

Collected Articles of the 3rd International
Linguistics Conference
(Taganrog, Russia)

Collected Articles of the 3rd International
Linguistics Conference
(Taganrog, Russia)

Edited by

Galina T. Polenova and Tatiana G. Klikushina

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

Collected Articles of the 3rd International Linguistics Conference (Taganrog, Russia),
Edited by Galina T. Polenova and Tatiana G. Klikushina

This book first published 2014

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2014 by Galina T. Polenova, Tatiana G. Klikushina and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system,
or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or
otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-5635-5, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-5635-5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
--------------------	---

Part I: Theoretical Linguistics

Diachronie der Opposition “Singular/Plural” (am Beispiel der ketischen Sprache).....	6
Galina Polenova	

The Typology of the Display of the Category “Person/Not-Person” in the Interrogative Pronouns “Who?” and “What?”	14
Marina Akhanova	

Case Category: The Relationship between “Surface” and “Deep” Cases	22
Ludmila Burenko	

Anthropomorphism in the World Picture	29
Olga Melnik	

The Adjective in the Part-of-Speech System	35
Olga Ikonnikova	

Relations of Possession in Germanic Languages.....	42
Evgeny Krasnoshcekov	

Opposition Relations within the System of Personal Pronouns-Subjects of Statements: The Communicative-and-Functional Aspect	53
G. Ph. Gavrilova and N. V. Malicheva	

Referenz als der Anhaltspunkt einer Bedeutungsklassifikation.....	62
Jewgenija Muraschova	

Die vermutliche älteste Quelle über die Jenissejer	68
Heinrich Werner	

The Cognitive Typology of Sub-basic and Super-basic English and Ket Verbs of Motion	81
Larisa Pavlenko	
The Nature of Phraseosyntactic Schemes and the Problem of their Research.....	87
Anna Melikyan	
Concept: Term and Notion	95
Natalya Dodonova	
La diathèse, est-ce une notion universelle dans la langue?.....	102
Guayana Gnezdilova	
Syntactic Wholes and Complex and Compound Sentences in the Functional and Semantic Field of Cause and Effect in English.....	107
Alexey Bakulev	
Part II: Lexicology	
About the Uniqueness and Productivity of Blends.....	114
Camiel Hamans	
How Unique are Blends?.....	126
Camiel Hamans	
The Somatizm “Heart” in English and Tajik Idioms.....	134
Barno Avezova	
Pragmatic and Communicative Potential of the English Proverbs	144
Ludmila Grichenko	
The Expression of Mental Actions and States of Man	151
Alexander Chervony	
An Etymological Dictionary of Shetland Norn: Dr. J. Jakobsen’s Lexicographical Masterpiece Revisited.....	160
Alexander Pavlenko and Galina Pavlenko	

The Use of Anglicisms in Modern Discourse: The Aspect of Intertextuality	170
Irina Khoutyz	

The Origin of the Concept “Zapad” (West) in the Russian Mentality	176
Anastasia Rybtsova	

Phraseosyntactic Schemes with WH-words in the Languages of Different Systems (English, Russian and Spanish)	182
Vadim Melikyan	

Caractéristiques sémantiques et structurelles des expressions verbales idiomatiques empruntées au français.....	190
Véra Lavrinenko	

The Ideal Cognitive Content of the Concepts “Uchitel” and “Uchenie” in Biblical Texts	195
Olga Arnautova	

The Analysis of Russian Borrowed Subsystem in the Ket Lexicon	203
V. P. Minaeva	

Grundtrinzipien der phraseographischen Beschreibung des Kirgisischen.....	208
Tatyana Bushuy	

Im Ausgangspunkt der Samarkander phraseologischen Schule.....	213
Anatoliy Bushuy	

Informationsrichtungen in der phraseologischen Schule zu Samarkand (in historischer Hinsicht)	219
Shohista Nurbaeva	

Names of Unique Plants in Albanian.....	223
Marina Domosiletskaya	

Part III: Text

Role of Means of Verbal Influence in Marking Semantic Contents of Language Units (Mass Media Language as an Example)	230
Edward Glinchevski	

The Texts of Contemporary American Advertisements and Commercials	241
Tatiana Klikushina	
Metaphor as a Means of Language World Picture Organizing in the English and Russian Linguocultures.....	249
Elena Deberdeeva	
Scientific and Naive Images of Space and Time in Russian and English Folk Texts (through the Example of Proverbs)	256
Natalia Bogatyriova	
On Text Linguistics	265
Sofia Agapova	
Funktional-kommunikative eigenschaften von nomina agentis.....	285
Michail Tscherkas	
Method Structure in Russian and Ukrainian Linguistic Tradition	292
Vladimir Glushchenko	
Zwischen Überschrift und Text: Einige Überlegungen über das Motto zu einem wissenschaftlichen Beitrag.....	299
Marina Oleynik	
Les particularités linguistiques de la communication par Internet. Le fonctionnement des emprunts dans la parole des internautes russes ..	304
I.V. Elov	
Part IV: Pragmatics	
Das Redeverhalten der russischen Politiker nach der latenten einwirkenden Strategie «des sicheren/unsicheren Redeverhaltens des Autors im Redegeschehen» (auf dem Material der Wahl- und Nachwahltexte der Kandidaten in die Staatsdumaabgeordneten 2007).....	312
L.N. Seliverstova	
Dialogical Speech in Linguo-Didactic Interpretation (on the Material of the German Language)	319
Ashur Yahshiyev	

Funktionelle und latente Pragmalinguistik	329
Galina Matveeva	

Valeur grammaticale et son actualization	333
R.F. Smirnova	

Gender Issues in Malaysian Parliamentary Discourse	342
Karen Kow Yip Cheng	

Part V: Ethnolinguistics and Translation

English Academic Texts on Education: Cross Cultural Potential and Linguistic Peculiarities	350
Victoria Tuzlukova, Ekaterina Andrienko and Ekaterina Goosen	

National vs. Cultural in English and Russian Moral Consciousness	360
Elena Poliakova	

Semantische Übersumation als literaturübersetzerisches Problem	367
Anatolij Serebrjakow, Swetlana Serebrjakowa and Aleksandra Milostiwaja	

Part VI: Language Teaching Methods

Observing Students while Correcting Mistakes in Cooperative Groups: Correction Strategies and Metalanguage Used	376
Sara Servetti	

An Automated Computational Tool adapted in Greek: A Study of Phonological Errors in Two SLI Children	389
Styliani Tsigka, Federico Boschetti, Sharon Chan and Tenia Tsavdaridou	

INTRODUCTION

This collection contains papers on key problems in theoretical linguistics, cognitive science, lexicology, text studies, pragmatics, ethnolinguistics and translation, and language teaching methods, presenting the results of research carried out by scientists from different countries.

G. Polenova's chapter deals with the study of universal diachronic oppositions, aiming to discuss the existence of the binary opposition "singular / plural" in the Ket language. Formerly known as Yenisei Ostyak, Ket is a Siberian language long thought to be an isolate, the sole survivor of a Yeniseian family, spoken along the middle Yenisei basin by the Ket people. The author of the article also analyzes the numeral and the plural forms of the Personal pronouns in the Ket language.

E. Muraschova studies reference as the basis of meaning classification. The meaning of the linguistic expression is based on real or probable mentioning of the object or the author's estimation concerning the object. This fact is considered as the reference by the author, and the object, or the author's estimation of the object, as the starting point.

H. Wemer refers to what is perhaps the oldest source concerning the existence of the Yeniseian people—the Arimaspi, who were described by Aristeeas of Proconnesus in his lost archaic poem *Arimaspea*. The scientist mentions the works of the ethnographer G. I. Pelikh, which recorded the folk works of Western Siberians.

The author T. Bushuy describes the basic principles of the phraseological and lexicographic descriptions of the Kirghiz language. She writes about the value of the Kirghiz-Russian Phraseological Dictionary by K. K. Yudakhin, being the best example of the Kirghiz idiomatic language.

The article of A. Bushuy deals with the origin of the Samarkand phraseological school. It outlines the key problems concerning the characteristic features of the phraseological units, the dispute as to the belonging of some parts of speech to phraseology, and the origin of the phraseological units. Special emphasis is devoted to the phraseology of the dialects.

The focus of discussion in S. Nurbaeva's article is the problem of information directions in the Samarkand phraseological school. Traditionally, Samarkand phraseologists compile different publications and give clear ideas of phraseological conceptions in the world.

M. Tscherkas discusses functional and communicative features of *nomina agentis* in his article, stating that the language functions not only as the instrument of abstract thinking, but as the means of human emotional reflection caused by the influence of information in a particular situation.

M. Oleynik tries to show the difference between the inscription and the text, and gives some ideas about the epigraph to a scientific article. There is the so-called “space” between the inscription and the text itself, where different readers’ hypotheses about the text are accumulated. These hypotheses can be determined by the epigraphs. The author analyzes the works by professor Nayhauss.

L. N. Seliverstova devotes their article to the problem of Russian politicians’ speech behaviour based on the hidden effecting strategy “assured / diffident speech behaviour of the author while making a public speech” (based on the material of the election and post-election texts of the 2007 State Duma contenders).

The article deals with the attempt to understand the term “pragmalinguistics.” G. Matveeva speaks about functional and latent pragmalinguistics, a division depending on the conscious or unconscious language behaviour of the speaker. The article is also devoted to the practical scope of pragmalinguistics.

A. Serebryakov, S. Serebryakova and A. Milostivaya investigate the problem of semantic “excessive summation” as a literature translation problem, stating that it is interesting to study the communicative potential of the general meaning of the text.

G. Gnezdilova tries to find out if diathesis is a universal notion in language, aiming to assess the category of Voice by means of diathesis.

V. Lavrinenko pays special attention to the semantic and structural peculiarities of idiomatic expressions denoting process borrowed from French in Russian.

I. V. Elov studies the peculiarities of internet communication and the function of borrowings in the speech of Russian people.

M. Akhanova investigates the typology of the display of the category “person / not-person” in the interrogative pronouns “who?” and “what?”

L. Burenko’s chapter deals with the Case category, i.e. the relationship between “surface” and “deep” cases.

The work of O. Melnik is devoted to the problem of anthropomorphism throughout the world.

O. Ikonnikova focuses on the adjective in the part-of-speech system.

E. Krasnoshcekov studies the relations of possession in Germanic languages.

G. Ph. Gavrilova and N. V. Malicheva speak about the opposition relations within the system of personal pronoun-subjects of statements, specifically the communicative-and-functional aspect.

L. G. Pavlenko represents the study of cognitive typology of sub-basic and super-basic English and Ket verbs of motion.

A. Melikyan investigates the nature of phraseosyntactic schemes and the problem of their research.

N. Dodonova's chapter deals with the concepts of Term and Notion.

A. Bakulev studies the syntactic wholes and complex and compound sentences in the functional and semantic field of cause and effect in English.

Camiel Hamans represents arguments for bidirectional morphological change and shows how unique blends are.

Barno Avezova deals with the problem of somatizm at the "heart" of English and Tajik idioms.

L. Grichenko pays special attention to the pragmatic and communicative potential of English proverbs.

A. Chervony's chapter is devoted to the expression of mental actions and states of man.

A. Pavlenko and G. Pavlenko deal with an Etymological Dictionary of Shetland Norn, Dr. J. Jakobsen's lexicographical masterpiece.

I. Khoutyz talks about the use of Anglicisms in modern discourse and the aspect of intertextuality.

A. Rybtsova studies the origin of the concept *Zapad* (West) in Russian mentality.

V. Melikyan represents phraseosyntactic schemes with WH-words in the languages of English, Russian and Spanish systems.

O. Arnautova reveals the ideal cognitive content of the concepts "Uchitel" and "Uchenie" in biblical texts.

V. Minaeva represents the analysis of subsystems borrowed from Russian in the Ket lexicon.

M. Domosiletskaya shows the peculiarities of the names of unique plants in Albanian.

E. Glinchevskiy investigates the role of means of verbal influence in marking semantic contents of language units (taking mass media language as an example).

T. Klikushina deals with the study of texts of contemporary American advertisements and commercials.

E. Deberdeeva focuses on metaphor as a means of "language world picture" organizing in English and Russian linguocultures.

N. Bogatyriova investigates scientific and naive Images of Space and Time in Russian and English folk texts.

S. Agapova offers a new viewpoint on Text Linguistics. The chapter concerns the problems of definition of text linguistics as well as differentiation of its most important principles. The author highlights the methods of text linguistics research and underlines the aspects crucial for its understanding and usage. Key words and concepts are text linguistics, cohesion, coherence, connectedness, theory of text, intertextuality, informativity, discourse, discourse analysis and corpus linguistics.

V. Glushchenko devotes his chapter to the problem of method structure in Russian and Ukrainian linguistic tradition.

A. Yahshiyev deals with the dialogical speech in linguo-didactic interpretation (in the material of the German language).

Karen Kow Yip Cheng discloses gender issues in Malaysian parliamentary discourse.

Victoria Tuzlukova, Ekaterina Andrienko and Ekaterina Goosen deal with English academic texts on education and discover their cross-cultural potential and linguistic peculiarities.

The article of E. Poliakova focuses on the national vs. cultural in English and Russian moral consciousness.

Sara Servetti points out correction strategies and the usage of metalanguage in the process of observing students while correcting mistakes in cooperative groups.

Styliani Tsigka describes an automated computational tool adapted in Greek with a focus on studying phonological errors in two SLI children.

This edition is dedicated to linguists, philologists, tutors, postgraduates and advanced students of the institutions of higher education, as well as other categories of readers interested in the problems of linguistics and language teaching methods.

PART I:
THEORETICAL LINGUISTICS

DIACHRONIE DER OPPOSITION “SINGULAR/PLURAL” (AM BEISPIEL DER KETISCHEN SPRACHE)

GALINA POLENOVA
(RUSSIA)

Binäre Oppositionen scheinen universal zu sein. Sie sind Philosophie, Logik, und dem ganzen Dasein eigen. Unser Gehirn besteht aus zwei Hemisphären. Wir haben zwei Ohren, zwei Augen, zwei Hände und Arme, zwei Beine und Füße. Zugleich aber gehören sowohl das Gehirn, als auch unsere Ohren, sowie Augen einem einheitlichen Ganzen - dem Kopf, und Hände, Arme, Beine, Füße – dem Körper.

In der Sprachkunde begegnen wir der Dichotomie auf Schritt und Tritt, vgl. solche Oppositionen, wie: Sprache / Rede, Synchronie / Diachronie, Subjekt / Objekt, Subjekt / Prädikat, Thema / Rhema, Gehalt / Gestalt, Agens / Patiens, Bestimmtheit / Unbestimmtheit; Lebewesen / Nichtlebewesen; Transitivität / Intransitivität u.ä.

Wie eine jede Erscheinung verändert sich die Sprache mit der Zeit, sie entwickelt sich. Diese Entwicklung ist widerspruchsvoll. Der Hauptsinn dieser Widersprüchlichkeit besteht in der Einheit von zwei Seiten: Veränderlichkeit und Beständigkeit unter der führenden Rolle der Veränderlichkeit.

Für die Sprache bedeutet die Einheit der Veränderlichkeit und Beständigkeit die Einheit von Synchronie und Diachronie. Für die Sprachen ohne schriftliche Überlieferungen gilt es, anhand der synchronen Daten ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung wiederherzustellen. Die binäre Opposition ‘Singular / Plural’ diachronisch zu erörtern ist das Ziel unseres Beitrags.

In den meisten Sprachen wird der Numerus grammatisch ausgedrückt: Singular (Einzahl) und Plural (Mehrzahl). Wie steht es damit in den jenessejischen Sprachen, zu denen Ketisch, Jugisch, Kottisch, Pumpokolisch, Assanisch und Arinisch zuzählen? In der einzigen noch lebenden jenessejischen Sprache, Ketisch, ist die Kategorie der Zahl nur der Bestandteil eines breiteren Begriffs der Pluralität, die ihrerseits wird als

Komponente der Kategorie ‘Quantität’ verstanden, indem sie durch ihre Ausdrucksmittel Gegenstands-, Vorgangs- und Merkmalquantität äußert, entsprechend – Gegenstands-, Vorgangs- und Merkmalpluralität. Die letzte wird durch Substantiv, Verb, Adjektiv, Pronomen, Adverb und Numeralien aktualisiert^(Porotova 1990: 7).

Diese Aktualisierung wirkt auf allen Ebenen der Sprache: **phonetisch** – Betonungsvariationen als Kennzeichen der Zahl, z.B. *lamtól* ‘ein Käferchen’ – *lámtol* in Mehrzahl; **lexikalisch** – Suppletivformen, wie *ket* ‘ein Mensch’ – *deŋ* ‘Menschen’, *oks* ‘ein Baum’ – *aq* ‘Bäume’; **grammatisch** – Suffigierung, vgl. *qim* ‘eine Frau’ – *qimn* ‘Frauen’.

Die Suffigierung ist in der heutigen ketischen Sprache das Hauptmittel der substantivischen Pluralbildung. Die Pluralsuffixe sind **–n** und **–ŋ**, die an den Stamm durch einen Bindevokal bzw. ohne diesen angefügt werden. Nach A. Castrén, fügen sich die Suffixe unmittelbar an den Stamm, wenn er auf einen Vokal ausgeht. Wenn aber der Stamm mit einem Konsonanten endet, so erscheint vor dem Pluralsuffix einer der Bindevokale (**a**) oder (**e**) (Castrén 1858: 18). T.I. Porotova fügte noch die Bindevokale **–i–**, **–o–**, **–u–** hinzu (Porotova 1990: 23). Wichtig ist die von T.I. Porotova bemerkte Besonderheit, dass 60 von 1300 der den Plural mit Hilfe eines Suffixes bildenden Substantive die Betonung auf dem Bindevokal im Plural haben, vgl. *as* ‘eine Feder’ – *as’áy* ‘Federn’, *ba:t* ‘ein Alter’ – *ba:táy* ‘Alten’, also sieht das Pluralsuffix in diesen Fällen so aus: **–aŋ** (**–oŋ**, **–iŋ**, **–uŋ**). Es sei bemerkt, dass ein Bindevokal nur vor **–ŋ** erscheint. Das Suffix **–n** braucht keinen Bindevokal.

Das **–ŋ** haben im Plural die das Folgende bezeichnenden Substantive:

- Verwandtschaftsnamen *am* ‘Mutter’ – *amaŋ* ‘Mütter’, *beb* ‘Schwiegertochter’ – *bebaŋ* ‘Schwiegertöchter’, *hun* ‘Tochter’ – *hunaŋ* ‘Töchter’, *hib* ‘Sohn’ – *hibaŋ* ‘Söhne’ u.ä.;
- Nichtlebewesennamen, z.B. *aj* ‘Sack’ – *ajaŋ* ‘Säcke’, *de* ‘der See’ – *deŋ* ‘Seen’, *kam* ‘Pfeil’ – *kamaŋ* ‘Pfeile’, *ki* ‘Falle’ – *kiŋ* ‘Fallen’ u.ä.;
- Substantive, die auf **–n** auslauten, z.B. *hi?n* ‘ein Kochlöffel’ – *hiniŋ* ‘Kochlöffel’, *sin* ‘ein Biber’ – *sinaŋ* ‘Biber’ u.ä.

Das Suffix **–n** kennzeichnet den Plural der Substantive, die bezeichnen:

- Lebewesen, z.B. *asup* ‘ein Rebhuhn’ – *asun* ‘Rebhühner’, *bε?s* ‘ein Hase’ – *bε?s’n* ‘Hasen’ u.ä.;

- Zusammensetzungen $-s'$, $-s'i$, $-s'a$, wie: *as'katis'a* 'ein Märchenerzähler' – *as'katis'an* 'Märchenerzähler', *assanos* 'ein Jäger' – *assanos'in* 'Jäger' u.ä.;
- Substantive auf $-ŋ$, z.B. *aŋ* 'ein Strick' – *aŋan* 'Stricke', *as'laŋ* 'ein Schibrett' – *as'laŋin* 'Schibretter', *hoŋ* 'ein Netz' – *hoŋan* 'Netze', *ekŋ* 'ein Donnerschlag' – *ekŋan* 'Donnerschläge', *kaŋ* 'ein Weg' – *kaŋan* 'Wege', *laŋ* 'eine hand' – *laŋan* 'Hände' u.ä..

In 75 Fällen haben die Substantive zwei Pluralkennzeichen. Die Suffixe $-ŋ$ und $-n$ verbinden sich in verschiedener Folge. Dazwischen steht ein Bindevokal. Die meisten von diesen Substantiven haben zugleich die Formen mit einem der Suffixe (Porotova 1990: 28). Beispiele: *batat* 'das Gesicht' – *batataŋ+an* 'die Gesichter', *bej* 'der Wind' – *bejaŋan* < *bejaŋan* 'die Winde', *d'i?* 'ein Adler' – *diniŋ* 'Adler', *ke?j* 'ein Flügel' – *keŋan* 'Flügel'.

Die Substantive auf *j*, *l*, *r*, *t*, *s* wechseln im Plural ihren Auslautsvokal gegen das Pluralsuffix, z.B. *qu?s'* 'ein Čum' – *quŋ* 'Čums', *qi?t* 'ein Bogen' – *qoŋ* 'Bögen', *ti?s'* 'ein Stein' – *tŋ* 'Steine', *qup* 'ein Birkhahn' – *qu:n* 'Birkhühner', *tap* 'ein Ring' – *ta:ŋ*, *ta:n*, *ta;q* 'Ringe', *ha?j* 'eine Zeder' – *hiŋ* 'Zedern' *qaj* 'ein Elch' – *qi:n* 'Elche'. In den letzten Beispielen ist auch der Stammvokal verändert. Solche Substantive gibt es wenig, meistens sind sie einsilbig. Noch Beispiele: *te:t* 'ein Ehemann' – *tatn* 'Ehemänner', *i?* 'ein Tag' – *?ekŋ* 'Tage', *i* 'ein Name' – *eŋ* 'Namen', *di:t* 'ein Auerhahn' – *dekŋ* 'Auerhähne', *hi?γ* 'ein Mann' – *hiyeŋ* / *ho?n* 'Männer'.

Einige Substantive bilden die Pluralform nur durch den Vokalwechsel. Sie sind: *s'e:s* 'ein Fluss' – *s'as* 'Flüsse', *ti:p* 'ein Hund' – *tap* 'Hunde', *hi:j* 'ein Bauch' – *hŋ* 'Bäuche', *ha:s* 'eine Trommel' – *has* 'Trommeln', *ha:j* 'eine Ruder' – *haj* 'Rudern'.

Als unregelmäßig gilt die Pluralbildung durch Variationen des Stammauslautes, wie: *s'ε?s'* 'eine Lerche' – *s'ej* 'Lerchen', *kul'* 'ein Bart' – *ku:l'i* 'Bärte', *to:k* 'ein Beil' – *toyi* 'Beile'.

Einen Sonderfall bilden die Wörter, die im Singular Paarbegriffe bezeichnen, wie *de:s* 'Augen', *hŋ* 'Hände'. Um ein Auge zu bezeichnen, fügen die Ketten das Wort *qol'ep* 'Hälfte' hinzu: *qol'epde:s*.

Im Verbsystem findet der Quantitätsbinarismus auch verschiedenen Ausdruck: durch Aktionsartkennzeichen und durch Subjekt-Objekt-Affixe. Im Singular wird die Zahl im Auslaut der Verbalform durch Null gekennzeichnet, und im Plural bekommt das Verb das Auslautsuffix $-n$.

Die Kennzeichen von Person und Zahl sind die wichtigsten Strukturelemente des ketischen Verbs. Sie bilden einen Rahmen: An- und Auslaut der Wortform, z.B. *don' dibbet* 'ein Messer mache **ich**' - *don' dibbitn* 'ein Messer machen **wir**'.

Die sächliche Klasse unterscheidet die Zahl weder bei der Deklination noch bei der Konjugation, z.B. *tur'e kissal* 'es übernachtet' - *tun'e hojan kissal* 'diese Sachen übernachten'.

Wenn man die Einheit und den Ursynkretismus der Redeteile im Ketischen in Betracht zieht (Polenova 2002: 9-13), so kann man die Evolution des verbalen Numerus ohne dessen Entwicklung beim Substantiv nicht erörtern.

Es waren V.N. Toporov und T.V. Tsivjan, die die Besonderheiten des ketischen Numerus als erste bemerkt hatten. Sie hielten die unregelmäßigen Pluralbildungsmittel für die archaischesten. Sie lenkten ihre Aufmerksamkeit darauf, dass solche Auslautskonsonanten der Singularformen, wie: *-j, -p, -l, -s, -t, -q* u.a. im Plural verschwinden. Nach ihrer Meinung könnten sie früher als Kennzeichen bestimmter semantischer Klassen der Einzelheit dienen (Toporov, Tsivjan 1968: 236).

So viele Abweichungen in der Pluralbildung (20-30 Typen) zeugen davon, dass die Entwicklung der grammatischen Kategorie des Numerus im Ketischen noch nicht abgeschlossen ist. Wir teilen die Meinung von A.S. Čikobava, der schrieb:

Das Sprachsystem ändert sich, aber seine verschiedenen Glieder ändern sich nicht gleichzeitig (auch das Tempo der Veränderungen kann verschieden sein). Deshalb koexistieren auf dem jeweiligen Querschnitt des Sprachsystems die Erscheinungen von verschiedener chronologischer Tiefe (Innovationen neben Archaismen): Es ist unmöglich, das Sprachsystem zu verstehen, indem man seine Geschichte ignoriert. Das Sprachsystem kann nicht 'frei von der Geschichte' sein, Synchronie kann Diachronie nicht missachten, Diachronie ist in Synchronie zugegen.¹

Davon ausgehend, versuchen wir hier, die Gesetzmäßigkeit in der Evolution der Numeruskategorie zu bestimmen, indem wir uns an die Kontensive Typologie im Sinne von G.A. Klimov halten (Klimov 1977). Ketisch, eine schriftlose archaische Sprache, gibt dazu alle Möglichkeiten.

Die erste Stufe bildet der oben vermerkte Suppletivismus (Beispiele: *ket* 'ein Mensch' – *deŋ* 'Menschen', *oks* 'ein Baum' – *aq* 'Bäume'). Das ist ein neutraler Sprachbau. Es gab da keine Redeteile im heutigen Sinn. Sogar im jetzigen Ketisch werden die Wörter nur nach ihrer syntaktischen

¹ Čikobava, A.S. *Istorism i lingvistika*, 443.

Funktion im Satz klassifiziert. In jener Zeit wirkten deiktische Elemente, Lautverbindungen von Vokalen *a, e, i, o, u* und den klassifizierenden Konsonanten *-t, -d, -j, -s, -n, -ŋ, -k, -m, -p, -l', -q/ɣ*. Mit Hilfe der deiktischen Partikeln *-an, (-on, -in, -un)* drückten die Urjenissejer eine unbestimmte Mehrzahl aus, vgl. *on* 'viel'. Und durch die Partikeln *-aŋ (-oŋ, -iŋ, -uŋ)* bezeichneten sie die Sammel- und Kollektivnamen (Beispiele: *ba:t* 'ein Alter' – *ba:táŋ* 'Alten', *am* 'Mutter' – *amaŋ* 'Mütter', *hun* 'Tochter' – *hunəŋ* 'Töchter', *hib* 'Sohn' – *hibaŋ* 'Söhne').

Sammelpluralität ist nach V.I. Degtjarjov

die höchst charakteristische Iniversalie, die ganz verschiedene, wenn nicht alle, Sprachen der Welt, in denen sich die grammatische Kategorie der Zahl entwickelt hat, einander näher bringt. ...Sammelnamen sind prägrammatische Pluralnamen, die als lexikalische Ausdrucksmittel für den Plural fungierten.²

Auf der prägrammatischen Ebene unterschied man Qualität und Quantität der Gegenstände der Umgebung nicht. Diese Einheit der Begriffe 'Qualität' und 'Quantität' drückten die Sammel- und Paarnamen, wie *deŋ* 'Menschen' und *de:s* 'Augen' aus.

Ketische Numeralien *in* 'zwei' und *doŋ* 'drei' bezeichneten zuerst je eine bestimmte Klasse. Davon zeugt das heutige Zahlwort 'eins', vgl. für Lebewesen - *qoq* 'eins'; für Nichtlebewesen - *qus* 'eins'. Diese Numeralie geht auf die Zeit der qualitativen Charakteristik der Wirklichkeitserscheinung zurück, vgl. die Beispiele oben: *s'ε?s* 'eine Lerche' – *s'ej* 'Lerchen', *qu?s* 'ein Čum' – *quŋ* 'Čums' (als 'Nomadensiedlung'), *tʔs* 'ein Stein' – *taŋ* 'Steine' (als 'steinige Gegend') u.ä.

Die Ausarbeitung des binären **grammatischen** Zahlausdrucks vollzieht sich in der Zeit des aktiven Sprachbaus. Die ersten grammatischen Pluralkennzeichen bekamen zuerst die Namen der aktiven Klasse, und dieses Kennzeichen war das Suffix *-n* (Beispiele: *asup* 'ein Rebhuhn' – *asun* 'Rebhühner', *bε?s* 'ein Hase' – *bε?s'n* 'Hasen'). Nichtlebewesen - die inaktive Klasse - hatten keine Kennzeichen für den Plural, vgl: *tur'e kissal* 'dieses übernachtet' - *tun'e hojaŋ kissal* 'diese Sachen übernachteten'. Es ist in diesem Zusammenhang die Bemerkung von T.I. Porotova interessant, dass ketische Feminina ein Pluralkennzeichen bald haben, bald nicht: (Porotova 1990: 16). Diese Tatsache zeugt davon, dass in der Entwicklung der Sprache eine Etappe gab, wo Feminina, wie Sachen, zu einer inaktiven Klasse gehörten. Später, beim nominativischen Sprachbau,

² Degtjarjow, W.I. Diachroničeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka, 25-26.

bekamen die Nichtlebewesen das Pluralsuffix **-ŋ** (Beispiele: *kam* 'Pfeil' – *kamaŋ* 'Pfeile', *ki* 'Falle' – *kiŋ* 'Fallen').

Die jenissejischen Personalpronomen weisen auch zwei Pluralformen auf: auf **-n** und auf **-ŋ**. Dabei kann ein Pluralpersonalpronomen je zwei Formen haben. Vgl: kott. *ai* 'ich' – *ajon* 'wir', *au* 'du' – *auon* 'ihr'; arin. *aiŋ* 'wir', *aŋ* 'ihr'; assan. *ajin* 'wir', *avun* 'ihr'; pump. *adiŋ* 'wir', *ajaŋ* 'ihr'; ket. *ad* 'ich' – *ətn* 'wir', *u*, *uk* 'du' – *əkŋ* 'ihr'.

Es könnten im Urjenissejischen die Personalpronomen der 1. Und 2. Person je zwei Pluralformen gehabt haben, ungefähr so:

**adin* 'wir' (zwei) und **adon* 'wir' (indiskrete Mehrheit),

**ukin* 'ihr' (zwei) und **ukon* 'ihr' (indiskrete Mehrheit).

Das Personalpronomen der 3. Person ist eine ziemlich späte Erscheinung (Polenova 2002: 38-46). Dieses Pronomen bezeichnet abwesende Personen, die sich in einer Entfernung von dem Sprechenden und dem Hörer befinden. Die Pluralform für 'sie' drückte einen Sammelbegriff aus. Dazu diente nur das Kennzeichen **-ŋ**, vgl: ket. *bu* 'er, sie' – *buŋ* 'sie'; kott. *unian* 'sie'. Es ist wichtig zu bemerken, dass das Pronomen der 3. Person im Ketischen und anderen Jenissej-Sprachen nur Lebewesen vertritt. H. Werner schreibt:

Merkwürdigerweise erscheint in den Jenissej-Sprachen überall, wo es sich um Sammel- oder Kollektivformen handelt, das Pluralsuffix **-ŋ**, auch wenn sich die Formen auf Benennungen von Lebewesen oder Personen beziehen, z.B. ket. *d'e?ŋ*, jug. *d'e?ŋ*, kot. *čeāŋ* 'Leute'; ket. *buŋ*, jug. *bein*, kot. *unian* 'sie' (belebt) ... Auch die Subjekt- und Objektaffixe des Plurals in den Verbalformen, die sich immer nur auf belebte Aktanten beziehen, haben das Pluralsuffix **-ŋ** (ket., jug. *daŋ* / *daŋ*, kot. *toŋ* 'wir'; ket., jug. *kaŋ* / *kaŋ*, kot. *on* 'ihr'; ket., jug. *aŋ* 'sie').³

In der modernen ketischen Sprache kann man auch jetzt die Bedeutungserweiterung des Suffixes (**-a**, **-o**, **-A**)-**ŋ** beobachten: z.B. *ob* 'Vater' – *obaŋ* 'Eltern', aber auch 'Väter'.

Interessant sind in dieser Hinsicht die Beispiele in den heutigen Sprachen von H. Eichner: deutsch: *Wort* – *Worte* – *Wörter*; lat. *locus* – *loci* – *loca*; russ. *list* – *listi* – *listja*; *volos* – *volosi* – *volosja*; *sub* – *subi* – *subja*; *muž* – *muži* – *mužja*; *orden* – *ordeni* – *ordena* (Eichner 1985: 150).

Die Tatsache, dass die Affixe **-n**, und **-ŋ** gemeinenjenissejisch und allen Redeteilen eigen sind, zeigt, dass sie uralt sind. Das bestätigt unsere Meinung, dass diese Affixe auf die Klassenkennzeichen zurückgehen. Es

³ Werner, H. das Klassensystem in den Jenissej-Sprachen, 51-52.

sei auch bemerkt, dass V.M. Illič-Svitič in seinem nostratischen Wörterbuch unter Pronomen und pronominalen Affixen als das nostratische Pronomen der 1. Person Plural (exklusiv) die Form *na* 'wir ohne euch' angeführt hat. Unter Namenaffixen für Kasus und Zahl ist als Pluralsuffix für Lebewesen (direkte Form) das Affix *-na* mit der Variante *-ān* für Semitisch-Afrikanische Sprachen angeführt worden (Illič-Svitič 1971: 7,11). Im Ketischen kennzeichnet *-na* den Genitiv Plural von Lebewesen und den des Pluralpronomens der 3. Person. Dasselbe Affix kann auch als Possessivpronomen für alle drei Personen gebraucht werden, z.B. *na te:s'ay* 'unsere (eure, ihre) Pelzstiefel'. Es gibt folgende Demonstrativpronomen: *ki* 'dieser', *tu* 'dieser, jener', *qa* 'jener'. Diese Pronomen bekommen *-na* / *-ne* im attributiven Gebrauch vor Lebewesen und im selbständigen Gebrauch als Verteter der Lebewesen, z.B. *kina den diembis'in* 'Diese Menschen sind gekommen', *qana es'tij onon* 'Jene sind in den Wald hingegangen'.

Wir kommen zur Schlussfolgerung, dass die grammatische Pluralkategorie im Ketischen erst in ihrem Werdegang begriffen ist. Die Sprache weist Spuren der Grammatikalisierung des lexikalischen Quantitätsausdrucks nach, von dem Begriff der indiskreten Mehrheit zu einer diskreten, die schon morphologisch dargestellt wird.

Literatur

- Čikobava, A.S. *Istorism i lingvistika*. // Obščėje jasikosnanije. Tbilissi, 1983.
- Klimov, G.A. *Tipologija jasekov aktivnogo stroja*. Moskau, 1977.
- Degtjarjov, V.I. *Diachroničeskaja grammatika russkogo jaseika. Drevnerusskije imena sobiratel'nije v sravnitel'no-istoričeskom isloženii*. Rostov-am-Don, 2007.
- Eichner, Heiner. Numerus Kollektiv. - *Grammatische Kategorien. Funktion und Geschichte*. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Berlin, 20.-25. Februar 1983. Herausgegeben von Bernfried Schlerath. Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag. Wiesbaden, 1985.
- Illič-Svitič, V.M. *Opit sravnenija nostratičeskix jaseikov (semitoxamitski, kartvelski, indojevropejski, uralski, dravidijski, altajski). Vvedenije. Sravnitel'nij slovar' (b-ķ)*. Moskau, 1971.
- Polenova, G.T. *Proisxoždenije grammatičeskix kategorij glagola (na materijale jennisjejskix jaseikov)*. Taganrog, 2002.
- Porotova, T.I. *Kategorija množestvennosti v jennisjejskix jaseikax*. Tomsk, 1990.

Castrén M.A. *Versuch einer jensei-ostjakischen und kottischen Sprachlehre nebst Wörterverzeichnissen aus den genannten Sprachen.* St. Petersburg, 1858.

Toporov, V.N., Tsivjan, T.V. Ob isučenii imeni v ketskom (nekotorije rezultati i perspektivi). // Ketskij sbornik. Lingvistika. Moskau, 1968.

Werner, Heinrich. *Das Klassensystem in den Jenissej-Sprachen.* Harrassowitz Verlag. Wiesbaden in Kommission, 1994.

THE TYPOLOGY OF THE DISPLAY OF THE CATEGORY “PERSON/NOT-PERSON” IN THE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS “WHO?” AND “WHAT?”

MARINA AKHANOVA
(RUSSIA)

According to M. M. Guhman's definition, the grammatical category is a language unit as a certain system (code). It is correlated with a paradigmatic axis and represents “the model objectively reflecting ... the facts of speech.”¹

Answering the question of whether there is a general principle of formation of a grammatical category, I. Behert writes:

Language needs means which would specify in the **relations** between persons, objects, processes, qualities etc. Some of these relations are expressed by specific signs of the dictionary—by conjunctions, prepositions, etc.—whereas other relations are considered, apparently, **so important** (it is allocated by us—M.A.) that they are expressed by means of grammatical categories.²

After many researchers, we consider morphological categories as systems of the numbers of morphological forms opposed to each other within a certain part of speech with homogeneous maintenance; the isolated form with the isolated value does not form a category.

Grammatical categories cannot exist outside of certain groupings of words. These groupings usually act as a part of speech.

¹ Guhman M. Grammaticheskaya kategoriya i struktura paradigm // Issledovaniya po obshchei teorii grammatiki. – M., 1968. S. 117–174.

² Behert I. Ergativnost' kak ishodnyi punkt isucheniya pragmaticheskoi osnovy grammaticheskikh kategoriy // Novoe v zarubezhnoi lingvistike. – M., 1982. №11. S. 411–431.

In this chapter we are going to consider the expression of a grammatical category “person/not-person” on the material of interrogative pronouns (IPs) “who?” and “what?”

It is not casual as we have chosen pronouns—a part of speech which indicates persons, things and their signs, but does not name them. It is a special part of speech, as the pronoun unites grammatical signs which are separately peculiar to the diversified parts of speech in one class. Properties of different parts of speech are shown and crossed in a category of pronouns. The originality of pronouns is also discovered, and many traditional grammatical categories take on special significance in the system of pronouns.

The presence of the category “person/not-person” or “people/not-people” is rather typical for the majority of languages of different systems. For the given typological phenomenon such synonymic streams of terms as “person/not-person” and “person/thing” are still common. However, use of the term “person” has some connected inconvenience in that it is applied to a designation of a purely grammatical category of the personal pronouns reflected in personal forms of verbs and personal-possessive system of names and participles of many languages. The homonymy of terms within one area of knowledge is undesirable. The use of the word “thing” as a linguistic term also has some drawbacks. The everyday variant of this Russian word is indistinctly semantic. As a term of philosophy or jurisprudence it does not assume the classification of phenomena of the objective world, which is necessary for our purposes. The word, in all its variations, provokes understanding of the reality designated by it only as a sensually perceived object of the physical world, whereas before us is the class of concepts not covering all objects of the physical world and only such objects.

However, any term is conditional. Only the strict definition of semantic borders and convenience of the use and stability of the term are important. The terminology accepted by us can already be considered to some extent as settled in the linguistic literature.

In all **Finno-Ugric languages**, IPs are opposed on the presence of the category of “person/not-person”; compare: Fin. *kuka(ken)*—“who?”, *mikä*—“what?”; Est. *kes*—“who?”, *mis*—“what?”; Vod. *tšen (tšŋka)*—“who?”, *mi (mikä)*—“what?”; Veps. *k'en*—“who?”, *m'i*—“what?”; Mord. *kije*—“who?”, *mez'e*—“what?”; Mar. *kö*—“who?”, *mo*—“what?”; Komi *kodi*—“who?”, *mji*—“what?”; Udm. *kin*—“who?”, *mo*—“what?”; Hung. *ki*—“who?”, *mi*—“what?”. The system of IPs on division of denotatums on classes of “people” and “not-people” in Finno-Ugric languages is isolated from the system of names, since in these languages neither grammatical gender categories nor

any other types of distinction of names on grammatical classes are present. However, the opposition of the IPs is based on the same principle, as in the opposition of the nouns designating the person and nouns designating lifeless objects and animals. Compare, for example: Ngan. *Сылы хезытыну? Балә хезытыты* “Who goes? Your father goes” and *Мә хезытыну? Балә хезытыты* “Who (by literal what) goes? Your dog goes.”

The Altay languages don’t differentiate the subdivision of nouns on two general classes “person/not-person”. This category reveals itself in pronominal replacements, in their grammatical forms and word compatibility, and consequently they should be carried to a semantically-grammatical category.

As well as in the previous group of languages considered, in the Altay group the IPs are also opposed regarding “people” and “not-people,” such as the Russian pronouns *кто?* and *что?*—“who?” or “what?” For example: Turkm. *ким*—“who?”, *наме*—“what?”; Chuv. *кам*—“who?”, *мён*—“what?”

Nevertheless, concerning the conformity of pronouns for “who?” to all animate objects and “what?” to inanimate objects in Russian, this does not coincide with the majority of Turkic languages, for example in Karakalpak *ким*—“who?” concerns only people, and *не*—“what?”, all other live beings and inanimate objects. In the Bashkir language the pronoun *кем*—“who?” is used concerning the person, and the words *ни* and *нимә* act for other animate and inanimate objects. The given opposition of the main IP in the Even language is originally presented as a pronoun *нии?*—“who?”, and is mostly applied on instruction to the person, and the pronoun *еек?*—“what?” or “who?” is opposed semantically to *нии* and can be put to all nouns without their differentiation on a category of the “person” and “not-person,” but the pronoun *нии* acts functionally when the subject is unknown.

Let’s consider some more interesting examples showing the features of the replacement of nouns, concerning certain classes, on the main IPs in material from Even, Manchurian and Nanaian languages. Here there are no distinctions between languages as in each there is a pair of IPs from which one replaces only nouns of the category “person” and another—first of all, nouns of the category “not-person”—but they can replace nouns of the category “person” and also be used when the character of the interesting subject remains unclear for the enquirer. The Russian sentence *Что* (“thing”) *находится в шкафу?* is corresponded to the Manchurian *Гуйсэ дэ ай би?*, the Even *Шкафту ёкун бисин?*, and the Nanaian *Хоргоду хай бйни?* The same thing occurs in the sentences corresponding to Russian *Кого* (“animal”) *убил охотник?*, the Manchurian *Бутара нялма*

ай бэ вахаби?, the Even *Бэючимни ёкунма вāчāн?*, and the Nanaian *Боатонго хайва вāхани?* In these sentences the replacement of the IPs by another pair is possible only in the event that the answer with a noun of the person is supposed, i.e. if it means that there is any person in a case. Hence, the nouns of the class “not-person” in the interrogative value are replaced only with pronouns: the Manchurian *ай* // the Even *ёкун* // and the Nanaian *хай*. A little differently, there is a situation with the nouns of the class “person.” They are more often replaced with pronouns, i.e.: the Manchurian *вэ* // the Even *нй* // and the Nanaian *уй*. For example, “Whom (person) are you talking to?”—Manchurian *Си вэ дэ гисурэмби?*; Even *Си нйнун улгучэмэтчэрэс?*; Nanaian *Сй уйди гисурэндуйси?* In this situation it is possible with full preservation of the same sense, though it is less comprehensible, to replace the IP—Manchurian *Си ай здэ гисурэмби?*; Even *Си ёкуннун улгучэмэтчэрэс?*; Nanaian *Сй хайди гисурэндуйси?* There are some cases when IPs, as those as others, are used, in which nouns of the class “person” on equal rights are replaced. So, for example, “What is your name?”—Manchurian *Сини зэбу вэ?* - *Сини зэбу ай?* If the asking wants to find out what the interesting subject is itself—the person, the animal or something inanimate—the pronoun *ай/ёкун/хай* is used only, i.e.: “What is there (has appeared)?”—Manchurian *Тубадэ ай тучикэ?*; Even *Таду ёкун ичэвуллэн?*; Nanaian *Чаду хай агбинкини?* Here, there is a possibility of answering with any noun irrespective of its class association (the person, an animal, a tree, etc.). The replacement of the pronouns used here with those in opposition to them (*вэ/нй/уй*) with the meaning of “who (the person)” is admissible only when it is expected to hear only a noun of the class “person” in the answer.

Therefore, the IP replaces a noun and defines its accessory to this or that class. Schematically, we have represented it as: $a \leftrightarrow A$; $b \leftrightarrow B \sim A$. From the other side we receive $A \leftrightarrow a \sim b$; $B \leftrightarrow b$, where the IP is usually translated by the Russian *кто?*—“who?” (*a*), which is correlated only with the class “person” (*A*) (nothing connects them with the class “thing”), the IP translated by the Russian *что?*—“what?” and (*b*) are correlative first of all with the class “thing” (*B*), but also with the class “person” (*A*) (Avrorin 1980, 15). It allows us to think that nouns of the person were isolated from the originally undivided mass of words with the meaning “thing,” and their isolation has not completely come to the end—they did not have time to be released from some features typical for all nouns in general (the ability to be replaced with the words of the group *b*). Nouns of the class “thing” remained in an initial mass of words and they do not have new signs of the class “person” (the inability to be replaced with the words of the group *a*).

In the majority of **Indo-European languages**, IPs are opposed under significations on people and not-people (animals are put into the first or second one). There are some examples from Germanic languages: Germ. *wer*–“who?”, *was*–“what?”; Norw. *hvem/kven*–“who?”, *kva/hva*–“what?”; Swede *vem*–“who?”, *vad*–“what?”; Irish *cé*–“who?”, *cad*–“what?”; Lux. *wien*–“who?”, *wat*–“what?” (Yazyki mira. 2000: 235, 328, 367, 440).

However, it is necessary to notice that in Indo-European languages, where there are various grammatical classes of names, the division of IP does not coincide with the classification of names as a rule. Compare: Eng. *who*–“who?” which concerns both men and women, and *what*–“what?”, about animals and things, which is opposed to it. K. E. Majtinskaya notices that IP and nouns differ on semantic distribution in such languages in which (as in German or Russian) the grammatical gender does not coincide with a natural sex (German *Tisch* “table” and Russian *стол* “table” refer to a masculine gender, though the thing has no sex). The German *wer*–“who?” refers only to people, and *was*–“what?” to things, phenomena and animals. In Russian it is possible to ask with the help of *кто?*–“who?” only about people and animals, and with the help of *что?*–“what?” about things and phenomena, though *кто?*–“who?” is thought of as both masculine and feminine, for example *кто* больна, была ли *кто-нибудь* из нас довольна своей судьбой, *некто* в белом подошла к моей кровати; compare: *кто* другой, *никто* другой (A. A. Shakhmatov's examples). *Что*–“what” (about thing) invariably causes the representation of a neutral gender, whatever thing or animal it concerns, i.e. дай почитать *что-нибудь*, *что-то* возится в комодe (a mouse or a cockroach) (Shakhmatov 2007, 496).

According to V. M. Zhirmunsky, in Indo-European languages the basic IP initially had a general form that was not differentiated on gender for words of an active class (animated) “who?”, to which the form of a neutral gender for words of a passive class (inanimate) “what?” was opposed. Compare: Lat. *quis*–“who?” (Got. *hwas*), and *quod*–“what?” (Zhirmunsky 1956, 232).

However, in some modern Indo-European languages we meet a division of IPs on gender. Compare: Got. *hwas*–“who?” m. g., *hva*–“what?” n. g., *hvō*–“who?” f. g. In the Icelandic and Faeroe languages, indirect case forms of IP differ on a masculine, a female and a neutral gender. Compare: Icel. *hver*–“who?” genitive case *hvers* (m. g.), *hverrar* (f. g.), *hvers* (n. g.) etc.

It is necessary to notice that the semasiological opposition of a category “person” and “thing” is important in the **Caucasian languages**, for example in Cartvelian languages there are two stems of interrogative

pronouns: *vin*–“who?” for the names designating the person and *ra*–“what?” for all other animated and inanimate objects and phenomena.

The person is opposed to a thing in the IP of Chechen, Ingush, Batsbiy, Didoy, Dargin, Archib and other languages. For example: Darg. *чу*–“who?”, *се*–“what?”; Gunzib. *цкlo*–“who?”, *уиio*–“what?”; Adyg. *хэм*–“who?”, *сyд*–“what?”; Bats. *mē* or *хbā*–“who?”, *ьyx*–“what?”; Chech. *mila*–“who?”, *hu*–“what?” In all these languages the person/not-person are opposed, irrespective of presence or absence of grammatical classes, and their quantities (in some languages there are two, three, four grammatical classes, and in the Adygea language grammatical classes do not distinguish completely).

However, in Caucasian languages we can find exceptions and deviations from the opposition “person/not-person.” In the Georgian language the IP *vin*–“who?” is applicable only to the person, and *ra*–“what?” to not-person (things, an animal, a plant), but there is an exception, for example, *ra gegola*–“who were you born?” Tsezsk and Khvarshin languages unite the IP of a thing and the person (“who?”, “what?”) in one general form, and the Khvarshin language opposes male to female persons, animals, inanimate objects and abstract concepts in the indirect form (Bokarev 1959, 276).

In the Lezghin language the IP *ьyx*–“who?” and *ьyч*–“what?” reflect not the opposition “person/not-person” but “*animated/inanimate*,” because the first IP concerns only every living thing (reasonable and unreasonable), and the second all inanimate objects. In a number of dialects the fact of replacement of the pronoun *ьyx*–“who?” by the IP *ьyч*–“what?” is marked when it concerns some small animals and insects (Meylanova 1983, 10).

Thus, the opposition of the basic interrogative pronouns on the division into the “person/not-person” is also typical of Caucasian languages, as well as Finno-Ugric, Indo-European and Altay. However, if in Indo-European languages there are a few examples of the expression of a category of gender in the IPs, in Gothic, Icelandic (see above) and the majority of Caucasian languages this category is absent.

IPs in the majority of **Dravidian languages** have a *lexical-grammatical category of gender* (in the Ural languages, by the way, this is completely absent). In Tamil., anc. Malayalam, Cota, Kannada, Codagu and Tulu, in the singular, we can differentiate masculine, feminine and neutral genders (the words designating animals, inanimate objects and abstract concepts), and in the plural the so-called gender of the person and not person. In Telugu, Kurukh and Malto in the singular there is the masculine and not masculine gender, and in the plural the person and neutral gender (not person). In Colamy, Pardzh, Gadaba, Gondy, Kuy and

Kuvy, both in the singular and plural there is a masculine and not masculine gender. In Brauy, Toda and modern Malayalam the category of gender is absent.

Thus, in expanded form the Dravidian system of gender is presented by masculine, feminine and neutral genders in each number, meaning the masculine gender (the nouns designating males), the feminine gender (the nouns designating females), and the neutral gender (the nouns designating animals inanimate objects and abstract concepts). However, in such a volume the category of gender is really presented only in some dialects. In other cases there is a neutralization between the masculine and the feminine genders, and as a result there is an opposition of the person and the neutral (not person) gender, or a neutralization of the distinction between the female and the neutral genders leading to the opposition “masculine/not masculine” gender, or a neutralization of the distinction between the masculine and the neutral genders when the not-feminine gender is opposed to the feminine gender. Finally, in a number of languages all gender distinctions are neutralized, the category of gender disappearing in all of them, all nouns referring to a common gender. Compare: Tam. *yāvaṇ*–“who?” (m. g.), *yāvaḷ*–“who?” (f. g.), *yāvar*–“who?” (person. g.), *yāōi*–“what?”; Col. *ed*–“who?”, “what?” (not m. g., s.); Mlt. *nēreh*–“who?” (m. g.), *nē (ri) ǝ*–“who?” (f. g.), “what?” (s., pl.), etc.

Thus, the Dravidian IPs reflect the “person/not-person” opposition forms typical for the majority of languages, but at the same time have the special lexemes that oppose the masculine gender to the feminine, although there is no reflection of a grammatical gender in case indicators.

In **Paleoasian languages** (not Yenisei languages) the opposition of the examined IP is caused by the display of the category “person/not-person.” Compare: Chuk. *меуин*–“who?” (person) (a stem *мик/мек*), *рэ́нүт*–“who?”, “what?” (except of a person) (a stem *рек/рак*), and the pets whose nicknames known to participants of the speech and refer to the class *меуин*?, for example: *Ы́тты́ын ныту́гы*. – *Мэ́уин* – *Ву́тыл* “the Dog has broken with leashes—Who?—Vutyl”; Ker. *ја́уут*–“what?” “who?” (a stem *ја́у*); *ма́ки*–“who?” (a stem *ма́ки*); Kor. *мэ́ки*–“who?” (only about a person), *йы́нны*–“what?”, *ми́кин*–“whose?” (it is interesting that a stem *е́у-я́у*- of indirect forms of the pronoun *йы́нны* forms a stem of the interrogative words replacing all parts of speech, including verbs); Aljut. *му́уа*–“who?”, *та́нуа*–“what?”; Gren. *kina*–“who?”, *suna*–“what?” (about objects, animals, etc.). A typological parallel found in the Nivkhsky language, where the pronouns *та́уит*?, *на́р*?, *а́н*? refer to “who?” (only about a person), and for all other objects with and without