

## 1. Introduction

- Nominal tense with nominal scope (Lecarme 1996; Nordlinger & Sadler 2004, 2008; Alexiadou, Haegeman & Stavrou 2007, and others): nouns are marked for grammatical tense but their temporal interpretation does not depend on the tense of the clause. The tense takes scope over the NP and is deictically interpreted in relation to the situation time (unlike in languages without nominal tense, where NPs are interpreted at a contextually given time).
- Tonhauser (2007) argues that ‘nominal tense’ in Guarani and other languages does affect the temporal interpretation of the NP but is not really tense because the semantic contribution of tense-related expressions in the NP differs from that of verbal tenses. There is currently no reliable evidence from any language for the existence of nominal tenses. However, Nordlinger & Sadler (2008) suggest that this may be due to the inherent semantic difference between nouns and verbs (nouns are more temporally stable than verbs).
- The paper contributes to these debates by examining the so-called predestinative forms in Tundra Nenets (Uralic).<sup>1</sup> The basic claim is that predestinatives express a TAM-like category and therefore provide empirical evidence for a temporal dimension of the interpretation of NPs.

## 2. Basic syntax and meaning of “predestinative” forms

- Predestinative forms of nouns: *-d°/-dā-* + possessive agreement

(1) s'ay°-dā-m'i      [tea-PRED-1SG]      'tea for me'  
       wada-d°da      [word-PRED-3SG]      'a word for him'

- Previous analyses emphasized that agreement on predestinatives can express a goal argument of ditransitive verbs

(2) kniga-dā-mt°      m'iŋa-d°m  
       book-PRED-ACC.2SG      give-1SG  
       I gave you a book.

- Siegl (2008a, b) on closely related Enets: predestinative affixes are actually applicative markers hosted by nouns instead of the verb.

- Malchukov, Haspelmath & Comrie (2010) on Samoyedic and Tungusic, Malchukov (2010) on Tungusic: agreement is NP-internal but interpreted as the goal argument (recipient/beneficiary).

- However: the beneficiary is clearly NP-internal: it cannot be separated from the head noun and has no effect on clausal syntax. It is encoded in the same way as the regular possessor. Structural parallelism between predestinatives and regular possessives:

Possessive		Predestinative	
(pidār°) ŋəno-r°	'your boat'	(pidār°) ŋəno-dā-r°	'boat for you'
Wata-h (GEN) ŋəno	'Wata's boat'	Wata-h (GEN) ŋəno-d°	'boat for Wata'

- The predestinative possessor and the regular possessor are in complementary distribution: *\*my gift for you*. This entails that when the possessor is distinct from the goal argument, the goal argument cannot be expressed by the predestinative.

(3) a. \*mən° kniga-dā-mt°      m'iŋa-d°m      b. kniga-m'i      n'ant°      m'iŋa-d°m  
       I      book-PRED-ACC.2SG      give-1SG      book-ACC.1SG      you.DAT      give-1SG  
       I gave you my book.      I gave you my book.

- That the goal argument is interpreted as coreferential with the possessor is not an inherent meaning of the construction (the encoded meaning of the predestinative), but some kind of implicature which can easily be cancelled.

(4) Masha-n°      kniga-dā-mt°      m'iŋa-d°m  
       Masha-DAT      book-PRED-ACC.2SG      give-1SG  
       I gave Masha a book for you.

<sup>1</sup> Tundra Nenets is spoken by about 21,000 people in Western Siberia and the Arctic part of European Russia. Unless indicated otherwise, the data comes from my own fieldwork supported by an ELDP grant and a grant from the Academy of Finland, project number 125225. The transcription is based on Salminen (1997), but is slightly modified.

- I will propose that the meaning of (2) is not ‘I gave you a book’ but rather something like ‘I gave [a book meant for you/your future book]’, where the element ‘you’ syntactically and semantically belongs to the NP-internal domain and behaves like a possessor, while the goal argument remains unexpressed (goal arguments can correspond to a referential null in Tundra Nenets).

- Question: what grammatical category does the predestinative express?

- Predestinatives exist in three grammatical cases. Like in regular possessives, case and agreement often cumulate.

	1SG	2SG	3SG
NOM	ḡəno-də-w°/ ḡəno-də-m’i	ḡəno-də-r°	ḡəno-də-da
ACC	ḡəno-də-w°/ ḡəno-də-m’i	ḡəno-də-mt°	ḡəno-də-mta
GEN	ḡəno-də-n°	ḡəno-də-nt°	ḡəno-də-nta

- Nominative: subject

(5) xasawa            n’u-da-m’i            soya°  
 man.                child-PRED-NOM.1SG    be.born.3SG  
 A son was born for me.

- Accusative: objects

(6) pedara-xəd°        tərpi-tə-waq            xos’°            yaqmə°-waq  
 forest-ABL            exit-PRED-ACC.1PL    find.CONV        cannot-1PL>OBJ.SG  
 We cannot find the exit from the forest for ourselves.

- Genitive: predicate (7a) or adjunct meaning roughly ‘as, for, instead’ (7b).

(7) a. t’uku°    wen’ako    mən’aq        wen’ako-d°-naq        xəya  
 this    dog        we                dog-PRED-GEN.1PL    become.3SG  
 This dog became our dog.

b. t’uku°    ti-m                ḡəmcodə-d°-naq        temta-we-waq  
 this    reindeer-ACC    food-PRED-GEN.1PL    buy-NARR-OBJ.SG.1PL  
 We bought this reindeer as food four ourselves.

### 3. Predestinative as nominal tense

- Properties of nominal tense with nominal scope (Nordlinger & Sadler 2004: 778):

- (i) nouns show a distinction in tense
- (ii) this distinction is productive across the whole word class
- (iii) it is not restricted to nominals functioning as predicates
- (iv) the tense marker is a morphological category of the noun and cannot be treated as a syntactic clitic.

- In some languages (e.g. Salishan), nominal tense serves to temporally locate the nominal independently of the possessive relation. In other languages (e.g. Hixkaryana), nominal tense with nominal scope is only active in possessive constructions and is not expressed in non-possessive NPs. Nenets seems to belong to the latter type.

- In non-possessive NPs the nominal tense is interpretively related to the reference of the NP (the property of ‘being X’). It establishes reference time, i.e. the time at which the property expressed by the noun is true of the individual denoted by the NP.

- In possessive NPs there are two semantic predicates: the property of ‘being X’ and the possessive relation. Consequently, there may be two interpretations of tense in a possessive phrase: either with respect to the nominal referent itself or with respect to the possessive relation.

- Tonhauser (2007) on Guarani:

Tnp    - the time at which the NP is interpreted [typically coincides with the event time T<sub>ev</sub>]  
 T<sub>poss</sub> - the time at which the possessive relation is true  
 T<sub>nom</sub> - the time at which the property denoted by the noun is true

(8) che-rôga-kue  
 1SG-house-PAST  
 my former house

- a. it is not a house anymore: T<sub>nom</sub> < T<sub>np</sub> [and consequently not ‘my’ house, i.e. T<sub>nom</sub> = T<sub>poss</sub> < T<sub>np</sub>]
- b. it is still a house but not ‘my’ house: T<sub>poss</sub> < T<sub>np</sub> = T<sub>nom</sub>

- Cf. Larson & Cho (2003) on the distribution of temporal adjectives in English: N-modifying vs. POSS-modifying reading.
- Nikolaeva (2009): Tundra Nenets has a two-way system of nominal tense with nominal scope: non-future vs. future ( $\emptyset$  vs.  $-d\acute{a}/-d^{\circ}$ ). The future tense indicates that  $Tev < Tposs$ .
- The predestinative does not affect the interpretation of the verbal predicate, but the time of the possessive relation must follow the situation time. For instance, in (9) the situation time is the time when the book either was or will be given, but the time at which the possessive relation will hold is in the future of this time in both instances.

- (9) a.  $kniga-d\acute{a}-mt^{\circ}$                        $m'i\eta a-d^{\circ}m$                       b.  $kniga-d\acute{a}-mt^{\circ}$                        $m'i\eta a-t^{\circ}\acute{a}-d^{\circ}m$   
 book-PRED-ACC.2SG      give-1SG                      book-PRED-ACC.2SG      give-FUT-1SG  
 I will give (you) a book for you.                      I will give (you) a book for you.

The following example is ungrammatical because the NP-internal temporal modifier locates the possessive relation prior to the situation time:

- (10)  $*[t^{\circ}ey^{\circ}$                        $pad^{\circ}ko-d^{\circ}-m'i]$                        $t^{\circ}uku^{\circ}$                        $yal'a-h$                        $xo\acute{a}-d^{\circ}m$   
 yesterday                      bag-PRED-ACC.1SG      this                      day-GEN                      find-1SG  
 I found today the bag (meant) for me yesterday.

Predestinatives cannot denote an entity which will not become somebody's possession after the event denoted by the verb. Infelicitous contexts with predestinatives:

- \*Petya gave me a book to keep.
- \*I brought you a book, but don't forget that it's mine.
- \*I gave you a library book.

- Furthermore, the entity denoted by the predestinative was not possessed by the possessor prior to the event denoted by the verb. Predestinatives cannot denote an entity which was in the possession of the same possessor prior to the event denoted by the verb (change-of-state property of Tonhauser 2007):

- (11) a.  $pasport^{\circ}-d\acute{a}-r^{\circ}$                        $to^{\circ}$   
 passport-PRED-NOM.2SG      arrive.3SG  
 A passport for you arrived (the new passport issued for you)/ \*your old passport with a new visa.
- b.  $n'abako-d\acute{a}-m'i$                        $t\acute{a}w^{\circ}ra^{\circ}$   
 sister-PRED-ACC.1SG      bring.3SG  
 He brought a sister for me (somebody whom I will adopt as a sister)/ \*He brought my (actual) sister.

Infelicitous contexts with predestinatives

- \*I brought you your old book (which I had borrowed).
- \*I found my last year's doctor.
- \*(My) old doctor for me arrived.

- Tundra Nenets exhibits the same ambiguity as Guarani:

(12) For non-relational nouns POSS-modifying reading is preferred

- $l'ekar^{\circ}-d\acute{a}-waq$                        $to^{\circ}$   
 doctor-PRED-NOM.1PL      come.3SG  
 A doctor for us arrived.

- a. The individual is not a doctor at the situation time
- b. The individual is already a doctor at the situation time but not our doctor (preferred interpretation)

(13) For inalienable (relational) nouns N-modifying reading is preferred because their semantics (the property of 'being X') crucially depends on the possessive relation: *husband-of*(x,y)

- $xasawa-d^{\circ}-m'i$                        $to^{\circ}$   
 doctor-PRED-NOM.1SG      come.3SG  
 A husband for me arrived.

- a. The individual is not anybody's husband at the situation time (preferred interpretation)
- b. The individual is somebody's husband at the situation time but not my husband

- However: This analysis goes against Nordlinger & Sadler's (2004: 790) typological observation that "if a language has independent nominal TAM at all, it will encode minimally a distinction between past and nonpast tense"

#### 4. Predestinative as nominal mood

- Further properties of predestinatives (not easily accounted for under tense analysis):
- They are indefinite/discourse-novel: incompatible with definite determiners and cannot appear in the contexts which would require a definite article in English
- Predestinatives are non-specific (they are incompatible with modifiers which require a specific noun such as *xusuwey*° ‘each’ or *xəŋ’əŋi*° ‘which’). For non-specific possessives see e.g. Szabolcsi 1994; Storto 2001.

Various understanding of specificity; the one which relevant here is defined in terms of partitivity and presuppositionality (Enç 1986; Diesing 1992) or pragmatic/referential anchoring (Lambrecht 1994; Heusinger 2002).

- Predestinatives are not discourse-linked and do not stand in a subset relation

(14) [The father brought five guns]

ŋopoy°	tun’i-m	n’ant°	tə-t°ə-w°	/* ŋopoy°	tun’i-də-mt°	tə-t°ə-d°m
one	gun-ACC	you.DAT	give-FUT-1SG> SG.OBJ	/ one	gun-PRED-ACC.1SG	give-FUT-1SG
I will give you one of the guns.						

- Genitive predestinatives only have a non-referring interpretation: they are available as predicates or ‘as’-type adjuncts whose meaning does not presuppose referentiality (secondary predicates)
- Nominative and accusative predestinatives have the syntactic distribution of non-specific indefinites:

- Only specific indefinites can be interpreted as topics (Portner & Yabushita 2001; Erteschik-Shir 2007) and predestinative are totally excluded from the syntactic constructions which, by their nature, require topical arguments:

(15) Object agreement with 3<sup>rd</sup> person objects is conditioned by topicality, but predestinative objects do not trigger agreement

ŋəno-də-mt°	s’erta-d°m / *s’erta-w°
boat-PRED-ACC.2SG	make-1SG / make-1SG>SG.OBJ
I made (you) your future boat.	

(16) Predestinative accusatives do not passivize (passivization is triggered by topicalization)

kniga-r°/*kniga-də-r°	pad-wi°
book-NOM.2SG / book-PRED-NOM.2SG	write-PASS.3SG
Your book is written / *A book meant for you is written.	

- Unlike regular possessives, predestinatives cannot be modified by a non-subjunctive relative clause, cf. Romance languages where, generally, only specific indefinites can be modified by an indicative relative clauses, while non-specific indefinites must be modified by a subjunctive relative clause, and Danish, where modifying relative clause renders indefinites specific (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 8–9, 52–53).

(17) a. [məny°	s’erta-we-m’i]	pidər°	ŋəno-r°	b. *[məŋ°	s’erta-we-m’i]	pidər°	ŋəno-də-r°
I	make-PART-1SG	you	boat-NOM.2SG	I	make-PART-1SG	you	boat-PRED-NOM.2SG
your boat which I made				the boat meant for you which I made			

- Since predestinatives are non-specific, they cannot freely occur in any context but have to be licensed.
- This is confirmed by the fact that the verb cooccurring with the predestinative must denote an event that brings about a possessive relation, so there are restrictions on the lexical semantics of the verbs which can select predestinatives.

(18) Predestinative subjects are typically allowed with intransitive verbs of appearance (‘enter’, ‘arrive’, ‘appear’, ‘be born’, etc.)

n’enec’ən-d°-waq	m’at-h°	t’u°
man-PRED-NOM.1PL	yurt-DAT	enter.3SG
A man meant for us entered a yurt (we were waiting for him).		

They are generally impossible with other intransitive verbs

- \*A doctor (meant) for us died
- \*A bag (meant) for us is heavy
- \*A medicine (meant) for you works well
- \*Your future husband left
- \*A boat (meant) for you is big
- \*A doctor (meant) for me is still studying

Predestinative objects are typically allowed with verbs of creation ('make', 'sew', 'built', 'write', 'cook', etc.), change of location ('give', 'bring', 'buy', etc.) or discovery ('find', 'meet', etc.). Other transitive verbs, for instance, verbs of destruction or manipulation do not generally allow predestinative objects.

- \*The child broke a cup meant for you
- \*I sold/saw/burnt a house meant for you
- \*I read a story meant for you

- Since predestinative subjects and objects are selected by a certain class of verbs, the meaning of the predestinative is more comparable to that of a dependent mood (subjunctive or irrealis) rather than tense.
- One of the characterizations of the subjunctive is that it is predominantly dependent and, except for a well-defined set of matrix occurrences here it is typically licensed by negation, an interrogative or the like, it cannot appear in root environments on its own. In complementation subjunctive is selected by a class of predicates which share a particular semantic characteristic, and therefore is licensed by the properties of the embedding context.
- For instance, Giannakidou (1998, 2009) proposed an account of mood choice in Greek complementation using the notion of (non)veridicality. A propositional operator  $F$  is veridical iff from the truth of  $Fp$  we can infer that  $p$  is true according to some individual  $x$  (i.e., in some individual  $x$ 's epistemic model).

If a propositional attitude verb expresses that at least one epistemic agent (the speaker or the subject) is committed to the truth of the complement, the verb will be veridical and select the indicative. If there is no commitment on the part of at least one epistemic agent, the verb is nonveridical and selects the subjunctive.

- In a similar manner, predestinatives are not presuppositional. The verbs that express the speaker's commitment to the existence of the predestinative entity prior of the event of question, cannot select for a predestinative (19a). If there is no such commitment, the verb can select for predestinative (19b). So the existence of the predestinative entity is asserted by the same utterance where it appears and is predicated as somebody's future possession relative to the situation time.

- (19) a. I broke [a cup meant for you]  
[A doctor meant for you] is still studying
- b. You found [a cup meant for me]  
[A doctor meant for you] arrived

- Certain verbs, e.g. *hope* in some languages, can take either the subjunctive or indicative, depending on the verb meaning (cf. Quer 1998). This supports the idea that the higher verb somehow licenses the subjunctive.

(20) Change of verbal meaning with predestinatives:

- |    |   |  |  |  |    |   |  |   |
|----|---|--|--|--|----|---|--|---|
| a. | $\eta\alpha\text{no-mt}^\circ$ /* $\eta\alpha\text{no-d}\alpha\text{-mt}^\circ$<br>boat-ACC.2SG / boat-PRED-ACC.2SG<br>Did you see your boat/*a boat meant for you? |  | $m\alpha\text{ne-sa-r}^\circ?$<br>see-INTER-2SG>SG.OBJ |  | b. | $\eta\alpha\text{no-d}\alpha\text{-mt}^\circ$<br>boat-PRED-ACC.2SG<br>Did you choose a boat for yourself? |  | $m\alpha\text{ne-sa-n}^\circ?$<br>see-INTER-2SG |
|----|---|--|--|--|----|---|--|---|

- From the syntactocentric perspective, researchers have explored the idea that, unlike the indicative, the subjunctive has in some sense a defective, indefinite or anaphoric tense, or that the temporal projection is altogether lacking (Rizzi 1986; Progovac 1993, 1994; Manzini 2000; Tsoulas 1995; Giorgi 2009, among others).
- In a similar vein, predestinative phrase seems to be structurally reduced: they lack specificity and definiteness projections (in the sense of Ihsane & Puskas 2001).
- No number opposition: predestinatives can only mean singular. Or rather, they denote an entity of indeterminate number whose relation is restricted by the meaning of some existence-type predicate.
- Given the suggested semantics, predestinatives seem to denote properties rather than individuals, so the literal translation of (2a) would be something like 'I gave you what will be your book'.
- Cf. future wh relative clauses in Greek (Agouraki 2003):

- (21)  $\epsilon\text{ho}$        $\alpha\text{ghorasi}$      $\text{ti}$        $\text{tha}$        $\text{foreso}$        $\text{sto parti}$   
I.have    bought    [what will    I.wear    at party]  
I have already bought what I am going to wear at the party.

Properties:

- Morphosyntactic restriction to future tense
- Non-presuppositional semantics where the NP denotes an individual that does necessarily exist yet but is defined by a unique property
- Selection by a small class of predicates
- Incompatibility with specific wh-question words ('which')
- Resistance to passivization and topicalization

- Predestinatives: future tense of irrealis/subjunctive mood?

- This may be a meaningless questions because, first, there is a well-known typological relationship between future tense and irrealis/subjunctive mood (Chung & Timberlake 1985, and many others) due to the fact that future, unlike past, is conceptualized as largely undetermined (Kamp & Reyle 1993: 534). Future time reference is often a sub-meaning of the irrealis category, e.g. in Manam (Lichtenberk 1983), and there is a historical connection between the two, e.g. in Basque (Jendraschek 2007).
- Second, dependent predications often express fewer TAM distinctions than main predications. In fact, Tundra Nenets (and some other languages) neutralizes the opposition between the future tense and the non-declarative moods in dependent clauses, even though it exists in independent clauses. We may suspect that the same is true of nominal predicates.
- This supports Nordlinger & Sadler's (2008) point that the semantics of TAM categories on nouns may differ from the semantics of verbal TAM, but it is still possible to talk about TAM-like categories with nominal scope.

## Abbreviations

ABL – ablative, ACC – accusative, CONV – converb, DAT – dative, FUT – future, GEN – genitive, INTER – interrogative, NARR – narrative, NOM – nominative, OBJ – object, PART – participle, PASS – passive, PRED – predestinative, SG – singular

## References

- Agouraki, Y. 2003. Future Wh-clauses in DP position. In: M. Weisgerber (ed.) *Proceedings of the Conference "sub7 – Sinn und Bedeutung". Arbeitspapier Nr. 114*. FB Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Konstanz, Germany. <http://ling.uni-konstanz.de/pages/conferences/sub7/>
- Alexiadou, A., L. Haegeman & M. Stavrou. 2007. *Noun Phrase in the generative perspective*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chang, S. & A. Timberlake. 1985. Tense, aspect, and mood. In: *Language typology and syntactic description*, ed. by Th. Shopen. Cambridge: CUP. 202-258.
- Daniel, M. 2009. Destinative in Nganasan: what is being tensed? <http://uralitytypology.pbworks.com/f/MishaDaniel2Tallinn2009.pdf>
- Diesing, M. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Enç, M. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:1–26
- Erteschik-Shir, N. 2007. *Information Structure: The Syntax-Discourse Interface*. Oxford: OUP.
- Giannakidou, A. 1998. *Polarity sensitivity as (non)veridical dependency*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Giannakidou, A. 2009. The dependency of the subjunctive revisited: temporal semantics and polarity. *Lingua* 119 (12): 1883-1908.
- Giorgi, A. 2009. Toward a syntax of the subjunctive mood. *Lingua* 119(12): 1837-1858.
- Ihsane, T. and G. Puskás. 2001. Specific is not Definite. *Generative Grammar in Geneva* 2:39–54.
- Jendraschek, G. 2007. *La notion modale de possibilité en basque. Morphologie, syntaxe, sémantique, variations diachronique et sociolinguistique* Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Heusinger, K. 2002. Specificity and definiteness and sentence and discourse structure. *Journal of Semantics* 19: 245-274.
- Kamp, H. & U. Reyle. 1993. *From discourse to logic*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Lambrecht, K. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Larson, R. & Cho, S. 2003. Temporal adjectives and the structure of possessive DPs. *Natural Language Semantics* 11: 217-247.
- Lecarme, J. 1996. Tense in the nominal system. In J. Lecarme, J. Lowenstamm & U. Shlonsky (Eds.), *Studies in Afroasiatic Grammar*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Lichtenberk, F. 1983. *A Grammar of Manam*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Nikolaeva, I. 2009. Nominal tense in Tundra Nenets, and Northern Samoyedic. In: P. Austin et al. (eds.) *Proceedings of Conference on Language Documentation and Linguistics Theory 2*, 13-14 November 2009 SOAS. SOAS: Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project and Department of Linguistics. 241-250.
- Malchukov, A., M. Haspelmath & B. Comrie. 2010. Ditransitive constructions: a typological overview. In: Malchukov, A., M. Haspelmath & B. Comrie (eds.) *Studies in ditransitive constructions. A comparative handbook*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1-64.
- Malchukov, A. 2010. "Quirky" case: rare phenomena in case-marking and their implications for a theory of typological distribution. In: Wohlgemuth, Jan & M. Cysouw (eds.) *Rethinking universals*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 139-167.
- Manzini, R. (2000). Sentential complementation: The Subjunctive. In Coopmans, Peter, Martin Everaert & Jane Grimshaw (eds.), *Lexical specification and insertion*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 241-268.
- Nordlinger, R. & L. Sadler. 2004. Nominal tense in cross-linguistic perspective. *Language* 80: 776-806.
- Nordlinger, R. & L. Sadler. 2008. When is a temporal marker not a tense?: Reply to Tonhauser (2008). *Language* 84(2): 325-331.
- Portner, P. & K. Yabushita. 2001. Specific indefinites and the information structure theory of topics. *Journal of Semantics* 18: 271–297.
- Progovac, L. 1993. Subjunctive: the (mis)behavior of anaphora and negative polarity. *The Linguistic Review* 10: 37-59.
- Progovac, L. 1994. *Negative and positive polarity: a Binding approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quer, J. 1998. *Mood at the interface*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Quer, J. 2001. Interpreting mood. *Probus* 13: 81-111.
- Rizzi, L. (1986). Null objects in Italian and the theory of *pro*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 501-557.
- Salminen, T. 1997. *Tundra Nenets inflection*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Siegl, F. 2008a. Applicatives on NP – evidence from Northern Samoyedic. Paper presented at the Language Documentation and Description Workshop, Uppsala.
- Siegl, F. 2008b. Benefactives and ditransitives in Forest Enets – towards a description of the predestinative conjugation. Paper presented at the conference "Dynamic tendencies in languages", Tartu.
- Storto, G. 2001. On the structure of indefinite possessives. In Brendan Jackson and Tanya Matthews (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory X*. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications, Cornell University.
- Szabolcsi, A. 1994. The noun phrase. In Kiefer, F. & K. Kiss, *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*.
- Tonhauser, J. 2007. Nominal tense? The meaning of Guaraní nominal temporal markers. *Language* 83: 831-869.
- Tonhauser, J. 2008. Defining crosslinguistic categories: The case of nominal tense (Reply to Nordlinger and Sadler) *Language* 84: 332-342.
- Tsoulas, G. 1995. Indefinite clauses: Some notes on the syntax and semantics of subjunctives and infinitives. *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 13: 515-530.