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

Маслюков Всеволод Романович. МГУ. sevamaslukov@icloud.com
Куликова Анна Андреевна. НУЛ по формальным моделям в лингвистике, ВШЭ. annie.kulikova@yandex.ru

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 *wθλti* '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 syntax 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 *res*P. We believe a *res*P-sized structure is exactly what *-man* takes as its complement in copular clauses with *wθλti*. NKh does not have a designated passive participle that could spell out a *res*P-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 converbs 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 wθλti* constructions follows from the fact that they do not have a *res*P 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 *Voice*P (~*Evt*P 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, Maienborn 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 wθλti* 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 converbs. We will also discuss converbs' 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) [năŋ-**ti** ăpλ-əman]   maša-jen   ńăχ-əλ
    [2SG-**ACC** hug-CVB]   masha-POSS.2SG   laugh-NPST[3SG]
    'Masha is laughing while hugging you.'

(2) išń-en   pᵾš-**man**   (wɵ-λ)
    window-POSS.2SG open-**CVB**   COP-NPST[3SG]
    'The window is open.'

(3) pet´a-jen   χɵχ-ət´λ´ə-**man**   #wɵ-λ   / ᵒᵏᵾw-əλ
    petya-POSS.2SG   run-PLAC-CVB   COP-NPST[3SG] / scream-NPST[3SG]
    'Petya lives running. / Petya is screaming while running.'
    with *wɵλ-ti* intended: 'Petya is running (now).'

(4) %išń-en   **χɵlɛŋ još-ən**   pᵾš-man   wɵ-λ
    window-POSS.2SG **dirty hand-LOC**   open-CVB   COP-NPST[3SG]
    Intended: 'Window has been opened with dirty hands.'

(5) [(λin)   kᵾt-ən-ən   mos-**əλt-ijə**λ-man] ...
    [(3DU)   between-POSS.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.

Literature
A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou. Structuring participles // Ch. B. Chang, H. J. Haynie (eds.). Proceedings of the 26th west coast conference on formal linguistics, 2008. P. 33-41.
H. Bartos. The syntax of Hungarian -vA adverbial participles: A single affix with variable merge-in locations // K. É. Kiss (eds.). Adverbs and adverbial adjuncts at the interfaces, 2009.
P. Caha. The nanosyntax of case. CASTL, University of Tromsø dissertation, 2009.
T. M. Crane. Resultatives, progressives, statives, and relevance: The temporal pragmatics of the-ite suffix in Totela // Lingua, 2013. V. 133. P. 164-188.
D. Delfitto. On the Logical Form of Imperfective Aspect // J. Guéron, J. Lecarme (eds). The Syntax of Time, 2004. P. 115 - 143.
K. H. Ebert. Ambiguous perfect-progressive forms across languages // P. M. Bertinetto, V. Bianchi, Ö. Dahl, M. Squartini (eds.). Temporal Reference, Aspect and Actionality. Vol. 2: Typological Perspectives, 1995. P. 185-203.
A. D. Kaksin. Modalnost I sredstva ee vyrazhenya v khantyiskov yazyke: monograph // Khanty-Mansiysk: Polygraphist, 2008.
C. Maienborn. Building event-based ad hoc properties: on the interpretation of adjectival passives // A. Riester & T. Solstad (eds.), Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 13, 2009. P. 35–49. University of Stuttgart. Stuttgart.
V. R. Masliukov. A syntactic and semantic account of converb construction in Kazym Khanty // D. V. Gerasimov (eds.), Devyatnadtsaya konferentsiya po tipologii i grammatike dlya molodyh issledovatelei. Tezisy dokladov (Saint Petersburg, 24–26 Nov 2022), 2022. P. 202-204. ILR RAC.
N. A. Murav'ev. Semantika i pragmatika glagol'nykh form odnovremennosti v mokshanskikh, komi-zyrianskikh i khantyiskikh idiomakh [Semantics and pragmatics of verbal forms expressing simultaneity in the Moksha Mordovian, KomiZyrian and Khanty idioms]. Finno-ugorskii mir = Finno-Ugric World. 2017; 2: 52–62. (In Russian)
G. C. Ramchand. Situations and Syntactic Structures. MIT Press Monographs, 2018.
Y. Shirai Where the progressive and the resultative meet: Imperfective aspect in Japanese, Chinese, Korean and English // Studies in Language 22 (3), 1998. P. 661-692.