Between progressive and resultative: rigid semantics and flexible syntax for Northern Khanty -man verb

Northern Khanty (further NKh) converb -man suffix\(^1\) is an instance of progressive-resultative polysemy, which is attested, albeit uncommon, crosslinguistically (Ebert 1995, Shirai 1998, Crane 2013). Semantic properties of the form are described in (Kaksin 2008, Murav’ev 2017). The form derives a non-finite verb form typically used to describe a state simultaneous to the event in the matrix clause (1). It can also form a separate predication together with the copula wɵliti ‘to be’, yielding resultative interpretations (2).

Remarkably, Hungarian\(^2\) -vA adverbial participles have a similar distribution in terms of both structure and meaning. In the most recent paper on the topic, -vA is analyzed as a single affix with variable merge-in locations (Bartos 2009). Although we believe a unified account in a similar vein is tenable for -man in NKh, we aim to show that it is best modeled within a more fine-grained structure of event structure, as proposed in (Ramchand 2018).

In Ramchand’s system, the lowest subevent projection is res. This head introduces a result state, with the holder of that state merged in the specifier of resP. We believe a resP-sized structure is exactly what -man takes as its complement in copular clauses with wɵliti. NKh does not have a designated passive participle that could spell out a resP-sized structure, which allows us to posit that it can be lexicalized by the bare verb root, as there is no competition for insertion (abiding by the Superset Principle (Caha 2009)). A semantically vacuous copula (it can be omitted in unmarked NPST[3SG] contexts, (2)) is then needed to form a finite predication, since conversbs cannot bear tense or agreement morphology.

Syntax-wise, this account explains why the object of transitive verbs in these cases is not licensed with Acc and surfaces as the subject, whereas the external argument is unexpressed.

Semantics-wise, the ungrammaticality of atelic verbs (e. g. unergatives, (3)) in -man wɵliti constructions follows from the fact that they do not have a resP in their Aktionsart. The acceptability of manner adverbials varies among the consultants (4). This may be attributed to coercion of manner adverbials into result adverbials, which are merged lower (Alexiadou Anagnostopoulou 2008).

Adverbial clauses with -man are a different breed. They allow Acc licensing for the direct object of the converb (1) and combine freely with unergatives (3). They also combine with causative and pluractionality markers (5), which appear between the verb stem and the -man suffix. Thus, here -man must attach at least a VoiceP (~EvtP in Ramchand’s system), but less than a TP (following Masliukov 2022).

This is where we venture into semantics. What unites progressive and resultative is stativity (see Delfitto 2004, Mainborn 2009, Ramchand 2018). We suggest that the -man suffix introduces a state. The closest argument in -man’s c-command domain is merged in the specifier of manP and interpreted as the state holder. It is always the resultee in case of -man wɵliti clauses and typically the external argument in adverbial -man clauses. With agents, the state corresponds to a state of ongoing activity (progressive reading) whereas with undergoers it is interpreted as a result state (resultative reading).

In our talk, we will provide additional evidence for the stative nature of -man and delve deeper into semantic and pragmatic constraints restricting the use of NKh conversbs. We will also discuss conversbs’ interaction with various modifiers and lexical aspect markers.

---

\(^1\) All data has been collected via elicitation during a field trip to Kazym village (Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug) in summer, 2022. The results of the project “Cross-modular interactions in grammatical theory: Modelling grammatical features in the languages of Russia”, carried out within the framework of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE University) in 2023, are presented in this work.

\(^2\) The two languages are genetically close (Uralic > Ugric).
(1) [nəŋ-ti ɑ̬p-λ-oman] maša-ųj-en ȵą́č-λ.
‘Masha is laughing while hugging you.’

(2) iš-ųj-en puš-man (wə-λ)
window-POS2SG open-CVB COP-NPST[3SG]
‘The window is open.’

(3) pet-á-ųj-en χə-akedirsɼ ə-man #wə-λ / ɬ-ω-λ.
‘Petya lives running. / Petya is screaming while running.’
with wə-λ-ti intended: ‘Petya is running (now).’

(4) %iš-ųj-en χəleŋ jəs-ən puš-man wə-λ
window-POS2SG dirty hand-LOC open-CVB COP-NPST[3SG]
Intended: ‘Window has been opened with dirty hands.’

(5) [ði(ɨn)] kət-ən-ən mos-əλt-ijəλ-ųj-man ... [3DU] between-POS.3DU-LOC kiss-CAUS-FREQ-CVB] ...
[3DU] between-POS.3DU-LOC kiss-CAUS-FREQ-CVB] ...
‘While kissing each other, they ...’

Glosses: 2, 3 — 2, 3 person; ACC — accusative case; CAUS — causative; COP — copula; CVB — converb; DU — dual; FREQ — frequentative; LOC — locative case; NPST — non-past tense; POSS — possessive; PLAC — pluractionality marker; PST — past tense; SG — singular.
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