



## Possession And Version In Yenisei Languages

Krasnoshchekov

Evgeny Associate professor, PhD Linguistics Department, Southern Federal University, Taganrog, Russia.

### ARTICLE INFORMATION

Original Research Paper

Received Jan. 2019

Accepted May. 2019

#### Keywords:

Version,  
possessiveness,  
subject / object version,  
benefactive,  
possessive affixes.

### ABSTRACT

This article is devoted to the analysis of the expression of the verb version in Yenisei languages and its connection with the category of possessiveness.

In Yenisei languages, such a relict phenomenon as a category of the verbal version has been preserved. That is, diatheses, which denote not the voice of the verb, but indicate spatial orientation, combativeness, and ineffectiveness of the actants. The main significance of this diathesis is associated with the addressee's hyper role; therefore, they must be regarded as different versions, namely, as oriented and subject versions.

As the version indicators are the elements taken by the verb; they indicate different relationships between subject and object, and also serve to express some other categories. The indicators that make up the forms of the subject version coincide with the possessive prefixes of the name and the indicators of the genitive case, expressing possession and belonging.

For some groups of verbs, possessive forms may be replaced by ordinary forms of the subject version. In the resulting verb forms, the version category, sometimes intersecting with the category of the aspect, is transformed into a possessive structure, the affixes of the ba-a-i and ba-bu-bu series go back to possessiveness, and the affixes of group D, accompanying the personal affixes of group B possessiveness.

### 1. Introduction

The Ket language is the last representative of the Yenisei language group - the language is very ancient. As it is studied, a number of signs of languages of the active system were discovered, although at this stage of development, the Ket language is referred to the nominative type (Vaida, 2004). Describing the languages of the active system, G.A. Klimov pointed out the absence of voice categories in them, stressing that non-voice diathesis operates in the active verb. (Klimov, 1977). At first, they tried to compare these diatheses with the voice of the verb of other languages, primarily Indo-European, but a closer examination revealed that this similarity is not adequate. However, certain meanings are associated with the voice of the verb are included in the diathesis and can be expressed in the corresponding verb form. By their significance, these diatheses are mainly related to the role of the addressee; therefore, they should be considered as different versions: oriented and subject versions. The category of a version is a universal category indicating the one to whom the action is intended, namely: for whom, in whose interests, in whose favor it is performed. A version (derived from the Latin *versio* - modification, rotation) is a grammatical category of a verb, denoting the relation of an action to its subject or an indirect object (mainly its purpose).

In the Yenisei languages, the version category is a two-term structure, its members form two binary oppositions: the opposition is "transitional" - "non-transitional" and the opposition is "introvertive"-"extravertive". Later, a

neutral version appears as a correlation term, which is sometimes marked as a 'non-extravertive', sometimes as 'non-introvertive'.

The subject version in the Yenisei languages appears in intransitive verbs that have two rows of affixes. These verbs with two rows of personal affixes are also noted in the Kott language. All verbs related to this type of conjugation, denote the action associated with its author; this action is for him or is directed at him. Often these are verbs with a benefactive meaning and mean that the action is performed in the interests of the actor or in his favor. That is why verbs such as 'dress', 'move', 'gird' and others, have always been interpreted as reflexive, although they may also be transitive.

The category of the oriented version is expressed by rows of affixes, some of which denote the introvertive version: it shows that the action is completely focused on the active actant and is concentrated on it or on the place where this action takes place. A number of other affixes denotes an extravertive version, which shows that the action comes from the active actant or from the place where the situation is being played out (Krasnoshchekov, 2016).

These two kinds of versions are most clearly seen in the verbs of movement. In the sense of leaving, retiring, leaving, flying away and the like, as a rule, the extravertive version is expressed; if the value is 'move back and forth', the introvertive version is used.

From the above introvertive and extravertive forms of the verb, it follows that the category of the version has nothing to do with the voice; it also does not coincide with transitivity and reminds of the corresponding category of Native American languages of the active order.

Forms of the subject version of a number of Yenisei verbs resemble an indirect reflexive voice and especially a transitional reflexive of Indo-European languages. In Yenisei languages, the meaning of reflexive is included in the subject version and can be expressed without difficulty by its forms.

Based on the material of the Yenisei (Ket, Yugh, and Kott) languages, it was found that in verbs having two rows of affixes, it is not reflexivity, but a subjective version (Werner, 1997), languages. In the Abkhaz language, just as in the Yenisei languages, the subject version is expressed by the repetition of personal affixes in the verb. Subsequently, the subject version is transformed into a possessive structure, replacing modern verbs of possession. Thus, the category of version in Yenisei languages is associated with the category of possessiveness.

The purpose of this article is to analyze the expression of a category of a version in Yenisei languages, as well as to clarify its connection with the category of possessiveness.

## 2. Method

The material of the study is the data of the Ket language (the last of the Yenisei group of languages (Paleo-Asian group), once common in Russia in the Yenisei River basin). To achieve the goal, the following methods were used: comparative-historical, comparative, and consequently-typological methods for the diachronic approach, as well as interpretation and generalization.

## 3. Discussion

The category of the version could be naturally developed from the semantics of the centripetal verbal structures, which expressed the direction of action on the subject, as opposed to the structures that expressed the centrifugal direction of action from the subject.

The category of the purpose of the action or version assumes, by virtue of its semantics, participation in the action or in the situation described by the verb of the additional person to whom the action is intended. At the same time, the producer of an action is characterized in terms of the content of a language in semantic terms as Agens, while a person who experiences an action as Patiens, the person to whom the action is intended, can be qualified as

“designatum” (D designatum), as opposed to “addressee”, expressing the function of actants in the indirect (dative) case.

In the sentence of type (1)

- (1) I wrote him a letter actant to him (in the dative case) is the addressee of the action, whereas in sentence (2)  
 (2) I killed the beast for him (that is, for him) the form for him expresses the designate designating the person for whom the indicated action is performed. The designate can act in a sentence along with the addressee, as in (3):  
 (3) I sent him (the addressee) a book for him (designat).

Constructions with designatum in the dative case can often be transformed into possessive constructions. Compare the German sentence (4):

- (4) Er hat mir die Hand verwundet, which can be transformed while retaining meaning in the sentence (5).  
 (5) Er hat meine Hand verwundet (Gamkrelidze, Ivanov, 1984).

Often the first of these constructions with the expression of the version is presented as grammatically correct in one language, the second - with the possessive construction - in the other. Compare: German (6) Ich wasche mir die Hände, [compare Russian (7) I wash my [self] hands, French Je me lave les mains], with English (8) I wash my hands.

Let's compare the data of all-Kartvelian language: georgian *z-i-s*, svan *sgur* 'sits' - a load. *a-z-i-s* <\* *h-a-z-i-s*, svan *x-a-sgur* <\* *h-a-sgur* "sits on top"; georgian *v-a-šen-eb* 'build', *v-i-šen-eb* 'build for myself', (*v*) *-u-šen-eb* [(*v*) *-u* <\* *h-w-u* ~] 'build for him'; svan *xw-a-* - *mār-e* 'cook', *xw-i-mār-e* 'cook for myself', *x-o-tār-e* (*x-oh* <\* *hwu* ~) 'cook for him' and so on (Machavariani, 1966).

In the Yenisei languages at the present stage, for example in Ket, at the syntactic level there is a neutral version, when there is no indirect addition, and a subject (non-centrifugal, centripetal) version, when an indirect addition is coreferent to the subject.

The version category marked by G.K. Werner (Verner, 1984), appears in the system of the Ket verb with the development of the active system, as its attribute. According to Werner's findings, the indicators of some rows (ba-) signified an action that is closed on the active actant or occurs at the place of his stay (centripetal version), while the indicators of other rows (bo-) carried information about the action directed beyond the active actant or his stay (centrifugal version) (Verner 1984). (see table 1).

Table 1

**Keth Subject-Object Affixes B**

Number	Person	Class	first row	second row	third row	fourth row
singular	1		<i>ba-</i>	<i>bo-</i>	<i>ba-</i>	<i>bo-</i>
	2		<i>ku-</i>	<i>ku-</i>	<i>ku-</i>	<i>ku-</i>
	3	masculine	<i>a-</i>	<i>o-</i>	<i>bu-</i>	<i>bu-</i>
	3	feminine	<i>i-</i>	<i>u-</i>	<i>bu-</i>	<i>bu-</i>
	3	inanimate	<i>i/o-</i>	<i>u-</i>	<i>o-</i>	<i>o-</i>
plural	1		<i>daŋ-</i>	<i>daŋ-</i>	<i>daŋ-</i>	<i>daŋ-</i>
	2		<i>kaŋ-</i>	<i>kaŋ-</i>	<i>kaŋ-</i>	<i>kaŋ-</i>
	3	animate	<i>aŋ-</i>	<i>oŋ-</i>	<i>bu-</i>	<i>bu-</i>
	3	inanimate	<i>a/o-</i>	<i>u-</i>	<i>o-</i>	<i>o-</i>

Compare:

- boyatn* 'i'll go, go'                      *bayabda* 'I hear'  
*kuyatn* 'you go, go'                      *kuyabda* 'you hear'  
*oaup* 'he will go, goes'                      *ayabda* 'he hears'

*uyatn* 'she will go, she goes' *iyabda* 'she hears'

(Polenova, 2011a)

Initially, in the Yenisei languages, the subject version and the opposed to the supposedly object version were somehow related to the oriented version. The oriented version was characteristic only of active verbs with rows of affixes of group B, while the subject version — and probably the object versions were distributed not only in the sphere of active, but also inactive verbs with rows of affixes of group D. We share the point of view of Werner G. K., that the subject and object versions arose later than the oriented version, which served as the basis for their development. As the forms of the subject and object versions, for example, forms of the oriented version with the commercial value could be rethought. Later, a formal distinction arose between the subject and object versions in the verb forms of the third person. Object affixes could be rethought from the former object version affixes, which are different from the third person affixes of the subject version. Even today, such Ket word forms remind of such a rethinking:

*da-ʌl'a-bu-g-di-Rus* 'she takes me (outside)' <'she takes me with herself (outside) [because it is in her interests]' (subject version)

compare: *da-kas'-ti-Rus* 'she takes me' (neutral version);

*di-bo-k-s'-i-ves* 'he brings me (here)' < he comes (here) and brings me with him [for my benefit]' (former object version),

compare: *d-ik-s'-i-ves* 'it comes (here)' (neutral version).

Comparing object and versional affixes in the first and second person, we see their complete coincidence, for example:

Table 2

**Actant Group D Affixes**

Person	Rows of Objects		Affix Rows of versioned affixes	
1.p. Sing.	<i>di/d(r)/t</i>	-	-	<i>di/d(r)/t</i>
2.p. Sing.	<i>ku/k/g(γ)</i>	-	-	<i>ku/k/g(γ)</i>
3.p. Sing. m	-	<i>a, ɔ</i>	-	<i>a</i>
f	-	<i>i</i>	-	<i>a</i>
n	-	-	<i>b/p/v/m</i>	<i>a</i>
1.p. Pl.	<i>dʌŋ/daŋ</i>	-	-	<i>dʌŋ/daŋ</i>
2.p. Pl.	<i>kʌŋ/kaŋ</i>	-	-	<i>kʌŋ/kaŋ</i>
3.p. animate	-	<i>aŋ,ɔŋ</i>	-	<i>aŋ</i>
inanimate	-	-	<i>b/p/v/m</i>	<i>a</i>

(Werner, 2004)

It is noteworthy that the third-person version affixes do not differ either in class or in number, for example: the suffix -a is used for all three genera, this is the difference between the rows of object and version affixes.

For comparison, consider the three paradigms of the verb *urgiŋ* 'wash' / 'wash' from the Yugh language:

1. The neutral paradigm.

<i>d-uragi<sup>ʔ</sup>ŋ</i>	I wash	<i>d-urɔrgi<sup>ʔ</sup>ŋ</i>	I washed
<i>k-uragi<sup>ʔ</sup>ŋ</i>	you wash he	<i>k-urɔrgi<sup>ʔ</sup>ŋ</i>	you washed
<i>d-uragi<sup>ʔ</sup>ŋ</i>	washes	<i>d-urɔrgi<sup>ʔ</sup>ŋ</i>	he washed

2. Forms of the subject version.

<i>d-ura-d-gi<sup>ʔ</sup>ŋ</i>	I wash myself	<i>d-urɔr-d-gi<sup>ʔ</sup>ŋ</i>	I washed myself
<i>k-ura-k-ki<sup>ʔ</sup>ŋ</i>	you wash yourself	<i>k-urɔr-k-ki<sup>ʔ</sup>ŋ</i>	you washed yourself

*d-ura-ja-giʔŋ* he washes himself *d-urɔr-a-gʔŋ* he washed himself

### 3. Transition paradigm.

<i>d-urd'-a-jgiʔŋ</i> <i>d-urd'-i-jgiʔŋ</i> <i>d-urd'-a-d-giʔŋ</i>	I wash him I wash her he washes me	<i>d-urd'-ɔ-rgiʔŋ</i> <i>d-urd'-i-d'i:rgiʔŋ</i> <i>d-urd'ɔr-di-giʔŋ</i>	I washed him I washed her he washed me etc.
--	--	---	--

In comparison with the forms of the neutral paradigm, the first forms of the paradigms 2 and 3 can be considered as marked. Marking in the forms of the subject version occurs with the help of personal affixes *-d-* (first person singular), *-k-* (second person singular), *-a-* (third person singular) and so on.

The category of the neutral version (morpheme *-s'*) arose from the neutral predicative index *s'i*, the original meaning of which is “to be”. The primary function of *s'i* was to indicate the state of the agent and the predicativeness of the word form to which this affix is attached. With the design of the verb as part of speech, the morpheme *s'* acquires the character of a neutral version, the designation of a state or action, a process as such, without emphasizing the role of the agent or patient. Compare: *d'an 's' on' ijuks'a* 'the grass becomes green' (Polenova, 2012).

According to G.T. Polenova possessive affixes in Yenisei languages with the development of the grammatical structure of the language began to denote belonging with names, and with verbs - the person of the subject performing the action and the object to which the action was directed. Those and other formants of pronominal origin.

Based on this fact, E.A. Kreinovich suggested that conjugation of verbs beginning with group B affixes (*b-a-i* series) had a genetically possessive character, that is, the action could belong to the subject as well as the thing (Kreinovich, 1968b). Example: *ba-y-a-b-da* 'I hear,' literally, 'my hearing'. Such examples can serve as confirmation of the connection between the version category and possessiveness.

Indicators of the first and second person: *b* and *k/g* go back to the genitive of the corresponding personal pronouns: *a-b* 'I', *uk* 'you'.

One can agree with the assumption of G.T. Polenova, that the initial function of element *b* was the expression of belonging to the human body, face (Polenova, 2011b). This assumption is confirmed by the fact that formant *b* is found in the Ket language in the forms of various pronouns, nouns and adjectives, for example: *ab* 'my'; *bu* 'he, she', *bin* 'himself'; *abbi* 'my', *butbi* 'her', *andabi* 'someone's' and so on.

In the course of further evolution, the class indicator of the activity of the subject *b* (Verner, 1974) acquired the meaning of the centripetal version of the active verb. It was opposed by the indicator *k*, as the exponent of the centrifugal version; *k* indicated the spread of action beyond the active actant. This explains the replacement of *b* by *k ~ y ~ x* in the imperative and in forms expressing causation (Dulzon, 1968).

For example: the verb *-bet* 'do' imperative - *il'get* 'do it!'. The form of the imperative demonstrates the absence of the speaker in the named action and the direction of the latter beyond the speaker, the alienation of this action, while the presence, participation, and interest of the subject are emphasized in the indicative.

Equipped with subjective indicators of group *B*, the same verb has the meaning of possession, compare: *s'ul'-ba-j-bat* 'Sledge-I-have' (with me) - *s'ul'-ku-j-bat* “You have sledge” (Kreinovich, 1968 a).

It follows from the above material that in the Yenisei languages the version category is a three-term structure, the members of which form two binary oppositions. Here are verb forms marked with the affixes *ba-a-i* and *bɔ-ɔ-i*. Compare: ket. *di-j-aq* 'I go there (one time)' - *d-ba-ts-aq* 'I go there (and come back)', *di-l'-aq* 'I went there (one time)' - *d-ba-t-l'-aq* 'I went there (and came back)'; *d-ba-t-ar-aq* 'he takes me outside' - *d-bɔ-ks-aq* 'he takes me (off)'. In verb forms like ket. *d-iks'ives* 'he comes' - *d-bɔ-ks'ives* 'he brings me here with him', *d-eg-saq* 'he listens'

- *d-εq-ba-t-saq* 'he overhears me', *t-tajge* 'he goes' - *t-bɔ-k-tajge* 'he leads me', and others. there is not only the opposition 'transitional'-'non-transitional', but also the opposition 'introvertive' - 'extravertive'. The neutral version appears as a correlation member, which is sometimes marked as 'non-extravertive', sometimes as 'non-invertive' (Krasnoshchekov, 2012).

In the verb forms of the Yenisei languages, in addition to the two main rows of actant affixes, additional affixal rows are often presented in both groups, which seem to duplicate the affixes of the main groups in their subjective function.

Such intransitive verbs of Yenisei languages with two rows of affixes of group *D* were considered as reflexive verbs, like verbs with two rows of subject affixes, since this type of conjugation includes verbs that constitute the majority and are absolutely not related to reflexivity and, therefore needing another explanation. Compare the following paradigm:

<i>t-ti-r-Rɔ</i>	I charge (gun)	<i>t-ti-l'-di-Ro</i>	I charged (gun)
<i>k-ti-ka-Rɔ</i>	you charge ...	<i>k-ti-l'-gu-Ro</i>	you charged ...
<i>t-ti-s-a-Rɔ</i>	he charges ...	<i>t-ti-l'-a-Ro</i>	he charged ...

When interpreting forms like *datisaRo* 'she charges (rifle)' it is impossible to proceed from reflexivity, since it is not expressed in them in any way.

The first step in the new understanding of the discussed Yenisei verb forms was made in the work of V.V. Ivanov (Ivanov, 1980), and, thus, it was actually indicated the versional nature of such forms of the verb. A similar point of view is presented in the works of V.G. Shabaev (Shabaev, 1984), where, along with the reflexive character of these verb forms, it is assumed that they have the meaning of 'action for oneself'. In the works of Werner G.K. (Werner 1994b) they are presented as forms of the subject version.

These verbs are different at first glance: *grow, fall, rise, sell, charge (gun)* and others, as well as *comb, dress, move, sit down, stop* and others with versioned paradigms, regardless of whether there are transitional or intransitive paradigms without version affixes, should, in our opinion, be combined into a single class, based on Yenisei language consciousness. Unites them, most likely a sign of action, closed on the subject (actor), with the value of commodity or purpose of action for the actor. This general meaning of versioned forms is wider than reflexivity; in such cases, it is simply combined with the specified total value of versioned forms. With this approach, it becomes clear why, for example, a verb such as 'charge (gun)' belongs to this class. Actually, literally, it means 'to charge (gun) for oneself (for oneself, in one's own interests, with a benefit or a disadvantage for oneself, etc.)' (Verner, 2011).

Such verbs with two rows of personal affixes are also marked in the Kott language (a group of Yenisei languages), only here there are no subject affixes for the third person. An example is the Kott verb *hi-pe:n* 'give':

<i>hi-pe:n-aŋ</i>	I give	<i>hi-li-pe:n-aŋ</i>	I gave
<i>hi-pe:n-u</i>	you give	<i>hi-li-pe:n-u</i>	you gave
<i>hi-a-pe:n-</i>	he gives	<i>hi-l-a-pe:n-</i>	he gave
<i>hi-om-pe:n-toŋ</i>	she gives	<i>hi-l-om-pe:n-toŋ</i>	she gave
<i>hi-om-pe:n-oŋ</i>	you give	<i>hi-l-om-pe:n-oŋ</i>	you gave
<i>hi-am-pe:n-</i>	they give	<i>hi-l-am-pe:n-</i>	they gave

This feature is also typical for the group of Ket and Yugh verbs, for example: ket.

<i>di'-rɔq</i>	I'm flying	<i>d-in-dɔq</i>	I flew away
<i>ku-rɔq</i>	you are flying away	<i>k-in-dɔq</i>	you flew away

<i>du-rɔq</i>	he flies away	<i>d-in-dɔq</i>	he flew away
<i>ds'-rɔq</i>	she flies away	<i>da-in-dɔq</i>	she flew away
<i>di-raŋ-dɔqŋ</i>	we fly away	<i>d-in-daŋ-dɔqŋ</i>	we flew away
<i>ku-ɣaŋ-dɔqŋ</i>	you fly away	<i>k-in'-gaŋ-dɔqŋ</i>	you flew away
<i>du-j-aŋ-dɔqŋ</i>	they fly away	<i>d-in'-aŋ-dɔqŋ</i>	they flew away

Verb word forms with affixes of the group **B** of the rows *ba-bu-bu* and *bɔ-bu-bu* are exactly the same as verbal forms with the affixes of the group **D**, were considered as reflexive forms.

Now consider the situation with the affixes of groups **B** and **D** in the Kott language. The basis of the differences between the rows *ba-a-i* and *bo-ɔ-u* of indicators of series **B** was also made up of versional phenomena. The features of these differences have been preserved in the Ket and Yugh languages so far, compare:

Yugh		Ket	
<i>ba-sa:r</i>	'I am spending the night'	<i>ba-tag</i>	'I will become (turn)'
<i>ba-ɣ-b-er</i>	'I-wear-it'	<i>bo-ɣävi:tn</i>	'I'll run out'
<i>bo-de</i>	'I am going, I will go'		
<i>bo-gojbej</i>	'I-flew away'		

In the Kott language, these differences were not preserved; the diversity of the series of subject-object indicators was not preserved in it. Among the indicators of series **B**, only one series is actually represented, which is fully represented in the object function. In the subjective function it is represented in the first and second persons of the singular and plural. But the Kott language reveals the following peculiarity: in all cases, the Kott verb word forms are formed by the indicators of the **B** series, both in the subject and in the object series. Only in some cases, the subject suffixes of the **B** series are duplicated by other subject prefixes or infixes of the **D** series:

<i>i-t<sup>h</sup>ak-ŋ</i>	'I jump-I'
<i>i-t<sup>h</sup>ak-u</i>	'You-jump-you'
<i>d'a:-tax-</i>	'He-jumps-he'
<i>on-t<sup>h</sup>agan-toŋ</i>	'We-jump-we'
<i>on-t<sup>h</sup>agan-oŋ &lt; oŋ-t<sup>h</sup>agan-oŋ</i>	'You-jump-you'
<i>d'a:n-t<sup>h</sup>ax- &lt; d'a : ŋ-t<sup>h</sup>ax-</i>	'they-jump-they' ... etc.

(Verner, 1990)

An innovative actant model with a number of prefixes **D** in the function of subject indicators extends further and concerns already verb forms with affixes **B**. This results in a particularly productive model with object affixes **B**, which also evolved from object version affixes in verb forms with a benefactive meaning 'for another' in the performance of the object.

With the advent of indicators of group **D** in the preposition, in the role of subject formants, a subjective version arises inside the verb, expressed by the morpheme 'd', comp.: *didoq* 'flying, fly', past tense *dil'doq* 'I flew', imperative *indoq!* 'fly! ', the verb 'to drink' with the subject version looks like this: ket. *da: -bdup* 'drink, drink'. Thus, this version (subjective) developed in the late active period. The proof is that in the form of an imperative the element *d* is preserved in contrast to the centripetal version *b*. Introduced into the structure of the verb, the subject version *d* began to accompany the personal indicators of group **B**, comp.: yugh. *boade* 'I go', *baxyb-der* 'I wear (clothes)' – examples of G.K. Werner.

#### 4. Results

The category of the version reveals a close connection with the category of inalienable affiliation, which is expressed by a possessive pronoun.

The universal version category does not always find an explicit grammatical expression in the verbal structure. In this regard, interesting data Kartvelian languages, where the verb is changed by persons. Personal indicators are usually prefixes, besides there are personal prefixes not only of the subject (first person \*w-, second person \*h-), but also the object of the action (first person \*m-, second person \*g-, third person \*h-).

"Version indicators" – vocal and sonantic elements are closely related to the verb polypersonalism. They point to different spatial and possessive relations between subject and object, and also serve to express some other categories.

It was the transfer of a similar semantic category of the version that was originally oriented to the Indo-European structure of the medium, which arose on the basis of verb paradigms with centrifugal semantics. In the ancient Indo-European language there was an opposition of two voices: active and medium (Savchenko, 1960). The Indo-European structure of the medium originated on the basis of verb paradigms with centrifugal semantics and was initially oriented towards the transfer of the semantic category of the version.

In the active voice, verbs mean a process that emanates from the subject and develops outside. In the medial voice, the verb indicates a process that develops in the subject itself.

The “medial” endings give the verb form the meaning of the subject version, the “non-medial” (active) endings characterize the non-subject version of the verb.

In the system of the Ket verb in the presence of several rows of indicators (except for the two main rows of actant affixes, conventionally indicated in the work of C. Bouda (Bouda, 1957), in terms of the first and third person, there are several more affixes of the group **B** and group **D**) the indicators of some rows (*b-*) indicated the action closed on the active actant or occurring at the place of his stay (centripetal version), and the indicators of the other rows (*bo-*) carried information about the action directed beyond the active actant or from its place of stay (centrifugal version).

ket	introversion version	extraversion version
<i>ba-γissal</i>	I will spend the night	<i>bɔ-γävitn</i> I run out
<i>ku-γissal</i>	you will spend the night	<i>ku-γävitn</i> you run out
<i>a-γissal</i>	he will spend the night	<i>ɔ-γävitn</i> he runs out
<i>-kissal</i>	it will spend the night	<i>u-γävitn</i> she runs out

As can be seen from the examples, the inanimate class has no personal prefixes, which confirms the direction of action (oriented) on the active (animated) participant in the situation. A number of affixes *bɔ-a-u* inanimate class can be distinguished by the affix *-u-* (female class).

In connection with the emergence of the subject-objective intention, the forms of the object version are gradually reinterpreted into transitive verb forms, on the basis of which the beneficial (nominating) case arose later in the Ket language.

The dichotomy 'introvertive'-'extravertive' is observed in verbs denoting the transition from one state to another; It is highly probable that at first the verbs of this semantic group with a number of *bɔ-ɔ-u* affixes were associated with a certain movement, as for example, this occurred in the following Ket verbs *s'atij bɔ-γotn* "I'm ashamed" (literally 'I am ashamed / I do shame '), *at at-ba-tn <at at bɔ-γotn* 'I am sick' / 'I am ill' (<'I make a disease'). (Werner, 1994a).

In productive forms, this version category sometimes overlaps with the view category; compare the following Ket forms with the name *bɔgdom* 'gun': *bɔgdom-ku-javet* - 'you have a gun'; *bɔgdom-a-javet* - 'he has a gun'; *bɔgdom-i-javet* - 'She has a gun'.

In this case, a construction arises that replaces modern verbs of possession (the version is transformed into a possessive structure): *bɔgdom-ba-javet* - 'I have a gun (I am armed with a gun)'; *bɔgdom-bɔ-gdaRan* - 'I will have a gun (I will be armed with a gun)'.

Verbal indicators of group *B* reveal material unity with possessive prefixes of the name and forms of the genitive case of personal pronouns.

Table 3

**Genitive indices of personal pronouns, possessive prefixes of names  
and verb indicators of group B in the singular**

Person	Genitive of personal pronouns	Possessive prefixes	Indicators of a verb of group B			
			first row	second row	third row	fourth row
1-е	<i>aba</i>	<i>b-</i>	<i>ba-</i>	<i>ba-</i>	<i>bo-</i>	<i>bo-</i>
2-е	<i>uku</i>	<i>k-</i>	<i>ku-</i>	<i>ku-</i>	<i>ku-</i>	<i>ku-</i>
3-е м.	<i>bu-d-a</i>	<i>da-</i>	<i>a-</i>	<i>bu-</i>	<i>bu-</i>	<i>o-</i>
ж.	<i>bu-d-i</i>	<i>d(t)-</i>	<i>-i-</i>	<i>bu-</i>	<i>bu-</i>	<i>u-</i>
вещ.	-	<i>d(t)-</i>	<i>i/o)</i>	<i>o-</i>	<i>o-</i>	<i>u-</i>

Example, ket.

*b-op* 'my father'    *b-i:t* 'I smell'

*k-op* 'your father'    *k-u:t* 'you smell'

*b-da* 'him' (genus. case of the personal pronoun of the 3-rd person singular)

*bu-di* 'her'

*da-op* 'his father'    *da-i:t* 'he smells'

*op-da* 'father' (genus. case of the noun) *am-di* 'mother'

*di-op* 'her father'    *d-i:t* 'she smells'

In the same way as in Ket and Yugh, in the Kott language appears in the third person singular numbers affix *a*, animated class, but unlike modern Yenisei languages in Kott the second row of personal affixes is represented only in plural number, compare: *di'-rɔq* 'I fly away', *ku-rɔq* 'you fly away'; *di-raŋ-dɔqŋ* 'we fly away', *ku-γaŋ-dɔqŋ* 'you fly away'.

The material of the Yenisei languages (Ket, Yugh, and Kott) allows to conclude that verbs with two rows of affixes of the group *D* express not reflexivity, but a subject version, recalling South and West Caucasian languages. It is noteworthy that, for example, in the Abkhaz language (the languages of the Caucasus) as well as in the Yenisei languages, the subject version is expressed by the repetition of personal affixes in the verbal form, for example:

Abkhazian *i-s-xa-s-cojt* 'I put it on my head'.

The difference between the rows of affixes *ba-bu-bu* and *bɔ-bu-bu* of group *B* is that they point to the opposition 'introvertive'-'extravertive', which they additionally express, but otherwise they are identical. It should be emphasized that both series are found in both transitional and intransitive verb word forms.

non-transitional forms  
*d-aya-va-tsaq* I run to the forest (times)  
 (and come back)  
*d-aya-bu-tsaq* he runs into the forest  
 (times) (and comes back)  
*da-aya-bu-tsaq* she runs into the forest  
 (times) (and comes back)

transitional forms  
*d-aya-bu-g-d-it* he leads me to the forest  
*d-aya-bu-g-b-it* he brings it to the forest  
*d-aya-bo-g-b-it* I bring it to the forest, etc.

## 5. Conclusion

After analyzing the material, we came to the conclusion that the category of the version is closely related to the category of possessiveness:

- In the effective forms, the category of a version of a number of verbs, intersecting with the category of a species, is transformed into a possessive structure, replacing modern verbs of possession.
- Verbal indicators of group B, which also evolved from the affixes of the object version in verb forms with beneficial meaning, reveal a material unity with the possessive prefixes of the name and the forms of parental case of personal pronouns.
- The use of affixes with the development of the grammatical structure of the language began to denote affiliation with names, and with verbs - the face of the subject performing the action and the object to which this action is directed.
- The conjugation of verbs beginning with the affixes of group B (series b-a-i) was genetically possessive, that is, the action could belong to the subject as well as the thing. Wherein:
- The possessive forms of a number of verbs can be replaced by the usual forms of the subject version.

Thus, we conclude that the affixes of the ba-a-i or ba-bu-bu series directly go back to the possessiveness / affiliation of the action, and the affixes of the **D** group, accompanying the personal affixes of the **B** group, indirectly confirmed the connection between the category of the version and possessiveness.

## References

- Bouda, K. (1957) Die Sprache der Jenissejer. Genealogische und morphologische Untersuchungen [The language of the Yeniseians. Genealogical and morphological studies] // In *Anthropos. Internationale Zeitschrift für Volker- und Sprachkunde*. Band 52, Paulusdruckerei in der Schweiz.
- Gamkrelidze, T.V., Ivanov V.Vs. (1984) *Indo-European language and Indo-Europeans*, Tbilisi, p. 334.
- Dul'zon, A.P. (1068) *Ket language*. Tomsk, p. 145.
- Ivanov, V.Vs. (1980) *Pre-Languages as an Object of Description in the Languages of the World*. Nauka, Moscow, p. 205.
- Klimov, G.A. (1977) *Typology of the active system/type languages*. Moscow, Nauka, p. 140.
- Krasnoshchekov, E.V. (2012) *Relation of possessiveness and version categories in the yenisei languages*. // pp. 16-18.
- Krasnoshchekov, E.V. (2016) *Category version and possessiveness in languages of different systems*. // In *Nauka. Novocherkassk*, p. 290
- Krejnovich, E.A. (1968) *Verb of the Ket language*, Leningrad, pp. a81-82, b114-116,
- Machavariani, G.I. (1966) *To the typological characteristic of all-Kartvelian basic language*. // In *Voprosy yazykoznaniya*, 1, pp. 6-7.
- Polenova, G.T. (2011) *Category version – evidence of past state of the language*. Taganrog: pp. 39a, 52b.
- Polenova, G.T. (2012) *In search of the origins of the language*. Taganrog: p. 53.
- Savchenko, A.N. (1960) *The origin of the middle voice in the Indo-European language*. – Rostov-na-Donu, p. 52.
- Shabaev, V.G. (1984) *Manifestation of ergativeness features in the use of personal indicators of the Ket verb*. // Leningrad, p. 238.
- Vaida, Edward J. (2004) *Ket. Lincom Europa /Edward J. Vaida*. Munchen, p. 5.
- Verner, G.K. (1974) *Relict signs of active system in the Ket language*. // 1, p. 38.
- Verner, G.K. (1984) *Typology of the elementary sentence in the Yenisei languages*. // pp. 60-61.
- Verner, G.K. (1990) *Kott language*. Rostov, p. 225.

Verner, G.K. (2011) "Himself" or "oneself" to the expression of versional relations in the Yenisei languages. // Taganrog, p. 69.

Werner, H. (1994) Zur Typologie der Jenissej-Sprachen. [On the typology of the Yenisei languages] = Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 45. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, p. a111.

Werner, H. (1994) Das Klassensystem in den Jenissej-Sprachen. [The class system in the Yenisei languages] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, Verlag, b, pp.120-123.

Werner, H. (1997) Die ketische Sprache. [The Ket language] = Tunguso Sibirica, Bd. 3. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, pp. b196-197.

Werner, H. (2004) Die Diathese in den Jenissej-Sprachen aus typologischer Sicht. [The diathesis in the Yenisei languages from a typological point of view] = Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 64. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, p. 91.