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1. Introduction

In Koryak there are two nominal forms, the so-called ‘possessives’ and the ‘relationals’. The possessives are formed by suffixing -nin/-n/-non/-in to nominal stems and the relationals are formed by suffixing -kin to nominal, adverbial and verbal stems. In the present paper I will aim to examine how the animacy hierarchy reflects on these forms.

---

1 The data presented here was mainly collected by the author in the summer of 2002 in the village of Evensk in the Severo-Evensk Region. The fieldwork was supported by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture, under a grant for the project ‘Urgent Linguistic Fieldwork of Paleosiberian Languages in Eastern Siberia’ headed by Fubito Endo (#12039228). I would like to thank my language consultant, Mrs. Kechgelxut Irina Gergol'tagovna (born in 1936) for supplying me with invaluable information necessary for the study. I also would like to thank Graeme A. Todd (Kansai University), Joseph Tomei (Kumamoto Gakuen University), Shinjiro Kazama (Tokyo University of Foreign Studies), and Toshihide Nakayama (ILCAA, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies) for their comments and suggestions on earlier versions of the paper read at the Fourth International Conference on Endangered Languages in Kyoto on 15th, November, 2002. Needless to say, I am responsible for any error and misinterpretation.

2 Koryak, together with the neighboring Chukchee, Itelmen, Kerek, and Alutor, belongs to the Chukchee-Kamchatkan language family. It is mainly spoken in the Koryak Autonomous Region in the northern part of the Kamchatka Peninsula and in the Severo-Evensk District along the sea of Okhotsk in Russia. According to the 1989 official census report of the USSR, about 4,700 people (52.4% of the total Koryak population) regard Koryak as their native language (Sidorova 1994:32). Koryak is characterized by a marked dialectal diversity: Besides the main dialects, Chawchavan and Palana, the presence of a number of other dialects, including Paren, Itkan, Kamenskoe, Apuka, and Karaga, has also been reported (Zhukova 1968:271). The dialect with which I deal in the present paper can be regarded as Chawch(van). The phonemic inventory of the dialect includes the following: p, t, t’, k, q, v, y, f, c, m, n, n’, ñ, l, l’, j, w, i, e, a, o, u, ø (Note: All the stops are voiceless. Voicing is not a contrastive feature. The symbol ' denotes palatalization of the alveolars. c is used as a symbol of the affricate [tʃ].)

3 I think that the terms possessive and relational should not be used differently and, for the reasons given below, that another unific term should be given to these forms. However, for the moment I will continue to use the traditional terms possessive and relational to avoid unnecessary confusion.
Studies on the possessives and relational in the Chukchi-Kamchatkan language family have been so far done by Skorik (1961:225-280), Zhukova (1972:97-104), Koptjevskaja-Tam (1995:301-321), Kibrik et.al (2000:245-249) and Nagayama (2002:11-35). In these studies morphosyntactic behavior of the possessives and the relational are described within the traditional semantic framework. Here I will introduce a different framework into the treatment of these two forms by examining them from the point of view of animacy hierarchy. Through this I will also point out the close parallelism to the ergative case marking upon which animacy hierarchy is similarly reflected.

2. Koryak Possessive and Relational

Possessives cover most of the meanings traditionally ascribed to adnominal genitives, for example, possession, kinship and other social relations, body parts, part-whole relations, and material (Koptjevskaja-Tam 1995:304). Relational describe an object as being ‘related’ to or pertaining to a certain place, time, or object (ibid.:306). See the following examples of possessives (1a)(1b)(1c).

\[(1a) \text{vəm-nin-}O \quad jaja-ya\]
I-Poss-Abs.Sg house-Abs.Sg
‘my house’

\[(1b) l'age-n-}O \sim l'age-nan-}O \quad icj-ə-}n\]
L’age-Poss-Abs.Sg L’age-Poss-Abs.Sg fur.coat-E-Abs.Sg
‘Ljage’s coat’

\[(1c) en'pic-in-}O \quad peyke-}n\]
father-Poss-Abs.Sg hat-Abs.Sg
‘father’s hat’

The following (2a)(2b)(2c) are the examples of relatives. Note that relational suffix -kin is added to the nominal stem in (2a), to the verbal stem in (2b) and to the adverbial stem in (2c).

\[(2a) \text{tanup-kin-}O \quad \text{tal}ɛtal\]
hill-Rel-Abs.Sg snow(Abs.Sg)
‘hill’s snow’
(2b) पौकिज-किन-Ø  लोढ़ाज़-Ø
arrive-Rel-Abs.Sg  day-Abs.Sg
’day of arrival’

(2c) आईजेप-किन-Ø  ल’ऑन्ग’-Ø
long.ago-Rel-Abs.Sg  story-Abs.Sg
‘an ancient story’

In spite of the semantic similarity to the genetive case, the possessives and relationals have not been regarded as the genitive because of their somewhat unique behavior in nominal inflection. They may combine with number markers, as in (3a)(3b), with case markers, as in (4a)(4b), and with predication markers, as in (5a)(5b), which do not appear on a nominal marked with the oblique case suffix.

(3a) ॉझे-न-Ø  लेवा-Ø
salmon-Poss-Abs.Sg  head-Abs.Sg
’salmon’s head’

ॉझे-ना-t  लेवा-o-t
salmon-Poss-Abs.Du  head-E-Abs.Du
‘two salmon’s heads’

ॉझे-ना-w  लेवा-u
salmon-Poss-Abs.Pl  head-Abs.Pl
‘salmons’ heads’

(3b) ॉक्लेग-किन-Ø  िेजा-o-n
winter-Rel-Abs,Sg  fur.coat-E-Abs.Sg
‘winter’s fur coat’

ॉक्लेग-किना-t  िेजा-o-t
winter-Rel-Abs.Du  fur.coat-E-Abs.Du
‘two winter’s fur coats’

ॉक्लेग-किना-w  िेजा-u
winter-Rel-Abs.Pl  fur.coat-E-Abs.Pl
‘winter’s fur coats’
(4a) yəmmo t-ə-ko-tva-ŋ en'pic-ine-k
   I(Abs) 1Sg.Subj-E-Pres-be-Pres father-Poss-Loc
   jaja-k
   house-Loc
   'I live in my father’s house.'

(4b) many-ə-t k-iləte-w-ə-nin
   hand-E-Abs.Du Pres-wash-Pres-E-3Sg.Subj/3Sg.Obj
   wejem-kine-te miml-e
   river-Rel-Instr water-Instr
   'He/She washed his/her hands with the river’s water.'

(5a) yəmmo ənp-ə-qəval-ena-ŋəm jəl'ŋəŋavəkə-ŋəm
   I(Abs) old-E-man-Poss-1Sg granddaughter-1Sg
   'I am the old man’s granddaughter.'

(5b) yəmmo uńk-ə-kina-ŋəm yıjnıkyıli'l-e-yəm
   I(Abs) forest-E-Rel-1Sg hunter-1Sg
   'I am a forest hunter.'

However, if viewed from the point of animacy hierarchy, the possessives and relationals show close parallelism to the other case marker, the ergative. That is, the different markers for adnominal attributes -nin/n-/nən/-in/-kin reflect the animacy hierarchy just as the different markers for the ergative and which marker is used depends upon the different degrees of animacy.

3. Animacy Hierarchy Reflected on the Ergative

I have already established that Koryak NPs are classified into four main classes according to the different ergative markings, with graduation from the highest animacy, class A, to the lowest, class C (Kurebito 2001:107-125). Class A has its own ergative marker -nən and contains only personal pronouns. Class B uses the locative case -k for the ergative preceded by the animate markers -ne (Sg.) and -jəka (Pl). Proper nouns referring to humans and dogs, the personal interrogative pronoun meaning ‘who’, and kinship address terms are included in class B. Class C uses the instrumental case -te for the ergative but has no animate marker. Kinship reference terms, animal
nouns and inanimate nouns are included in class C. There is also another class, B/C, which falls between the classes B and C and has optional ergative marking. This class uses the locative or instrumental, and the corresponding animate marking, optional, which includes human nouns, demonstrative pronouns, and the interrogative pronoun meaning ‘which’.

The table 1 shows the classification of Koryak NPs according to different ergative markers.

Table 1. Animacy Hierarchy reflected on the Ergative Case from the Highest Animating Class A to the Lowest Animating Class C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ergative Marker</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPs</td>
<td>personal pronoun</td>
<td>proper noun / ‘who’ / kinship address terms</td>
<td>kinship reference terms / animal nouns / inanimate nouns</td>
<td>human nouns/ demonstrative pronouns / ‘which’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are examples of each class. (6) shows an example of a personal pronoun which belongs solely to class A.

(6) ə-nən  yə-leʔo-lin  kajy-ə-n  ənənko
he/she-Erg  Past-see-3 Sg. Obj  bear-E-Abs. Sg  there

tənupe-lg'-ə-k
hill-surface-E-Loc
‘He/She saw a bear on that hill’

The following (7a)(7b)(7c)(7d) are examples of class B; (7a) is that of a human proper name; (7b) is that of the personal interrogative pronoun ‘who’; (7c) is that of a kinship address term.
(7a) "l'aye-na-k  tejk-ə-nin-Ø
L'age-Anim.Sg-Loc(Erg) make-E-3Sg.Subj/3Sg.Obj-Past
icS-ə-n  qlavol-ə-ŋ
fur.coat-E-Abs.Sg husband-E-Dat
'the L'age sews a fur coat for her husband.'

(7b) mik-ne-k  ənn’ej-u  ənn-u
who-Anim.Sg-Loc(Erg) this-Abs.Pl fish-Abs.Pl
ye-jel-linew  me-ŋqo  ajava-ŋqo
Past-bring-3Pl.Obj where-Abl remote.place-Abl
'Who and from where were these fish brought?'

(7c) appa-na-k  ku-tejk-ə-ŋ-nin
daddy-Anim.Sg-Loc(Erg) Pres-make-E-Pres-3Sg.Subj/3Sg.Obj
ujetik-Ø
sledge-Abs.Sg
'Daddy is making a sledge.'

The following (8a)(8b) are examples of class C; (8a) is that of a kinship reference term and (8b) that of an animal noun.

(8a) en'pic-te  ku-tejk-ə-ŋ-nin
father-Instr(Erg) Pres-make-E-Pres-3Sg.Subj/3Sg.Obj
ujetik-Ø
sledge-Abs.Sg
'Father is making a sledge.'

(8b) ŋanko  qoja-ta  ku-nu-ŋ-nin
there reindeer-Instr(Erg) Pres-eat-Pres-3Sg.Obj
pəSə-n
mushroom-Abs.Sg
'A reindeer is eating mushrooms over there.'

The following (9) shows an example of class B/C, which includes human nouns.
(9) $el^\prime Ya-ta$ ~ $el^\prime Ya-na-k$ $\forallcci$
woman-Instr(Erg) woman-Anim.Sg-Loc(Erg) you(Abs.Sg)

$ne-ku-\forallegew-wi$
Inv-Pres-call-2Sg.Obj
‘The woman/ a woman is calling you.’

4. Animacy Hierarchy Reflected on the Adnominal Attributes

The possessive -$nin/-n/-n\foralln/-in$ and the relational -$kin$ show quite similar parallelism to this classification. First, -$nin$ is suffixed to personal pronouns, which belong to the class corresponding to the above, class A.

(10a) $\forallm-nin-\emptyset$ $jaja-\foralla$
I-Poss-Abs.Sg house-Abs.Sg
‘my house’
(10b) $\forall-nin-\emptyset$ $peyke-\emptyset$
he-Poss-Abs.Sg hat-Abs.Sg
‘his hat’

-$n/-n\foralln$ is suffixed to proper nouns referring to humans and dogs, the personal interrogative pronoun meaning ‘who’, and kinship address terms which correspond to the above class B. See the example of a proper noun in (11a), the personal interrogative pronoun ‘who’ in (11b) and a kinship address term in (11c).

(11a) $notaja\forallva-n\foralln-\emptyset$ ~ $notaja\forallva-n-\emptyset$
Notaja\forallva-Poss-Abs.Sg Notaja\forallva-Poss-Abs.Sg

$icts-\foralla$
fur.coat-E-Abs.Sg
‘Notaja\forallva’s fur coat’

(11b) $mik-n\foralln-\emptyset$ ~ $mik-\foralla-n-\emptyset$ $icts-\foralla$
who-Poss-Abs.Sg who-Poss-Abs.Sg fur.coat-E-Abs.Sg
‘who’s fur coat’

---

4 Either $-n$ or $-n\foralln$ can be used after these noun stems and the difference in meaning between them is not clear. However, some informants suggest that $-n\foralln$ is preferred when the attribute with this suffix is focused.
(11c) \textit{appa-nən-}\textit{Θ} \sim \textit{appa-n-Θ} \textit{icɨɛ-ə-n}

daddy-Poss-Abs.Sg \quad \text{daddy-Poss-Abs.Sg fur.coat-E-Abs.Sg}

‘Daddy’s fur coat’

\textit{-in}, is suffixed to kinship reference terms, animal nouns and inanimate nouns, which correspond to the above, class C. See the example of a kinship reference term in (12a) and that of an animal noun in (12b). Inanimate nouns can occur with \textit{-in} only when they denote material as in (12c) and strong subordination as in (12d). (12d) means ‘the leaf which is still on the tree.’ If you want to refer to a leaf which has already fallen to the ground, you should use the relational \textit{-kin} and say \textit{uttəkin watwət}.

(12a) \textit{en’pɪc-in-Θ} \textit{icɨɛ-ə-n}

father-Poss \quad \text{fur.coat-E-Abs.Sg}

‘my father’s fur coat’

(12b) \textit{ʃəɬ-ɪn-Θ} \textit{veloɬ-ə-n}

dog-Poss-Abs.Sg \quad \text{ear-E-Abs.Sg}

‘a dog’s ear’

(12c) \textit{wəwəw-en-Θ} \textit{jəğa-ya}

stone-Poss-Abs.Sg \quad \text{house-Abs.Sg}

‘stone house’

(12d) \textit{utt-in-Θ} \textit{watwət}

tree-Poss-Abs.Sg \quad \text{leave(Abs.Sg)}

‘a leaf on the tree’

cf. \textit{utt-ə-kin-Θ} \textit{watwət}

tree-E-Rel-Abs.Sg \quad \text{leave(Abs.Sg)}

‘a leaf on the ground’

\textit{-kin} is suffixed solely to inanimate nouns. Thus we may set up the lowest animate class D in addition to classes A, B, and C.

(13a) \textit{wejam-kin-Θ} \textit{taj̃tə-na}

river-Rel-Abs.Sg \quad \text{fishing.camp-Abs.Sg}

‘a river’s fishing camp’
(13b)  *jaja-ken-Ø*  *jatem-Ø*
house-Rel-Abs.Sg  cover-Abs.Sg
‘a cover which is taken off a house’

There is also another class which corresponds to the above class B/C with optional possessive marking, -nən/-n or -in according to the definiteness. This class includes human nouns, demonstrative pronouns, and the interrogative pronoun meaning ‘which’. The following (14) is an example of the human noun.

(14)  *el'ʃ-en-Ø*  ~  *el'sa-nən-Ø*
woman-Poss-Abs.Sg  woman-Poss-Abs.Sg
icə-ə-n
fur.coat-E-Abs.Sg
‘a woman’s/the woman’s fur coat’

Now let us round off the above examination. Table 2 shows the animacy hierarchy reflected on the possessive and relational from the highest animate class A to the lowest animate class C. From this table it is clear that NP classification by adnominal attribute markers is parallel to that by the ergative markers, except that the adnominal attribute has another class, D, which is the lowest animate.

Table 2. Animacy Hierarchy Reflected on the Adnominal Attributes from the Highest Animate Class A to the Lowest Animate Class C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B/C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adnominal Attribute markers</td>
<td>-nin</td>
<td>-n/-nən</td>
<td>-in</td>
<td>-n/-nən</td>
<td>-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPs</td>
<td>personal pronoun</td>
<td>proper noun / 'who' / kinship address terms</td>
<td>kinship reference terms / animal nouns / inanimate nouns</td>
<td>human nouns/ demonstrative pronouns / 'which'</td>
<td>inanimate nouns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Final Remarks

The possessive and relational in Koryak, in spite of the semantic similarity to the genitive case, have been treated as different forms from the case markers because of their unique behavior in nominal inflection. However, from the point of view of animacy hierarchy they show very close similarity to the ergative which takes different case markers according to the degree of animacy hierarchy. So, it might be possible to think that the genitive case also appears in various forms from the possessive -nin-/-n/-mon/-in to the relational -kin according to the same parameter as the ergative.

ABBREVIATIONS
Abs = absolutive, Dat = dative, Du = dual, E = epenthetic schwa, Erg = ergative, Instr = instrumental, Inv = inverse, Loc = locative, Obj = object, Pl = plural, Poss = possessive, Pres = present, Rel = relational, Sg = singular, Subj = subject
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