

From Clause to Discourse: The Structure of Evenki Narrative

Lenore A. Grenoble

1. Introduction

Despite relatively extensive research in Evenki morphosyntax, little attention has been given to analyzing how clauses combine in discourse. This paper presents a first attempt to examine Evenki discourse structure. The present paper provides an analysis of how clauses combine at a local level, and then examines the evidence for larger, upper-level discourse structures. It does not attempt to provide a comprehensive analysis of all discourse structures in Evenki, but rather focuses only on the structure of narrative discourse. Data come from two sources: field recordings of personal narratives and published folklore texts.

This approach to discourse structure stems from two different and, in points, conflicting theoretical claims. While some theories of discourse maintain that it is hierarchically structured, others see it as linear, with cohesion created at the clause and sentential-level; such theories deny the existence of larger discourse units. For example, Halliday and Hasan (1976) argue that cohesive devices in texts serve to create texture at the level of clauses joining with other clauses and specifically state that these clauses do not combine into higher-level structures in the way that clauses combine to create sentences.¹ In a similar vein, Centering Theory (e.g. Grosz and Sidner 1986) aims to provide explanations for both cohesion and salience based on the way discourse entities are introduced and discussed or, more specifically, pronominalized. It rests on the claim that every utterance in a (cohesive) discourse introduces a number of forward-looking centers which are in turn ranked; it is because of this ranking that certain centers acquire prominence. Later work (such as Gordon et al. 1993) has focused exclusively on local-level organization. At the same time, Rhetorical Structure Theory (e.g. Mann and Thompson 1988) centers around the fundamental notion that discourse is hierarchically structured; providing a model for these hierarchies is a central goal of RST. Polanyi and Scha (1983) propose a model of discourse grammar that places each clause in a discourse unit. Their

1 “A text is a unit of language in use. It is not a grammatical unit [...] a text is sometimes envisaged to be some kind of super-sentence, a grammatical unit that is larger than a sentence but is related to a sentence in the same way that a sentence is related to a clause, a clause to a group and so on: by constituency, the composition of larger units out of smaller ones. But this is misleading” (Halliday and Hasan 1976:2).

version of discourse grammar is analogous to syntactic structure in that it is recursive, consisting of various types of coordinations and embeddings of discourse units. Based on a study of Navajo and Central Alaskan Yup'ik, Mithun (2008) argues that the scope of markers of grammatical dependency goes beyond the domain of the sentence to larger discourse and pragmatic contexts, and proposes that such extensions may well be more widespread than previously believed.

Two things are clear. First, clauses can be in a hierarchical relationship, as in the case of subordination, which is an asymmetrical relationship with a head and dependent clause. Cognitive studies of discourse processing support this claim that this relationship is hierarchical and provide evidence that speakers distinguish between superordinate and subordinate clauses. The distinction between main and subordinate clauses, together with information about the main story protagonist, has an effect on anaphors resolution. (Morrow 1985). In a study which centered around the retelling of a non-verbal cartoon, Tomlin (1985) found that speakers reported main, plot-advancing events in main clauses and less important events in subordinate clauses, which further suggests that main clauses are more salient than subordinate ones. In addition to the implications this has for the cognitive processing of discourse, it strongly suggests that main clauses are the center of focus.

Second, in some languages at least, there is a difference between the links used at the boundaries of larger or upper-level discourse structures and the links between sentences within these units. Summary-head linkage (Thompson and Longacre 1985) is one device used at the edges of such units, creating links between them. The Evenki narratives analyzed here provide evidence of a range of devices used to create local-level cohesion. On a more global level, discourse organization is also structured but the linguistic marking of such structures is not obligatory. Clauses and sentences aggregate into topically defined discourse units or *episodes*; the boundaries of such episodes may be linguistically marked. Specific linguistic (i.e. formal) links to preceding or following episodes may also exist, but they are optional, although they are most likely to occur at the boundaries of dialogue episodes.

In the traditional folktales, the upper-level structure is an episode. Episodes have internal topical coherence and there is a strong tendency for the boundaries of episodes to be linguistically marked. Similarly, there are sometimes linguistic links between episodes. But they are not structurally subordinate or superordinate to one another; rather, they stand in a linear relation. In contrast, the personal narratives collected more recently do not show strong evidence of hierarchical organization above the sentence level. While it may be that the differences in structure are due to differences in genre, I hypothesize that they reflect the impact of Russian on Evenki discourse structure. This is seen in an increase in the use of coordinators and a decrease in the use of converbs as a subordinating device along with a decrease in the use of tail-head linkage.

The data used for this study come from two sets of sources: published folklore texts (Romanova and Myreeva 1971, recorded during field expeditions in 1958), and

personal narratives from my own field recordings which were elicited while conducting fieldwork on Evenki in Southern Sakha in 1998 and 1999.² Both sets of texts were collected in regions where the eastern dialects of Evenki are spoken and show some phonological and morphological variation with the described norms of the language (e.g. Konstantinova 1964). The published texts are normalized to standard Evenki orthography and transcribed using IPA here. The longest text used here is taken from Myreeva and Romanova (1971:46–56) and, following their numbering system, is referred to as Text No. 14, (*nuɟurmək aɟadʒ:akan-huna:tka:n*, ‘Njungurmek the orphan girl’). I follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules and abbreviations throughout.³

The discussion is organized into two major sections. The first section examines clause linkage and then turns to how sentences combine. The second section addresses the question of upper-level discourse structures.

2. Cohesion between clauses and sentences

Handbooks and descriptive grammars generally provide only brief discussion of how clauses are combined, with little to no discussion of the range of uses or distribution of these structures. In brief, Evenki clauses are combined in three basic ways: (1) parataxis and intonation; (2) subordination and converbs; (3) coordinators and coordinating particles.⁴ Not all are used with equal frequency. Although standard descriptions of Evenki cite particles as being used to conjoin clauses in my corpus they are more frequently used to conjoin noun phrases and only rarely clauses. There are only a handful of examples, too few to draw any conclusions. More work is needed to determine how extensively they are actually used in conjoining clauses. Coordinators are rarely used to conjoin clauses but do conjoin sentences. The use of converbs for subordination is much more frequent than coordination (Nedjalkov 1997:89–90).

A sentence in Evenki minimally consists of a single clause with a single finite verb. In the unmarked case, a single sentence consists of one and only one finite verb, although there can be multiple nonfinite clauses within a single sentence. The

² The field texts were elicited and transcribed together with N. Ja. Bulatova.

³ The Leipzig Glossing Rules can be found on the Max Planck website at <http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/files/morpheme.html>. Additional abbreviations are as follows: ANT = anteriority; DERIV = derivational; INCEP = inceptive; INGR = ingressive; PART = particle; SIML = simultaneity. The gloss RA is used for the participle in *-rV* which is used in negation in combination with the negative verb *ə-* (glossed here as NEG); see Bulatova and Grenoble (1999:43); Nedjalkov (1997:96–101, 267).

⁴ Kolesnikova (1966:213–216) cites five ways of “expressing the semantic and syntactic relationships between parts of a complex sentence” in Evenki: (1) intonation; (2) constituent order; (3) conjunctions (*sojuzy*); (4) relative conjunctions; and (5) particles. Throughout this paper I refer to coordinators without specifying whether they are conjunctions or temporal adverbials. (See Haspelmath 2008, who uses *coordinator* as the hypernym and *conjunction* for a special type of coordinator, or what he calls ‘and’-coordination.)

question then arises as to how to distinguish a single sentence consisting of multiple finite clauses on the one hand from a series of single-clause sentences on the other. In published texts, there is often no unambiguous way to determine this. In spoken texts, intonation and pauses provide key criteria. In modern Evenki the situation is further complicated by the influence of Russian syntax, which has led to an increased use of conjunctions (often borrowed from Russian) and a decrease of Evenki converbs, and thus a decrease in non-finite subordinating forms. This question requires further research. For the purposes of the present analysis, a sentence will be considered to consist of one and only one finite clause unless there is compelling evidence to analyze it differently.

Parataxis

One strategy for conjoining clauses in Evenki is parataxis. In example (1), all three predicates are in the same finite verb form—the non-future with *-rV-* (allomorph *-dV-*) which here has an aorist reading:⁵

1. Text No. 14, ¶2: p. 46

Bəramən əmə-rə-n, əriksə-n urumul-də-n,
time come-PST-3SG breath-3SG shorten-NFUT-3SG

ŋonim dʒal-i-n urumul-də-n.
long thought-FV-3SG shorten-NFUT-3SG

‘The time had come, her breath shortened, her long thoughts shortened.’

When the subject of each verb is the same, the two conjoined verb forms can occur adjacent to one another, as in (2):

2. Text No. 14, ¶88: p. 54

Ge: bi-mi: ugu: buga
one be-CVB.COND upper world

bukatirin dʒə təgə-rə-n, il-da-n.

5 The exact interpretation of this tense is disputed. Simonov (1999) argues that it is most frequently understood as signaling an action which took place in the immediate past. Nedjalkov (1995:441) analyzes it as a past or a non-future; Nedjalkov (1997:237) shows how the interpretation of tense is dependent upon verb class and glosses it as a non-future. He notes, however, that approximately 98% of verb forms in *-rV-* in narration denote single, past events. Following Nedjalkov, I gloss it here as a non-future but note that it is consistently interpreted as a past or aorist in the examples in this paper. In the dialects under study here, *-tʃV* is one of four past tense morphemes (Bulatova 1987:54). Example (4) illustrates this.

hero PART wake.up-NFUT-3SG stand.up-NFUT-3SG.
 ‘That hero of the upper world woke up and stood up.’

In both (1) and (2) there are no coordinators and all verbs are finite forms, all with the non-future morpheme *-rV-*. Although relatively infrequently, parataxis is found in spontaneous narratives in my field recordings, as in (3):

3. Fieldnotes, Iengra (Sakha), 1998: speaker is 52 year-old woman

bəjə-l ɣənəktədʒəriə:tiniʃə-ɣnə-m bi:
 man-pl walking-3PL see-HABT-1SG 1SG

nugartin minə-βə əβ-kil itʃə-rə
 3PL 1SG-ACC NEG see-RA
 ‘I see people walking around; they do not see me.’

Kolesnikova (1966:216–218) distinguishes two types of paratactically conjoined clauses with conjunctive meaning (*bessojuznye predlozhenija s soedinitel’nymi otnoshenijami*): those where the predicates represent simultaneously occurring actions and those where they signal sequencing. The latter are found most frequently in narrative speech and the verbs occur most typically with the morpheme *-rV-*, i.e., the non-future morpheme. Other finite verb forms are possible, as are participles, although the non-future is by far more common (and has a past tense reading throughout these narratives). Example (2) illustrates this use of parataxis clearly. In contrast, in (3) the two actions are represented as taking place simultaneously: here the speaker describes how she placed herself in a position to observe others without being herself observed, a fact which is important to understanding the upcoming action of the narrative.

Intonation is the primary means for distinguishing clauses which are joined paratactically from those which are not conjoined but rather represent separate sentences (Kolesnikova 1966:225; Lebedeva et al. 1985:246). This topic requires further study and instrumental measurements. Kolesnikova (1966:216–222) distinguishes several different semantic categories of clauses which are combined with varying intonational contours and differing pauses. Temporal and conditional clauses have roughly the same rhythmic patterns. The clause which contains temporal information, or the first of two clauses indicates some kind of condition for completion of the action, is pronounced with elevated pitch; the pause between the two clauses is not significant. In causal phrases, the cause is generally in the second of two clauses. In this type the first clause is uttered with lowered pitch and there is a relatively long pause between the two clauses. When the second of two clauses expresses the consequence of an action, the first clause is uttered with a “calm, narrative-like” intonational contour (p. 221) and the second clause is uttered with elevated intonation. The pause between these two clauses is longer than the pause

preceding a causal clause. These descriptions suggest that different types of conjoined clauses may in fact be distinguished prosodically but the need for further research in this area is clear.

Coordinators

Descriptive grammars of Evenki mention the use of coordinators at best in passing, with little detail, although the lack of detail is itself suggestive of their relatively limited usage. Konstantinova (1964:249) states that there is limited use of the coordinators *taxduk* ‘then’ and *tarit* ‘therefore’, as well as *taxli* ‘then’ and *əmi:βal* ‘although’; the latter two are not found in my corpus. In addition, she notes the use of the (borrowed) Russian conjunction *i* ‘and’. Nedjalkov (1997:90) similarly states that the coordinator *taxduk* is only rarely used for coordinating noun phrases; apposition is the most frequent means. In addition, the particle *-dV* is used for coordinating phrases and, less frequently, clauses. Although in theory clauses can be conjoined with coordinators, in the present corpus (both published texts and field recordings), coordinators are used almost exclusively sentence-initially, not internally. Thus they occur to link sentences (or larger chunks of sentences) but not clauses. Although statistics may be misleading, because the use of coordinators may vary somewhat with individual speaker style and discourse type, a count of their use in Text No. 14 is helpful. In this text, only two coordinators are used: *taxduk* ‘then’ and *tarit* ‘therefore’. There are a total of 25 tokens of *taxduk*, and 17 of *tarit*, or a total of 42 coordinators in the entire text, which consists of 466 sentences. All coordinators are found sentence-initially with the exception of four instances of *taxduk*. In only two of all instances is the coordinator used to conjoin NPs; elsewhere, in sentence-initial or clause-initial position, it conjoins clauses. (In each case that is the coordinator *taxduk*.⁶) Thus there are only two sentences where clauses are conjoined within a sentence, not across sentence boundaries:

4. Text No. 14, ¶6: p. 46

- 1 *ər omolgi; tɣa:ɲna ərdəkəɲ ili-ksa; tuksa-tʃa;*
 this boy morning early get.up-cvb.ant run-pst
- 2 *taxduk kirəktə-βə βa:ksa: əni:n-dulə-βi tuksa:βna əmuβ-tʃə:*
 then woodpecker-acc kill-cvb.ant mother-loc-refl run-CVB.SIML bring-PST

6 In my own field recordings, some conjunctions occur sentence-internally to conjoin clauses or phrases but this is the result of Russian influence, as the conjunctions used are borrowed from Russian (e.g. *i* ‘and’; *posle* ‘after’; and *to...to* ‘now... now’); see Grenoble (forthcoming) for further discussion.

‘Early the next morning this boy got up and ran (out), then having killed a woodpecker, he brought it back to his mother, while running.’

In (4) a series of actions occur in succession: the boy gets up, runs out, kills a woodpecker, and brings it to his mother. The sentence includes two converbs of anteriority (*iliksa:* and *βa:-ksa:*) and a participle of anteriority; these participles, when used non-attributively, often function as finite verbs. The use of the coordinator is unusual and can be seen as conjoining two different sets of action, occurring in two different places. This example itself illustrates the hazards of relying on published texts, where the decision to treat lines 1 and 2 as a single sentence was probably an editorial decision, and does not reflect actual intonation. Thus it seems safe to say that coordinators do not conjoin non-finite clauses or finite clauses across sentence boundaries in the folklore texts. In the following brief personal narrative, where we have acoustic data to justify analyzing each line as a separate sentence, the coordinator occurs sentence-initially in line 3:

5. Field notes, recorded in Iengra (Sakha), 1998; speaker is a 12 year-old boy

- 1 *ta-du: umukon iktənə bi-hi-n*
there-DAT one 3.year.old be-PRS-3SG
‘[There] is one 3-year-old deer there.’
- 2 *bi: tara dʒaβa-ri:β.*
1SG that catch-PST-1SG
‘I caught him.’
- 3 *taxduk nuŋan-dulan təg-ri:m.*
then 3SG-LOC sit-PST-1SG
‘Then I sat on him’
- 4 *nuŋan minə-βə garada:t-ti-n.*
3SG 1SG-ACC throw-DUR-PST-3SG
‘He was throwing me.’
- 5 *bi: nuŋan-man i:ri:β-dʒa-ha:i:ri:β-dʒa-ha tʃutʃuβu-Ø-m.*
1SG 3SG-ACC pull-IPFV-CVB.ANT-pull-IPFV-CVB.ANT let.go-NFUT-1SG
‘I pulled-pulled, let him go.’

This narrative follows what might be considered canonical structure. The first line provides the setting; the verb is in the present tense. After this, lines (2) – (5), each main verb is in the past tense; there are three punctual actions (*dʒaβari:β* ‘I caught’; *təgri:m* ‘I sat’; and *tʃutʃuβum* ‘I let go’) which constitute the foregrounded, plot-advancing actions. This leaves the issue of the verb *garada:tin* ‘he was throwing’ in

line 4 and the imperfective converb forms *iri:βdʒaha:-iri:βdʒaha:* ‘[I] had been pulling [and] pulling’ in line 5. The verb *garada:ttin* ‘he was throwing’ in line 4 differs from the mainline verbs in lines 2, 3, 5 in aspect (it is marked durative) and person (with a 3rd person subject). The change in subject is underscored by the use of the nominative pronoun *nuʃan*. (Although overt use of subject pronouns is by no means required in Evenki, each change of subject is explicitly marked with the pronoun in this narrative: 1SG *bi:* in lines 2 and 5; 3SG *nuʃan* in line 4.) The converbs in line 5 are in the imperfective aspect; reduplication of the converb emphasizes the repetition of the action. Thus the actions signaled by these verbs are distinct in terms of duration and repetition, respectively. They can be seen as providing backgrounded information and, from the speaker’s point of view, motivation for the action of letting the deer go. Despite the rather straightforward nature of this narrative, it should be noted that it is not typical of the majority of narratives in the corpus, in that most sentences (with the exception of line 5) have only one verb form, the finite main verb. Although such short sentences do occur, it is unusual to have four in a row. It is much more frequent for such short sentences to be mixed together with longer sentences with one or more converbs.

This limited use of coordinators is typical for Tungusic. In fact, Brodskaja (1988:49) argues that the Evenki “conjunctions” *tarit* ‘therefore’ and *təli* ‘then’ (which does not occur in the present corpus) are best analyzed not as conjunctions *per se* but rather as anaphoric deictic pronominal adverbs.⁷ Negidal, closely related to Evenki, is described as using only two coordinators *tadukkoj* ‘then’ and *tixəm* ‘therefore’ (Tsintsius 1982) and similarly Ul’ch uses the sequential *tara ~ tatara* ‘then’ or *gutʃi* ‘still’ (Sunik 1985). Even lacks coordinators (Novikova 1980; Robbek 1989). In Udihe the particle *-dV* is used as a coordinator, or borrowings of the Russian conjunctions *i* ‘and’, *a* ‘and’, ‘but’, or *no* ‘but’ are used (Nikolaeva and Tolskaya 2001). The particle *-dV* also occurs in Evenki and is generally more frequent than the use of other coordinators (Nedjalkov 1997:87, 90). My own more recent fieldwork (2008) has shown widespread use of *taxduk* in a conjunctive function, conjoining two or more  as well as frequent use of Russian conjunctions such as *i* ‘and’ and *a* ‘and’, ‘but’, *no* ‘but’, similar to what is described for Udihe.

The spread of the use of conjunctions and, in fact, the wholesale borrowing of Russian *ss* appears to be spreading throughout Siberian languages. Bogoras (1922) noted the use of Russian conjunctions such as *i* ‘and’ and *potom* ‘then’ in Western Itelmen nearly one hundred years ago (cited in Comrie 1996). Use of such conjunctions and conjoining syntax has been noted in Abakan Xakas (Anderson

7 In fact, Brodskaja (1988:48) argues that *gumə*, historically a simultaneous converb from the verb ‘speak’ is the one linguistic device in Evenki which functions as a conjunction, arguing that it is a postposition with respect to the direct speech, i.e. that it occurs immediately after the reported speech and links it to the subsequent text. In example (13) below, however, it precedes direct speech.

2003); in Samoyedic (Bátori 1980); and in Shor in the use of Russian conjunctions and syntax, as in *ili...ili* ‘either...or’; *no* ‘but’; and *kogda* ‘when’ (Nevskaja 2000).

Converbs

Although it is possible to use only finite verbs in sentences and clauses, it is much more common for some of the actions or events to be signaled by converbs, in particular in narratives. Evenki has a complex converb system used for subordination (Nedjalkov 1995, 1997:23–58). The use of converbs is widespread in spoken Evenki and even short narratives frequently have more complex sentences than in (1)–(3), which were atypical in their absolute lack of converbs. Example (6) illustrates a fairly typical use of the converb of anteriority used in conjunction with a finite verb to signal a sequence of actions:

6. Text No. 14, ¶6: p. 46

Omolgi: ja:n ərdəkə:n ili-ksa agi-tki: ηənə-tʃə:.
 boy again early.morning get.up-CVB.ANT forest-ALL go-PST
 ‘The boy, again having gotten up in the early morning, went off to the forest.’

Here the first action in the series is presented in a converb: the converb of anteriority *iliksa*: ‘having gotten up’ signals an action that takes place prior to that of the main verb. This is a typical kind of construction and occurs with high frequency in both spoken language and traditional folktales.

When more than one action occurs prior to that of the main verb, each is signaled with a converb of anteriority:

7. Text No. 14, ¶83: p. 53

[prior context: Hurkokchon asks Gevan to let him in]

1 *Ta:duk Ge:βan-əti:rkə:n urkə-ndʒə-βi ni:-kse:, ər bəjə-βə,*
 then Gevan-old.man door-AUG-REFL open-CVB.ANT this man-ACC

2 *ηa:la-duk-in dʒaβa-ksa:, dʒu:-la:-βi i:β-rə-n.*
 hand-ABL-3SG take-CVB.ANT home-LOC-REFL lead.in-NFUT-3SG
 ‘Then Gevan-old man opened the door, took this man by the hand, [and] led him into his home.’

In (5) three actions are presented as occurring in succession: the converbs of anteriority *ni:kse:* ‘having opened’ and *dʒaβaksa:* ‘having taken’ signal the two actions which precede that of the main verb. The clauses iconically map real-world event order, and a change in ordering of clauses would result in a change in

meaning. Sentences like these are indicative of a difference in how clause structure relates to discourse structure in Tungusic as opposed to Indo-European. Converbs are generally viewed as subordinating devices, such that both converb clauses in (7) are subordinate to the main clause, as is the converb *iliksa*: ‘having gotten up’ in (6). Nedjalkov (1997:23) sees converbs as the “most common way of expressing adverbial subordination” in Evenki. This is in keeping with the canonical definition of a converb as “a nonfinite verb form whose main function is to mark adverbial subordination” (Haspelmath 1995:3).

Finally, it can be seen that converbs are used to conjoin sentences, where the final, finite verb of the first sentence is repeated or “recapitulated” in the beginning of the second sentence with a converb, in tail-head linkage. Tail-head linkage is often associated with languages of Papua New Guinea (see Farr 1999; Genetti 2005; van Kleeff 1988) although it has been identified in a number of other languages as well. The term was first used by Thurman (1975) and is typically defined as “a way to connect clause chains in which the last clause of a chain is partially or completely repeated in the first clause of the next chain” (de Vries 2005:363).⁸

In Evenki tail-head linkage, the main verb of the first sentence prototypically is in final position and the converb clause in the next sentence in initial position, providing clear links across sentence boundaries. There are, however, some deviations in the Evenki data, and temporal adverbials, subjects and sometimes full clauses may occur before the converb clause. In Evenki, tail-head linkage most typically occurs within an episode and not across episode boundaries. Tail-head linkage serves important discourse functions by creating referential coherence and thematic continuity and facilitates cognitive processing.

Example (8) shows typical use of tail-head linkage:

8. Text No. 14, ¶88: p. 54

1 *Ge: bi-mi: ugu: buga*
one be-CVB.COND upper world

bukatirin dze tægə-rə-n, il-da-n.
hero PRT wake.up-NFUT-3SG stand.up-NFUT-3SG

8 de Vries (2005) identifies two types of tail-head linkage in Papuan languages, *chained* and *thematic*. Chained tail-head linkage occurs across chains and carries coreferential coherence mechanisms (such as gender agreements and switch reference) and event sequencing mechanisms (sequence-simultaneity morphology) across chain boundaries. It is chained tail-head linkage which is of interest to us here. In contrast, thematic tail-head linkage involves a head clause that is syntactically separate from the chain and signals thematic discontinuity. I have found no examples of this type in Evenki.

- 2 *Tar ili-ksa:* *tykən gun-də səxə-tfīr o:l-da-n*
 that stand.up-CVB.ANT thus say-NFUT story-POSS do-INGR-NFUT-3SG
 ‘This hero of the upper world woke up and stood up.
 Having stood up, he started to speak, saying:’
 [his speech follows]

Line 1 ends with the finite verb *ildan* ‘(he) stood up’ and line 2 begins with recapitulation of that verb as a converb of anteriority (*iliksa:*), following the demonstrative distal pronoun *tar* ‘that’, which is frequently used in Evenki as an anaphoric pronoun (see §4.1.2).

Tail-head linkage occurs repeatedly throughout published folktales such as Text No.14. It does not appear to be obligatory, and some stretches of discourse occur without any tail-head linkage at all. It is perhaps notable that tail-head linkage occurs only sporadically in my own field recordings, where it is found exclusively in narrative text, as in (9) and (10):

9. Field notes, recorded in Iengra, Sakha, 1999; 69 year-old woman

- 1 *bi: buga-la-βi: mutfu-dzəŋa:-β ənti:l-dulə:-βi:*
 1SG homeland-LOC-REFL return-FUT-1SG parents-LOC-REFL
- 2 *dzu:-la: mutfu:-na əmə-Ø-m dza:n digi-tfi: bi-t/sə:-β*
 home-ALL return-C.SIM come-NFUT-1SG 10 4-POSS be-PST-1SG
 ‘I returned (*lit.* will return) to my homeland, to my parents.
 Returning home, I came, I was 14 years old.’

10. Field notes, recorded in Iengra, Sakha, 1998; 12 year-old boy

- 1 *Papa, amin-mi: gunə-Ø-n:*
 papa father-REFL say-NFUT-3SG
- 2 *Hutə, kə ga-kal pəkyrə:βun-mə.*
 child PRT take-IMPER.2SG gun-ACC
- 3 *Bi: pəkyrə:βun-mə ga-ha pəkyrəjə:n-mi-m*
 1SG gun-ACC take-CVB.ANT shoot-PST-1SG
 ‘Papa, my father, said to me: “Child, take the gun.”
 I, having taken the gun, shot.’

Both of these examples differ from the more prototypical usage seen in (8). Word order in both (9) and (10) shows Russian influence: the verb is not in final position, in line 1 (9) and line 2 (10), without any clear discourse motivation for a change in

canonical word order. (In Text No. 14, in contrast, the verb is fairly rigidly in final position, including imperative forms of the verb. There are no examples of the imperative not in final position.) It is even more striking that there is such limited use of tail-head linkage in the narratives recorded in the field, given its widespread usage in folklore. This difference most likely stems from Russian influence and not a difference in genre (personal narrative versus folklore). In fact, all of the field narratives show some code-switching between Russian and Evenki, regardless of the age or fluency of the speakers (Grenoble 2007).

In sum, Evenki sentences consist of one finite verb form and may also include nonfinite converb forms. Clauses can be combined paratactically and are only infrequently conjoined with coordinators. The use of converbs for subordination is widespread in Evenki narrative and most sentences are longer than one finite verb but include one or two converb clauses. Both coordinators and converbs can be used to create linkage across sentence boundaries, providing some evidence for linkage to create higher-level discourse units, or macro-structures. Section 3 considers the evidence for such structures in detail.

3. Episodes as macro-structures

As seen in section 2, sentences can be conjoined by coordinators or converbs but may not be. The distribution of coordinators and converbs to conjoin sentences is not random but is at least in part determined by discourse structure. In this section I show the organization of Evenki discourse in macro-units or episodes which are themselves organized in non-hierarchically. Episodes are thematically defined but specific linguistic devices may occur (1) at the boundaries of episodes; (2) internal to the episode; and (3) to link episodes. Before turning to a description of these devices, we should first examine the notion of the episode in more detail.

Studies of written narrative have tended to focus on the paragraph as the macro-unit resulting from the hierarchical organization of information. Paragraphs are both thematic and structural units, consisting of groupings or sequences of sentences, which are then organized into the narrative structure. The paragraph is thus interpreted as a structural unit in written discourse, and paragraphs are typically oriented around a (macro- or discourse-level) topic, or “a coherent stretch of discourse, larger than a sentence and smaller than the whole discourse” (Thompson and Longacre 1975:208).⁹ The paragraph is, however, a unit limited to written discourse, and it has been shown that paragraph length is sometimes determined not by topical criteria but by visual criteria, such as avoidance of overly short or overly long paragraphs. For this reason Longacre (1979) distinguishes between a *structural* paragraph and an *orthographic* paragraph to distinguish two different kinds of units, with the orthographic paragraph being determined to a certain extent by “eye

⁹ See also Grimes (1975) and Longacre (1979). Pu (2006) provides a detailed overview and critical discussion.

appeal.” In order to avoid terminological confusion, I use the term *paragraph* here to refer to the orthographic paragraph, and *episode* to Longacre’s structural paragraph.

An episode, like a sentence, can vary length. Although at its lower limit one episode can consist of only one sentence, there appears to be no upper limit in length. That said, the episodes in the present corpus generally consist of no more than 5–8 sentences, with 5 being more typical. Evenki narratives are characterized by three basic kinds of episodes: sequence, descriptive and dialogue episodes.¹⁰ Sequence episodes are the backbone of narrative: they present the main storyline in a series of plot-advancing, chronologically organized clauses and sentences. *Descriptive episodes* encompass a number of types of “description,” including evaluation, background information, scene-setting devices, and so on. *Dialogue episodes* (or *dialogue paragraphs* following Longacre 1996:123–151) consist of direct speech. Whereas much of a story is told in third-person past narrative, the speech of the characters is often reported directly, without deictic shifts. Direct speech is commonly found in both oral and written narratives and, similar to sequence episodes, moves the storyline forward by reporting events. Reported speech—direct or indirect—can serve to advance the plotline of a narrative as much reported events or actions do. For Longacre, the unit is one that is fundamentally dialogue, with two interlocutors participating in the exchange; his examples include two-part or three-part exchanges of the kind identified in conversation analysis. Longacre’s discussion deals primarily with shorter citations, direct or indirect, that are produced in quick succession in narratives. There is little of this in the Evenki corpus, where excerpts of reported speech can be quite short, varying from a quoted word to a clause or sentence (as in example 10), or they can be relatively long, consisting of many sentences. In this case the dialogue episodes are more “paragraph-like” in length. In Text No. 14, the dialogue episodes give the speech of a single interlocutor. I would argue that not every instance of reported speech constitutes a dialogue episode, as individual citations may be embedded in other episodes.

In both folklore and personal narratives, the distinction between the different kinds of episodes is remarkably clear-cut, although evaluation can be incorporated into sequence episodes which are primarily and unambiguously made up of plot-advancing clauses. A full study of episodes in narrative would justify distinguishing at least these three types of episodes. For the present purposes, however, it is

10 Although my analysis here is informed by Longacre’s (1996:101-122) taxonomy of “etic paragraph types,” it differs from it in important ways. Longacre distinguishes a relatively large number of different paragraph types, ranging from sequence to such categories as frustration paragraph or awareness paragraphs. The Evenki narrative texts provide no motivation for distinguishing between these different types, although they may be significant rhetorically. Instead, there are three basic types: two which involve third-person narration—sequence episodes and descriptive episodes—and a third category which involves direct speech—dialogue episodes.

sufficient to differentiate between dialogue episodes on the one hand and sequence and descriptive episodes on the other, as this is the difference which is most regularly marked linguistically.

Within the boundaries of an individual episode, there may be no morphological or syntactic links between sentences. Semantic links are key, and without them an episode lacks coherence. In Evenki, as in other languages, there is a strong tendency for the theme of an episode to be sentential-level topic and subject. Furthermore, once the theme is introduced, it is generally referenced with anaphoric zero, although a full pronoun may also occur. (Beyond this basic distribution, the use of anaphora in Evenki discourse is complex and requires further research.)

In Evenki, there are no clear, obligatory signals for the boundaries of episodes.¹¹ They are noticeably absent from the personal narratives in this corpus. In some cases this may be due to the brevity of the narratives. But in other cases the narratives are quite long with episode changes. In contrast, the folktales do show linguistic marking of episode boundaries, and so the analysis here focuses on their structure. Certain linguistic devices are regularly used in these folktales, and some clear patterns emerge from their usage. That said, the same devices that are used within a single episode are also used at the boundaries of episodes, but with some significant differences in regard to discourse structure. Coordinators and tail-head linkage are more likely to be found internally in sequence episodes, and (2) summary-head linkage is more common at the beginning of a new episode. Both tail-head and summary-head linkage are predictably found immediately before or after dialogue episodes, and when there is clear motivation for creating local coherence.

Coordinators

As mentioned in section 2, coordinators are used relatively rarely in Text No. 14 and, where they do occur, the overwhelming majority (38 out of 42) are used to conjoin separate sentences, not clauses within sentences. One of the coordinators, *taxduk* ‘then’, emphasizes sequentiality, while the other, *tarit* ‘therefore’, signals causal relations between sentences. In this text, *tarit* occurs only episode-internally. The coordinator *taxduk* occurs both within episodes and at episode boundaries, but in predictable ways. Episode internally, both of these coordinators conjoin sentences which are part of a series of actions occurring in one setting (i.e. at the same time, place, and/or involving the same characters) and which are related to one another either sequentially (in the case of *taxduk*) or causally (in the case of *tarit*). In (11), for example, the events in line 1 are highlighted as having occurred before the event of line 2, the return to the homeland:

11. Text No. 14, ¶53: p. 51

¹¹ Longacre (1996:289) points out that it is common for languages not to mark the final. boundary (or closure) of a paragraph, although Highland Papua New Guinea languages do.

- 1 *Sagdagu: sagdaguz-βa ga-βki:, nakuɔdagu: nakuɔdagu-βə ga-βki:*
 older older-ACC take-P.HABT younger younger-ACC take-P.HABT
- 2 *Taxduk buga-la-βar dʒu-la-βar ɔniɔ-dulə-βər ɲənə-βki-l.*
 then homeland-LOC-REFL home-LOC-REFL mother-LOC-REFL go-P.HABT-PL
 ‘The older [brother] took the older [sister], the younger took the younger.
 Then they went to their homeland, to their home, to their mother.’

Use of *taxduk* with a clear sequential meaning is also found in my field recordings. In some cases, it alternates with (or is even supplanted by) the Russian sequential conjunction *potom* ‘then’, as seen in (12):

12. Field notes, recorded in Iengra (Sakha), 1998; speaker is a 55 year-old woman

- 1 *Potom ilan anyani-βa təgə-t-ty-n.*
 then three years-ACC sit-DUR-PST-3SG
- 2 *Taxluk ju-tʃə-n.*
 then leave-PST-3SG
 ‘Then (*Russian*) he sat [was in prison] for three years.
 Then he got out.’

In addition, the coordinator *taxluk* occurs when there is no immediate or direct semantic connection between two adjacent sentences, either within a single episode or across episode boundaries. In both cases, the use of the coordinator creates local coherence, by simply connecting sentences. The coordinator serves to underscore sequentiality and, in so doing, creates coherence.¹² One common instance of this usage can be categorized as a transition from description to action, as exemplified in (13):

13. Text No. 14, ¶23: p. 48

- 1 *Tar ɲəkədʒərəktyɔ, ər-giɔ tar-giɔ ədyn, burga o:tʃa.*
 meanwhile here-ELA there-ELA wind blizzard make-PST

12 This may be a widespread discourse function of conjunctions. Nevile (2006) makes similar claims for the use of what he calls *and*-prefacing in airline pilots’ talk: *and* creates links between preceding and following talk and presents the *and*-prefaced turn as sequentially relevant.

- 2 *Taxduk hargu buga-duk aβahi:l ataman-tyn əmə-tfə:*
 then lower earth-ABL devil-PL ataman-3PL come-PST
 ‘Meanwhile from here and there a wind and a storm started up.
 Then the leader of the devils of the lower world arrived.’

Line 1 provides a description of a change in the weather. (In this text, such changes are associated with changes in scene; see §4.2.2.) In line 2, a new character appears. There are no semantic links between lines 1 and 2, and *taxduk* creates a necessary link between the two and thus serves as a cohesive tie.

The distal deictic pronoun *tar* ‘that’ is relatively frequently used in combination with a converb form; its usages can be divided into three groups according to distribution. First, the construction may be a kind of tail-head linkage where the converb is a recapitulation of the finite verb of the preceding sentence, with the addition of the pronoun *tar*, as in (14):

14. Text No. 14, ¶14; p. 47

- 1 *Tar ahatka:r-kujaka:r buga-la:βar so:mat uta-t-ra-ø*
 that girl-PL-child-PL home-LOC-REFL very hurry-NFUT-DUR-3PL
- 2 *Tar-dat buga-la:βar dʒə jənə-hi-nə.*
 that-PART home-LOC-REFL PRT GO-INCEP-NFUT
- 3 *Tar jənə-hin-dʒə-nə-l, əki.mə-tyn tykən gun-nə*
 that go-INCEP-IMPV-CVB.SIML-PL oldest-3PL thus say-CVB.SIML
- 4 *turəl-ke:n o:tfa:*
 speak-DERIV do-PST
 ‘Those girls were really hurrying home.
 They immediately left for home.
 As they were leaving, the oldest of them started speaking, saying thus:’

Note that lines 3–4 introduce an upcoming dialogue episode; this kind of linkage is particularly prevalent here and at the ends of dialogue episodes, creating transitions between the preceding or following sequence episodes and the direct speech.

Second, the converb may not recapitulate the preceding verb, but paraphrases it in some way, creating summary-head linkage. In such cases, the converb explicitly references the preceding speech with a verb of speech (15) or auditory perception (16). Both examples occur immediately after a direct speech and are representative of the text as a whole:

15. Text No. 14, ¶79; p. 53

Tar guni-ksə; *nuŋan dəgdʒə-xin-ə-n*
 that say-CVB.ANT 3SG fly-INCEP-FV-3SG
 ‘Having spoken, he flew off.’

16. Text No. 14, ¶95: p. 55

Tara: dołdy:ksa: ər dulin buga bukyri-n ətʃə: tuluj-ra
 that hear-CVB.ANT this middle land hero-3SG NEG tolerate-RA
 ‘When he heard that, the hero of middle earth could not stand it.’

Both begin with a mention of the preceding dialogue episode, explicitly referencing the previous speech. In this way summary-head linkage creates a tie between the preceding episode and the upcoming sequence episode.

Third, Text No. 14 shows frequent usage of a lexicalized connective, historically derived from the deictic pronoun *tar* ‘that’ and a converb of anteriority from the verb *ŋəkəj-* ‘go’, as *tar ŋəkəskə:* ‘meanwhile’, which is found in the personal form *tar ŋəkəskə:n* as well as the plural (i.e. *tar ŋəkəskə:l*, *tar ŋəkəskə:r*), although less frequently. Vasilevich (1958:287) cites *tug ŋəkəskə* as particular to the Tungir and Zej dialects, occurring in both singular and plural, with *myz* defined as ‘so’, ‘thus’, but is used only with *tar* in this text. If all its forms are considered together, it is the second most frequent connective in Text No. 14, with a total of 20 tokens.¹³ In only one instance does it repeat the finite verb of the preceding sentence, where it could be considered an instance of tail-head linkage. Elsewhere, there is no lexical link between the sentences, as in (17):

17. Text No. 14, ¶11: p. 47

- 1 *Tykən gun-tʃə:lə:n,*
 Thus say-CVB.ANT-3SG
- 2 *nuŋartyn utə-n urkə-lə-n əmə-ksə:l, tyk-tə-Ø.*
 3PL hut-3SG door-LOC-3SG go-CVB.ANT-PL descend- NFUT-3PL
- 3 *Tar ŋəkəksə:kə:r ɲa:n-da:ɪ tykən gu:l-tʃə:*
 then again-PRT thus say-INGR-PST
 ‘After she had spoken thus,
 they, having arrived at the door of the hut, descended.
 Then, she [one of them] again began to speak thus:’

¹³ Both the connective *tar ŋəkəksə:* and the use of *tar* with a converb of anteriority do not occur at all in my field recordings, again presumably under Russian influence.

This is a typical example for the use of this connective. It does not have lexical meaning in this context but signals some sort of temporal connection between the two sentences. Here it introduces an upcoming dialogue episode.

Dialogue episodes

In the present corpus, episode boundaries are not regularly marked in Evenki narrative, with the exception of dialogue episodes. Dialogue episodes in folktales are consistently introduced by a verb of speech or, less frequently, a verb of perception which reports the hearing of the speech. This may be genre specific, and may be related to the nature of oral literature in Evenki.¹⁴ Although the verbs and the verb forms vary throughout the text, typical examples are seen in (17) above, and in (18)–(19):

18. Text No. 14, ¶8; p. 47

Tara dʒəβuksəjəl əni.ni-n gu.nʃət-te-n:
 that eat-CVB.ANT-PL mother-3SG say-NFUT-3SG
 ‘Having eaten [the meat], his mother started to say.’

19. Text No. 14, ¶20; p. 47

Sol.kok.tʃon ikə-l-də-n:
 Solkokchon sing-INGR-NFUT-3SG
 ‘Solkokchon started singing.’

Such verbs of speech create clear boundaries for the beginning of the dialogue episodes. Explicit reference to the speech of one of the characters helps create smooth transitions from one segment of the text to the next. One striking feature of this particular text is that the dialogue episode itself often begins with formulaic language, which “announces” that the character is speaking directly.

Tail-head linkage and dialogue episodes

Although tail-head linkage occurs primarily episode-internally, there is a strong tendency to use tail-head linkage in the sentences immediately preceding a dialogue episode, as in (20), i.e. in the closing or final boundary of the episode immediately preceding the dialogue:

¹⁴ The reported speech in the personal narratives I have recorded is readily distinguished from straight narration by pauses, changes in intonation, deictic shifts, changes in voice (imitating the speech of the original speaker) and, quite frequently, in code-switching.

20. Text No. 14, ¶23-24; p. 48

- 1 *Tar axi:la:-da:βi amə-tʃə:*
 that marry-CVB.PURP-REFL come-PST
- 2 *Tar amə-ksə:kən dʒə tykən gu:n-də ulgur-də-tʃə; səjəli: səhərgə-l-tʃə:*
 that come-CVB.ANT PRT thus say-NFUT tell-IMPV-PST story-? tell-INGR-PST
- 1 ‘He came to get married.
 2 Having come, he spoke thus, telling this story.’

Example (20) exemplifies the use of tail-head linkage in these contexts: it conjoins the two sentences immediately preceding a dialogue episode. The second of these sentences overtly introduces direct speech with a verb of communication. In Text No.14 tail-head linkage of this type is found at the conclusion of a longer episode and also in between two dialogue episodes, such that it provides the only link between two otherwise adjacent dialogue episodes. It is not obligatory but the frequency with which it occurs is striking: it is found before 10 of a total of 40 dialogue episodes in this text. Rhetorically it does not introduce the upcoming dialogue episode so much as signal closure of the preceding episode, at least in cases where the preceding episode consists of more than the two linked sentences.

Summary-head Linkage

Changes in scene—changes in the physical setting, in particular a change in location, or a change in the participants—are signaled not only semantically, with explicit changes in content, but also morphosyntactically. Change in setting also includes major changes in weather; in Text No. 14 such changes symbolize the onset of a new scene and are often followed by the appearance of a new participant, or a change in spatial or temporal setting. The beginning of a new scene is often marked with what can be called *summary-head linkage* (Thompson and Longacre 1985), where the first clause (or sentence) of the new unit summarizes the events, actions or speech of the preceding unit. It differs from tail-head linkage, where the main verb of the first sentence is repeated with a converb in the first clause of the subsequent sentence. In summary-head linkage, the converb clauses does not repeat or recapitulate a specific verb in the preceding sentence; rather it references the actions of the preceding unit by “summarizing” them. The criteria for defining summary-head linkage in Evenki are thus in part formal and in part semantic. Formally, summary-head linkage is signaled by a sentence-initial converb; semantically, this converb recaps the contents of the preceding episode. The converb functions as a clear signal that the previous episode (and scene) has ended and a new one is beginning. It thus serves as a kind of signpost to the interlocutors about narrative

structure. This is illustrated in the following example. In the interest of space, I have provided a summary of the surrounding context:

21. Text No. 14, ¶86: p. 54

Prior context: descriptive episode in which Gevan feeds Huruguchon, who eats a lot.

Tar dʒəβu-ksə: ətə-rə-n-də, butkatyri-l-du:la: ɲənə-rə-n.
 that eat-CVB.ANT finish-NFUT-3SG-PART hero-PL-LOC go-NFUT-3SG
 ‘Having eaten, he finished, and went to the heroes.’
 [following context: description of the heroes]

The converb of anteriority *dʒəβuksə:* summarizes the content of the previous episode, where Hurguchon’s eating is described in detail. This line signals a transition in setting (from Gevan’s house to the place where the heroes are sleeping) and in action (from feasting to waking up these heroes).

Summary-head linkage frequently occurs after a dialogue episode. Here it serves to introduce the next episode or the speech of a different protagonist. In all such instances the summary is encoded in a converb of anteriority. It is an overstatement to call this a “summary,” as the converb clause does not recapitulate the contents of the preceding discourse. Rather, it simply makes reference to the speech itself. Thus it is not a true “summarizing” device but rather a coherence mechanism. In this particular instance, it helps create a smooth transition from a dialogue episode to third-person narration and thus serves global coherence.

22. Text No. 14, ¶95: p. 55

[context: hero of upper world makes his dying speech]

Tara do:dy:ksa; ər dulin buga bukyr-in ətʃə: tulu:ra.
 that hear-CVB.ANT this middle earth hero-3SG NEG stand-RA
 ‘Having heard that, this hero of middle earth could not stand it.’
 [following context: a battle which results in the death of avahi]

Example (23) is the first line of the final episode of the story, concluding the tale with the final wedding. It begins with a summarizing statement about the preceding text, which was a dialogue episode:

23. Text No. 14, ¶113: p. 56

[context: Gevan concludes speech to Hurkokchon about marrying his daughter]

Tar ulgutʃəməʃi-ksə:l hunaʃ-pa-n
 that talk-CVB.ANT-PL girl-ACC-3SG

ga-da-n sibajβa-βa o:ra-n
 take-NFUT-3SG wedding-ACC make-NFUT-3SG

‘Once they had discussed [this], he (Hurkokchon) took his daughter and married her.’

Episodes are organized thematically into longer stretches of text. In longer narratives, these episodes can be further grouped into larger scenes. Such scenes are marked by thematic continuity but do not have any specific linguistic marking.

Of all three types, dialogue episodes are the most clearly marked linguistically, in terms of being clearly delineated from surrounding episodes and in terms of deictic shifts, due to a change from third-person (and, frequently, past tense) narration in sequence episodes to the deictics of direct speech, i.e., the first and second persons and, as appropriate, the present or future tense. In Evenki narrative, dialogue episodes are consistently introduced with verbs of communication, which provide explicit signals of upcoming direct speech. In addition, a particular kind of tail-head linkage is frequently found at the end of the previous episode as an indicator of an upcoming episode boundary. They are frequently also opened by a converb construction and frequently have some sort of explicit closure as well. Dialogue episodes are the most clearly delineated episodes in the texts in my corpus.

4. Conclusion

Thus narratives are not simply a linear string of sentences or clauses but are in fact hierarchically organized such that some parts of the text are subordinate to others. They are subordinate both structurally and in terms of information status. Moreover, the structure affects how new information can contribute to the discourse. This is a two-way relation, so that just as main, pivotal plot-advancing information is in main clauses and less important, background or elaboration is in subordination clauses, so too can it be said that the information encoded in main clauses is interpreted as more central, pivotal, foregrounded, or in focus. Cohesion is created at a local-level as clauses are connected to one another. Building from the bottom up, smaller units come together in larger units, or episodes. The episode is a macro-unit which is often defined semantically, as consisting of a series of related propositions or as “a sequence of sentences dominated by a macroproposition” (van Dijk and Kintsch 1983:204). In the data presented here, episodes are linked at a local level, at episode boundaries, and in this sense in a linear fashion, not hierarchically in a structural sense.

Although the present analysis has relied heavily on one lengthy folktale, the structures here are representative. It is striking that the use of such macro-structures,

as well as the use of tail-head linkage, is found almost exclusively in folklore texts that were collected some decades ago, when there was a larger speaker population of Evenki. More importantly, the folktales were collected from speakers who were either monolingual or who had at most limited command of Russian and claimed Evenki as their first language. While it might be argued that the presence of tail-head linkage is genre-specific, and thus found only in folklore, I would assert that this is not the case. Compelling evidence against this is the sporadic use of tail-head linkage in some spontaneous personal narratives (as in example 5). In addition, the use of such structures is both areally and typologically expected. The lack of such structures in more recent field recordings can best be explained through Russian contact. It is broadly claimed that discourse features can and do spread. Although more work is needed in this area, examples include Ameka (2007:137–139) for contact influence on discourse formulae and the ways of telling stories in Likpe and Epps (2007) for pragmatic features in Hup. An extreme version of this view is found in Beier et al. who posit the existence of discourse areas, in contrast to linguistic areas, and argue that discourse categories may—and often do—precede grammatical diffusion. Quite specifically, they propose that “the sharing of discourse forms, which can be motivated on political and cultural grounds, mediates the borrowing of grammatical forms” (p. 137). In their model, linguistically distinct groups come to an area and borrow discourse forms, such as myths, folklore, and ceremonies. After this kind of intense interaction, linguistic forms (phonological, morphological, syntactic, or semantic) which are embedded in these discourse forms surface in the language of the borrowing group. Although the strong view of this model requires further research, it does support diffusion of discourse features, such as the cohesive devices examined here.

References

- Ameka, Felix. 2007. Grammars in contact in the Volta Basin (West Africa). On contact-induced grammatical change in Likpe. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon, eds., *Grammars in contact. A cross-linguistic typology*, 114-142. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2003. Yeniseic languages from a Siberian areal perspective. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 56, 1/2:12-39.
- Bátori, István. 1980. Russen und Finnougrier: Kontakt des Völker und Kontakt des Sprachen. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Beier, Christine, Lev Michael and Joel Sherzer. 2002. Discourse forms and processes in indigenous Lowland South America: An areal-typological perspective. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31:121-145.
- Bogoras, W. 1922. Chukchee. In F Boas, ed., *Handbook of American Indian Languages II*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian.
- Brodskaja, L. M. 1988. *Slozhnopodchinennoe predlozhenie v èvenkijskom jazyke*. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Bulatova, N. Ja. 1987. *Govory èvenkov amurskoj oblasti*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Bulatova, Nadezhda Ja. and Lenore A. Grenoble. 1999. *Evenki*. (LWM/141). Munich: Lincom.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1996. Language contact in northeastern Siberia (Chukotka and Kamchatka). In Jahr, Ernst Håkon and Ingvild Broch, eds., *Language contact in the Arctic. Northern pidgins and contact languages*, 33-45. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Epps, Patience. 2007. The Vaupés melting pot: Tucanoan influence on Hup. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon, eds., *Grammars in contact. A cross-linguistic typology*, 267-289. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farr, Cynthia J.M. 1999. *The interface between syntax and discourse in Korafe, a Papua language of Papua New Guinea*. (Pacific Linguistics C-148.) Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Genetti, Carol. 2005. The participial construction of Dolakhā Newar. Syntactic implications of an Asian converb. *Studies in Language* 29/1:35-87.
- Gordon, Peter C., Barbara J. Grosz and Laura A. Gillion. 1993. Pronouns, names, and the centering of attention in discourse. *Cognitive Science* 17:311-347.
- Grenoble, Lenore A. *forthcoming*. The impact of Russian in the Siberian linguistic context: The case of Evenki. In Bostjan Dvorak and Stephan Eissler, eds., *Proceedings of the 2007 Congress of the Slavic Linguistic Society*.
- . 2007. Pereklyuchenie kodov i izmenenija v jazykovoj structure, in Nikolai Vakhtin, ed., *Jazykovye izmenenija v uslovijax jazykovogo sdviga*, 116-138. St. Petersburg: ILLI RAN.
- Grimes, Joseph E. 1975. *The thread of discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Grosz, Barbara J. and Candace L. Sidner. 1986. Attention, intentions, and the structure of discourse. *Computational Linguistics* 12/3:175-204.

- Halliday, M.A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. New York: Longman.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1995. The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category. In Martin Haspelmath and Ekkehard König, eds., *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective*, 1-55. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 2007. Coordination. In Timothy Shopen, ed., *Language typology and syntactic description, vol. II: Complex constructions*, 1-51. (2nd edition.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kolesnikova, V. D. 1966. *Sintaksis èvenkijskogo jazyka*. Moscow-Leningrad: Nauka.
- Konstantinova, O. A. 1964. *Èvenkijskij jazyk*. Moscow-Leningrad: Nauka.
- Lebedeva, E. P., O. A. Konstantinova and I. V. Monaxova. 1985. *Èvenkijskij jazyk*. Leningrad: Prosveshchenie.
- Longacre, Robert E. 1979. The paragraph as a grammatical unit. In Talmy Givón, ed., *Discourse and syntax. Syntax and semantics* 12, 213-241. New York: Academic Press.
- . 1996. *The grammar of discourse*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Mann, William C. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1988. Rhetorical Structure Theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text* 8/3:243-281.
- Mithun, Marianne. 2008. The extension of dependency beyond the sentence. *Language* 84/1:69-119.
- Morrow, D.G. 1985. Prominent characters and events organize narrative understanding. *Journal of Memory and Language* 24:304-319.
- Nedjalkov, Igor' V. 1995. Converbs in Evenki. In Martin Haspelmath and Ekkehard König, eds., *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective*, 421-455. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 1997. *Evenki*. London: Routledge.
- Nevile, Maurice. 2006. Making sequentiality salient: *and*-prefacing in the talk of airline pilots. *Discourse Studies* 8/2:279-302.
- Nevskaja, Irina. 2000. Shor-Russian contact features. In Dicky Gilbers, John Nerbonne and Jos Schaecken, eds., *Languages in contact*, 283-298. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Nikolaeva, Irina and Maria Tolskaya. 2001. *A grammar of Udihe*. London: Routledge.
- Novikova, K. A. 1980. *Ocherk dialektov èvenskogo jazyka: Ol'skij govor*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Polanyi, Livia and R. J. H. Scha. 1983. The syntax of discourse. *Text* 3/3:261-270.
- Pu, Ming-Ming. 2006. Discourse organization and coherence. In June Luchjenbroers, ed., *Cognitive linguistics investigations: Across languages, fields and philosophical boundaries*, 305-324. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Robbek, V. A. 1989. *Jazyk èvenov Berëzovki*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Romanova, A. V. and A. N. Myreeva. 1971. *Fol'klor èvenkov jakutii*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Simonov, Mixail Dmitrievich. 1999. Eshche raz o proisxozhdenii nastojashchego vremeni na -RA v tunguso-man'chzhurskix jazykax. *Linguistic and Oriental Studies from Poznan* 4:17-24.
- Sunik, O. P. 1985. *Ul'chskij jazyk. Issledovaniya i materialy*. Leningrad: Nauka.

From Clause to Discourse: The Structure of Evenki Narrative

- Thompson, Sandra A., and Robert E. Longacre. 1985. Adverbial clauses. In Timothy Shopen, ed., *Language typology and syntactic description, Volume II: Complex constructions*, 171-234. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thurman, R. C. 1975. Chuave medial verbs. *Anthropological Linguistics* 17/7:342-352.
- Tomlin, R.S. 1985. Foreground-background information and the syntax of subordination. In Talmy Givón (ed.), *Quantified studies in discourse. Text* (Special Issue), 5: 85-123.
- Tsintsius, V.I. 1982. *Negidal'skij jazyk*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. and Walter Kintsch. 1983. *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- van Kleef, Sjaak. 1988. Tail-head linkage in Siroi. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 20:147-56.
- Vasilevich, G. M. 1958. *Èvenkijsko-russkij slovar'*. Moscow: Gos izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovarej.
- Vries, Lourens de 2005. Towards a typology of tail-head linkage in Papuan Languages. *Studies in Language* 29/2:363-384.