

AN OUTLINE OF NOUN MORPHOLOGY IN SURGUT AND SALYM KHANTY

Assoc. Prof. Victoria Vorobeva ¹

Prof. Dr. Irina Novitskaya ²

Assoc. Prof. Dilara Ichkineeva ³

¹ Tomsk State University, Russia

^{1, 2} Tomsk Polytechnic University, Russia

³ Bashkir State University, Russia

ABSTRACT

This study presents findings resulting from a comparative analysis of the system of nominal morphological markers attested by various researchers in the Surgut dialect and in the badly described Salym dialect. The analysis focused on the morphological markers that form paradigms of three nominal categories: case, number and possession. It aimed at systematizing the linguistic data of Surgut and Salym Khanty.

Keywords: *Surgut Khanty, Salym Khanty, morphology, number, possession, case*

INTRODUCTION

On a par with the Vakh and Vasyugan dialects, the Surgut and Salym dialects belong to the Eastern cluster of Khanty that is opposed to the Western one, according to a contemporary classification of the dialects in question [1]. The names of the idioms adopted by the speakers are designations given after the name of an area: the Surgut district and a tributary of the Ob river: Salym. The Surgut dialect is subdivided into several variants: Pim, Trom-Agan, Agan, and Yugan [2], [3] while László Honti distinguishes Pim, Trom-Agan, Trom-Yugan, and Yugan variants [4]. According to Marta Csepregi, Trom-Agan and Trom-Yugan form one variant designated as the Trom-Agan. Nowadays all dialects of Khanty are very susceptible to the natural process of language shift. The overwhelming majority of the ethnic population speaks Russian, however, speakers of the Surgut dialect of Khanty have lost their native language less than speakers of other Eastern dialects – Vakh, Vasyugan and Salym. The intergenerational transfer of the Salym dialect of Khanty has been completely disrupted. Ethnic speakers of Salym Khanty use Russian as a means of daily communication. Surgut Khanty is currently spoken in the Surgut district of the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug-Ugra by the Khanty who live in the basins of the Lyamyn, Pim, Trom-Agan, Agan, Maly and Bolshoy Yugan rivers. According to A. S. Pessikova's estimates obtained during some ethnographic expeditions between 1992 and 2015, the number of speakers of Surgut Khanty totalled 2,811 people [3]. The difference between Surgut and Salym Khanty has been noticed in phonetics. Variants of the

Surgut dialect represent the λ -type, while the Salym dialect is regarded as the t -type [1]. For example, Sur. *uləm* – Sal. *utəm* ‘sleep, dream’ [2]. Csepregi argues that the Salym dialect displays some morphological features that point to its affiliation with the Eastern cluster, however, in terms of phonetics it belongs to the southern cluster [3]. It has also been revealed that the transition of $[\lambda]$ to $[t]$ started in the Irtysh-Kondinski dialect about 200 years ago and gradually spread to the north and east. Salym Khanty was the first to be affected by this process, with Surgut Khanty going through this process at present. Another distinctive feature is vowel gradation. Surgut Khanty share vowel gradation with all Eastern dialects, except Salym Khanty. It occurs both in the declension of nouns and the conjugation of verbs, e.g. $[o] \sim [i]$ *koləγ* ‘nephew’ – *kilγ-əλ* nephew-POSS.3SG ‘his/her nephew’.

Studies of the morphosyntactic features of various Khanty dialects were initiated in the nineteenth century by M. A. Castrén [5], S. Patkanov [6], H. Paasonen [7], K. F. Karjalainen [8], W. Steinitz [9]. A chrestomathy of Surgut dialect was published by M. Csepregi [3], [10]. Some aspects of the grammar of Yugan Khanty may be found in [11] and grammar notes of various variants of Surgut Khanty – in L. Honti’s Chrestomathy [4]. Unfortunately, the Salym dialect is insufficiently described. There has been no one Salym chrestomathy to date. For comparative analysis, the data on Surgut Khanty have been elicited from [3], [4], [8], [10]. Some language data on Salym dialect have been found out in [4] and some elicited from the examples done by N. Tereshkin in the Eastern Khanty dictionary [2].

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The noun has three inflectional categories: number, case, and possession. There is no grammatical category of gender or that of definiteness in Khanty. In the morphological structure of the word, the nominal categories are represented in the following order: number marker + possession marker + case marker. For example, Sur. 1. *kiriw-l-əm-nə* vehicle-PL-POSS.1SG-LOC ‘in my boats’; 2. *kiriw-ət-nə* vehicle-PL-LOC ‘in boats’.

Number. The Khanty noun has 3 numbers: singular, dual and plural. Each number has two forms: free and bound. Their use depends on the presence or absence of possessive markers in the word structure. In example (1) above, the number marker *-l-* is used in the dependent form and the marker *-ət-* is in the absolute form. The free number markers indicate the duality or plurality of the object, the bound number markers – the duality or plurality of the possessed object. According to most grammarians, bound number markers and possessive suffixes are jointly treated as one morpheme. The paradigms of the free and bound number markers in the dialects under the study are illustrated in tables 1–2. Allomorphs of the same morpheme are given after a slash.

Table 1. Free number and bound markers in Surgut

Number	Free markers	Bound markers
SG	Ø <i>kat</i> ‘house, <i>imi</i> ‘woman’, <i>wajəy</i> ‘animal’	Ø <i>kat-in</i> house-POSS.2PL ‘your house’
DU	<i>γən/kən/κən</i> <i>kat-κən</i> house-DU ‘two houses’	<i>γəl/κəl/κəl</i> <i>kot-γəl-in</i> house-DU-POSS.2PL ‘your two houses’
PL	<i>t/ət</i> <i>wajy-ət</i> animal-PL ‘many animals’	<i>λ</i> <i>kot-λ-in</i> house-PL-POSS.2PL ‘your houses’

Table 2. Free number and bound markers in Salym

Number	Free markers	Bound markers
SG	Ø <i>kat</i> ‘house, <i>imi</i> ‘woman’, <i>wajəy</i> ‘animal’, <i>n'öy</i> ‘small river’, <i>âwə</i> ‘daughter, girl’, <i>pos</i> ‘mitten’	Ø
DU	<i>γən/kən</i> <i>âwə-γən</i> daughter-DU ‘two daughters, girls’, <i>n'ök-kən</i> small.river-DU ‘two small rivers’	<i>ηət</i>
PL	<i>t/ət</i> <i>pos-ət</i> ‘many mittens’ mitten-PL, <i>âwə-t</i> daughter-PL ‘many daughters, girls’	<i>t</i>

As it follows from the table, the singular number (in both free and bound types) is unmarked in both dialects. The dual free marker *-γən* is identical in Surgut and Salym, whereas the bound dual marker differs; cf. Surgut *-γəl* and Salym *-ηət*. The suffix *-ηət* is a feature of most southern dialects and the mixed dialects Nizyam and Sherkal combining features of the southern and northern Khanty [4]. The plural free marker is *-t* which is shared by both analyzed dialects and, in general, by the Ob-Ugric languages. This nominal suffix *-t* is polysemous in Salym. It marks plurality and plurality of possession. The plurality of possession is marked by the suffix *-λ-* in Surgut.

Possession. The category of possession is morphologically marked by possessive suffixes. These possessive markers encode a person, a number of the possessor and a number of the possessed simultaneously. The nominal possessive paradigm includes forms for three persons (1, 2, 3) and three numbers (SG, DU, PL). All in all, it may include 27 markers. The noun marked by a possessive suffix is the head of the construction that is referred to as the possessum and termed the ‘possessed’. The possessive suffixes encode the referent that serves as the

possessor. Table 3 presents nominal possessive suffixes in Surgut Khanty. Regrettably, possessive markers of Salym Khanty can hardly be presented and analyzed due to unavailable language data.

Table 3. Possessive markers in Surgut.

Possessor		Possessed		
		SG	DU	PL
SG	1	əm/em/am <i>păn-am</i> sting- POSS.1SG ‘my sting’	am <i>păn-γəλ-am</i> sting- DU-POSS.1SG ‘my two stings’	am <i>pănə-λ-am</i> sting-PL- POSS.1SG ‘my stings’
	2	ən/en/e/a <i>păn-a</i> sting- POSS.2SG ‘your sting’	a <i>păn-γəλ-a</i> sting-DU- POSS.2SG ‘your (two) stings’	a <i>pănə-λ-a</i> sting-PL- POSS.2SG ‘your stings’
	3	λəλ/iλ <i>păna-λ</i> sting- POSS.3SG ‘his/her sting’	Ø <i>păn-γəλ</i> sting- DU-POSS.2SG ‘his/her two stings’	Ø/-λ/-əλ/aλ <i>păna-λ</i> sting- PL/POSS.2SG ‘his/her stings’
DU	1	mən <i>păna-mən</i> sting- POSS.1DU ‘our (2) sting’	mən/əmən/amən <i>păn-γəλ-mən</i> sting- DU-POSS.1DU ‘our (2) two stings’	mən/əmən/amən <i>păn-λ-mən</i> sting-PL- POSS.1DU ‘our (2) stings’
	2	in/in <i>păn-in</i> sting- POSS.2DU ‘your (2) sting’	ən <i>păn-γəλ-ən</i> sting- DU-POSS.2DU ‘your (2) two stings’	ən/in <i>păn-λ-ən</i> sting-PL- POSS.2DU ‘your (2) stings’
	3	in/in <i>păna-in</i> sting- POSS.3DU ‘their (2) sting’	ən <i>păn-γəλ-ən</i> sting- DU-POSS.3DU ‘their (2) two stings’	ən/in <i>păn-λ-mən</i> sting-PL- POSS.3DU ‘your (2) stings’
PL	1	TjY. əχ, əχ (K), TjA. γəγ/iγ (H), J., P. – əw/ew/iw (H), uw/əw (C) <i>păna-γ</i> sting- POSS.1PL ‘our sting’	TjY. əχ, əχ (K), TjA. əγ (H), J., P. əw (H), uw (C) <i>păn-γəλ-əγ</i> sting-DU- POSS.1PL ‘our two stings’	TjY. əχ, əχ (K), TjA. γəγ/iγ (H), J., P. əw/ew/iw/uw (H), uw (C) <i>păn-λ-əγ</i> sting-PL- POSS.1PL ‘your stings’
	2	in/in <i>păn-in</i> sting- POSS.2PL ‘your sting’	in/ən <i>păn-γəλ-ən</i> sting- DU-POSS.2PL ‘your two stings’	in/ən <i>păn-λ-ən</i> sting-PL- POSS.2PL ‘your stings’
	3	iλ/iλ <i>păn-iλ</i> sting- POSS.2PL ‘their sting’	aλ <i>păn-γəλ-aλ</i> sting-DU- POSS.3PL ‘their two stings’	aλ <i>păn-λ-aλ</i> sting-PL- POSS.3PL ‘their stings’

The researchers' disagreement concerns the forms for 1PL of the possessor and SG, DU and PL of the possessed. Possessive markers tend to coincide. All DU and PL markers of the possessed have identical forms.

Case. This category is represented by a different number of nominal cases (3–11) in Khanty. In all Northern Khanty dialects the nominal paradigm involves three cases; in Eastern Khanty dialects the category of case includes between 7 and 11 cases. The exact number of attested cases in a separate dialect largely depends on the opinion of the given researcher. From the semantic and functional perspective, the Surgut and Salym Eastern Khanty nominal cases fall into three groups. The first includes the nominative case alone, its functional syncretism encompasses nominative, accusative and genitive semantics. The second group includes all core spatial cases: ablative, agentive-locative, allative, and lative-illative-dative-allative. Functionally, the agentive-locative case is utilized to encode spatial meanings and mark the logical subject. The third group comprises all remaining cases: abessive, comparative, distributive, expletive, instrumental-comitative, instrumental-objective, and translative. All these cases function as markers of an indirect object of the verb or as adverbial modifiers. Due to the fact that most cases are characterized by polyfunctionality, researchers of Eastern Khanty use different terms to define cases, for example, the marker *-a/-ä* is termed lative [3], [10], lative-dative [4], illative-dative [11], lative, illative, dative [8]. We adopt a compound way of their designation, i.e. major functional variants are enumerated via hyphen: e.g. lative-illative-dative-allative. If any case is termed differently in literature, another name is given in brackets with a reference to the researcher who mentioned it, e.g. abessive (caritive K), agentive-locative (locative T, H).

Surgut Khanty. This overview of the Surgut Khanty case system is grounded in the data provided by Honti [4]. Karjalainen's research focused primarily on Trom-Yugan (Trom-Agan) Khanty. It is worth mentioning that Honti differentiated Trom-Yugan and Trom-Agan on phonological grounds: Trom-Yugan Khanty was characterized by vowel harmony, whereas Trom-Agan had lost that feature by then. Another variant of Surgut Khanty in which Honti identified vowel harmony was Yugan Khanty. The gradual elimination of vowel harmony is known to have started in the Yugan river area at the turn of the nineteenth-twentieth centuries and have been completed by the beginning of the 21st century [10]. This is supported by the fact that no vowel harmony is attested in Khanty dialects in the most recent grammar of the language [10]. Table 4 presents an overview of the cases and their markers in the variants

Table 4. Case markers in Surgut Trom-Yugan, Trom-Agan, Yugan, Pim

No.	Case	Marker				Examples
		TjY.	TjA.	P.	Y.	
Group 1						
1	Nominative	Ø				<i>imi</i> ‘woman’ <i>ap-əm rit</i> father-POSS.3SG boat ‘a boat of my father’, <i>iki säsəy wär</i> old.man trap make.NPST.3SG ‘A man made a trap.’
Group 2						
2	Ablative (Exessive, Elative K)	i/i/	i/	i/ iwəλ (H)	i	<i>kot-i</i> house-ABL ‘away from a house’ <i>juγ-i</i> tree-ABL ‘away from a tree’, <i>sāŋkij-i</i> sand-ABL ‘out of sand’
3	Agentive- Locative (Locative, Agentive, Inessive K) (Locative H, C)	nə/nə̃	nə			<i>imi-nə put wär-λ-i</i> woman-AG food cook-PASS.3SG ‘Food is cooked by a woman’, <i>kot-nə</i> house-LOC ‘into a house’, <i>süwəs-nə</i> autumn-LOC ‘in autumn’
4	Allative (Approximative K, H, C)	nam/ näm	nam		nam/ näm	<i>imi-näm</i> woman-ALL ‘to a woman’ <i>kut-əλ-nam</i> house-POSS.3SS-APP ‘to his house’
5	Lative-Illative- Dative-Allative (Lative, Illative, Dative K) (Lative C) (Lative-Dative H)	a/ä	a		a/ä	<i>jəŋk-a</i> water-ILL ‘(fall) into water’, <i>iməj-ä</i> woman-DAT ‘(say) to a woman’, <i>ä^ynə̃-a wəλ-ta mən-λ-əm</i> A'gan-ALL live-go-PRS-S.1SG ‘I am going to live to the Agan.’ [8]
Group 3						
6	Abessive (Caritive K)	ləy/lə̃y ləy/lə̃y	ləy			<i>imi-ləy</i> woman-ABS ‘without a woman’ <i>tüwət-ləy</i> fire-ABS ‘without fire’, <i>äwi-ləy</i> daughter-ABS ‘without a daughter’, <i>uləm-ləy</i> dream-ABS ‘without dreams’
7	Distributive	pti/pti (K) təλtā/tə̃λta (H) — (C)	? (H) — (C)		λta/λtä (H) — (C)	TrY. <i>ěj lāŋki-təλtā</i> one squirrel-DISTR ‘with one squirrel each’, TrY. <i>äwi-pti</i> girl-DISTR ‘each girl’, TrY. <i>rit-əλ-pti</i> boat-PL-DISTR ‘(take seats) in boats’
8	Expletive	— (K) p(ti)/p(ti) (H) — (C)	? (H) — (C)		p(ti) (H) — (C)	Y. <i>ləŋə-pti</i> summer-EXPL ‘every summer’, TrY. <i>katlə-pti</i> day-EXPL ‘ever day’
9	Instrumental- Comitative	nat/nät	nat		nat/nät	<i>rit-nat</i> boat-INS ‘by boat’ <i>ləjəm-nat</i> ax-INS ‘with /by an axe’, <i>ni-kən-nat</i>

	(Comitative K)				woman-DU-COM ‘with two women’, <i>imi-nāt</i> woman-COM ‘with a woman’
10	Instrumental-Objective (Instrumental K) (Instructive-Final H, C)	at/ät	at	at/ät	<i>suntuk wär-at tör'əmt-əy</i> box blood-OBJ flow-NPST.3SG ‘There is blood coming out of the box.’ <i>mä nüñ-at nipək-at mə-λ-əm</i> 1SG 2SG-ACC book-OBJ give-PRS-1SG ‘I give you a book’.
11	Translative	γε/κε (K) γə/γə̃ (H) kə/κə (C)	γə (H) kə/κə (C)		<i>ittən-γə jə-γ</i> evening-TR become-NPST.3SG ‘The evening has come.’ <i>wöñ-kə</i> ‘(become) son-in-law’, <i>ķə̃məñ-κə</i> ‘(become) a swan’, <i>λăk-κə</i> (from <i>λăw</i> ‘horse’) ‘(become) a horse’

As the data in the table show, researchers’ opinions differ with regard to the inflections of such cases as the ablative and distributive. The most controversial seems to be the distributive case. It is not included in the nominal case paradigm consisting of nine markers that was described by Csepregi. However, the use of this case marked by *-pti/-pti* was attested in Surgut Khanty by Karjalainen and illustrated by numerous examples [8]. As a consequence, Karjalainen distinguished ten case markers in the paradigm. Unlike him, Honti divided the distributive into two cases: the distributive per se and the expletive. The former is used to mark the object immediately following the predicate with *-təłtä/-təłta*, the latter can mark any object functioning as a complement or an adverbial with *-pti/-pti*. This extends the paradigm to 11 cases in Honti’s view. The following examples (1–3) illustrate the use of the distributive case in Trom-Yugan Khant.

- (1) *ěj läñki-təłtä urt-ətəy*
one squirrel-DISTR divide-PST.SBJ.1PL:OBJ.SG
‘Each of us was given a squirrel.’ [4]
- (2) *äwi-pti ķul-t məj-ə*
girl-DISTR fish-PL give-IMP.SBJ.2SG:OBJ.SG
‘Give each girl a fish.’ [8]
- (3) *ķatλə-pti pira mən-λ*
day-DISTR backwards go-NPST.SBJ.3SG
‘[He] loses weight every day.’ [8]

Salym Khanty. This dialect has not been thoroughly studied yet, and the only source where the case system is holistically described is Honti’s Khanty reader [4]. Table 5 gives a brief overview of the category in this dialect. Due to the absence of attested data, examples are not provided for all cases.

Table 5. Case markers in Salym

#	Case-	Marker	Examples
<i>Group 1</i>			
1	Nominative	Ø	imət ‘a stuffed bird’
<i>Group 2</i>			
2	Ablative	? iwət	pal'ta kəsa iwət coat pocket from ‘out of the pocket of the coat’
3	Agentive-Locative (Locative H)	nə	əj n'öyə anə kŭrmat-nə, əj n'öyə anə pəsan oytə-nə one meat bowl threshold-LOC one meat bowl table surface-LOC ‘One cup with meat is at the threshold, the other is on the table.’ [2]
4	Allative (Approximative H)	nam	—
5	Lative-Illative-Dative- Allative (Lative-Dative H)	a	kimət kät jöyət-mən kăram oŋ-a the.second day come-PST.1DU Karym inside-ALL ‘On the second day we got to the river Karym.’
<i>Group 3</i>			
6	Abessive	(tə)	—
7	Distributive	?	—
8	Expletive	ptə	—
9	Instrumental- Comitative	(nat)	—
10	Instrumental-Objective (Instructive-Final H)	at	sōj-at wār-ta good.thing-INS.OBJ do-INF ‘to do somebody a favour’ [2]
11	Translative	yə/kə/kə	n'ăk-ka atəm-ta joke-TR bad-INF ‘to make nasty jokes about sb’ [2]

As Honti points out, the ablative case can be formed analytically by means of the postpositive *iwət* like in Pim Khanty. However, although there is no denying the morphological way of forming this case, no marker is introduced to exemplify it. Such morphemes as *-nat* and *-tə* are believed to function as the markers of the instrumental-comitative and the abessive cases respectively. The existence of the distributive case is doubted by Honti.

CONCLUSION

The analysis focuses on three nominal categories: number, possession, and case that are shared by both analyzed dialects. It allowed us to systemize linguistic data on each dialect and reveal their shared and unique features with regard to the terms and morphological forms. In this research, the category of case is presented as one of the most controversial. The contradiction mainly concerns the content of the case category. Disagreements concern the issue of the number of cases (from 9 to 11), the titles of cases confused by their multi-functionality, and forms of inflections. Surgut and Salym Khanty dialects have morphologically marked distinctive features. They have bound number markers of DU and PL and the case

forms of abessive and ablative markers. The possessive markers and some case markers of Salym Khanty can hardly be presented and analysed due to unavailable language data. It is supposed that a present study helps to display a range of shared or unique features in the domain of nominal morphology of Surgut and Salym from the typological perspective.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper was financially supported by Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation (grant No. 14.Y26.31.0014).

REFERENCES

- [1] Solovar V. N., Nakhracheva G. L., Shiyanova A. A., Dialects of Khanty. Khanty-Mansiysk, 2016;
- [2] Tereshkin N.T., Dictionary of the Eastern Khanty dialects. Leningrad: Nauka, 1981;
- [3] Csepregi M., Surgut Khanty dialect. Khanty-Mansiysk, 2017;
- [4] Honti L., Chrestomathia Ostiaca. Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest, 1984/1986;
- [5] Castrén M. A., Schiefner A., Versuch einer ostjakischen Sprachlehre. Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1858;
- [6] Patkanov S. K., Fokos-Fuchs D. Laut-und Formenlehre der Süd-ostjakischen Dialekte. Budapest, 1911;
- [7] Paasonen H., Vértés E. Ostjakische grammatische Aufzeichnungen nach den Dialekten an der Konda und am Jugan. Helsinki, 1965;
- [8] Karjalainen K. F., Vértés E. Grammatikalishe Aufzeichnungen aus Ostjakischen Mundarten. Bearbeitet and herausgegeben von E. Vértés. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 1964;
- [9] Steinitz, W., Ostjakologische Arbeiten. I., IV. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1975, 1980;
- [10] Csepregi M., Szurguti osztják chrestomathia. Studia uralo-altaica supplementa 6. Szeged: József Attila Tudományegyetem, 1998/2011;
- [11] Filchenko A. Yu., Aspect of the Grammar of Eastern Khanty. Tomsk: TSPU-Press, 2010.