

Cohesion in Koryak – A culturally conditioned Phenomenon?

Inauguraldissertation

zur Erlangung des Akademischen Grades

eines Dr. phil.

vorgelegt dem Fachbereich 05 – Philosophie und Philologie

der Johannes Gutenberg-Universität

Mainz

von

Erika Golz

aus

Köln

Mainz

2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of abbreviations	5
Volume I	
0. Acknowledgements	7
1. Preface	7
2. Introduction	10
3. Grammatical sketch	15
3.1. System of phonemes (Žukova, 1972:7/8; Moll, 1960: 117-119)	15
3.1.1. Vowels	15
3.1.2. Consonants	16
3.2. Vowel harmony	16
3.3. The noun	16
3.3.1. Declension	17
3.3.2. Number	19
3.3.3. Person of noun	19
3.3.4. Nomen agentis	20
3.4. The adjective	20
3.4.1. Qualitative adjectives	20
3.4.2. Relational adjectives	20
3.4.3. Inflection of the adjectives	21
3.4.4. Denotation of a "qualitative situation" (Žukova, 1972: 166-172)	21
3.5. Substitute words/pronouns (Žukova, 1972: 180-194)	22
3.5.1. Personal pronouns	22
3.5.2. Possessive pronouns	22
3.5.3. Demonstrative pronouns	22
3.5.4. Reflexive pronouns	23
3.5.5. Question words	23
3.5.6. nike-/neka, nijke-/nejka	23
3.6. The verb (Žukova, 1972:195-278)	24
3.6.1. Procedurals (German: Aktionsarten)	25
3.6.2. Formation of transitive/intransitive verbs	25
3.6.3. Formation of analytic verbs (Žukova, 1972:217-220)	25
3.6.4. Modalities and tenses (Žukova, 1972:200)	26
3.6.4.1. The indicative mode	26
3.6.4.2. The intentional mode	27
3.6.4.3. The subjunctive mode	27
3.6.5. Coreferentiality of the finite verb forms	28
3.6.6. Inverse alignment in the finite verb forms	29
3.6.7. Infinite forms of the verb	30
3.6.7.1. The infinitive	30
3.6.7.2. The supinum	30
3.6.7.3. The pariciple	30
3.6.7.4. The converb	31
3.6.8. Negation	32
3.7. The adverb (Žukova, 1972: 278-285)	32
3.8. Syntax	33

4. Cohesion and Coherence	36
5. Method	42
6. Segmentation of the texts	44
7. Cohesive means	46
7.1. Reference and Phoricity	46
7.2. Substitution	47
7.3. Ellipsis	49
7.4. Recurrence	50
7.5. Lexical cohesion	51
7.6. Connectivity	52
7.7. Discourse marker	53
7.8. Temporal structures	54
7.9. Grounding	55
8. Conclusion	58
Bibliography	59
Volume II Appendix: Koryak texts	
Legends	
Text 1 GKA-2-L	4
Text 2 LJAA-1-L	29
Text 3 AAS-1-L	43
Biographical texts	
Text 4 AAS-2-B	49
Text 5 PIR-1-B	58
Text 6 VRD-1-B	85
Expository texts	
Text 7 ASJA-1-S	94
Text 8 EID-2-S	104
Text 9 KNA-1-S	111
Texts about Koryak customs	
Text 10 EID-3-G	115
Text 11 AAS-2-G	125
Text 12 OKO-1-G	130
Fairy Tales	
Text 13 GKA-1-M	159
Text 14 LPK-1-M	178
Text 15 PIR-2-M	186
Adventure reports	
Text 16 PIR-3-E	202
Text 17 PIR-4-E	209
Text 18 PIR-5-E	224

List of abbreviations:

A	agent
AUG	augmentative
ABL	ablative
ADJ	adjective
ALL	allative
COM	comitative
CONT	contiguitive
CONV	converb
DAT	dative
DIM	diminutive
dl	dual
E	epenthetic vowel
ERG	ergative
FUT	future
IMP	imperative
INF	infinitive
INT	intentional
INSTR	instrumental
INV	inverse
LOC	locative
NARR	narrative
NEG	negation
P	patient
PART	participle
PAST	past
PERL	perlative
pl	plural
POSS	possessive
PRES	present
proc.	procedural
PTCL	particle
qual. sit.	qualitative situation
REL	relative form
sg	singular
SUBJ	subjunctive
SUP	superlative
SUPIN	supine
SURF	surface
=	stem

0. Acknowledgements

1. Preface

Informants:

(VRD)

(EID)

(LPK)

(LJAA)

(KNA)

(OKO)

(ASJA)

(GKA)

(AAS)

(PIR)

2. Introduction

The term “Paleosiberian languages,” according to Comrie (1981:238), refers to a group of languages in northeast Siberia which do not belong to any of the Altaic, Uralic or Indo-European Siberian language-families (ibid.:1981:238,239). The term “Paleosiberian” refers to neither a typological nor a genetic group, but to a group of small families and language isolates which represent the remnants of a probably “much richer picture” of languages that once existed in northeast Siberia (ibid.:239). Paleosiberian languages have to be differentiated into two small, genetically related language-families, i.e. the Chukotko-Kamchatkan and the Eskimo-Aleutian family, as well as three language-isolates, i.e. Yukaghir, Ket and Nivkh (ibid.:239), whereby Ainu is disputed.

The three main languages of the Chukotko-Kamchatkan group are Chukchi, Koryak (today at most 1000 speakers, Alexander King p.c.) and Itelmen (In 2022 at most 20 speakers of Itelmen (Alexander King, p.c.)). Were it not for the clear ethnic difference, Chukchi and Koryak might well be regarded as dialects of the same language. Alyutor and Kerek are also considered members of this family. Traditionally, Alyutor was regarded as a dialect of Koryak and Kerek dialect of Chukchi. This grouping was probably based more on ethnological grounds. With regard to the linguistic relationship between the four languages, it is Chukchi, Koryak, Alutor and Kerek that can be regarded as dialects of a one language (ibid.).

A more detailed comparison of the linguistic structures in the Chukotko-Kamchatkan family is provided in the handbook *Jazyki Azii i Afriki: čukotsko-kamčatskie jazyki*, Moskva, 1979:230-263. Cp. Fortescue, Michael. *Comparative Chukotko-Kamchatkan Dictionary*, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2011.

Whether or not Itelmen is related to the group is still under discussion in more current literature. Georg/Volodin (1999) adhere to the hypothesis that Itelmen was not originally a member of the Chukotko-Koryak language family, but introduced to Kamchatka through independent settlers who came from the Kuril Islands. They take the language features generally acknowledged as proof for the genetic relationship as a result of areal language contact (Georg/Volodin, 1999:224-241).

The first reports of Koryak settlements are dated to the middle of the 18th century (Krašeninnikov, 1972). After an academic lull during the 19th century, in 1900/1901 the Jesup Pacific Expedition yielded new findings. The expedition report of Jochelsen contains ethnographic, folkloric and linguistic material. Another result of the expedition was the publication of *Koryak Texts* by Bogoras, 1917 and the grammatical sketch “Chukchi,” in *Handbook of American Indian Languages*

edited by Franz Boas, 1922. Despite the name, the sketch provides an description of Koryak and Itelmen, as well as Chukchi.

During the early Soviet period, linguistic research on Koryak was continued by S. N. Stebnickij, G. M. Korsakov, G. I. Mel'nikov and T. A. Moll (Žukova, 1968:271; cp. Žukova, 1972:4).

In addition to the term 'Koryak', in the '30s and '40s the terms "Nymylany" and "nymylanskij jazyk" were also employed in academic literature; these were introduced by Stebnickij. The Koryaks-Chavchuvens use the term "Nymylany" for the settled Koryak people. The literal meaning of *nəmylg'an* is 'living in the village' (*nəmnəm* 'village'). According to King (2011:200-201), Alutor is a name for "the variant of Nymylan originating in the Pacific coast villages from Tymlat in the south to Vyvenka in the north" in Russian-language publications and in Kamchatka.

The first systematic classification of Koryak dialects goes back to Bogoras (1917:2/3) who differentiated between a western group and an eastern group (cp. Žukova, 1980:10). In his collection *Koryak texts* (1917), Bogoras publishes texts in five dialects: "Pa'llan, Paren, Kamenskoye, Quare'nin, Lesna," as he calls them

Given that the majority of Koryak speakers speak the Chavchoven dialect (the dialect of reindeer herders), it became the basis for Stebnickij's work (1932), using the Latin alphabet (Žukova, 1988:3). The first Koryak literature dates from 1934. Subsequently, the alphabet was changed to Cyrillic in 1937 as part of larger policy changes promoting Russian and Cyrillic across the USSR.

Stebnickij follows Bogoras in his differentiation between the dialects: he discerns a northern and a southern group. The northern group comprises two subgroups; the eastern subgroup comprises the Chavchuvenskij, Apukinskij and Kerekskij dialects while the western subgroup comprises Kamenskij, Parenskij, and Itkanskij. In addition to the Palano dialect, Aljutorskij, Karaginskij and Ukinskij also belong to the southern group. Žukova (1968) considers Parenskij, Itkanskij, Kamenskij and Apukinskij to be northern dialects and Palanskij and Karaginskij to be southern dialects. Žukova (1988:4) chose in her collection of texts (recorded during the years 1952 – 1982) the following four Koryak dialects: Chavchuvenskij, Kamenskij, Palanskij and Karaginskij. King (2011) underlines that, even in a dialect area, the language often changes from one village to the next and that in the village there may be people with dialects from different areas. Therefore it is not astonishing that some of my recordings contain regional dialectal features among different forms of the Chavchoven dialect.

Žukova's Koryak grammar (1972) is based on field work from expeditions in 1952, 1954, 1958, 1960 and 1961. It describes the language of the Koryaks-Chavchuvens, i.e. the dialect which became the language of literacy. Further materials for Žukova's grammar were earlier grammatical sketches, school books, belletristic literature in Koryak and articles from the regional newspaper *Korjaskij bol'shevik*.

Research is being carried on nowadays by a new generation of scientists, who have been active since the last decade of the 20th century. One of the most influential scientists is the linguistic anthropologist Alexander D. King, the author of Koryaks.net, which contains lots of scientific hints for research and who does a lot of coordination of the scientific work about Koryak. In his book *Living with Koryak Traditions* (2011) he gives an excellent overview about the social, cultural, ethnic and linguist situation of the Koryaks. His list of publications covers all important themes of the Koryak society: economic forms or reindeer breeding and herding, cultural forms of dancing, language preservation, religious beliefs, cultural institutions in Kamchatka. Since 2012 he has been working on a large project with Valentina R Dedyk to document the last generation of fully fluent speakers, initially funded by the Endangered Languages Documentation Project. Materials can be found at *Koryak Ethnopoetics: Stories from Herders and Maritime Villagers*. Endangered Languages Archive. <http://elar.soas.ac.uk/deposit/0167>.

Valentina Romonanovna Dedyk, a student of A. N. Zhukova, an indigenous Chukchi, lives, works and teaches in Palana at the IUU. She works hard for the creation of teaching materials for growing Koryaks. Her list of publications comprises materials for the linguistic education of pupils from the 1st to the 11th class. These publications are supported by a special booklet: *the Korjaskij jazyk v tablicah, (The Koryak language in tables)* (Zhukova/Dedyk:2004), which contains all schemes of declinations, conjugations, and key grammatical rules in Koryak. Her teaching materials rely on the traditional activities of the Koryak: reindeer breeding, fishing, hunting, gathering and preparing plants. The materials for the 10th and 11th classes include the themes of hunting on land and sea. The grammatical themes are coordinated with the content of the materials. To the teaching materials for 4-8th classes, pedagogical recommendations are added in Russian. Dedyk also published materials for the spiritual development of Koryak pupils: e.g. "O leksike duhovnoj kultury korjakov" (Dedyk, 2010) and "Evangelie ot Luki" (2005). Some of her most important recent publications merge linguistics and ethnology: "Etnopedagogicheskoe vospitanie v korjaskoj sem'e" (Dedyk, 2009), "Patrioticheskoe vospitanie cherez organizaciju olimpiad" (Dedyk, 2011), "Tradicionnoje vospitanie korjakov v proizvedenijah K. Kekketyna" (Dedyk, 2013), "Vlijanie tradicionnogo vospitanija v semje Korjakov na formirovanie lichnosti rebjonka" (Dedyk, 2015).

Two publications are dedicated to the problem of the preservation of the language.

In further publications Dedyk gives hints to the further development of forms of teaching such as the following:

- a lesson as an Interview, a form of dialogic teaching with a role playing game
- a lesson with mutual teaching
- traditional lessons under new aspects: new ways of acquiring new vocabulary
- learning material through themes applied to practical work"
- a lesson with open thoughts: a lesson based on scientific popular literature, newspaper articles, radio-programs, parts of fairy-tales.
- a lesson which acquaints the pupils with fairy tales
- a lesson which makes the pupils familiar with the world of Koryak names

For difficult questions of teaching Dedyk has published pedagogical recommendations for the teachers.

Megumi Kurebito, who has been working on the Chavchoven dialect in the Magadan region on the mainland, is preparing a new comprehensive grammar of the Chavchoven dialect. Her research interests are mainly typological. Her list of publications in English comprises a paper on the polysynthetic character of Koryak (2017), a paper (2018) on the property predication in Koryak, and a further paper on Koryak about '*a compound predicate construction with biclausal appearance*'. (2020) To these publications are joined publications of five Koryak texts (Kurebito: 2014, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019)

Megumi Kurebito founded the Japan Society for Northern Languages in 2018, and is its president now (<https://hoppougengo.web.fc2.com/>). This society held an online international symposium in November 2021. It also publishes an annual journal, "Northern Language Studies".

Yukari Nagayama is a Japanese linguist who focuses her work mainly on the Alutor language, which has only 100-200 speakers. It is subsumed as one of the five neighbouring languages: Chukchi, Koryak, Kerek, Alutor and Itelmen. Nagayama's research interests are concentrated on typology: she has published a grammar of the Nymylan - Alutor dialect (2003), a Nymylan (Alutor)- Russian dictionary in 2 parts (2017/2019), publications of Alutor texts, publications about the problems of the region (use of fish and plants resources) and the problem of language

preservation. The Alutor were recognized as an independent ethnic group in 2000 and still don't have an orthographic system for their language. There is only one written publication in Alutor (Kilpalin 1993). There are very rare and short radio broadcasts on Alutor.

Compare her bibliography on her website:

Kushiro-pu.academia.edu

Evdokija Pronina has worked on a mostly pedagogical basis on the Koryak language: she has published special pedagogical dictionaries and other teaching materials for the 1st through 4th classes. She has edited Koryak texts and fairy tales for educational purposes. Pronina (2001, 2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2017, 2018), Ninani (2014), Nutev'in (2015).

In the following thesis, I present an analysis of cohesion in Koryak as there is no analysis of discourse structures in Koryak to date. I start with a grammatical sketch based on the research of Žukova and a discussion of the two notions of coherence and cohesion. I then proceed with some methodological remarks on the analysis of nine means of cohesion: phoricity, substitution, ellipsis, recurrence, lexical cohesion, connectivity, temporal structures, discourse marker and grounding. The individual chapters are constructed around the interface between the theoretical background and a concrete analysis of the texts (see the methodological remarks). In the conclusion of the thesis, I try to establish connections between the individual chapters on both theoretical as well as analytical levels of the Koryak texts. The objective of the thesis is to establish a general overview of cohesive ties in discourse structure, in theory as well as for Koryak texts. The underlying question of this work is the question of the culture dependency of cohesion in Koryak.

3.2. Vowel harmony (Žukova, 1972:20-22)

The system of vowelharmony consists of two series, which are differentiated by the height of the vowel: 1. [i], [e], [u] 2. [e], [a], [o]

These two series combine the named vowels in the following pairs: [i]-[e],[e]-[a],[u]-[o]

Three combinations of vowels in one word/incorporative complex are possible:

1. [i]-[e]-[u], (1) *g'uemtevilg'ən* 'human being'
2. [e]-[a]-[o] (2) *ən'ajočgən* 'sack'
3. [a]-[i]-[u] (3) *kačəkmiŋu* 'children'

Comrie (1981:245,256) regards this third combination as a disruption of the system insofar as the [e] of the first series is replaced by the [a] of the second series in many cases.

The vowel harmony is realized in the units of the morphemes in that one word/incorporative complex root morpheme vowels adapt to affix vowels and vice versa. Furthermore, two root morphemes adapt equally to one another. Whether the system of dominant and recessive vowels in Chukchi as elaborated upon in Kämpfe/Volodin (1995: 15-17) is also applicable to Koryak remains a question for further research. According to this approach in Chukchi, a word that contains dominant vowels provokes dominant or neutral vowels in the other morphemes, while a word that contains recessive or neutral vowels does not undergo a change with respect to vowel harmony.

3.3. The Noun (Žukova, 1972:76-144)

The noun categories are: animacy, definiteness, number, case and person.

The declension of the nouns is based on the two parameters of definiteness and animacy; nouns designating inanimate objects are declined according to the I. declension.

The category of definiteness is expressed only with animate subjects. Nouns designating indefinite persons decline according to the I. declension, those designating definite persons and nick-names of animals according to the II. declension. Animacy is limited to persons, animals are not animate in Koryak. See the examples in 3.3.1.

The basic word form that combines the meanings of third-person, singular number and absolutive case is opposed to the oblique forms that cannot combine the expression of case, number and person within their boundaries. The combination of the categories in the oblique forms is expressed by a combination of words or by other syntactic means. See the examples of the 1. and the 2. declension in 3.3.1.

Absolutive case and singular number are expressed by the following formal means:

(partial) doubling of the stem: *liglig* 'the egg'

disappearance/restitution of the final vowel: *ən'pič(i)* 'the father'

suffix –n: *aŋka-n* 'the sea'

suffix –lŋən: *vəlo- lŋən* 'the ear'

The latter two cases have in common that the suffixes are lost with the formation of any of the oblique forms.

The category of definiteness finds expression in the suffixed article –nè/-na for singular, -jək for plural (a collective meaning which becomes clear in the context). This category is, however, used in the oblique cases only. Furthermore, it is neutralized in the absolutive case.

3.3.1. Declension

I. Declension

Absolute	sg:kajṅ-E-n, dl:kajṅ-E-t, pl:kajṅ-u	a bear
Instrumental/Ergative	kajṅ-a	by a bear
Locative	kajṅ-E-k	at a bear
Dative	kajṅ-E-ṅ	for a bear
Allative	kajṅ-étəṅ	to a bear
Perlative	kajṅ-épəṅ	alongside a bear
Ablative	kajṅ-E-ṅḵo	from a bear (away)
Narrative/Causative	kajṅ-E-kjit	about a bear/ because of a bear
Designative	kajṅ-u	as a bear
Contiguitive	kajṅ-E-eta	at a bear
Comitative I	ga-kajṅ-a	with a bear
Comitative II	gajḵə-kajṅ-a	with a bear
Associative I	ga-kajṅ-E-ma	with a bear
Associative II	gav'ən-kajṅ-E-ma	with a bear
	v'ala	a knife
	v'ala	by a knife
	v'al-E-k	at a knife
	val-E-ṅ	for a knife
	val-étəṅ	to a knife
	val-épəṅ	alongside a knife
	val-E-ṅḵo	from a knife (away)
	val-E-kjit	about a knife/because of a knife
	val-u	as a knife
	val-E-eta	at a knife
	ga-val-a	with a knife
	gajḵə-val-a	with a knife
	ga-val-E-ma	with a knife
	gav'ən-val-E-ma	with a knife

II. Declension

Absolute	sg:kajṅ-E-n, dl:kajṅ-E-t, pl:kajṅ-u	Kajṅən (prop. Name)
Ergative/Locative	kajṅ-E-na-k	by Kajṅən
Dative	kajṅ-E-na-ṅ	for Kajṅən
Allative	kajṅ-E-na-jtəṅ	to Kajṅən
Perlative	kajṅ-E-na-jpəṅ	alongside Kajṅən
Ablative	kajṅ-E-na-ṅḵo	from Kajṅən (away)
Narrative/Causative	kajṅ-E-na-kjit	about Kajṅən / because of Kajṅən
Designative	kajṅ-E-nu	as Kajṅən

In proper names consisting of first name, father's name and family name, the suffixed article and the case-suffix is added to all three elements,

(1) Ergative: Ivannənak Pavlovičənak Gutorovənak

Furthermore, addition of the suffixed article and the case-suffix to one part of the name is also possible.

The II. declension does not take the instrumental case or the comitative cases.

The suffixes of the dative, allative, ablative and perlativ evoke the change of the vowels in the stem to the II. series:

Abl.: *nota-ηko* ‘from the tundra’,

Abs.: *nutənut* ‘the tundra’

3.3.2. Number

Number in Koryak has the categories of singular, dual and plural. The three categories are formally expressed in the absolutive case only.

- (2) *gəjnik* ‘wild animal’
gəjnik-ti ‘two wild animals’
gəjnik-u ‘3+ wild animals’

but:

- (3) *gəjnik-a* ‘by a wild animal’
gəjnik-a ‘by two wild animals’
gəjnik-a ‘by 3+ wild animals’

One form of a singulative is marked by the suffix *-lɣ-E-n* and usually used to mark a single example of an object which exists as a pair or a collection of equal objects:

- (4) *məngət* ‘the two hands’
məngə-lɣ-E-n ‘one hand’

All nouns can take the dual form and the morphological variants of the suffixes are:

-t (after vowels, after two consonants and epenthetic schwa):

-ti/-tê (after one consonant)

- (5) *v’ala-t* ‘two knives’, *pojg-E-t* ‘two spears’
liglig-ti ‘two eggs’

The plural form is marked by the suffixes:

-u/-o (after consonants), *-v’* (after vowels), *-v’v’i/-v’v’è* (after vowels in a two-syllabic stem)

For collective nouns ending in *-jəčg’(ən)* or *-lv’ən*, plural-suffixes are not documented.

The Koryak language seems to be in the process of replacing the suffix *-v’v’i/-v’v’è* with the suffix *-v’*.

Plural suffixes in the absolutive case are used in both declensions equally.

The so-called plural of the II. declension, comprising a collective meaning and realized by the suffix *-jək* is also part of the plural system:

<i>Kavavo</i>	the Kavavovs
<i>Kavanə-jək</i>	by the Kavavovs
<i>Kavanə-jək</i>	at the Kavavovs
<i>Kavanə-jək-E-η</i>	for the Kavavovs
<i>Kavanə-jək-a-jtəη</i>	towards the Kavavovs
<i>Kavanə-jək-a-jpəη</i>	alongside the Kavavovs
<i>Kavanə-jək-a-ηko</i>	from the Kavavovs
<i>Kavanə-jək-E-k-et</i>	about the Kavavovs, because of the Kavavovs
<i>Kavanə-čgəne-no</i>	as the Kavavovs

3.3.3. Person of nouns

This category is expressed through formal markers that have their origin in the pronouns. Nouns can have pronominal markers as suffixes. The category is based on the contrast between speaker, addressee, and a third person. Nouns with personal endings can be used as predicates to attribute a quality to a person. See also Launey (2002: 113-118) with regard to the quality of nouns as predicates under the heading of omnipredicativity in Classical Nahuatl. Dunn refers to this construction in Chukchi as the “NAMING PREDICATE construction” (1999:318). In Koryak, it can also be used in the function of address, in which case the unmarked third person is used instead of the second person.

Singular

1p <i>gəmmo</i>	<i>ɕajəkmiη-i-gəm</i>
I	boy (I)
2p <i>gəčči</i>	<i>ɕajəkmiη-i-gi</i>
you	boy (you)
3p <i>əнно</i>	<i>ɕajəkmiη-E-n</i>
he	boy (he)

Dual

1p <i>muji</i>	<i>ɕajəkmiηə-muji</i>
we	boys (we two)
2p <i>tuji</i>	<i>ɕajəkmiηə-tuji</i>
you	boys (you two)
3p <i>əčči</i>	<i>ɕajəkmiηə-t</i>
they	boys (the two of them)

Plural

1p <i>muju</i>	<i>ɕajəkmiηə-muju</i>
we	boys (we)
2p <i>tuju</i>	<i>ɕajəkmiηə-tuju</i>
you	boys (you pl.)
3p <i>əčču</i>	<i>ɕajəkmiηə-t</i>
they	boys (they)

Pipikəlŋə-gi, pipikəlŋə-gi, gəmnan év'əncam tə-e-lg'u-ŋ-ə-n.
 Mouse-you mouse-you, I nevertheless 1sg-Fut.I-find-Fut.I-E-3sg
 You mouse,, you mouse, I will, nevertheless, find you.

3.3.4. Nomen agentis

Nomen agentis is formally marked by the suffix *-lg'-E-n*.

Actor nouns are based on the stems of verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs and the negative modal word *ujŋé*:

- (6) *ačəčgatə-lg'-ən* 'the one, who laughs', *ačəčgat-E-k* 'to laugh'
gəkəŋə-lg'-ən 'the one, who goes on a reindeer's sledge', *gəkəŋé* 'reindeers's sledge'
ujŋé 'no, not' - *ujŋé-lg'-ən* 'the one, who doesn't own anything',
 'the one, who is not used to the end'

The nomina agentis have the full paradigm of the I. and II. declension. They take personal endings in the same way that all other nouns do.

Semantically, the nomina agentis denote an object (or a person) through its significant characteristic or a characteristic according to the underlying action.

3.4. The Adjective (Žukova, 1972:144-166)

In oblique cases, the adjective in attributive function is usually incorporated, i.e. the incorporation comprises the stem of the adjective, but not its formants as shown below.

In some rare cases, independently used adjectives take oblique case suffixes.

In the absolute case (and other cases that are used more often—instrumental/ergative, locative, dative), the adjective can be used independently (attributively or in predicative function) or in incorporative form. In the Koryak language, different types of adjectives can be discerned by the different types of word formations.

3.4.1. Qualitative adjectives

Adjectives formed by the circumfix *n-E=-kin(ə)/-kən(a)* denote the permanent qualities of an object and all qualities of objects that are seen, heard, smelled, touched or tasted:

- (7) *n-ilgə-kin* 'white'
nə-məjəŋ-kin 'big'
nə-gəŋəlo-kən 'high'

New adjectives of this category are formed from stems of nouns, adverbs, intransitive verbs, and transitive verbs.

3.4.2. Relational adjectives

Relational adjectives denote the quality of an object with regard to its relation to another object, quality or action.

Three groups of relational adjectives can be identified:

1. Suffixes *-in(ə)/-ən(a)*, *-n(ə)/-n(a)* after vowels, *-nin(ə)/-nən(a)* after proper names ending in vowels or consonants with the exception of *-n*.

(8) *ənniv-in jajana* ‘grandfather’s house’

2. Suffix *-kin(ə)/-kən(a)*

Relational adjectives denote the quality of an object by indicating its relation to another object, quality or action, or some time or place.

(9) *aŋka-kən* ‘of the sea’

This group of adjectives is formed from the stems of nouns, verbs, certain pronouns and adverbs.

3. Stem of the noun with the circumfix *gə-/ga-=-lin(ə)/-lən(a)*
(identical in form to the past participle)

(10) *ga-kmiŋə-lin* ‘having children’, *kəmiŋən* ‘child’

3.4.3. Inflection of the adjectives

Qualitative and relational adjectives in the absolutive case regularly show number agreement (dl: *-t*, pl: *-v*) and mark person with suffixes (adjectives ending in *-in/-ən*, *-kin/-kən* take the person suffix following this adjectival construction. Adjectives that are formed with the circumfixes *nə-=-kin(ə)/-kən(a)* and *gə-/ga-=-lin(ə)/-lən(a)* lose the wordforming suffix before the person-ending).

(11) *vitkukinə-j-gəm* ‘I am the first’, *vitkukin* ‘the first’,

Adjectives can function to modify a noun or make a predicate.

3.4.4. Denotation of a “qualitative situation” (Žukova, 1972:166-172)

In Koryak, there is a group of words that are characterized by the same morphological structure, i.e. the circumfix *ə-/a-=-kə/-ka*. Such words are derived from qualitative adjectives and adverbs and they function as the denotation of a qualitative situation (the physical or psychic situation of living subjects and their surroundings). This group of words differs formally from both adjectives and adverbs.

Adj	qual. sit.	Adverb
<i>nə-tgəl-kin</i>	<i>ə-tgəl-kə</i>	<i>nə-tgəl-g'ev'</i>
hot	hot	hotly

The syntactic function of the category “qualitative situation” is that of the predicate in an impersonal sentence. The subject is expressed by an infinitive or a noun/personal pronoun in the dative.

(12) *Ənkə-ŋ tətəl' ə-ŋin'mə-kə* *vočel jalgət-ə-k.*
he-DAT very qual.sit-interesting-qual.sit here nomadize-E-INF
For him, it is very interesting to nomadize here.

3.5. Substitute words/pronouns (Žukova, 1972:180-194)

Deictics in the Koryak language are organized into the following groups:

- personal pronouns
- possessive pronouns
- demonstrative pronouns
- reflexive pronouns
- question words with the stems *eḵ-/jaḵ-*, *miŋ-/mèŋ-*, *mik-/mèk-* (the last only in relation to human beings)
- substitute words with the stem *nikè-/nèka-*, *nijkè-/nejka-* (the last only in relation to human beings)

3.5.1. Personal Pronouns (figure 3)

	Singular			Plural		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Abs.	gəmmo	gəčči	əнно	mujj (dl) mujju (pl)	tujj (dl) tujju (pl)	əčči (dl) əčču (pl)
Erg.	gəm-nan	gə-nan	ə-nan	močg-E-nan	točg-E-nan	əčg-E-nan
Loc.	gəm-E-k	gən-E-k	ən-E-k	muj-E-k	tuj-E-k	əj-E-k
Dat.	gəmk-E-ŋ	gənk-E-ŋ	ənk-E-ŋ	mojk-E-ŋ	tojk-E-ŋ	əjk-E-ŋ
All.	gəmkə-jtəŋ	gənkə-jtəŋ	ənkə-jtəŋ	mojka-jtəŋ	tojka-jtəŋ	əjka-jtəŋ
Perl.	gəmkə-jpəŋ	gənkə-jpəŋ	ənkə-jpəŋ	mojka-jpəŋ	tojka-jpəŋ	əjka-jpəŋ
Abl.	gəmkə-ŋko	gənkə-ŋko	ənkə-ŋko	mojka-ŋko	tojka-ŋko	əjka-ŋko
Cont.	gəmək-jitè	gənək-jitè	ənək-jitè	mujək-jitè	tujək-jitè	əjək-jitè
Narr./Caus.	gəmkè-kjit	gənkè-kjit	ənəkè-kjit	mujkè-kjit	tujkè-kjit	əjkè-kjit
Design.	gəmninè-nu	gəninè-nu	əninè-nu	mučginè-nu	tučginè-nu	əčginè-nu

3.5.2. Possessive Pronouns

Possessive pronouns are formed by taking the stems of the personal pronouns and adding the suffixes: *-nin* (sg.), *-čgin* (pl.):

<i>gəm-nin</i> ‘my’	<i>mu-čgin</i> ‘our’
<i>gə-nin</i> ‘your’	<i>tu-čgin</i> ‘your’
<i>ə-nin</i> ‘his/hers/its’	<i>ə-čgin</i> ‘their’

Possessive Pronouns take suffixes of person (1st, 2nd Ps sg and pl) and number (3rd Ps sg and pl) and can thus function as predicates, just as nouns can.

(13) *gəmnin-è-gi* ‘mine (you)’, *mučgin-è-tujj* ‘ours (you pl), *gəninèt* ‘yours (they)’

3.5.3. Demonstrative pronouns

Demonstrative pronouns indicate three grades of distance between the object and the speaker. They form paradigms of the I. and II. declension. See the following:

v’əččīn ‘this’ (near)
əŋŋīn ‘that’ (at a small distance)
ŋaen ‘that’ (at a far distance, possibly out of view)

məŋin ‘who’ (relative pronoun), I. and II. declension

ʔullu ‘another’, ‘one of’

The paradigm here is that of the II. declension. Furthermore, in the oblique cases the stem is: *ʔutin-/ʔoten-*

3.5.4. Reflexive pronouns

The reflexive pronoun in Koryak is *uvik* ‘oneself’ (I. Declension).

Negative pronouns are formed using the word *ujŋé: ujŋé jənnə* ‘nothing’

3.5.5. Question words

The direct question for nouns is the word *jənnə?* ‘what?’ (I. declension). The question for nouns denoting human beings is *méki?* ‘who?’ (II. declension).

	Sg.	Pl.
Abs.	<i>méki</i>	<i>mékin-ti (dl) méki-v’ (pl)</i>
Loc./Instr./Erg.	<i>mik-nè-k</i>	<i>mik-E-jək</i>
Dat.	<i>mék-na-ŋ</i>	<i>mék-E-jək-E-ŋ</i>
All.	<i>mék-na-jtəŋ</i>	<i>mék-jəka-jtəŋ</i>
Perl.	<i>mék-na-jpəŋ</i>	<i>mék-jəka-jpəŋ</i>
Abl.	<i>mék-na-ŋʔo</i>	<i>mék-jəka-ŋʔo</i>
Cont.	<i>mik-jitè</i>	<i>mik-jitè</i>
Narr./Caus.	<i>mik-E-kjit</i>	<i>mik-E-kjit</i>
Design.	<i>mik-nè-nu</i>	<i>mik-E-čgə-nè-nu</i>
Abs.	<i>jənnə</i>	
Instr.	<i>eʔ-é</i>	
Loc.	<i>eʔ-E-k</i>	
Dat.	<i>jaʔ-E-ŋ</i>	
All.	<i>jaʔ-étəŋ</i>	
Perl.	<i>jaʔ-épəŋ</i>	
Abl.	<i>jaʔ-ə-ŋʔo</i>	
Com. I	<i>gè-eʔ-é</i>	
Com. II	<i>gèjkə-eʔ-é</i>	
Com. III	<i>ga(v’ənn)-jaʔ-ma</i>	
Cont.	<i>eʔ-jitè</i>	
Narr./Caus.	<i>eʔ(ə)-kjit</i>	
Design.	<i>eʔ-(n)u</i>	

3.5.6. *nikè-/nèka-, nijkè-/nèjka-*

The main classes of words (nouns, verbs, adjectives) can be replaced by substitute-words with the stem *nikè-/nèka-, nijkè-/nèjka-* which have an abstract meaning. They are used when the speaker forgets the fitting word or wishes to avoid the pronunciation of a certain word.

The Paradigm of substitute-words with the stem *nijké-* follows the II. declension.

	Sg	Pl
Abs.	<i>nijké</i>	<i>nijké-t</i> dl <i>nijké-v</i> ’ pl
Loc.	<i>nijké-né-k</i>	<i>nijké-jək</i>
Dat.	<i>nijké-na-η</i>	<i>nijka-jkə-η</i>
All.	<i>nijké-na-jtəη</i>	<i>nijka-jka-jtəη</i>
Perl.	<i>nijké-na-jpəη</i>	<i>nijka-jka-jpəη</i>
Abl.	<i>nijké-na-ηko</i>	<i>nijka-jka-ηko</i>
Cont.	<i>nijké-jitè</i>	<i>nijké-jitè</i>
Narr./Caus.	<i>nijké-kjit</i>	<i>nijké-jkə-kjit</i>
Design.	<i>nijké-nu</i>	<i>nijké-čgəné-nu</i>

Substitute words with the stem *niké-/néka-* take regular adjective affixes:

- (14) *nə-niké-kin* ‘having some permanent quality’
nik-in ‘belonging to somebody’, ‘made from some material’

The words substituting adjectives take affixes of number, person and case.

Substitute words with the stem *niké-/néka-* replace verbs form the whole paradigm of transitive and intransitive verbs. They also take all affixes of verb-derivation. By replacing nouns, they form the whole paradigm of noun-declension and take all affixes of noun-derivation.

3.6. The Verb (Žukova, 1972:195-278)

3.6.1. Procedurals (German ‘Aktionsarten’)

The procedurals (term used by J. Forsyth, 1970) in Koryak represent, in contrast to a grammaticalized aspect-opposition, a verbal category that is marked by non-obligatory morphological derivations on the stem, which indicate the verbal meaning in terms of temporal boundaries, repetition, frequency and intensity of the action. The procedurals are combinable.

Procedural meanings include:

short duration of an action

semelfactitivite or noniterative punctual aspect of an action– *lķiv/lķév*

- (15) Inf: *ačəčgəlkévək*: ‘smile once’, ‘laugh once

iterativite aspect –*tku/-tko*:

- (16) Inf: *kumηətkuk*: ‘shout several times’

long duration or habitualness of an action and/or beginning of an action of indefinite duration. –*ηvo*

- (17) *ləkləη-kə* *kojaηa* *k-* *av’-e -ηvo-η* *jaη-jaηa*:
Winter-LOC reindeer PRES-eat -proc-PRES reindeer.moss
In winter, the reindeer eats reindeer-moss.

habitualness–*lg’ət/-lg’at*

- (18) Inf: *itəlg’ətək*: ‘be (somewhere) habitually’

intensity– -jv , -čij/-čej, -čit/-čet

intensity, frequency– -jv:

(19) Inf: *évəkləjvək* – ‘to beat soundly’, *évəklək* – ‘to hit’

diminutive– -čij/-čej:

(20) Inf: *nijkučijək* – ‘to jump a little’

intensive action in which several persons take part– -čit/-čet:

(21) *Ėčču ga- tan’ηə-čel-linav’ janotəlg’o čukča-v.*
They PAST.II-fight-proc-PAST.II.3pl in.earlier.times Chukchi-pl
čav’čuva-v’ əčgəl’vən
Koryak-pl each.other
In the past, the Chukchi and the Koryak people fought [against] each other.

Prefixes:

intensity, telicity–mel-/mal-

(22) *ėkmitək* – ‘to take’, *mėlekmitək* – ‘to grasp’

diminutive–-kaj-

(23) *kajəčačgatək* – ‘to smile’, *ačačgatək* – ‘to laugh’

3.6.2. Formation of transitive/intransitive verbs

Causative transitive verbs are formed from intransitive verbs by adding the prefix *j-~n-*, which is often used together with the suffix *-ėv/-av*.

(24) *čoččəmavək* – ‘to prepare oneself’, ‘to equip oneself’,
j-E-čoččəmavək – ‘to prepare sth./sb.’, ‘to equip sth./sb.’

Intransitive verbs are formed from the stems of transitive verbs by adding the prefix *in(è)-/èn(a)-*:

(25) *tiηuk* – ‘to drag sth.’, *inè-tiηuk* – ‘to drag out’, ‘be occupied with dragging’

3.6.3. Formation of analytic verbs (Žukova, 1972:217-220)

Analytic verbs exist in both transitive and intransitive forms.

The transitive verbs are formed from an invariant part with an ending identical to the designative case -u/-o, -nu/-no after the loss of the infinitive-forming morpheme and an auxiliary: *ləηək* ‘to regard as’. This group of verbs has meanings concerned with the expression of emotions. The transitive meaning of the whole construction is brought about by the transitive auxiliary.

The intransitive verbs are formed from an invariant part, usually an adverb and the auxiliaries *itək* ‘to be’ or *ng’ėlək* ‘to become’.

(26) trans.: *čəηg’ėčəηu ləηək* ‘to care for’
itr.: *alvaη itək* ‘to differ’

3.6.4. Modalities and tenses (Žukova, 1972:200) (figure 4)

1. type of modality	2. type of modality		
	Categorical	Uncertainty	Evidential
Indicative	Present	---	
	Future I	Future II	
	Past I		Past II
Intentional	Intentional I	Intentional II	Imperative: only 2 nd person
Subjunctive	Subjunctive I	Subjunctive II	

3.6.4.1. The indicative mode

Present tense (indicative-categorical)

The marker of the present tense is a circumfix: *ku-/ko- =-ŋ*, *k=-ŋ*. The position of person and number markers is explained below:

(27) *tə-ku-ejgučev'ŋə-ŋ* 'I learn'

The present tense can indicate durative and habitual meanings. As such, it can denote a past meaning.

(28) *ʒməŋ v'učče-ju ənkæp ku- jgulèn'-ŋ -ə-nin.*
 all this-pl long.ago PRES-know-PRES-E-3sg:3sg
 All this (he/she) has known already for a long time .

Past tense I (indicative-categorical)

Past tense I does not have a formal marker in the Koryak language. The markers of person and number are directly fixed to the stem.

Furthermore, past tense I can be used in contexts of narration as a past tense II when the mode-factor of evidentiality is absent.

Past tense II (indicative-evidential)

The meaning of the past tense II is based on the mode of evidentiality: the reported events are not conveyed by an eye-witness. The formal marker is the prefix *g(è)-/g(a)*. Person and number are expressed by suffixes: the person/number of the subject (for the intransitive verb) and the marker of person/number of the patient (for the transitive verb). The person/number markers are identical to the person/number markers of the nouns/adjectives. Žukova (1972:234) regards this tense as a secondary formation of the form of the participle in *g(è)-/g(a)-=-lin(è)/-lèn(a)*.

Future tense I (indicative-categorical)

The future I is formed by means of the circumfix *j(è)-/j(a)-=-ŋ*, which is affixed directly to the verb stem.

(29) *e-lkətə-ŋ* 'he will go away'

Future tense II (indicative-uncertain)

Future tense II denotes an action to be fulfilled after the moment of speech, but an action of which the reality of fulfilment the speaker regards as uncertain.

- (30) *Dəjaŋ, titè məč-če- g'èkèv -iki? Mitiv' mən-g'aqav'-la.*
now, when 1pl-FUT.II-leave-FUT.II? tomorrow 1pl-leave-pl
Now, when shall we leave? Let's go tomorrow.

The formal marker of the future tense II is the prefix *j(è)-/j(a)* (comp. future I) and the mode suffix -*iki/-èkè, -jki/-jkè, -jkən(i)/-jkən(è), -ikən(i)*

3.6.4.2. The intentional mode

In the categorical mode (intentional I), the person/number affix of intransitive verbs indicates the subject of the verb (see table), while in the transitive verb, the person/number affix reflects both Agent and Patient (see table). Furthermore, reduced forms (with loss of suffixes) are possible. Intentional I has no specific tense/modality marker, and the person/number affixes are also syncretic markers for mode. According to Palmer (1986:108-115), the imperative mode is, strictly speaking, restricted to the 2nd person (challenge to the hearer). In Koryak, however, a whole paradigm for all persons, in which the 1st and 3rd person in dependence on the context have desiderative or exhortative meaning, exists. The paradigm is termed intentional mode (cp. Michael Dunn for Chukchi; 1999:188). In the 2nd person imperative, the special marker *k-* is striking.

The uncertainty mode of the intentional results in the formation of a paradigm intentional II with the meaning of pushing sb. to an action of which the fulfilment is uncertain.

- (31) *An'pěče-ŋ év-ə-ŋ: "K-ə- lè -jki émečču."*
Parents-DAT say-E-CONV INT.II-E-go-INT.II alone
She said to the parents,: "Go alone."

The uncertainty mode in the intentional II is expressed by the suffixes -*iki/-èkè, -jki/-jkè, jkən(i)/-jkən(è)* (the last appears before person suffixes).

There is a bias for intentional I to be used for momentary actions, and for intentional II to be used for durative actions.

The non-evidential form of the imperative (imperative III) is formed by means of the *circumfix* *g(è)-/g(a)--(t)è,-(t)a*,
e.g. *gè-gəntèv-è* – run away!

The action is to be performed beyond the view of the speaker.

3.6.4.3. The subjunctive mode

The subjunctive mode denotes 1) actions which were not realized in the past, and 2) actions which may have been realized under certain circumstances.

- (32) *Amu miŋkəe ŋən kuŋ-ju -gəg'i ənkəep mən-g'- ə-əg'ə -nat.*
probably somewhere turn.off.the.way-3pl, long.ago 1pl-SUBJI-E-reach-3pl
they probably turned off the road somewhere [along the way], we would have caught up
with them already long before [now].

Ėkilu nmitg'av t- g'- it -ə -k g'ətvəlg'ət-ə-k, činin tē-g'- əj -ə-k
 if skilled 1sg-SUBJ.I-be-E-1sg go.by.boat-E-INF, myself 1sg-SUBJ.I-cross-E-1sg
v'ëem-ə-k.
 river-E-LOC
 If I had mastered the stick, I would have crossed the river by myself.

The subjunctive mode I is formed with an affix *-g'-* which follows the person/number-prefix. Subjunctive II with the meaning of uncertainty is formed by adding the suffix *-iki/-ėkė*, to the stem with the person/number subjunctive prefix.

(33) *G'am əčgənan činčin nē- n- g'- ėkmit -iki v'učče-ju javėnaŋ-o.*
 but they:ERG themselves INV-1sg-SUBJ.II-take-SUBJ.II this-pl thing-pl
 But they (probably) would have bought these things by themselves.

3.6.5. Coreferentiality of the finite verbforms

Person and number of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd person, singular, plural and dual are expressed as Portmanteau-affixes on the verb.

Only the finite verbforms take the coreferential affixes.

Compare the theoretical framework and discussion for Chukchi in Comrie, 1979, who outlines that a language may vary in the nature of its nominal/verbal/syntactic constructions in that some may be ergative/absolutive and some may be nominative/accusative and that even in one and the same construction erg./abs. and nom./acc. traits may be combined.

The Koryak prefix-system indicates S (the subject in the intransitive sentence) and A (the agent in the transitive sentence), and thus follows a nominative/accusative pattern:

Person/Number/Case	Indicative	Intentional	Subjunctive
1s A/S	t-	m-	t-
1pl A/S	mət-	mən-	mən-
1dl A/S	mət-	mən-	mən-
2s A/S	--	ķ-	n-
2pl A/S	--	ķ-	n-
2dl A/S	--	ķ-	n-
3s A/S	--	n-	n-
3pl A/S	--	n-	n-
3dl A/S	--	n-	n-

(figure 5)

The ķ- prefix in the intentional mode is also a portmanteau marker of mode and person.

In contrast, the system of person/number-suffixes has a partial ergative/absolutive alignment, i.e. most of the suffixes show the identity of S and P (the patiens in the transitive sentence).

Person/Number	S			P		
	Ind.	Int.	Subj	Ind.	Int.	Subj
1s	-k	-k	-k	-gəm	-gəm	-gəm
1pl	-mək	-mək	-mək	-mək	-mək	-mək
1dl	-mək	-mək	-mək	-mək	-mək	-mək
2s	-gi/-gè	-n	-n	-gi/-gè	-gi/-gè	-gi/-gè
2pl	-tək	-tək	-tək	-tək	-tək	-tək
2dl	-tək	-tək	-tək	-tək	-tək	-tək
3s	-i	-n	-n	-n	-n	-n
3pl	--	-nèv'/nav'	-nèv'/-nav'	-nèv'/nav'	-nèv'/nav'	-nèv'/-nav',-v'
3dl	-i,-nèt/-nat	-nèt/-nat	-nèt/-nat	-nèt/-nat	-nèt/-nat	-nèt/-nat, -t

(figure 6)

The paradigms of Past II intransitive and transitive verbs demonstrate a complete overlapping of S and P in the inflectional suffixes of person and number.

Two other portmanteau morphemes should be mentioned here:

-nin, *-tkə* are used as portmanteau suffixes for the expression of certain person and number combinations.

-nin: 3sgA:3sgP, 3plP, 3dlP, Present, Past I, Future I, Future II; 3sgA:3sgP Subj. I

-tkə: 2plA:3sgP, 3plP, 3dlP, Present, Past I, Future I, Future II

3.6.6. Inverse alignment in the finite verbforms

The use of the inverse prefix system has been investigated by Comrie, 1980. His approach has been adapted here.

The underlying structure that causes the system of inverse alignment is a hierarchy of animacy (agency, i.e. person): 1Ps sg > 1Ps pl > 2Ps sg > 2Ps pl > 3Ps sg > 3Ps pl (Comrie, 1980:66/69), which influences the interaction between person and verb morphology.

The inverse affixes are used where the agent of the transitive verb is lower on the scale of hierarchy than the patient (ibid.:62). These affixes signal the inverse alignment of the participants in the transitive predication.

Part of the Koryak system of inverse prefixes is covered by verbforms that take the prefix *-inë-*, which have to be interpreted as “pseudo-intransitive, in the sense that they take person-and-number affixes as if they were intransitive verbs” (ibid.:69). Functionally, the forms with *-inë-* are part of the inverse system:

2Ps sg : 1Ps sg, 2Ps pl : 1Ps sg, 3Ps sg : 1 Ps sg (3Ps sg : 1 Ps sg not for Int. I, II, Subj. I). The remaining inverse forms take the prefix *nè-* (*g'an-* for Intentional I, II); compare the discussion for Chukchi by Michael Dunn (1999), and for Carib of Surinam by Spike Gildea (1994).

Indicative Inflections

A/P	1sg	1pl	1dl	2sg	2pl	2dl	3sg	3pl	3dl
1sg									
1pl									
1dl									
2sg	ine- inverse								
2pl									
2dl									
3sg									
3pl		ne- inverse							
3dl									

(figure 7)

3.6.7. Infinitive forms of the verb

3.6.7.1 The infinitive

The Koryak infinitive is a nominal form of the verb that represents an action in its most general form. It fulfills the naming function of the verb together with the 3. ps. Past I and the 2. ps. intentional.

The infinitive is formed by adding the suffix *-E-k, -kkə* to the stem of the verb:

- (34) *pəŋlo-k* ‘to ask’
va-kkə ‘to be’

The infinitive-marker is homophonous to the locative-case and to the converb-marker. This corresponds to Bußmann’s (2002:304) explanation of the infinitive as a form, which is historically derived from a locative of destination of a deverbal abstract noun: “a nominal form of the verb, which can be explained historically by a frozen locative of aim of an abstract verb” (my translation). The Koryak data prove this thesis.

3.6.7.2 The supinum

The supinum in Koryak denotes the aim of an action; it is used especially often with verbs of motion.

Supinum is marked with the suffix *-nvəŋ* directly following the stem of the verb. The suffix *-nvətəŋ* is alternatively used, often used in connection with the verb *g’əkəvək* ‘to start off’:

- (35) *aktəkajgə ləvə-nvəŋ*
 it.is.not.allowed defeat-SUPIN (you)
 It is not permitted for me to defeat you.

3.6.7.3. The participle

The participle is formed by means of the circumfix *gə-/ga=-lin(ə)-lən(a)*, which is added to the stem (including the procedurals and the desiderative).

- (36) *V’uččīn ujičvinəŋ gə-təjkə-lin v’ala-ta uttə-tg’ul-in.*
 this toy PART-make-PART knife-INSTR wood-piece-ADJ
 This toy is made from a piece of wood using a knife.

The form is identical to the form of adjectives that are formed from the stems of nouns (*ga-tom-lèn* ‘with needles of a cornifer; *tomtom* ‘needles of a cornifer’) and is also identical in form to Past tense II (the evidential).

Furthermore, the participle can also express the passive voice.

(37) *uttu ga-nčoččəmav’-lənəv* ‘the wood (pl) is prepared (pl)’

3.6.7.4. The converb

Following the definition of the converb in Haspelmath/König (1995:3), the converb is a “non-finite verb form whose main function is to mark adverbial subordination.” Furthermore, “converbs are verbal adverbs.” Koryak converbs denote an additional action that is connected to the main action, expressed by the predicate of the sentence. The converbs are formed from the stems of the verbs (including the procedurals and the desiderative). The grammatical form of the converb does not undergo morphological changes of person, number, tense or case. The specification of tense becomes clear in the context of the main predicate as does the coordinates for person and number. In general, Koryak converbs have the function of denoting the circumstances of an action.

The converbs that denote a simultaneous action are formed by the following affixes:

suffix *-ma*

circumfix *gəjkə-/gajkə--(t)ě/(t)a*.

(38) *va-ma* ‘being’, *vakkə* ‘to be’
gəjkə-iv-ě ‘saying’

The difference between these two converbs is the nuance that the first denotes two synchronically running actions, while the second denotes a simultaneous circumstance.

Converbs denoting an action that refers to the state of the subject performing the main action are formed by adding the suffix *-ŋ*. These converbs also have the meaning of simultaneity.

(39) *vəlla-ŋ* ‘standing’

Converbs formed by means of the circumfix *əm-/am--(t)ě/(t)a* mark an additional action which occurs simultaneously or precedes the main action and explains the main action.

(40) *əm-iv-ě* ‘having said’

The subject of main predicate and converb can be congruent or differ.

(41) *To kin’vat gə- gəntəv’-linət g’əlla əm-ləjv-ě nota-jpəŋ.*
 and now PAST.II-run.away-3pl mother conv-stroll-conv tundra-PERL
 And now they have run away because the mother (bear) strolled across the tundra.

Converbs ending in the suffix *-k* denote an additional action that precedes the main action.

(42) *plətku-k* ‘having finished’

This converb is homophonous to the infinitive.

Converbs marked by the circumfix *tuj-/toj* = -(t)e/-(t)a are related to an action, of which the incident takes place while the main action is occurring.

- (43) *Tuj- əpkij -a vutkè-kjit t- kaj- paŋənatv-ə-k.*
CONV-come-CONV this-NARR 1sg-a.little-tell -E-1sg
Having barely arrived, I told [them/him/her] a little about it.

The suffixes *-k* and *-ŋ* that form the converbs are identical to the suffixes of the locative and the dative cases. Furthermore, as there are also locative adverbs with these suffixes, Žukova comes to the conclusion that they form the basis of wordformation in Koryak (Žukova, 1972:278). She analyses the meaning of the suffix *-k* as a relational suffix in the broadest sense (ibid.:250). The *-k* – marker is also homophonous to the infinitive-marker.

The converb-circumfix *gəjkə-/gajkə* = -(t)é/-(t)a is identical to the circumfix of the comitative II case.

The converb *évəŋ* that usually introduces the report of direct speech is used especially often.

The verbal formation verbstem + suffix *-(i)nəŋu/-(ə)naŋo* is used like a converb when it lacks an auxiliary; in connection with an auxiliary, it functions as an analytic verb.

3.6.8. Negation

Negation is formed with the construction of the modal word (*ujŋé*) + stem with the circumfix *é-/a-* = *-kè/-ka* + auxiliary in the conjugated form.

The following verbs are used as auxiliaries:

itək ‘to be’ itr.
jətək ‘to be’, ‘to have’ trans.

- (44) *Ujŋé é- lkət -kè tə- k- it-ə -ŋ.*
NEG NEG-go.away.NEG 1sg-PRES-be-E-PRES
I don’t go away.

3.7. The adverb (Žukova, 1972:278-285)

The formal description of the adverbs is manifold. Word-forming elements are derived from many kinds of roots. As a class, adverbs are united by their function of modifying the circumstances of an action.

Qualitative adverbs denote the qualitative properties of an action. They are regularly formed by the circumfix *n(ə)* = *-g’év/-g’av*.

- (45) *nə-məl-g’év* ‘well’
Cp.: *nə-məl-kin* ‘good’

3.8. Syntax

Koryak syntax has not yet been the subject of thorough investigation. In the 1968 *Handbook* (Jazyki narodov SSSR, vol.5), Žukova provides a short sketch of the syntax of simple and the complex sentence (ibid.:288-290). A more recent description is that of Žukova/Dedyk (2004:63-74).

Simple sentences, formed by one or two links, extended or non-extended, are typical in Koryak. The simple sentence follows an ergative pattern (cf. Lewandowski, 1994, vol.1, p.270f.) as in (46). In transitive sentences, the subject stands in the ergative case and the object in the absolutive case, which is unmarked here:

- (46) *Ig-ě təm-nèn kojana.*
wolf-ERG kill-3sg:3sg reindeer
The wolf killed the reindeer (Žukova, 1968:288/289).

In intransitive sentences, the subject stands in the absolutive case:

- (47) *G'égəlhən ko-jpəg'ajna-ŋ.*
wolf PRES-howl-PRES
The wolf howls/is howling. (ibid:289)

Wordorder in sentences

(See Žukova/Dedyk, 2004:66; table 77)

In both intransitive and in transitive sentences, the subject precedes the predicate, while in transitive sentences the direct object follows the predicate.

Adverbial components usually stand in front of the sentence.

- (108) *Ano -k amkəka galga-v'.*
spring-LOC many duck-pl
In spring, there are many ducks.

Attributes are posited in front of the referee.

- (109) *Tajaŋəčg'-a gě- tējka-lin nə-tuj-kin škola.*
worker-ERG PAST.II-make-3sg ADJ-new-ADJ school
The worker built a new school.

According to Žukova, two modes of syntactic connection exist in the simple sentence, i.e. coordination and subordination. Furthermore, coordination is expressed by means of conjunctions and intonation (Žukova, 1968:289).

- (110) *Ge- junəl-linət Kujkənnjaku to Miti.*
PAST.II-live-3pl Kujkynjaku and Miti
Kujkynjaku and Miti lived there.
- (111) *Na-nmə-nav' kəpəe-v, jaəla-v', kətgəmə-v'.*
INV-catch-3pl glutton-pl fox-pl sable-pl
They caught gluttons, foxes and sables.

Subordination, according to Žukova, is expressed by means of congruence, government, addition and incorporation. These devices are expressed by means of inflection, auxiliary words and incorporation (ibid:289):

congruence:

- (112) *rajonkëna-ta gazeta-ta*
 regional-INSTR newspaper-INSTR
 through the regional newspaper

government:

- (113) *ëkmit-ə-k mængə-eta*
 take-E-INF hand-CONT
 take by the hand

addition:

- (114) *nomg'av' k-ə-lgolgëpə*
 warmly INT.I –E-dress
 Dress wamly!

incorporation (Žukova/Dedyk, 2004:65, table 74):

- | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| 1) | | | |
| adjective | + noun | | |
| <i>nə-mějəŋ-kin</i> ‘big’ | <i>jajana</i> ‘house’ | | <i>majŋəjajana</i> ‘big house’ |
| 2) | | | |
| numeral | + noun | | |
| <i>ŋəččək</i> ‘two’ | <i>məŋgəlŋən</i> ‘hand’ | | <i>ŋəjanməŋga</i> ‘with two hands’ |
| 3) | | | |
| noun | + verb | | |
| <i>koja-ŋa</i> ‘reindeer’ | <i>təŋjəvək</i> ‘to lose’ | | <i>kojatəŋjəv’laj</i> ‘they lost reindeer’ |
| 4) | | | |
| adverb | +verb | | |
| <i>v’invə</i> ‘secretly’ | <i>ačəčgatək</i> ‘to laugh’ | | <i>vəŋvačəčgatək</i> ‘to laugh secretly’ |
| 5) | | | |
| adjective | + verb | | |
| <i>nəməjəŋkin</i> ‘big’ | <i>əv’jik</i> ‘to eat’ | | <i>mějŋəv’jik</i> ‘to eat one’s fill’ |
| 6) | | | |
| verb | +verb | | |
| <i>əv’jik</i> ‘to eat’ | <i>plətək</i> ‘to finish’ | | <i>əv’jiplətək</i> ‘to finish eating’ |

As can be taken from this overview of incorporative phenomena, incorporation is an active process in Koryak. This is one phenomenon in the field of morphological techniques in Koryak. Other morphological wordforming processes in Koryak are reduplication, e.g. in nouns, and circumfixation, e.g. in tense marking. Examples can be found in broader scope in the subchapters on the declensions and the conjugations (see.above.). It has to be remarked that Koryak is generally an agglutinating language with a ratio of one grammatical meaning per morpheme.

4. Cohesion and Coherence

In the introduction to these concepts, I refer to various theories in the field of cohesion and coherence in order to provide an overview of the current approaches start the discussion. Notions of cohesion and coherence can be regarded as the two sides of one coin, contributing to the creation of textuality. This chapter aims at a clarification of the notions and their classification into a clear system. This leads to an integrated framework of cohesion and coherence on several levels, which is the basis for the analysis in the following chapters.

I adhere to the traditional view that cohesion is the layer of textuality consisting of grammatical and lexical structures that present the surface structures, which serve as clues for text comprehension. Following Schiffrin (1987:9),

In sum studies of cohesion indicate that the meaning conveyed by a text is meaning which is interpreted by speakers and hearers based on their inferences about the propositional connections underlying what is said. Cohesive devices do not themselves create meaning; they are clues used by speakers and hearers to find the meanings which underlie surface utterances.

The thesis that cohesion is a net of explicit or surface linguistic markers that convey a net of textual structures is generally acknowledged in the literature: cf. Károly (1999) who reviews the definitions of cohesion of several authors such as de Beaugrande & Dressler (1981), Halliday & Hasan (1976), Grabe & Kaplan (1996), and Hardy & Leuchtmann (1996).

Cohesion is a notion that arose with the development of text linguistics in the 1970s and refers to surface linguistic clues that relate predications, i.e. that are efficient on the transphrastic level. Textual linguistic phenomena of cohesion were investigated by authors such as Harris (1952) for recurrence, Harweg (1968) for referential substitution and Greimas (1966, 1971) for isotopic chains (i.e. lexical cohesion). These phenomena were then synthesized in the monograph *Cohesion in English* by Halliday and Hasan (1976). They discussed the following five subcategories:

- reference,
- substitution,
- ellipsis,
- connectivity
- lexical cohesion

The above-mentioned studies are the foundation of the present study. Their approaches are adapted and elaborated upon in the English grammar of Quirk et al. (1985) and Martin (1992). Christiansen (2011) refers mainly to Halliday and Hasan's categorization of cohesive means. In the present work, I propose a widening of Halliday and Hasan's spectrum of cohesive means. I propose as additional candidates for cohesive structural elements the following:

- recurrence,
- temporal structures,
- discourse markers and
- grounding.

These phenomena use surface grammatical and lexical means to create texture. The presentation of cohesive means, including those of Halliday and Hasan, is relevant for the following nine chapters of this thesis.

A definition of coherence must take the following observations into account and, despite the confusion in the definitions of cohesion and coherence, I assume that clear-cut definitions of these two notions along the lines of surface and semantic deep structure are possible and that the discussion in the literature can be organized along these lines. I will therefore proceed to the alignment of the notions of coherence in the literature in a similar way to the three approaches of Rickheit and Schade (2000:277-78) and Viehweger (1989:257):

1. the text grammatical approach
2. the semantico thematic approach
3. the functional pragmatic-approach

Heinemann and Heinemann (2002:198-200) define coherence and cohesion under the headings of "grammatically coined textuality," "semantically coined textuality," "pragmatic communicative textuality," and introduce "cognitive determined textuality" as a fourth notion. Adamzik (2004:1) reduces these four phases of development to three:

- 1) the transphrastic approach that concentrates on the linguistic means,
- 2) the communicative pragmatic approach that elaborates on the communicative function of the text as a whole and
- 3) the cognitive approach that underlines the processes of production and reception of texts.

The development of these four stages of the analysis of coherence or text analysis follows the widening of the perspective of text analysis and the addition of further dimensions of text analysis. The development from the textgrammatical to the semantico-thematic approach is accompanied by the activation of concepts and relations between them on the basis of world and discourse knowledge (Fix 2008:15-34). The development to the pragmatic-approach can be explained by the addition of a dimension of text analysis which is characterized by the embedding of the text in a situational context, its function, and its use (Gansel and Jürgens 2008:61-66). The inclusion of the cognitive processes of text production and reception is characteristic of the cognitive dimension, the fourth stage of development (Fix 2008). Of course, the third and fourth stage of this model reflect a new impetus in pragmatics as can be observed in the works of Austin and Searle in the 1960s and 1970s and the upturn of the cognitive sciences in the 1970s and 1980s.

I will proceed now with a more elaborate definition of the cognitive model of coherence as it is presented in the literature. The general assumption is that coherence is a property of the two participating minds who establish coherence in the processes of text production and text comprehension. Coherence can thus be described as the quality of the mental representation of the message when it is successfully transmitted. It is no longer in the text but in the participating minds. These are developed by means of inferences on the basis of world-, text- and discourse-knowledge imputed to the intended meaning of the sender and thus recreate the sent message (cp. Bublitz, 2011:45ff.). The following cognitive theories are relevant.

With respect to an understanding of coherence as a cognitive process Viehweger (1989:258ff.) proposes a procedural text model, in which coherence is no longer an “imminent property of language utterances”, but a

dynamic procedure underlying every language production, by which the individual knowledge systems participating in text production are instrumentalized and controlled, relative to an action plan, in a way that an “evolved connected language utterance will develop” (Lurija, 1982:223) as a result of text interpretation.

According to Viehweger, various kinds of knowledge are necessary to render possible the working of this model of text analysis (production and comprehension). These are: “language knowledge,” “knowledge of the real world or encyclopaedic knowledge,” “illocutionary knowledge,” “pattern or schema knowledge,” and “knowledge of conversational principles,” this last of which is equivalent to “metacommunicative knowledge.” Viehweger’s notion of coherence

thus follows the changing text models from structural and functional models to the dominance of procedural and cognitive components in the textmodels since the 1980s.

In the collection of essays *Coherence in spontaneous text* (Gernsbacher and Givon, 1995), the thesis that coherence is “a mental phenomenon” (ibid.:VII) prevails

To the extent that the receiver’s mental representation matched that of the sender’s the text is coherent....
Coherence thus emerges not in the text, but in the two collaborating minds (ibid.:VIII).

Rickheit and Schade (2000) argue, following Schade et al. (1991) and Rickheit and Strohner (1992), that production and reception processes work in a production and reception system:

As soon as these systems reach stability, cohesion and coherence can be assumed. ... [My translation],
[Rickheit/Schade, 2000:279]

Applications of coherence and cohesion theories vary. The general tendency is the use of coherence as a dominate framework in a system of coherence and cohesion. The notion of cohesion tends to be subordinated to, if not replaced by, the notion of coherence. Brinker (2005:18, note 18) relies on a comprehensive notion of coherence, which is differentiated in several aspects: grammatical, thematic, pragmatic, cognitive, explicit and implicit aspects (cp. Brinker, 2000a:164). He thus subsumes aspects of both cohesion and coherence. The grammatical structures correspond to the above notion of cohesion, whereas the thematic structures are equivalent to the semantic-thematic notion of coherence.

In all these definitions, the problem of differentiation between grammatical-lexical, thematic, pragmatic, and cognitive aspects of textuality becomes apparent. Since the 1980s, however, approaches that integrate the various aspects of coherence into one multilevel synchronic model have appeared.

Halliday (1985:53) differentiates between three levels of text analysis: 1) the “textual meaning,” which comprises the connections to the textual cotext and the context of situation; 2) the “interpersonal meaning,” which refers to the communicative aspect of language, in Rickheit and Schade’s analysis the pragmatic aspect of language; and 3) the “ideational meaning,” i.e., the language as “representation of experience,” of processes: “actions, events, processes of consciousness and relations.” Heinemann and Viehweger’s (1991:84) suggestion for an integrative text notion corresponds to this type of multilevel text notion:

attempts to comprehend the network of surface structures and text meanings, of text structures and illocutionary structures, of verbal and nonverbal communication, of practical object-related actions and text structure, of practical actions, cognitive processes and emotions... of action, social structure and text structure, of text production and text comprehension... [My translation]

In the same way, Brinker (1997:17) requires an integration of the structural and the pragmatic text notions:

The notion of “text” designates a limited sequence of linguistic signals, which on its own is coherent and, which as a whole, signals a recognizable communicative function. [My translation, cp. Feilke, 2000:68]

Monika Schwarz (2001:151-159) advocates a similar approach: the interaction of grammatically coded textual information and the conceptual activation of knowledge leads to the appearance of coherence, which is thus understood as a phenomenon that starts from the grammatically coded surface text and ends with the mental representation of a semantic conceptual continuity of a text. With regard to the relation between cohesion and coherence, Giora (1985:26) sees the function of cohesion as an auxiliary function of coherence, as phoricity, for example, helps to retrieve the discourse topic.

Candidates for a transitional function between cohesion in the sense of the grammatical/lexical surface structures and coherence in the sense of the semantic – thematic coherence are the so-called coherence relations and lexical cohesion. Lexical cohesion contributes to coherence in that the semantic fields that are part of lexical cohesion indicate the thematic aspects that dominate a text and therefore its coherence. The so-called coherence relations are thematic relations rooted in connectivity. They comprise syndetic and asyndetic relations that form a net of functional relations on the various levels of the hierarchy of the text from the connection between the individual predications up to paragraphs and whole text parts. Their functions contribute to establishing a network of thematic sense-relations and thus also to coherence (cp. Bublitz, 2011:37-48). In general, it can be said that cohesive devices are signals of collaboration between one speaker/writer and the next to enable coherence (Tanskanen, 2006:24-25).

This overview of approaches to cohesion and coherence gives rise to the following observations: on the one hand, the cohesive means that were elaborated upon at the beginning as the basis for the analysis of the present thesis occur as means of coherence in the text grammatical and semantic-thematic aspects of coherence theory and, at the same time, they may form the text

grammatical basis for integrated notions of coherence. On the other hand, these means of cohesion may be subject to a pragmatic-functional or a cognitive analysis as some theories of phoricity rely on cognitive assumptions (cp. chapter 7.1.) or some aspects of recurrence (cp. chapter 7.4) may be analyzed from a functional point of view. Thus, pragmatic and cognitive approaches may be not only aspects of theoretical development with regard to coherence but also with regard to cohesion. These observations will be elaborated upon in the course of this work.

The preceding overview of the problems of cohesion and coherence relies mainly on German-language research, especially the development of understanding of text coherence. For an overview about research in other language areas see Thiele (2000) for English speaking countries, Enkists's report on the Nordic countries, Perennec (2000) for Romance countries, and Mazur (2000) on Slavic languages.

An important question of this thesis is therefore the influence of cultural conditions on the forms of cohesion in Koryak, i.e. the specificities of cohesion in this cultural area. This discussion will also involve an examination of the influence of coherence on cohesion as it is assumed that coherence is more closely related to the content structures of the texts than cohesion.

5. Method

The methodological approach follows a combination of structural, functionalist -i.e., pragmatic- and cognitive methods. I describe the structural properties of the cohesive means as well as their function in context. In this way, the present work also has a pragmatic dimension (cp. Gansel and Jürgens, 2008). Psycholinguistic aspects such as speech production and comprehension processes are considered where relevant. The structural approach follows Harweg's (2000) delineation of the structural period of text analysis in the '50s and '60s, which extends the hierarchy of linguistic units to include phoneme, morpheme and sentence to the text level. Structural means here the general sense of a rule-governed internally interdependent system (cp. Albrecht, 2007:215ff.) as in Saussurean structuralism. However, it is not meant in the sense of historic structuralism which is not yet concerned with text linguistics. With regard to the representation of structural, pragmatic (functional), and cognitive elements, this thesis presents an integrative approach as outlined in the 'Cohesion and Coherence' chapter above.

The main objective of this thesis is to explore the theoretical foundations of the individual domains of cohesion and to discuss their subsumption and application to the corpus of Koryak texts. The results of the application to the oral texts for the theoretical basis is considered in each chapter. The objective of this procedure is a classification of the domains of cohesion in theory and with regard to Koryak. The individual chapters also present a discussion of the interdependencies between the various domains of cohesion, which leads to the thesis that cohesion in theory and in its application to Koryak is characterized by the interdependency between phoricity and connectivity as the two columns upon which the other phenomena of cohesion are based and which are the basic notions into which the other phenomena are integrated.

The notion of culture which underlies the observations with regard to the influence of culture on the various means of cohesion is based on the abstract notion of Konersmann (2010:8-9):

Something like "culture" does not exist. There is only the wealth of events and manifestations, this mass of legacies and references, these manifold, recorded in words, gestures, works, rules and techniques, forms of human intelligence and work on the world – all that becomes manifest as a cultural fact. From this diversity of human practice and production culture emanates as the provisional and, finding itself in constant movement, correlation of action, this open space for communication as which it appears. [My translation]

The fields of culture which appear in Koryak society can be identified and thus included in this definition. These are handicraft, economy, upbringing and education, literature, social customs, social relations, relations to nature and animals, language, morality, and religion.

In Chapters 7.1. to 7.9. a short definition of each cohesive means and its cultural conditioning is attempted. This is followed by a conclusion in Chapter 8

6. Segmentation of the texts

The most recent segmentation method for spontaneous oral speech is segmentation into intonation units (cp. Himmelmann and Ladd, 2008; Chafe, 1994, 1997, 1999, 2008; Stelma and Cameron, 2007; Ladd, 2001; Cruttenden, 1997). The criteria for intonation units are pitch and rhythm. Regarding pitch, the criteria are the boundary tone at the end of a segment and the new onset as well as the reset of the baseline in a new segment. For rhythm, the criteria are the segmental pauses, the lengthening of the final segment in a given unit and anacrusis at the beginning of a new unit (Himmelmann, 2008:260). The analyses of intonation units take into consideration, however, the problem of the relation between intonation units and grammatical units, i.e. predication units (in English clauses).

Predication units are the morphosyntactic realization of an illocution in which a finite verb ascribes a property to an entity which is the predication basis. The predication basis is thereby not necessarily identical to the subject as there must be a differentiation between psychological, logical, and grammatical subjects. Furthermore, differentiation betweenthetic and categorical predications must also be made. Thetic predications present the information as a wholistic all new or a wholistic all old event in which an event is accepted or negated as a whole. Categorical predications, in contrast, present the information in the form of a rhematic judgement, such as the above-defined ascription of a property to an entity (Serzisko, 1992: 18-24, 38-45).

The relationships between the intonation units and the predications have been analyzed in various works. In his essay "Linking intonation units in spoken English," Chafe (1988:1-27) finds a correspondence between intonation units and clauses (defined as a topic-comment construction mostly realised as subject-predicate) in 70% of conversational speech and comes to the conclusion "that the clause is the typical way of verbalising an idea." This means that "clause linkage is the predominant type of intonation unit linkage" (ibid.:1-4, 24).

The correlation between intonation units and syntactic structure is analysed in a more refined way in Serzisko (1992:84-114). A corpus of 27 texts in Ik results in a 85% correspondence between pause units and predication units. Similar findings were obtained by Chafe (1993), Croft (1995), and Park, "the most common form of the IU is the clause" (2002:643). Park (2002:642) concludes that from both sides, i.e. from the side of the clause as an IU and from the side of the IU as a clause, there are correspondences between the two forms of a unit.

The fact that the strong correspondence between intonation and predication units allows for the conclusion to be drawn that predication units are also basic cognitive units of segmentation of spontaneous oral speech. (cp. Hymes, 2003) The predication units have been chosen as the segmentation basis for this corpus. Thereby, predication units are understood as units which not only enclose a finite verb and a subject but a verb phrase with objects and peripheral adjuncts. Following Serzisko, (1992:21-24) I have counted the following as complex predicates:

- predications introduced by a conjunction;
- predications introduced by a particle;
- predication plus noun clause;
- propositional verbs introducing direct or indirect speech are counted as independent units;
- adverbial clauses are counted as independent units;
- relative clauses, embedded in an independent predication, are considered part of this predication;
- a series of several finite verbs or predicates under the scope of one adverb or subject is segmented as one predication;
- in the same way, units containing reformulations of a finite verb or an impersonal expression are also segmented as one predication based on the identification of the predication basis or the lack of a predication basis in part of the predication;
- repetitions of finite verbs are left added to the same predication, because of a lack of semantic independence;
- dependent participles are included in the predication because they are used in an attributive function and thus serve only the widened specification of the predication base;
- in the same way converbs are attributed to the predication on which they depend because of the identity of the predication base.

7. Cohesive means

7.1. Reference and Phoricity

The main means of anaphoric relations in Koryak texts cover the sphere of mere subject–object phoricity and the means of location, time, and event anaphors (Cp. Cornish 1986, 1999; Kleiber 1994; Vater 2005). Both anaphors and cataphors are possible. The analysis of the use of the demonstratives anaphorically indicates that they are mostly conditioned by special cognitive and affective factors. They present, on the one hand, a special case of accessibility, the so-called recognitional use, a special case of reactivation of a topic. On the other hand, there are affective factors which regulate the use of demonstratives. Both factors present an enrichment of the accessibility scale in Givon's or Ariel's sense. Longer topic chains and shifts of topics have special thematic effects in their context and are connected with the formation of paragraphs. They are closely connected to the content structures of the texts and to the dominance of certain culturally conditioned subjects, to the change between the collective and individual actors in the texts, in dependence on the social structure of this culture. Several of the phoric means do not work in accordance with the continuity/accessibility scale of Givon. A rudimentary working of this scale with antecedent nouns and polypersonal verbs (affixed pronominals on the verb) could be discerned, but independent personal pronouns, demonstratives and 'person of the noun' do not integrate into this scale. Their usage is conditioned by other factors such as thematic effects for independent personal pronouns and the 'person of the noun' and by cognitive or affective factors as well as thematic effects for the demonstratives. The frequent interlacing of phoric structures with thematic factors, i.e. with the content structures of the texts, prompts the consideration of this factor as an influential element in phoric structures. This results in an enrichment of the semantics by discourse content including specific cultural information contained in the texts. The length of topic chains, perspectivization of topic chains in texts, shifts of topics, and specific emphasis of topics are all factors which are shaped by the culturally-conditioned thematic structure of the texts. The special use of the 'person of the noun', the demonstratives or the independent pronouns provide evidence for the culturally specific orientation of the Koryak language.

A pure approach to accessibility proved insufficient for the analysis of phoricity in Koryak texts. This observation is also an indication of the relation between cohesion and coherence. Not only is cohesion a clue to coherence but coherence as the semantic-thematic-cultural factor also influences cohesion.

With regard to the aim of this thesis to discuss the interdependencies between the various means of cohesion, it is possible to make an initial remark about the interdependency between phoricity and connectivity. In my opinion, it is self-evident that phoricity relies on connectivity, because otherwise phoricity would not be a discourse relevant phenomenon. At the same time, it contributes to the connection among the predications by establishing the flow of topics between them. This means that there is a close interdependency between these two factors of cohesion.

7.2. Substitution

Starting from the definition of substitution as a form of nominal phoricity, it has been demonstrated that the anaphoric substitution has a function which transgresses mere cohesive force. Anaphoric nouns not only contribute to textual connections making a text cohesive, but also have thematic functions and thus procure the link to the culture.

Substitutions appear as foci of cultural interest. They show the commitment to nature by foregrounding animals and plants to focus on the close relationship between men and nature. We can see this through the use of substitutions in the text about the Koryak writer Keccay Kekketyn: text EID-2-S in volume 2 of this thesis

This is reflected in Schwarz-Friesel's (2007) term progressive anaphor. They may indicate the subject of the text and thus directly create elements of coherence. Alonso's (2014) elements of inferencing and knowledge structures as a basis for cognitive coherence are certainly relevant for substitution as a cohesive means. The system of substitution built on the stem *-nike/-neka-* (*-nijke/-nejka-*), which is a typical feature of Koryak, has no cohesive force. This is due to the lack of a proper lexical value of this stem. It only exists in cooperation with the immediate context which provides the missing meaning, even more so as it works mostly within one predication.

- (2-1) GKA-2-L, 107
- | | | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------------------|------------|-------------------|--------------|
| ənnin | Kəg'ujkəneku | gəjijəlin | g'ano | <u>nəkajtəŋ</u> , | Təjkətəjəŋ |
| ənnin | Kəg'ujkəneku | gə- jijə-lin | g'ano | nəka-jtəŋ | təjkətəj-ə-ŋ |
| that | Kujkyneku | PAST.II-fly-3sg | there | something-ALL | sun-E-DAT |
| that | Kujkyneku | flew there to the, | what's it, | sun | |

The significance of the practical analysis of substitution for the theory is considerable. The *nike/-neka-* substitutes in Koryak challenge all theories of phoric substitution because they are not a

cohesive means in the sense of phoric movement, according to Harweg or Halliday/Hasan. They do not have a referential value of their own but receive their meaning by the neighbouring lexemes in the same predication. They cannot form a meaningful predication on their own. The use of nominal substitutes in the sense of Linke and Nussbaumer and Schwarz-Friesel confirms Harweg's (1978) theory, but at the same time indicates that it is surpassed because lexical substitutes in the Koryak texts work according to pragmatic and cognitive laws. They surpass Givon's approach in that it does not consider semantic shifts in phoric chains. Stutterheim's (1997) approach considers semantic shifts but does not consider the laws of lexical substitution as hyponymy and synonymy and has difficulties presenting the tracking of semantic shifts over long stretches of text. These observations justify a postulation of substitution as an independent phenomenon between phoricity and lexical cohesion. The fact that nominal substitution uses the structures of phoricity underlines the special position of lexical substitution. As there are hardly any cases of verbal synonymy in the Koryak texts, this phenomenon is a neglectable factor in substitution. However, theoretically the fact that verbal synonyms do not procure coreference on their own but need phoric elements to form a phoric chain relegates them to the domain of lexical cohesion. The fact that lexical substitution is interrelated with thematic-semantic factors underlines the thesis that lexical elements in cohesion have a transitional function in relation to coherence.

- (2-2) LJAA-1-L, 010
 ujnè ivkè "g'égə̀lɣən"
 ujnè iv-kè g'égə̀lɣən
 Neg say-NEG wolf
 they don't name him wolf
 011
 kèv'ɣə̀vɔlɔɣ "ɣajɣə̀nočg'ən"
 k- èv'-ɣə̀vo-la-ɣ ɣajɣə̀nočg'ən
 PRES-name-proc-pl-PRES outdoor.animal
 they name him "outdoor animal"
 012
 to kajɣən, ujnè iv'kè "kajɣən"
 to kajɣən ujnè iv'-kè kajɣən
 and bear Neg say-NEG bear
 and they don't call the bear bear.
 013
 kèv'ɣə̀vɔlɔɣ "gə̀jnik"
 k- èv'-ɣə̀vo-la-ɣ gə̀jnik
 PRES-name-proc-pl-PRES wild.animal
 they call him "wild animal."

I have elaborated on the role of the noun-substitutes for the reflection of the Koryak culture in the texts. Substitutes appear as keywords and thus as carriers of cultural information. Mediated by the noun-substitutes, Koryak texts reflect commitment to the land, nature, animals, language and folklore. The *-nike/-neka-* substitutes are a specific and culturally original linguistic phenomenon of Koryak and the Chukotko-Kamchatkan language family.

7.3. Ellipsis

Ellipses in the Koryak oral texts are bound backward or forward to the cotext by the lack of information they contain. From the context, they receive the missing information that makes them cohesive. This is not usually established by a strict cotext control in the sense of Klein (1993), but by a control through the linguistic cotext at various distance levels. This is due to the fact that, apart from the pro drop and noun drop cases, most of the occurring ellipses are independent constructions in the sense of Rath (1979). In this way, a cohesive tie between the ellipsis and its cotext is established. By binding together units of various sizes the ellipses also have a text structuring function. Due to its special structure, the ellipsis receives a certain prominence and can thus fulfill various pragmatic functions in its cotext. They become the more prominent the greater the distance between the gap and its reference point. The main functions are those of forming a summary or commentary; providing the result of a development of contents; announcing a theme; accentuating certain units; underlining certain information; and of interlacing text units. Furthermore, the ellipses may have an intertextual function, pointing back and forward between texts. Also, they may indicate moments of heightened suspense and serve as a mode of expression for thoughts and reflections. Ellipses thus are interrelated with the structures of the texts, with their thematic developments. The semantic-thematic factor of coherence thus also plays a role in the use of this cohesive means and creates a link to the cultural context. Koryak society is revealed as a culture of reindeer herding, far from western civilization, fighting for first results of education, closely connected to nature and fighting with wild animals like wolves or lynx, with rudimentary developments in medicine and health care, enjoying simple leisure activities like tea drinking and cooking in the tundra.

The phenomenon of Koryak ellipses can be described by the general, mostly theory-independent inventory of ellipsis. A discourse-oriented approach based on the theories of Klein (1993) and Rath (1979) on the interlacement of missing elements with co- and context in the form of co- and/or context control and dependency and construction transfer/independence of construction may be taken as the basis for the analysis. The necessity to include the wider semantic-thematic cotext into the resolution of ellipses shows that the theory of ellipses demands a broadening of the theoretic approaches with regard to semantic factors. Due to its structure, the gap that is filled by the co-/context ellipsis works necessarily on the cognitive level. It demands from the hearer a cognitive effort for its resolution.

In general, it can be stated that ellipsis is not a pervasive feature in Koryak speech. It is rather the exception in the flow of language. Only the pattern of omitted predicates reoccurs from time to time. Furthermore, there are no specificities in the structure of ellipsis which would give rise to a revision of the generally acknowledged theoretical inventory of ellipses: Compare McShane (2005), Winkler and Schwabe (2003), Kreutzer (2004), Klein (1993), Kindt (2013:39-106), Rickheit and Sichelschmidt (2013:160/161).

7.4. Recurrence

Recurrence in spoken Koryak texts relies mainly on phoricity, substitution, lexical cohesion and ellipsis. These are Linke/Nussbaumer's (2000) means of recurrence of content.

Among the means found in the Koryak texts, there are mainly production based false starts and word finding repetitions, on the one hand, and production and comprehension based forms such as linking repetitions and expansions (asymmetrical repetitions), as well as syntactic parallelism (symmetrical repetitions) and repetitions with variation, on the other. These means all contain an element of playfulness with lexemes and syntax. This is confirmed by the variety of forms which transcends the theoretical guidelines, especially in the case of expansions.

Interestingly enough, repetition in Koryak is found on all syntactic levels from the single predication to interpredicative links and expansions of predications. All of these belong to the domain of syntactic repetitions and are thus subsumable under Linke and Nussbaumer's (2000) categorization of 'recurrence of expression' with functions in the pragmatic and cognitive sphere. Spoken Koryak relies on syntactic variation, and not on repetition. Repetitions only occur occasionally and have mostly a local effect. In some texts, there are, however, repeated motifs which structure the texts into sense units or form a frame of the text and create cohesion through the whole text at the same time. At this point, a relation of recurrence to the content structures of the stories and mediated by this to the culture is observable. The fact that in a traditional fairy tale a wide range of repetitions suddenly appears is characteristic for this text genre only but it demonstrates that recurrence may be an integral part of Koryak text structures and forms of Koryak culture that can be used for specific purposes.

The text analysis shows that recurrence in Koryak partly works according to the elaborated laws but has an independent character of playfulness governing its use. Recursive elements in Koryak

texts are not strictly functionally used but give the texts a shade of a poetic nature. This trait is certainly culturally conditioned, but it is certainly not an exclusive feature of Koryak. Other languages may show similar traits.

The cultural influence in recurrence comes however about mostly by the four means of recurrence which were mentioned in the beginning of this chapter: phoricity, substitution, ellipses and lexical cohesion. These are the means that are closest to the phenomenon of thematic coherence and thus to the themes of Koryak culture. This is elaborated in the four respective chapters. In comparison, syntactic recurrence gives rather marginal hints to Koryak culture. Among the text genres a fairy tale was deeply structured by recurrence and showed that recurrence may be a trait of a culturally specific traditional text genre and maybe is from there transferred to other forms of Koryak story telling.

7.5. Lexical cohesion

This chapter has presented an overview of the research on various aspects of lexical cohesion. The research is dominated by the discussion on the terminological differentiation between lexical cohesion and its neighbouring fields and the role of coreference in lexical cohesion, as well as by the discussion about the term collocation. In this case, the complexity of the theoretical discussion is not reflected in the actual appearance of linguistic facts. The main means of lexical cohesion in the Koryak texts are semantic fields. In general, it can be said that they mirror the thematic complexes of the texts. They illustrate the various aspects of Koryak society, religion, economy, and culture, i.e. the cosmos of Koryak life. They demonstrate that the main fields of Koryak culture and life are still present in the consciousness of the older generation and that traditions are still remembered. They reveal a society with the following cultural traits, whereby various stages of this society are mirrored, from older stages to more contemporary stages. Furthermore, it should be added that some of the texts reflect an earlier state of this society, which is characterized by the following:

- a traditional system of kinship, an extended family with more than two generations under one roof,
- traditional systems of courting and marriage,
- the groom works for the family of his bride
- it is a society of fishers
- it is a society of reindeer herders

- conflicts with wild animals
- a primitive society without electricity, heating and technical progress
- it is an economically-weak society (begging is not uncommon)
- primitive medical care
- witchcraft
- close relationship with nature: living in the tundra, working with plants
- nomadic society
- primitive means of transport
- traditional funeral rites
- emerging literature
- high estimation of teaching, and literacy
- the creation of the earth lies in a mythological past with a raven as the creator

Scripts, schemata, scenarios and frames as cognitive elements are also included in these semantic fields and shape the resolution of indirect anaphors in dependence from the semantic fields. Certain semantic fields indicate certain fixed schemata of knowledge and certain scripts, scenarios and frames of social behaviour.

7.6. Connectivity

Connectivity in Koryak is mostly a matter of asyndesis. Connections with conjunctive adverbials represent a considerable share, but hypotactic connections formed by conjunctions are rare. Mann and Thompson's (1987, 1988, 1992) RST theory interprets these asyndetic connections as a semantic deep structure with a variety of possible relations. The character of the various modes of connection cannot, however, be isolated in most cases. The texts are characterized with a mixture of connections of asyndetic elaborative and temporal character with single conjunctive connections in between. This analysis will be further enriched through the discussion of discourse markers in the next section. The Koryak text data make use of Lehmann's (1988) manifold model in a reduced manner only, which is caused by the specificities of oral language structures. Seen from another angle, it can be said that Mann and Thompson's model is an adequate model for describing the connective structures of Koryak oral texts. Lehmann's morphosyntactic model and Mann/Thompson's semantic deep structure model complement each other theoretically and also in the application to the Koryak texts.

The texts are organized around one central message or presupposition, towards which they present an elaboration or exemplification. The cultural information about this society are contained in the contents of the stories. Most of the other texts function in a similar way. For example, text EID-3-G serves to illustrate a central custom of the Koryak society, i.e. the custom of marriage. All macrosegments are subordinated to elaborate on this central theme. The pragmatic principle that dominates most Koryak texts is advice about a central theme. At this point, the connection between connectivity and its cultural conditioning becomes clear. The hierachical building of the micro and macrosegments of the texts serves the organization of the content structures of the texts and thus bridges the gap to their cultural impact. The content structures of the texts provide insight into the cultural traits of Koryak society. Connectivity is, in a similar way, informative about the traits of this society as lexical cohesion, as I discuss in the previous section. It indicates, however, not only the fields of Koryak culture, but also its inherent logic, the laws of its working, i.e. its interior structuring.

7.7. Discourse markers

In general, it can be said that in the present corpus, Koryak discourse markers (DMs) originate from different sources, such as coordinate conjunctions, causal conjunctions, various time adverbials, manner adverbials, and a modal adverb. All of them lose, to some extent, their original lexical meaning and are used in various modes to structure the texts. Several markers have the function of organizing text segmentation. They divide the texts into sense units, signal or accompany the division of the texts into its parts. This is valid for the additive conjunction *to* ‘and’ as well as for some of the time adverbials. They leave the plane of simple coordination or time structuring and gain a new function in the structuring of the texts. They convey speech acts and not segments on the ideational plane. This corresponds to Frazer’s interpretation of the function of DMs as procedural (Frazer: 1999, 2006, 2009a, 2009b). It also confirms, however, Gülich’s (1970) theory of the function of DMs as segmentation signals. The pragmatic plain thus gains significance in this area of cohesion. Functions of speech acts for each other and for the structure of the text become the dominating factor. The cognitive level also plays a role in the extent to which the change of speech planes is involved. The specificity of the use of markers in this Koryak corpus consists in the use of simple grammatical means. Koryak is not a language with refined rhetorical means or a refined rhetorical tradition in dialogues like English (compare the discussion of dialogic markers in English in Schiffrin (1987)). It uses simple conjunctions and adverbs in a special transformed function as DMs, and, thus, the creativity of the speakers

demonstrates rhetorical effect. Without using sophisticated rhetorical means, Koryak is nevertheless able to achieve a sound structuring of discourse.

The following is also relevant for the position of DMs in general rhetorics. Koryak as a language from a remote area proves that DMs are possibly one of the fundamental aspects of discourse structuring that appears independently from the concrete individual language.

DMs relate to coherence insofar that discourse marking occurs in close agreement with the thematic-semantic structure of the texts. For example, the segmentation of the texts into narrative steps, which was demonstrated above, closely mirrors the sense units of the texts. As in the previous sections, coherence and cohesion are connected. Discourse marking here adds another perspective to the coherence structure of the texts. The segmentation into content units reflects how the Koryak people view reality, how they structure their flow of thoughts, how they provide rhythm in their narrations, and thus contributes to the mental and rhetorical culture of this people while mirroring it at the same time.

7.8. Temporal structures

Implicit and explicit means of temporal structuring are means of cohesion in Koryak texts. There are various cohesive structures based on temporal structures. Especially interesting in these time structures is the use of the past and the present tense, whereby the past appears as past II and as past I. The present has various functions such as scenic presentation or presenting a layer of reflections, judgements and commentaries. In some expository texts it may take the form of an habitual present. Tenses can vary according to the text genre as in the differentiation between narrative texts and expository texts.

Interestingly, Koryak has a differentiated system of tenses which are amply used in the texts with the exception of the problematic type of modality, i.e. such tenses like future II, intentional II and subjunctive II are only rarely used. The rare use of future I is also noteworthy. The possibilities of taxis are, however, not exhaustively utilized in the Koryak texts as the texts are mostly organized in a successive line of action. Temporal inclusion and overlap are not a usual means of temporal organization in Koryak oral texts. This may be due to the oral character of the texts in a society without literary traditions. Koryak text structures are not subject to a refined and reflected text organization - also with regard to temporal structures - as it may be contained in the detailed prescriptions of a poetic instruction in a society with long literary traditions.

In general, three dominant time layers can be discerned in the texts:

1. the legendary past: *ajjon*: ‘long ago’, usually expressed by past II which denotes a time that is not eyewitnessed and may be located in mythological times or before the birth of the participating persons;
2. the simple past, expressed by past I, which is used for the narration of past events of personal experience;
3. the present, which is used very flexibly in various functions, such as historical present, actual present and habitual present.

The cognitive level can also easily be traced in the temporal structures of the Koryak texts. Time is essentially a category of the cognitive structure of the human conscience and thus structures all verbal utterances. This is the precondition for the fact that cognitive elements are the basis for all time related utterances. As maintained for the pragmatic elements the time structuring of the Koryak texts allows conclusions to be drawn about the mental structures of the Koryak narrators.

7.9. Grounding

Grounding is a complicated field in Koryak. In the texts chiefly organized by a line of sequential activity, the theoretical criteria yield contradictory results. As the application of the theoretical approach to the Koryak texts discussed above demonstrates, these criteria may lead to contradictory results, i.e. the grammatical criteria may contradict the perception of the hearer of what is humanly or culturally important.

A sequential time line of accomplishments and achievements does not align with the activity of narration in the present tense. The texts without a sequential line of action rely partly on a dependency system along the lines of Mann and Thompson’s RST Theory and partly on a line of action that has a habitual, exemplifying character. The theoretical discussion has proved relevant, but not always sufficient for understanding grounding in Koryak. Koryak speakers seem to play with grounding, using various criteria for different narrative passages. For example, Chvany’s (1990) contrast of narration and dialogue does not apply to the intermingling of narration and dialogue in some Koryak texts. The Koryak text structures raise many questions and require

further research. The analysis of the oral texts indicates that sequentiality is only one factor among others for grounding and is not the main criterion of grounding as was maintained for a long time in theoretical debates (Hickmann 1995; Chvany, 1985, 1990; Thompson 1987; Tomlin 1985; Reinhart 1984; Hopper and Thompson 1980; Wårwik 2011).

Due to the recurring contradictions, it is possible that the spatial picture of a single ‘figure on the ground’ has to be abandoned in favour of a multifactorial model of various layers such as reflection, commentary, scenic presentation, dialogic structures and/or a line of sequential action, which would allow for various gradations in dependance from the standpoint of the hearer. A hierarchy of such factors or layers will be difficult to establish and certainly depends on the cultural background of the recipient and/or an insider’s view on the culture in question. Here Reinhart’s factor of cultural importance is key. There is, however, no doubt that every part of these texts contributes in its way to the presentation of cultural information and thus works on the neutralization of the factors of grounding. Neutralization of grounding in this context means that passages are no longer considered as providing fore- and background but as providing the text with various functions of content elements. In general, I tend to abandon the idea of grounding as a whole and replace it with a functional model. In Koryak, different passages which were identified by various grammatical criteria for different values of grounding may now be identified by their different functions for the story as a whole. This new approach could be based on the interrelationship between grammatical criteria and coherence structures, i.e. thematic-semantic structures and factors of cultural information and provides new insight into the observations of interdependencies between cohesion and coherence. It demonstrates, at the same time, the general dependence of grounding on cultural factors. Otherwise, the ranking of salient features has perhaps to be revised for this cultural area. Sequential action lines and fictive conversations may have an almost equal value of foregrounding, and thus hold the interest of the recipient.

The pragmatic side of grounding is certainly of interest in this connection. Koryak speakers strive to catch the interest of the listener. With respect to the criteria of the theoretical approaches, it is possible to say that Koryak oral texts consist solely of foreground elements. Each passage contributes in its own way to convey a story of general interest. All the more, as every passage conveys in its way important cultural information with the consequence that the criterion for cultural importance for the story is neutralized. As a selection of special features of Koryak culture which tend to direct the attention of the reader/hearer, the following can be identified: relations to animals, burial customs, leisure activities, general living situations, health problems, customs of courting, social situations, ecological problems, fairy tales, problems of language

decay: education and preservation of the language, information about the Koryak writer Keccaj Kekketyn, manufacture of an arkan (lasso), habits of witchcraft

The question of whether grounding structures allow conclusions to be drawn about the cognitive structures of Koryak speakers can be answered in the affirmative. Koryak speakers have proved to be unconventionally inventive narrators who have original ways of catching the interest of the listener. Past events are filled with life by fictive conversations. Present tense activities change with reflections, commentaries and judgements. Various layers of time and narration complement each other and render the stories lively and entertaining.

8. Conclusion

After the presentation of my research goals and naming of the informants whose texts were chosen for analysis, in the "introduction" the earlier and the current research situations were presented, which illustrate a lively research situation. This is followed by the presentation of the grammatical fundamentals of Koryak following A. N. Žukova's grammar (1972). Some essentials about the relation between cohesion and coherence, which are at the root of my analysis about cohesion in Koryak, follow. Together with the remarks about the method of the thesis, i.e. a mixture between structural, functional (pragmatic), and cognitive approaches and about the segmentation of the texts, I arrive at the analysis of the cohesive means and their dependance from the cultural conditions of Koryak life. Together with a second volume of Koryak texts, the present work is meant to initiate further research on Koryak.

Cohesion in Koryak is best understood through a conjunction of phoricity and its related phenomena, i.e. substitution, ellipsis, lexical cohesion and recurrence, on the one hand, and connectivity and its related phenomena such as discourse modes, and temporality and grounding, on the other hand. I arrive at a similar model to Adamzik (2004) who sees cohesion as a combination of recurrence and connectivity. I agree that recurrence can be seen as the subsuming principle of ellipsis, phoricity, substitution and lexical cohesion. The phenomena of reference in the single predications are brought together by the phenomenon of connectivity. Connectivity, in turn, gives rise to chains and nets of phoric items. Connectivity is further refined and enriched by phenomena such as DMs, temporal structures and grounding. This is valid for both the theory of cohesion and Koryak storytelling.

Cohesion in Koryak is a phenomenon on structural, pragmatic and cognitive levels. These three levels are theoretically present in all forms of cohesion. The analysis of the Koryak texts illustrated the presence of the three levels in the cohesive structures of these texts. At the respective places, the corresponding levels were indicated. This underlined the omnipresence of the various levels in all phenomena of cohesion. The influence of coherence on cohesion was demonstrated in individual chapters.

Bibliography

- Adamzik, K. (2004), *Textlinguistik, Eine Einführende Darstellung*; Tübingen, Max Niemeyer
- Albrecht, J. (2007), *Europäischer Strukturalismus. Ein forschungsgeschichtlicher Überblick*; Tübingen, Gunter Narr
- Alonso, P. (2014), *A multi dimensional approach to discourse coherence: from standardness to creativity*, Bern, Lang
- Bogoras, V. G. (1917) *Koryak Texts*, Publications of the American Ethnological Society, Leyden, Brill u.a.
- Brinker, K. (1997, 4. durchgesehene und ergänzte Aufl.), *Linguistische Textanalyse. Eine Einführung in Grundbegriffe und Methoden*; Berlin, Erich Schmidt Verlag
- Brinker, K. (2001), *Linguistische Textanalyse*; Berlin, Erich Schmidt
- Brinker, Klaus, (2005, 6. überarb.u. erw. Auflage): *Linguistische Textanalyse. Eine Einführung in Grundbegriffe und Methoden*, Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag
- Brinker, K. (2000), Textstrukturanalyse, in: *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik, HSK, 16.1*, 164-175
- Brinker, K. & Antos, G. & Heinemann, W. & Sager, S. F. (eds.) (2000), *Text und Gesprächslinguistik. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung, HSK 16, Bd 1: Textlinguistik*; Berlin, de Gruyter
- Bublitz, W. (2011), Cohesion and Coherence, in: Zienkowski, J. & Östmann, J.-O. & Verschueren, J., 37-49
- Chafe, W. L. (1994), *Discourse, Consciousness and Time. The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing*, Chicago/London: Chicago UP
- Chafe, W. L. (1988), Linking intonation units in spoken English, in: Haiman, J. & Thompson, S. (eds.), *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*; Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1-27
- Chafe, W.L. (1993), Prosodic and functional units of language, in: Edwards, J. A. & Lampert, M. D. (eds.), 33-44
- Chafe, W. L. (1997), The interplay of syntax and prosody in the expression of thoughts, in: *Berkeley Linguistic Society: proceedings of the annual meeting*, 23, 389-401
- Chafe, W. L. (2008), Aspects of discourse analysis, in: *Brno Studies in English*, 34, 23-37n
- Christiansen, T. (2011), *Cohesion: A Discourse Perspective*; Bern, Berlin, Peter Lang
- Chvany, C. (1985), Backgrounded Perfectives and Plot-Line Imperfectives: Towards a Theory of Grounding in Text, in: Michael S. & Timberlake Flier, Alan (eds.), *The Scope of Slavic Aspect*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 247-73.

- Chvany, C. (1990) Verbal Aspect, Discourse Saliency, and the So-called 'Perfect of Result' in Modern Russian, in: Thelin (ed.), *Verbal Aspect in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 213-35.
- Comrie, B. (1981), *The languages of the Soviet Union*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Cornish, F. (1986), *Anaphoric Relations in English and French, A Discourse Perspective*, London, Croom Helm
- Cornish, F. (1999), *Anaphora, Discourse and Understanding. Evidence from English and French*; Oxford, Clarendon Press
- Croft, W.A. (1995), Intonation units and grammatical structure, in: *Linguistics*, 33, 5, 839-882
- Cruttenden, A. (1997), *Intonation*; Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Dedyk, V. R. (2006), Vnedrenie novyh tehnologij v process obuchenija rodnomu jazyku.// Severovedcheskije nauki i obrazovanie v perspektive XXI veka.//Materialy vserossijskogo nauchno-prakticheskoy konferencii, posvashchennoj 75-letiju Instituta narodov Severa.//Severovedcheskije issledovanija St. Petersburg. Izdatel'stovo RGPU im . A.I. Gercena. Vyp.3.
- Dedyk, V. R. (2005), *Evangelie ot Luki*, Moskva
- Dedyk, V. R. (2006), *Korjakskie skazki*, Kn. dlja dop. cht. uch-sja 5-7 kl., Avev G.K. Dedyk V. R. , "Izdatel'stvo "Drofa" St. Petersburg
- Dedyk, V. R. (2008), Faktory identifikacii korjakov v sovremennyh uslovijah // Realnost' etnosa. Obrazovanie i gumanitarnyje tehnologii integracii etnicheskoy, etnoregional'noj i grazhdanskoj identichnosti// St. Petersburg, RGPU imeni A.I. Gercena
- Dedyk, V. R. (2009), Etnopedagogicheskoe vospitanije v korjaskoj sem'e.// Real'nost' etnosa. rol' obrazovanija v formirovanii etnicheskoy i mezhkonfessional'noj tolerantnosti.// St. Petersburg, RGPU imeni A.I Gercena
- Dedyk, V. R. (2010), Sohranenie i razvitije korjaskogo jazyka.//Materialy mezhdunarodnoj nauchno-prakticheskoy konferencii "Regiony Rossii dlja ustojchivogo razvitija: obrazovanije i kult'ura narodov Rossijskoj Federacii", Novosibirsk: ZAO IPP "Osfet", - 1204s. ill.
- Dedyk, V. R. (2010), O leksike duhovnoj kultury korjakov.// Real'nost' etnosa. Obrazovanije kak faktor ustojchivogo razvitija korennyh malochislennyh narodov Severa, Sibiri i Dal'nego vostoka.// Sbornik stat'ej po materialam 12 Mezhdunarodnoj nyuchno- prakticheskoy konferencii. St. Petersburg. RGPU imeni A.I. Gercena
- Dedyk, V.R. (2011), Patrioticheskoe vospitanije cherez organizaciju olimpiad// Real'nost' etnosa. Obrazovanija i etnicheskaja bezopasnost' .// Sbornik stat'ej po materialam 13 Mezhdunarodnoj nauchno-prakticheskoy konferencii St. Petersburg RGPU imeni A.I. Gercena
- Dedyk, V. R. (2011), Sohraneniije i razvitije korjaskogo jazyka. Problemy vozrozhdenija, sohraneniija i razvitija etnokulturnyh tradicij korennyh malochislennyh narodov Severa, Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka// Sbornik materialov mezhtregional'noj nauchno-prakticheskoy konferencii. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskij. Izd.-vo KIPKPKP.

- Dedyk, V.R. (2012), Korjaskij jazyk dlja 5 klassa obrazovatel'nyh uchrezhdenij: metodicheskiye rekomendacii k uchebniku.-Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskij: Izd.-vo KIPKPK - (48 l.) 3p.l.
- Dedyk, V.R. (2012), Korjaskij jazyk dlja 4 klassa obrazovatel'nyh uchrezhdenij: metodicheskiye rekomendacii k uchebniku.2-e izd.-Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskij: Izd.-vo KIPKPK - 36s- (3 p.l.)
- Dedyk, V.R. (2013), Tradicionnoje vospitanie korjakov v proizvedenijah K. Kekketyna. Real'nost' etnosa. Rol' obrazovanija v razvitii mezhnacional'nyh otnoshenij v sovremennoj Rossii: Sbornik stat'ej po materialam XV Mezhnarodnoj nauchno-prakticheskoj konferencii. St. Petersburg, 23-25 Aprelja / Pod nauch.red. I. L. Naboka.-St. Petersburg: Izd.-vo RGPU im. A.I. Gercena, 2013 - s. 348 - 352. (4 s.)
- Dedyk, V.R. (2013), Korjaskij jazyk: 4 klass: uchebnoje posobije dlja obshcheobrazovatel'nyh uchrezhdenij.- St. Petersburg: filial izd-va "Prosveshchenije", 63 s.: il (4 .p.l.)
- Dedyk, V.R. (2013), Bukvar' dlja 1 klassa: metodicheskiye rekomendacii k uchebniku.- Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskij, Izd.-vo KIPKPK, - 92 s (6 p.l.)
- Dedyk, V.R. (2013), Korjaskij jazyk: 2 klass: metodicheskiye rekomendacii k uchebniku.- Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskij, Izd.-vo KIPKPK, 100 s. (7 p.l.)
- Dedyk, V.R. (2013), Korjaskij jazyk: 3 klass: metodicheskiye rekomendacii k uchebniku.- Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskij, Izd.-vo KIPKPK, 84 s. (6 p.l.)
- Dedyk, V.R. (2013), Korjaskij jazyk: 6 klass obshcheobrazovatel'nyh uchrezhdenij: metodicheskiye rekomendacii k uchebniku.- Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskij: izd. vo KIPKPK- 36 s. (3 p.l.)
- Dedyk, V. R. (2013), Korjaskij jazyk: 5 klass: Uchebnoje posobije dlja obrazovatel'nyh uchrezhdenij. - St. Petersburg: filial izd.-va " Prosveshchenije" 63 s.: il (4 p.l.)
- Dedyk, V. R. (2014), Statja " Sohranenie i razvitie jazyka, kul'tury i byta korjaskogo naroda cherez pedagogicheskuju dejatel'nost', St. Petersburg, RGPU im. A.I. Gercena "Real'nost' etnosa, 6 s.
- Dedyk, V. R. (2015), Korjaskij jazyk: 7 klass obshcheobrazovatel'nyh uchrezhdenij:metodicheskiye rekomendacii k uchebniku. - Petropavlovsk - Kamchatskij: Izd. -vo KIPKPK - s. 65 (5 p.l.)
- Dedyk, V. R. (2015), Stat'ja " Vlijanije tradicionnogo vospitanija v semje korjakov na formirovanije lichnosti rebjenka" Petropavlovsk - Kamchatskij "GDE ETA KNIGA?"
- Dedyk, V.R. (2015), Korjaskij jazyk 6 klassa. Uchebnoje posobije dlja obshcheobrazovatel'nyh uchrezhdenij. St. Petersburg, filial izdatel'stva "Prosveshchenije"
- Dedyk, V.R. (2015), Korjaskij jazyk 7 klassa. Uchebnoje posobije dlja obshcheobrazovatel'nyh uchrezhdenij. St. Petersburg, filial izdatel'stva "Prosveshchenije"
- Dedyk, V.R. (2016), Korjaskij jazyk: dlja 8 klassa. Uchebnoje posobije dlja obrazovatel'nyh organizacii. St. Petersburg, filial izdatel'stva "Prosveshchenije" 87 s. . il.

- Dedyk, V.R. (2016), Korjaskij jazyk dlja 8go klassa obshcheobrazovatel'nyh organizacij: metodicheskiye rekomendacii k uchebniku, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskij: Kamch.IRO.- 53 s.
- Dedyk, V. R (2017), Korjaskij jazyk: 9 klass: uchebnoje posobie dlja obshcheobrazovatel'nyh organizacij, St. Petersburg, filial izd-va "Prosveshchenije", 79 s.
- Dedyk, V.R. (2017), Korjaskij jazyk dlja 9 klassa: metodicheskiye rekomendacii k uchebniky; Petropavlovsk- Kamchatskij: KamchIRO,-84 s.
- Dedyk, V.R. (2018), Korjaskij jazyk: 10 klass: uchebnoje posobie dlja obshcheobrazovatel'nyh organizacij - filial izd.va " Prosveshchenije"
- Dedyk, V. R. (2018), Bukvar' 1 klass, Uchebnoje posobie na korjaskom jazyke dlja obshcheobrazovatel'nyh Organizacij. / A. N. Zhukova, V.P. Dedyk, O.L. Bolotaeva; St. Petersburg: Filial izd.-va Prosveshchennije, 159 s.: il. (Novyj uchebnik Dal'nego Vostoka)
- Dedyk, V. R. (2018), Metodicheskie rekomendacii k uchebniku na korjaskom jazyke "Bukvar'", Petropavlovsk - Kamchatskij, IRO, 152 s.
- Dedyk, V.R. (2018), Korjaskij jazyk dlja 10 klassa: metodicheskie rekomendacii k uchebniku, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskij: Kamch. IRO, - 75 s.
- Dedyk, V. R. Severjanin (2017). 5-6 klassy uchebnoje posobije na korjaskom jazyke dlja obrazovatel'nyh organizacij. - St. Petersburg: filial izd.-va "Prosveshchenije, - 111 s: il.
- Dedyk, V. R. (2020), Rol' uchebno-metodicheskij posobij v sohranении v razvitii korjaskogo jazyka/Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskij, Kamch.IRO.
- Dedyk, V. R. (2020), Korjaskij jazyk. 4 klass: uchebnoe posobije dlja obshcheobraz. organizacij (V. R. Dedyk, O. L. Bolotaeva; St. Petersburg: filial izd.-va "Prosveshchenije " 143 s. (Novyj uchebnik Dal'nego Vostoka)
- Dedyk, V. R., Dedyk, E.I., Severjanin (2016), 3-4 klassy: uchebnoje posobije na korjaskom jazyke dlja obrazovatel'nyh organizacij, St. Petersburg: filial izd.-va "Prosveshchenie" - 127 s.: il
- Dedyk, V. R., Bolotaeva, O. L. (2020), Korjaskij jazyk: 5 klass: uchebnoe posobije dlja obshcheobrazovatel'nyh organizacij/ St. Petersburg: filial izd.-va "Prosveshchenie" - 143 s. (Novaj uchebnik Dal'nego Vostoka)
- Dedyk, V.R., Safonova, L. M. (2019), Korjaskij jazyk. 2 klass: uchebnoe posobije dlja obshcheobrazovatel'nyh organizacij/ St. Petersburg: filial izd-va "Prosveshchenie" - 175 s. (Novyj uchebnik Dal'nego Vostoka).
- Dedyk, V.R., Safonova, L. M. (2019), Korjaskij jazyk. 3 klass: uchebnoe posobije dlja obshcheobrazovatel'nyh organizacij/ St. Petersburg: filial izd-va "Prosveshchenie" - 175 s. (Novyj uchebnik Dal'nego Vostoka).
- Dedyk, V.R., Safonova, L. M. (2021), Korjaskij jazyk. 6 klass: uchebnoe posobije dlja obshcheobrazovatel'nyh organizacij/ St. Petersburg: filial izd-va "Prosveshchenie" - 159 s.

- Dedyk, V.R., Safonova, L. M. (2021), Korjaskij jazyk. 7 klass: uchebnoe posobije dlja obshcheobrazovatel'nyh organizazii/ St. Petersburg: filial izd-va "Prosveshchenie" - 175 s. (Novyj uchebnyk Dal'nego Vostoka).
- Enkvist, N. E. (2000), Text linguistics in the Nordic Countries, in: Text- und Gesprächslinguistik, HSK, 16.1, 140-145
- Feilke, H. (2000), Die pragmatische Wende in der Textlinguistik; in: Text- und Gesprächslinguistik, HSK 16.1, 64-82
- Figge, U. L. (2000), Die kognitive Wende in der Textlinguistik, in: Text- und Gesprächslinguistik, HSK 16.1, 96-104
- Fix, U. (2009), Stand und Entwicklungstendenzen der Textlinguistik, 1, in: *Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, 46,1, 2009, 11-20
- Fortescue, Michael. *Comparative Chukotko-Kamchatkan Dictionary*, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2011.
- Frazer, B. (1999), What are discourse markers? In: *Journal of pragmatics*, 31, 931-952
- Frazer, B. (2006), Towards a theory of discourse markers, in: Fischer, Kerstin (ed.)
- Frazer, B. (2009a), Topic orientation markers, in: *Journal of pragmatics*, 41, 5, 892-898
- Frazer, B. (2009b), An account of discourse markers, in: *International review of pragmatics*, 1, 2, 293-320
- Gansel, C. & Jürgens, F. (2008), Textgrammatische Ansätze, in: Janich, N. (ed.), 55-83
- Georg, Stefan & Volodin, Alexander P. (1999), *Die itelmenische Sprache, Grammatik und Texte*; Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz
- Gernsbacher, M. A. & Givón, T. (eds.) (1995), *Coherence in spontaneous text*; Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins
- Gippert, J. & Himmelmann, N. & Mosel, U. (2008), *Essentials of language documentation*; Berlin, de Gruyter
- Giora, R. (1985), What's a coherent text?, in: Sözer, E. (ed.), 16-35
- Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R.B. (1996), *Theory and practice of writing*; London, Longman
- Greimas, A. J., (1971), *Sémantique structurale, Recherche de méthode*; Paris: Larousse
- Grimes, J. E. (1972), Outlines and Overlays, in: *Language*, 48, 2, 513-524
- Gülich, E. (1970), *Makrosyntax der Gliederungssignale im gesprochenen Französisch*, München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985), *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*; London, Edward

- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976), *Cohesion in English*; London, New York, Longman
- Hardy, D.E. & Leuchtman, A. (1996), Topic versus cohesion in the prediction of Causal ordering in English conversation, in: *Discourse processes*, 21, 237-254
- Harris, Z. S. (1952), Discourse Analysis, in: *Language*, 28, 1-30
- Harweg, R. (1968, ²1979), *Pronomina und Textkonstitution*; München, Fink
- Harweg, R. (1978), Substitutional Text Linguistics, in: Dressler, Wolfgang U., 247-260
- Harweg, R. (2000), Strukturalistische Linguistik und Textanalyse, in: Text- und Gesprächslinguistik, HSK 16.1, 28 - 36
- Heinemann, M. & Heinemann, W., (2002), *Grundlagen der Textlinguistik. Interaktion – Text – Diskurs*; Tübingen, Niemeyer
- Heinemann, W. & Viehweger, D. (1991), *Textlinguistik. Eine Einführung*; Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen
- Hickmann, M., (1995), Discourse organization and the development of reference to person, space, and time, in Fletcher, P. & MacWhinney, B. (eds.), *Handbook of child language*; Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. 194-218
- Hopper, P. J. & Thompson, S. A. (1980), Transitivity and Grammar in Discourse, in: *Language*, 56, 2, 251-299
- Hymes, Dell, (2003), *Now I know only so far, Essays in Ethnopoetics*, University of Nebraska Press
- Károly, K. (1999), Recent advances in the study of lexical cohesion and repetition, in: *Sprachtheorie und germanistische Linguistik*, 9, 2, 239-162
- Kekketyn, Kecaj, (2018), *Povesti: Teksty, Perevody, Kommentarii (sostavitel' N. S. Sebnickij, T.A. Golovaneva, N.A. Nepomnjashchik, Poltorackij I.S., Pronina E.P.; perevod s korjakkского S. Stebnickogo, E.P. Proninoj; otvetstvennyj redaktor E.N. Kuzmina) - Novosibirsk: Akademizdat, 476 s.: il.*
- Kilpalin, K. V. (1993), *Nominalization in Alutor, Ania: skazki severa*, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky: RIO, Kamchatskoj oblastnoj tipografii
- King, Alexander D. (2011), *Living with Koryak Traditions, Playing with Culture in Siberia*, Lincoln & London, University of Nebraska Press
- Klein, W. (1993), *Ellipse*, in: *Syntax*, HSK 9.1, 763-799; Berlin/NewYork, Walter de Gruyter
- Konersmann, Ralf (2010), *Kulturphilosophie - Eine Einführung*; Hamburg, Junius
- Krashennikov, S. P. (1972), *Explorations of Kamchatka: North Pacific Scimitar*; Oregon, Historical Society Press
- Kreutzer, J. (2004), *Systematik der Ellipse*; Frankfurt/M, Lang, Dissertation

- Kurebito, Megumi (2017), Koryak. In: Michael Fortescue, Marianne Mithun, and Nicholas Evans (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Polysynthesis*, 832-850. Oxford University Press.
- Kurebito, Megumi (2018), Property predication in Koryak viewed from Japanese. In: Pardeshi, Prashant and Kageyama, Taro (eds.) *Handbook of Japanese Contrastive Linguistics*, 677-696. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Kurebito, Megumi (2020), Koryak. In: Tasaku Tsunoda (ed.) *Mermaid Construction, A Compound-predicate Construction with Biclausal Appearance*, 817-849. Berlin/Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Kurebito, Megumi (ed.)(2014), *Koryak Text 1*. Toyama: Faculty of Humanities, University of Toyama.
- Kurebito, Megumi (ed.)(2016), *Koryak Text 2*. Toyama: Faculty of Humanities, University of Toyama.
- Kurebito, Megumi (ed.)(2017), *Koryak Text 3*. Toyama: Faculty of Humanities, University of Toyama.
- Kurebito, Megumi (ed.)(2018), *Koryak Text 4*. Toyama: Faculty of Humanities, University of Toyama.
- Kurebito, Megumi (ed.)(2019), *Koryak Text 5*. Toyama: Faculty of Humanities, University of Toyama.
- Ladd, D. R. & Himmelmann, N. (2008), Prosodic description: an introduction for fieldworkers, in: *Language Documentaion and Conservation*, 2, 244-274
- Lehmann, C. (1988), Towards a typology of clause linkage; in: Haiman, J. & Thompson, S. D. (eds.)
- Linke, A. & Nussbaumer, M. (2000), Rekurrenz; in: *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik*, HSK 16.1, 305-315
- Mann, W. C. & Thompson, S. A. (1986), Relational processes in discourse, in: *Discourse Processes*, 9, 1, 57-90
- Mann, W. C. & Thompson, S. A. (1987), *Rhetorical Structure Theory: A Theory of Text Organization*, ISI/RS Report 87-190, Information Sciences Institute
- Mann, W. C. & Thompson, S. A. (1988), Rhetorical structure theory: towards a functional theory of text organisation, in: *Text*, 8.3, 243-281
- Mann, W. C. & Thompson, S. A. (1992), *Discourse description. Diverse linguistic analysis of a fundraising text*; Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins
- Martin, J. R. (1992), *English Text, System and Structure*; Philadelphia/Amsterdam, John Benjamins
- Mazur, J. (2000), Textlinguistik im slawischen Sprachraum, in: *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik*, HSK, 16.1, 153-163

- McShane, M. J. (2005), *A theory of ellipsis*; Oxford [u.a.], Oxford University Press
- Moll, T. A. (1960), *Korjaksko-russkij slovar'*; Leningrad, Gosudarstvennoe, učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo
- Nagayama, Y. (2003), *Očerki grammatiki aliutorskogo jazyka*, Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University
- Nagayama, Y. & Nutajulgin, V. M. & Čečulina, L. I. (2017), *Nymylansko-russkij slovar': aljutorskij dialekt: Čast' 1*, Sapporo
- Nagayama, Y. & Nutajulgin, V. M. & Čečulina, L. I. (2019), *Nymylansko-russkij slovar': aljutorskij dialekt: Čast' 2*, Sapporo
- Nagayama, Y. & Pronina, E. P. (eds.) (2021), *Jazyk i zhizn' narodov Kamchatki, lichnye istorii i vospominania*, Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University
- Ninani, A. (2014), *Na dobroj zemle: skazki na korjaskom i russkom jazykah: (red. korjaskih tekstov E.P. Pronina; per. s korjak. avtora i E.P. Pronina; Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskij: Novaja kniga - 28 s.: il. (Kamchatskoe detstvo)*
- Nutev'in, K. (2015), *Skaski korjakov reki Anuka=Anok'v'ajamkenav' lymn'ylju: na korjaskom (chavchuvenskom) i russkom jazykah: transliteracija kor. tekstov s latinskoj grafiki na sovremennuju korjaskuju grafiku i perevod na russkij jazyk E. P. Pronina - Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskij: Novaja kniga, 2015 - 44s: il - (Kamchatskoje detstvo)*
- Ortner, H. (1987), *Die Ellipse, Ein Problem der Sprachtheorie und der Grammatikschreibung*; Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag
- Park, J. S. (2002), *Cognitive and interactional motivations for the intonation unit*, in: *Studies in Language* 26,3, 637 - 680
- Pérennec, M. H. (2000), *Textlinguistik im romanischen Sprachraum*, in: *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik, HSK, 16.1*, 145-153
- Prechter, S. (2001), *The significance of discourse markers in the development of social roles*; Trier, Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier
- Pronina, E.P. (2001a), *Programma po korjaskomu jazyku dlja pedagogičeskich učilishch - Korjaskij okružnojj institut usovershenstvovanija učitelej, Palana*
- Pronina, E.P. (2001b), *Programma po korjaskomu jazyku dlja 1 - 4 klassov nachal'noj shkoly - Korjaskij okružnojj institut usovershenstvovanija učitelej, Palana*
- Pronina, E.P. (2002), *Deti Severa: uroki kultury (sbornik dokladov nauchno-praktičeskich seminarov (1999-2000) "Problemy korjaskogo jazyka"; avtor predisl. Erich Kasten; avtor foto na obl. V. Kravchenko) - Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskij: kamc. pech. dvor, kn. izd.-vo 2002 - 167 s - Bibliogr. v konce statej.*

- Pronina, E.P. (2017), *Kartinnij slovar' korjaskogo jazyka: 1-4 klassy: uchebnoe posobie dlja obshheobrazovatel'nyh uchrezhdenij*, 4-e izd. St. Peterburg: filial iz-va Prosveshchenie, 127 s. iv.il. 23 sm - Pril. (23,(1) s.)
- Pronina, E.P. Ajev G. K. (2002), *Uchebnyj tematiceskij slovar' razgovornoj leksiki korjaskogo jazyka*, Korjak. okr. in-t usovershenstvovaniya uchitelej - Palana, Petropavlovsk - Kamchatskij: izd. -vo Kamch. gos. ped. un-ta, 90 s.
- Pronina, E.P., Golovaneva, T.A. (2018), *Korjasko-russkij slovar' k postranichnym snoskam: prilozhenie k knige, Povesti Kecaja Kekketyna: Teksty, Perevody Kommentarii /sostavitel' - Novosibirsk: Tipografija "Srochnaja poligrafija" - 60 s.*
- Quirk et al. (1985, 3.ed.), *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*, London, Longman
- Rath, R. (1979), *Kommunikationspraxis, Analysen zur Textbildung und Textgliederung im gesprochenen Deutsch*; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht
- Reinhart, T. (1984), Principles of Gestalt perception in the temporal organization of narrative texts, in: *Linguistics*, 22, 6, 779-810
- Rickheit, G. & Schade, U. (2000), *Kohärenz und Kohäsion*, in: *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik*, HSK 16.1, 275-283
- Rickheit, G. & H. Strohner (1992), Toward a cognitive theory of linguistic coherence, in: *Theoretical Linguistics*, 18, 209 - 237
- Rickheit, G. & Sichelschmidt, L. (2013), Verstehen von Ellipsen – ein holistischer Prozess, in: Henning, M. (ed.)
- Schade, U. & H. Langer & H. Rutz & L. Sichelschmidt (1991), Kohärenz als Prozeß, in Rickheit, G. (ed.), 7-58
- Schiffrin, D. (1987), *Discourse Markers*; Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Schwabe, K. & Winkler, S. (2003), *The interfaces, deriving and interpreting omitted structures*; Amsterdam, Benjamins
- Schwarz, M. (2001), Kohärenz: materielle Spuren eines mentalen Phänomens, in: Bräunlich, M. & Neuber, B. & Rues, B. (eds.), *Gesprochene Sprache – transdisziplinär*, Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Gottfried Meinhold, 151-159; Frankfurt/Main, Lang,
- Schwarz-Friesel, M. (2007), Indirect anaphors in text, a cognitive account, in: Schwarz-Friesel, M. & Consten, M. & Knees, M. (eds.), 3-20
- Schwarz-Friesel, M. & Consten, M. & Knees, M. (eds.) (2007), *Anaphors in text: cognitive, formal and applied approaches to anaphoric reference*; Amsterdam, Benjamin
- Schwarz-Friesel, M. & Consten, M. (2011), Reference and Anaphora, in: Bublitz, W. & Norrick, N.R. (eds.) 347-372
- Serzisko, F. (1992), *Sprechhandlungen und Pausen, Diskursorientierte Sprachbeschreibung am Beispiel des Ik*; Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag

- Serzisko, F. (1995), Repetition in Discourse Ein Versuch, Paper read at the Cologne Institute of Linguistics, Cologne University
- Serzisko, F. (2000), Repetition in Discourse, Paper read at RCLT La Trobe University, Australia
- Stebnickij, S. S. (1932), Škola na tundre, Moskau, Leningrad
- Stebnickij, S.N. (1947), Bukvar' na koriakskom jazyke dlja koriakskoj nachal'noj shkoly, Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe uchebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo ministerstva prosveshčenija RSFSR
- Stebnickij, S.N. (1994), Očerki po jazyku i fol'kloru koriakov. ed. by A.N. Zhukova, Makeev, and Ch.Taksami, Sankt-Peterburg
- Stutterheim, C. v. (1997), *Einige Prinzipien des Textaufbaus*; Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag
- Thiele, W. (2000), Textlinguistik im englischsprachigen Raum, in: Text- und Gesprächslinguistik, HSK, 16.1, 132-139
- Thompson, S. A. (1987), Subordination and Narrative Event Structure, in: Tomlin, R. S. (ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*; Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins
- Tomlin, R. S. (1985), Foreground – Background Information and the Syntax of Subordination, in: *Text*, 5, 85-122
- Vater, H. (2005), *Referenzlinguistik*; München: Fink
- Viehweger, D. (1989), Coherence – Interaction of Modules, in: Heydrich et al. (eds.)
- Žukova, A. N. (1967), *Russko-Koriakskij Slovar'*; Moscow, Sovetskaja Enciklopedija
- Žukova, A. N. (1968), Koriakskij Jazyk, in: *Iazyki Narodov SSSR: Mongol'skie, Tunguso-Man'chzhurskie u Paleoaziatskie Iazyki*. vol. 5. P. I. Skorik, ed. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Žukova, A. N. (1972), *Grammatika Korjaskogo Jazyka: Fonetika, Morfologija*. Leningrad
- Žukova, A. N. (1980), *Iazyk Palanskih Korjakov*. Leningrad.
- Žukova, A. N. (1988), *Materialy i issledovanija po koriakskomu iazyku*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Žukova, A. N. & Dedyk, V. R. (2004), *Korjaskij jazyk v tablicah, Učebnoje posobie dlja učaščihsja starših klassov, čast' 2*, Sankt Peterburg, Prosveščenie