

GABOR B. SZEKELY (Pécs)

## ON THE ORIGIN OF THE PREDICATIVE PARTICLE IN EASTERN OSTYAK

In some of the Eastern dialects of the Ostyak language (Vah (V.), Vasjugan (Vj.) and Salym (Sal.)) there is a particle to be agglutinated mainly to the adjectival stem whose forms can be V., Vj. *-ăki/ăki*, Sal. *-ăkă*. The function of this clitic element is to indicate the predicative position of the adjective in nominal sentences. The use of this particle is not obligatory, the alternative form without the particle in question is used in the same kind of nominal sentences. Its occurrence is limited to the predicate expressing third person singular, dual or plural in present tense. Thus it has no suffix to assign any person other than third person. For example: V. *köčəγ pestăki* 'The knife is sharp' (SVD 358), V. *tim kulătămăki* 'This fish is bad' (Gulya 1969 : 24), V. *turim kăčăki* 'I have a sore throat' (SVD 479), Vj. *tem ämp jəmăki* 'This dog is a good dog' (KV 171), Vj. *jŭγ mănni äjăki* 'He is younger than me' (SVD 21), Sal. *kŭfărălă šăns-ürăt jăšpeŋăkă* 'There are stripes on the back of the squirrel' (SVD 71). The dialectal variations of this form seem more archaic in nature than the form having a zero morpheme in the same position. Therefore it is to be assumed that there is historically a strong connection among other parts of the Ostyak noun paradigm which mark syntagmatic relations such as lative and translative cases, the derivational suffixes of infinitive *-ta*, *-təpe*, of adjective *-i* and the noun particle *-γă*. (For this particle see Honti 1984 : 87).

With this assumption we want to prove that these syntagmatic markers are common in a specific way from a historical point of view. We propose that we seek the origin and development of the predicative particle in the set of suffixes mentioned above.

In Tereškin's opinion the role of the predicative particle is to mark the predicative position of the adjective in nominal sentences (cf. Терешкин 1961 : 57—58). In the glossary of his book he lists the adjectives with their predicative forms and gives the stem forms and the forms of the predicative particle by writing them in parentheses, e.g. V. *lolăŋ (ăki)* 'nicked' (Терешкин 1961 : 155a), but some adjectives, such as e.g. V. *wökăŋ* 'strong' (Терешкин 1961 : 131b) have no forms with the predicative particle in his list. Neither is it clear whether these words can be used with the predicative particle or not. Gulya is of the same opinion in his grammatical survey as Tereškin (Gulya 1966 : 16, 33; Гуя 1976 : 307). There is a less known dialect of Eastern Ostyak, the so-called Salym dialect in which Honti has observed the use of this predicative particle having the form *-ăkă* (Honti 1982 : 115, and 1984 : 97—98). He makes a remark on a historically possible correspondence between the predicative particle in question and the Tremjugan (dialect of Ostyak)

particle  $-\gamma\tilde{a}/-\gamma\tilde{a}$  which appears as the last suffix of the adjective in an adjectival phrase. The most important work done in this field can be found in Vértés 1958. She collected all the data occurring in Karjalainen-Toivonen and made some interesting remarks on the role and development of the predicative particle. Vértés assumes that there is a connection between the origin of this particle and the Eastern Ostyak translative case suffix. However, she does not seem to be quite successful when it should come to proving the connection (Vértés 1958 : 191). I will point out later on in this article that the element  $-k-$  of the V., Vj.  $-\tilde{a}ki/-\tilde{a}ki$ , Sal.  $-\tilde{a}k\tilde{a}$  particle seems to be identical with the elements  $-\gamma$  and  $-k-$  of translative case suffixes V., Vj.  $-\gamma\tilde{a}/-\gamma\tilde{a}$ , Sal.  $-k\tilde{a}$ , but it is supposed that both suffixes are historically complex ones consisting of two lative case suffixes which together express translative meaning.

In order to prove that originally the predicative particle was a local case suffix we shall have to take a look at the sentence structure of the nominal predicate in Ob-Ugric languages. There are two types of nominal predicates in such sentence structure: a simple and a complex one. The latter concatenates a noun and an auxiliary verb, in this order. The nominal part of the complex predicate can bear the nominative or the translative cases (See more in Лыскова 1986; Honti 1984 : 98). Here are some examples of the complex predicate when the noun is marked by a translative case suffix: J.  $\acute{a}l\acute{e}n\acute{e} ma ke\acute{n}ar\acute{e} w\acute{a}l\acute{e}m$  'In the beginning I was poor' (SVD 28), Sal.  $ma \acute{j}em\acute{a}k\tilde{a} w\acute{o}tt\acute{e}m$  'I live well' (SVD 93), V.  $m\acute{a} \acute{j}em\acute{a}ki w\acute{a}ll\acute{e}m$  'I live well' (SVD 93), V., Vj.  $por\acute{e}y w\acute{a}l\acute{w}\acute{e}l$  'He is a priest' (DEWOS 1194), vogul N  $am l\acute{o}m\acute{w}\acute{o}j\acute{i}y \acute{o}l\acute{e}y\acute{e}m$  'I am a mosquito' (Kálmán 1976 : 142). In these sentences the nominal parts of the complex predicates have translative case suffixes J  $-\gamma\tilde{a}$ , Sal.  $-k\tilde{a}$ , V., Vj.  $-\tilde{e}y$ , vogul N  $-\acute{i}y$ . It should be noted that the marked and the unmarked nouns in this kind of complex predicates have the same meaning. I assume that the role of the translative case suffix is to indicate the predicative position of the noun in the sentence. What I intend to prove in this article is that the function of the predicative particle used to be to express translative meaning.

The form of the lative case in different dialects of the Ostyak language is to be reconstructed as PO (Proto-Ostyak)  $*-a/-\tilde{a}$  (see Honti 1984 : 60), and is originated from the lative case suffix PU  $*-k$  (Hajdú 1966 : 62, 124—125). The translative case suffix has remained only in the Eastern Ostyak dialects and in the Obdorsk dialect of Northern Ostyak. The reconstruction for this suffix is PO  $*-\gamma a/-\gamma \tilde{a}$  (Honti 1984 : 60) and it is supposed to be a survived form of the lative case suffix PU  $*-k$ . However, it is difficult to suppose that both suffixes were inherited from Proto-Uralic since there is a vocalic form for lative case suffix  $*-a/-\tilde{a}$  and a consonant + vowel for the translative case suffix  $*-\gamma a/-\gamma \tilde{a}$ . However, the different sound changes in these suffixes do not support the idea of common origin.

We are proposing a new reconstruction for the Proto-Ostyak translative case suffix with respect to the correspondence between the meaning of lative and translative cases. Historically the two case forms convey the same meaning: the lative case serves to indicate changing/moving in space just as the translative does to indicate changing in the state of affairs. Consequently, there must have been a constant lative case suffix  $*-k$  in Proto-Ostyak while, at the same time, a translative case suffix was bound to appear by reduplication and, for that matter, by reinterpretation of the old form. Consequently, the proform of this suffix must have been PO  $*-kV\tilde{k}$ , where the first  $-k-$  is the lative case suffix and the

second *-k* is the reduplicated lative case suffix to acquire the translative meaning. Suffix combinations can also be found in other Uralic languages (see Györke 1943 : 39—40; Collinder 1960 : 291—297).

I propose the following reconstruction of the development of the present-day lative and translative case suffixes in Ostyak dialects: for the lative case suffix PO *\*-V)-k* > *\*-Vγ* > *-a/-ä*, and for the translative case suffix PO *\*-V)-kVk* > *\*-V)-kVγ* > *\*-V)-γVγ* > *-V)-γV* in Eastern dialects, *\*-V)-γV* > *-Vγ* > *-i* in Obdorsk dialect and > *-a/-ä* in other Northern dialects.

We can see from the reconstruction proposed here that the identical forms of lative and translative case suffixes in the present-day Northern Ostyak go back to different case forms historically.

A similar phenomenon of historical reduplication can be witnessed in connection with the forms and use of the infinitive suffix in some of the Eastern Ostyak dialects as seen from the comparison of the two forms of the infinitive suffix. There is a short form *-tV*, and a long form *-tVγə* to express the infinitival meaning (see Honti 1984 : 55—56). We are suggesting that the PO form of the infinitive suffix should be reconstructed as *\*-tVkVk*, where the first consonant is the locative case suffix PFU *\*-t*, and the rest of this proto-suffix is the very same element that we demonstrated above for the reduplicated part of the reconstructed translative suffix PO *\*-kVk*. (Collinder notes that the long form of the infinitive ending in Ostyak «may be identical with the ending *-ta(k)/-tä(k)* of the Finnish (lative case of the) infinitive» (Collinder 1960 : 271)).

The analysis elaborated and presented here is instrumental in demonstrating how to reconstruct the origin and development of the predicative particle. It has been proposed that the complex suffixes be considered as results of a certain kind of combinations or reinterpretations of the simple ones. We have also proposed that from a historically point of view the Proto-Ostyak translative case suffix and the ancestor of the predicative particle have the same origin. Consequently, both suffixes contain two lative suffixes. In our comparison of the infinitive suffix PO *\*-tVkVk* > (*-taγə*) and the translative case suffix PO *\*-kVk* > (*-əki*), we can see that both forms had been affected by the same sound changes. The translative case form of the noun in the complex nominal predicate helps us to understand that the meaning of this form used to indicate a kind of change in the state of affairs.

As a conclusion of our results in this article, we put forward a proposal concerning the reconstruction of the origin and development of the predicative particle. For the final and complex form of the reconstruction to be offered below we refer to the assumptions and arguments elaborated above.

The starting point, thus, is the PO *\*-V)-kVk*, where *-V* is the stem vowel. In order to get the present-day form of the particle we propose the following analysis:

PO *\*-a)-kak* > *\*-akαγ* > *\*-akəγ* > *\*-əkəγ* > VVj. *-ək̄i*,  
 PO *\*-ä)-käk* > *\*-äkäγ* > *\*-äkəγ* > *\*-əkəγ* > VVj. *-ək̄i*,  
 PO *\*-ä)-käk* > *\*-äkäγ* > *\*-äkəγ* > *\*-əkəγ* > Sal. *-ək̄ə*.

Finally, I would like to call attention to the important implications of the method applied here. It seems to be useful and rewarding to analyse the history of several suffixes of Ostyak (and perhaps of other Uralic languages) by the method of comparative historical syntax, because the markers of syntactic relations show the common origin of different suffixes, such as the adjectival *-i*, the suffix of the present participle *-tə*, and the suffixes analysed above. It seems to be highly prob-

able that the syntax of Proto-Ostyak was affected by a strong tendency to reflect the world as a change from one state of affairs to another by means of a set of suffixes originating from lative meaning.

#### Abbreviations

SVD — Н. И. Терешкин, Словарь восточнохантыйских диалектов, Ленинград 1981.

#### REFERENCES

- Collinder, B. 1960, Comparative Grammar of the Uralic Languages, Uppsala.  
 Gulya, J. 1966, Vahi osztják nyelvtanulmányok II. — NyK 68, 3—34.  
 — 1969, Vahi osztják szójegyzék. — NyK 71, 21—59.  
 Györke, J. 1943, Tó, képző, rag (Szó- vagy jelrészten). — MNyTK 67, Budapest.  
 Hajdú, P. 1966, Bevezetés az uráli nyelvtudományba, Budapest.  
 Honti, L. 1982, A szalimi osztják nyelvjárás hang- és alaktanának ismertetése. — NyK 84, 91—119.  
 — 1984, Chrestomathia Ostiacica, Budapest.  
 Kálmán, B. 1976, Wogulische Texte mit einem Glossar, Budapest.  
 Karjalainen, K. F. 1964, Grammatikalische Aufzeichnungen aus ostjakischen Mundarten. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Edit Vértes, Helsinki (MSFOu 128) (= KV).  
 Vértes, E. 1958, Nyelvtani adalékok a keleti osztják (chanti) nyelvjárásokhoz. — NyK 60, 183—191.  
 Лыскова Н. А. 1986, Именное сказуемое в обско-угорском предложении (на материале северных диалектов хантыйского и мансийского языков). — СФУ XXII, 128—137.  
 Терешкин Н. И. 1961, Очерки диалектов хантыйского языка. Часть первая, Ваховский диалект, Ленинград.

ГАБОР Б. СЕКЕИ (Печ)

#### ПРОИСХОЖДЕНИЕ ВОСТОЧНОХАНТЫЙСКОЙ ПРЕДИКАТИВНОЙ ЧАСТИЦЫ

Автор с помощью сравнительно-исторического метода анализирует происхождение и формирование встречающейся в восточнохантыйских диалектах частицы — ваховский, васюганский *-əki* / *-əki*, салымский *-əka*. Эта частица главным образом употребляется на конце прилагательных, выступающих в роли сказуемого, первоначально она была связана с показателем древнехантыйского транслатива. Для подтверждения этого автор приводит форму составного именного сказуемого с транслативным суффиксом, а также суффикс инфинитива. Согласно предлагаемому анализу, древнехантыйский транслатив (прахант. *\*-kVk*) мог возникнуть путем удвоения суффикса латива (*\*-k*) и вместе с этим переосмысления функции, отсюда могли произойти и современные диалектные соответствия. Вероятно, что та основа формирования восточнохантыйской предикативной частицы, которая в прошлом на конце прилагательного могла быть показателем изменения состояния, к нашему времени утратила это значение, фонетическая же форма возникла в ходе изменения прахантыйского *\*-a)-kak* > *\*-akay* > *\*-akəy* > *\*-əkəy* > вах., вас. *-əki*.