

j in Sayan-Samoyed Temporal Suffixes

AGO KÜNNAP

Tartu

Our honourable jubilarian, a man of merit TIBOR MIKOLA, whose role in the investigation of Samoyed languages is hard to overestimate, has treated the Proto-Samoyed consonant **j* in his survey about the historical development of Samoyed languages differently in comparison with its earlier treatments, writing, „Die Entwicklung von PS *j* war in hohem Masse davon abhängig, in welcher Stellung es auftrat: 1. anlautend, 2. inlautend im Silbenanlaut, oder 3. im Silbenauslaut.

1. Das anlautende *j*- ist in den nordsam. Sprachen entweder als *j*- erhalten oder *d'*- geworden. Der Wandel *j*- > *d'*- ist ganz jung, Castrén hat vor etwa 150 Jahren noch überall *j*- gehört. Im Südsam. sind die Fortsetzungen des PS *j*- verschiedene Affrikaten. Einige selk. Wörter zeigen nicht die Vertretungen von **j*-, sondern die von **w*-. Diese Sonderentwicklung ist in manchen Wörtern auf dem gesamten Sprachgebiet vor sich gegangen, in anderen nur in einigen Dialekten.

2. Die Entwicklung von inlautend in Silbenanlaut stehendem **j*- stimmt im wesentlichen mit der von **j*- überein, doch begegnet im Enz. und Ngan. mehrmals Vokalisierung oder Ausfall des *-j*-.

3. Die Entwicklung des auslautenden **-j* weicht von der obigen ab. Die Tendenzen im Nordsam. treten dabei noch einigermaßen deutlich hervor, die Lage im Südsam. ist unklar. Wir gehen i. f. die Sprachen einzeln durch: [...]

Selk. a) **ǰj*, **uj* > N yy, (Pr) ü, M öö, ö, y, (Do) ũ, S yy. Für andere Verbindungen mit *-j* haben wir wenige Beispiele. b) **Vj* > *VI'*.

Saj[ansamojedisch] verschiedene Vertretungen." (MIKOLA 1988: 226–227).

Observing the verb in Samoyed, Mikola reconstructs as **j* one of the imperative-adhortative suffixes (3rd person in indeterminative conjugation) (245, cf. also 250) and he regards it as resulting from the 3rd person in indeterminate conjugation. He goes on writing, „Im Nordselk. ist **-mV-* zu Moduszeichen geworden, an das noch das andere Imperativzeichen **-jV-* und die *Vx-e* treten. In den meisten selkupischen Mundarten aber, auch in manchen Nordmundarten, geht **-jV-* dem **-mV-* voran, wobei das *-t-* von *-mV-* zum *Vx* zu gehören scheint. [...] Selk. ... M *-imd*, *-imdi*, *-imdat* ... " (246–248). In Northern Samoyed and Selkup the **j*- suffix has formed reflexive conjugation (255).

Among Proto-Samoyed participle markers he finds a place also for **-j*, which in Selkup occurs only in the compound suffixes **-pVju* and **-mV + *-j*, in the Koibal dialect of Kamass only in the compound suffix **-pVju* (258–259).

So, in his survey Mikola has touched upon several important features, connected with the phonetical aspect of the consonant **j* and with the occurrence of the **j*-suffix in Samoyed verbs. In general, **j* obviously occurs as a rather frequent and, in many cases, a hidden consonant in Samoyed verbs.

Describing the Forest dialect material of Nenets, collected by himself, Pekka Sammallahti writes: „Whether the suffix */ŋa/* (which precedes the personal suffixes but comes after the future tense marker) is an indicative marker is not clear: it seems to lack in other mood forms

(the imperative excluded), but also in the indicative ... After palatalized consonants, /*ŋa*/ turns into /*d'a*/, e. g. underlying /*m̃iŋŋat̃*/ 'I am going' gives the surface form /*m̃iŋd'āt*/ through the immediate forms /*m̃iŋŋāt*/ → /*m̃iŋjāt*/ → .'' (SAMMALAHTI 1974: 68). He adds: „The verbs which lack /*ŋa*/ or its alternative for vocalic stems /*ə*/ are probably all /*j*/-stems [...], e. g. /*ŋām̃taš*/ 'to sit down' (underlying /*ŋām̃təj̃šə*/, sglaor /*ŋām̃t̃i*/ (from underlying /*ŋām̃t̃əj̃t̃ə(m)*/)." (134–135).

Juha Janhunen reasons, „In verb conjugation *-*j* (?originally the marker of a verbal noun) appears to have functioned as a formēr of the stem of aorist of finite conjugation (in Nganasan). Obviously quite early the material has obtained a function, particularly referring to intransitiveness and/or reflexiveness (e. g., in Nenets). Later, analogies and secondary suffixation have blurred the general picture but the reduction of the stem-final low vowel, brought about by the *-*j*-suffix, is reflected yet in simultaneous morphological changes, cf., for example, Nenets *xaecb* 'to leave' (< **kājā*- < Uralic **kād'ā*- ...) versus *xaecb* 'to stay' (< **kāj̃ā-j̃*- < **kāj̃ā-j̃*-)." (JANHUNEN 1981: 228).

On my part, I have referred to the abundance of the *-*j*-material in Kamass verb forms (KÜNNAP 1977). As meanwhile a good deal has been published about another Sayan-Samoyed language, viz. Mator, we have ground enough to return to the *-*j*-material of the Sayan-Samoyed verbs.

By way of explaining of the following it should be pointed out that in discussing Sayan-Samoyed languages I proceed from a proved newer view suggesting there were two of them with the following dialects: the Kamass language (Kam) with the Kamass (KamKam) and Koibal (KamKoi) dialects and the Mator language (Mat) with the Mator (MatMat), Taigi (MatTai) and Karagass (MatKar) dialects.

At that, when observing the Mator language material I confine myself to primary sources of which there are only three as Eugene Helinski suggests (HELIMSKI 1978): HELIMSKI 1987, PALLAS 1787–1789 and ПОТАПОВ 1957. (The rest of them occur only as copies of the primary sources.)

The observation of the Kamass language material indicates that *-*j* in it does not occur as an independent mode or temporal marker (see KÜNNAP 1977). On the other hand, the suffix *-*ja* is quite common in Mator finite verb forms, and the originality of its *-*j* is beyond all question. According to translations these Mator finite verb forms should be expressed by indicative present (or aorist) forms. Possibly the suffix *-*ja* – as well as the suffixes *j̃* (rare), *nV*, *gV* et al. – functions as the marker of the present tense (or aorist) of the Mator language.

First of all, I would present definite cases of the Mator *ja*, i. e., these where *ja* follows a vowel: MatMat (ПОТАПОВ 1957)

аямь 'I am able' (80), *агитыямь* 'I send' (87), *апыццямь* 'I plant' (91), *арамцямь* 'I sweep' (80), *балямь* 'I bite' (78), *хымцямь* 'I pour' (82), *канцямь* 'I carry' (83), *капцямь* 'I drag' (60), *карцямь* 'I burn' (70), *кыргытыямь* 'I open' (85), *коямь* 'I find' (82), *кряямь* 'I flay' (72), *крьцжидямь* 'I hit the target' (98), *мазіямь* 'I wash' (81), *меямь* 'I take' (58), *міязжастыямь* 'I shatter' (89), *міямь* 'I give' (67), *напцямь* 'I press' (67), *ниццямь* 'I compel' (72), *нуццояцжямь* 'I get sour' (71), *омцямь* 'I gather' (93), *тохтыямь* 'I teach' (84), *гцицямь* 'I dart (an arrow)' (89).

It is not yet clear whether in Mator recordings the Russian *я*, following a consonant, is not even used to denote the palatalisation of the consonants:

MatMat (Potapov 1957) *енгелстуулянь* 'I yawп' (73), *кымьнджигулянь* 'I die' (96), *нагрямь* 'I tremble' (68).

The letter *ь* between the preceding consonant and *я* may indicate non-palatalisation and, simultaneously, the occurrence of the actual *jV*:

MatMat (Potapov 1957) *бадьямь* 'I feed' (76), *хальгрямь* 'I drop' (85), *камдьямь* 'I pour' (79), *монцодольямь* 'I wish' (70), *сабыдьямь* 'I interrupt' (87), *топьянь* 'I chew' (71).

As Helinski indicates, in the form *нундулянь* 'I declare' (84) we come across a transitive suffix, cf. *нюндамь* 'I hear' (92). The same is valid in the verb form *керытьямь* 'I dress (smb.)' (82) where *ja* can possibly be found, cf. *кернам* 'I dress myself'. (HELIMSKI 1993: 376.)

The contrasting of Mator verb forms with those of the Kamass language indicates that in Kamass the *l'V* suffix commonly corresponds to the Mator *jV*- suffix. *l'V* is a general marker of the Kamass present-future tense (KÜNNAP 1978: 117-124).

By way of examples, from these equivalents I have chosen such pairs of Mator-Kamass verbs which have common Samoyed stems (according to JANHUNEN 1977), and which do not reveal any derivation suffixes to facilitate comparison, including the further comparison with the usage of the rest of the Samoyed languages. So, cf. for example:

MatMat (Potapov 1957) KamKam (Donner-Joki 1944) (Janhunen 1977).

<i>коянь</i> 'I find' (82)	<i>kul'am</i> ['I see'] (34a)	*ko-
<i>крянь</i> 'I flay' (72)	<i>käl'em</i> [id.] (30a)	*kirä-
<i>мазиянь</i> 'I wash' (81)	<i>buz'l'am</i> [id.] (11b)	*mäsä-
(see Klesment 1994: 34, too)		
<i>мьянь</i> 'I give' (67)	<i>mäl'em, mäl'em</i> [id.] (39b)	*mi-
<i>канциянь</i> 'I carry' (83)	<i>k'änd'l'am</i> ['I travel'] (26a)	*kántä-
<i>канцьянь</i> 'I drag' (60)	<i>~ k'änd'lam</i> ['I leave']	
	(ibid.)	

Since the non-palatalized present-future suffix *l'V* is well known in Kamass, we could suppose that the suffix *l'V* in Kamass is explained as a compound origin of *l'V* + *jV*. This supposition can also be extended on the Kamass preterite suffix *b'V* (< *bV* + *jV*). (See more closely KÜNNAP 1977: 58-60.) Certainly, it is necessary to consider a possible mutual assimilation of the suffixes *l'V* and *b'V* whereby it is not clear which of them has set an example. Regrettably, the data about the Mator preterite marker are practically lacking.

At any rate it is hardly believable that in the marker of the Kamass suffix *l'V* we come across the original palatalisation of the initial consonant. Most probably the palatalisation has been caused by the following *j* (the point of departure is the compound suffix *l'V* + *jV*) or the influence of analogy of the preterite marker *b'V*. Observing the Mator verb forms which, beside the ordinary suffix *ja*, have also suffixes *l'V* and *ljV* (read *l'V?*) in single cases, it seems more

reliable, though, that in both Kamass and Mator the formation and assimilation of the suffix sequence *lV + jV* has taken place.

lV cases:

MatMat (Potapov 1957) *омурламъ* 'I dine' (84), (?) *кандагуль* 'I am cold' (73),
MatKar (Pallas 1787–1789) *cúndzschrlam* 'I piss' (53), *ósoronlo* 'I want to eat' (52).

Cf., for example:

MatMat (Potapov 1957)

KamKam (Donner-Joki 1944)

омурламъ 'I dine' (84)

am̃ōrʔl'am ['I eat'] (5b)

нундульямъ 'I declare' (84)

ñm̃l̃m̃l̃em ['I hear'] (47b)

(See Mator *лѧ*- and *лѧ*-cases above, too.)

What else attracts attention is that in Kamass both suffixes *lV* and *l(V)* as the present-future marker and both suffixes *bV* and *bi* as the preterite marker are used in the conjugation paradigm of one and the same verb, whereby *lV* and *bV* are more consistently used in the singular. For example KamKam (DONNER-JOKI 1944) 'erschreckt werden':

Ind. pres. [-fut. ?]

1.p. <i>nerēl̃ĩiem</i>	<i>nerēlb̃w̃ĩ ~ nerēl̃ēb̃w̃ĩ</i>	<i>nerēlb̃ε̃ʔ</i>
2.p. <i>nerēl̃ĩiel̃</i>	<i>nerēl̃l̃w̃ĩ ~ nerēl̃ēl̃w̃ĩ</i>	<i>nerēll̃ε̃ʔ</i>
3.p. <i>nerēl̃ĩie</i>	<i>nerēlg̃w̃ĩ ~ nerēl̃ēg̃w̃ĩ</i>	<i>nerēl̃ēl̃ε̃ʔ</i> [pro <i>nerēl̃ε̃ʔ</i> ?] (146)

Ind. pret.

1.p. <i>nerēb̃ĩiem</i>	<i>nerēb̃b̃w̃ĩ</i>	<i>nerēb̃b̃ε̃ʔ</i>
2.p. <i>nerēb̃ĩiel̃</i>	<i>nerēb̃b̃l̃w̃ĩ</i>	<i>nerēb̃b̃l̃ε̃ʔ</i>
3.p. <i>nerēb̃ĩie ~ nerēbi</i>	<i>nerēb̃g̃ĩ</i>	[?] <i>nerēb̃b̃l̃ε̃ʔ ~ nerēbĩĩʔ</i>

It is also worth mentioning that actually here, in the cases of *l'* and *b'* Donner often used the respective system of spelling *l̃ĩ* and *b̃ĩ* which could be the trace of the original compound suffix (*lV + jV* and/or *bi + jV*). It could certainly be only a phonetical nuance as well, or else a peculiarity of Donner's transcription, since Aulis J. Joki writes: „Über einige (insbesondere in Verbalformen vorkommende) palatalisierte Konsonanten bemerkt Donner in seinen Originalaufzeichnungen: «*l' ~ l̃ĩ*, *r ~ r̃ĩ*, *b' ~ b̃ĩ*, *p' ~ p̃ĩ*. Diese Laute sind offenbar alle wirklich palatalisiert, ausser *r* im Präsens, wo *r̃ĩ < r l'*.» Aber etwas später sagt er «*r, b, p* sind nicht palatalisiert, sondern man muss *r̃ĩ, b̃ĩ, p̃ĩ* schreiben.» (DONNER-JOKI 1944: 125).

Last but not least, attention could be drawn to the fact that Kamass has a gerundial and participial marker *-ĩ*, *-i* (see KÜNNAP 1977: 62–63).

So we can see that the occurrence of *j* in Sayan-Samoyed temporal suffixes is not uniquely clear. Anyway, one can arrive at the truth of its wide usage, particularly so in Mator, the initial source being obviously the **j*-type verbal noun suffix, familiar to the whole family of Uralic languages. Concerning the Mator rare *j*Ø-cases I must say they need a special investigation.

References

- DONNER, K. – A. J. JOKI 1944, *Kamassisches Wörterbuch*, Helsinki.
- HELIMSKI, E. 1987, *Two Mator-Taigi-Karagas Vocabularies from the 18th Century*. – Journal de la Société Finno-ougrienne 81, 49–84.
- HELIMSKI, E. A. 1978, *Leksikografičeskie materialy XVIII – načala XIX vv. po sajano-samodiskim jazykam*. – Jazyki i toponimija 6, Tomsk, 47–58.
- HELIMSKI, E. A. 1993, *Matorsko-tajgijsko-karagasskij jazyk*. – Jazyki mira. Ural'skie jazyki. Moskva, 372–379.
- JANHUNEN, J. 1977, *Samojedischer Wortschatz*, Helsinki (= Castrenianumin toimitteita 17).
- JANHUNEN, J. 1981, *Uralilaisen kantakielen sanastosta*, Helsinki (= Journal de la Société Finno-ougrienne 779).
- KLESMENT, P. 1994, *Sajaanisamojeedi verbide *l-lised sufiksist*. Diplomitöö, Tartu. (Manuscript in University of Tartu.)
- KÜNNAP, A. 1977, *Kamassi keele konjugatsioonid j-elementidega*. – Fenno-ugristica 4, Tartu, 58–68.
- KÜNNAP, A. 1978, *System und Ursprung der kamassischen Flexionssuffixe II. Verbalflexion und Verbalnomina*. Helsinki (= Mémoires de la Société Finno-ougrienne 164).
- MIKOLA, T. 1988, *Geschichte der samojedischen Sprachen*. – The Uralic Languages. Description, History and Foreign Influences, Leiden – New York – København – Köln, 219–263.
- PALLAS, P. S. 1787–1789, *Linguarum Totius Orbis Vocabularia comparativa I–II*, Petropoli.
- POTAPOV, L. 1957, *Zum Problem der Herkunft und Ethnogenese der Koibalen und Motoren*, Helsinki (= Journal de la Société Finno-ougrienne 541).
- SAMMALLAHTI, P. 1974, *Material from Forest Nenets*, Helsinki (= Castrenianumin toimitteita 2).