation.

Jennings, R.E. 1994. *The genealogy of disjunction*. New York: OUP.

Jetté, Jules, and Eliza Jones. 2000. *Koyukon Athabaskan dictionary*. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Language Center.

Kari, James. 1990. *Ahtna Athabaskan dictionary*. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Language Center.

Kibrik, Andrej A. 1998. "Polevaja lingvisticheskaja rabota na Aljaske: issledovanija verxnekuskokvimskogo atabskskogo jazyka". [Field work in Alaska: Studies in Upper Kuskokwim Athabaskan]. In: A. Barabashev et al. (eds.) *Professionaly za sotrudnichestvo*, vypusk 2. Moscow: Janus-K, 310-324.

Kibrik, Andrej A. 2002. "A typologically oriented portrait of the Athabaskan language family". In: *Third winter typological school*. Moscow district, January 31 – February 6, 2002. Moscow: RSUH, 38–49.

Rice, Keren. 1989. *A Slave grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Scollon, Ron, and Suzanne B.K. Scollon. 1981. *Narrative, literacy, and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Tenenbaum, Joan Marsha. 1978. *Morphology and semantics of the Tanaina verb*. Columbia University Ph.D. dissertation.

Thompson, Chad. 1989. *Voice and obviation in Athabaskan and other languages*. University of Oregon Ph.D. dissertation.

Tuttle, Siri. 1998. *Metrical and tonal structures in Tanana Athabaskan*. University of Washington Ph.D. dissertation.