A mirative connector in Kamas

Gerson Klumpp

University of Tartu

The article is about a conditional converb form of the Kamas verb *ku-* 'see, find', which appears in the older Kamas texts in "pre-mirative sequences" (Skribnik 2023), i.e. in contexts, where a new scene, or a new detail within a given scene, is introduced from the perspective of a salient protagonist. In the same context may also appear a finite vision verb, or no vision verb at all. All three variants are understood as representing a narrative pattern, whereby the variants with an explicit vision verb enhance perceptional identification with the protagonist. The variant with the conditional converb is more frequent than the finite variant, and it has an areal parallel in South Siberian Turkic. It is argued that it is preferred in order to soften the transition between past-tense based narration and a present-tense based existential clause. Further it is argued that the Kamas form was grammaticalizing into a mirative connecting adverbial, which is in complementary distribution with the general Kamas connector *dĭgəttə* 'then'. Mirative operators in Uralic are usually adverbials or participle-based clauses; with the Kamas form, connectors are added to this class of functional operators.

1. Introduction

The Kamas texts from 1912/1914 exhibit a frequent narrative pattern, in which a new scene, or a new detail within a given scene, is introduced from the perspective of a salient protagonist. The pattern comes in three basic variants, which are illustrated in a quasi-minimal triplet with examples from different tales in (1a–c). In each example is a protagonist on the move when he comes across an inhabited tent, which will become the site of the next episode of the tale. The tent is always introduced in an existential posture verb construction,[1] but the way the protagonist becomes aware of it is expressed in different ways: in an implicit strategy without a vision predicate (1a), or in an explicit strategy, in which the narrator applies a vision verb, either in a finite construction (1b), or in a nonfinite one (1c).

(1) a. *bazoʔ*   *tüťe*   *kandǝ-bi.*   *maʔ*   *nu-ga.*
        again   a_bit   walk-PST   tent   stand-PRS
        'Again he walked a bit. A tent is standing [there]. [The owner of the tent
        has two daughters who will become the main protagonist's wives.]'
        (KW: 95, AA_1914_Corpse_flk.078–79)[2]

(1) b. *urgo*   *măja-nǝ*   *kambi.*   *urgo*   *sagǝr*   *măja-gǝn*
        big   mountain-LAT   go.PST   big   black   mountain-LOC
        ku-bi: *maʔ*   *nu-ga.*
        see-PST   tent   stand-PRS
        'He went to the big mountain. On the big black mountain **he saw:** a tent is
        standing [there]. [In this tent, the protagonist will be reunited with his
        mother.]' (KW: 197, AIN_1912_Frogwoman_flk.032–33)

(1) c. *peńǝj-loʔbdǝ-bi*   *ťăga-n*   *tăžǝ.*   **ku-bi-n-dǝ**
        float-INGR-PST   river-GEN   downstream   see-PTCP-LLOC-3SG
        maʔ   *nu-ga,*   *esseŋ*   *śar-laʔbǝ-jǝʔ.*
        tent   stand-3SG   child.PL   play-DUR.PRS-3PL
        '[The mouse] started floating downstream. **As it sees** (lit.: in its seeing), a
        tent is standing [there], children are playing. [The mouse will pretend to be
        their grandfather.]' (KW: 88, AA_1914_Mouse_flk.010–11)

The narratological term for the implicit visual encounter in (1a) is *free indirect perception* (Palmer 2004: 48–49, 79–80, see Section 4). It is the most frequent variant

---

[1] On posture verbs in Siberian existential and locational constructions see recently Däbritz (2023: 102–110, 2022: 16).

[2] All Kamas text examples are presented with reference to their original publication in the *Kamassisches Wörterbuch* (KW = Joki 1944) as well as to the INEL Kamas corpus (Arkhipov et al. 2019, Gusev et al. 2019).

in the investigated text corpus, there are about 35 passages which qualify as such instances. The rarest variant is the one with a finite vision predicate as in (1b). There are altogether four instances in which we find three different verbs of vision: *ku-* 'see, find' as in (1b), *măn-* 'watch', and *măndə-* 'look' (see examples (5a–c) in Section 2). All instances exhibit *paratactic complementation*, i.e. the clause with the vision predicate and the clause with the object of perception are juxtaposed, possibly separated by a colon as in (1b).

The nonfinite construction in (1c) occurs seven times in the corpus. It is more frequent than the finite variant, but different from the latter, there is no variation of the vision verb, all seven instances show the same verb *ku-* 'see, find'. The construction builds on the *conditional converb*, that is a participle inflected for syncretic[3] lative-locative case and a possessive suffix cross-referencing the subject (-*bi*-LLOC-PX). The converb functions as the protasis predicate of conditional and temporal complex sentences. Its reading 'if' or 'when', as well as its temporal anchoring (past/present/future), depend on the context (see Section 3). A literal translation of (1c) is 'in its [i.e. the mouse's] seeing (or finding) a tent stands there'. The actual translation chosen here is 'as it sees', a possible variant would be 'as it finds'. An actual conditional rendering 'if it sees/finds', but also a proper temporal rendering 'when it sees/finds', seem both awkward (see more in Section 6). The functional relation between the object of perception and the vision verb is less clear than in the finite construction: either there is no complement at all or it's a special perception complement construction (see Section 2).

Five of the remaining six instances of the nonfinite variant are presented in (2a–e). (2d) has an almost identical variant in the phonography recordings (see Klumpp 2013: 53), which is not listed separately here. The order of examples follows the order in which they occur in the Kamas texts in KW. For reasons of space the context is summarized. In all seven instances, the clause in the protasis consists exclusively of the converb form with neither any overt constituent nor any modifier. The clauses which express the perceived state-of-affairs show either a stative posture predicate ('stand' in (1c) and (2a), 'sit' in (2e)), a stative resultative predicate ('be torn into pieces' in (2c), 'stick (be pushed into)' in (2d)), or a durative dynamic predicate ('come (closer)' in (2b)). With the exception of the pro-drop subject in (2e), the subject of the predicate is always lexically expressed: in (1c) and (2a–b) the subject expression introduces a new referent, in (2c–d) a given referent appears in a new state, and in (2e) a given referent reappears. In terms of information structure, the clauses in (1c) and (2b) are thetical (all-new focus), show subject-verb focus with a topical locative constituent (2b, d), or verb focus with a topical subject referent (2c, e).

---

[3] The distinction of lative and locative case is, in general, neutralized in possessive declension.

(2) a. **ku-bi-n-də**   talaj-ən-də   toʔ-ən-də   jada
   see-PTCP-LLOC-3SG   sea-GEN-3SG   shore-LLOC-3SG   village

   nu-ga.
   stand-PRS

   '[The protagonist has arrived at a big body of water.] **As he sees,** there is
   a village on the shore of the sea. [He gets off his horse and will soon be
   discovered by the local Khan.]' (KW: 89, AA_1914_Khan_flk.020)

(2) b. *kandə-bi-iʔ,*   *urgo*   *aʔtə̆*   *toʔbd-o-bi.*   *dĭ-zeŋ*   *aʔtə̆-n*
   walk-PST-3PL   big   road   hit-ITR-PST   DEM-PL   road-GEN

   toʔ-gən-də   *amna-iʔ.*   **ku-bi-n-dən**   *bozeraʔ*
   side-LLOC-3SG   sit.PRS-3PL   see-PTCP-LLOC-3PL   red

   ine-zə̆bi   *aləp*   *šon-namna*   *dĭ-zeŋ*   *šündə-bi-iʔ.*
   horse-ADJ   hero   come-DUR.PRS   DEM-PL   whistle-PST-3PL

   '[The two boys] walked, hit upon a big road. They sit at the side of the road.
   As they see, a hero with a red horse is coming. They whistled.' (KW: 92,
   AA_1914_Brothers_flk.018–021)

(2) c. *büźe*   *kambi*   *šeden-də.*   **ku-bi-n-də**   *ular*
   man   go.PST   corral-LAT   see-PTCP-LLOC3SG   sheep

   talə-j   *ńeʔbd-ö-leʔ.*
   rupture-CV   tear-ITR-CV

   'The man went to the corral. **As he sees**, the sheep [of his guest] is torn
   into pieces. [The guest, i.e. the main protagonist will demand compen-
   sation.]' (KW: 95, AA_1914_Corpse_flk.058–59)

(2) d. *koʔpsaŋ*   *üʔməl-lüʔ-bi-iʔ.*   *ular-iʔ*   *ner-ö-bi-iʔ,*
   girl.PL   run-MOM-PST-3PL   sheep-PL   frighten-ITR-PST.3PL

   tuno-loʔbdə-bi.   **ku-bi-n-dən**   *tagaj*   *sij-gən-də*
   gallop-INGR-PST   see-PTCP-LLOC-3PL   knife   heart-LLOC-3SG

   müʔbd-ö-leʔbə.
   push-ITR-DUR.PRS

   '[The protagonist's allegedly sheep herding wife shall be invited into the
   tent by the daughters of the protagonist's host.] The girls ran off. The sheep
   got frightened and started galloping. **As they see**, a knife is sticking in her
   heart. [The daughters bring the news and their guest will demand
   compensation.]' (KW: 95–96, AA_1914_Corpse_flk.091–93)

(2) e.   *dĭ*   *karə-j*   *ńeʔ-lüʔ-bi.*   **ku-bi-n-dən**   *büšťer-leʔ*
          DEM   open-CV pull-MOM-PST   see-PTCP-LLOC-3PL   laugh-CV
          amna.
          sit.PRS
          '[The main protagonist is hiding under a trapdoor, his antagonist's gang
          want to get hold of him.] He [the antagonist] pulled (the door) open. **As
          they see**, he's sitting [there] and laughing. [They fetter him and take him
          to the river.]' (KW: 99, AIN_1914_Trickster_flk.027–28)

The object of interest in this study is the form *kubində* 'as (s)he sees/finds'.[4] I am interested in the motivation of a Kamas narrator for applying it in text passages where a new scene or a new detail within a given scene is introduced from the perspective of protagonist. Despite their limited amount, the Kamas tales allow for some considerations concerning this motivation. The context the form occurs in has been called "pre-mirative sequence", or "pre-mirative context", by Elena Skribnik (2023). Both venitive motion and visual perception are components which precede the use of a mirative form, or may lead to a mirative extension of a form (see Sections 5–6).

The study is based on the Kamas data collected by Kai Donner, considered are all texts sorts (tales, riddles, prayers, song), including the published texts (KW, INEL Kamas Corpus) as well as transcribed parts of the phonograph recordings (Klumpp 2013) and some isolated clauses from Donner's lexical and grammar notes (KW, Donner Manuscripts). The form in question does not occur in the texts of the last speakers and their speech remains outside the scope of this paper.

The article is structured as follows: Section 2 is about the Kamas verbs of vision and their complements. In Section 3, I introduce the conditional converb. The following two sections discuss the motivations for applying a vision verb in the introduced narrative pattern: while Section 4 is about perceptional identification, in Section 5, mirativity is identified as a crucial notion. In Section 6, an areal parallel is introduced, namely a construction in South Siberian Turkic, which also shows a conditional form in this context. In Section 7, *kubində(n)* is compared to the Kamas connecting adverbial *dĭgəttə* 'then' and it is suggested to interpret *kubində(n)* as a mirative connector. The conclusions are presented in Section 8.

---

[4] I sometimes use the 3rd person sing. form *kubində* as a representative for all possible forms despite the fact that the 3rd person plural *kubindən* is attested more frequently (4 out 7). In a narrative with a 1st person sing. narrator, the form would be *kubińi* (cf. (6) in Section 3). In fact, there is a Kamas narrative in 1st pers. singular, namely the recording with Innokentij Ašpurov known under the title "Kertomus metsästa (Story from the forest)" (see Klumpp 2013: 47). The edition of this recording is in progress, there are no occurrences of the form in question.

2. Kamas vision verbs and their complements

In distinguishing Kamas visual perception verbs I follow the widely applied classification of perception verbs by Viberg (1984, 2008, and elsewhere). Viberg divides them into three groups: activities, experiences and phenomena (e.g. Viberg 2008). The first group is characterized by control ('look (at)'), the second group by a lack of control ('see, find'), and the third group by a reversal, in which the subject is not the perceiver, but the perceived ('look, appear (as)'). The Kamas vision verbs are presented in Table 1.

	ACTIVITY	EXPERIENCE	PHENOMENON-BASED
SIGHT	*măn-, măndə-, măndo-, măndər-* 'look (at, around, for)'	*ku-* 'see, find'	*ĭdə-* 'be visible, appear (as)'

Table 1: Basic grid for verbs of visual perception in Kamas (cf. Viberg 2008)

The experiential vision verb is unmistakably *ku-* 'see, find' (KW: 15, 33, 34, 35, 59), which continues Proto-Samoyed **ko-* 'sehen, finden' (Janhunen 1977: 72). In the activity function we find several verbs which derive from Proto-Samoyed **mŝncɜ-* 'sehen' (Janhunen 1977: 86–87), namely *măndə-* 'look (at)' (KW: 37), see (5c), *măndo-* 'look around' (KW: 37), see (4), *măndər-* 'look for' (KW: 37), and *măn-* 'watch' (5b). The phenomenon-based vision verb is *ĭdə-* 'be visible, appear (as)' (KW: 20; Janhunen 1977: 16). This verb and some other verbs with semantic affinity to visual perception like *aŋńer-* 'notice', *kuldo-* 'to be found', *ṕe-* 'look for, search' and *ṕer-* 'show' are mentioned here for the sake of completeness, but not relevant for the remainder of the article.

Altogether I counted 34 clauses with a finite or nonfinite vision predicate in the Donner materials. In terms of frequency, *ku-* 'see, find' is clearly dominant with 30 instances, whereas derivates of **mŝncɜ-* occur only four times: *măn-* and *măndə-* each once, and *măndo-* twice. The majority of instances (23 out of 34) show a finite verb in past, present, or future tense, in addition, there is one instance of an imperative. Among the nonfinite forms (11 out of 34), there are altogether eight instances of the aforementioned conditional converb (see Section 3), one instance of the anterior converb (see Klumpp 2002: 125–127), one of the converb in *-mA* (4), and one of the infinitive. The seven instances of *kubində(n),* which are examined in this article, make approximately one fifth (7 out of 34) of all vision verb events in the Donner materials.

As concerns the syntax of the 34 vision verb events, almost two third of all instances (21 out of 34) show the experiential verb *ku-* 'see, find' taking a direct object. The object may be overtly expressed as in (3a), or covertly as in (3b).

(3) a. *tănan* *ťödə-ńi* **ku-lio-m**
2SG.OBL dream-LLOC.1SG see-PRS-1SG
'I see you in my dream' (KW: 15)

(3) b. *ne* **ku-bi**, *pa* *kabar-bi,* *da* *ťuga* *toʔ-luʔ-bi.*
woman see-PST wood grasp-PST and dead hit-MOM-PST
'[The mouse says: Here I am.] The woman saw it, took a piece of wood and hit it dead.' (KW: 88, AA_1914_Mouse_flk.027)

In two (out of 34) cases the vision verb is *măndo-* 'look (around/through)', which apparently does not take direct objects or complement clauses (4).

(4) *mazəro-gəʔ* **măndo-ma** *dĭ* *ne* *baʔ-luʔ-bi*
smoke_hole-ABL look-CV DEM woman throw-MOM-PST
bĭssət-tə
drink.INF-LAT
'[A maneater on top of the tent casts a shadow.] Peering through the smoke hole, the woman stopped drinking [her soup].' (KW: 90, AA_1914_Maneater_flk.009)[5]

In four (out of 34) vision events we find a paratactic complement clause as already met in (1b). The other instance of *ku-* 'see, find' in this type of construction is (5a). The two remaining clauses show the verbs *măn-* 'watch' (5b) and *măndə-* 'look' (5c). The predicate in the complement clause is either a stative posture verb ('stand' in (1b) and 'sit' in (5c)), a durative dynamic event ('drive (cattle)' in (5b)), or a punctual dynamic event ('cut off' in (5a)). In terms of information structure we deal with thetic clauses in (1b), (5b) and (5c), and with VP focus in (5a).

(5) a. *uraže* *śa-bi* *nuna-nə.* *teʔme-źəʔ* *üšt-ö-bi.*
U. climb-PST cliff-LAT rope-INS lower-ITR-PST
dĭttə **ku-bi:** *teʔme-bə* *saj* *băppi*
then see-PST rope-ACC.3SG off cut.PST
'Uraže climbed up into the cliff. With a rope he let himself down. Then he saw: [the other man] cut off his rope.' (KW: 93, AA_1914_Raven_flk.009–011)

---

[5] Based on Donner's manuscript the reading of the example differs slightly from the readings in KW and the INEL corpus.

(5) b. *šaʔ-lām-bi*   *nünə-bi-n-də*   *kegə.*   **mălla?bə:**
        hide-RES-PST   hear-PTCP-LLOC-3SG   call   watch.DUR.PRS
        mal   sürer-lamnə-iʔ.
        cattle   drive-DUR.PRS-3PL
        'She hid when hearing a call. She's watching: cattle is being driven).'
        (KW: 96, AA_1914_Head_flk.008−9)

(5) c. *dĭgəttə   mān   nĭ-gən-də   śa-lām-bi.   dĭ-gəʔ*
        then   tent.GEN top-LAT-3SG   climb-RES-PST   DEM-ABL
        *mazəro-gəʔ   ťü-də   **măndə-bi:**   ija-t*
        smokehole-ABL   ground-LAT   look-PST   mother-3SG
        amna,   tamnug-ən   ńe   koʔbdo   amna.
        sit.PRS   frog-GEN   woman   daughter   sit.PRS
        'Then he climbed up on the tent top. From there he looked down through
        the smokehole. His mother and the frog woman's daughter are sitting
        there.' (KW: 197, AIN_1912_Frogwoman_flk.035−37)

In Donner's Kamas materials there is no attestation of a perception verb with a
nonfinite direct-object complement (*I saw the standing of a tent there*), or a finite
clause complement introduced by a complementizer (*I saw that/how there stood a
tent*). As seen in the examples above, clauses which express the object of perception,
are simply juxtaposed in a paratactic complementation strategy (Noonan 2007).[6]
Between the matrix clause and the complement clause may occur a pause, which is
often orthographically rendered with a comma or a colon (see more examples from
different languages in Section 5).

In the seven instances of the conditional converb *kubində(n)* (1c), (2a−e), the
relation between the vision verb and the object of perception is not that clear. I can
think of three possible interpretations of the literal meaning 'in his/her
seeing/finding a tent stands there': first, one may claim that the subject of the main
clause occurs as a pro-drop object of *ku-* in the converb clause ('seeing *it*, a tent
stood there'). I disfavour this reading because the main clause often introduces a
focal subject, which may hardly be a topical pro-drop object before its introduction.
Second, we deal with a special complementation strategy. Aikhenvald and Storch
(2013: 22) mention for instance a special complementation strategy in Manambu
(Sepik, northern Papua New Guinea) and Korowai (Trans New Guinean, South
Papua) using a medial clause within a clause chain: 'He saw, and/while his elder
brother was asleep' meaning 'He saw that his older brother was asleep'. The Kamas

---

[6] On complementation in Kamas (pre- and post-shift) see Arkhipov−Wagner-Nagy 2023: 438−
447, and on complements of perception verbs in particular op. cit.: 434−444.

structure 'in his seeing his elder brother was asleep' would then simply mean 'he saw that his elder brother was asleep'. In my opinion, however, we do not deal with a basic complementation strategy in Kamas. And third, the question of complementation is no longer relevant because the vision verb has been transformed into a connecting adverbial; this is the favoured interpretation, see Section 7.

3. The conditional converb

The conditional converb is a nonfinite form based on the participle in *-Bi*, which is also the base of the Kamas past tense (Klumpp 2002: 127–130, KW: 176). Inflected for syncretic possessive lative-locative and a possessive suffix, which cross-references the subject, the participle serves as a subordinate predicate in protasis clauses, i.e. clauses which provide a causal or temporal setting for another clause (the apodosis). Most of the Kamas simple and complex converbs show, or allow for, temporal readings, but this is the only form used in the conditional sentence constructions (see also Arkhipov–Wagner-Nagy 2023: 433–435[7]).

The seven instances of *kubində(n)* as in (1c) and (2a−e) make approximately one quarter of all attested forms of the conditional converb (7 out of 29). Klumpp (2002: 127–130) lists 27 instances of the form, to which must be added one form, which had been overlooked there, and one, which comes from a later transcript of a phonograph recording (Klumpp 2013).[8] The greatest part (23 out of 29) show bipartite structures with protasis and apodosis. The remaining six are monopartite examples without context from Donner's lexical and grammatical notes. Two of them have a Finnish translation with a temporal rather than a conditional reading: *ambińi* 'syödessäni; while I am/was eating' and *t̆ippińi* 'ampuessani; while I am/was shooting' (Klumpp 2002: 127–128, nos. 53a and 59). The other four merely illustrate morphology without translations.

Among the 23 bipartite structures, there are altogether eight with the conditional converb of *ku-* 'see, find'. Different from the seven instances of *kubində(n)*, the form

---

[7] Arkhipov–Wagner-Nagy (2023: 433) analyze the form as built on the genitive, not on the lative-locative, which, however, is not correct: it shows the typical 1st person singular of the lative-locative *-ńi* (see e.g. (6)), whereas the first person genitive is *-nə* (see Klumpp 2022: 825). In addition, they segment the second person singular *-bi-nan* as *-bina-n*, speculating if *-bina* may be analyzed as a "future conditional converb" with cognates in the North Samoyed languages (Arkhipov–Wagner-Nagy 2023: 433–434). Such an analysis is not possible.

[8] The phonograph recordings show at least four more forms. Their context is not sufficiently understood at the present moment, so I don't consider them here.

in (6) shows a 1st person singular subject and a direct object. The construction has a conditional reading.[9]

(6)   *tăn*   *ine-l*   **ku-bi-ńi**   *nörbə-li-m*
       2SG   horse-2SG   see-PTCP-LLOC1SG   tell-FUT-1SG
       'if I'll see your horse I'll tell you; (jos) näen hevosesi, kerron' (Klumpp 2002: 129)

As mentioned in the Introduction, in the seven instances of *kubində(n)*, the protasis consists of only the conditional converb with no other constituents present. There are, however, three more instances of such a structure. The two instances in (7a) are from a riddle and have a conditional rather than a temporal reading, whereas (7b) from a narrative has a clear temporal reading.

(7) a.   **iʔbə-bi-n-də**   *kōška-gəʔ=dəʔ*   *boʔbdə*,
       lie-PTCP-LLOC-3SG   cat-ABL=CONTR   low
       uʔbdə-bi-n-də   *ine-gəʔ=dəʔ*   *püržə*.
       stand_up-PTCP-LLOC-3SG   horse-ABL=CONTR   tall
       'When it's lying it's smaller than a cat, when it got up it's taller than a horse.' (KW: 85, NN_1914_Riddles_flk.010)

(7) b.   **tu-lamnə-bi-n-də**   *kegərer-ie:*   *ajə*   *kar-o-ʔ!*
       arrive-DUR-PTCP-LLOC-3SG   call-PRS   door   open-ITR-IMP2SG
       'When arriving he calls: Gate, open!' (KW: 96, AA_1914_Head_flk.010)

The examples with *kubində(n)* conform to the majority of instances of the conditional converb in having the protasis clause preceding the apodosis clause (22 of 23). The only attestation of the reverse order is (8), which has a temporal reading. The form with the auditory perception verb *nünə-* 'hear' in (8) shows how visual perceptive *kubində* could be used in a comparable context. Such use of *kubində*, however, is not attested.

(8)   *šaʔ-lām-bi*   **nünə-bi-n-də**   *kegə*.
       hide-RES-PST   hear-PTCP-LLOC-3SG   call
       'She hid when hearing a call.' (KW: 96, AA_1914_Head_flk.008)

In summary, leaving the seven instances of *kubində* undecided for their conditional or temporal value, the majority of the remaining 16 instances shows a conditional reading (13 out of 16). In ten of these, the verb in the apodosis is in future

---

[9] In Donner's grammar notes, (6) appears together with a parallel construction with a finite verb form (FUT1SG) in the protasis: *tăn inel **kulim** nörbəlim* 'if I'll see your horse I'll tell you; [(jos) näen hevosesi, kerron' (Klumpp 2002: 129, fn. 144).

tense as e.g. in (6). In the remaining three instances, the verb is in present tense, including clauses with zero copula as e.g. in (7a). Note however that a present tense in the apodosis may also occur with a temporal reading of the converb, as e.g. in (7b). The other two instances of a temporal reading of the converb, however, have a past tense form, see (8) above and (9) below. In (9), the temporal reading is supported by the conjunction *kamən* 'when'. An explicit conditional conjunction is attested in Kamas in the Russian loanword *ježəli* 'if' (KW: 23, Arkhipov–Wagner-Nagy 2023: 434), however, there are no textual occurrences of this word in the Donner materials.

(9)   *kamən   măn   **amor-bi-ńi***   *dĭ*   *šo-bi*
       when   1SG   eat-PTCP-LLOC1SG   DEM   come-PST
       'He came while I ate; kun minä söin, hän tuli' (Klumpp 2002: 127)

In Section 6, I will ask why it is the conditional converb, which specializes as an operator in the pre-mirative sequence and refer to a parallel construction in South Siberian Turkic contact languages of Kamas.

4. Perceptional identification

In the Introduction, the instance of *kubində(n)* in (1c) was contrasted with an instance of the finite form *kubi* 'saw' in (1b) and an instance of free indirect perception in (1a). All three are instances of a narrative pattern, in which a protagonist comes to a place and finds something meaningful for the further development of the story (a pre-mirative sequence in terms of Skribnik 2023). The instances with vision verbs may be understood as more explicit variants of the pattern, and the one without a vision verb as variants, in which visual perception remains implicit. Two more examples of an implicit variant are presented in (10a, b). Both show again a stative posture predicate in the second clause ('sit' in (10a) and 'lie' in (10b)).

(10) a. *mazəro-nə   śa-bi.   müjə-bə   büźe*
         smoke_hole-LAT climb-PST   finger-ACC3SG   husband
         köjēʔ-leʔ   amna.
         mark-CV   sit.PRS
         'She climbed up to the smoke hole [and sees:]. Her husband is marking [his finger].' (KW: 97, AA_1914_Head_flk.031–32)

(10) b. *dĭ*   *krȫ·s*   *pa-m*   *tĭ·l-bi,*   *tĭ·l-bi,*   *kü-ne·*
         DEM   cross   wood-ACC   dig-PST   dig-PST   die-PTCP
         ne   *i·ʔbə*
         woman   lie.PRS
         '[The protagonist comes across a wooden cross.] He dug and dug this cross
         out, a dead woman lies [there].' (Klumpp 2013: 50)

The number of instances of the narrative sequence with an implicit vision event was given as about 35. Their exact number depends on the criteria applied, but the elaboration of these criteria is not the concern of the present article. It suffices to see that in similar contexts like (1a–c) a narrator may apply a vision verb or not. The difference between an explicit and an implicit vision event can be captured in terms of *perceptional identification*. The term is applied in a study by van Krieken et al. (2017) on how to evoke and measure identification with narrative characters. They propose six dimensions, along which identification may be increased or decreased, depending on the linguistic cues applied. These are the spatiotemporal, the perceptual, the cognitive, the moral, the emotional and the embodied identification (van Krieken et al. 2017: 7). The use of perception verbs is a linguistic cue to perceptual identification, in which "readers adopt the character's perceptual perspective and mentally represent what the character sees, hears, and physically experiences" (van Krieken et al. 2017: 5). For instance in (11a) where the protagonist's vision is spelled out such a cue is present, but not in (11b).

(11) a. *She looked outside. The garden was filled with purple flowers.*
(11) b. *She stepped outside. The garden was filled with purple flowers.*

                                                                        (van Krieken et al. 2017: 7).

(11b), like the Kamas examples (1a) and (10a, b) are cases of *free indirect perception* in terms of Palmer (2004: 48–49, 79–80). As Palmer argues, in a sequence "*He sat on the bench. The train pulled away.* (…) the second sentence looks as if it is as much a simple physical description as the first sentence. However, it can also be read as the character's perception of the physical event and, even more importantly, by extension, the character's experience of the psychological implications of the event" (Palmer 2004: 48–49). The Kamas texts are certainly not written fiction. They are comparably simple and short tales told by essentially two speakers to a field-working linguist. I ignore here the difference between a professional writer and an untrained transmitter of folklore when I adopt the notion of free indirect perception from literature studies in order to describe the difference between the implicit and the explicit perception. With van Krieken et al. (2017) I conclude that the application of a visual verb in the discussed narrative pattern enhances perceptual identification. While both variants, the one without and the one with a vision predicate, qualify as

pre-mirative contexts in terms of Skribnik (2023), for Kamas I will argue that the explicit variant is crucial for the development of a mirative operator.

5. A mirative narrative pattern

The narrative pattern, which has been described as introducing a new scene or a new detail of a given scene from the perspective of a given protagonist, is encountered across different languages and narratives of different genres. Skribnik (2023: 239–240) refers to Campbell's (2008/1949) "Hero's Journey" as well as to Propp's (1958) Morphology of the Folktale. The Kamas examples belong to this type, however, my impression is that we deal with a pattern which is not restricted to folk tales. It would go beyond the scope of the present article to give a more systematic overview here, instead, a couple of examples from different languages is offered: (12a–f) illustrate how different narrators apply a vision verb ('see' or 'look') in the pattern in question. In the examples, I keep the orthography as in the sources, where a colon after the verb of vision does sometimes appear and sometimes does not. This difference is of minor importance. Note, however, that in none of the examples is the object of perception formally complemented as e.g. in English *I saw that there stood a tractor* or *I saw a tractor standing there*.

(12) a.   Xakas

Ізікті азыбысхам свет чарыдыбыстым комнатада. **Körzem:** табаннар чат парчадырлар, хайдағда нимелер.

*Izikti azybysxam svet čarydybystym komnatada. **Körzem:** tabannar čat parčadyrlar, xajdaɣda nimeler*

'[The narrator heard loud music from a dormitory room.] I opened the door, turned on the light in the room. **I see:** the guys are lying around, some stuff.' (http://lingconlab.ru/spoken_khakas/search, 20.01.24)

(12) b.   Udmurt

Одйгаз кизён нуналэ бусые потыса, **адӟисько:** трактор сылэ.

*Odigaz kiźon nunale busye potysa **aďźiśko:** traktor syle.*

'Once on a sewing day going out to the field **I see:** a tractor is standing [there].' (Wolga-Kama-Corpora, Udmurt Corpora, "Удмурт дунне" 2012.08.30)

(12) c.   Komi

*Ańuta pyris oš kerkaö. Da **aďďźö:** seni pukalö da bördö aslas ićet ćojis Mašö.*

'Anyuta entered the house of the bear, and **she sees** there sits her little sister Masha and cries.' KoZ (UK4: 424.18; Klumpp 2016: 555)

(12) d.   South Selkup

      kurpa kurpa nalɣupka **kolʼǯʼimbat** *šoɣor natʼen*

      'The girl ran and ran. **She saw:** there stood an oven.' (INEL Selkup corpus, BMS_1967_Geese-Swans_flk.020)

(12) e.   South Selkup

      kundaŋ kuralʼešpa nalguka. **mannimbat** *muge amnanda*

      'The girl ran for a long time. **She gave a look:** there stood a bird cherry tree.' (INEL Selkup corpus BMS_1967_Geese-Swans_flk.026)

(12) f.   North Mansi

kwonä	*kwālė-s,*	***sunsi-tä:***	*xarä*	*paul*
outside	get_up-PST	see-3SG.O:SG	sparse	village

      ãl-nä-tä.

      be-PTCP.PRS-3SG

      '[The boy] got outside. **He sees:** there's a sparse village.' (Munkácsi 1892–1896 Vol. II: 19, Sipőcz 2014: 123)

In the Kamas examples presented so far, the clauses which express the perceived state-of-affairs, did not exhibit any peculiar verbal categories, the verbs come in indicative present or past tense. This is true also of most of the examples from other language presented in (12) above. (12f) from North Mansi, however, shows such a category, namely the grammatical encoding of mirativity. The example comes from a study by Katalin Sipőcz on evidentiality in Mansi (Sipőcz 2014: 123). Her focus of attention is not on the vision verb, but on the verb in the existential clause, namely a present participle with a subject cross-referencing possessive suffix (*ãlnätä* 'be-PTCP.PRS-3SG') instead of a finite form of the verb 'to be'. Such participle-based predicates have been identified as the main grammatical means of expressing evidentiality in all Ob-Ugric languages except for East Khanty (Skribnik–Laakso 2022: 531). Originally figuring as nonfinite object complements of verbs of perception or cognition, they underwent insubordination. Note that in (12f) the participle does occur with a verb of perception, however, this is not a primary participle-based object complement, but an instance of the already grammaticalized evidential which occurs equally well without any cognitive or perceptional matrix verb (see Sipőcz 2014). According to Sipőcz (2014: 127) these present-tense participle based forms are always focal.

Evidentiality is the grammatical encoding of the source of information (Aikhenvald 2018: 1). Vision is a primary source of information besides other sources like hearing, hearsay or inference (Aikhenvald–Storch 2012: 8). All the above examples show evidence based on vision, but only the Mansi example shows grammatically encoded evidentiality. In case of the evidential participle-based

predicates, however, it has been stated that they have a strong mirative extension, and in North Mansi it even became the dominant meaning (Skribnik and Kehayov 2018: 543). Mirativity is the grammatical encoding of the unprepared mind (Aikhenvald 2012: 437), i.e. a category dealing with the speaker's knowledge structure and psychological unpreparedness (DeLancey 1997: 33, 35). Aikhenvald (2012: 473) offers a range of cross-linguistically attested mirative submeanings like (i) sudden discovery, sudden revelation or realization, (ii) surprise, (iii) unprepared mind, (iv) counterexpectation, and (v) new information, pointing out that mirative forms may have further discourse functions like marking the main point of a story or surprising and focal points in a narrative (Aikhenvald 2012: 474). Some of these notions may be easily found in the examples in (12), but again, only in the North Mansi example (12e) the pre-mirative sequence is followed by a predicate exhibiting the grammatical encoding of mirativity.

Turning to the Kamas instances of *kubində(n)* in (1c) and (2a–e), I wonder which of the mirative submeanings summarized by Aikhenvald (2012: 473–474) are relevant. Some of them have a strong connotation of surprise, namely the arrival of a warrior in (2b), the torn-up sheep in (2c), or the knife sticking in the heart of a woman in (2d). But I wonder if "unprepared mind" is the correct understanding of a situation when someone opens a door in order to find out what is behind it (as with the cellar door in (2e)), and I wonder how seeing a tent or a village when moving through landscape is a case of "sudden discovery", cf. (1c) and (2a). Including the examples with finite vision verbs, there appears again surprise (as with the cut rope in (5a)), there is again a tent in the landscape (1b), the observation of driving cattle (5b), or a protagonist finding his mother (5c). What all those instances have in common is that they are focal points in the narrative, focal for the continuation of the narrative, opening the site and introducing the interaction-personal for a subsequent episode, or in the words of Skribnik (2023: 237) "surprising key points".

According to Aikhenvald, all mirative meanings "can be defined with respect to (a) the speaker, (b) the audience (or addressee), or (c) the main character" (Aikhenvald 2012: 473). In summarizing the present section, I suggest to understand the application of an explicit vision event in our narrative pattern as a pre-mirative strategy directed at the audience to enhance the perceptional identification of the audience with the main character. The submeaning of mirativity I consider most relevant for the development of the form *kubində(n)* is realization of relevant new information on behalf of a central protagonist of the narrative. It needs to be pointed out that the application of a vision predicate as such is not grammatical encoding of mirativity. Instead, we deal with a structure from which a mirative marker, grammatical or adverbial, may develop. As a next step, the role of the conditional in the encoding of the vision verb must be clarified.

6. Mirativity and the conditional: an areal parallel

The Kamas conditional converb protasis *kubində(n)* 'as (s)he/it sees/finds' has a striking areal parallel in South Siberian Turkic. An example from Xakas has already been presented in (12a), repeated here with glossings in (13a), another one is (13b). The Xakas verb *kör-* may express experienced vision ('see') as well as vision as activity ('look') (Baskakov–Inkizhekova-Grekul 1953); the *Xakasskij slovar' onlajn* offers кöрерге as a search result for Russian видеть 'see' as well as for смотреть and глядеть, both 'look (at)', and instances of *kör-ze(-)* are sometimes translated with Russian смотреть, sometimes with видеть.[10] So, for instance *körzem* in (13a) is translated in the Russian original translation as смотрю 'I look', and *körze* in (13b) as видит '(s)he sees'.

(13)   Xakas

(13) a.   Ізікті азыбысхам свет чарыдыбыстым комнатада. **Кöрзем:** табаннар
          чат парчадырлар, хайдағда нимелер.

        Izik-ti   *azy-bys-xa-m*   *svet*
        door-ACC   open-PERF-PST1-1SG   light

        čary-dy-bys-ty-m   *komnata-da.*   *Kör-ze-m:*
        shine-CAUS-PERF-PST2-1SG   room-LOC   see-COND-1SG

        taban-nar   *čat*   *par-čadyr-lar,*   *xajdaɣ=da*   *nime-ler*
        guy-PL   lie.CV go-PRS-PL   what:kind:of=INDEF   thing-PL

        '[The narrator heard loud music from a dormitory room.] I opened the door, turned on the light in the room. **[When] I look:** the guys are lying around, some stuff.' (http://lingconlab.ru/spoken_khakas/search, 20.01.24)

(13) b.   **Кöрзе,** вокзал істінде милиционер пастыр чöрче, …

        Kör-ze,   *vokzal istin-de*   *milicioner*
        look-COND   station inside-LOC   policeman

        pastyr čör-če
        go.CV   move-PRS

        '[An illiterate old woman at the train station has no idea where tickets are sold.] **[As] she sees:** a policeman was going around inside the station. [She turns to the policeman for help.]' (https://khakas.altaica.ru/, 20.01.2024)

Like in Kamas, the South Siberian Turkic conditional is based on a nonfinite form (Schönig 1998: 414, Skribnik 2023: 253). The conditional converb is used in a range of constructions, "almost all of are the first component in a complex sentence (…) used as one of the means expressing a temporal/conditional subordinate clause"

---

[10] A Xakas verb which designates unmistakably the activity 'look' is *paxla-* (Baskakov–Inkizhekova-Grekul 1953: 147).

(Anderson 1998: 33–35). An overview on its formation and function is offered by Menz (2012), where a special paragraph is devoted to perception verbs: "Verbs of perception, like *is-/uqsa-* 'to hear' and *kör-* 'to see' marked with the conditional form a special kind of temporal clause. The predicate of the main clause in this construction is either present or past tense" (Menz 2012: 64, referring to Nevskaja 1993: 77). According to Menz, "a conditional interpretation is not possible in this construction because the event of the embedded clause cannot be interpreted as the cause of the event in the matrix clause" (ib.).[11] Referring to Baskakov (1985: 193), Menz reports that "this construction conveys the sudden emergence of the event expressed in the matrix clause" (Menz 2012: 64). A construction which expresses the perception of an event which "emerged suddenly" from the perspective of the perceiver, may be called a mirative construction, at least it carries typical mirative meanings like sudden discovery, sudden revelation or realization, surprise, or unprepared mind (Aikhenvald 2012: 473). Of the two examples above, (13b) may in addition carry the idea of a focal point or the further development of the story. In addition to Xakas also Altai-kizhi prefers the conditional converb in *-SA* in pre-mirative sequences (Skribnik 2023: 253).

With the Xakas and Kamas formally and functionally parallel mirative construction one more feature of Sayan Samoyed-Turkic language contact has been identified,[12] a further elaboration, however, is difficult due to the scarce Kamas data. One may also ask how widespread the phenomenon is in Siberian languages. In narrative data from the Kamas sister language Selkup, I could not find any instance, and in the overview on pre-mirative sequences in Siberian languages by Skribnik (2023), the aforementioned Turkic languages Xakas and Altai-kizhi seem to be the only ones, in which the conditional figures in this structure. However, I found an example from West Mansi (14).

---

[11] In the Introduction, I found not only the conditional reading 'if (s)e sees/finds ~ saw/found' awkward, but also the temporal reading 'when (s)he sees/finds ~ saw/found'. This holds for Kamas. In case of Xakas, however, where *kör-* means also 'look', a temporal reading 'when (s)he looks ~ looked' is fine, cf. (13a).

[12] For more see e.g. Anderson 2005, Klumpp 2002: 833–834.

(14)   West Mansi

ækʷ_mæt_sʲitəl   *kojs*   *pyw-əɣ*   *ni:ləp-əs-ɣə* [...] **ʃuʃ-k-əm:**
suddenly   Kois   son-DU   appear-PST-3DU   look-PTCP.COND-1SG

isʲkeæ̯k-kar   *jæɣ*   *mæn*   *wujp*   *tæw*   *ton*   *wujp*
younger-NZER   father   what_kind_of   like   3SG   that   like

'Suddenly Kois' two sons appeared. [...] **When I look,** the younger one resembles his father.' (OUDB PM 1339: 167, 171)[13]

(14) from West Mansi shares with Kamas and Xakas the presence of a conditional operator, turning the vision event semantically into a protasis, and the absence of mirative or evidential operator in the apodosis. The three languages differ in that the Kamas construction applies a clear experiential vision verb (*ku-* 'see'), the Xakas one an ambiguous verb (*kör-* 'see, look'), and the Mansi construction an actional vision verb (North Mansi *sunsi-*, West Mansi *ʃuʃ-* 'look').[14]

It is beyond the scope of this article to investigate the role of the conditional in the pre-mirative narrative pattern in Mansi and its possible correlation with the use of grammatical mirative marking in the apodosis. The West Mansi example in (14), however, points to a possibly larger area, and one may ask why the conditional functions in such contexts in Kamas, in Xakas, and to some unknown extent also in Mansi.

According to Aikhenvald (2006) it is typical for conditionals to be used as evidential strategies: "Conditionals and other nondeclarative moods may acquire overtones of uncertain information obtained from some other source, for which the speaker does not take any responsibility" (Aikhenvald 2006: 321, naming as the best known example the French conditional and referring to Dendale 1993). Since miratives are often a further development of evidentials it should come as no surprise to find a conditional applied in a mirative narrative pattern. However, this explanation would apply if the conditional would occur with the perceived state-of-affairs ("as if there is tent"), but not with the preceding vision verb, which communicates uncontroversially that the protagonist sees something or takes a look.

A different argument may be drawn from the temporal ambiguity of the conditional forms in Kamas, Xakas and Mansi. As one may have noticed, the clauses in the apodosis often host an existential predication in present tense (see examples (1a–c), (2a–e), (5b–5c) from Kamas, (13a, b) from Xakas, and (12a–c), (12e/13), and (14) from other languages. Skribnik (2023: 244) observes a change of tense such that narratives, in general, are based on the past tense, including the motion predicate,

---

[13] OUDB: Ob-Ugric Database at http://www.babel.gwi.uni-muenchen.de.
[14] The experiential Mansi vision verb is *wāɣ-* 'see, know' (Kubitsch et al. 2023: 345).

but the perception predicate appears in present tense. Turning once more to van Krieken et al.'s (2017) cues to identification with a character, one finds the criteria of spatio-temporal identification, which is higher with present tense than with past tense because present tense "collapses the tenses of character and reader" (van Krieken et al. 2017: 7). Often in the aforementioned examples, the preceding predication is in past tense, which is expected in narrative texts (see examples (1a–c), (2c–e), (5b–c) from Kamas, (13a) from Xakas, and (12c–f) from other languages). A switch from past tense to present tense is thus motivated when it comes to the description of a new scene and its perception. In (1a–c), repeated here as (15a–c), different transitions in tense can be observed: (15a) and (15b) show sharp transitions from past-tense based movement to present-tense based perception of a scene. In (15c), the transition is softer because between the past-tense motion event and the present-tense existential event there is the visual event in form of the tense-neutral conditional converb.

(15) a. *bazoʔ   ťüťe   kandə-bi.   maʔ   nu-ga.*
again   a_bit   walk-PST   tent   stand-PRS
'Again   he   walked   a   bit.   A   tent   is   standing   [there].' (KW: 95, AA_1914_Corpse_flk.078–79)

(15) b. *urgo   măja-nə   kambi.   urgo   sagər   măja-gən*
big   mountain-LAT   go.PST   big   black   mountain-LOC
ku-bi: maʔ   nu-ga.
see-PST   tent   stand-PRS
'He went to the big mountain. On the big black mountain he saw: a tent is standing [there].' (KW: 197, AIN_1912_Frogwoman_flk.032–33)

(15) c. *peńəj-loʔbdə-bi   ťăga-n   tăžə.   ku-bi-n-də*
float-INGR-PST   river-GEN   downstream   see-PTCP-LLOC-3SG
maʔ   nu-ga,   esseŋ   śar-laʔbə-jəʔ.
tent   stand-3SG   child.PL   play-DUR.PRS-3PL
'It started floating downstream. As it sees, there is a tent standing, children are playing.' (KW: 88, AA_1914_Mouse_flk.010–11)

As a motivation to apply the converb instead of the finite verb I thus assume the converb's tense-neutrality. Having ascribed a transition marking function to the conditional converb in the protasis, I ask in the next section if it can be understood as a connecting adverbial.

7. A mirative connector

Up to this point it has been observed that the Kamas conditional converb form *kubində* etc. occurs in a pre-mirative narrative pattern where a new scene or a detail of a given scene which is important for the development of the narrative, is introduced as appearing to the eyesight of a given protagonist. The alternatives in this pattern are either an implicit variant without a vision verb but free indirect perception, or a construction with a finite vision verb and a paratactic complement. It has been argued that the explicit strategy with a vision verb enhances perceptual identification with the protagonist and it has a mirative component. In Mansi, for instance, the complement clause predicate may show grammatical encoding of mirativity. Encoding the vision verb in the conditional has been observed as a pre-mirative strategy in West Mansi, Xakas and in Kamas. It further has been discussed that the relation between the vision verb and the visually perceived state-of-affairs is less clear with the conditional converb. In the following I want to clarify the functional status of *kubində.*

Comparing the instances of *kubində(n)* in the mirative narrative strategy with the finite instances (Introduction, Section 2), the lexical fixation is noteworthy. The conditional converb occurs always with *ku-* 'see, find', whereas the finite instances show variation between this verb and *măn(də)-* 'look'. If there happened to exist a parallel formation ***măndəbində* 'as (s)he looks/looked' then it was at least less frequent and did not make it into the handful of narratives which have been recorded. As was seen in previous examples (12e, 13b, 14), in a pre-mirative sequence there may also figure an agentive verb 'look', however, considering that an experiential vision verb like *ku-* 'see, find' is more to be associated with an unprepared mind, it is hardly surprising that the grammaticalization of a Kamas mirative operator starts with *ku-.*

Another noteworthy property of *kubində* is its persistent appearance as a one-word operator. Due to its formal appearance as a conditional converb form it was understood as a protasis clause, which consists of one word only. A protasis provides a causal or a temporal setting for the apodosis. As Menz (2012: 64) observed for the South Siberian Turkic conditional with perceptions verbs, it is not possible to interpret the embedded clause (i.e. the protasis) as causal for of the event in the matrix clause (i.e. the apodosis). It is, in my opinion, a dummy-protasis with the purpose to background the visual event as a marker of mirativity and foreground the state-of-affairs which is the object of perception (cf. Sipőcz 2014: 127 on the focality of evidential and mirative participle predicates in Mansi). Once the protasis is not a clause any longer and consists of one word only, this word may be reanalyzed as an operator in the left periphery of the matrix clause, the former apodosis.

What has also been observed with *kubində* is a shift of syntactic and semantic weight. In the construction with a finite verb we have a proper seeing event and an event which is the paratactic complement ('x saw y stands'). In case of the converb-operator we have an event and a satellite ('x seeing y stood'). As a translation of *kubində* it was suggested 'as (s)he/it sees/finds'. Another example from Mansi may support this reading. Like (12f) it features a mirative participle-based predicate in the paratactic complement clause, but different from that it appears with a conjunction *kwoss* 'while, when, as'. The conjunction may be compared to the use of the conditional in the Mansi example (14), but the conjunction in (16) is more specific.

(16)   ***Kwoss*** *suns-i:* *ań-maləŋ*   *paul*   *nāŋk-nē-te.*
        while   look-3SG   DP   village   be_visible-EV.PRS/MIR-3SG
        '**As (**s)he looks, well, a village is seen.' (Munkácsi 1892–1896 Vol. IV: 214, Kubitsch et al. 2023: 350)

The introduction of new scenes and protagonists does not need the perspective of an already acting character. The beginning of a narrative does usually not involve any verb of vision, at least not in the Kamas tales. When the satellite expression 'in her/his seeing' appears at the transition from one episode of a narrative to another it reminds of a connecting adverbial or a connective discourse marker, whose function is to connect an utterance to previous talk (see e.g. Beeching–Detges 2014: 3). The general sentence-connecting adverbial in Kamas is *dĭgəttə* 'then' (also in shortened form *dĭttə*) as in (17a–b). The full form is still segmentable as *dĭ-gət-tə*, which is the demonstrative *dĭ* in discourse deictic function inflected for ablative case and a 3rd person singular possessive suffix, originally meaning 'from her/his/its this'. Originally the demonstrative functioned here as a *hypostatization* anaphora (Fraurud 1992) which refers to the situation, action or spoken text of a salient participant in the preceding discourse, and the possessive suffix cross-referenced the salient participant (Klumpp 2015: 224).[15] As (17a) and (17b) show, there is no cross-referencing any longer, the possessive suffix of the 3rd person sing. appears also in instances with a plural or a non-3rd person participant.

---

[15] In Buryat, a Mongolic language in the larger neighbourhood of Kamas, a way to form hypostatization anaphora is by pronominal verbs in a converb form, e.g. *tii-geed* (shortened *t'eed*) V.DEM.DIST-CVB.PERV 'after doing that' (Skribnik 2024). The phonetic similarity between Buryat *tii-geed* (*t'eed*) and Kamas *dĭgəttə* (*dĭttə*) is probably accidental.

(17) a. *süʔmə-leʔ*   *naŋ-bi*   *dǐ*   *ńi-nə.*   **dǐgəttə**
         jump-CV   cling-PST   DEM   boy-LAT   then
         ťabəro-bi-iʔ.
         wrestle-PST-PL
         'She jumped and clung to this boy. Then they wrestled.' (KW: 93,
         AA_1914_Brothers_flk.066–67)

(17) b. *urgāba* *ku-bia-m,*   **dǐgəttə**   *par-laʔ*   *šo-bia-m.*
         bear   see-PST-1SG   then   return-CV   come-PST-1SG
         'I saw a bear, then I returned.' (KW: 98, AA_1914_Girl_flk.017)

In the Donner texts, the connecting adverbial *dǐgəttə* 'then' is more than three times more frequent than *kubində* (23 vs. 7), and it survived in post-shift Kamas.[16] Based on the attested text material it seems that *kubində* is in complementary distribution with the general connector, there are no instances where the two operators would follow each other. However, there is an instance in which the aforementioned narrative pattern is introduced by the general connector (18), but the vision verb appears in finite form here. The distribution suggests that the two operators, the general connector *dǐgəttə* 'then' and the mirative connector *kubində(n)* 'as (s)he/they see(s)', belong to the same class of connecting adverbials.

(18) *uraže* *śa-bi*   *nuna-nə.*   *teʔme-źəʔ*   *üšt-ö-bi.*
      U.   climb-PST   cliff-LAT   rope-INS   lower-ITR-PST
      dǐttə **ku-bi:**   *teʔme-bə*   *saj*   *băppi*
      then   see-PST   rope-ACC.3SG   off   cut.PST
      'Uraže climbed up into the cliff. With a rope he let himself down. **Then he saw:** [the other man] cut off his rope.' (KW: 93, AA_1914_Raven_flk.009–011)

Based on the above observations, I understand the Kamas conditional converb form *kubində* etc. as a connective adverbial with a mirative meaning. It originates from a pre-mirative sequence in terms of Skribnik (2023), in which a protasis predicate has been conventionalized to function as a one-word operator with a mirative extension at the left periphery of the sentence. In terms of grammaticalization I can think of two parameters in the reknown framework of Lehmann (2002, chapter 4), which point to such an ongoing process: First, the syntagmatic variability parameter of fixation, i.e. the item cannot any longer be shifted around freely, but occupies a fixed slot. Second, the paradigmatic cohesion parameter of paradigmaticity, where the item does not any longer participate loosely

---

[16] The frequency of *dǐgəttə* 'then' (also in the variant *tǐgəttə*) in the INEL corpus is 1760 instances among 49,000 words.

in a semantic field, but belongs to small, tightly integrated paradigm of sentence connectors.

8. Conclusions

The present article aimed at establishing a mirative operator in the domain of connective adverbials. For Uralic languages, mirative operators have been described as resulting from insubordinated participle predicates, or as adverbials (Skribnik–Kehayov 2018). In opposition to an adverbial, which may take different positions within a clause, a connector appears at the left border of a clause or discourse unit. The Kamas conditional converb *kubində(n)*, attested seven times in the texts collected by Kai Donner, in a context, in which we also find a finite vision predicate or no vision predicate at all, has been analyzed as an operator which connects narrative discourse units and, in opposition to the general connecting adverbial *dĭgəttə* 'then', carries a mirative component. In Kamas, the two operators resemble each other in structure. The Kamas data is small, and I do not want to draw conclusions about the South Siberian parallel formation (Xakas *kör-ze*(-PX)). However, based on the information by Menz (2012: 64) and Skribnik's analysis of pre-mirative patterns, I do not see an obstacle for understanding the Xakas form as a mirative extension too. It must be noted that while Skribnik's (2023) pre-mirative sequence consists of several facultative parts (most prominently venitive motion and visual perception), in case of the Kamas operator the explicit presence of a verb of visual perception has been the condition for the development of a mirative operator.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations in the glossings follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules,[17] some non-trivial abbreviations are spelled out here:

ADJ	adjective derivation
CONTR	contrastive particle
CV	converb
DEM	demonstrative pronoun
DP	discourse particle
DUR	durative aktionsart
EV	evidential
INGR	ingressive aktionsart
INS	instrumental case
LLOC	syncretic lative-locative case

---

[17] https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/Glossing-Rules.pdf (Accessed: 10 October 2024)

MIR	mirative
MOM	momentaneous aktionsart
NZER	nominalizer
OBL	oblique form of personal pronouns,
RES	resultative aktionsart

Acknowledgements

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Evidentiality in Grammar. In: Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (2nd edn.), Vol. 4. Oxford: Elsevier. 320–325.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2012. The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology* 16: 435–485. DOI 10.1515/lingty-2012-0017

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. – Storch, Anne 2013. *Linguistic expression of perception and cognition: a typological glimpse.* In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. – Anne Storch (eds.), *Perception and Cognition in Language and Culture.* Brill's Studies in Language, Cognition and Culture 3. Leiden: Brill. 1–45.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2018. Evidentiality: The framework. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality.* Oxford University Press. 1–43.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 1998. *Xakas.* Munich–Newcastle: Lincom Europa.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2005. *Language Contact in South Central Siberia.* Turcologica 54. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Arkhipov, Alexandre – Däbritz, Chris Lasse – Gusev, Valentin 2019. *INEL Kamas corpus. User documentation.* (Accessed: 10 October 2024) https://corpora.uni-hamburg.de/repository/file:kamas-1.0_INEL_Kamas_Corpus_1.0_User_Documentation/PDF/INEL_Kamas_Corpus.pdf

Arkhipov, Alexandre – Wagner-Nagy, Beáta 2023. Kamas. In: Behnke, Anja – Beáta Wagner-Nagy (eds.), *Clause Linkage in the Languages of the Ob-Yenisei Area. Asyndetic Constructions.* Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Theory 23. Leiden – Boston: Brill. 415–452.

Baskakov, N. A. [Баскаков Н. А.] 1985. *Диалект лебединских татар-чалканцев (куу-кижи): Грамматический очерк, тексты, переводы, словарь. (Северные диалекты алтайского (ойротского) языка)*. Москва: Наука.

Baskakov, Nikolaj A. – Inkizhekova-Grekul, Anastasija I. [Баскаков Н. А. – А. И. Инкижекова-Грекул] 1953. *Хакасско-русский словарь*. Москва: Министерство културы СССР.

Beeching, Kate – Detges, Ulrich 2014. Introduction. In: Beeching, K. – U. Detges (eds.), *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery: Crosslinguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change.* Studies in Pragmatics 12. Leiden–Boston: Brill.

Campbell, Joseph 2008 [1949, 1968]. *The hero with a thousand faces.* 3rd edn. Bollingen Series XVII. Novato, California: New World Library.

Däbritz, Chris-Lasse 2022. On the typology of locative predication in Samoyedic languages. In: Kaheinen, Kaisla – Larisa Leisiö – Riku Erkkilä – Toivo E.H. Qiu (eds.), *Hämeenmaalta Jamalille. Kirja Tapani Salmiselle.* Helsinki: Helda Open books. 53–68.

Däbritz, Chris-Lasse 2023. Non-canonical structures in locative and existential predication in the Ob-Ugric languages. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 99: 93–123.

DeLancey, Scott 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1: 33–52.

Dendale, Patrick 1993. Le conditionnel de l'information incertaine: marqueur modal ou marqueur evidentiel? In: Hilty, Gerold (ed.), *Proceedings of the XXe Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes*, Tome I, Section I. La phrase. Tübingen: Francke. 165–176.

Fraurud, Kari 1992. *Situation reference: what does "it" refer to? In: Processing noun phrases in natural discourse.* PhD Thesis at the Department of Linguistics of Stockholm university.

Gusev, Valentin – Klooster, Tiina – Wagner-Nagy, Beáta 2019. "INEL Kamas Corpus." Version 1.0. Publication date 2019-12-15. http://hdl.handle.net/11022/0000-0007-DA6E-9. Archived in Hamburger Zentrum für Sprachkorpora. In: Wagner-Nagy, Beáta, Alexandre Arkhipov, Anne Ferger, Daniel Jettka, and Timm Lehmberg (eds.), *The INEL corpora of indigenous Northern Eurasian languages.*

Janhunen, Juha 1977. *Samojedischer Wortschatz – Gemeinsamojedische Etymologien.* Castrenianumin toimitteita 17. Helsinki: SUS.

KW = Joki, Aulis J. 1944. *Kai Donners Kamassisches Wörterbuch nebst Sprachproben und Hauptzügen der Grammatik.* Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae VIII. Helsinki: Finno-Ugric Society.

Klumpp, Gerson 2002. *Konverbkonstruktionen im Kamassischen.* Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 58. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Klumpp, Gerson 2013. On Kai Donner's phonograph records of Kamas. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 37: 45–59.

Klumpp, Gerson 2015. Resolving ambiguity of demonstrative use in Kamas. *ESUKA–JEFUL* 6(2): 217–242. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2015.6.2.09

Klumpp, Gerson 2016. Semantic functions of complementizers in Permic languages. In: Boye, Kasper – Petar Kehayov (eds.), *Complementizer Semantics in European Languages.* Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 57. Berlin – Boston: Walter de Gruyter. 529–586.

Klumpp, Gerson 2022. Kamas. In: Bakró-Nagy, Marianne – Johanna Laakso – Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 817–843.

Kubitsch, Rebeka – Sipőcz, Katalin – Szeverényi, Sándor 2023. Az érzékelésigék rendszerének vizsgálata az udmurt, manysi és nganaszan nyelvekben és annak történeti vonatkozásai. In: Cser, András – Attila László Nemesi (eds.), *Nyelvelmélet és diakrónia* 5. Budapest: Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem Bölcsészet- és Társadalomtudományi Kar. 333–362.

Lehmann, Christian 2002. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization.* 2nd revised edition. http://www.christianlehmann.eu/publ/ASSidUE09.pdf (Accessed: 10 October 2024)

Menz, Astrid 2012. The conditional in South Siberian Turkic. In: Marcel Erdal, Irina Nevskaya – Astrid Menz (eds.), *Areal, historical and typological aspects of South Siberian Turkic.* Turkologica 94. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 59–74.

Munkácsi, Bernát 1892–1896. *Vogul népköltési gyűjtemény.* Vol. I–IV. Budapest: Reguly Társaság.

Nevskaja, Irina A. [Невская, И. А.] 1993. *Формы деепричастного типа в шорском языке.* Новосибирск: Издательство Новосибирского государственного университета.

Noonan, Michael 2007. Complementation. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description:* Volume 2, *Complex constructions.* 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 52–150.

Palmer, Alan 2004. *Fictional Minds.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Propp, V. J. = Пропп, В. Я. 1969 [1928]. *Морфология сказки [Morphology of the Folktale], 2-е изд. (Исследования по фольклору и мифологии Востока 1).* Москва: Главная редакция восточной литературы издательства «Наука».

Schönig, Claus 1998. South Siberian Turkic. In: Johanson, Lars – Éva Ágnes Csató (eds.), *The Turkic Languages.* London – New York: Routledge.

Sipőcz, Katalin 2014. A manysi evidenciálisról. *Folia Uralica Debreceniensia* 21: 121–141.

Skribnik, Elena 2023. Reading Siberian folklore: Miratives, pre-mirative contexts and "Hero's Journey" In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. – Robert L. Bradshaw – Luca Ciucci – Pema Wangdi (eds.), *Celebrating Indigenous Voice. Legends and Narratives in Languages of the Tropics and Beyond.* Anthropological Linguistics 5. Berlin–Boston: Walter de Gruyter. 237–259.

Skribnik, Elena 2024. Boundaries in discourse: bridging linkage in Buryat. Conference abstract. Third Conference on the Endangered Languages of East Asia. Ca' Foscari University of Venice May 6-8, 2024. Book of abstracts, 5–7. https://www.unive.it/pag/fileadmin/user_upload/eventi/conferenze/CELEA/documenti/Book-abstractsCELEA3.pdf (Accessed: 10 October 2024)

Skribnik, Elena – Kehayov, Petar 2018. Evidentials in Uralic Languages. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 525–553.

Skribnik, Elela – Laakso, Johanna 2022. Ugric. General Introduction. In: Marianne Bakró-Nagy – Johanna Laakso – Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic languages.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 523–536.

van Krieken, Kobie – Hans Hoeken – José Sanders 2017. Evoking and Measuring Identification with Narrative Characters – A Linguistic Cues Framework. *Frontiers in Psychology* 8: 1190. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01190

Viberg, Åke 1984. The verbs of perception: A typological study. In: Butterworth, Brian – Bernard Comrie – Östen Dahl (eds.), *Explanations for Language Universals.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 123–162.

Viberg, Åke 2008. Swedish verbs of perception from a typological and contrastive perspective. In: Gómez González, María de los Ángeles – Lachlan J. Mackenzie – Elsa M. González Álvarez (eds.), *Languages and Cultures in Contrast and Comparison.* Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 123–172.