

The Kamas repetitive adverb *bazoʔ* 'again, in addition, in turn, back again'

Gerson Klumpp

University of Tartu

1. Introduction

For the Kamas adverb *bazoʔ*, glossaries and grammar sketches report the two meanings (i) 'again, anew' (German 'wieder, aufs neue', Russian 'опять', Swedish 'ännu') and (ii) 'in addition, another, one more' (German 'noch'¹, Russian 'ещё', Swedish 'ånyo'): *bāzoʔ*, *bāzuʔ* 'aufs neue, wieder; noch' (KW: 8b, 185), *baazóʔ*, *baazoʔ* 'опять; еще / ännu; ånyo', *baazoʔ* 'опять; ещё' (Castrén 1847: 91, 218), *bāzoʔ* 'noch' (Castrén 1855: 191), *bazoʔ* 'aufs Neue; noch' (Castrén 1854: 601), and in the Koybal dialect *базы* 'ещё' (Spasskij 1806: 39). The word is a borrowing from South Siberian Turkic (Joki 1952: 84–85), where it means 'again, once more', e.g., Literary Xakas *пазох* 'ещё раз' (XRS 1980: 139), Qoybal, Qaragas *bazók* 'wiederum' (Castrén 1857: 125, 164). The Turkic word actually consists of two parts, namely, a repetitive adverb *paza*, *baza* 'also, another; again' (Radloff 1960 IV: 1193, XRS 1980: 139, Castrén 1857: 125, 164) plus an enclitic additive particle =*ok*/=*ök* 'also' (Radloff 1960 I: 991–992, XRS 1980: 133, Castrén 1857: 85, 134). The Turkic word-final consonant *k* ~ *x* became a glottal stop in Kamas. This glottal stop may also be dropped or assimilated with a following consonant (cf. Joki 1952: 85). The vowel of the second syllable may be reduced (see the phonetic variants in KW: 8b). The spelling of the Koybal form <базы> thus suggests a reading [bazəʔ]. The borrowed adverb is attested only in Kamas and Koybal, but neither in the other Sayan Samoyed language Mator, nor in any South Selkup dialect which had been in contact with Turkic. The two components of the Turkic word do not occur as separate borrowings in Kamas.²

¹ Cf. Umbach (2012: 1844) on German *noch*: "The additive reading of *noch* cannot be translated into English by a focus particle – neither *still* nor *even* nor *also/too* are equivalent. Translation is usually provided by *in addition* (unstressed variant) and *another, one more* (stressed variant)".

² In Kott, a Yeniseic language of the area, an equivalent adverb is attested, in which the same Turkic additive particle figures on an indigenous stem: *inšo*, *inšöx* 'noch; wiederum' (Castrén 1858: 249, 260). One may note that the Kott stem *inš(-)* differs from the Proto-Yeniseic stem with the same meaning **pʰasə* 'noch' (Werner 2002, Vol. 2: 304), which, on the other hand, shows striking similarity to the South Siberian Turkic word *paza* 'auch, noch' (Radloff 1960 IV: 1542). Radloff's dictionary,

In the Kamas text corpus, along with the aforementioned meanings, two additional meanings of *bazo?* can be observed, namely, (iii) ‘in turn’ and (iv) ‘back again’. As is generally known, the Kamas text corpus consists of two unequal parts: a small corpus of approximately 3,500 words recorded by Kai Donner from two speakers in 1912–1914, at a time when a small community held the language still in use (see KW: XXXVII–XLI), and a larger corpus of ca. 61,000 words recorded by Ago Künnap from two reactivated rememberers in the 1960s and early 1970s (see e.g. Künnap 1991). With the exception of four fragmentarily preserved phonograph recordings (see Klumpp 2013) the Donner materials consist of the writings as published by A. J. Joki in KW. The Künnap materials, in contrast, consist of tape recordings that were fully transcribed only recently and published along with the Donner texts in the Hamburg INEL Kamas corpus (see Arkhipov et al. 2019, Gusev et al. 2019). Altogether there are 203 instances of *bazo?* in the texts, 20 in the Donner texts (19 in the published texts and one in the unpublished phonograph recordings³), and 183 in the Künnap texts.⁴ From the Künnap texts, seven instances have been sorted out because of unintelligible contexts so that the actual numbers relevant for the present article are $19 + 176 = 195$.

Two typical instances of the reading ‘again’ of *bazo?* are illustrated in (1b). In the first instance, the adverb occurs in clause-initial position, and in the second instance in preverbal position. Note that in the examples cited in this article, the text in (a) always introduces a preceding event which provides the frame for the repeated event in (b), which may be followed by further repetitions (c), (d), etc. The reference to the INEL corpus contains the relevant sentence numbers. In examples from the Donner texts, I add the tale number as in KW. Where necessary, transcription, glossings and translations have been slightly adapted.

(1) AA_1914_Girl_flk.007, 014 (Tale 10 in KW)

- a. *büze tuno-bi urgāba mo-la? a?t̥-gən kalla? nō-bi.*
 man run-PST.3SG bear become-CV road-LOC go.CV stand.DUR-PST.3SG
 ‘The man ran and turned into a bear. He went and stood on the road.’
- b. ***bazo?** dī büze urgāba mo-bīza **bazo?** a?t̥-gən nu-la?bə.*
 REP DEM man bear become-CV:ANT REP road-LOC stand-DUR.PRS.3SG
 ‘Again the man having turned into a bear was again standing on the road.’

in addition to the South Siberian Turkic and Uyghur forms, mentions a Sart word *baz* ‘noch, wiederum’ for which Persian origin is indicated. Radloff seems not to link the Sart word to the South Siberian Turkic word *paza*, for which Joki (1952: 85), finally, suggests a Mongolic origin.

³ See file SU0233 at the Archive of Dialects and Related Languages of Estonian at Tartu University (<http://www.murre.ut.ee/arhiiv/>), digits 7.16–7.22. The understanding of the text passage is currently not sufficient to include the example into the present research.

⁴ In the Künnap texts 54 instances are spelled *bazo* (without the glottal stop), which is a free variant with no difference in meaning.

The function of *bazo?* in (1b) is that of a repetitive adverb, which presupposes a preceding event of the same kind as the one asserted in the clause it occurs in. In the definition by Tovena and Donazzan (2008: 87), an adverb of repetition “does not modify in a direct way the assertive content of the sentence in which it occurs, but adds to its presupposed content the piece of information that there exists (at least) another event that temporally precedes the asserted one and shares with it some relevant property”. The authors spell out two core semantic conditions for repetitive adverbs: (i) Ordering of the two events in time such that “the asserted event is the repeated one and must follow the presupposed event(s)”; (ii) “Existence of a shared property that characterizes the asserted event as being the repetition of the presupposed one” (Tovena and Donazzan 2008: 90). Both conditions are satisfied with *bazo?* in (1b). In fact, except for event time, (1a) and (1b) share not one, but all properties: the same man turns into the same bear and stands on the same road. In Section 2, the reading ‘again’ of *bazo?* is investigated in more detail. While the temporal ordering of the two events does not raise any doubts, the exact character of their relevant shared properties needs clarification. As will be seen, full identity as in (1a, b) is not the only felicitous constellation for the use of *bazo?* in the meaning ‘again’.

In their analysis of repetitive adverbs, Tovena and Donazzan include also operators which are often called *additive*, as e.g. the aforementioned German *noch* (Umbach 2012), i.e. operators which fall into the domain of the second meaning of *bazo?* ‘in addition, another, one more’. This meaning is illustrated in (2b).

(2) PKZ_196X_SU0229.069, 071

- a. *dīgəttə šestra-nə ni-t mǐ-bie-m tüzöj, i ular mǐ-bie-m.*
 then sister-LAT son-3SG give-PST-1SG cow also sheep give-PST-1SG
 ‘Then I gave a cow to the son of my sister, and also a sheep I gave.’
- b. *dīgəttə oñi? ne-nə bazo büzo mǐ-bie-m.*
 then one woman-LAT REP calf give-PST-1SG
 ‘Then, in addition, I gave a calf to a woman.’

In (2b), the predicate in the scope of the adverb is a repetition of the events in (2a) only to the degree that the speaker-subject again gives some farm animal to somebody, but the actual animals and also the recipients differ. A translation with ‘again’ would not be felicitous here, instead ‘in addition’ applies. (The German equivalent would be unstressed *noch* as in ‘Dann habe ich noch einer FRAU ein KALB gegeben’). Instances like (2b) will be discussed in Section 3. Following Tovena and Donazzan (2008), I keep the term *repetitive adverb* also for these instances because the notion of re-, not co-occurrence seems to be a crucial component of Kamas *bazo?*. This also holds for the rarer meanings ‘in turn’ and ‘back again’, which will be treated in Sections 4 and 5, respectively. I also prefer the term *repetitive adverb* over the competing term *iterative particle* sometimes used for words like German *wieder*, or English *again* (see e.g. Goebel 2020: 184, Tiemann et al. 2015).

While this article deals in detail only with *bazo?*, it should not go unmentioned that the adverb in question is not the only repetitive and/or additive operator in Kamas. Others are the enclitic particle =gö, e.g. *ine=gö* ‘noch ein Pferd (another horse)’ (KW: 190), whose syntactic and semantic functional range is quite unclear because it is not attested in any text. One may assume that it is a functional equivalent to the South Siberian Turkic particle =ok/=ök mentioned in the beginning. This topic shall not be pursued here. All other operators are earlier or later borrowings from Russian. Already in the Donner texts, we find the conjunction *i* ‘also, and’ (copied from Russian и) and the adverb *iššo* ‘still, yet, another’ (copied from Russian ещё). The first one connects events (x occurred and also y occurred), not presupposing that the second event would share reoccurring properties with the first one. There are three such instances in the Donner texts. I did not count the multitudinous instances in the Künnap texts. The other one, *iššo*, clearly overlaps with the meaning ‘another’ of *bazo?* and will be discussed in Section 3.3. In the Künnap texts, two more Russian operators appear: the additive focus particle *tože* ‘also, too’ (copied from Russian тоже), and the enclitic particle =že in additive use (copied from Russian же). They do not occur with proper repetitions, but relate the expression in their scope to another utterance, predicate or argument. I will come back to *tože* in Section 2, but the 14 instances of additive =že will not be discussed in this contribution.

In the following sections 2–5, I turn to the four different meanings of *bazo?* in the order as in the title of the paper: ‘again’, ‘in addition...’, ‘in turn’, and ‘back again’. Wherever possible, I will point out changes which may be identified between the Donner and the Künnap texts. Results are summarized in Section 6.

2. ‘Again’

In both subcorpora, the majority of instances of *bazo?* occurs with the unchallenged meaning ‘again’ (14 out of 19 in the Donner texts and ca. 140 out of 176 in the Künnap texts⁵). There are (at least) three subtypes which will be discussed in the following order in the next subsections: repetitive proper (2.1), repetitive-restitutive (2.2), and repetitive with differing arguments, which may have a given referent (2.3.1), or a new referent (2.3.2).

⁵ The examples were classified on the basis of their (often quite long) contexts. In some instances several readings are possible. The actual translations in the corpus reflect choices by the editors. Neither for the Donner, nor for the Künnap texts are original Russian translations by bilingual speakers available. The greatest part of the translations of the Künnap texts was provided by the INEL team. Here, the Russian translation is often the closest one. Besides *опять* ‘again’ we find *снова* and *вновь* ‘anew’, *ещё* ‘another, in addition, (к) другой ‘(to) another’’, *тоже* ‘also’, *дальше* ‘further’, *назад* and *обратно* ‘back’ as well as forms of the verb *вернуться* ‘return’, and others. Naturally, the English and German translations show a lot of variation too.

2.1. *Repetitive proper* means that the reoccurring event differs from the preceding event only in time, but their predicates and arguments are the same. Typical instances of the proper repetitive function were already presented in (1b) above, two more are presented in (3b–c) and (4b–c). The examples consist of parallel text passages from the two different Kamas text corpora, (3) from a tale recorded by Donner and (4) from a renarration of the same tale recorded by Künnap. Two children sit at the side of a road and whistle upon the arrivals of different horsemen.⁶ In all four instances, the adverb stands in the typical preverbal position.

(3) AA_1914_Brothers_flk.021, 26, 33 (Tale 6 in KW)

- a. *dī-zeŋ šündā-bi-i?*
DEM-PL whistle-PST-3PL
‘They whistled.’
- b. *bazo? šündā-lü?-bi-i?*
REP whistle-MOM-PST-3PL
‘They whistled again.’
- c. *dī-zeŋ esseŋ bazo? šündā-bi-i?*
DEM-PL child.PL REP whistle-PST-3PL
‘They, the children, whistled again.’

(4) PKZ_196X_SU0223.005, 013, 019

- a. *dīgəttə oŋi? svistnul tāŋ*
then one whistle.MOM.PST.3SG.MASC (Ru.) strong
‘Then one [of them] whistled forcefully.’
- b. *dīgəttə dī-zeŋ bazo? svistnul[i]* (...)
then DEM-PL REP whistle.MOM.PST.3PL (Ru.)
‘Then they whistled again (...)’
- c. *dī-zeŋ bazo? svistnuli*
DEM-PL REP whistle.MOM.PST.3PL (Ru.)
‘They whistled again.’

As concerns the identity of arguments, one may observe a slight irritation: in (4a), one of the children whistles, but in (4b, c) both of them, so there is only partial identity between the subject arguments of (4a) and (4b). It may suffice here to observe that this does, obviously, not challenge a felicitous reading in terms of ‘again’.

2.2. *Restitutive* means that the part of an event which is perceived as a repetition is not necessarily the action itself, but its result, e.g. *Tina closed the window again* may mean that Tina caused the window to be again in the state of being closed, but in the fact she

⁶ These horsemen are “heroes” in the Donner tale, but “wizards” in the Künnap tale. This detail may be remembered later in the article.

has never closed it before. There is an immense amount of literature on the repetitive-restitutive ambiguity of English *again* and German *wieder* (see e.g. Blackham 2017 for an overview, or Gergel and Beck 2015 with a diachronic perspective on *again*). The two different meanings may be distinguished by stress, e.g. German stressed *wieder* is repetitive, unstressed *wieder* restitutive (Fabricius-Hansen 1983: 98), or by combination with adverbs (German *wieder* ~ *wieder zurück*, English *back* ~ *back again*), or languages may have several repetitive adverbs of which some are ambiguous, others not: e.g. in Hungarian, *megint* shows both readings, but *ismét* only the repetitive reading (Csirmaz 2015). In the Kamas data I find it difficult, sometimes even impossible, to decide in which cases the use of *bazo?* is repetitive and in which cases restitutive because often both readings apply at the same time. E.g. in (1b) above, the second instance ('standing on the road again') may well be read as restitutive if the road is the place where the bear usually lingers. Another ambiguous case is (5)–(6), again from parallel versions of a tale. The tale is about a man and a woman who run out of food, acquire life-stock, lose it, and in the end find themselves starving again. Note that the predicates in (5a–b) are of a co-hyponymic relation (run out of food, starve), in (6a–b) they are identical.

(5) AA_1914_Head_flk.002, 050 (Tale 9 in KW)

- a. *dī-zen am-žət-tən nag-o-uʔ-bi* (...)

DEM-PL.GEN eat-INF-3PL NEG.EXIST-DUR-MOM-PST.3SG

'They had run out of food.'
- b. *dī nüke büze ĩmbi-dən=də naga, bazo? püjō-lāmnə-bi.*

DEM woman man what-3PL=INDEF NEG.EXIST.PRS.3SG REP hunger-DUR-PST

'The woman and the man were left with nothing, they were starving again.'

(6) PKZ_196X_SU0225.156, 207

- a. *dī-zen ĩmbi=də nag-o-bi* (...)

DEM-PL.GEN what=INDEF NEG.EXIST-DUR-PST.3SG

'They had nothing (...).'
- b. [...] *ĩmbi=də bazo? naga dī-zeŋ-də*

what=INDEF REP NEG.EXIST.PRS.3SG DEM-PL-LAT

'[...] again they have nothing'.

I call the use of *bazo?* as in (5b) and (6b) repetitive-restitutive, and I found such ambiguity in 5 of the 14 *again*-instances of the Donner texts, and in approximately one third of the 140 instances of the Künnap texts. However, if one looks for examples in which the context clearly reveals that it is not about a reoccurring action but only about the restitution of a former state (e.g., something was lost and somebody brings it back), the number is much smaller (0 in the Donner texts, 16 in the Künnap texts). These are instances of the counterdirectional meaning 'back again', in which *bazo?* is competing with the spatial adverb 'back(ward)'. These cases will be discussed separately in Section 5.

2.3. The third type of ‘again’ to be discussed here is repetitive, but with differing arguments, given or new. As stated by Tovena and Donazzan (2008: 90), the preceding and the reoccurring event must have “a shared property that characterizes the asserted event as being the repetition of the presupposed one”. Later in their article they go on: “The presupposed property denotes a set of events and is a hypernym of the property characterising the asserted event and of those for the antecedents. Hence, alternatives, i.e. asserted event and antecedents, are characterised by co-hyponym properties” (op. cit.: 103). In (5) above, we found such a co-hyponymic relation between the predicates ‘run out of food’ in (5a) and ‘starve’ in (5b). In the present section, I want to find out, to what degree co-hyponymy of arguments is crucial for readings of ‘again’. The discussion begins with argument expressions whose referent is given (2.3.1) and continues with argument expressions with a new referent (2.3.2).

2.3.1. In (7b), there is a pronominal goal expression ‘to her’. The referent of the expression is a girl who spends night in a forest hut in order to be visited by Jack Frost and obtain a treasure from him. The adverb *bazo?* presupposes that such a visit has occurred before, and in fact it did, but not with this girl, but with her stepsister. For the two girls, a number of co-hyponymic relations can be established: they are both daughters in the same family, they are both girls who are determined to spend the night in the forest hut, they are both proven by Jack Frost (no matter what other properties they share), and so on. The pronominal reference, in opposition to a lexical expression, does not contribute any new property that might challenge the understanding that the second visit qualifies as a repetition. The same holds also for the possessive lexical expression in (8b) (‘his horse’), which repeats the constellation of (8a), albeit with a different horse and a different owner.

(7) PKZ_196X_Morozko_flk014, 044

- a. *šiššəge šonə-ga.*
cold come-PRS.3SG
‘The Frost comes [to her].’
- b. *dīgəttə bazo? šiššəge dī-ʔnə šonə-ga.*
then REP cold DEM-LAT come-PRS.3SG
‘Then again, the Frost comes to her.’

(8) AA_1914_Brothers_flk.022, 027 (Tale 6 in KW)

- a. *ine-t sīni-gən-də šo-la? üzə-bi.*
horse-3SG knee-LOC-3SG come-CV descend-PST.3SG
‘His horse sank on its knees.’ (6.23)
- b. *ine-t bazo? sīni-gən-də šo-la? üzə-bi*
horse-3SG again knee-LOC-3SG come-CV descend-PST.3SG
‘Again his horse sank on its knees (~ his horse, again, sank on its knees).’

The structures in (7b) and (8b) invite for an alternative way of expression by using an additive operator with the meaning ‘also, too’, e.g. in case of (8b): ‘Also HIS horse sank on its knees ~ HIS horse sank on its knees too’. And indeed in (9)–(10), we observe divergence between the Donner text and the parallel text from the Künnap subcorpus: while Donner’s speaker uses *bazo?* with different referents who utter a call to the helping spirit in (9a) and (9b) (the first and the second horseman from the aforementioned tale), Künnap’s speaker chooses a strategy with the Russian focus particle *tože* ‘also, too’ here (10b).

- (9) AA_1914_Brothers_flk.023, 028 (Tale 6 in KW)
- a. “*penzüt, e-ne idə-ne šündə-lie.*”
 helping_spirit NEG-PTCP be_visible-PTCP whistle-PRS.3SG
 [He says:] “Helping spirit, the invisible whistles!”
- b. *bazo?* “*penzüt mā-lia.*”
 REP helping_spirit say-PRS.3SG
 ‘Again he says “helping spirit!”.’
- (10) PKZ_196X_SU0223.008–009, 014–015
- a. *dīgəttə dī kəldun mändə-bi: “dīn e-ne*
 then DEM wizard say-PST.3SG there NEG-PTCP
idə-ne amno-la?bə. ugāndə pim-nie-m.”
 be_visible-PTCP sit-DUR.PRS.3SG very fear-PRS-1SG
 ‘Then the wizard said: “There sits the invisible. I’m very scared.”’
- b. *dī tože mən-də: “e-ne ide-ne*
 DEM also say.PRS-3SG.OC NEG-PTCP be_visible-PTCP
ugāndə kuštu. ugāndə mən pim-nie-m.”
 very strong very 1SG fear-PRS-1SG
 ‘He also says: “The invisible is very mighty. I am very scared.”’

The difference between (9b) and (10b) consists in the absence of explicit repetitive marking in (10b) because the additive particle *tože* ‘also, too’ does not designate an ordering in time (see Tovena and Donazzan 2008: 88 with references). This choice between an additive and a repetitive strategy was not yet at hand for the speaker of (9b); at least *tože* is not attested in Donner’s materials. In the Donner texts, *bazo?* is used 5 times with a differing given argument, i.e. in 26% of all instances (19). In the Künnap texts, we find it only in approximately 2% of all instances in this context (4 of 176), opposed to 77 instances of *tože* (out of 117, i.e. in 66% of all instances of *tože*). These proportions show that the Russian operator had clearly taken over marking additivity in the context of a repetitive event with a differing given subject in late Kamas.⁷

⁷ The difference between *tože* and *bazo?* shows most clearly in this context. In the context of a repeated event with a differing *new* argument, *tože* (18 of 117, i.e. ca. 15%) is still slightly preferred

One may wonder why there is no *tože* in the Donner texts? In view of the numerous Russian functional words attested already in Donner’s materials (KW: 4b *āli* ‘or’, KW: 21a *i* ‘and, also’, KW: 12b *da* ‘yes; and’, KW: 22b *iššo* ‘still, in addition’, KW: 25a *kak* ‘when, as’, KW: 41a *mōžat* ‘possibly, perhaps’, KW: 42 *nādo* ‘must, is necessary’, KW: 45b *no* ‘nun, na’, KW: 49b *onākə* ‘probably’, KW: 65b *štōbə* ‘in order to’, KW: 73a *tolko* ‘only’; cf. also Joki 1952), it seems unlikely that *tože* was not known at that time despite the fact that it had not been recorded by Donner. Browsing the texts, one finds several text passages in which this marker would be likely to occur, e.g. in Tale 2, where a protagonist acquires three helpers who, each at a different time, enter his black bag in order to be carried along (KW: 88–89). None of these repeated actions is marked for additivity (nor repetition). This observation is in line with a general impression that discourse steering elements, which mark parts of a narration in terms of time relations, cause, or epistemicity, are quite rare in the Donner tales. Against this background, it seems possible that in spontaneous speech *tože* did already occur, but the folklore texts, as often, are more conservative in this respect.

2.3.2. In opposition to the cases in the preceding section, in (11), the repeated event introduces a new referent. In those cases, it is again crucial for the felicity of a reading ‘again’ that the properties of the second referent do not contradict or outnumber the properties of the first referent. In (10b), *kuzə* ‘person, man’ does not contribute more information than already established for the first referent. The two referents share the property of being proposing men, not more. The word order observed in (11b) is that the new referent is in the scope of the repetitive adverb in the initial position. In principal, the example is ambiguous between an ‘again’ and an ‘another’ reading. In Section 3, I will present examples, which show the same word order but do not allow for an ‘again’ reading because the properties of the second referent contradict those of the first referent.

(11) PKZ_196X_SU0215.121, 144

a. *dī davaj mǎna mono?ko-štə.*

3SG INCH 1SG.ACC/LAT propose-INF.LAT

‘He started to propose to me.’

b. *o? ke⁸ amno-bia-m, bazo kuzə mǎna mono?ko-bi.*

one winter/year sit-PST-1SG REP person 1SG.ACC/LAT propose-PST.3SG

‘I lived for one year, again a man proposed to me.’

over *bazo?* (12 of 176, i.e. ca. 7%). A more detailed account of *tože* in the Künnap texts cannot be given here.

⁸ There is no word [ke] in Kamas. The present form may be explained as a spontaneous, unconscious or uncorrected contamination of two competing similar words: *ke* ‘winter’, which can also mean ‘year’, and *pe* ‘year’, which contributes the palatalization of the onset consonant.

3. ‘In addition, another, one more’

In the preceding section, I introduced examples for which the reading ‘again’ is either the only option or a possible option. Now I turn to examples for which a reading ‘again’ does not work, but ‘in addition, another, one more’ is the only available reading. As in the preceding section, I start with cases in which the differing referent is given (3.1) and proceed to those with a new referent (3.2). In a separate subsection (3.3), I discuss the difference between repetitive *bazo?* and additive *iššo*.

3.1. For a felicitous reading ‘again’ with a differing given or new referent in the repeated event, it has been observed in Section 2.3 that the properties of this referent must not contradict or outnumber those of the first referent. But exactly this is the case in (12b) where the definite demonstrative goal expression ‘to this woman’ can’t be in a co-hyperonymic relation with another woman because two different women cannot share the property of being one and the same woman.⁹ After having killed one of two women present in a tent (12a), the maneater turns to the second woman (12b). The word order is strikingly different from the preceding examples: in the Donner texts, (12b) is the only instance of *bazo?* in clause-final position and I correlate this word order with the function of expressing additivity instead of proper repetitivity. How much this word order holds only for non-subject arguments, I can’t tell.

(12) AA_1914_Maneater_flk.016, 017 (Tale 3 in KW¹⁰)

a. *dö ne kut-la? baʔbdə-bi, ami-m kut-la? baʔbdə-bi.*
 DEM.DIST woman kill-CV throw-PST.3SG other-ACC kill-CV throw-PST.3SG
 ‘He killed that woman, the other one he killed.’

b. *dīgəttə šo-bi dī ne-nə bazo?.*
 then come-PST.3SG DEM woman-LAT REP
 ‘Then he came also to this woman (Dann kam er noch zu DIEser Frau).’

3.2. An example with a new referent in the repeated event was already presented in (2b). The same holds for the following examples. In (13a–c), the aforementioned horsemen arrive at the place where the whistling children are hiding. The three protagonists differ in the coat colours of their horses, the first one has a foxy-red horse, the second a black, and

⁹ The definite expression with a demonstrative differs thus from the definite expression with a possessive suffix: ‘his horse’ in (8b) was a property which could be shifted to another referent.

¹⁰ Donner’s Tale no. 3 is short and cryptic and invites for a misinterpretation such that the maneater approaches one woman first, then turns to the woman he kills, and finally comes back to the first woman. This would be a repetitive-restitutive reading, which I reject. The misunderstood variant is obviously what Künnap’s consultant was prompted with and how she uses *bazo?* in her variant, which I do not quote here (but see PKZ_196X_SU0225.147–148).

the third one a white horse. The use of *again*, or German *wieder*, or Russian *опять* is not possible in such a context because the properties of the differing argument in the second (and in the third) event included in the scope of the repetitive adverb must either be the same (‘a hero with a red horse’ ... ‘again a hero with a red horse’), or they must be less specific (‘a hero with a red horse’ ... ‘again a hero with a horse’ ~ ‘again somebody’). If not, the use of ‘again’ is not felicitous (‘a hero with a red horse’ ... *‘again a hero with a black horse’), but instead the reading ‘in addition’ applies (‘in addition, a hero with a black horse’) (13b–c).

(13) AA_1914_Brothers_flk.020, 025, 032 (Tale 6 in KW)

a. *ku-bi-ndən bozəra? ine-zəbi aləp šon-namna.*

see-PTCP-LOC.3PL foxy_red horse-ADJ hero come-DUR.PRS.3SG

‘As they saw, a hero with a foxy-red horse was coming.’

b. *bazo? sagər ine-zəbi aləp šon-namna*

REP black horse-ADJ hero come-DUR.PRS.3SG

‘In addition comes a hero with a black horse. (Es kommt noch ein Held mit einem SCHWARZEN Pferd.)’

c. *bazo? širi ine-zəbi aləp šon-namna*

REP white horse-ADJ hero come-DUR.PRS.3SG

‘In addition comes a hero with a white horse. (Es kommt noch ein Held mit einem WEIßEN Pferd.)’

Interestingly, the versatility of *bazo?* in such a context seems to have decreased in the Künnap texts. In (14b), the speaker – possibly prompted by its occurrence in the Donner version of the tale (13b) – also begins with *bazo?*, but then hesitates and splits the sentence into three parts, expressing first the repetitive moment (‘again comes [one]’), and then specifying the argument (‘with a black horse, a second wizard’), in a way that would be necessary too if one wanted to translate the adverb with English ‘again’, or German ‘wieder’, or Russian ‘опять’ (e.g., Again comes a hero, [now] with a black horse), or in the case of German stressed *noch* (Es kommt NOCH ein Held, [jetzt] mit einem SCHWARZEN Pferd). It is not unlikely that in the speech of the last Kamas speaker, the functional profile of the Russian adverb *опять* had an influence on the use of *bazo?* here. But not in general, as (2b) has shown, where she uses *bazo?* without hesitation in the additive meaning.¹¹ For the sake of completion I also add the second repetition with the white horse (14c), in which she uses only the strategy with an ordinal numeral.

¹¹ A reviewer pointed out that (2b) differs from (13b) not only in the position of *bazo?*, which is clause-initial in (13b) but not in (2b), but also in the weight of the arguments, which is low in (2b) – the identity of the recipient doesn’t matter –, but high in (13b) – a new protagonist is introduced. So identity of the referent and scope of the adverb may play a role for the speaker’s choice.

(14) PKZ_196X_SU0223.003, 011–012, 019

- a. *ku-lia-ʔi: šonə-ga kældun oŋiʔ, ine kōmə.*
 see-PRS-3PL come-PRS.3SG wizard one horse red
 ‘They see: there comes a wizard, the horse is red.’
- b. *amno-laʔbə-ʔjə, amno-laʔbə-ʔjə, bazoʔ šonə-ga ...*
 sit-DUR.PRS-3PL sit-DUR.PRS-3PL REP come-PRS.3SG
sagər ine-t-šiʔ [oʔ- baš- šide] šide-git kældun.
 black horse-3SG-INS one other two two-ORD wizard
 ‘Again comes one... with his black horse, a [...] second wizard.’
- c. *nagur-git ine šonə-ga, dī ine siri.*
 three-ORD horse come-PRS.3SG DEM horse white
 ‘A third horse comes, this horse is white.’

3.3. Both repetitive contexts treated in this section, that with a differing given non-subject argument in 3.1, and that with a differing new argument in 3.2 are contexts in which one may, in principal, also expect the operator *iššo* ‘still, another, in addition’ previously mentioned in the introduction. In the Künnap texts, there are 77 instances of *iš(š)o*,¹² the bulk of which represent scalar and continuative meanings like ‘still’, ‘not yet’ (with negation), ‘even’ (with comparatives) and others, which will not be pursued in the present paper. A crucial component of the semantics of *iššo* is the “adding up to a larger whole” (König 1991: 143–145 on German *noch*, but also including Russian *еще*). For Italian *ancora* and French *encore*, Tovená and Donazzan (2008: 93) observe that in combination with telic predicates, their readings are either incremental (‘one more’) or repetition of the whole event (‘again’). The first reading seems to hold for Kamas *iššo*. In (15), from a description of wedding traditions, the operator stands before an indefinite goal expression and may be translated as ‘to another/one more house’ (the English translation in the INEL corpus says ‘to the next house’, the Russian translation ‘еще в один дом’ is closer to the Kamas original).

(15) PKZ_196X_SU0216.082–083

- dīgəttə baška tura-nə kala-ʔi. dīn dəre že*
 then second house-LAT go.FUT-3PL there so ID
bīt-le-ʔi, dīgəttə išo oŋiʔ tura-nə.
 drink-FUT-3SG then ADD one house-LAT
 ‘Then they will go to a second house. There they will drink in just the same way, then [they go] to one more house.’

Unlike (15), in (16) *iššo* does not occur together with an argument. In such contexts, it is impossible to distinguish between a reading ‘once more’, which would be repetitive and quasi-synonymous with ‘again’, and an incremental reading ‘more’.

¹² 54 instances are spelled *iššo* and 23 *išo*; the difference in spelling does not reflect a difference in meaning.

(16) PKZ_196X_SU0217.PKZ.123, 125

dīgattə nušo bīl-sittə bazo? šo-bi dī kuza. [...]
 then beer drink-INF REP come-PST.3SG DEM man
bar bīt-lu?-pi da kirgar-la?bə: “išo de?, māna amga!”
 all drink-MOM-PST.3SG and shout-DUR.PRS.3SG ADD give.IMP.2SG 1sg.ACC/LAT few
 ‘Then in order to drink beer this man came again. [...] He drank all up and shouted:
 “Give [once] more, I had few!”’

The only two instances in the Donner texts are of the same kind as in the previous example. Both occur in the same sentence. In Donner’s manuscript version of (17), both instances appear in epentheses, in his Finnish translation, however, only the second one: ‘jumala antoi vielä kenties antaa (vielä) minulle’. The correct interpretation is probably that the adverb may appear in either position, but not necessarily twice (as indicated by the Finnish translation).

(17) AA_1914_Head_flk.036 (Tale 9 in KW)

Context: A man believes that food which had fallen into his tent through the smoke hole had been given to him by God. He starts praying:

kudaj mö-bi, (iššo), možət, mī-gə-j (iššo)¹³ māna!
 god give-PST.3SG ADD maybe give-IMP-3SG ADD 1SG.ACC/LAT
 ‘God has given, maybe he shall give me [once] more.’

The translations of (17) in the INEL corpus operate with ‘once more’: ‘...maybe he shall give me once more’, Russian ‘...может, ещё разок мне даст!’. It remains unclear how much Russian *euĕ* filled a gap among the functional words of Kamas. In Donner’s materials, there is no other utterance attested in which an adverb with the meaning ‘more’ would occur. The strongest candidate for such a function may be the comparative form of *i?gö* ‘much, many’, *i?gö=arak* ‘more’ (Castrén 1847: 92 *iigöarâĕ* ‘побольше’), but it is not attested in any clause nor syntagm. Still one may conclude for Kamas *iššo* that a repetitive meaning in the sense of Tovená and Donazzan (2008: 93) is questionable and that it is rather an additive-incremental operator (Tovená and Donazzan 2008: 93) with no essential semantic overlap with *bazo?* ‘again’.

4. ‘In turn’

Among the instances of *bazo?* in the Donner texts, there is one which can neither be translated by ‘again’, nor by ‘in addition, one more’ (18b). The example comes from the same text as example (12) above. The man eater tells the woman about his killing of the other woman (18a). Next he is advised by her to blow the fire because it is dark in the

¹³ The word is spelled *ŷšö* in the manuscript; so far no competing reading other than *iš(š)o* exists.

tent. She has prepared the fire with moist wood, and when the maneater exposes his neck while blowing the fire, she chops it off (18b).¹⁴ Neither the reading ‘again’ applies here, nor the reading ‘in addition, another’. What we observe instead is the reoccurrence of an event of killing, but the arguments are not the same as in the first event: the former agent is now the patient (the maneater), and the agent is now somebody else (the clever woman). In this context, the reading ‘in turn’ may apply (cf. German *wiederum* which is derived from *wieder* ‘again’). This meaning is not attested in the Künnap texts. (And the equivalent is missing due to the misinterpretation of the end of Tale 3, see footnote 12.)

(18) AA_1914_Maneater_flk.019, 022 (Tale 3 in KW)

a. *mǎn kut-laba?-bio-m.*

1SG kill-RES-PST-1SG

‘I have killed her.’

b. *dī ne baj?kə-bə bazo? saj_ha?-lu?-bi.*

DEM woman throat-ACC.3SG REP off_chop-MOM-PST.3SG

‘The woman, in turn, chopped off his throat.’

5. ‘Back again’

The *restitutive-counterdirectional* function of *bazo?* is attested only in the Künnap texts. In (19), a mill has been stolen and a rooster present at the site promises to bring it back. In the tale, there was no preceding event in which the rooster would have brought the mill to the owners. The use of *bazo?* here is clearly *restitutive-counterdirectional*, i.e. it refers to the restitution of the preceding state of possession by finding the mill and moving it back (in the counterdirection) where it had been before.

(19) PKZ_196X_SU0191.228–233

ertə-n dī-zeŋ u?bdə-bi-?i: naga tərman-də.

morning-GEN DEM-PL get_up-PST-3PL NEG.EXIST.PRS.3SG mill-3SG

dīgəttə tibi_kuriz: “i-? tər-ga?! mǎn kalla-m.

then male_chicken NEG-IMP.2SG cry-IMP.2PL 1SG go.FUT-1SG

det-li-m bazo? ši?ñile?”.

bring-FUT-1SG REP 2PL.ACC/LAT

‘In the morning they got up: the hand mill is missing. Then the rooster [said]: “Don’t cry, I will go and bring it back to you again.”’

¹⁴ In KW: 90 the end of the tale is erroneously presented vice versa: the maneater kills the woman. That the version in KW is based on a misreading of the manuscript has been substantiated in an earlier contribution in memory of Eugene Helimski (Klumpp 2010: 298–299), where it is shown that Tale 3 shares essential features with a Selkup-Yeniseic didactic tale tradition, and the woman who kills the maneater corresponds to the Selkup mindful woman *nätänka*.

Based on the absence of such examples in the Donner texts alone, one may not yet assume that the use of *bazo?* in the counterdirectional function would be an innovation in the Künnap texts. But there is a competing adverb, *pi?da*, *pü?da* ‘back, backward’ (KW 54b, 184 *pi?da*, *pü?da* ‘zurück, nach hinten, rückwärts’, Castrén 1847: 90 *phyjdy* ‘назад; takaisin’, 233, 260 *fyide* id., Müller 1740: 22 <pfuitù> ‘retrosum’), which was used in the counterdirectional function. In the Künnap texts, it still occurs once with an intransitive motion verb (20a), and the same construction is also attested in the Donner materials (albeit not in a text) (20b). In an older source, the adverb is also attested with transitive ‘give’ (20c). It is this particular occurrence, which parallels the function of *bazo?* in (19) above, on the basis of which one may assume that it was *pü?da*, and not *bazo?*, which expressed counterdirectional meaning in older stages of Kamas.

(20) PKZ_196X_SU0213.180

- a. *dī-zeŋ nagur-gö kamb-i-?i, a mǎn par-lu?-pia-m pi?tə.*
 DEM-PL three-COLL go.PST-3PL but 1SG return-MOM-PST-1SG back
 ‘They went the three of them, but I returned back.’
- b. *mǎn pü?də par-lia-m*
 1SG back return-PRS-1SG
 ‘I go back’ (KW 54b)
- c. <ПЮДЮМЛЯ>
pü?də mī-lie
 back give-PRS.3SG
 ‘gives it back’ (Sp. 35b)¹⁵

6. Summary

The aim of this article was to sketch the functional profile of the Kamas repetitive adverb *bazo?*. For this purpose, all 195 well understood occurrences in the two Kamas text corpora, the older Donner texts and the younger Künnap texts, were classified into four meaning groups: ‘again’, ‘in addition, another’, ‘in turn’, and ‘back again’. The first group was further divided into instances with a proper repetitive reading, those with a repetitive-restitutive reading, and repetitive instances with a differing given, or new argument expression. The restitutive reading was distinguished from the counterdirectional reading ‘back again’. New arguments in a repetitive context in order not to challenge the reading ‘again’ must not show properties which contradict or outnumber properties of the referent in the preceding event. Otherwise the reading ‘in addition’ applies. This reading makes the second largest group in the corpus. The counterdirectional group makes the

¹⁵ The original translation by Spasskij comes in 1SG ‘возвращаю, отдаю назад (I return sth, give sth back)’.

third group. The reading ‘in turn’ is attested in only one example from the Donner texts, in which the constellation of subject and object arguments contains the notion of switch.

It could be shown that *bazo?* always occurs with ordered events. For differing predicates, one may observe that they are tolerated as long as they are in a co-hyponymic relation (e.g. *run out of food* and *hunger*). Other differing predicates could not be found with *bazo?*; they are a clear case for the use of *tože* ‘also’ in the Künnap texts. Partial subject identity between the first and second event does not constitute a problem for the reading ‘again’ (as in 4ab).

Changes between the two text periods can be characterized as ground loosing and ground gaining: (i) in repeated events with a differing given argument, the adverb finds a competitor in the form of the Russian borrowing *tože* ‘also’, which, however, does not contain the notion of ordered events. (ii) The versatility of *bazo?* to occur with new differing referents is possibly disturbed by the influence of Russian *опять* in the Künnap texts. (iii) While the repetitive-restitutive meaning is attested also in earlier texts, in late Kamas, *bazo?* intrudes into the domain of counterdirectional meaning. This meaning had been earlier expressed by a locative adverb *pü?da* ‘back’.

A few observations on word order in the Donner texts: in the reading ‘again’, *bazo?* can occur in preverbal position or in clause-initial position. The latter is chosen if the clause introduces a new subject and the reading is ‘in addition’. With a new argument other than the subject, in this reading the adverb is also found in clause final position. The meaning ‘in turn’ does not correlate with a specific word order. Regarding word order in the Künnap texts, one must remark that the preverbal and the clause-initial position are also here the most frequent, but since word order is more free in these texts (as a result of Russian influence), I could not observe any strong correlations between functions and word order. E.g., the postverbal position of *bazo?* in the reading ‘back again’ as in (19) is in no way prevalent.

As far as the few instances of *iššo* allow to conclude, it was used to mark incremental additivity (‘more’) rather than repetition, and there was no functional overlap between this adverb and *bazo?*.

Abbreviations

Non-trivial abbreviations used in the glossings are: ADD additive particle, ADJ adjective derivation, ANT anterior (converb), COLL collective numeral, CV converb, DIST distal (demonstrative), DUR durative (tense, aktionsart), ID identificational particle, INCH inchoative particle, INDEF indefinite particle, INS instrumental case, LAT lative-dative case, LOC locative case, MOM momentaneous aktionsart, NEG negative verb, NEG.EXIST negative existential particle, OC objective conjugation, ORD ordinal number, REP repetitive adverb, RES resultative aktionsart.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the Estonian Research Council grant PRG1290.

References

- Arkipov, Alexandre, Chris Lasse Däbritz, Valentin Gusev 2019. INEL Kamas corpus. User documentation. https://corpora.uni-hamburg.de/repository/file:kamas-1.0_INEL_Kamas_Corpus_1.0_User_Documentation/PDF/INEL_Kamas_Corpus.pdf.
- Baskakov, Nikolaj A., Anastasija I. Inkižekova-Grekul, 1953. *Xakassko-russkij slovar’*. Moskva: Ministerstvo kul’tury SSSR.
- Blackham, John Hartley 2017. *There and back again: an adverb’s tale*. Master thesis. Department of Linguistics, University of Utah.
- Castrén, Matthias A. 1847. *Manuscripta Castréniana XIX. Samoiedica 13: Kamass-Samoiedica*. Manuscript. Helsinki University Library.
- Castrén, Matthias A. 1854. *M. Alexander Castréns Grammatik der samojedischen Sprachen*. Herausgegeben von Anton Schiefner. (Nordische Reisen und Forschungen 7.) St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Reprint 1969, Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR.)
- Castrén, Matthias A. 1855. *M. Alexander Castréns Wörterverzeichnisse aus den samojedischen Sprachen*. Herausgegeben von Anton Schiefner. (Nordische Reisen und Forschungen 8.) St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Reprint 1969, Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR.)
- Castrén, Matthias A. 1857. *M. Alexander Castrén’s Versuch einer koibalischen und karagassischen Sprachlehre*. Herausgegeben von Anton Schiefner. (Nordische Reisen und Forschungen 11.) St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Reprint 1969, Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR.)
- Castrén, Matthias A. 1858. *Versuch einer jensisej-ostjakischen und kottischen Sprachlehre*. Herausgegeben von Anton Schiefner. (Nordische Reisen und Forschungen 12.) St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Reprint 1969, Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR.)
- Csirmaz, Aniko 2015. Repetitive adverbs in Hungarian: Syntactic and semantic variation. Conference abstract. The 39th Annual Penn Linguistics Conference. <https://www.ling.upenn.edu/Events/PLC/plc39/abstracts/talks/CsirmazPLC39.pdf>
- Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine 1983. Wieder ein Wieder? Zur Semantik von Wieder. In: Rainer Baeuerle, Schwarze Christoph, Armin von Stechow (eds.): *Meaning, use and interpretation of language*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 97–120.
- Gergel, Remus, Sigrid Beck 2015. Early Modern English *again*: A corpus study and semantic analysis. *English Language and Linguistics* 19(1): 27–47.
- Goebel, Alexander 2020. *Representing Context: Presupposition Triggers and Focus sensitivity*. Dissertation. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Gusev, Valentin, Tiina Klooster, Beáta Wagner-Nagy 2019. INEL Kamas Corpus. Version 1.0. Publication date 2019-12-15. <http://hdl.handle.net/11022/0000-0007-DA6E-9>. Archived in Ham-

- burger Zentrum für Sprachkorpora. In: Wagner-Nagy, Beáta, Alexandre Arkhipov, Anne Ferger, Daniel Jettka, and Timm Lehmborg (eds.): *The INEL corpora of indigenous Northern Eurasian languages*.
- Joki, Aulis J. 1944. *Kai Donners Kamassisches Wörterbuch nebst Sprachproben und Hauptzügen der Grammatik*. (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae VIII.) Helsinki: Finno-Ugric Society.
- Joki, Aulis J. 1952. *Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen*. (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 103.) Helsinki: Finno-Ugric Society.
- Klumpp, Gerson 2010. Kamassisch-selkupisch-ketische Parallelen in der Märchenfolklore. In: Gusev, Valentin, Anna Widmer (eds). *Gedenkschrift für Eugen Helinski. = Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 32/33: 297–312.
- Klumpp, Gerson 2013. On Kai Donner's phonograph records of Kamas. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 37: 45–59.
- König, Ekkehard 1991. *The Meaning of Focus Particles. A Comparative Perspective*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Künnap, Ago 1991. Zur Erinnerung an die letzte Sprecherin des Kamassischen. *Linguistica Uralica* 27(2): 150–151.
- KW = Joki 1944.
- Müller, Gerhard Friedrich (ca.) 1740. *Vocabularium Latine-Tatarice-Arinice-Cottice-Kamaschice-Buriatice*. Manuscript. Moscow, RGADA f. 199 o. 2 nr. 529 č. 2, pp. 10–23.
- Radloff, Wilhelm 1960. *Versuch eines Wörterbuchs der Türk-Dialekte*. Vol. I–IV. 's Gravenhage: Mouton & Co.
- Spasskij, Grigorij I. 1806. Словарь Языка Койбальскаго. In: Potapov, Leonid P. 1957. Zum Problem der Herkunft und Ethnogenese der Koibalen und Motoren. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 59.
- Tovena, Lucia M., Marta Donazzan 2008. On ways of repeating. *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes* 37: 85–112. <http://rlv.revues.org/1724>.
- Tiemann, Sonja, Mareike Kirsten, Sigrid Beck, Ingo Hertrich, Bettina Rolke 2015. Presupposition processing and accommodation: An experiment on wieder ('again') and consequences for other triggers. In: Florian Schwarz (ed.): *Experimental perspectives on presuppositions*. Springer, 39–65.
- Umbach, Carla 2012. Strategies of additivity: German additive *noch* compared to *auch*. *Lingua* 122(15): 1843–1863.
- Werner, Heinrich 2002. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Jenissej-Sprachen*. Band I–III. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- XRS = Baskakov & Inkižekova-Grekul 1953.