*VICTORIA VOROBEVA, IRINA NOVITSKAYA (*Tomsk)

## Possessive Constructions in the Obdorsk Dialect of Khanty Language

**Abstract**. The paper presents an analysis of the structural types of possessive constructions in the Obdorsk dialect of Khanty. It is shown that the concept of possession is encoded by means of adnominal and predicative possessive constructions of differing structural types. Adnominal possessive constructions are built according to five structural models with explicit and implicit possessor, in four of which the head is marked with a possessive suffix. Predicative possessive constructions can be built with the verbs "have", "be", "not be" and "remain". The canonical is a transitive possessive construction in which both the possessor and possessed are uncoded. Predicative esse-consrtuctions are less frequent and may incorporate the marked possessed.

**Key words:** possession, adnominal, predicative, Khanty language, Obdorsk dialect, Finno-Ugric languages

## Introduction

Possession as a conceptual domain and its representations in various languages have long been in the focus of numerous studies in linguistics (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2003; Heine 1997; Stassen 2009; Payne, Barshi 1999 and others). It has been established that the concept of possession is a universal notion (Stolz, Kettler & al. 2008: 6), however, its manifestation in the languages may vary considerably (Broschart 2001; Honti 2008). The numerous ways and patterns of expressing possessive relations in the languages of the world have enabled linguists to work out linguistic taxonomies of language means capable of conveying the idea of possession from the typological perspective and to analyze their use in many grammatical constructions in various languages.

Possessive constructions in the Finno-Ugric languages of the Ob-Yenissei area (e.g. Eastern Khanty, Southern Selkup, Ket, Teleut) have also been thoroughly described (Tomsk Journal of Linguistics and Anthropology 2015, 2016; Vorob'jova, Novitskaja, Girfanova, Vesnin 2017), however, this task is far from being complete since not all languages or dialects have been addressed and not types of such constructions and their functions have been covered.

The goal of the present article is to carry out an analysis within a general functional-typological framework of all cases in which the concept of possession was identified in the Obdorsk dialect of Khanty. This approach enabled us to work out a system of means capable of

conveying the idea of possessive relations as it has been attested in five texts in the Obdorsk dialect.

**Methodological background**

In the present paper we follow the opinion that possession is both a conceptual and grammatical category which can be viewed as a part of a broader conceptual category of relativity (Чинчлей 1990; McGregor 2009). From the semantic standpoint, the concept of possession involves such domains as (legal) ownership, belonging, kinship and part-whole relations (Seiler 1983: 4). Each domain may allow further subcategorization into alienable and inalienable possession (Едыгарова 2010 : 15–21).

In linguistic terms, there are two entities: a possessor and a possessed (also designated as a possessum, possessee) which are in the possessive relation (designated as a relator). The possessive relation is "asymmetric" (Stassen 2009 : 11), in that the possessor controls the possessed. Both the possessor and the possessed can be encoded by a noun or a pronoun. The possessive relation can be manifested in three types of syntactical constructions: predicative (Stassen 2009; Kowalik 2016), adnominal (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2002; 2006; Duguine 2008; Гращенков 2007; Krasnoukhova 2011) and external possessive ones (Haspelmath 1999). Languages do not tend to manifest the concept of possession on the syntactical level alone, so there are also some morphological means to encode possessive relations (like English –'s, Russian suffixes -ov-, -in- as in *d'ed-ov-a krovat'*, *mam-in-a ruka*) as well as lexical ones (English *property, possession, my, their*). Hence, the relator may be overtly expressed by a verb, it may take the form of a more or less bound case marker, or it can have a zero marking (Tham 2013). In terms of the prototypical approach, possessive relations may vary with regard to the co-occurrence of their typical features (Taylor 1996; Mazzitelli 2015).

The core syntactical construction to encode the concept of possession is an adnominal or attributive one (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2002 : 765; Budzisch 2015 : 45). In adnominal possession, a possessive construction involves two elements, a possessor and a possessee, that jointly

constitute a noun phrase (NP) – a possessive NP (PNP) (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001). The possessor can be either pronominal or nominal, thus we deem it is appropriate to talk about the pronominal possessive construction and the nominal possessive one. Additionally, a PNP may contain relators, or construction markers (CMs), whose function is to mark explicitly the exact type of relation between the possessor and the possessee (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2002). In a PNP construction markers can be morphologically bound either to the possessor (dependent-marking), to the possessee (head-marking), or to both (double-marking), or they can function as unbound elements (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001). In languages of the world the concept of possession (represented by numerous semantic categories) in a PNP is either morphologically marked (e.g. by case-markers, possessive markers, prepositions, prefixes, linking pronouns) or not (e.g. compounding, juxtaposing); in the former case, the CMs can be found either in pre- or post-position to the marked element (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2002, 2001). Both word-order typologies, i.e., possessee—possessor and possessor—possessee are found with an almost equal frequency in the language systems of the world (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001). Languages in Europe preferentially use dependent-marking PNPs. In the eastern and southeastern periphery of Europe double-marked and prepositional PNPs tend to be common (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2003). Globally, dependent-marking PNPs and their analytic counterparts are the preferred PNP types (Bickel, Nichols 2013). There are opposing views on the commonality of the head-marked possessive NPs in the Americas and the Pacific (Dixon and Aikhenvald 1999; Krasnoukhova 2011). Juxtaposition is, in general, quite uncommon (Bickel, Nichols 2013).

Opposed to the adnominal possessive construction is the predicative possessive construction. In predicative possession the relations of possession are construed in the main predication of a clause or sentence, that is, the possessed item is predicated of a possessor (Stassen 2013). Predicative possession encodes the possessive relationship between possessor and possessee either in the form of a syntactically transitive construction (Habeo-possessive constructions) or a syntactically intransitive one (existential sentences or Esse-possessive constructions) (Stassen

2013). The intransitive possessive constructions can further be divided into three subtypes (the Oblique/Locational possessive, the Topic possessive and the Conjunctional Possessive/ the With-possessive) depending on how the possessor and the possessee are encoded (Stassen 2009; 2013). Another type of intransitive possessive constructions, albeit not unanimously accepted by researchers, is the genitive possessive that "shares several features with the locational, with- and topic possessives. It consists, in its standard version, of an intransitive existential clause containing a verb "to be/exist". <...> The possessor is marked "genitival", that is, the possessor acts as a modifier of the possessed". Interestingly this construction recruits already existing marking of (adnominal/attributive) possession to express even predicative possession (Stassen 2009:107; Kowalik 2016:9). In the languages of the world the genitive possessive may be overtly marked with a genitive case or unmarked/zero, while the existential verb does not necessarily have to be present (Kowalik 2016:10).

The third type of possessive constructions, i.e. the external possessive one, differs from the abovementioned types in that it does not have a possessive modifier as a dependent constituent of the modified NP. The possessive NPs occur NP-externally as constituents of the clause (Haspelmath 1999:1). External possessive constructions code the possessor as a core grammatical relation of the verb and in a constituent separate from the one containing the possessed item (Payne, Barshi 1999). Although this type of possessive constructions has been identified in various languages of the world, the marking of the possessive relation does not boil down to one-for-all option (Haspelmath 1999). As evidence shows, the possessor in such constructions may be dative-marked, locative-marked, or adessive-marked, which is claimed to be areally specified (Ibid., p. 11-13).

An analysis of possessive constructions may be carried out within a certain paradigm (Heine 1997, Stassen 2009, Tham 2013) and may involve taking into account some key properties attributed to the possessor (human/non-human), the possessee (animate/inanimate), and the type of relation of possession (alienable/inalienable, physical, abstract, or temporary/permanent)

(Stassen 2009). Nevertheless, other properties may also affect the way of encoding the concept of possession: the use of a noun or a pronoun to encode the possessor, the number and definiteness of the possessor and others (Kowalik 2016).

**Presentation of examples**

All examples in the Obdorsk dialect are presented in the following way: In line (a) a reference to the text is mentioned and in line (b) an example is written in the Obdorsk dialect orthography. The example is glossed using the Leipzig Glossing Rules in line (c). Its translation into English is presented in line (d). Examples are numbered from one (1) onwards throughout the article. For morpheme boundaries we follow glossing traditions of other authors (Николаева1995, Nikolaeva 1999).

(a) Three sons

(b) χɔn χuləm jik tăj-ə-l.

(c) king three boy have-EP-PRS

(d) A tsar had three sons.

**Genealogical and sociolinguistic profile of the Obdorsk dialect**

The Obdorsk dialect (older name is Ostyak) represents the northern subgroup of the Khanty dialect continuum that belongs to the Ugric (Uralic) family (Abondolo 1998:358; Nikolaeva 1999:3; Ядобчева-Дресвянина 2002:6). The Obdorsk dialect of Khanty is an endangered language spoken by the indigenous people of Yamalo-Nenetskij Avtonomnyj Okrug as well as of Khanty-Mansiyskij Avtonomnyj Okrug in the Tyumen region in Russia (Николаева1995:6-7). According to the estimates, in 1989 the number of people speaking Khanty (all dialects) was around 22,000 of which only 62,9 % were native speakers (Abondolo 1998). The 2010 census data showed that there remained only 9,580 speakers out of 30,900 ethnic population (Ethnologue 2017).

The three dialect groups of Khanty (Eastern, Northern and Southern) are different in terms of their preservation. While the southern dialects of Khanty are no longer used, the eastern and

northern dialects still survive in the home, but the few Khanty-speaking youth are forced to switch to Russian which they tend to name as the first language (Nikolaeva 1999:3). The best preserved are northern dialects of Kazym, Shuryshkar, Berjozov, and Obdorsk out of which the latter is attested in "Das Evangelium Matthai" (1868) as well as in a corpus containing 27 texts (http://larkpie.net/siberianlanguages/northern-khanty). The eastern dialects of Khanty (Vakh, Vasjugan, Surgut, Trom-Jugan) are more endangered than Northern dialects but there still survived linguistic traditions in some isolated, remote settlements as in the small settlement of Korliki where Vahk speakers reside.*

The Obdorsk dialect has two variants: the Sob and the Poluysk local idioms (spoken by people in the settlements Katravozh and Pelvozh situated in the lower basin of the Ob) which are fairly close with respect to their morphology and syntax, but display some differences in their vocal systems and declension (Николаева1995:7; Nikolaeva 1999:4).

**Grammatical profile of the Obdorsk dialect**

A number of grammatical features are presented here to assist the comprehension of examples given in the results section of the article. The grammatical features are listed in accordance with the evidence discussed in (Николаева1995; Nikolaeva 1999; Ядобчева-Дресвянина 2002).

Unlike the eastern dialects of Khanty, the northern dialects do not have ergative syntactical structures. The standard word order is SOV.

The inflectional words usually have an agglutinative structure which may involve 5-7 morphemes (root, 2-3 derivational affixes, tense, voice and agreement). While in the majority of cases a word can be divided into a linear sequence of distinct morphs, each of which has a regular shape and a single function, the boundaries between morphemes can at times be vague, and some morphemes can be syncretic in terms of their functional meaning. The majority of affixes are suffixes. The so-called preverbs represent a category intermediate between a free lexical item and a bound morpheme. Some function words (mostly focus particles) are clitics. There are some analytical constructions (certain aspectual, temporal and modal categories).

Depending on their semantics, Obdorsk nouns are divided into animate and inanimate, have two declension types (main/absolute and possessive), inflect for number, case and possession, they do not have grammatical categories of gender, class, and definiteness. Nouns distinguish between singular (SG), dual (DU) and plural (PL). The case system includes the unmarked Nominative (NOM), the Locative (LOC) and the Translative (TRNS). Adnominal possession is marked with possessive suffixes which are inflected for person and number. Possessive forms indicate one of the three numbers and three persons (1, 2, 3) of the possessor by means of the possessive suffixes that attach to the possessed noun. The number of the possessed noun is expressed by a number affix preceding the possessive affixes.

With regard to their inflectional properties adjectives are not distinguishable from nouns. However, adjectives participate in analytical comparative and superlative constructions and function as adverbial modifier of manner.

Personal and possessive pronouns distinguish three numbers and three persons.

Verbs are divided into transitive and intransitive, inflect for tense (Present, Past, analytical Future), mood (Indicative and oblique – Imperative, Evidential, Adhorative, Optative, Conjunctive, Conditional), voice (Active with two conjugations: subjective and objective, and Passive), aspect (General and Stative), have three numbers as well as the subject agreement and the object agreement. Along with finite forms there are infinite forms: Infinitive, Participle, Converb, i.e. a verbal adverb.

An important feature of Obdorsk is its tendency to omit copulae under certain circumstances.

**Description of the language data sources**

The Obdorsk texts analyzed in the present article are:

1. Fox : Recorded in Katravozh in 1990 from Stepan Kelchin (born in 1915).

2. Husband and Wife : Recorded in Katravozh in 1990 from Anna Seraskhova.

3. Kuropatka : Recorded in Katravozh in 1990 from Dmitriy Tobolchin.

4. Three sons : Recorded in Katravozh in 1990 from Irina Syazi.

5.  Wonderful baby : Recorded in Katravozh in 1990 from Irina Syazi.

Texts 2–5 were published in Nikolaeva (1999). All texts chosen for an analysis are of different length, they collectively consist of 380 sentences. Each text is a Khanty fairy-tale.

**Research results**

In this section we present the outcomes of an analysis that aimed at identifying all cases with possessive constructions of different kind. Subsequently, all constructions were grouped according to their types and analyzed in terms of their salient features.

**Adnominal possession**

Adnominal possessive constructions are a common phenomenon in the Obdorsk texts. The most frequent type of adnominal possessives is built according to the following model:

Model 1. Head Marking in NP

$$(^{Pr}\text{dependent-NP})_{possessor} - {}^{N}\text{head-NP}_{possessed +} \text{possessive suffix}$$

In Model (1) the locus of marking is on the head. The possessor, in preposition to the marked possessed, is explicit in 13 out of 90 examples of this type found in the texts. In the remaining 77 examples of such constructions the possessor is marked implicitly with a possessive suffix attached to the head, which, according to Nikolaeva (1995:166), is a common practice, since an explicit marking of the pronominal possessor is only required to express some emphasis or contrast. The possessed can either be a person/relative (woman, wife, daughter, people, husband, sister, father, bride), or a living being (horse, herd, kuropatka), or a part of body (arm, leg, heart, head), or an ability (strength, mind), or an object (house, kerchief, earth, bridge, pocket, money, sled, noose, word, path, etc.). These semantic groups comply with those classes of nouns that are included into the category of inalienable possession (body parts and kin relations, part-whole or spatial relations, culturally important possessed items like names, domestic animals, shadows, souls, etc., as well as such items as excuviae, speech, footprints, mental and physiological states, pets) (Heine 1997:10; Kockelman 2009:29). It can thus be presumed that this model of possessive constructions tends to be used to mark the concept of inalienable possession in

Obdorks. This type can be illustrated by examples 1–5 with an explicit possessor and 6–8 with an implicitly marked possessor:

(1) Husband and wife

wan u-s-ŋən, χŭw u-s-ŋən, **lŭw im-el** χuləm pŭs jăŋχ-ə-s wɔs-na. (27)

short be-PST-3DU long be-PST-3DU **3SG woman-POSS.3SG** three times walk-EP-PST

town-LOC

Over long or short, **his wife** went to town three times.

(2) Fox

"χŏti numəs-l-ə-m pa, law-ə-l, **nin wer-ə-n**, law-ə-l". (44)

how think-PRS-EP-1SG and say-EP-PRS **2DU thing-EP-POSS.2DU** say-EP-PRS

"I think that your task is to give bride-ransom, if **you have a bride-ransom."**

(3) Kuropatka

lŭw law-ə-l: "**ma** ătti **im-em** sem-li păl-li, i ăn werit-l **χɔt-l** ătti." (5)

3SG say-EP-PRS **1SG** DET **woman-POSS.1SG** eye-ADJ.CAR ear-ADJ.CAR [and] NEG

can-PRS **house-POSS.3SG** DET

And he answered: "**My wife** is blind and deaf, she can't clean **the house**."

(4) Three sons

śi kem-na law-i-li-j-ə-l: "ănta, law-ə-l, **ma lis-em** lăl-t-al ńur ănta." (17)

DEM after-LOC say-EP-DER.IPFV-DER.FREQ-EP-PRS NEG say-EP-PRS **1SG noose-**

**POSS.1SG** set-PTCP1-3SG really NEG

Then he said: "No, they don't set **my nooses** at all."

(5) Fox

"χŏti wer-l, law-ə-l, **mŭŋ wer-ew** itta pa pa niŋ-ə-n wŭj-a-lən." (91)

how make-PRS say-EP-PRS **1PL thing-POSS.1PL** DEM and woman-EP-2DU take-IMP-

PL

"This is **our matter**, take the woman."

(6) Wonderful baby

"mŏsa **min ńɔŋχəl-emən** pa lŭw, śit śi li-ti pit-l." (11)

what **1DU dirt-POSS.1DU** and 3SG DEM DEM eat-INF start- PRS

"He is **our flesh and blood**, he'll have something to eat."

(7) Fox

ɔχsar iki măn-man wŏj-ə-ŋ pŭl menm-ij-ə-l, law-i-li-j-ə-l, **sămχ-ə-l** wŏj-na u-l. (112)

fox old:man go-CVB fat-EF-ADJ.PRPR morsel tear:off-DER.FREQ-EF-PRS say-EP-

DER.IPFV-DER.FREQ-EP-PRS **heart-EP-POSS.3SG** fat-LOC be-PRS

Old man fox went and tore of off the fatty pieces, ate, **his heart** was covered with fat.

(8) Husband and wife

itta **im-eŋən ik-eŋən** itta wŭl ńurəm pŭtar-en-na wɔtem ńŭk-ep **χɔt-ə-n** itta tăm χătl mŏsa

lɔj-ə-l. (45)

that **woman-POSS.3DU old:man-POSS.3DU** that big glade vicinity-POSS.2SG-LOC

grey cover-ADJ.PRPR **house-EP-POSS.2DU** DET DEM day what stand-EP-PRS

The grey **house of the old man and the old woman** near to that big glade is still

standing.

As I. Nikolaeva mentions, in a word combination with a pronominal possessor a possessed noun bears the morphological marking of the internal constructional possessive relations (Nikolaeva 1999:52). In example (8) the possessor and the possessed are syntactically distanced.

The first type of the adnominal possessive construction can be compounded by one more dependent element (see Model 1a) that characterizes the possessed item (which is also called by I. Nikolaeva (1999:52) "a construction with multiple possessors"). It is illustrated in examples 9-10.

Model 1a. Head Marking in NP

| ($^{Pr}$dependent-NP)$_{possessor}$ − $^{N}$dependent-NP$_{possessor}$− $^{N}$head-NP$_{possessed+}$possessive suffix |
| --- |

(9) Fox

**mŭs taś-l, ɔs taś-l, kălaŋ taś-l**. (166)

**cow herd-POSS.3SG sheep herd-POSS.3SG reindeer herd-POSS.3SG**

**The herd of cows, the herd of sheep, the herd of reindeer**.

(10) Fox

"śep-ə-l ewəlt tɔŋχa uś-i-li-j-ə-m ŏχ-ə-t sɔrń-eŋ **ŏχ kɔpejka-l-al**, **śel ŏχ kɔpejka-l-al, pătər ŏχ kɔpejka-l-al** tŏχi śi, tăta śi, law-ə-l, kămənsi kɔpejka tup χăj-ś-ə-s pa śi ăntam." (87)

pocker-EP-POSS.3SG from DEM find-EP-DER.IPFV-DER.FREQ-EP-PTSP2 money-EP-PL gold-ADJ.PRPR **money [kopeck]-PL-3SG silver money [kopeck]-PL-POSS.3SG copper money [kopeck]-PL-POSS.3SG** to:there FOC here FOC say-EP-PRS how:many [kopeck] only leave-INTR-EP-PST and DEM NEG.EX

In my pocket I found only a bit, a few kopecks remained, gold **kopecks, silver kopeks, copper kopeks.**

In examples (9-10) the possessor is implicitly marked by a possessive suffix, whereas the possessed is expressed by an attributive word combination: gold money, silver money, cow herd, reindeer her, etc.

A closer look at the functioning of the possessive suffixes in the examples built according to Model 1 enables one to notice that these suffixes may be used in the non-possessive sense, for example as markers of definiteness or associative possessiveness, which is in line with what has been observed before (Nikolaeva 1999: 52, 83). The same examples can be treated as an illustration to the non-possessive use of possessive suffixes as markers of identifiability or direct anaphoric use (Budzisch 2017: 58). Consider the following examples (11–15):

(11) Fox

**mŭw-ə-l** jel χir-l-em pa năŋ lipi ewəlt suŋχ-ant-a, sŭkat-a. (16)

**land-POSS.3SG** ahead dig-PRS-SG.1SG and 2SG inside from kick-DER.FREQ-IMP.SG break-IMP.2SG

I'll keep on digging **the earth** and you kick and thrust from inside.

(12) Husband and wife

pa śi law-ə-l, **im-el** law-ə-l: "mŭŋ-ə-t śi, lujt-ə-ŋ jɔs-pi χuləm niŋ, kurt-eŋ sew-pi χuləm niŋ, χănsəŋ săχ-pi χuləm niŋ, law-ə-l, ma śi, law-ə-l, **jewi-l-am pil-na** jăχ-l-ə-m. (43)

and DET say-EP-PRS **woman-POSS.3SG** say-EP-PRS 1PL-EP-PL DEM ring-EP-ADJ.PRPR arm-ADJ.COM three woman iron-ADJ.PRPR scythe-ADJ.COM three woman brilliant coat-ADJ.COM three woman, say-EP-PRS 1SG FOC say-EP-PRS **sister-PL-POSS.1SG companion-LOC** walk-PRS-EP-1SG

**The wife** said: "It's us, three women with rings on their hands, three women with iron scythes, three women in decorated fur coats, it's me that came **with the sisters.**

(13) Three sons

"**lɔw-l-an** wŭj-a-lən pa tŏχ-l-al jŏχəś kir-a-lən, pŭj-l-al ɔlŋəś kir-a-lən." (21)

**horse-PL-POSS.2PL** take-IMP-PL and front-PL-POSS.3SG homewards harness-IMP-PL arse-PL-POSS.3SG ahead harness-IMP-PL

"Take **the horses** and harness them with their back to the front, with their front to the back."

(14) Wonderful baby

nu śikəńśa, śiti jăŋχ-i-li-t-al ewəlt itta **taś-l** pɔχəl wek kŭssi wŭl-li ji-l. (54)

INTJ DET so walk-EP-DER.IPFV-PTSP1-3SG from that **herd-POSS.3SG** half forever for big-TRANS come-PRS

While he roamed in this way, **the herd** grew very large.

(15) Three sons

nu śikəńśa, ittam-ə-t law-i-li-j-ə-l ănti: "ăn ki χɔs-l-ə-ti, law-ə-l, i **lɔw-ə-n** măn-em mij-a-lən." (25)

INTJ DET that-EP-PL say-EP-DER.IPFV-DER.FREQ-EP-PRS DET NEG if know-PRS-EP-2PL say-EP-PRS one **horse-0-2PL** 1SG-ACC/DAT give-IMP-PL

He then said: "If you can't, give me one of **the horses**".

As these examples indicate, possessive suffixes of the third and second person can be deployed in this function. In example (12) the suffix of the first person is attached to the head noun accompanied by a post-positive element *pil-na,* thus forming a construction that will be discussed further.

A non-possessive, direct anaphoric use of the possessive suffix to mark an already mentioned referent, which is known to be a common feature of many Uralic languages (Budzisch 2017), is found in the text about a partridge in which the mentioning of the bird in a subsequent sentence requires marking with a possessive affix:

(16)   Kuropatka

imŏsaj-na ătti turəm ewəlt jăχt-ə-l, kŭt ewəlt śikəńśa **kurɔpatka** jŏχət-l. (3)

one-LOC DET sky from walk-EP-PRS middle from DET **Kuropatka** arrive-PRS

Once **Kuropatka** came flying along through the sky.

**kurɔpatkaj-əl-na** ińśəs-l-a: "iki, iki, năŋ mŏla-ji χɔt-en χŭl-eŋ?" (4)

**kuropatka-EP-POSS.3SG-LOC** ask-PRS-PASS old:man old:man 2SG what-TRNS house-POSS.2SG dirt-ADJ.PRPR

**Kuropatka** asked him: "Old man, old man, why is your house filthy?"

An analysis of how possessive suffixes can function in Obdorsk texts enabled us to reveal a structural variant of the model under discussion. This variant incorporates a post-positive element *pil-na* "with" which is attached to the head noun to form a comitative NP (Николаева1995:171; Nikolaeva 1999:53), while the possessor can be pronominal (like in this model) or nominal/lexical (like in Model 3). It is thought that its use is explained by an ability of this element to convey the idea of involvement, partnership that is emphasized in the sentences. Consider the following examples:

(17)   Three sons

itta χɔn jɔχ-l-al wŭ-l-li pa kim wɔśt-ə-l-li, wɔs mŏsa χuj, kur mŏsa χuj itta **jɔχ-l-al pil-na** jŏχi wŭ-l-li, ew-el śi leśat-l-ə-lli. (45)

that king man-PL-POSS.3SG take-PRS-SG.3SG and out gather-EP-PRS-SG.3SG town what man village what man that **man-PL-POSS.3SG companion-LOC** homewards take-PRS-SG.3SG girl-POSS.3SG FOC prepare-PRS-EP-SG.3SG

The tsar took his people and put them out and he took the town lad, the village lad **together with his friends** to himself, he got his daughter ready to wed him.

(18)  Husband and wife

śi **im-el pil-na** pŏtər-l-ə-ŋən.

DET **woman-POSS.3SG companion-LOC** speak-PRS-EP-3DU

This is how **they talked**.

(19)  Husband and wife

χuləm pŭs jăχ-m-al ewəlt χuləm **χănaŋ niŋ-ə-l pil-na** χuləm pŭs jŏχt-i-li-j-ə-s, iki nemŏsa ewəlt ănt uś-ə-s. (28)

three times walk-PTSP2-3SG from three **elder:sister woman-EP-POSS.3SG companion-LOC** three times arrive-EP-DER.IPFV-DER.FREQ-EP-PST old:man nothing from NEG find-EP-PST

While she went the three times, **the sisters** came three times, the old man knew nothing.

(20)  Husband and wife

pa śi law-ə-l, im-el law-ə-l: "mŭŋ-ə-t śi, lujt-ə-ŋ jɔs-pi χuləm niŋ, kurt-eŋ sew-pi χuləm niŋ, χănsəŋ săχ-pi χuləm niŋ, law-ə-l, ma śi, law-ə-l, **jewi-l-am pil-na** jăχ-l-ə-m. (43)

and DET say-EP-PRS woman-POSS.3SG say-EP-PRS 1PL-EP-PL FOC ring-EP-ADJ.PRPR arm-ADJ.COM three woman iron-ADJ.PRPR scythe-ADJ.COM three woman brilliant coat-ADJ.COM three woman, say-EP-PRS 1SG FOC say-EP-PRS **sister-PL-POSS.1SG companion-LOC** walk-PRS-EP-1SG

The wife said: "It's us, three women with rings on their hands, three women with iron scythes, three women in decorated fur coats, it's me that came **with the sisters.**

(21)  Husband and wife

im-el law-ə-l: "**śit-l-an pil-na**, law-ə-l, ma śi jăχ-s-ə-m, law-ə-l, a năŋ, law-ə-l, ănt uś-l-en," law-ə-l. (39)

woman-POSS.3SG say-EP-PRS **that-PL-POSS.2SG companion-LOC** say-EP-PRS 1SG FOC walk-PST-EP-1SG say-EP-PRS [but] 2SG say-EP-PRS NEG find-PRS-SG.2SG say-EP-PRS

His wife said: "I also came **with them**. You didn't recognize me."

It can be inferred from these examples that the possessive suffix attached to the head noun does not convey the idea of possession, instead, it points to the more identifiable status of the referent.

The second type of adnominal possessive constructions is represented in a fewer number of cases and can schematically be presented by the following model:

Model 2. Double zero marking in NP (Juxtaposition)

$^N$dependent-NP$_{possessor}$ - $^N$head-NP$_{possessed}$

In Model (2) both elements – the dependent and the head are unmarked which is explained as a common practice in possessive constructions with a lexical possessor (Nikolaeva 1999:52). Left juxtaposition in this case is seen as a sufficient means of encoding possessive relation with the relator recoverable from the context. This means that it is the word order that determines the relations between the elements of a NP (Николаева1995: 164–165). Before we proceed to possessive structures, it should be noted that the most common type of semantic relations between the elements in the model in question can be defined as attributive one (examples 22–23), which is why such structures are excluded from our analysis.

(22)  Fox

wan măn-s-ə-ŋən, χŭw măn-s-ə-ŋən, **kălaŋ taś** uś-l-ə-t. (102)

short go-PST-EP-3DU long go-PST-EP-3DU **reindeer herd** find-PRS-EP-3PL

They went for a long or a short time and found **a herd of wild reindeer**.

(23)    Husband and wife

i jɔs-l-al-na kat-l-ə-t asar jiŋk-i i **kew an**, i mawi jiŋk-i i **kew an**. (12)

one   hand-PL-POSS.3SG-LOC   seize-PRS-EP-3PL   bitter   water-ADJ.PRPR   one   **stone**

**vessel** one sweet water-ADJ.PRPR one **stone vessel**

In one hand they carry a **bottle** with bitter water, in the other **a bottle** with sweet water.

Possessive relations in this model of constructions are less frequent and may encode the

semantics of ownership and belonging (examples 24–28):

(24)    Fox

śi wɔs-na jŏχət-l-ə-ŋən, **iki χɔt** mŏśat-l-ə-ŋən. (101)

DEM town-LOC arrive-PRS-EP-3DU **old:man house** get-PRS-EP-3DU

So they went off to the city and looked for the **old man's house.**

(25)    Three sons

nu śikəńśa, itta tɔŋχa **χɔn mit jɔχ** jăŋχ-ə-mt-i-l-ə-t, itta eŋəm-ti ɔpi tu-l-a tu-l-a śikəńśa.

(39)

INTJ DET DET DEM **king servant man** walk-EP-DER.INCH-DER.FREQ-PRS-EP-3PL

that grow-PTSP1 brother bring-PRS-PASS bring-PRS-PASS DET

**The tsar's workers** went and brought the young man. They brought him.

(26)    Fox

law-a-ti: śi **neŋχ-eŋən taś**. (109)

say-IMP-PL DEM **person-DU herd**

Say that this is **the herd of those people.**

(27)    Fox

itta ɔχ-ti **wɔj wɔs-na mŭw χɔr-ŋən wɔs-na** jŏχət-s-ə-ŋən itta ɔχsar ik-eŋən χɔr mŭs-ŋən.

(132)

that croak-INF **animal town-LOC land male-DU town-LOC** arrive-PST-EP-3DU that fox old:man-DU male cow-DU

Old man fox and old man bull arrived in **the city of the snake and old man mammoth**.

(28)  Wonderful baby

śikəńśa **wɔj kalm-ə-t** uś-ə-s. (28)

DET **animal footstep-EP-PL** find-EP-PST

He found **the tracks of wild animals.**

The same structural type is found in the following constructions encoding the meaning of part-whole that are not treated as possessive by I. Nikolaeva (1999:53). Consider examples (29–31):

(29)  Kuropatka

itta kurɔpatka **jŭχ tăj-na, sumət tăj-na** nŏχ lat-em-l pa law-ə-l: "ma χɔt-en ăn leśat-l-em, năŋ χɔt' im-en wel-s-en. (15)

that Kuropatka **tree top-LOC birch top-LOC** up sit-VBLZ.INCH-PRS and say-EP-PRS 1SG house-2SG NEG prepare-PRS-SG.1SG 2SG [although] woman-2SG kill-PST-SG.2SG

Kuropatka flew to **the top of the tree, to the top of the birch** and said: "I won't clean your house, even if you have killed your wife.

(30)  Three sons

itta χuj śikəńśa **χɔn wɔs jus kŭtəp** jŏχət-ti pit-s-ə-t pa śikəńśa śilta eŋəm-ti jŭχ-ə-t ewəlt i măn-man i śɔl jŭχ wer-ə-s, i sɔχəl jŭχ wer-ə-s. (18)

that man DET **king town road middle** arrive-INF start-PST-EP-3PL and DP from:there grow-INF tree-EP-PL from one go-CVB one smooth tree make-EP-PST one board tree make-EP-PST

The group got **halfway to the tsar's**, then he made smooth poles from the young trees along the path and made boards.

(31)    Wonderful baby

**kurt ɔləŋ-na** ul-li-l-ə-ŋən **wɔs ɔləŋ-na** ul-li-l-ə-ŋən nŭsa neŋχuj-ŋən śi ul-l-ə-ŋən, ul-l-ə-ŋən. (3)

**village first-LOC** be-DER.IPFV-PRS-EP-3DU **town first-LOC** be-DER.IPFV-PRS-EP-3DU poor person-DU DET be-PRS-EP-3DU be-PRS-EP-3DU

**At the edge of the village, at the edge of the town** poor people lived. They lived and lived.

According to Nikolaeva (1995:168–169; 1999:52), NPs of this kind contain words that are incapable of functioning independently because semantically they are subservient to another concept. These elements are mostly spatial nouns like *pelək* "side, half, something", *kŭtəp* "middle", *ɔləŋ-na* with a locative marker meaning "in front of". These nouns are commonly used in attributive or possessive structures in which their semantics is determined by an adjacent word.

Summing up, it can be inferred that Model 2 is better suited to convey an attributive relation in a NP rather than a possessive one since the latter is reduced to the meaning of ownership and belonging.

Similarly to Model 1, Model 2 can be built with multiple possessors (examples 32–33). As a rule, they serve to describe some characteristics of the possessed.

(32)  Fox

**χɔr ɔχsar iki. (2)**

**male fox old:man**

**Old man fox.**

(33)  Fox

**χɔr mŭs luχəs iki. (7)**

**male cow friend old:man**

**My friend** was **old man bull.**

Moreover, the first and the second types of adnominal constructions can combine with one another – Model 3.

Model 3. Combined Head and Double Zero Marking

| ($^{Pr}$dependent-NP)$_{possessor}$ - $^N$dependent$_{posessor}$/head$_{possessed}$+possessive suffix - $^N$head-NP$_{possessed}$ |
|---|

In this model the marked head of the first construction becomes the possessor of the second one (examples 34–35).

(34)   Wonderful baby

   **wɔs-em i ɔleŋ** leśat-l-ə-m. (93)

   **town-POSS.1SG one end** prepare-PRS-EP-1SG

   I'll give **half of my city**.

(35)    Husband and wife

   **ŏχsam-l-al pelək** pŭs-s-ə-lal ja! (34)

   **kerchief-PL-POSS.3SG side** open-PST-EP-PL.3PL INTJ

   They undid **the edge of the kerchiefs**–oh!

The next type of adnominal possessive constructions is presented by Model 4:

Model 4. Head marking in NP

| $^N$dependent-NP$_{possessor}$ - $^N$head-NP$_{possessed\ +}$possessive suffix |
|---|

In the following examples the relationship between the modifier (possessor) and the head (the possessed) is coded by a possessive suffix attached to the head. Both the possessor and the possessed are nouns. Examples with this construction are not numerous, all in all 17 cases in the texts, and they encode the meaning of family relations (examples 36–37), part–whole (example 38–39), physical ability (example 40), part of the body (example 41), belonging (example 42):

(36)   Husband and wife

   iki, **lŭw im-el** χuləm **χănaŋ niŋ-ə-l**. (35)

   old:man **3SG woman-POSS.3SG** three **elder:sister woman-EP-POSS.3SG**

   They were **the three sisters of the old man's wife.**

(37) Fox

ɔj, χŭw wan ul-l-ə-t, imŏsaj-na taś-ə-ŋ wɔs χuj jŏχt-ə-s ittam taś-ə-ŋ **wɔs iki ew-el** χŏśa,

**χɔr mŭs im-el** χŏśa mɔjl-ə-ti-ji. (154)

INTJ long short be-PRS-EP-3PL one-LOC herd-EP-ADJ.PRPR town man arrive-EP-PST

herd-EP-ADJ.PRPR **town old:man girl-POSS.3SG** to **male cow woman-POSS.3SG** to

feast-INF-TRNS

They lived there for a long or a short time. All at once the man from the rich city came to

visit **his daughter, old man bull's wife.**

(38) Three sons

lŭw, law-ə-l, ńar jŭχ śi sewr-ə-s, sewr-ə-s pa tuta năŋ ătti **jus ŭŋ-en-na** χul-l-ə-t. (36)

3SG say-EP-PRS raw tree FOC cut-EP-PST cut-EP-PST and there 2SG DET **road**

**mouth-POSS.2SG-LOC** lie-PRS-EP-3PL

He chopped a fresh tree, he chopped, there at **the start of your road** it lies.

(39) Three sons

śi kem-na law-li-j-ə-l: "ma, law-ə-l, uś-l-ə-m, itta χuj law-ə-l, ma, lawə--l, ăt-en χɔn wɔs-

en, law-ə-l ătti, **wɔs ŭŋ-ə-l**, law-ə-l, jertəp-l-al ăn tărəm-l-ə-t". (42)

DEM after-LOC say-EP-DER.IPFV-DER.FREQ-EP-PRS 1SG say-EP-PRS find-PRS-EP-

1SG that man say-EP-PRS 1SG say-EP-PRS thing-POSS.2SG king town-2SG say-EP-

PRS DP **town mouth-EP-POSS.3SG** say-EP-PRS fence-PL-POSS.3SG NEG suffice-

PRS-EP-3PL

The man said: "I know that in this tsar's town, **at the entrance to the town** there are not

enough fences".

(40) Fox

kat **neŋχuj jur-emən-na** (17)
two **person power-POSS.SG.1DU-LOC**
**With the strength of** two **persons**

(41) Three sons

t'ɔ, tumi-l-al pa law-ij-ə-l-ə-t: "tăm jina ătsəm ănta, χŏti săχajət mŭŋ **lɔw pŭj-l-al** ɔlŋəś kir-l-uw?" (23)

[those] that-PL-POSS.3SG and say-DER.FREQ-EP-PRS-EP-3PL this indeed stupid NEG

how then 1PL **horse arse-PL-POSS.3SG** ahead harness-PRS-1PL

And they said: "He must be a fool, how shall we harness **the horses with their backs** to

the front?"

(42)   Wonderful baby

"pa ur-na jăχ-ti **ńawrem χŏn-l** tal-ə-m-al pa mŏlaj-na lapət-l-emən?" (31)

and  forest-LOC  go-PTSP1  **child  stomach-3SG**  pull-EP-PTSP2-3SG  and  what –LOC

feed-PRS-SG.1DU

"The forest-going **child's stomach** is empty. With what shall we feed it?"

Similarly, possessive constructions with this model can be with multiple possessors (example

36) and with the post-positive element *pil-na* (see example 19).

Judging  from  the  semantics  of  the  head  noun,  this  model  of  adnominal  possessive

constructions tends to be useful in encoding inalienable possession.

The  final  type  of  adnominal  possessive  constructions  found  in  the  Obdorsk  texts  is  built

according to the following model:

Model 5. Complex marking

| ăt+(possessive suffix) - $^{(N)}$dependent-NP$_{possessor}$ – $^{N}$head-NP$_{possessed}$ possessive suffix |
| --- |

What is different in this type of constructions is that it incorporates an initial word *ăt* «thing,

object» which is also marked with a possessive suffix (examples 44–45).

(43)   Kuropatka

ńɔl-l-al, juχəl-l-al kăs-t-al ewəlt kurɔpatka purl-ə-nt-l, măn-l kămən lapət ńurəm wŭlti i **ăt-l**

**kŭl ik-el** śiti-ji talti-ji χiś-l (18)

bow-PL-POSS.3SG  arrow-PL-POSS.3SG  seize-PTCP1-3SG  from  Kuropatka  fly-EP-

DER.FREQ-PRS  go-PRS  each  seven  glade  through  [and]  **thing-3SG  devil  old:man-3SG**

so-TRNS empty:handed-TRNS remain:behind-PRS

By the time he found a bow and arrow Kuropatka had flown off. He flew through seven glades and **the demon** remained there with empty hands.

(44) Three sons

śi kem-na law-li-j-ə-l: "ma, law-ə-l, uś-l-ə-m, itta χuj law-ə-l, ma, law-ə-l, **ăt-en χɔn wɔs-en**, law-ə-l ătti, wɔs ŭŋ-ə-l, law-ə-l, jertəp-l-al ăn tărəm-l-ə-t. (42)

DET after-LOC say-EP-DER.IPFV-FREQ-EP-PRS 1SG say-EP-PRS find-PRS-EP-1SG that man say-EP-PRS 1SG say-0-PRS **thing-POSS.2SG king town-POSS.2SG** say-EP-PRS DP town mouth-EP-3SG say-EP-PRS fence-PL-POSS.3SG NEG suffice-PRS-EP-3PL

The man said: "I know that in **this tsar's town**, at the entrance to the town there are not enough fences.

Judging from the only two examples (44–45) with this construction found in the texts, it can be inferred that the word *ăt* «thing» is used in them as an emphatic means to draw attention to the possessive relations.

Thus, adnominal possessive constructions in Obdorsk can be built according to five models among which models 1 and 3 tend to be used to encode inalienable possession, whereas model 2 is frequent in attributive phrases and model 4 is combined in structure.

**Predicative possession**

The most frequent predicative possessive construction in the Obdorsk dialect is a transitive one which is built with the verb *tăjti* "have" (see also Honti 2008:164):

Model 5. Predicative transitive construction

| $NP_{possessor}$ - $NP_{possessed}$ - $VP_{have}$ |
| --- |

As it is seen from the linguistic data, the word order in the sentences may vary, for example, SOV, OSV, with the predicate always found in the final position. Consider examples (45–51):

(45) Fox

i **wer** ittam **ma tăj-l-ə-m.** (135)

one **thing** DET **1SG have-PRS-EP-1SG**

**There's** only **one thing.**

(46)   Fox

**lŭw** lip-el-na **χŏsap tăj-l.** (145)

3SG inside-3SG-LOC **hollow have-PRS**

**it's hollow on** the inside.

(47)   Husband and wife
iśi χɔrpi kurt-e-ŋ sew, iśi χɔrpi lujt-ə-ŋ jɔs-pi, iśi χɔrpi χănsəŋ săχ-pi **niŋ ma** pa **tăj-l-ə-m**.

(15)
same like iron-EP-ADJ.PRPR scythe, same like ring-EP-ADJ.PRPR arm-ADJ.COM same

like decorated coat-ADJ.COM **woman 1SG** and **have-PRS-EP-1SG**
**I** also **have** just such **a woman** with iron scythes, just such a one with a ring on her hand in

a decorated fur coat.
(48)   Three sons
χɔn χuləm **jik tăj-ə-l**. (1)
**king** three **boy have-EP-PRS**
**A tsar had** three **sons.**
(49)   Three sons
χɔn **tăj-ə-l** rupit-ti **jik**, rupit-ti jik, lel-əm-ti **jik tăj-ə-l**. (3)
**king have-EP-PRS** work-INF **boy** work-INF boy sit-VBLZ.INCH-INF boy have-EP-PRS
**The tsar had a** young **man** who worked, he rode on the team.
(50)   Three sons
**mŭŋ** χŏti **ŏχ tăj-l-uw**, sɔrńi **ŏχ tăj-l-uw**, śel **ŏχ tăj-l-uw** (6)

**1PL** how **money have-PRS-1PL** gold **money have-PRS-1PL** silver **money have-PRS-**

**1PL**

**We have money**, golden **money**, and silver **money**.

(51)   Wonderful baby

ma, law-t-al, ma ur-na **taś tăj-l-ə-m.** (55)

1SG say-PTCP1-3SG 1SG forest-LOC **herd have-PRS-EP-1SG**

**I have a herd** in the forest.

In the corpus of 5 texts (380 sentences) this construction was identified in 40 cases. The

possessor is always explicit and can be expressed by a personal pronoun or a noun. The

possessed, with regard to its semantics, can have a living being (woman, son, man, herd,

daughter, friend) or an object (money, town, house), or some feature (hollow, illness, laughter) as a referent.

This pattern is also found in negative symmetrical constructions containing a negative particle ***ăn*** and/or a negative pronoun ***nemŏsa***:

(52)  Wonderful baby

śiti ul-li-l-ə-ŋən, **nemŏsa ăn tăj-l-ə-ŋən**, χŭj-ti lɔt **ăn tăj-l-ə-ŋən**, **nemŏsa ăn tăj-l-ə-ŋən**,

śiti χŏtaś tɔŋχa ul-l-ə-ŋən. (13)
so be-DER.IPFV-PRS-EP-3DU **nothing NEG have-PRS-EP-3DU** sleep-INF place **NEG**

**have-PRS-EP-3DU nothing NEG have-PRS-EP-3DU** so how DET live-PRS-EP-3DU
As they lived, **they had nothing, they had no place to sleep, they had nothing**, they just

lived.

(53)  Wonderful baby
katra **aś-en ăn tăj-i-li-j-ə-s.** (57)
before **father-2SG NEG have-EP-DER.IPFV-DER.FREQ-EP-PST**
**Your grandfather had none** earlier.

(54)  Three sons

śi kem-na law-i-li-j-ə-l ănti: "pa năŋ ŏχ ki, ŏχ tăj-a-ti, **ma ŏχ ăn tăj-l-ə-m** pa mŏla wer?

(7)

DEM after-LOC say-EP-DER.IPFV-DER.FREQ-EP-PRS DEM and 2SG money if money

have-IMP-PL **1SG money NEG have-PRS-EP-1SG** and what matter

Then he said: "If you have money and **I have no money** what difference does it make?

Have-constructions are also used in the future form which is built analytically:

(55)  Wonderful baby

**ńawrem tăj-ti pit-l-ə-ŋən**, i imi law-i-li-t-al: "ma itta **ńawrem tăj-ti lŏχi pit-l-ə-m**." (8)

**child have-INF start-PRS-EP-3DU** one woman say-EP-DER.IPFV-PTCP1-3SG **1SG**

DEM **child have-INF wretched start-PRS-EP-1SG**

A baby was on its way the wife said: "I'm going to have a baby."

(56)  Wonderful baby

iki law-ə-l itta: "jesək sɔrńi! **ńawrem tăj-ti pit-l-ə-mən** pa mŏlaj-na lapət-l-em?" (9)

old:man say-EP-PRS holy gold **child have-INF start-PRS-EP-1DU** and what-LOC feed-

PRS-EP-SG.1SG

The husband said: "My God! **There's going to be a child**, what shall I feed it with?"

Unlike transitive Habeo-constructions, an intransitive predicative possessive construction with the verb ***ulti "to be"*** is a much rare case in Obdorsk. As I. Nikolaeva pointed out, such predicative possessive constructions are either locative or built with a possessed noun that is marked with a suffix (Nikolaeva 1999:42). In the corpus under study we identified a few Esse-constructions that contained elements functioning in the semantic roles of possessor and possessed, whereas the predicate encoded the meaning of possession. Schematically this type of constructions with the possessive meaning can be presented by the following Models.

Model 6. Intransitive predicative possessive construction

| $(NP_{possessor}) - NP_{possessed} - VP_{be}$ |
|---|

Examples of this model:

(57)  Fox

ɔχsar iki law-ə-l: "**ŏχ ul-ti pit-l**. (29)

fox old:man say-EP-PRS **money be-INF start-PRS**

Old man fox said: "**We'll have money**.

(58)  Fox

"al tiŋ ăntam, **ŏχ** χŏti, law-ə-l, **u-l.**" (46)

very:much bride:price NEG.EX **money** how say-EP-PRS **be-PRS**

there is no bride-ransom, but **there is money**," he said.

Model 7. Intransitive predicative possessive construction with marked head

| $(NP_{possessor)} - NP_{possessed}+\text{possessive suffix} - VP_{be}$ |
|---|

(59)  Fox

**sămχ-ə-l** wŏj-na **u-l.** (112)
**heart-EP-3SG** fat-LOC **be-PRS**
**His heart** was covered **with fat.**

(60)  Fox

śiməś t, law-ə-l, lip-el-na **χŏsap-ə-t ul-li-j-ə-l** pa śi ler tăj-ə-l pa χir-l-ə-n ki, jŭχ χŏsap lipi-

na lăŋ-l-ə-n ki, nɔχər jŭχ jŭkanna jŭχ lŭw χŭnti ńŏχt-ə-l-ə-l.

such say-EP-PRS inside-POSS.3SG-LOC **hollow-EP-PL be-DER.IPFV-DER.FREQ-EP-PRS** and DEM root have-EP-PRS and dig-PRS-EP-2SG if tree hollow inside-LOC enter-PRS-EP-2SG if cone tree as:if tree 3 when run-EP-TR-EP-PRS

**Trees** like that **are hollow** and have roots. If you burrow into the hollow of a tree like that,

they won't disturb the larch.

(61) Wonderful baby

**aś-em aŋk-em ul-m-el** ewəlt **rupataj-ə-l** siməl **u-s.** (69)

**father-POSS.1SG mother-POSS.1SG** be-PTCP2-3PL from **[work]-EP-POSS.3SG** few

**be-PST**

While **my father and mother** lived, **they had** little **work.**

Possessive relations are also found in asymmetrical constructions with the negative verb

**ăntam** "not be" and/or a negative pronoun **nemŏsa**:

(62) Fox

pa **năŋ** kim pit-ti **śir-en ăntam**? (13)

and **2SG** out fall-INF **strength-POSS.2SG NEG.EX**

Don't **you have the strength** to come out?"

(63) Three sons
**niŋ ăntam, ŏχ ăntam, nemŏsa ăntam**. (48)
**woman not:be money not:be nothing NEG.EX**.

**They had no bride, no money, nothing at all**

(64) Fox

" **nemŏsa mus** tăj-ti sij-ə-m **ăntam**." (24)

**nothing illness** have-INF noise-EP-POSS.1SG **NEG.EX**

"**I have no illness** at all."

(65) Three sons

**niŋ ăntam, ŏχ ăntam, nemŏsa ăntam.** (48)

**woman NEG.EX money NEG.EX nothing NEG.EX**.

**They had no bride, no money, nothing at all.**

(66)  Wonderful baby

śikəńśa śiti numəs-l itta ńawrem: "aś-em aŋk-em śiti law-i-li-j-ə-s: **ur-na wɔj ăntam, χŭl**

**ăntam** pa ur-na wɔj-ə-t χŭl-ə-t śi ul-li-t-el." (44)

DEM  so  think-PRS  DEM  child  father-POSS.1SG  mother-POSS.1SG  so  say-EP-

DER.IPFV-DER.FREQ-EP-PST **forest-LOC animal NEG.EX fish NEG.EX** and forest-

LOC animal-EP-PL fish-EP-PL FOC be-DER.IPFV-PTCP1 -3PL

The youth thought: "My parents say that there are **no wild animals in the forest, no fish,**

but it appears there are wild animals and fish in the forest."

(67) Fox

"al **tiŋ ăntam**, ŏχ χŏti, law-ə-l, u-l." (46)

very:much **bride:price NEG.EX** money how say-EP-PRS be-PRS

**there is no bride-ransom**, but there is money," he said.

Another possibility to convey possessive relations in Obdorsk is by means of an intransitive

construction with the verb *χăjti "remain":*

(68)  Fox

kămənsi **kɔpejka χiś-m-al**. (90)
how:many **[kopeck] remain-PTCP2-3SG**
Only a few **kopeks remained**.

(69)  Fox
itta **taś-ə-t** aratəlna **χɔr mŭs** pela χăś-s-ə-t. (165)
that herd-EP-PL all **male cow** towards **remain-PST-EP-3PL**

All **the herds remained old man bull's**.

It should be noted that examples with the verb *χăjti "remain"* are not at all numerous and are

found, as a rule, in the final sentences of stories.

**Conclusion**

The study of Obdorsk language data shows that the concept of possession is systematically encoded in adnominal and predicative possessive constructions alone, thus lacking any external possessive constructions.

Adnominal possession is structurally represented by five models. In all but one models the head is marked with a possessive suffix. The model with an unmarked head presents a case of juxtaposition which is seen as a key way to convey attributive relations in a NP. The models with the marked head can be differentiated into nominal or pronominal, and are preferable to encode inalienable possession. It is possible to build possessive adnominal constructions with multiple possessors, or combine them.

Apart from their primary function as the markers of possessive relations, possessive suffixes can be used in non-possessive sense, e.g. as markers of anaphoric reference, definiteness, associative possessiveness and identifiability.

Predicative possessive constructions are differentiated into transitive habeo-constructions and intransitive ones, the latter can be built with the verbs "to be", "not be" and "to remain". The core predicative possessive construction is the transitive one, in which the relator is encoded by the verb "to have". In such structures, the possessed is unmarked. Intransitive predicative possessive constructions are peripheral and the possessed may be marked with a possessive suffix.

**Acknowledgement**

Abbreviations

1 – first person, 2 – second person, 3 – third person, ADJ- adjectivizer, CVB - converb, CMs – construction markers, CAR – caritive affix, COM – comitative suffix, DEM demonstrative, DER – derivational suffix, DET determiner, DU – dual, FOC focus, FREQ – frequentative suffix, INTJ – interjection, EP – epenthetic vowel, INCH – inchoative suffix, INF – инфинитив, INTR intransitivizer, IPFV imperfective suffix, IMP imperative, LOC – locative, [N] – noun, NEG – negative, NEG.EX – negative existential predicate, NP – noun phrase, PASS – passive, [Pr] – personal pronoun, PL – plural; PRPR – propriative affix, PTCT1 – present participle, PTCT2 – past participle, PST – past tense, POSS – possessive suffix, PRS – present tense; SG – singular; TRNS – translative, TR transitivizer, VBLZ – verbalizer.

REFERENCES

Abondolo, D. 1998, Khanty. – Abondolo, D. The Uralic Languages, London–N.Y., 358–386.

Broschart, J. 2001, Possession (Linguistic). – International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences, [Oxford], 11831–11834.

Budzisch, J. 2015, Possessive Constructions in Southern Selkup Dialects. – Tomsk Journal of Linguistics and Anthropology 4 (10), 45–50.

–        – 2017, On the non-possessive use of possessive suffixes in Central and Southern Selkup. Tomsk Journal of Linguistics and Anthropology 2 (25), 58–66.

Das Evangelium Matthaei in den Dialect der obdorskischen Ostjaken übersetzt von P. Wologodski, 1868. London.

Dixon, R. M. W, Aikhenvald, A. Y.1999, Introduction. – Dixon, R.M.W., Aikhenvald, A.Y. The Amazonian Languages, 1–21, Cambridge.

Duguine, M. 2008, Structural Case and the Typology of Possessive Constructions. – BLS 34 1, 97–108.

Ethnologue. 2017, Languages of the World [Electronic resource]. URL: https://www.ethnologue.com/language/kca

Haspelmath, M. 1999, External Possession in a European Areal Perspective. – Payne, D., Barshi, L. External Possession: What, Where, How, and Why. Amsterdam, 3–29.

Heine, B. 1997, Possession. Cognitive Sources, Forces, and Grammaticalization, Cambridge.

Honti, L. 2008, 'HABERE' «по-уральски» // Linguistica Uralica XLIV. 3. 161–177.

Kockelman, P. 2009, Inalienable possession as grammatical category and discourse pattern. – Studies in Language 33:1, 25–68.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. 2001, Adnominal Possession. – Language Typology and Language Universals, Vol. 2, Berlin, 960–970.

– – 2002, Adnominal Possession in the European Languages: Form and Function. – Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung (STUF) 55 2, 141–172.

– – 2003, Possessive Noun Phrases in the Languages of Europe. – Noun Phrase Structure in the Languages of Europe, Berlin–New York, 621–722.

– – 2006, Possession, Adnominal, Elsevir, 765–769.

Kowalik, R. 2016, Predicative possession in South Saami. Stockholm University, Faculty of Humanities, Department of Linguistics. Independent thesis Advanced level (degree of Master (Two Years)).

Krasnoukhova, O. 2011, Attributive possession in the languages of South America. Linguistics in the Netherlands, 28. 86–98.

Mazzitelli, L. F. 2015, The expression of predicative possession. A comparative study of Belarusian and Lithuanian. Vol. 18. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Nichols, J., Bickel, B. 2013, Locus of Marking in Possessive Noun Phrases. – M. Haspelmath, M. Dryer, The World Atlas of Language Structures Online, Leipzig. http://wals.info/chapter/24.

Nikolaeva, I. 1999, Ostyak. München; Newcastle: Lincom Europa.

McGregor, W. B., 2009, Introduction. – McGregor, W. B. The expression of possession. Berlin, 1–11.

Payne, D., Barshi, L. 1999, External Possession: What, Where, How, and Why. – External Possession, Amsterdam, 3–29.

Seiler, H. 1983, Possession as an operational dimension of language, Tübingen.

Stassen, L. 2009, Predicative Possession, Oxford.

– – 2013, Predicative Possession. – M. Haspelmath, M. Dryer, The World Atlas of Language Structures Online, Leipzig. http://wals.info/chapter/117.

Stolz, Th., Kettler, S., Stroh, C., Urdze, A. 2008, Split Possession: An Areal-linguistic Study of Alienability Correlation and Related Phenomena in the Languages of Europe, Amsterdam–Philadelphia, I.

Taylor, J. R. 1996, Possessives in English. An Exploration in Cognitive Grammar. Oxford.

Tham, S. W. 2013, Possession as non-verbal predication //Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society. 39 1, 302–316.

Tomsk Journal of Linguistics and Anthropology, 2015, Tomsk. URL: https://ling.tspu.edu.ru/en/archive.html?year=2015&issue=4

– – 2016, Tomsk. URL: https://ling.tspu.edu.ru/en/archive.html?year=2016&issue=4

Vorob'jova, V., Novitskaja, I., Girfanova, K., Vesnin, V. 2017, Adnominal Possessive Constructions in Narym, Vasjugan and Middle-Ob Dialects of Selkup. – LU LIII, 54–64.

Гращенков П. В. 2007, Типология посессивных конструкций. – Вопросы языкознания, 3, 25–54.

Едыгарова С. 2010, Категория посессивности в удмуртском языке. Дисс. …. канд. филол. наук, Тарту.

Николаева И. А. 1995, Обдорский диалект хантыйского языка. Москва, Гамбург.

Чинчлей К. Г. 1990. Типология категории посессивности. Кишинев.

Ядобчева-Дресвянина В. Я. 2002. Склонение и спряжение в обдорском диалекте хантыйского языка. Автореф. … дисс. канд. филол. наук, Санкт-Петербург.

**Text Data**

Fox : Recorded in Katravozh in 1990 from Stepan Kelchin (born in 1915).

Husband and Wife : Recorded in Katravozh in 1990 from Anna Seraskhova. The text was published in Nikolaeva (1999).

Kuropatka : Recorded in Katravozh in 1990 from Dmitriy Tobolchin. The text was published in Nikolaeva (1999).

Three sons : Recorded in Katravozh in 1990 from Irina Syazi. The text was published in Nikolaeva (1999).

Wonderful baby : Recorded in Katravozh in 1990 from Irina Syazi. The text was published in Nikolaeva (1999)

**Addresses**

Victoria Vorobeva

Foreign Languages Department

Institute of Power Engineering

National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University

E-mail: victoriavorobeva@mail.ru

Telephone: (3822) 701-777 (ext. 3413)

Irina Novitskaya

Foreign Languages Department

National Research Tomsk State University

E-mail: irno2012@yandex.ru

Telephone: +79138202786

*ВИКТОРИЯ ВОРОБЬЕВА, ИРИНА НОВИЦКАЯ*

# ПОСЕССИВНЫЕ КОНСТРУКЦИИ В ОБДОРСКОМ ДИАЛЕКТЕ ХАНТЫЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА

В статье рассматриваются все возможные способы выражения посессивных отношений в обдорском диалекте хантыйского. Анализ основывается на корпусе текстов, записанных в 1990 г. в посёлке Катравож в Приуральском районе Ямало-Ненецкого автономного округа. Проведённый анализ позволяет заключить, что в прототипичекий инвентарь средств, используемых для кодирования посессивности, входят посессивные маркеры, участвующие в структуре четырех адноминальных посессивных моделей из пяти возможных, и глагол с семантикой обладания в структуре посессивной предикативной конструкции. Предикативные посессивные конструкции с глаголом эксзистенциональности и другими, в которой обладаемое может маркироваться посессивными суффиксами, являются непродуктивными средствами выражения посессивности.