

〈論文〉

Some evidence for the origin of the Ainu antipassive prefix *i-*

Deokhyun Nam

1. Introduction

Ainu is a virtually extinct language with no known relatives which was formerly actively spoken by the traditionally hunter-fisher-gatherer people called Ainu primarily in Kurile (Chishima), Sakhalin (Karafuto), and Hokkaidō. The Ainu people nowadays mainly speak Japanese or Russian.

Detailed studies of Ainu began in the late 19th century. To date, numerous descriptive studies have been published for Ainu, particularly with a view to documenting different dialects of the language and their oral literature rapidly dying out like many other languages in the world. In contrast, not many Ainu experts in Japan associated Ainu linguistics with other fields in linguistics like linguistic typology or syntactic theories, meaning that Ainu has much room for studies in such perspectives.

The present study focuses on Ainu antipassive constructions (逆受動態構文) and aims to provide additional evidence for Bugaeva (2021)'s scenario about the origin of the antipassive function in Ainu. Some of the evidence is typologically-oriented, instantiating the association of Ainu linguistics with linguistic typology, a field of linguistics that aims to uncover and explain diversity and universals of human languages by empirical approach. The Ainu data in the present study are based on descriptive works and the Ainu sagas

mentions, the element *i-* appearing on the verb in this way was traditionally understood as an “indefinite object marker” (see references indicated in Bugaeva 2021: 217). Bugaeva (2004: 50-51; 2021) was the first author to justly point out that such constructions can be interpreted to be antipassive constructions in which *i-* functions as an antipassive marker.

Let us turn to the historical aspect. Due to the lack of records, it is difficult to directly know what the Ainu grammar was like before the late 19th century. For that reason, the origin of the antipassive prefix *i-*, which already appeared in the first Ainu grammar (Chamberlain & Batchelor 2015[1887]: 120), can only be speculated, based on different scientific methods developed in historical linguistics and diachronic typology. Regarding the origin, a few scenarios have been proposed, and these will be discussed in § 3.

3. Known scenarios of the history of the antipassive *i-*

There are two scenarios previously proposed about the origin of the antipassive prefix *i-*, which I call “the 4th-person-to-antipassive scenario” and “the generic-to-antipassive scenario” respectively.

3.1 The 4th-person-to-antipassive scenario

Ainu has the bound person pronoun *i-*, homophonous with the antipassive prefix *i-*. According to Bugaeva (2021), those two elements are distinct markers. The bound person pronoun *i-* is traditionally called a “fourth person pronoun”¹ (四人称代名詞) and has the following multiple functions: first person plural inclusive, second (SG/PL) person honorific, and logophoric (SG/PL) (Bugaeva 2021: 219, 234). Below are examples cited in Bugaeva (2021: 220):

1 Matsumoto (2007) criticizes this term, claiming that it is Western Eurocentric. I will use it in the present study for the purpose of convenience.

- (2) a. *húci topén pe i-e-re*
 grandmother be.sweet thing 4O-eat-CAUS
 ‘Grandmother let us (you and me (an him/her/they), 1PL.INCL)
 eat sweets.’
 (Tamura 1984: 75, cited in Bugaeva 2021: 220)
- b. *ku-i-e-pakasnu*
 1SG.A-4O-about.APPL-teach.to
 ‘I’ll teach (it) to you (HON)’
 (Tamura 1984: 33, cited in Bugaeva 2021: 220)
- c. *somo i-rura yak-ka pirka pirka sekor hawean*
 NEG 4O-carry if-even be.good be.good QUOT say.SG
 ‘(She) said, “It is really OK not to see me (LOG) off.”’
 (Tamura 1988b: 18, cited in Bugaeva 2021: 220)

In historical terms, it is conceived by many authors that the antipassive prefix and the fourth person bound pronoun are historically related (Kindaichi 1993[1931]: 252; Tamura 2001[1970]: 220; 1971: 8; 1988a; Ikegami 2004[1983]; Shibatani 1990: 45-47; Bugaeva 2021). Many of them, including Kindaichi (1993[1931]: 252), Tamura (1988a), and Shibatani (1990: 45-47), suggest that the fourth person bound pronoun *i-* was the source from which the antipassive prefix *i-* emerged. I will call this scenario “the 4th-person-to-antipassive scenario”.

3.2 The generic-to-antipassive scenario

Bugaeva (2021: 235-236) proposes the “scenario ‘generic element antipassive marker’”, which I rephrase as “the generic-to-antipassive scenario”, according to which the antipassive prefix developed through O-incorporation of a generic noun ‘thing, place, time’, rather than from the fourth person bound pronoun. As supports for her scenario, Bugaeva (2021: 235) mentions the fact that “antipassives in Ainu do not allow any overt expression of the object” and grammaticalizations changing a generic noun into an antipassive

marker are cross-linguistically attested, also mentioning the productivity of incorporation in Ainu.

4. Discussion: evidence for the generic-to-antipassive scenario

I consider that Bugaeva's generic-to-antipassive scenario is more plausible than the 4th-person-to-antipassive scenario. However, although Bugaeva (2021: 235-236, 240) provides a couple of pieces of evidence for the scenario, there is still room for strengthening its validity. Particularly, I will provide Ainu-internal evidence from other parts of the Ainu grammar and Ainu-external or typological evidence by observing other languages, as additional evidence. Also, although Bugaeva (2021: 235) considers that the antipassive *i-* originates in O-incorporation of the generic noun **i*, I assume that the form was originally **hi* or **ihi*.

The discussion will be divided into two parts. In the first (§ 4.1), I will point out that it is much more reasonable to suppose the generic-to-antipassive change than the 4th-person-to-antipassive change, based on differences in their functional mechanisms and cross-linguistic distributions. In the second (§ 4.2), I will compare the antipassive prefix *i-* with other grammatical markers in Ainu and functionally similar elements in other languages from diachronic (or historical) perspectives.

4.1 The 4th-person-to-antipassive scenario vs. the generic-to-antipassive scenario

The 4th-person-to-antipassive scenario per se is not likely to be natural, due to the following facts. It is difficult to suppose a functional mechanism whereby a fourth person pronoun, that is, a pronoun with first person plural inclusive, second (SG/PL) person honorific, and logophoric (SG/PL) functions, is reinterpreted to be a generic noun or an antipassive marker. None of the proponents of this scenario, including Kindaichi (1993[1931]), Tamura (1988a), and Shibatani (1990), provides any concrete explanation. Bugaeva (2021: 237-239) argues that the antipassive prefix *i-* developed into the fourth person pronoun *i-*, by considering that the antipassive became

able to (indirectly) mention a speech act participant because of its patient-defocusing function. However, it does not seem that the reverse (viz., a 4th-person-to-antipassive change) would happen because of the patient-defocusing function. As for typological distribution, I could not find any languages in which an antipassive marker actually arose from a first person plural inclusive, second (SG/PL) person honorific, or logophoric (SG/PL) pronoun.

In contrast to the difficulty with which to suppose a mechanism for the 4th-person-to-antipassive scenario, it is easy to find an explanation for the generic-to-antipassive scenario. As Bugaeva (2021) suggests, this is O-incorporation, whereby the generic noun *i* occurs as a prefix on the verb as its object. It is known that a similar lexical O-incorporation is common in Ainu with the nouns such as *he* ‘head’ and *ho* ‘buttock’ (Tamura 2001[1973]; Bugaeva 2017b: 897-898), for example: *henoye* ‘to return (intr.)’, *honoye* ‘to lean (intr.)’ (< *noye* ‘to twist (tr.)’ (Tamura 2001[1973]: 421)). Typological data further support the plausibility of the generic-to-antipassive scenario. Sansó (2019: 408-409) discusses “antipassives from indefinite/generic elements in object position” as one of the recurrent patterns of how antipassive markers emerge in the world’s languages, with actual examples from Koasati, Bantawa, and Ixcatec (see Sansó (2019) for sources). Meanwhile, no equivalents to the 4th-person-to-antipassive scenario are mentioned in Sansó (2019).

4.2 Comparison with other grammatical markers

Aside from the antipassive prefix *i-*, Ainu has two grammatical markers that are likely to come from the generic noun **hi*: the nominalizing suffix *-i* and the construct suffix *-hV~-V(hV)*. Each of these will be discussed in turn, and based on that, I will show that the original form of the antipassive *i-* is also likely *hi*, and how the generic-to-antipassive scenario is plausible. Then, it will be followed by cross-linguistic observation that is in favor of the scenario. Finally, it will be explained how, given that the generic-to-antipassive scenario is correct, the antipassive prefix only occurs as *i-*, instead

of **hi-*.

4.2.1 Comparison with the nominalizing suffix *-i*

4.2.1.1 Diachrony of the nominalizing suffix *-i*

Ainu has the nominalizing suffix *-i* with different allomorphs which is illustrated below (the suffix in question is in boldface):

- (3) a. *ku-yee* ***he*** *sunke* (Rayciska dialect (in Sakhalin))
 1SG-say NMLZ lie
 ‘What I said is a lie.’ (my English translation)
 (Murasaki 1979: 95)
- b. *aokai* *utara* *te-wano* *kamui*
 1PL.INCL PL here-from god
ewak-i *a-ko-hekom-pa* *kusune*
 live-NMLZ 1PL.INCL-APPL-return-PL will
 ‘We are about to leave this place for the god’s residence.’ (my English translation)
 (“Kemka Karip”: 294, in *Yukar* Vol.4)
- c. *a-ki* *aine* *ainu* *tumam* *netopa*
 PASS-do thereupon human trunk body
*kor-**ihi*** *a-ko-eramuan*
 have-NMLZ 1SG-APPL-understand
 ‘After all was done, I understood that he had a human’s trunk.’ (my English translation)
 (“Poro Oina” (Variant 1): 261, in *Yukar* Vol.2)
- d. *réra* *ka* *isam* ***hi*** *ta* (Chitose dialect)
 wind even nonexistent NMLZ in
makanak-iki *cikuni* *horak* *hum-i* *an*
 how tree fall_dwon sound-CSTR be.SG
 ‘Why are there sounds of a tree falling down when there is no wind?’ (my English translation)
 (Satō 2008: 176)

Chiri (1974[1936]: 48), Kim (2000: 216), and Bugaeva (2021: 235) suggest that it is *-i*, not *-hi*, which is the main or basic variant of the nominalizing suffix. However, it would only be so in the synchronic sense. The historically original form of the nominalizing suffix is said to be the generic noun *ihi* ‘thing, place, time’ (Nakagawa: 1983) or *hi* ‘thing, place, time’ (Bugaeva 2011: 524; 2016: 100; 2017b: 889) (the form *-ihi* appears in (3c); also see Tamura (1971: 4-5)). A construction nominalized by *-h(i)* can be analyzed as a construction where the basic clause or verb functions as a modifier of the noun *h(i)* (Bugaeva 2016: 100; 2017a: 222). Evidently, that *-hi* or *-ihi* is the original form means that *-i* is a result of its sound change (erosion).

Therefore, as far as the nominalizing suffix is concerned, it is likely that the generic noun *hi* (or *ihi*) is the source element and the sound change from /hi/ to /i/ occurred. Then, the same can be applied to the antipassive prefix *i-* as well: if the generic noun *hi* can function as a common element of relative clauses, it probably can function as a verbal object as well². Likewise, if *hi* (or *ihi*) phonologically changed to *-i* in the process of the grammaticalization of *hi* (or *ihi*) into the nominalizing suffix, the same is expected for the grammaticalization of *hi* (or *ihi*) into the antipassive prefix as well.

4.2.1.2 Cross-linguistic parallels

The assumption that the antipassive prefix *i-* and the nominalizing suffix *-i* developed from a common generic noun is also supported by the following cross-linguistic observation.

According to Lipkind (1945: 16-17), Winnebago, a Siouan language spoken in Midwestern United States, has homophonous intransitivizing and nominalizing prefixes *wa-* and *wa-*, each illustrated below:

2 Furthermore, Chiri (1956a: 34; 1956b: 262) shows instances in which it functions as a subject or a possessor. For even further extended usage, see Bugaeva (2021: 220-224).

- (4) Winnebago intransitivization by *wa-*
ruc ‘to eat (tr.)’ > *warúc* ‘to eat (intr.)’
e ‘to say (tr.)’ > *we* ‘to say (intr.)’

(Lipkind 1945: 17)

- (5) Winnebago nominalization by *wa-*
gáh ‘to plan’ > *wagáh* ‘paper’
têh ‘to urinate’ > *watêh* ‘bladder’

(Lipkind 1945: 17)

Lipkind (1945: 17) mentions that the nominalizing *wa-* “probably means ‘something’ or ‘thing’”. Then, it is possible to consider that *wa-* is like the Ainu generic noun *hi* and developed the nominalizing function in a similar way. I also suppose that intransitivization by *wa-* may be regarded as antipassivization from their obvious functional overlap³ (as Polinsky (2013) indicates, the term “antipassive” was coined by Silverstein (1972), later than Lipkind (1945)). Therefore, the Winnebago case probably shows developments of an antipassive marker and a nominalizer from a common generic noun. Also, Winnebago shares a lot of typological properties with Ainu, including: SOV basic word order, postposition predominance, person-marking prefixes on the verb and noun, and presence of applicative prefixes (based on Lipkind (1945)). This fact seems to make it easier for similar grammaticalization patterns to take place between the two languages, because, according to Narrog (2017: 172), “synchronic language structures may constrain and guide some aspects of grammaticalization”, suggesting that languages with similar structures are likely to undergo similar grammaticalizations.

Likewise, in Bantawa, a Sino-Tibetan language spoken in Eastern Nepal, the morpheme *kha* can function as, among others, an antipassive prefix, a purposive nominalizing suffix or a noun suffix ‘place’ (Doornenbal 2009).

3 “Intransitivization” does not equal to “antipassivization” in that the former also can refer to other phenomena, for example, passivization.

Doornenbal (2009: 335) suggests relationships among the functions of *kha*. I suppose that the antipassive and nominalizing functions stem from the generic noun ‘place’. Bantawa, like Ainu, has SOV basic word order, postposition predominance, and person-marking prefixes on the verb and noun (based on Doornenbal (2009)). Besides, it also coheres with Ainu in that the antipassive marker is prefixal and the nominalizer is suffixal. Therefore, the Bantawa case also makes it plausible that the Ainu generic noun underwent a similar grammaticalization.

Finally, Japanese, a Japanese-Ryukyuan language spoken in Japan, is another language to exhibit a similar parallel⁴. It has a number of lexicalized verbs in which the noun *mono* ‘thing, object’⁵ occupies the initial position. In some of such cases, *mono* functions as the verb’s object, with intransitivizing functions, like in: *mono-iu* ‘say something’ (< *iu* ‘to say’), *mono-omō* ‘be anxious’ (< *omō* ‘to think’). There are also cases in which the whole construction is nominalized, like: *mono-shiri* ‘knowledgeable person’ (< *shiru* ‘to know’), *mono-uri* ‘peddler’ (< *uru* ‘to sell’). Another way to combine *mono* with a verb is to attach *mono* to the end of a verbal element so that it looks like a kind of nominalizer (e.g., *tabe-mono* ‘food, lit. object to eat’, *ki-mono* ‘clothes, lit. object to put on’), like the Ainu case discussed in § 4.2.1.1. Therefore, the Japanese case instantiates developments of a prefixal antipassive-like element and a suffixal nominalizer from a common generic noun. Japanese shares relatively few properties with Ainu, including: SOV basic word order and postposition predominance. However, it is not impossible that historical contact relationship between the two languages has something to do with the supposed parallel (cf., “Contact-induced Grammaticalization” discussed by Heine & Kuteva 2003; 2005; 2011).

4 The Japanese information is from my personal knowledge.

5 I thank Hwie Her (my cousin) for suggesting the word ‘object’ as another possible translation than ‘thing’.

4.2.2 Comparison with the construct suffix *-hV~-V(hV)*

4.2.2.1 Diachrony of the construct suffix *-hV~-V(hV)*

Ainu nouns have construct forms⁶, marked by the construct suffix *-hV~-V(hV)*. They are noun forms signaling that the referent of the noun is possessed by somebody or something (cf., Creissels 2009; 2018). Consider the following examples (the suffix in question is in boldface):

- (6) a. *nan nupek-**i** ko-maknatara*
 face light-CSTR APPL-clear
 ‘The face’s light shines.’ (my English translation)
 (“Kemka Karip”: 202, in *Yukar* Vol.4)
- b. *kamuy kam-**u** ku-e rusuy na* (Ishikari dialect)
 bear meat-CSTR 1SG-eat want EXCLMA
 ‘I want to eat the bear’s meat.’ (my English translation)
 (Asai 1970: 776)
- c. *nea sapa-**ha** tumam-**aha** ebittano berke horak wa,*
 that head-CSTR trunk-CSTR wholly split break and
 ‘His head and trunk completely break apart and...’ (my English translation)
 (“Kamuikarsapa Kamuikartumam”: 423, in *Yukar* Vol.3)
- d. *tara hekaci sik-**ihi*** (Sakhalin dialect)
 that boy eye-CSTR
 ‘that boy’s eyes’ (my English translation)
 (Tamura 1988: 33)

6 This is a term Creissels (2009; 2018) proposed to use for cross-linguistic comparison of this grammatical category. In Ainu linguistics, the forms are known as “concrete forms”, “possessive forms”, “belonging forms”, or “affiliative forms”.

With regard to the allomorphs, according to Nakagawa (1983) and Nam (2020), *-ihi* is historically the original form, so that the construct suffix *-hV~V(hV)* dates back to the generic noun **ihi* ‘thing, place, time’⁷. Nam (2020) further proposes a concrete developmental model for how the generic noun **ihi* grammaticalized into the construct suffix, underpinning this generic-to-construct scenario. Tamura (1988a: 34), although she does not discuss what the construct suffix ultimately comes from, argues that the short allomorphs represented as *-V* developed through erosion of the long allomorphs represented as *-VhV*, meaning that the latter is the older forms. This is also compatible with the generic-to-construct scenario.

Now, the following can be said. If it is true that the origin of the construct suffix is the generic noun *ihi* (Nakagawa 1983; Nam 2020) or *hi*, and *-i* is a result of the sound change it underwent (Nakagawa 1983; Tamura 1988a: 34; Nam 2020), the same can be expected for the antipassive prefix *i-* as well.

4.2.2.2 Cross-linguistic parallel

Construct-marking construction is not a cross-linguistically common category (Creissels 2009: 74; 2018: 3-4; Haspelmath 2019: 105), so that it is not easy to find languages to exhibit similar situations of antipassive constructions and construct-marking constructions to the Ainu one. I will only briefly discuss a relevant case.

Apalai, a Carib language spoken in Northern Brazil, has homophonous nominalizing and construct suffixes (*-ry* and *-ry*) (Koehn & Koehn 1986: 85-86, 89-95)⁸, like Ainu. Moreover, Apalai has the noun *kyry* which can mean ‘thing’ (Koehn & Koehn 1986: 85), and to me, it seems to have historical relationship with the two grammatical suffixes. Although it is unknown to me whether the same form also can function as an antipassive marker or not, the Apalai case seems to show how a generic noun can grammaticalize into

7 It will be *hi* instead if, as Refsing (1986: 85) suggests, the initial *i* is “a supporting vowel”.

8 Koehn & Koehn (1986) call the construct suffixes “possession suffixes”.

different grammatical markers.

4.2.3 Why does the antipassive prefix only occur as *i-*?

The total loss of the preceding *h* in the antipassive prefix *i-* may be due to the length of the history of its incorporation to verbs. Additionally, the following explanation is also possible. As Chiri (1974[1936]: 48), Satō (2008: 175), and Bugaeva (2021: 235) mention, as a rule, the nominalizing suffix *-(h)i* has *h* when preceded by a vowel and lacks it when preceded by a consonant. Then, the following could be the case: the initial *h* (or *ih*) became unable to occur for the antipassive prefix *i-* as a result of the frequency with which it was word-initial and was *not preceded by a vowel* (within the same word), as the initial *h* of the nominalizing suffix *-(h)i* generally does not occur when it is *not preceded by a vowel*.

Finally, also note that the total loss of a preceding *h* is assumed to have actually happened for the applicative prefix *o-* (Bugaeva 2010: 782, 784) and *e-* and *o-* in phrases like *e-kim-ne* (head-mountain-be) ‘to the mountain’ or *o-kim-ne* (buttock-mountain-be) ‘from the mountain’ (Tamura 2001[1973]: 421-423), which are prefixal as well as the antipassive *i-*.

5. Conclusion

In basic agreement with Bugaeva (2021)’s scenario, this study showed that the following evidence supports the assumption that the Ainu antipassive prefix *i-* originates from the generic noun *(i)hi* ‘thing, place, time’ through O-incorporation:

- (a) The generic-to-antipassive change is contrastive to the 4th-person-to-antipassive change in that it is functionally explicable and is attested in some other languages.
- (b) The Ainu nominalizing suffix and construct suffix originate from the generic noun *(i)hi* ‘thing, place, time’, and the sound change from *(i)*

hi to *-i* occurred for both grammaticalization processes.

(c) Cross-linguistic observation says that an antipassive marker can develop together with a nominalizer from a common generic noun in languages which are structurally similar to or geographically close to Ainu.

(d) There are possible explanations for how (*i*)*hi* phonologically changed to *i-* when or after it became the antipassive prefix.

Bugaeva's introducing the term "antipassive" into Ainu studies seems to have been the start of typological approach to the non-pronominal prefix *i-*. The typological approach made it possible to compare Ainu antipassive constructions with constructions in other languages which are antipassive constructions under the common definition. Part of the findings I presented in this paper was gained in that way. I hope that this paper could show how studies of an individual language may benefit from another field of linguistics.

Abbreviations

1-first person 4-fourth person A-transitive subject ANTIP-antipassive APPL-applicative CAUS-causative CLF-classifier CSTR-construct marker EXCL-exclusive EXCLAM-exclamative HON-honorific INCL-inclusive intr-intransitive LOG-logophoric NEG-negative NMLZ-nominalizer O-object PASS-passive PL-plural QUOT-quotative s-intransitive subject SG-singular tr-transitive V-vowel

Yukar Texts

Kannari Matsu 金成 まつ (original texts) & Kindaichi Kyōsuke 金田一 京助 (Japanese translation and notes) (1961), *Ainu Jojishi Yūkara Shū* 《アイヌ叙事詩ユーカラ集》 [Collection of Yukar, Ainu Sagas] Vol.2. Tōkyō:

Sanseidō 三省堂.

Kannari Matsu 金成 まつ (original texts) & Kindaichi Kyōsuke 金田一 京助 (Japanese translation and notes) (1963), *Ainu Jojishi Yūkara Shū* 《アイヌ叙事詩ユーカラ集》 [Collection of Yukar, Ainu Sagas] Vol.3. Tōkyō: Sanseidō 三省堂.

Kannari Matsu 金成 まつ (original texts) & Kindaichi Kyōsuke 金田一 京助 (Japanese translation and notes) (1964), *Ainu Jojishi Yūkara Shū* 《アイヌ叙事詩ユーカラ集》 [Collection of Yukar, Ainu Sagas] Vol.4. Tōkyō: Sanseidō 三省堂.

References

- Asai Tōru 浅井 亭 (1970), *Ainugo-no Bunpō: Ainugo-Ishikari-hōgen-bunpō-no Gairyaku* 《アイヌ語の文法：アイヌ語石狩方言文法の概略》 [The Grammar of Ainu: Outline of the Grammar of Ishikari Dialect of Ainu]. In: *Ainu-bunka Hozon-taisaku Kyōgikai* 《アイヌ文化保存対策協議会》 [Consultations for Ainu Culture Conservation] (ed.), *Ainu Minzokushi* 《アイヌ民族誌》 [Ainu Ethnography], 771-800. Tōkyō: Daiichihōki 第一法規.
- Bugaeva, Anna (2004), *Grammar and Folklore Texts of the Chitose Dialect of Ainu (Idiolect of Ito Oda)* (ELPR Publication Series; A-045). Suita: Osaka Gakuin University.
- Bugaeva, Anna (2010), Ainu Applicatives in Typological Perspective. *Studies in Language* 34(4): 749-801.
- Bugaeva, Anna (2011), A Diachronic Study of the Impersonal Passive in Ainu. In: Malchukov, Andrej & Anna Siewierska (eds.), *Impersonal Constructions Cross-linguistically* (Studies in Language Companion Series [SLCS]; 124), 517-546. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bugaeva, Anna (2016), On the Innovative Nature of Sakhalin Ainu: Focusing on Nominalization. *Studia Orientalia* 117: 95-117.
- Bugaeva, Anna (2017a), Noun-modifying Clause Constructions in Ainu. In: Matsumoto, Yoshiko, Bernard Comrie & Peter Sells (eds.), *Noun-modifying Clause Constructions in Languages of Eurasia: Re-*

- thinking Theoretical and Geographical Boundaries* (Typological Studies in Language [TSL]; 116), 203-250. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bugaeva, Anna (2017b), Polysynthesis in Ainu. In: Fortescue, Michael, Marianne Mithun & Nicholas Evans (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Polysynthesis*, 882-905. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bugaeva, Anna (2021), Unspecified Participant: A Case of Antipassive in Ainu. In: Janic, Katarzyna & Alena Witzlack-Makarevich (eds.), *Anti-passive: Typology, Diachrony, and Related Constructions* [Typological Studies in Language [TSL]; 130], 213-246. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Chamberlain, Basil Hall & John Batchelor (2015[1887]), *Ainu Grammar*. Andesite Press. (Scholar Selected Series).
- Chiri Mashihō 知里 真志保 (1974[1936]), Ainugohō Gaisetsu 《アイヌ語法概説》 [Outline of Ainu Expressions]. In: Chiri Mashihō 知里 真志保 (1974), *Chiri Mashihō Chosakushū* 《知里真志保著作集》 [Collected Works of Chiri Mashihō] Vol.4, 3-197. Tōkyō: Heibonsha 平凡社.
- Chiri Mashihō 知里 真志保 (1956a), *Ainugo Nyūmon: Tokuni Chimei-Kenkyūsha-notameni* 《アイヌ語入門: とくに地名研究者のため に》 [Introduction to Ainu: Particularly for Toponymists]. Sapporo: Hokkaido Publication Project Center Ltd.
- Chiri Mashihō 知里 真志保 (1956b), *Ainugo Chimei Shōjiten* 《アイヌ語地名小辞典》 [Ainu Place Name Small Dictionary]. Sapporo: Hokkaido Publication Project Center Ltd.
- Creissels, Denis (2009), Construct Forms of Nouns in African Languages. In: Austin, Peter K., David Nathan, Peter Sells, Oliver Bond & Monik Charette (eds.), *Proceedings of Conference on Language Documentation and Linguistic Theory 2*, 73-82. London: SOAS.
- Creissels, Denis (2018), Binominals and Construct Marking. In: Masini, Francesca & Steve Pepper (eds.), (to appear).
- Doornenbal, Marius (2009), *A Grammar of Bantawa: Grammar, Paradigm Tables, Glossary and Texts of a Rai Language of Eastern Nepal*. Utrecht: LOT.

- Haspelmath, Martin (2019), Indexing and Flagging, and Head and Dependent Marking. *Te Reo* 62(1): 93-115.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva (2003), On Contact-induced Grammaticalization. *Studies in Language* 27(3): 529-572. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.27.3.04hei>
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva (2005), *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva (2011), The Areal Dimension of Grammaticalization. In Narrog, Heiko & Bernd Heine (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, 291-301. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199586783.013.0023>
- Ikegami Jirō 池上 二良 (2004[1983]), Hoppō Shogengo-niyosete 《北方諸言語に寄せて》 [Remarks on Languages of the Northern Regions]. In: Ikegami Jirō 池上 二良 (2004), *Hoppō Gengo Sōkō* 《北方言語叢考》 [Thoughts on Northern Languages], 3-14. Sapporo: Hokkaidōdaigaku Toshokankōkai 北海道大学図書刊行会 .
- Kim Kong-Chil 金 公七 (2000), *Ainue Yenkwu: Hanile-wa-uy Pikyo-uy Kwan-cem-eyse* 《아이누語研究 : 韓・日語와의 비교의 관점에서》 [Study on Ainu: Viewed from Comparison with Korean and Japanese]. (Kim Kong-Chil Cecak-cip 《金公七 著作集》 [Collected Works of Kim Kong-Chil]; 3). Seoul: Hankwukmwunhaksa 韓國文學社 .
- Kindaichi Kyōsuke 金田一 京助 (1993[1931]), *Ainugo 1* 《アイヌ語 1》 [Ainu 1] (Kindaichi Kyōsuke Zenshū 《金田一京助全集》 [Complete Works of Kindaichi Kyōsuke]; 5). Tōkyō: Sanseidō 三省堂 .
- Koehn, Edward & Sally Koehn (1986), Apalai. In: Derbyshire, Desmond & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.), *Handbook of Amazonian Languages* Vol.1. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 33-127.
- Kubodera Itsuhiko 久保寺 逸彦 (1977), *Ainu Bungaku* 《アイヌ文学》 [Ainu Literature]. Tōkyō: Iwanamishoten 岩波書店 .
- Lipkind, William (1945), *Winnebago Grammar*. New York: King's Crown Press.
- Matsumoto Katsumi 松本 克己 (2007), *Sekai-no Gengo-nonakano Nihongo: Nihongo Keitōron-no Aratana Chihei* 《世界の言語のなかの日本語 : 日本語

- 系統論の新たな地平》[Japanese in World's Languages: New Horizons of Genealogy of the Japanese Language], Tōkyō: Sanseidō 三省堂.
- Murasaki Kyōko 村崎 恭子 (1979), *Karafuto-ainugo: Bunpō-hen* 《カラフトアイヌ語: 文法篇》[Sakhalin Ainu: Grammar]. Tōkyō: Kokushokankōkai 国書刊行会.
- Nakagawa Hiroshi 中川 裕 (1983), *Ainugo-no Basho-hyōgen-to Meishi-no Shozoku-kei* 《アイヌ語の場所表現と名詞の所属形》[Place Expressions and Noun Belonging Forms in Ainu]. In: *Nihongengogakkai Dai 86kai Taikai Kenkyūhappyō Yōshi* 《日本言語学会第86回大会研究発表要旨》[Handbook of the 86th Meeting of Linguistic Society of Japan (LSJ)], 197-198.
- Nam Deokhyun 南 徳 鉉 (2020), *Ainugo-no Shozokusetsubiji-no Keiseikatei* 《アイヌ語の所属接尾辞の形成過程》[Developmental Process of the Ainu Construct Suffix]. In: *Nihonrekishigengogakkai Nisennijūnen Taikai Kenkyūhappyō Yōshi* 《日本歴史言語学会2020年大会研究発表要旨》[Abstracts for the 2020's Meeting of Japan Society for Historical Linguistics (JSHL)], 7-8. (Available online at http://s3-ap-northeast-1.amazonaws.com/jp-histling.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/10153233/2020_application_ver2.pdf, Accessed on 2021-09-05.)
- Narrog, Heiko (2017), Typology and Grammaticalization. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology*, 151-177. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Polinsky, Maria (2013), Antipassive Constructions. In: Dryer, Matthew S. & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (Available online at <http://wals.info/chapter/108>, Accessed on 2021-09-02.)
- Refsing, Kirsten (1986), *The Ainu Language: The Morphology and Syntax of the Shizunai Dialect*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Sansó, Andrea (2019), The Sources of Antipassive Constructions. In: Cennamo, Michela, Claudia Fabrizio, with the assistance of Renato Parlato (eds.), *Historical Linguistics 2015: Selected Papers from the 22nd*

- International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Naples, 27-31 July 2015*, 405-421. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Satō Tomomi 佐藤 知己 (2008), *Ainugo Bunpō-no Kiso* 《アイヌ語文法の基礎》 [The Fundamentals of the Ainu Grammar]. Tōkyō: Daigakushorin 大学書林.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi (1990), *The Languages of Japan* (Cambridge Language Surveys). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silverstein, Michael (1972), Chinook Jargon: Language Contact and the Problem of Multi-level Generative Systems II. *Language* 48: 596-625.
- Tamura, Suzuko (2001[1970]), Personal Affixes in the Saru Dialect of Ainu. In: Yumanishobō (ed.), *Ainugo Kō* 《アイヌ語考》 [Thoughts on Ainu] Vol.4, 206-240. Tōkyō: Yumanishobō ゆまに書房.
- Tamura Suzuko 田村 すず子 (1971), Ainugo Saru-hōgen-no Ninshōdaimeishi 《アイヌ語沙流方言の人称代名詞》 [Personal Pronouns in the Saru Dialect of Ainu]. *Gengo Kenkyū* (*Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan*) 59: 1-14.
- Tamura Suzuko 田村 すず子 (2001[1973]), Ainugo Saru-hōgen-no Gōsei dōshi-no Kōzō 《アイヌ語沙流方言の合成動詞の構造》 [Structure of the Compound Verb of Saru Dialect of Ainu]. In: Yumanishobō (ed.), *Ainugo Kō* 《アイヌ語考》 [Thoughts on Ainu] Vol.4, 407-428. Tōkyō: Yumanishobō ゆまに書房.
- Tamura Suzuko 田村すず子 (1993[1979]), *Aynugo Nyūmon* 《アイヌ語入門》 [An Introduction into Ainu] (Goken Kyōzai Sensho 《語研教材選書》 ; 21). Tōkyō: Institute of Language Teaching, Waseda University.
- Tamura Suzuko 田村 すず子 (1984), *Aynugo Nyūmon: Kaisetsu* 《アイヌ語入門: 解説》 [An Introduction into Ainu: Commentary] (Goken Kyōzai Sensho 《語研教材選書》 ; 32). Tōkyō: Institute of Language Teaching, Waseda University.
- Tamura Suzuko 田村 すず子 (1988a), Ainugo 《アイヌ語》 [The Ainu Language]. In: Kamei Takashi 亀井 孝, Kōno Rokurō 河野 六郎 & Chino Eiichi 千野 栄一 (eds.), *Gengogaku Daijiten* 《言語学大辞典》 [Encyclopedia of Linguistics] Vol.1, 6-94. Tōkyō: Sanseidō 三省堂.
- Tamura Suzuko 田村 すず子 (1988b), *Ainugo Onseishiryō* 《アイヌ語音声資料》

[Ainu Audio Materials] Vol.5. Tōkyō: Institute of Language Teaching,
Waseda University.