



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Alexey Starchenko

PERIPHRASTIC NOMINALIZATION IN KHANTY

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

**SERIES: LINGUISTICS
WP BRP 78/LNG/2019**

*Alexey Starchenko*¹

PERIPHRASTIC NOMINALIZATION IN KHANTY²

This paper focus on periphrastic nominalization — a construction which has nominal external syntax and which is used to express complement clauses. In this paper we examine the morphological and syntactic properties of this construction and compare those properties with those of typical nominalizations. In particular, a classification of nominalization into processes and results is used as the basis for comparison. As it is a crucial point regarding the contrast between a word and a construction, we also discuss whether the periphrastic nominalization shows signs of grammaticalization.

Keywords: North Khanty, Kazym Khanty, nominalization, periphrasis, grammaticalization.

JEL Classification: Z.

¹ National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia.

² The article was prepared within the framework of the Academic Fund Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE University) in 2018 — 2019 and by the Russian Academic Excellence Project «5-100».

1. The object of study

Khanty is a Finno-Ugric language, Ob-Ugric branch, mainly spoken in the Khanty-Mansi and Yamalo-Nenets autonomous regions in Russia. In this paper we consider Kazym, which is a Northern dialect of Khanty. Below we briefly list the basic features of Kazym Khanty (henceforth, Khanty):

- Khanty is left-branching, that is, the word order in the clause is SOV, and dependents precede the head in the noun phrase;
- Khanty is consistently head-marking, both in noun phrases and clauses;
- unlike most other Finno-Ugric languages, Khanty has few cases: dative, locative and unmarked nominative.

The most productive model of nominalizing verbs in Khanty is periphrastic³. In this paper, we use the term *periphrastic nominalization* to refer to a model of morphological derivation of deverbal nouns which makes use of auxiliary words. A more customary model, which employs bound morphemes, is called *synthetic*.

The structure of the construction is as follows: the word *wer* ‘deed, action’ which bears the usual nominal morphology expressing the nominal categories of the nominalization, and a non-finite form of the verb, which hosts the nominalization’s verbal categories. In (1), this non-finite form, directly preceding the word *wer*, is a non-past participle from the verb *λəmattə*- ‘to dress’.

- (1) [täm ewij-en n̄awr̄em λəmattə-ti w̄er-λ]⁴ ma w̄ə-λ-εm
this girl-POSS.2SG baby dress-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.3SG I know-NPST-1SG.SG
‘I know that this girl is dressing the baby. (lit. I know about the dressing of the baby by this girl)’

Two non-finite forms can be part of this construction. The first one has a wide syntactic distribution: it can express sentential arguments (2a-b) and non-past (i.e. present / future) participles (2c). The second one can only be used as a past participle (3) outside the periphrastic nominalization construction⁵.

- (2) a. λ̄uw χot ara los̄ət-ti oλ̄ɲit-əs
he house dismantle-PTCP.NPST begin-PST[3SG]
‘He began to dismantle the house.’
b. m̄ärə-tij-ən p̄äl-λ-əm

³ The data was gathered in the village of Kazym Khanty-Mansiysk Autonomous Okrug in 2018.

⁴ In the examples square brackets show nominalization clause boundaries.

⁵ The examples (2c) and (3) are provided by Bikina D.A.

thunder-PTCP.NPST-LOC fear-NPST-1sg

‘I’m afraid of loud noises.’

c. ari-ti ewi rəpit-λ äškələj-ən
sing-PTCP.NPST girl work-NPST[3SG] school-LOC

‘The girl who is singing works at the school.’

(3) χən-ti rəpit-əm učit’əl’ ewi
when-INDEF work-PTCP.PST teacher girl
‘the girl who was once a teacher’

Both forms can participate in the periphrastic nominalization construction, showing no differences except temporal reference. For the sake of simplicity, we will henceforth refer to both forms as *participles*.

Periphrastic nominalization is the main way to express an argument clause for a number of matrix predicates, particularly for mental predicates (*wəti* ‘know’, *nəmti* ‘remember’, etc.) and evaluative predicates (*jäm* ‘be good’, *atəm* ‘be bad’, *turas* ‘discomfort’, etc.) (see example 1 above and example 4).

(4) [λəw χəŋksa taλ-ti wər-λ] mən-əm turas äntə
he cigarette pull-PTCP.NPST deed-DIM-POSS.3SG I-DAT discomfort NEG.EX
‘His smoking does not bother me.’

Khanty also has synthetic nominalization, which is formed by the suffix *-əpsi*.

(5) λəw wəl-əpsi-λ lawərt
he live-NMLZ-POSS.3SG hard
‘His life is hard.’

However, this nominalization is unproductive: it cannot be formed from a number of verbs (for example **purtəpsi* ‘biting’, **ara jakəpsi* ‘dismantling’, **katləpsi* ‘catching’).

Nominalization formed by means of a free, rather than bound, morpheme is a typologically rare phenomenon (to the best of our knowledge, a similar construction occurs in Eastern Khanty [Potanina and Filchenko 2007] and in Tundra Nenets, another Uralic language which has been in contact with Northern Khanty [Nikolajeva 2017: 157]); such constructions have never been the object of detailed research. In this paper, we describe the morphological and syntactic properties of the Khanty periphrastic nominalization and discover the differences between it and synthetic nominalizations which are more common in the world’s languages. We also pay attention to another important question: is there a single construction which has been grammaticalized, or should it be considered syntactically compositional?

2. The syntax of periphrastic nominalization

2.1. Verbal syntax

2.1.1. Argument expression

Nominalization can express its arguments overtly.

- (6) = (1) [tām ewij-en n̄awr̄em λ̄om̄ətt̄ə-ti w̄er-λ] ma w̄ə-λ-εm
this girl-POSS.2SG baby dress-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.3SG I know-NPST-1SG.SG
'I know that this girl is dressing the baby.'

S- and A-participants are marked the same way as possessors are usually marked in a canonical possessive construction. The subject's grammatical person can be indexed by a possessive morpheme on the noun *w̄er*, which is mandatory if the subject is a personal pronoun. The object is never indexed. However, apart from the indexing, the marking of the arguments is analogous to that which is used in the finite clause, since the possessive construction and finite sentences do not mark the case of core arguments. Thus, the argument marking strategy is accusative-possessive or sentential in terms of Koptjevskaja-Tamm [1993].

When S- or A-participants are omitted, they are typically interpreted as coreferential to the subject of the main clause:

- (7) [w̄ūli kat̄əλ-ti w̄er] ma w̄ə-λ-εm
deer catch-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.3SG I know-NPST-1SG.SG
'I know how to catch deer.'

Contrariwise, if an O-participant is obligatory in the finite clause, it cannot be omitted in a nominalized clause either:

- (8) a. *[λ̄ūw kat̄əλ-ti w̄er-λ] ma w̄ə-λ-εm
he catch-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.3SG я know-NPST-1SG.SG
Intended meaning: 'I know that he is catching.'
- b. [λ̄ūw w̄ūli kat̄əλ-ti w̄er-λ] ma w̄ə-λ-εm
he deer catch-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.3SG I know-NPST-1SG.SG
'I know that he is catching a deer.'

2.1.2. Tense

Khanty periphrastic nominalizations expresses tense. The tense morpheme is interpreted as relative to the tense of the matrix clause: the present participle marker *-ti* marks the simultaneity of the events

expressed by the nominalization and the matrix clause, the past tense marker *-əm* suggests that the former precedes the latter.

- (9) a. [tām neŋ-en ńawɾem λəməttə-ti wɛɾ-λ] ma
 this woman-POSS.2SG baby dress-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.3SG I
 wə-λ-ɛm
 know-NPST-1SG.SG
 ‘I know that this woman is dressing the baby.’
- b. [tām neŋ-en ńawɾem λəmətt-əm wɛɾ-λ] ma
 this woman-POSS.2SG baby dress-PTCP.PST deed-POSS.3SG I
 wə-λ-ɛm
 know-NPST-1SG.SG
 ‘I know that this woman (has already) dressed the baby.’
- c. [tām neŋ-en ńawɾem λəməttə-ti wɛɾ-λ] ma
 this woman-POSS.2SG baby dress-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.3SG I
 wə-s-ɛm
 know-PST-1SG.SG
 ‘I knew that this woman was dressing the baby.’
- d. [tām neŋ-en ńawɾem λəməttə-əm wɛɾ-λ] ma wə-s-ɛm
 this woman-POSS.2SG baby dress-PTCP.PST deed-POSS.3SG I know-PST-1SG.SG
 ‘I knew that this woman had already dressed the baby.’

2.1.3. Adverbial modification

Nominalization can be modified by a wide range of adverbs: manner (10a), duration (10b), temporal (10c), (10d), and epistemic (10e).

- (10) a. [χαλ **jäma** wɛλ-əm wɛɾ-ɛm] ma amət-s-ɛm
 fish well get-PTCP.PST deed-POSS.3SG I rejoice-PST-1SG.SG
 ‘I rejoiced in my good fishing.’
- b. [sí neŋ-en ńawɾem χuw λəməttə-əm wɛɾ] ma wə-λ-ɛm
 this woman-POSS.2SG baby long dress-PTCP.PST deed I know-NPST-1SG.SG
 ‘I know that this woman was dressing the baby for a long time.’
- c. [ewij-en χatəλ **kutəp-en** λəməttə-ti ńawɾem wɛɾ-λ] ma
 girl-POSS.2SG noon-LOC dress-PTCP.NPST baby deed-POSS.3SG I
 wə-λ-ɛm

know-NPST-1SG.SG

‘I know about the girl dressing the baby at noon.’

d. [muλyatəλ ajiki-n λoxs-əλ n̄oxt-əm wɛr] ma

yesterday boy-POSS.2SG friend-POSS.3SG overtake-PTCP.PST deed I

nəm-λ-εm

remember-NPST-1SG.SG

‘I remember a boy was catching up with a friend yesterday.’

e. [λuw nɛmasija χot losit-əm wɛr-λ] ma wə-s-εm

he really house dismantle-PTCP.PST deed-POSS.3SG I know-NPST[3SG]

‘I know he has really dismantled the house.’

However, the last class of adverbs is not homogeneous in this respect. Not all epistemic adverbs can modify the construction under discussion⁶. In (11b) the adverb *jima* ‘really’ is outside the nominalization clause and the example is correct, while (11a), where the adverb is inside the clause, is ungrammatical.

(11) a. *[sí nɛŋ-en n̄awrɛm **jima** λəməttə-əm wɛr] ma

this woman-POSS.2SG baby really dress-PTCP.PST deed I

wə-λ-εm

know-NPST-1SG.SG

‘I knew this woman had really dressed the baby.’

b. *jima* [sí nɛŋ-en n̄awrɛm λəməttə-əm wɛr] ma

really this woman-POSS.2SG baby dress-PTCP.PST deed I

wə-λ-εm

know-NPST-1SG.SG

‘I really knew that woman had already dressed the baby.’

2.2. Nominal properties

All the nominal properties of the nominalization construction are expressed on the auxiliary word *wɛr*. Nominalization has all the inflectional categories that a regular Khanty noun can have and it can be modified by adjectives.

⁶Note that an adverb *jima* ‘really’ seems to be a synonym of *nɛmasija* ‘specially, really’. The syntactic behavior of these adverbs is different.

2.2.1. External syntax

The construction has the syntactic distribution of a noun and typically serves as the argument of the matrix verb. It can be marked for case and be the complement of a postposition.

- (12) [χοηksa taλ-ti wεr-en-ən] sí χολλ'-əλ-n
cigarette pull-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.2SG-LOC EMPH cough-NPST-2sg
'You are coughing because of your smoking.'

- (13) [amp-ət χurət-ti wεr-ət] ewəλt λəw pakn-əs
dog-PL bark-PTCP.NPST deed-PL from he be.scared-PST[3SG]
'He was scared because he heard dogs barking.'

2.2.2. Possessive and number morphology

The nominalization can host any combination of possessive (12), (14), (15) and number morphemes (12). Not only plural, but also dual number is possible.

- (14) a. [ma wεr-ti wεr-εm] λəw-eλ turas
I do-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.3SG he-DAT discomfort
'My trick disturbs him.'
- b. [ma wεr-ti wεr-λ-am] λəw-eλ turas
I do-PTCP.NPST deed-PL-POSS.3SG he-DAT discomfort
'My two tricks disturb him.'
- c. [ma wεr-ti wεr-ηαλ-am] λəw-eλ turas
I do-PTCP.NPST deed-DU-POSS.3SG he-DAT discomfort
'My tricks disturb him.'

2.2.3. Adjectival modification

The construction may be modified by adjectives (15). Only adjectives expressing evaluation (*wən* 'big, bad', *aj* 'little', meaning 'easy, unimportant', *jäm* 'good', *atəm* 'bad') are completely productive in this respect.

- (15) [λəw χοηksa taλ-ti wən wεr-λ] ma wə-λ-εm
he cigarette pull-PTCP.NPST big deed-POSS.3SG I know-NPST-1SG.SG
'I know about his bad habit of smoking.'

3. Typological background

3.1. Syntactic properties

The construction has a set of nominal and verbal morphological properties close to full for finite forms like nominalization. According to the examples which Serdobolskaya [2005] and Alexiadou [2001] observe in a large dataset, in a given language tense is expressed in a nominalized clause if it can also be expressed in ordinary noun phrases. However, in Khanty, lexical noun phrases do not have the grammatical category of tense, while nominalizations do. Interestingly, the only example provided by Serdobolskaya [2005] which contradicts the universal mentioned above is the Italian perfective infinitive, which is a periphrastic construction, although not exactly parallel to the one under study here.

In addition, the behavior of Khanty periphrastic nominalization differs from what is known about the typical behavior of synthetic nominalizations. Alexiadou [2001] shows that nominalizations, denoting an event whose properties are shown by periphrastic nominalization, have restrictions on the possibility of their modification by adverbs related to the semantic class of these adverbs, or the place in the verbal spine where they are merged. Adjectives which correspond to “higher” syntactic nodes (i.e. attaching to the level higher than AspP) are not typically able to modify the nominalization (if adverbial modification is possible at all). Khanty nominalizations allow a very wide range of adverbs, including epistemic and evaluative. This can be explained by the following stipulation: Khanty periphrastic nominalizations contain more verbal structure than a typical synthetic one. This claim can be corroborated by the fact that the periphrastic nominalization can be marked for tense. It is interesting that the periphrastic nominalization hardly allows adjectival modifiers, except manner ones, which are of the “lowest” level.

3.2. Process or result

An important property of nominalizations, according to which they are divided into two different groups, is whether they inherit the verbal argument structure. Nominalizations which have an argument structure typically denote events (in particular, like events expressed by regular VPs, they can be interpreted as either processes or achievements/accomplishments) and have a wide range of verbal properties, while the set of their nominal properties is limited. The nominalizations which do not inherit the verb’s argument structure denote results and do not show verbal properties. Using the terminology of Grimshaw [1990], we call the former processes and the latter results.

We applied a number of tests proposed by Grimshaw [ibid.] for the distinction between process and result nominalizations to the construction in question.

1. A process describes an event: it has its own participants and is localized along the temporal axis, i.e. it has its own time. The result nominalization does not have any these properties. According to this parameter, Khanty nominalizations can be classified as processes (see, e.g.,(10b)).
2. The arguments of a process nominal cannot be omitted, unlike the arguments of a result nominal. In Khanty, the internal argument of the periphrastic nominalization arguments cannot be omitted (6), so, it is a procedural nominalization.
3. Process nominals can attach agent-oriented modifiers, while result nominalizations cannot. Khanty nominalization again behaves as a process:

(16) [λ_{uw} **nemasija** χot losit-əm wer-λ] ma wə-s-εm
 he specially house dismantle-PTCP.PST deed-POSS.3SG I know-PST-1SG.SG
 ‘I know that he deliberately dismantled the house.’

4. Result nominals can take modifiers of the same type as English *a*, *one*, while process nominals cannot. Khanty speakers differ in whether such modifiers are acceptable for them:

(17) [?][ewi *ńawrem* λəməttə-ti i wer-λ] ma wə-λ-εm
 girl baby dress-PTCP.NPST one deed-POSS.3SG I know-NPST-1SG.SG
 ‘I know about one case of a girl dressing the baby.’

5. Result nominals can be modified by numerals while process nominals cannot (at least without further elaboration). According to this test, Khanty periphrastic nominalization is a result nominal (see 2.2.2). However, this test gives inconsistent results in different languages. For example, it was shown by Szabolcsi [1994] for Hungarian and by Markantonatou [1995] for Greek that nominalizations with plural morphology can have process interpretations. Nominalizations in these languages share the following property: the number differences in these constructions reflect the differences in the aspectual properties of the events denoted by the constructions. In Khanty, however, the periphrastic nominalization can be marked not only for plural, but also for dual, in which case an aspectual interpretation, not a quantitative one, seems to be less likely.
6. According to the previously formulated generalization, modifiers such as *often* or *always* can combine with result nominals only in the plural and with process nominalizations in the singular. Khanty nominalizations can be combined with such modifiers in any number, so the results of this test do not point in any direction.

(18) a. [ewi isa *ńawrem* λəməttə-ti wer-λ] ma wə-λ-εm
 girl often baby dress-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.3SG I know-NPST-1SG.SG

‘I know that a girl often dresses the baby.’

- b. [ewi isa íawɾem λəməttə-ti wɛr-λ-aλ] ma
 girl often baby dress-PTCP.NPST deed-PL-POSS.3SG I
 wə-λ-ɛm
 know-NPST-1SG.SG

‘I know that a girl often dresses the baby.’

7. The aspectual properties of an event expressed by a procedural nominalization can be expressed by dedicated morphological markers, which is only possible for process, not result, nominals. Khanty nominalization can take aspectual modifiers (16).

№	Test	Process	Result	-ti wɛr.
1.	Projecting arguments	Possible	Impossible	Possible
2.	Projecting internal arguments	Obligatory	Non-obligatory	Obligatory
3.	Agent modifiers	Possible	Impossible	Possible
4.	Modifiers like <i>a, one</i>	Impossible	Possible	?Possible
5.	Plural form	?Impossible	Possible	Possible
6.	Modifiers like <i>often, always</i> are combined with	Singular	Plural	Any number
7.	Aspectual modifiers	Possible	Impossible	Possible

Khanty nominalization inherits the argument structure of its verbal stem, which is shown by tests 1 and 2, that is, it is to be classified as process. However, it also has some properties of a result nominal.

Sometimes, one and the same form can be interpreted as either process or result (as, for example, in the English form *destruction*) in several contexts. In this case, Grimshaw [1990] predicts that each specific use of such ‘polyfunctional’ forms should have only the properties associated with one particular type of nominalization (for example, while an indefinite article and an aspectual modifier are in principle possible, they cannot occur with a nominalization simultaneously: **a destruction of the city by enemies for three hours*). However, Khanty periphrastic nominalization disobeys this rule: it may at the same time exhibit the properties of both constructions (e.g. be simultaneously modified by an adverb and bear plural morphology (18b), the arguments with the sentential marking and modifier like *a, one* (15), etc.).

4. Evidence for Grammaticalization

4.1. Non-compositional semantics

First of all, it is necessary to point out the non-compositional semantics of this construction. It could be assumed that the ‘deed’ element could combine with the participle to produce a structure with the semantics of a deverbal noun (if there is the possibility of a compositional analysis of the construction’s semantics, taking into account the problematic nature of *wɛr* ‘deed’ — see section 4.2). We have every reason to assume that a compositional analysis of this construction can only make sense if the verb within the construction denotes an action (i.e. an agentive dynamic event). It can, however, contain states (19), verbs with an inanimate S-participant (20), and even impersonal verbs (21).

(19) [λuw ul-ti wɛr-λ] ma wə-λ-ɛm
he sleep-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.3SG я know-NPST-1SG.SG
‘I know that he is (always) asleep.’

(20) [tata jɪŋk uw-əɪ wɛr] ma wə-λ-ɛm
here water flow-PTCP.PST deed I know-NPST-1SG.SG
‘I know that the water is running here.’

(21) a. [jɛrt-ti wɛr] atəm
rain-PTCP.NPST deed bad
‘Rain is bad.’
b. [pätλə-ti wɛr] män-ɛm turas
darken-PTCP.NPST deed I-DAT discomfort
‘I don't like it when it gets dark.’

4.2. Function of *wɛr*

If we assume that a participle in the nominalization behaves regularly, i.e. projects an ordinary participial relative clause, it should assign a semantic role to the target of the relativization (a trace, which is coreferent to a the head noun phrase)⁷. For example, in (22) the word *action*, which controls the participle phrase, fills one of its valences (Agent), and if the participle phrase has another agent, the sentence becomes ungrammatical.

(22) a. I know about your completed action.
b. *I know about your [by John completed]_{RC} action.

⁷This requirement is not universal for any language, for example, it has been claimed not to work in Nakh-Daghestanian languages [Kibrik 1992, Lander 2012]. We do not know about the existence of such constructions for Khanty.

However, it is hard to tell which semantic role the verb which heads the Khanty participial construction assigns to the word *wer*. As we can see in (23), the verb valency slots are occupied by the words *ewi* and *ńawrem*, leaving no semantic role for *wer*. We can provide an additional argument in favor of the fact that *wer* is not a part of the verb's argument structure: at least some impersonal verbs can participate in the periphrastic nominalization construction (23).

- (23) [ewi ńawrem λəməttə-ti wer-λ] ma wə-λ-εm
 girl baby dress-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.3SG I know-NPST-1SG.SG
 'I know about the girl dressing the baby.'

4.3. Nominalization of the *werti* verb

The word *wer* is a verbal stem itself. A periphrastic nominalization can be formed from the verb *werti* 'to do', which has the same root as the auxiliary component of the construction. This is an argument for the fact that one of these elements which share the same root elements is lexical while the other one is an auxiliary.

- (24) [λuw wer-ti wer-λ] män-εma jām
 he do-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.3SG I-DAT good
 'His behavior pleases me.'

4.4. The interpretation and obligatoriness of the possessive marker

The person and number of the S/A-participant of the nominalized predicate is indexed by a possessive marker on the nominalization. The marker can be omitted if this participant is expressed by an overt NP and in contexts like (25c), where the S/A-participant of the nominalized predicate coincides with the subject of the matrix clause. If S/A is expressed by a personal pronoun, or *pro* is not expressed (and does not coincide subject of the matrix clause), the possessive index is required:

- (25) a. λuw ńawrem λəməttə-ti wer-λ ma wə-λ-εm
 he baby dress-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.3SG I know-NPST-1SG.SG
 'I know he is dressing the baby.'
- b. *λuw ńawrem λəməttə-ti wer ma wə-λ-εm
 he baby dress-PTCP.NPST deed I know-NPST-1SG.SG
 'I know he is dressing the baby.'
- c. λuw ńawrem λəməttə-ti wer-λ ma wə-λ-εm
 he baby dress-PTCP.NPST deed-POSS.3SG I know-NPST-1SG.SG
 'I know how to dress a baby.'
- #'I know he is dressing the baby.'

For the noun *wer*, as for nouns in general, a possessive markers is not obligatory when the possessor does not coincide with the subject of the clause containing a noun.

4.5. Morphological derivation

Nominalization (that is, the word *wer*) cannot attach derivational morphemes (26), meaning that in terms of derivation *wer* is treated differently as the part of nominalization and in a free context.

- (26) a. * $[\lambda_{uw} \text{ } \chi o\eta ksa \text{ } ta\lambda\text{-}ti \text{ } wer\text{-}ije\text{-}\lambda] \text{ } m\ddot{a}n\text{-}\epsilon m \text{ } \ddot{a}n \text{ } turas$
 he cigarette pull-PTCP.NPST deed-DIM-POSS.3SG I-DAT NEG discomfort
 ‘His small smoking does not bother me.’
- b. $wer\text{-}ije\text{-}\lambda$
 deed-DIM-POSS.3SG
 ‘little job’
- c. * $[\lambda_{uw} \text{ } \chi o\eta ksa \text{ } ta\lambda\text{-}ti \text{ } wer\text{-}\acute{s}iwi\text{-}\lambda] \text{ } m\ddot{a}n\text{-}\epsilon m \text{ } \ddot{a}n \text{ } turas$
 he cigarette pull-PTCP.NPST deed-AUG-POSS.3SG I-DAT NEG discomfort
 ‘His heavy smoking does not bother me.’
- d. $wer\text{-}\acute{s}iwi\text{-}\lambda$
 дело-AUG-POSS.3SG
 ‘Big job.’

5. Conclusion

Khanty periphrastic nominalization exhibits a wide range of nominal and verbal properties. This can be potentially explained by the fact that the periphrastic nominalization has separate nominal and verbal parts which can participate in syntactic processes (at least to some extent) separately.

The construction in question cannot be classified as denoting a result or a process but can exhibit properties of both. Thus, the periphrastic nominalization, despite showing similarities with the synthetic one, clearly forms a separate class of constructions.

Periphrastic nominalization shows a number of properties which suggest it has undergone grammaticalization, and cannot be considered to be compositional either syntactically or semantically. Grammaticalization mainly affects the functional element of the whole construction, the word *wer*. Whether the properties of the participle differ within the nominalization and in other contexts in terms of internal syntax remains to be seen.

References

- Alexiadou, Artemis (2001). *Functional Structure in Nominals: Nominalization and ergativity*. Amsterdam.
- Grimshaw, Jane (1990). *Argument Structure*. Cambridge.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (1993). *Nominalizations. (Theoretical Linguistic Series)*. London, New York.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin (2003). "Subject case in Turkish nominalized clauses". In: *Syntactic Structures and Morphological Information*. Ed. by U. Junghanns & L. Szucsich. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, pp. 129–215.
- Markantonatou, Sailer (1995). "Modern Greek deverbal nominals: an LTM approach". In: *Journal of Linguistics* 31, pp. 267–299.
- Nikolajeva, Irina (2017). "The general noun-modifying clause construction in Tundra Nenets and its possible origin". In: *Noun-Modifying Clause Constructions in Languages of Eurasia: Reshaping theoretical and geographical boundaries*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, pp. 147–178.
- Szabolcsi, A (1994). "The Noun Phrase". In: *Syntax and Semantics 27. The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*. Academic Press, pp. 179–274.
- Potanina, Olga and Andrey Filchenko (1992). Poslelogi v vostochno-khantyjskikh dialektah [Postpositions in Eastern Khanty dialects]. *Vestnik TGPU*, No. 4(67). Tomsk, pp.63-70.
- Kibrik, Alexander (1992). *Očerki po obshhim i prikladnym voprosam yazykoznanija (universal'noe, tipovoe i spetsifichnoe v yazyke)* [Essays about general and applied linguistics issues (universal, typical and specific in the language)]. Moscow, MSU Publ.
- Lander, Juri (2012). *Relyativizatsiya v polisinteticheskom yazyke: adygejskie otnositel'nye konstruktsii v tipologicheskoj perspective* [Relativization in polysynthetic language: Adyghe relative constructions in typological perspective]. Moscow.
- Serdobolskaya, Natalia (2005). *Sintaksicheskij status aktantov zavisimoj nefinitnoj predikatsii* [The syntactic argument's status in the dependent non-finite predication]. Moscow.

Contact details:

Aleksey Starchenko,
National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia), School of linguistics;
E-mail: aleksey-starchenko@mail.ru

Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of

HSE.

© Starchenko 2019