

Short Grammatical Description of Khanty

Ulla-Maija Forsberg

Phonology

There is a clear tendency in the Khanty dialects, in phonology as well as at the other levels of grammar, for the eastern dialects to show a remarkable complexity compared to the other dialect groups. The northern dialects show a great simplification and the southern dialects fall somewhere in between.

The consonant system in Proto-Khanty was, according to Honti (1984: 25), the following:

Labial	<i>p</i>			<i>m</i>			<i>w</i>
Dental	<i>t</i>	<i>s</i>		<i>n</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>ʌ</i>	
			<i>č</i>	<i>ɲ</i>	<i>ʎ</i>		<i>r</i>
Palatal			<i>ć</i>	<i>ń</i>	<i>ʎ'</i>		<i>j</i>
Velar	<i>k</i>			<i>ŋ</i>			<i>ɣ</i>

There was also a labial velar consonant (fricative) **ɣ°*, which occurred only in one position (function): as the personal marker of the first person plural, as well as in possessive suffixes and in the verbal personal endings.

The essential changes from Proto-Khanty to the Surgut, southern (Irtyš and northern (O = Obdorsk) dialects are the following:

1. In front of a velar vowel, word-initial *k* changed into *χ* in all the western dialects, i.e. in the southern (Irtyš) and the northern dialects. There is thus a difference between the Irtyš/O and Surgut dialects in the words that begin with *χ* in Irtyš/O and *k* in Surgut.
2. The Proto-Khanty lateral fricative *ʌ* was (and still is) preserved in the Surgut dialects whereas in the Irtyš dialects it merged with *t* and in O with *l*. The original palatalized lateral **l'* changed into a lateral palatalized fricative in Surgut and a palatalized *ʎ'* in the South. The Proto-Khanty *ʎ* lost its cacuminality in the most dialects, taking the place of the unmarked lateral in the consonant system.

3. The Proto-Khanty \check{c} was preserved in all positions in the Surgut dialects, while in the Irtyš dialect it changed into \check{s} in when it precedes a consonant. In other positions, it was preserved in the Irtyš dialect, too. The palatalized affricate \acute{c} changed into \acute{t} in both the eastern (including Surgut) and southern (Irtyš) dialects. In O, \check{c} is represented by s and \acute{c} by \acute{s} .
4. In the Surgut dialects, the labial vowels o and \bar{o} labialized the velar consonant following them, resulting in $*k > k^\circ$, $*\gamma > \gamma^\circ$, $*\eta > \eta^\circ$. In Proto-West-Khanty (predecessor of the southern [Irtyš] and northern dialects), the velar fricative $*\gamma$ between vowels changed into w after a labial front vowel, while in other positions both $*k$ and $*\gamma$ became a voiceless fricative χ . When n followed in the next syllable, $*\gamma$ changed into nasal η . In word-final positions in nouns, it disappeared.
5. The marker of the first person plural $*\gamma^\circ$ was preserved in some of the Surgut dialects, whereas in other dialects, including Irtyš, it changed into w .

The consonant phonemes in Surgut (Tremjugan, Trj) and Irtyš dialects are thus the following (Honti 1984: 26):

Trj	p			m			w
	t	s		n	l	Λ	
			\check{c}	η		r	
	\acute{t}			\acute{n}	l'	$\acute{\Lambda}$	j
	k			η			γ
	k°			η°			γ°
<hr/>							
Irtyš	p			m			w
	t	s		n	l		
		\check{s}	\check{c}	η		r	
	\acute{t}			\acute{n}			j
	k	χ		η			γ

The phonological system of the northernmost dialects (O) has undergone a remarkable simplification. In the consonant system, the only opposition left is the palatalization of the dental consonants. The cacuminal row has disappeared.

O	<i>p</i>		<i>m</i>		<i>w</i>
	<i>t</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>l</i>	
	<i>t'</i>	<i>ś</i>	<i>n'</i>	<i>l'</i>	<i>r</i>
	<i>k</i>	<i>χ</i>	<i>ŋ</i>		<i>j</i>

The vowel system in Proto-Khanty was the same as in the modern easternmost dialects (Vach and Vasjugan). It consists of 15 phonemes in the first syllable, 11 full vowels and four reduced or short vowels. The full vowels can also be considered to have a lax articulation, whereas the reduced ones have a firm articulation (Honti 1984: 19).

Full	<i>i</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>ü</i>
	<i>o</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>ö</i>	
	<i>a</i>	<i>ɔ</i>	<i>ä</i>	<i>ḡ</i>
Reduced	<i>ǎ</i>	<i>ǒ</i>	<i>ě</i>	<i>ǝ</i>

In Surgut, the number of reduced vowels has increased, while the number of full vowels has decreased. The number of vowel phonemes that occur in the first syllable is 13. In non-initial syllables, Trj has eight vowels and the rest of the Surgut dialects have four. This is because the original (Proto-Khanty) velar/palatal vowel harmony is preserved in the easternmost dialects and the Trj dialect of the Surgut group. The other Surgut dialects, as well as the Irtyš and the northern dialects, have lost it (Honti 1984: 20).

	1st syllable			2nd syllable		(other Surgut dialects)
Trj	<i>i</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>
		<i>o</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>
		<i>ǎ</i>	<i>ä</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>ä</i>	<i>ä</i>
		<i>ǒ</i>	<i>ě</i>	<i>ǎ</i>	<i>ǝ</i>	<i>ǝ</i>
		<i>ǎ</i>	<i>ǎ</i>			
			<i>ḡ</i>			

The southern dialects show a somewhat simplified picture. The number of vowel phonemes in initial syllables is 11 and in non-initial syllables, four (Honti 1984: 21):

	1st syllable			2nd syllable
DN	<i>u</i>	<i>ü</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>
	<i>o</i>		<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>
	<i>a</i>		<i>ä</i>	<i>ä</i>
	<i>ǒ</i>		<i>ě</i>	<i>ǝ</i>
	<i>ǎ</i>		<i>ǎ</i>	

In O, the vowel system is even simpler, consisting of only ten vowels in the initial and four vowels in non-initial syllables. It is, interestingly enough, practically the same as the vowel system of the northern Mansi dialect (despite the two having arrived at the present state through very different historical developments) (Honti 1984: 22):

	1st syllable		2nd syllable
O	<i>u</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>
	<i>o</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>
	<i>a</i>	<i>ä</i>	<i>a</i>
			<i>ə</i>
	<i>ǔ</i>	<i>ĩ</i>	
	<i>ǒ</i>	<i>ǎ</i>	

Morphology

Khanty has three numbers – singular, dual and plural – in the absolute nominal declension and in all personal categories (possessive suffixes of nouns and verbal personal endings). In the absolute nominal declension, the singular is unmarked, while the dual suffix goes back to Proto-Khanty **kVn* and the plural suffix *-t* derives from Proto-Uralic.

Dialect	Trj	Other Sur	DN/DT	O
SG	∅	∅	∅	∅
DU	<i>ɣən/ɣə̃n</i>	<i>ɣən</i>	<i>ɣən</i>	<i>ɲən</i>
PL	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>

In the possessive declension, the dual suffixes represent Proto-Khanty **kVl* and the plural marker goes back to Proto-Khanty **l*. The dual suffix is likely a combination of the original Uralic dual **k* (which appears e.g. in the absolute dual *-ɣ* in Mansi) and a plural **l* of obscure origin.

(DN/DT = Demjanka, Southern/Irtyš, Ko = Konda, Southern/Irtyš)

Dialect	Trj	Other Sur	DN/DT	Ko	O
SG	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅
DU	<i>ɣə̃ʌ/ɣə̃ʌ̃</i>	<i>ɣə̃ʌ</i>	<i>ɣət</i>	<i>ɲət</i>	<i>ɲil</i>
PL	<i>ʌ</i>	<i>ʌ</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>l</i>

E.g.

O	<i>ewem</i> 'my daughter (1)'	<i>ewenilam</i> 'my 2 daughters'	<i>ewilam</i> 'my daughters (PL)'
Ko	<i>ewem</i> 'my daughter (1)'	<i>ewen̄atam</i> 'my 2 daughters'	<i>ewitam</i> 'my daughters (PL)'
Trj	<i>wǎlim</i> 'my reindeer (1)'	<i>wǎliγǎläm</i> 'my 2 reindeer'	<i>wǎliǎläm</i> 'my reindeer (PL)'

Possessive Paradigms

Khanty makes use of possessive suffixes indicating the person of the possessor and the number of the possessed (singular, dual or plural). The full possessive paradigm (in the nominative) thus consists of 27 forms. Of these forms, the second and third dual and second plural (2DU 3DU 2PL) have merged into a single suffix. This is a feature common to all Khanty and Mansi dialects, even if the morphology of the suffixes varies. The possessive forms can further be inflected in the nominal cases.

(O = Northern, Ko = Konda, Southern/Irtyš, Trj = Eastern/Surgut)

O *ewi* 'girl, daughter' (Honti 1984: 140)

	SG possessed	DU possessed	PL possessed
1SG	<i>ewem</i>	<i>ewenilam</i>	<i>ewilam</i>
2SG	<i>ewen</i>	<i>ewinilan</i>	<i>ewilan</i>
3SG	<i>ewel</i>	<i>ewinilal</i>	<i>ewilal</i>
1DU	<i>ewem̄an</i>	<i>ewinilām̄an</i>	<i>ewilām̄an</i>
2DU	<i>ewan</i>	<i>ewinil̄an</i>	<i>ewil̄an</i>
3DU	<i>ewan</i>	<i>ewinil̄an</i>	<i>ewil̄an</i>
1PL	<i>ewew</i>	<i>ewinil̄aw</i>	<i>ewil̄aw</i>
2PL	<i>ewan</i>	<i>ewinil̄an</i>	<i>ewil̄an</i>
3PL	<i>ewel</i>	<i>ewinilal</i>	<i>ewilal</i>

Ko *ew̄a* 'girl, daughter' (Honti 1984: 132)

	SG possessed	DU possessed	PL possessed
1SG	<i>ewem</i>	<i>ewen̄atam</i>	<i>ewitam</i>
2SG	<i>ewen</i>	<i>ewen̄atan</i>	<i>ewitan</i>
3SG	<i>ewit</i>	<i>ewen̄atat</i>	<i>ewitat</i>
1DU	<i>ewem̄an</i>	<i>ewen̄atām̄an</i>	<i>ewitām̄an</i>
2DU	<i>ewet̄an</i>	<i>ewen̄at̄an</i>	<i>ewit̄an</i>
3DU	<i>ewet̄an</i>	<i>ewen̄at̄an</i>	<i>ewit̄an</i>
1PL	<i>ewew</i>	<i>ewen̄at̄aw</i>	<i>ewit̄aw</i>
2PL	<i>ewet̄an</i>	<i>ewen̄at̄an</i>	<i>ewit̄an</i>
3PL	<i>ewet</i>	<i>ewen̄atat</i>	<i>ewitat</i>

Trj *wǎli* ‘reindeer’ (Honti 1984: 130)

	SG possessed	DU possessed	PL possessed
1SG	<i>wǎlim</i>	<i>wǎliγǎläm</i>	<i>wǎliǎm</i>
2SG	<i>wǎle</i>	<i>wǎliγǎlä</i>	<i>wǎliǎ</i>
3SG	<i>wǎliǎ</i>	<i>wǎliγǎ</i>	<i>wǎliǎ</i>
1DU	<i>wǎlimən</i>	<i>wǎliγǎlämən</i>	<i>wǎliǎmən</i>
2DU	<i>wǎlin</i>	<i>wǎliγǎläən</i>	<i>wǎliǎən</i>
3DU	<i>wǎlin</i>	<i>wǎliγǎläən</i>	<i>wǎliǎən</i>
1PL	<i>wǎliγ°</i>	<i>wǎliγǎläγ°</i>	<i>wǎliǎäγ°</i>
2PL	<i>wǎlin</i>	<i>wǎliγǎläən</i>	<i>wǎliǎən</i>
3PL	<i>wǎliǎ</i>	<i>wǎliγǎläǎ</i>	<i>wǎliǎǎ</i>

The 1SG suffix **-m* goes back to Proto-Uralic and has cognates in all of the related languages. The same element of the first person is included in the 1DU suffix, which additionally has a marker *-n*. The whole suffix **-mVn* can be traced back to Proto-Uralic, as it has cognates in Mansi (N *āyimen* ‘the daughter of us two’), Saami (N *nieidaime* id.) and Samoyedic (Nenets *ngənomiyih* ‘the boat of us two’). The 1PL suffix originates from Proto-Ugric. Honti (1985, 1998) gives a reconstruction consisting of a round vowel and *-k* resulting in the Ob-Ugrian languages in *-k°* and further in something identical to the modern Surgut form *-əγ°*. In most of the Khanty dialects, as well as in Mansi, the suffix is represented by *-w* (*-əw*, *-uw*) in possessive suffixes (Mansi N *χāpəw* ‘our boat’) as well as in the verbal conjugation as a personal suffix (see pp. 24–25). In Hungarian, this Proto-Ugric personal suffix appears in its most original form, round vowel + *-k*, in the verbal conjugation, as the suffix of 1PL in the objective (definite) conjugation (e.g. *adjuk* ‘we give it’).

The form of the 2SG suffix *-n* has its origin in the verbal conjugation. In the conjugation, *-n* has a wider distribution, extending throughout an area where the Ob-Ugrian languages are the core and reaching to Komi in the west and Samoyedic in the east. In Ob-Ugrian, this 2SG *-n* has further occupied the second person pronouns, which did not occur in the neighbouring languages (Kulonen 2001a). The 2DU suffix goes back to **-tVn* (shown p. 15 in the southern [Ko] paradigm) and is parallel to the 1DU suffix **-mVn* (cf. Saami N *nieidade* ‘the daughter of you two’). The 2PL suffix originally had only the *-n* element, which refers only to person.

The three persons 2DU, 3DU and 2PL have merged in all of the dialects, but the merging has gone in different directions in different dialects. In Ko (southern), the suffix clearly has its origins in the 2DU suffix (as it is exactly the same as in Saami, for instance), while in O and Trj it is not possible to say which is the original function, 3DU or

2PL. As *-n* likely originates from verbal inflection and the second person *singular*, it is more likely that the *-n* (*in ~ an*) is the original 3DU suffix consisting of the dual marker of the possessive suffixes without a personal element, which would be a Proto-Khanty **-Λ-* (PU **s*). This, in turn, appears in the 3SG and 3PL suffixes with its regular sound correspondences (O *-l*, Ko *-t*, Trj *-Λ*).

Nominal Case System

The nominal case system in Proto-Finno-Ugrian was the following (Janhunen 1982, Korhonen 1991)

Nominative	∅	Locative	<i>*-nA</i>
Accusative	<i>*-m</i>	Ablative	<i>*-tA</i>
Genitive	<i>*-n</i>	Lative	<i>*-k, ?*-n, ?*-j</i>

In the first phase of Proto-Ugric, the locative and the ablative merged into a case, which Korhonen calls the prolocative (Korhonen 1991):

Nominative	∅	Prolocative	<i>*-nA, *-tA</i>
Accusative	<i>*-m</i>	Lative	<i>*-k, ?*-n</i>

In the next phase (Proto-Ugric II), a new ablative case emerged, probably from a local derivative element. The accusative case (**-t*) comes from the pronominal declension (still occurring in this function in Khanty, see p. 19–); modern Hungarian uses this suffix in the accusative in nominal declension. At this stage, three new local cases were also formed on the basis of a series of postpositions (root **-nV*):

Nominative	∅	Locative	<i>*-nA, *-tA</i>	Locative II	<i>*-nVt(A)</i>
Accusative	<i>*-m/*-t</i>	Ablative	<i>*-l(A)</i>	Ablative II	<i>*-nVl</i>
		Lative	<i>*-k</i>	Lative II	<i>*-nVk</i>

In Proto-Khanty (Honti 1984: 40), the old case suffixes were represented as follows:

Nominative	∅	
Lative (Dative)	<i>*-a/*-ä</i>	< PFU, PUgric II Lative <i>*-k</i>
Locative	<i>*-na/*-nä</i>	< PFU Locative, PUgric II Locative <i>*-nA</i>
Instructive-Final	<i>*-at/*-ät</i>	< PFU Ablative, PUgric II Locative <i>*-tA</i>
Instrumental-Comitative	<i>*-nat/*-nät</i>	< PUgric Locative II <i>*-nVt</i>
Translative	<i>*-ya/*-yä</i>	< PFU, PUgric II Lative <i>*-k</i>

Additionally, there was an abessive case (*-l̥aγ/*-l̥aγ) of unknown origin. The ablative was expressed, as in most of the modern Khanty dialects, with a postposition.

In the eastern dialects, the Proto-Khanty system was expanded with the approximative (*-pa/*-p̥ä (VVj) ~ *-nam/*-näm (Sur), distributive (*-t̥alt̥ä/*-t̥alta) and expletive (*-pti/*-pt̥i) cases, all of which are still preserved in the Surgut dialects. The ablative postposition was agglutinated into a suffix. In the southern (Irtyš) dialects, the function of the instrumental-comitative was taken over by the instructive-final and locative, while the functions of the translative were replaced by the lative. In addition, the abessive lost its productivity. The same happened to the abessive in the northern dialects: the locative took over the functions of both the instrumental-comitative and the instructive. The translative disappeared in all northern dialects except Obdorsk. All these steps have led to very different case systems depending on the dialect: the Surgut dialects have a diverse system of 11 cases and have thus approximately doubled the number of cases from the earlier phases and proto-languages, whereas the northern Khanty dialects today have the smallest number of nominal cases in the entire Uralic language family. The modern systems are the following (to show the dialectal variation in the case systems, the Kaz = Kazym dialect from the northern area as well as V = Vach dialect from the eastern area are also presented, Kr = Krasnojarsk, Southern/Irtyš):

O (Honti 1984: 139)			
Nominative	<i>ewi</i> ‘girl’	<i>eweŋən</i> ‘2 girls’	<i>ewet</i> ‘(PL) girls’
Lative-Dative-Loc.	<i>ewina</i>	<i>eweŋənnə</i>	<i>ewetna</i>
Translative	<i>ewəji</i>	(? <i>eweŋənni</i>	? <i>ewetti</i>)

Kaz (Honti 1984: 136)			
Nominative	<i>ewi</i> ‘girl’	<i>eweŋən</i> ‘2 girls’	<i>ewet</i> ‘(PL) girls’
Lative-Dative	<i>ewiŋa</i>	<i>eweŋəna</i>	<i>eweta</i>
Locative	<i>ewiŋən</i>	<i>eweŋənən</i>	<i>ewetən</i>

Kr (Honti 1984: 133)			
Nominative	<i>ewə</i> ‘girl’	<i>eweŋən</i> ‘2 girls’	<i>ewit</i> ‘(PL) girls’
Lative-Dative	<i>ewəja</i>	<i>eweŋəna</i>	<i>ewita</i>
Locative	<i>ewənə</i>	<i>eweŋənnə</i>	<i>ewitna</i>
Ablative	<i>ewiwə(t)</i>	<i>eweŋəniwə(t)</i>	<i>ewitiwə</i>
Instrum.-Comitative	<i>ewəjat</i>	<i>eweŋənət</i>	<i>ewitat</i>
Abessive	<i>ewəta</i>	?	?

Trj (Honti 1984: 129)

Nominative	<i>imi</i> ‘woman’	<i>imiyən</i> ‘2 women’	<i>imit</i> ‘(PL) women’
Lative-Dative	<i>iməjä</i>	<i>imiyənä</i>	<i>imitä</i>
Locative	<i>iminə</i>	<i>imiyənnə</i>	<i>imitnə</i>
Ablative	<i>iməji</i>	<i>imiyəni</i>	<i>imiti</i>
Approximative	<i>iminäm</i>	<i>imiyənnäm</i>	<i>imitnäm</i>
Instructive-Final	<i>iməjät</i>	<i>imiyənät</i>	<i>imität</i>
Instrum.-Comitative	<i>iminät</i>	<i>imiyənnät</i>	<i>imitnät</i>
Translative	<i>imiyə</i>	<i>imiyənyə</i>	<i>imityə</i>
Abessive	<i>imiyəλ</i>		
Expletive	<i>imipti</i>		? <i>imitəpti</i>

V (Honti 1984: 123)

Nominative	<i>köt</i> ‘hand’	<i>kötkən</i> ‘2 hands’	<i>kötət</i> ‘(PL) hands’
Lative-Dative	<i>kötä</i>	<i>kötkənä</i>	<i>kötətä</i>
Locative	<i>kötnə</i>	<i>kötkənə</i>	<i>kötətnə</i>
Ablative	<i>kötöy</i>	<i>kötkənöy</i>	<i>kötətöy</i>
Approximative	<i>kötpä, kötäpä</i>	<i>(kötkən(ä)pä)</i>	<i>(kötət(ä)pä)</i>
Instructive-Final	<i>kötə</i>	<i>kötkənə</i>	<i>kötətə</i>
Instrum.-Comitative	<i>kötnä(t)</i>	<i>kötkənnä(t)</i>	<i>kötətnät</i>
Translative	<i>kötəy</i>	<i>(kötkənəy)</i>	<i>(kötətəy)</i>
Abessive	<i>kötləy</i>	<i>kötkənləy</i>	<i>kötətləy</i>
Distributive	<i>kötəltä</i>	?	?
Comparative	<i>kötniŋi(t)</i>	<i>kötkənniŋi(t)</i>	<i>kötətniŋi(t)</i>

Pronominal Case System

The personal pronouns have three basic cases: nominative, accusative and dative. The nominative is represented by the personal pronoun stem, the accusative has the ending *-t* and the dative is formed with the possessive suffix added to the stem. This seems to have been the pronominal case system of Proto-Khanty. Many of the related Finno-Ugric languages show a similar use of pronoun stem + possessive suffix (or relics of the system) either as accusative (Mansi, Hungarian) or dative (Erzya, Mari, Komi, Udmurt), so it is probably an old feature and might be the first actual inflected form of personal pronouns in the development of PFU (Kulonen 2001b). An accusative case with the ending *-t* is also found in Hungarian (nominal inflection) and Finnish

(personal pronouns), but the historical relationship of these accusative suffixes is not quite clear, essentially because of the two different strategies in personal pronoun declension in the Uralic languages, the other being a series of uninflected pronouns with a round vowel (Singular **mun* **tun* **sun*). Khanty, as well as Mansi, Hungarian, Mari and the Permic and Baltic-Finnic languages represent the first type: a stem with illabial vowel (singular **mi*, **ti*, ? **si*) and declension with possessive suffixes. The three cases in O (northern), DN (southern) and Trj (eastern, Surgut) are the following (Honti 1984: 143, 148, 150):

Nominative

	O	DN	Trj
1SG	<i>mä</i>	<i>mä(n)</i>	<i>mä</i>
2SG	<i>nǎŋ, nǐŋ</i>	<i>nǒŋ</i>	<i>nǒŋ</i>
3SG	<i>luw</i>	<i>těw</i>	<i>Λěŷ°</i>
1DU	<i>min</i>	<i>min</i>	<i>min</i>
2DU	<i>nin</i>	<i>nin</i>	<i>nin</i>
3DU	<i>lin</i>	<i>tin</i>	<i>Λin</i>
1PL	<i>muŋ</i>	<i>mǒŋ</i>	<i>měŋ</i>
2PL	<i>nǎŋ</i>	<i>nǐŋ</i>	<i>nǐŋ</i>
3PL	<i>luw(ət)</i>	<i>těŷ</i>	<i>Λěŷ</i>

Accusative

The accusative in the northernmost dialects (incl. O) has merged with the dative. Accusative on its own is present only in the Kazym dialect of the northern group (and therefore presented here). This basic accusative has the ending *-t* (*-at*, *-ät*, *-tǐ*):

	Kaz	DN	Trj
1SG	<i>mantǐ, manət(tǐ)</i>	<i>mǎnt</i>	<i>mǎnt</i>
2SG	<i>naŋət(tǐ)</i>	<i>nǒŋat</i>	<i>nǒŋət</i>
3SG	<i>Λǎwət(tǐ)</i>	<i>těwat</i>	<i>Λěŷ°ät</i>
1DU	<i>mǐnət(tǐ)</i>	<i>minat</i>	<i>minät</i>
2DU	<i>nǐnət(tǐ)</i>	<i>ninat</i>	<i>ninät</i>
3DU	<i>Λǐnət(tǐ)</i>	<i>tinat</i>	<i>Λinät</i>
1PL	<i>mǔŋət(tǐ)</i>	<i>mǒŋat</i>	<i>měŋät</i>
2PL	<i>naŋət, nǐnət(tǐ)</i>	<i>nǐŋat</i>	<i>nǐŋät</i>
3PL	<i>Λǐwət(tǐ)</i>	<i>těŷat</i>	<i>Λěŷät</i>

Dative

The basic form of the dative is stem + possessive suffix. It appears in its most original form in DN (southern dialects) and some of the northern dialects (Nizjam and Šerkaly). In Kazym, the possessive suffix can take the further lative suffix (-*a*). In Surgut, the *t*-element can show influence from the accusative, while in the easternmost dialects, the dative is formed, analogically to the nominal declension, with the stem + nominal lative ending.

	O (Acc.-Dat.)	Kaz	DN	Trj
1SG	<i>mānem</i>	<i>mānem(a)</i>	<i>mēnem</i>	<i>māntem</i>
2SG	<i>nāñen, nēñən</i>	<i>nāñen(a)</i>	<i>nōñen</i>	<i>nōñäti</i>
3SG	<i>luwel</i>	<i>ΛūweΛ(a)</i>	<i>tēwet</i>	<i>Λēγ^oäti</i>
1DU	<i>minemən</i>	<i>mīnemən</i> <i>mīnemna</i>	<i>minemən</i>	<i>minäti</i>
2DU	<i>ninan</i>	<i>nīnan(a)</i>	<i>ninesən</i>	<i>ninäti</i>
3DU	<i>linan</i>	<i>Λīnan(a)</i>	<i>tinesən</i>	<i>Λinäti</i>
1PL	<i>muñew, muñiləw</i>	<i>mūñew(a)</i>	<i>mōñew</i>	<i>mēñäti</i>
2PL	<i>nāñilən, nēñilən</i>	<i>nāñan(a)</i> <i>nīnan(a)</i>	<i>nēñesən</i>	<i>nēñäti</i>
3PL	<i>luwilal</i>	<i>ΛīweΛa</i>	<i>tēyet</i>	<i>Λēγäti</i>

Secondary Cases

There are a variable number of secondary cases of pronouns in different dialects. Of these, the locative is the most widespread. A locative form of the 1SG pronoun is also attested in O (Honti 1984: 150):

	O	Locative DN	Trj
1SG	<i>mānemna</i>	<i>mānə</i>	<i>mānə</i>
2SG		<i>nōñnə</i>	<i>nōñnə</i>
3SG		<i>tēwnə</i>	<i>Λēγ^onə</i>
1DU		<i>minnə</i>	<i>minnə</i>
2DU		<i>ninnə</i>	<i>ninnə</i>
3DU		<i>tinnə</i>	<i>Λinnə</i>
1PL		<i>mōñnə</i>	<i>mēñnə</i>
2PL		<i>nēñnə</i>	<i>nēñnə</i>
3PL		<i>tēynə</i>	<i>Λēγnə</i>

The eastern dialects, including Trj in the Surgut group, have a complete nominal case paradigm for the pronouns as well (Honti 1984: 143):

	Ablative	Approxim.	Comitative	Instrumental	Translative
1SG	<i>mäniŋtem</i>	<i>mäntemnäm</i>	<i>mäntemnät</i>	<i>mäntemät</i>	<i>mäntemyə</i>
2SG	<i>nöŋniŋte</i>	<i>nöŋätinäm</i>	<i>nöŋätinät</i>	<i>nöŋätəjät</i>	
3SG	<i>Λěŋ°niŋtiΛ</i>	<i>Λěŋ°ätinäm</i>	<i>Λěŋ°ätinät</i>	<i>Λěŋ°ätəjät</i>	
1DU	<i>minniŋtimən</i>	<i>minätinäm</i>	<i>minätinät</i>	<i>minätəjät</i>	<i>minätiyə</i>
2DU	<i>ninniŋtin</i>	<i>ninätinäm</i>	<i>ninätinät</i>	<i>ninätəjät</i>	<i>ninätiyə</i>
3DU	<i>Λinniŋtin</i>	<i>Λinätinäm</i>	<i>Λinätinät</i>	<i>Λinätəjät</i>	<i>Λinätiyə</i>
1PL	<i>měŋniŋtiy°</i>	<i>měŋätinäm</i>	<i>měŋätinät</i>	<i>měŋätəjät</i>	<i>měŋätiyə</i>
2PL	<i>něŋniŋtin</i>	<i>něŋätinäm</i>	<i>něŋätinät</i>	<i>něŋätəjät</i>	<i>něŋätiyə</i>
3PL	<i>ΛěŋniŋtiΛ</i>	<i>Λěŋätinäm</i>	<i>Λěŋätinät</i>	<i>Λěŋätəjät</i>	<i>Λěŋätiyəö</i>

Verbal Inflection

The structure of inflected verbal forms is stem + (tense +) (genus/object +) person, e.g.:

Ko	
<i>păn-əm</i>	‘I (did) put (smth)’ [<i>păn-</i> + 1SG]
<i>păn-t-əm</i>	‘I (do) put (smth)’ [<i>păn-</i> + PRS + 1SG]
<i>păn-aj-ən</i>	‘you were being put’ [<i>păn-</i> + PASS + 2SG]
<i>păn-t-aj-ən</i>	‘you are being put’ [<i>păn-</i> + PRS + 2SG]
<i>păn-t-em</i>	‘I (do) put it’ [<i>păn-</i> + PRS + SG<1SG]
<i>păn-t-eŋət-am</i>	‘I (do) put them two’ [<i>păn-</i> + PRS + DU + 1SG (or <i>păn-</i> + PRS + DU<1SG)]
Trj	
<i>tu-Λ-əm</i>	‘I bring (smth)’ [<i>tu-</i> + PRS + 1SG],
<i>tu-s-əm</i>	‘I brought (smth)’ [<i>tu-</i> + IMPF + 1SG],
<i>tu-Λ-oj-əm</i>	‘I am brought’ [<i>tu-</i> + PRS + PASS + 1SG],
<i>tu-Λ-əyəl-am</i>	‘I bring them two’ [<i>tu-</i> + PRS + DU + 1SG (or: <i>tu-</i> + PRS + DU<1SG)],
<i>tu-s-Λ-a</i>	‘you brought them’ [<i>tu-</i> + IMPF + PL + 2SG (<i>tu-</i> + IMPF + PL<2SG)]

Tempus

The only tense common to all Khanty dialects is the present tense marked with the (Proto-Khanty) suffix **l*, the origin of which is unknown. Most of the dialects have a system of two tenses, the other one being either the unmarked perfect (as in the southern dialects) or the imperfect with the marker *-s-*. This imperfect marker also appears in Mansi and has cognates in Nenets and Mari. Originally, it was probably a present/past participle suffix, as can be seen in some Mansi dialects (Kulonen 2007: 184–188). Of the Surgut dialects, Trj has both perfect (unmarked) and imperfect (*-s-*). The easternmost dialects (Vach and Vasjugan) make use of two additional narrative past tenses.

Dialect	PKh	VVj	Sur	Sal	Irt	Ni	Sher	Kaz	Ber	O
Present	<i>*l</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>Λ</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Λ</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>l</i>
Perfect	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	–	–	–	–
Imperfect	<i>*s</i>	<i>s</i>	(<i>s</i>)	(<i>s</i>)	–	–	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i>
Hist.perf.	–	<i>yäl</i>	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hist.imperf.	–	<i>yäs</i>	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Genus

The passive voice marker in Proto-Khanty was **-Vj-*, where the quality of the vowel cannot be reconstructed on the basis of a large variation in the modern dialects. In absolute final position, i.e. in the 3SG where no personal suffix is attached, the passive form ends with a vowel (except in South). In Trj, it disappears in some other forms, too. The eastern dialects show a labial vowel (*-u*, *-uj-* in VVj, *-o*, *-oj-* in Surgut) and most of the northern dialects have *-a*, *-aj-*, as well as Irtyš, where also the 3SG forms (absolute final) include *-j*. Some (middle) dialects show a reduced vowel *-ə*, *-əj-*, (Kazym) *-ĩ*, *-ĩj-*. As stated on p. 22, the passive marker is placed between the tense suffix and the personal ending, unlike e.g. Mansi, which has a syntactically identical passive voice with an (etymologically) different suffix, which was originally a derivative element and is placed in front of the tense suffix.

In the passive forms, the basic personal endings of the verb are also visible. As an introduction to the personal forms, the past passive paradigms from O *mă-* ‘to give’ (‘I was given, you were given’, etc.), Ko *păn-* ‘to put, to place’ (‘I was placed’, etc.) and Trj *Λăpət-* ~ *Λipt-* ‘to feed’ (‘I was fed’, etc.) are provided (Honti 1984: 113, 115, 122):

	O ‘to give’	Ko ‘to place’	Trj ‘to feed’
1SG	<i>măšajəm</i>	<i>pänajəm</i>	<i>Λäpətsojəm</i>
2SG	<i>măšajən</i>	<i>pänajən</i>	<i>Λäpətsə</i>
3SG	<i>măša</i>	<i>pänaj</i>	<i>Λäpətsi</i>
1DU	<i>măšajmən</i>	<i>pänajmən</i>	<i>Λäpətsojmən</i>
2DU	<i>măšajtən</i>	<i>pänajtən</i>	<i>Λäpətsotən</i>
3DU	<i>măšajən</i>	<i>pänajən</i>	<i>Λäpətsiən</i>
1PL	<i>măšajəw</i>	<i>pänajəw</i>	<i>Λäpətsojəw°</i>
2PL	<i>măšajti</i>	<i>pänajtə</i>	<i>Λäpətsotəy</i>
3PL	<i>măšajət</i>	<i>pänajət</i>	<i>Λäpətsät</i>

Personal Endings

There are two sets of verbal personal endings in Khanty, one of which is used in passive (provided above) and the subjective conjugation (sentences without object or with a focalized object), and the other in the objective conjugation (with a topicalized object often lacking in the overt sentence [as a zero anaphora]). The personal suffix follows the tense suffix except in the unmarked perfect, where it follows the stem.

The verbal endings of the subjective conjugation show the basic and original personal elements. In Proto-Khanty, they were the following:

1SG	2SG	3SG	1DU	2DU	3DU	1PL	2PL	3PL
<i>-m</i>	<i>-n</i>	∅	<i>-mən</i>	<i>-tən</i>	<i>-yən</i>	<i>-y°</i>	<i>-təy</i>	<i>-t</i>

The third person singular has no ending, while the third persons dual and plural represent the absolute dual and plural suffix, respectively. The second person dual shows the areal innovation of *-n* instead of the PU suffix *-t* for the second person (see p. 16), but the old element *-t-* is present in the second persons of dual and plural. In addition to the passive paradigm presented above, the following paradigms of the subjective conjugation illustrate the mechanism. Examples are given from both the present and the perfect tense (Synja [Syn] here representing the northernmost dialects and imperfect instead of perfect). It can be noted that the 3SG form ends in a tense suffix, but when there is no such suffix (as in the southern perfect), a special personal ending *-ot* is added. It is of relatively late origin, and interesting in the sense that it is the only occurrence of a round vowel in non-first syllables in the southern dialects. A similar occurrence is the passive suffix *-oj-* in Surgut.

Present tense (Honti 1984: 111, 114, 121)

	Syn <i>põn</i> - ‘to place’	Ko <i>pän</i> - ‘to place’	Trj <i>äpät</i> - ‘to feed’
1SG	<i>põnləm</i>	<i>päntəm</i>	<i>äpätləm</i>
2SG	<i>põnlən</i>	<i>päntən</i>	<i>äpätlən</i>
3SG	<i>põnəl</i>	<i>pänt</i>	<i>äpätəl</i>
1DU	<i>põnləmən</i>	<i>päntəmən</i>	<i>äpätləmən</i>
2DU	<i>põnlətən</i>	<i>päntətən</i>	<i>äpätlətən</i>
3DU	<i>põnləŋən (-tən)</i>	<i>päntəŋən</i>	<i>äpätləyən</i>
1PL	<i>põnləw</i>	<i>pänttəw</i>	<i>äpätləy°</i>
2PL	<i>põnləti</i>	<i>päntətə</i>	<i>äpätlətəy</i>
3PL	<i>põnlət</i>	<i>päntət</i>	<i>äpätlət</i>

Perfect (Honti 1984: 112, 115, 121)

	Syn <i>põn</i> - ‘to place’	Ko <i>pän</i> - ‘to place’	Trj <i>äpät</i> - ‘to feed’
1SG	<i>pötsəm</i>	<i>pänəm</i>	<i>äiptəm</i>
2SG	<i>pötsən</i>	<i>pänən</i>	<i>äiptən</i>
3SG	<i>pönəs</i>	<i>pänot</i>	<i>äipət</i>
1DU	<i>pötsəmən</i>	<i>pänmən</i>	<i>äipətmən</i>
2DU	<i>pötsətən</i>	<i>päntən</i>	<i>äiptətən</i>
3DU	<i>pötsəŋən</i>	<i>pänŋən</i>	<i>äipetyən</i>
1PL	<i>pötsəw</i>	<i>pänəw</i>	<i>äiptəy°</i>
2PL	<i>pötsəti</i>	<i>päntə</i>	<i>äipətəy</i>
3PL	<i>pötsət</i>	<i>pänət</i>	<i>äiptət</i>

It can further be noted that as the subjective conjugation endings represent the original verbal inflection, there is also no syncretism between the 2DU 3DU and 2PL forms, as in the case of possessive suffixes. The only exception is Synja, where there is a parallel suffix 3DU *-tən* adopted from 2DU.

The objective conjugation suffixes are adapted from the possessive suffix paradigm. In addition, the elements (endings) referring to two (dual) or more (plural) objects are the same as those denoting to DU or PL possessed in the possessive paradigm. The only exception to this is the SG<3SG suffix in the easternmost dialects, which use *-tə* instead of the expected *-l*. The objective conjugation is essentially used when there is a topicalized non-overt object in the sentence (zero anaphora, or rather the object represented by the objective conjugation suffix in the verb), but it can be used with an overt object as well. The idea of topicality instead of the former analysis based on the definiteness of the object comes from Mansi and the analysis made by Virtanen (2015).

Sample paradigms from the following dialects illustrate the similarity between the objective conjugation and possessive suffixes (Honti 1984: 111–122):

O <i>mă</i> - ‘to give’ (present)			
	SG object	DU object	PL object
1SG	<i>mălem</i>	<i>mălŋilam</i>	<i>măllam</i>
2SG	<i>mălen</i>	<i>mălŋilan</i>	<i>măllan</i>
3SG	<i>mălli</i>	<i>mălŋili</i>	<i>mălli</i>
1DU	<i>mălemən</i>	<i>mălŋilmən</i>	<i>mălləmən</i>
2DU	<i>măllən</i>	<i>mălŋilən</i>	<i>măllən</i>
3DU	<i>măllən</i>	<i>mălŋilən</i>	<i>măllən</i>
1PL	<i>mălew</i>	<i>mălŋiləw</i>	<i>mălləw</i>
2PL	<i>măllən</i>	<i>mălŋilən</i>	<i>măllən</i>
3PL	<i>mălət</i>	<i>mălŋilal</i>	<i>măllal</i>

O <i>mă</i> - ‘to give’ (preterite/imperfect)			
	SG object	DU object	PL object
1SG	<i>măsem</i>	<i>măsŋilam</i>	<i>măslam</i>
2SG	<i>măsen</i>	<i>măsŋilan</i>	<i>măslan</i>
3SG	<i>măsli</i>	<i>măsŋili</i>	<i>măsli</i>
1DU	<i>măsemən</i>	<i>măsŋilmən</i>	<i>măsləmən</i>
2DU	<i>măslən</i>	<i>măsŋilən</i>	<i>măslən</i>
3DU	<i>măslən</i>	<i>măsŋilən</i>	<i>măslən</i>
1PL	<i>măsew</i>	<i>măsŋiləw</i>	<i>măsləw</i>
2PL	<i>măslən</i>	<i>măsŋilən</i>	<i>măslən</i>
3PL	<i>măsət</i>	<i>măsŋilal</i>	<i>măslal</i>

Syn <i>pön</i> - ‘to place’ (present)		
	SG object	DU/PL object
1SG	<i>pönlem</i>	<i>pönləl(l)am</i>
2SG	<i>pönlen</i>	<i>pönləl(l)an</i>
3SG	<i>pönləl(li)</i>	<i>pönləl(li)</i>
1DU	<i>pönlemən</i>	<i>pönləlmən</i>
2DU	<i>pönləl(l)ən</i>	<i>pönləl(l)ən</i>
3DU	<i>pönləl(l)ən</i>	<i>pönləl(l)ən</i>
1PL	<i>pönlew</i>	<i>pönləl(l)əw</i>
2PL	<i>pönləl(l)ən</i>	<i>pönləl(l)ən</i>
3PL	<i>pönlel</i>	<i>pönləl(l)at</i>

SHORT GRAMMATICAL DESCRIPTION OF KHANTY

Ko <i>păn-</i> ‘to place’ (present)			
	sg object	du object	pl object
1SG	<i>păntem</i>	<i>păntenġatam</i>	<i>păntemăt</i>
2SG	<i>pănten</i>	<i>păntenġatan</i>	<i>păntenăt</i>
3SG	<i>păntət</i>	?	
1DU	<i>păntemən</i>	<i>păntenġatəmən</i>	
2DU	<i>păntetən</i>	<i>păntenġətən</i>	
3DU	<i>păntetən</i>	<i>păntenġətən</i>	
1PL	<i>păntew</i>	<i>păntenġətəw</i>	<i>păntewăt</i>
2PL	<i>păntetən</i>	<i>păntenġətən</i>	
3PL	<i>păntet</i>	<i>păntenġətət</i>	

Trj <i>läpət-</i> ‘to feed’ (present)			
	sg object	du object	pl object
1SG	<i>läpətləem</i>	<i>läpətləyäläm</i>	<i>läpətläläm</i>
2SG	<i>läpətləe</i>	<i>läpətləyälä</i>	<i>läpətlälä</i>
3SG	<i>läpətləy</i>	<i>läpətləyäl</i>	<i>läpətläl</i>
1DU	<i>läpətlətəmən</i>	<i>läpətləyäləmən</i>	<i>läpətləmən</i>
2DU	<i>läpətlətən</i>	<i>läpətləyälən</i>	<i>läpətlälən</i>
3DU	<i>läpətlətən</i>	<i>läpətləyälən</i>	<i>läpətlälən</i>
1PL	<i>läpətlətəy°</i>	<i>läpətləyäləy°</i>	<i>läpətläləy°</i>
2PL	<i>läpətlətən</i>	<i>läpətləyälən</i>	<i>läpətlälən</i>
3PL	<i>läpətläl</i>	<i>läpətləyäläl</i>	<i>läpətläläl</i>

Trj <i>läpət-</i> ‘to feed’ (perfect)			
	sg object	du object	pl object
1SG	<i>lip̄tem</i>	<i>lip̄ətyäläm</i>	<i>lip̄ətläm</i>
2SG	<i>lip̄te</i>	<i>lip̄ətyälä</i>	<i>lip̄ətlä</i>
3SG	<i>lip̄əttəy</i>	<i>lip̄ətyäl</i>	<i>lip̄ətal</i>
1DU	<i>lip̄əttəmən</i>	<i>lip̄ətyäləmən</i>	<i>lip̄ətləmən</i>
2DU	<i>lip̄ətətən</i>	<i>lip̄ətyälən</i>	<i>lip̄ətlən</i>
3DU	<i>lip̄ətətən</i>	<i>lip̄ətyälən</i>	<i>lip̄ətlən</i>
1PL	<i>lip̄əttəy°</i>	<i>lip̄ətyäləy°</i>	<i>lip̄ətləy°</i>
2PL	<i>lip̄ətətən</i>	<i>lip̄ətyälən</i>	<i>lip̄ətlən</i>
3PL	<i>lip̄ətiäl</i>	<i>lip̄ətyäläl</i>	<i>lip̄ətläl</i>

Directives

Proto-Khanty had an imperative form for second persons. The imperative suffix was a full vowel (**a/*ä* [subjective conjugation], **i/*i* [objective conjugation]) and is still represented as a full vowel in different dialects (Honti 1984: 47). 2SG has no personal ending, and in 2DU and 2PL forms of the subjective conjugation respective personal endings are attached to the vowel-final imperative form. In the objective conjugation, the personal suffixes and the scope of objective conjugation forms vary between dialects, and the differences are not easily explicable.

Some examples of imperatives:

DN (Vértes 1975: 10)

<i>jāŋy-a</i>	<i>měŋ-a</i>	<i>jöχ</i>	<i>tuw-e!</i>
walk-IMP.2SG	go-IMP.2SG	to=home	take-IMP.SG<2SG

‘come, go and take him home!’

O *mă-*, *mij-* ‘to give’ (Honti 1984: 122)

	Subj. Conj.	SG Object	PL Object
2SG	<i>mija</i>	<i>miji</i>	<i>mijila</i>
2DU	<i>mijatən</i>	<i>mijalən</i>	<i>mijijalən</i>
2PL	<i>mijati</i>	<i>mijalən</i>	<i>mijijalən</i>

Ko *păn-* ‘to put’ (Honti 1984: 115)

	Subj. Conj.	SG Object	DU Object	PL Object
2SG	<i>păna</i>	<i>păne</i>	<i>păneŋəta</i>	<i>păneta</i>
2DU	<i>pănatən</i>	<i>pănetən</i>	<i>păneŋətən</i>	?
2PL	<i>pănatə</i>	<i>pănetən</i>	?	?

Trj *läpət-* ‘to give to eat’ (Honti 1984: 112)

	Subj. Conj.	SG Object	DU Object	PL Object
2SG	<i>liptä</i>	<i>lipte</i>	<i>liptiyəlä</i>	<i>liptilä</i>
2DU	<i>liptitən</i>	<i>liptitən</i>	<i>liptiyələŋ</i>	<i>liptiləŋ</i>
2PL	<i>liptitəy</i>	<i>liptitən</i>	<i>liptiyələŋ</i>	<i>liptiləŋ</i>

In many dialects, there are also optative/jussive forms. In the northern dialects, they are lacking. The southern dialects have optative forms for first and third persons. There is no difference between subjective and objective conjugation. The forms seem to be based on the 2SG imperative:

DN *păn-* ‘to put’ (Honti 1984: 115)

1SG	<i>pănam</i>
3SG	<i>pănaŋ(at)</i>
1DU	<i>pănamən</i>
3DU	<i>pănaŋən</i>
1PL	<i>pănaw</i>
3PL	<i>pănat</i>

The Trj dialect also shows optative/jussive for first and third persons, and in most of them (excl. 1SG and 1DU), there is also a full paradigm for the objective conjugation:

Trj *läpät-* ‘to give to eat’ (Honti 1984: 112)

	Subj. Conj.	SG Object	DU Object	PL Object
1SG	<i>łiptimät</i>	?	?	?
3SG	<i>łiptäjät</i>	<i>łiptität</i>	<i>łiptiyälät</i>	<i>łiptilät</i>
1DU	<i>łiptimənät</i>	?	?	?
3DU	<i>łiptiyənät</i>	<i>łiptitənät</i>	<i>łiptiyälənät</i>	<i>łiptilənät</i>
1PL	<i>łiptiy°ät</i>	?	<i>łiptiyäläy°ät</i>	<i>łiptiläy°ät</i>
3PL	<i>łiptität</i>	<i>łiptilälät</i>	<i>łiptiyälälät</i>	<i>łiptilälät</i>

In the southern and Surgut dialects, the passive voice also has an optative paradigm. The suffix used in these forms in *-mus/-mos-* in Surgut and *-mas-* in the South. In the southern (Kr) dialect, the suffix has the function of optative and the structure of the form is stem + mood (*-mas-*) + genus (*-əj*) + person; in Trj, the suffix *-mus/-mos-* serves as the passive suffix, as the personal endings come from the optative paradigm where the mood suffix is in fact a kind of clitic. The structure of the Trj forms is stem + genus (*-mus/-mos-*) + person + mood (*-at*):

Kr *seŋk-* ‘to beat’

(Honti 1984: 116)

Trj *läpät-* ‘to give to eat’

(Honti ibid. 113)

1SG	<i>seŋkmasəjəm</i>	<i>läpätmusəmat</i>
2SG	<i>seŋkmasəjən</i>	<i>läpätmusənat</i>
3SG	<i>seŋkmasə(j)</i>	<i>läpätmosat</i>
1DU	<i>seŋkmasəjmən</i>	<i>läpätmosmənat</i>
2DU	<i>seŋkmasəjtən</i>	<i>läpätmustənat</i>
3DU	<i>seŋkmasəjənən</i>	<i>läpätmusyənät</i>
1PL	<i>seŋkmasəjəw</i>	<i>läpätmosəy°at</i>
2PL	<i>seŋkmasəjtə</i>	<i>läpätmostəyāt</i>
3PL	<i>seŋkmasəjət</i>	<i>läpätmosat</i>

Syntax

This very short description of syntactical phenomena is based on Southern Khanty.

Word Order

The basic word order in Khanty is SOV (and in intransitive constructions, S-Adv-V). The place for Topic is in the beginning of the sentence and the place for Focus in front of the verbal predicate. There are, though, exceptions, meaning that the word order can be seen as a tendency rather than a strict rule:

SOV

DN (SüdostjK: 6)

[- -]	<i>urt</i>	<i>täpät</i>	<i>piš</i>	<i>täw=soχ</i>	<i>tunt-ot</i>
[name]	hero (S)	7	fold	horse=pelt (O)	put=on-PAST.3SG (V)

‘the hero put on a sevenfold horse pelt’

DN (SüdostjK: 9)

<i>mä</i>	<i>jěγ-păγ-em</i>	<i>wet-en</i>
1SG	brother-PX.SG<1SG (O)	kill-PAST.2SG (V)

‘you killed my brother’

Ko (SüdostjP III: 2)

<i>χutəm</i>	<i>imə</i>	<i>χutəm</i>	<i>χut</i>	<i>wet-ət</i>
3	woman (S)	3	fish (O)	catch-PRET.3PL (V)

‘the three women caught three fishes’

SVO

DN (SüdostjK: 1)

[- -]	<i>urt,</i>	<i>těw</i>	<i>tăj-ot</i>
[name]	hero	3SG (S)	have-PRET.3SG (V)
<i>sewəŋ</i>	<i>ewə,</i>	<i>wetəŋ</i>	<i>ewə</i>
braided	daughter (O)	beautiful	daughter (O)

‘the hero, he had a braided daughter, a beautiful daughter’

SVAdv

DN (SüdostjK: 2)

mě̃n-t-əmə̃n, jě̃y-pẵχ, wit woč̣-əmen-a
 go-PRS-1DU (V) brother upstream town-PX.SG<1DU-LAT (Adv)
 ‘brother, we’ll go to our upstream town’

Complex Sentences

Temporal subordinate sentences are formed with action converb structures if the sentences refer to the same time:

DN (SüdostjK: 3)

tě̃w-kem̃nə [– –] kimẵt ä̃ŋkər-məmitat-nə, [– –]
 then outwards look-PRTC.PX.SG<3PL-LOC,
jeyə χör pět-ewə enə rot töt ti kätt-ət
 river bend bottom-ABL big boat there PTCL appear-PAST.3SG
 ‘then when they looked out (of the window), a big
 boat [– –] appeared in the bend of the river’

If the sentences refer to happenings that follow each other, a particle *kem̃nə* follows the participle form of the subordinated verb:

DN (SüdostjK: 10)

nö̃χ χẵnč-atəmet kem̃nə ewəm-ta, mostə-ta
 up rip-PRTC.PX.SG<3SG *kem̃nə* hug-INF kiss-INF
nö̃χ ti jě̃w-ət
 up PTCL start-PRS.3SG

‘when she has unpicked [the seams], she starts to hug and kiss him’

When there is any hint of causality in the subordination, a conjunction is used (along with a finite verb):

DN (SüdostjK: 10)

kö̃š nö̃y ätmitt-ət wey-ət ě̃nt tě̃rm-ət
 CNJ up lift-PRS.3SG strength-PX.SG<3SG not be=enough-PRS.3SG
 ‘when (~ even though) she tries to lift him, she has no strength’

Predicative Structures

In present predicative sentences where both NPs represent 3SG, there is no copula:

DN (SüdostjK: 1)

<i>äj-pe</i>	<i>jëg-păγ-ət,</i>	<i>unt=tonχ-ta</i>	<i>pelkat</i>	<i>χoj,</i>	<i>kõtəp</i>
small-CL	brother.PX.SG<3SG	forest=devil(-CAR)	half	man,	middle
	<i>jëg-păγ-ət</i>	<i>pes=nem-ta</i>	<i>χoj</i>		
	brother.PX.SG<3SG	without-name-CAR	man		
‘his youngest brother is the man-half-forest-devil; his middle brother is the nameless-man’					

In other persons and tenses, the verb *us-* (*ut-*) ‘to be’ is needed:

DN (SüdostjK: 11)

<i>tütəŋ</i>	<i>nun</i>	<i>us-tan</i>
fiery	cunt	be-PRS.2SG
‘you are a fiery cunt’		

Possessive Structures

The GN structure in Khanty is expressed with a possessor in nominative + possessed with a possessive suffix:

DN (SüdostjK: 12)

<i>tăyər-sem</i>	<i>kěŋən-tat</i>
armour	button-PX.PL<3SG
‘the buttons of the armour’	

DN (SüdostjK: 10)

<i>tăw</i>	<i>söχ-ət</i>	<i>jontəm=jăt-tat</i>
horse	pelt-PX.SG<3SG	seam-PX.PL<3SG
‘the seams of the horse’s pelt’		

DN (SüdostjK: 7)

<i>möŋə</i>	<i>jart-ew-a</i>	<i>tut-ew</i>
1PL	fortress-PX.SG<1PL.LAT	bring-PRS.SG<1PL
‘we’ll take him into our fortress’		

Sav (SüdostjK: 141)

mũŋ *moχ-tew* *wet-aj-ət* *těw neŋ-ət* *pěta*
 1PL child-PX.PL<1PL kill-PAST.PASS-3PL 3SG wife-PX.SG<3SG because
 ‘our children were killed because of his wife’

When the possessor itself is possessed (is marked with PX), the possessed can also be left unmarked:

Sav (SüdostjK: 143)

măńək-em *kur* *sămarm-ət-em*
 nephew-PX.SG<1SG foot grab-PRS-SG<1SG
 ‘I’ll grab my nephew’s foot’

Sav (SüdostjK: 143)

măńəkət *kur* *tə* *sămarm-ət*
 nephew-PX.SG<3SG foot PTCL grab-PAST.SG<3SG
 ‘he grabbed his nephew’s foot’

The predicative possession is expressed with the verb *tăj*- ‘to have’:

DN (SüdostjK: 1)

[–] *urt, těw* *tăjot* *sewəŋ ewə, wefəŋ ewə*
 [name] hero, 3SG have-PRET.3SG braided daughter beautiful daughter
 ‘the hero, he had a braided daughter, a beautiful daughter’

Dative Shift and Passive

All Khanty dialects make use of dative shift to move topical/animate recipients and benefactives from oblique to object position. The object is marked with nominative, or, if it is a personal pronoun, with accusative, and the original object in the new oblique position is marked in the southern dialects with the instrumental-comitative (*-at*) case. Other dialects use either locative (*-nə*, northern dialects) or instructive-final (*-at/-ăt*, eastern dialects), depending on the case system (see pp. 18–19). (One can also observe in these examples that in the case of coordinated parts of speech [marked here with _], the inflectionally suffix usually occurs only on the latter one.)

DN (SüdostjK: 3-4)

mān-t, tüwetten χōj, pēt-ettem māχta,
 1SG-ACC tall man ear-PX.PL<1SG along

pěytā nōyās, pěytā wāχsar-at māχta tāk-at
 black_sable_black_fox-INSTR along throw-OPT.3PL

‘may they cover me (throw around me), a big man,
 up to my ears (with) black sables, black foxes’

Similarly, topicalized objects can be moved to subject position by using the passive voice. The new subject is in the nominative and the former subject becomes the agent marked with locative (in all dialects; the locative in the northern dialects has a heavy load because it is used to mark many oblique constituents, even grammatical ones!):

Ko (SüdostjP III: 14)

āj=pa neη-nə kōttap=pa neη ẽńtast-aj
 young=PRTC woman-LOC middle=PRTC woman ask-PAST.PASS. 3SG

‘the middle woman was asked by the youngest woman’

(< *āj=pa neη kōttap=pa neη ẽńtast-at*
 young=PRTC woman middle=PRTC woman ask-PAST.SG.3SG)

DN (SüdostjK: 9)

jěŋk-a wayət-tə ewe-t-nə kōjant=otəŋ-at seŋk-t-aj
 water-LAT go-PRTC girl-PL-LOC yoke=end-INSTR beat- PRS-PASS.3SG

‘he is beaten by the water-carrying girls with
 the tip of the (water-carrying) yoke’

(< *jěŋk-a wayət-tə ewe-t kōjant=otəŋ-at seŋk-t-et*
 water-LAT go-PRTC girl-PL yoke=end-INSTR beat-PRS-SG.3PL

‘the water-carrying girls beat him with the tip of the yoke’)

Both the dative shift and the passive can occur in the same sentence, as in the following example. It is to be expected, because an animate, human entity often acts as a recipient in the sentence, and additionally, is the main character in the story and thus has a high degree of topicality:

DN (SüdostjK: 4)

pěytə nōyəs, pěytə wăχsar-at wəŋ-tat χănəm-tat-nə
 black_sable_black_fox-ISTR son-in-law-PX.PL<3SG_relative-PX.PL<3SG-LOC
ti kit-aj
 PTCL send-PAST.PASS.3SG
 ‘he was sent black sables and black foxes
 by his sons-in-law, his relatives’

The agent in a passive sentence is often overt only when it is focalized. Agentless passive sentences are much more common (illustrated here with four sentences in a row from SüdostjK: 7):

DN

těw-kemnə urttat-nə tōt=ti kätt-aj.
 then hero-PX.PL<3SG-LOC that=PTCL catch-PAST.PASS.3SG
tōt səyat nik ti wayətt-aj.
 that time to=shore PTCL walk+CAUS-PAST.PASS.3SG
täpət piš täw sōχ səmə-ja ti jont-aj,
 seven fold horse pelt inside-LAT PTCL sew-PAST.PASS.3SG
rot-a ti păn-aj.
 boat-LAT PTCL put-PAST.PASS.3SG
 ‘Then his heroes caught him. After that, he was
 taken down to the shore. He was put inside the
 sevenfold horse pelt and laid down in a boat.’

Another type of passive is the impersonal, where both subject and agent are lacking. The impersonal passive describes an action only, without reference to who is the actor (or the target). Here, an example is presented with context:

DN (SüdostjK: 6)

jewəttə-ta tōt=tə jěw-ət i čupa pira
 shoot-INF that-PTCL start-PAST.3PL and only around
jewəttə-ta jěw-aj
 shoot-INF start-PAST.PASS.3SG
 ‘they (the heroes) started to shoot, there was shooting all around’

Negation

In the standard negation, a negative particle *ěn(t)* is used. It is followed by the finite verb (predicate) in the same form as in affirmative sentences:

DN (SüdostjK: 11)

<i>χoj</i>	<i>tu-tə</i>	<i>χăčax</i>	<i>ěnt</i>	<i>tăj-t-an</i>
man	carry-INF	strength	NEG	have-PRS.2SG

‘you don’t have the strength to carry a man’

(cf.

<i>χoj</i>	<i>tu-tə</i>	<i>χăčax</i>	<i>tăj-t-an</i>
man	carry-INF	strength	have-PRS.2SG

‘you have [enough] strength to carry a man’ [constructed])

Sav (SüdostjK: 150)

<i>măn=pă</i>	<i>ěnt</i>	<i>χeť-t-am</i>
1SG=too	NEG	stay-PRS.1SG

‘I won’t stay either’

(cf.

<i>măn=pă</i>	<i>χeť-t-am</i>
1SG=too	stay-PRS.1SG

‘I will stay, too’ [constructed])

In the negation of predicative structures (existentials), the negative word is *ěntəm*. It is used with negative counterparts of affirmative sentences both without a copula and with *ut-* ‘to be’ (see p. 32). It cannot be called a negative particle because it is inflected in number:

DN (KT 58)

<i>těj tōtt(ə) ěntam-ət</i>	<i>măn tōtt(ə) ěntam</i>	<i>nin tōtt(ə) ěntam-eyən</i>
3PL there NEG-PL	1SG there NEG	2DU there NEG-DU

‘they are not there’ ‘I am not there’ ‘you two are not there’

The negation of directives has a negative particle of its own in *ăt*. It is followed by the imperative form, which is the same as in affirmative directives:

Sav (SüdostjK: 150)

<i>ät</i>	<i>täwətt'-atən!</i>
NEG	scold-IMP.2DU

‘don’t scold me (, you two)!’

The same negative particle is also used in conjunctive functions (the conjunctive is expressed in the example with the Russian loan word *štobi*, but the function is stressed by using the imperative/optative variant of the particle):

DN (SüdostjK: 11)

<i>jöχ</i>	<i>ti</i>	<i>něr-ot</i>	<i>štobi</i>
home	PTCL	run-PAST.3SG	<i>štobi</i>
<i>χeti-tat-nə</i>		<i>ät</i>	<i>äjət-taj</i>
grandson-PX.PL<3SG-LOC		NEG	see-PRS.PASS.3SG

‘(she) runs home so that she would not be seen by her grandsons’