

THE GRAPHICAL FEATURES OF THE FIRST TEXTS IN THE KHANTY LANGUAGE

Teacher Irina Moldanova¹

Dr. Yuliya Normanskaia²

¹ **Russia**/Tomsk State University, Khanty-Mansiysk Technological and Pedagogical College

² **Russia**/Tomsk State University, Moscow Institute of Linguistic RAS

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the first literary texts of the Khanty written language of L.P. Vologodskiy “Matveĭ elta jemyń aĭkol-jastypsa” (Sacred legends of Matthew in the Obdorsk dialect, 1868), the publication is available at <http://lingvodoc.ispras.ru/dictionary/1167/4/perspective/1167/5/view?page=1>, I. Egorov, I. Попов “Емынь ястопса” (Sacred History, 1900), available at <http://lingvodoc.ispras.ru/dictionary/902/27/perspective/902/28/view> and A.A. Dunin-Gorkavich “Русско-остяцко-самоѣдскій практическій словарь наиболѣе употребительныхъ словъ” (Russian-Ostyak-Samoyed practical dictionary of the most common words, 1910), available at <http://lingvodoc.ispras.ru/dictionary/653/2/perspective/653/3/view>.

Systematic analysis of the graphics of the first literary texts has not been conducted in the Khanty dialects yet. It was considered that the number of errors did not have a significant effect on the development of the Khanty written language. Our analysis showed that these mentioned above texts contain a systematic and accurate transfer of the features of the Khanty dialects, they have significant differences between them as the books by L.P. Vologodskiy “Matveĭ elta jemyń aĭkol-jastypsa” (Sacred legends of Matthew in the Obdorsk dialect, 1868), I. Egorov, I. Попов “Емынь ястопса” (Sacred History, 1900) were written in the Obdorsk (Western) Khanty dialect and the dictionary by A.A. Dunin-Gorkavich “Русско-остяцко-самоѣдскій практическій словарь наиболѣе употребительныхъ словъ” (Russian-Ostyak-Samoyed practical dictionary of the most common words, 1910) in the Vakh (Eastern) dialect.

The article reviews the graphic features of the vowel system in the first literary texts and dialectal differences reflected in them.

The conducted analysis showed that there are differences between phonetics of the written monuments reflected in their graphics and phonetics of the modern Khanty language. In the first syllable the short [ǎ] and long [a] are not demarcated and denoted by the same letter. In certain positions vowel *ǎ* is denoted by the vowel *e*: near the front consonants - *š*, *λ* (> in the first literary texts - *s'*, *l*), near central consonants: - *ś* (> in the first literary texts - *s*), *ń* (> in the first literary texts - *n*). In the second syllable the differences are related to the reduced vowel *ə* which is not used in the first syllables in the modern dictionaries. In the second syllables in the first literary texts the vowels *e*, *a*, (*y*) *ы*, *o* are used. We can assume that the system of non-first syllables is much richer in the Khanty language and it has undergone changes in the direction of reduction in the modern dialects.

Keywords: Khanty language, first literary texts, dialect, vowels, written monuments, syllable

INTRODUCTION

There are several stages in the development of the Khanty written language: the first stage is "missionary" (XVIII century - 30 years of XX century); the second stage – script based on the Latin alphabet (1931-1937); the third stage is the modern written language based on the Cyrillic alphabet (since 1937).

As far as we know, the missionary stage of the Khanty script was not studied by linguists. As mentioned in Wikipedia with references [1], [2], “All these (missionary) publications had influence neither on the distribution of writing among the Khanty nor on the further development of their writing”. As well numerous errors were believed to be in the missionary texts. At the same time, studies of the first Cyrillic books created in the framework of the activities of the Translation Commission in the Tatar [3], in the Saam [4], Udmurt [5], in the Mari language [6] showed that these books were on high scientific level. They have systemic differences from the modern literary languages, but these peculiarities are primarily related to the fact that they were written in the dialects of the relevant languages. The clarification of the biographies of their authors, the place of their birth, the identification of their native dialect and the correlation of graphic features with the modern dialect that is prevalent in the areas of residence of the creators of the books show that in most cases they practically do not differ. This is an indication that, on the one hand, the majority of dialects for 100-150 years that have passed since the creation of the first books have changed very little, on the other hand, the accuracy of fixation is close to that that modern scientists receive only as a result of the analysis of dialects in the phonetic program Praat. Note that most of the missionaries did not have a philological education, but they were native speakers, or Russian priests working in close contact with the most educated and religious native speakers, hence we can only admire the accuracy of their work.

But it should be emphasized that this accuracy was achieved only in the books created after 1860, and the information about the Khanty dialects (Beryozovsk and Yugansk) appeared in the XVIII century in the comparative dictionary by P.S. Pallas where the data of ten territorial variants of the Khanty vernaculars existed in the second half of the 18th century. The first written monument in the Khanty language is “The Gospel of Matthew in Russian and Khanty languages”. It was translated by John Vergunov, who was an archpriest, and Feodor Karpov, who was a priest, in Beryozovo in 1819 [7]. Around the same period another written monument “The Gospel of Matthew” dates back that was written on a transitional dialect between Beryozovsk and Obdorsk done by priest L. P. Vologodskiy.

According to V. Steinitz [8], this is “the most significant achievement of the period before M. A. Castrén - the works of L. P. Vologodskiy “The Dictionary of the Northern Khanty dialects” (1840 - 1842) and “The translations of excerpts from the Gospels into the Northern Khanty dialect”, which were the first literary texts in the Khanty language”. Hungarian linguist P. Hunfalvy published these materials and basing on them developed a grammar of the Northern dialect of Khanty (1875). The Northern dialects of Khanty were studied by Finnish scientist Karl August Engelbrekt Ahlqvist being made an expedition to the Northern Khanty. He published a revised translation from the Vologodskiy’s Gospels with a German translation, a Khanty-German dictionary (Über die Sprache der Nordostjaken) and some original texts (1880). Almost

all Khanty dialects were studied by Finnish scientist K. Karjalainen. His most important work is the study of the first syllable vowels of the Khanty dialects (1904-1905). V. Steinitz criticized his phonetic characters noting that they “are characterized by an extremely complicated and cumbersome transcription”. Nevertheless, in his opinion, despite all the shortcomings a serious study of phonetics was impossible without taking into account the work of K. Karjalainen.

In the archives of the Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg a number of other Khanty dictionaries were found in the East Khanty dialects “(Yenisey, Narym, Tobolsk, Surgut, Tomsk, Inbatsk, Karasin and Bonshin variants of Eastern Khanty)” being created in the 19th century. Analysing their graphic features is the perspectives of the further investigation.

The attempts of creating a written Khanty language are described in the article of N.B. Koshkareva “Actual problems of improving Khanty graphics and orthography” [2]. N.B. Koshkareva notes that the authors of the first books aimed to reflect on writing the real pronunciation of Khanty words (voicing of voiceless consonants in the intervocalic position or in front of the resonants). The endeavour to reflect the features of the Khanty pronunciation on writing is evidenced by the signs *н* (postdorsal *ɲ*), sign *у* for indicating the bilabial [w] that is more appropriate to the articulatory peculiarities of this sound than the Russian letter for denoting the bilabial sound. N.B. Koshkareva associates the first stage of the development of Khanty writing with the names of priests L.P. Vologodskiy in Obdorsk and I. Egorov in Beryozovo who did the first translations of the biblical texts. These written monuments of Khanty, created by the priests, are significant sources of studying the history of the Khanty language.

The article presents research outcomes of the graphical features of the vowels system of the first and second syllables in the first written monument of L. P. Vologodskiy “Matveĭ elta jemyń aĭkol-jastypsa” (Sacred legends of Matthew in the Obdorsk dialect, 1868”), the publication is available at <http://lingvodoc.ispras.ru/dictionary/1167/4/perspective/1167/5/view?page=1>.

In the cases of the graphic differences from the modern dialects we decided to address to two other monuments in order to determine whether these differences are peculiarities of the graphic system of L. P. Vologodskiy or they were peculiar to the dialects of that time. To do this, in controversial situations, we involve in the analysis materials from the book by I. Egorov, I. Popov, “Emin yastops” (Sacred History, 1900), available at <http://lingvodoc.ispras.ru/dictionary/902/27/perspective/902/28/view> and A. A. Dunin-Gorkavich “Русско-остяцко-самоѣдскій практическій словарь наиболее употребительныхъ словъ” (Russian-Ostyak-Samoyed practical dictionary of the most common words, 1910), available at <http://lingvodoc.ispras.ru/dictionary/653/2/perspective/653/3/view>. There are 5355 words in the written monument of L. P. Vologodskiy, 5039 words in the “Sacred History”, 999 words in the dictionary of A. A. Dunin-Gorkavich. To conduct the analysis of these written monuments, they were fully glossed in the ELAN program and concordances were created that are available at <http://lingvodoc.ispras.ru/> (see links above).

Before turning to the analyses, a brief mention should be made of the biographies of the authors who translated the books in question into the Khanty language, since, as mentioned above, it is expedient to relate the language of the book to the native dialect

of its creator, or, if he was not the native speaker, his place of residence while working on the translation.

Detailed information about the missionary activities of Holy Father Luke Vologodskiy translated “The Gospel of Matthew” is found in the book of A. I. Sulotskiy “About Siberian clergy” [9]. The Mission was opened on the proposal of Tobolsk archpastor Evgeniy in 1832 in Obdorsk. Holy Father Makariy (Bogolepov) and his assistant Luke Vologodskiy, the disciple of theology in the Tobolsk Diocese, arrived in the Obdorsk Mission. Holy Father Luke Vologodskiy later became a priest and knew Ostyak well, according to contemporaries. They composed a dictionary of the Ostyak language and translated the Symbol of Faith, commandments, the Lord's Prayer and one of the Gospels in the Ostyak language. Some of these works were presented for consideration to the Academy of Sciences. Academician A. M. Shjögren, an outstanding specialist and collector of materials in the Uralic languages, gave a positive assessment to these translations.

Peter Popov opened the Russian-Khanty school in Obdorsk in 1846. He himself and priest Ivan E. Egorov, the author of the first Khanty and Nenets ABC-book and the book “Emin yastops” (Sacred History), published in the Khanty language in 1900, worked as teachers there.

A. A. Dunin-Gorkavich, the author of the Khanty-Russian dictionary, published in 1910, was a forest engineer. He was transferred to Siberia in 1890 where he headed the Samarov forestry of the Tobolsk province.

Thus, it becomes clear that the authors of three analyzed books were Russian. When writing, they consulted with native speakers who lived in the areas of their ministry in Obdorsk (now Salekhard) (for the first two books) and in Tobolsk (the Tyumen region). The places of the creation of these books were almost separated almost by one thousand kilometers therefore the dialects that formed their basis in the XIX century were significantly different from each other. Interestingly, these books have similar graphic features that are gradually disappearing in the modern dialects. This became evident that they are not errors or innovations since they are represented in different sources created on territorially distant areas, but they are a protolanguage heritage.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The text of the written monument of L.P. Vologotskiy is written in Latin.

The standard correspondence of the Kazym vowel *ǎ* is *a* in the written monument, for example:

kaz. *pǎkət* – obdor. (Vol.) *pakyt* ‘herd, flock’;

kaz. *sǎχ* – obdor. (Vol.) *sach* ‘fur coat’;

каз. *pǎnt* – obdor. (Vol.) *pant* ‘path’;

kaz. *tǎlaŋ* – obdor. (Vol.) *talani* ‘whole’.

But the grapheme *e* is fixed in certain positions: next to the front consonants kaz. *š*, *λ* (> Vol. *s*) and central consonants *ś*, *ń*.

kaz. *šǎŋkap* – obdor. (Vol.) *s'eňkap* ‘unexpectedly’;

kaz. *šǎta* – obdor. (Vol.) *seda* ‘there’;

kaz. *ńǎł jaŋ* – obdor. (Vol.) *neljań* ‘forty’;

kaz. *łaśkam* – obdor. (Vol.) *leśkam* ‘spacious’.

The Kazym grapheme *o* corresponds to the letters *o*, *u* in the written monument:

kaz. *oŋχ* – obdor. (Vol.) *oń* ‘hole’;

kaz. *kor* – obdor. (Vol.) *kor* ‘stove’;

kaz. *oꝑət* – obdor. (Vol.) *ubyt* ‘hair’;

kaz. *χoŋ* – obdor. (Vol.) *chun* ‘when’;

kaz. *noꝑət* – obdor. (Vol.) *nubyt* ‘century’.

The specific sound of the Kazym dialect, which is indicated by the grapheme *ε* in the written monument, corresponds to the letter *e*, for example:

kaz. *kεm* – obdor. (Vol.) *kem* ‘how much/many’;

kaz. *jεrt* – obdor. (Vol.) *jert* ‘rain’;

kaz. *jεrmat* – obdor. (Vol.) *jermat* ‘tight’;

kaz. *nεman* – obdor. (Vol.) *neman* ‘purposely’.

The short vowel kaz. *ǔ* corresponds to *u* in the written monument in the position after *w* *y*:

kaz. *łǔŋk* – obdor. (Vol.) *luńk* ‘chock’;

kaz. *nǔmpi* – obdor. (Vol.) *numbi* ‘top’;

kaz. *jǔkana* – obdor. (Vol.) *jukana* ‘instead’;

kaz. *pǔt* – obdor. (Vol.) *put* ‘boiler’;

kaz. *nǔša* – obdor. (Vol.) *nuža* ‘need’.

In the position after *w*:

kaz. *wǔtəŋ* – obdor. (Vol.) *vytyń* ‘wide’, kaz. *wǔna* – obdor. (Vol.) *vyna* ‘wine’.

The vowel *ǔ* corresponds to *o* in the written monument in the position after *m*, *s* *u*:

kaz. *mǔrt* – obdor. (Vol.) *mort* ‘degree’;

kaz. *nǔwi* – obdor. (Vol.) *novy* ‘white, light’;

kaz. *nǔχ* – obdor. (Vol.) *noch* ‘up’;

kaz. *χǔlta* – obdor. (Vol.) *cholta* ‘when’.

In the position after *m*, *s*:

kaz. *sǔr* – obdor. (Vol.) *sur* ‘gap’;

kaz. *sǔmp* – obdor. (Vol.) *sump* ‘ridiculous, unnecessary’;

kaz. *mǔχtǔ* – obdor. (Vol.) *muchty* ‘through, past’;

kaz. *mǔj* – обдор (Vol.) *muǔ* ‘what’.

The vowel *i* corresponds to *i*, *y* in the written monument:

kaz. *šiməl* – obdor. (Vol.) *šimil* ‘little’;

kaz. *širən* – obdor. (Vol.) *siršna* ‘then’;

kaz. *jir* – obdor. (Vol.) *jir* ‘sacrifice’.

Only *a*, *e*, *i*, *ə* are used in the non-first syllable in Kazym dialect [2]. The vowels *a*, *e*, *i* used in the second syllable in Kazym are similar to vowel represented in the written monument:

kaz. *nepek* – obdor. (Vol.) *nebek* ‘paper’;

kaz. *šitam* – obdor. (Vol.) *šitak* ‘quiet’.

But when the vowel *ə* is used in the second syllable in the Kazym word there are examples with *a*, *o*, *i*, *y* in the written monument. It is remarkable that the same vowels are in most cases represented in other written monuments:

kaz. *pōtar* – obdor. (SH) *no'mapъ* ‘talk’, Ahl. *pōtar* [10: 1248];

kaz. *joχət* – obdor. (Vol.) *jugot* ‘then’ – obdor. (SH) *ě'zomъ* ‘last’;

kaz. *jeməŋ* – obdor. (Vol.) *jemyń* – obdor. (SH) *e'mынгъ* ‘sacred, holy’;

kaz. *šorəs* – obdor. (Vol.) *šaras*, – east-kh. *чáрасъ* ‘sea’;

kaz. *šorəm* – obdor. (SH) *со'рамъ*, *сора'мъ* ‘death’ – east-kh. *сурáм* ‘to be dead’;

kaz. *šorəs* – obdor. (SH) *сě'разъ*, *ся'рысъ* – east-kh. *чурасъ* ‘thousand’.

Table № 1. Correspondence of the vowels of the first and second syllables in the written monument and the literary Khanty (Kazym dialect)¹

First syllable			Second syllable		
Literary (Kazym)	Khanty	Gospel of Matthew (Vol.)	Literary (Kazym)	Khanty	Gospel of Matthew (Vol.)
<i>ǎ</i>		<i>a</i> , <i>e</i> next to <i>c s</i> (– kaz. <i>ś</i>), <i>ń</i> , <i>s'</i> (– kaz. <i>š</i>)	<i>a</i>		<i>a</i>
<i>o</i>		<i>o</i> , <i>u</i>			
<i>ε</i>		<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>		<i>e</i>
<i>ŭ</i>		<i>u</i> , <i>y</i> <i>w</i> _			
<i>ǒ</i>		<i>o</i> , <i>u</i> <i>m</i> _, <i>s</i> (– kaz. <i>ś</i>)_			
<i>i</i>		<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>		<i>i</i>
			<i>ə</i>		<i>a</i> , <i>o</i> , <i>y</i> , <i>i</i>

¹ The table shows the correspondences for which there are more than three examples in the text of the written monument.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis it can be concluded that the differences between the vowels in the graphics of the first syllable in the "Matveĭ elta jemyń aĭkol-jastypsa" of L.P. Volodogskiy from the Kazym dialect are insignificant and are reduced primarily to the special reflexivity of the vowels in the position next to the palatal consonants, for example, after *s* that corresponds to kaz. *ś*, *a* > *e*, *o* > *u*, *i* > *y*, after labial *m*, *w*, *o* > *u*, *u* > *y*.

The rest of the correspondences are absolutely regular and they are observed throughout the text of the written monument. An exception is kaz. *ϕ* that has two possible correspondences *u* and *o*. Interestingly, the same variability is observed in the reflection of kaz. *ϕ* in different words in the work of I. Egorov, I. Popov "Emyn yastops" (Sacred History, 1900), for example, kaz. *χϕn* – Vol. *chun* - SH *хунь* 'when'; kaz. *ηϕat* – Vol. *nubyt* - SH *нобытъ* 'century'. Perhaps it is a special pronunciation of *ϕ* that was sounded like a sound in the range from *o* to *u* for Russian speakers.

The most interesting results were obtained by analyzing the vowels of the second syllable. It turned out that in the first texts in the Khanty language not only the graphemes *ə*, *a*, *i*, *e* were used in the second syllable but also *o*, *y*. While in the modern Kazym dialect the grapheme *ə* is used frequently in the second syllable, there are the vowels *a*, *i*, *o*, *y* in the same position in the written monuments. It is important to note that these second vowels in most occurrences regularly correspond to each other in different written monuments in Western and Eastern dialects and, probably, they should be restored for the Protokhanty period. It is remarkable that in the earlier dictionaries of the modern Khanty literary language vowels of the second syllable that were common for the first books are indicated, for example, [Vol.] *śaras* 'sea', shur. *сярас* [11], shur. *шарас* [12], kaz. *шорс* [13], kaz. *шорăс* [14], kaz. *шорас* [15], east-kh. *чáрась* 'sea'.

This indicates that there are no graphic errors in the first books in the Khanty language; it is a systemic fixation of real pronunciation (compare special reflexes after palatal and labial consonants) which has an archaic character. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that the Western Khanty dialects have not changed for the last 100 years, since there are scripts in the dictionary [13] that are not significantly different from the first books.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

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

ABBREVIATIONS

Ahl. – Beryozovsk dialect according to Alkqist (DEWOS), east-kh. – Eastern Khanty dialects (Middle-Surgut, Vakh), kaz. – Kazym dialect of Khanty, obdor. – Obdorsk dialect of Khanty, RAS – Russian Academy of Sciences, SH – Sacred History, Vol. – L.P. Vologotskiy.

REFERENCES

- [1] Prokof'ev G.N., Languages and writing of the peoples of the North, 1937;

- [2] Koshkareva N.B., Actual issues of improving Khanty graphics and orthography / Vestnik Ugrovedeniya, 2013, 3(14), pp. 47-78;
- [3] Nurieva F. Sh., The dialectal base of the books written in “christened Tatar” in the latter half of the 19th century / Ural-Altai Studies, Moscow, 2015, 2 (17), pp. 67-74;
- [4] Bakula V. B., Vocalism of the first syllable in the Kildin Sami dialect (case study of Matthew 1878) / Ural-Altai Studies, Moscow, 2016, 3 (22), pp. 13-33;
- [5] Bezenova M. P., The Udmurt written monument “Christian admonition of Saint Tikhon in the Votyak language” of 1891 («Ӝеч кыльӛс. Святой Тихонлэн ӛечлы дышетӛм кыльӛсыз»): graphic and vocalic features / Ural-Altai Studies, Moscow, 2016, 1 (20), pp. 7 – 40;
- [6] Klyucheva M. A., Normanskaya Yu. V., The first Meadow Mari alphabet books (1870s): a linguistic review. Part I. Introduction. Vowels and letters for them / Ural-Altai Studies, Moscow, 2015, 3 (18), pp. 18 – 63;
- [7] Solovar V. N., Nakhracheva G. L., Shiyanova A. A., Dialects oh Khanty, Russia, 2016, pp 3-12;
- [8] Steinitz V., Khanty (Ostyak) language / Languages and writing of the peoples of the North, P. II, 1937, pp. 197-198;
- [9] Sulotskiy A. I., About Siberian clergy / ed. B.A. Chupina V. A., Tyumen, 2000;
- [10] Steinitz W., Dialektologisches und etymologisches Wörterbuch der ostjakischen Sprache (DEWOS), Berlin, 1966-1993.
- [11] Skameyko R.R., Syazi Z. I., Khanty-Russian and Russian-Khanty dictionary (Shuryshkar dialect), Leningrad, 1985;
- [12] Valgamova S. I., Koshkareva N. B., Onina S. V., Shiyanova A. A., Dialectological dictionary of Khanty language (Shuryshkar and Obdorsk dialects), Ekaterinburg. 2011;
- [13] Solovar V. N., Picture dictionary of Khanty language (Kazym dialect), St. Petersburg, 1997;
- [14] Kononova S.P., Russian-Khanty thematic dictionary (Kazym dialect), St. Petersburg, 2002;
- [15] Solovar V. N., Khanty-Russian Dictionary (Kazym dialect), Tyumen, 2014;