

Aspectual and discourse-pragmatic properties of verbal forms expressing Simultaneity in three Finno-Ugric languages

(Short title: Forms of Simultaneity in Finno-Ugric languages)

Nikita Muravyev (Higher School of Economics, Moscow)

Aspectual and discourse-pragmatic properties of verbal forms expressing Simultaneity in three Finno-Ugric languages

This paper concerns the converb forms expressing Simultaneity in Izhma Komi, Northern Khanty and Moksha belonging to the Finno-Ugric group of languages. The existing typological classifications of temporal relations and simultaneity relations in particular either are not detailed enough or lack rigorous criteria and thus appear not to be sufficient for understanding the usage and the distribution of temporal converbs. The study attempts at building a more detailed typological classification of Simultaneity functions which accounts for the data of the languages under consideration. The analyzed parameters of variation include the viewpoint aspect of the events, clause modification type, givenness of the conveyed information and the pragmatic type of the predicate. Special attention is paid to the discourse-pragmatic properties of the forms which bring new insights into the discussion.

Converb, temporal relations, simultaneity, aspect, discourse, Izhma Komi, Moksha, Northern Khanty

Аспектуальные и дискурсивные свойства глагольных форм со значением одновременности в трёх финно-угорских языках

В данной статье рассматриваются формы деепричастий, выражающие семантику одновременности в коми-зырянском, хантыйском и мокшанском языках финно-угорской языковой группы. Существующие типологические классификации таксисных функций и, в частности, функций зоны одновременности представляются либо недостаточно проработанными, либо построенными на неочевидных критериях и поэтому не являются достаточными для понимания функционирования и дистрибуции таксисных деепричастий. Исследование представляет собой попытку построить типологически-ориентированную классификацию функций одновременности, адекватно описывающую рассматриваемый языковой материал. В статье анализируются параметры видового ракурса ситуаций, типа клаузуальной модификации, статуса активации информации и прагматического типа предиката. Особое внимание уделяется дискурсивным свойствам форм, которые открывают новые перспективы для исследования таксисных конструкций.

Деепричастие, одновременность, аспект, дискурс, коми-зырянский язык, мокшанский язык, хантыйский язык

1. Introduction

Finno-Ugric languages have a wide variety of non-finite verb forms (participles, converbs, action nominals) that can be used in adverbial constructions denoting various circumstantial relations between the events (e. g. time, cause, condition, concession). The vast

majority of adverbial forms describe temporal relations such as simultaneity, anteriority, posteriority and some finer semantic distinctions. These relations are often expressed by means of more than one form and one form can express more than one relation. This study gives a closer look at polysemy and competition of these forms, and some properties that determine their usage.

There is currently little known about semantic and discourse-pragmatic variation of the converb forms. Some relevant observations can be found in a cross-linguistic study of converb forms by I. Nedjalkov (1998) as well as in the studies on the typology of converbs (Haspelmath and König 1995) and the typology of temporal constructions by Xrakovskij (2009). For instance, König (1995: 73-85) in discussing factors which influence semantic interpretation lists aspectual properties of the events, the order of the main and the dependent clause, operator scope, intonation etc. Although these factors have never received detailed typological consideration there exists a number of studies on individual languages such as Onishi (1994: 468–476) on Motuna, Lehmann (1989: 267) on Tamil, or Pazel'skaja and Šluinskij (2007) on Mishar Tatar; see also discussion of Finno-Ugric data by Čeremisina and Solovar (1991), Ylikoski (2001) and Nekrasova (2015). This article presents an attempt to build a typologically oriented classification of Simultaneity subtypes and converb forms used in these functions which accounts not only for semantic but also for discourse-pragmatic parameters of variation.

The Moksha data for this research have been collected during fieldwork in the villages Lesnoe Tsibaevo and Lesnoe Ardaševo of the Mordvin Republic (2013–2015), Izhma Komi and Northern Khanty data have been collected in the villages Muzhi, Vosyakhovo, and Ovgort of the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Region (2016, 2017), all the data come from elicitation.

Section 2 of the article presents an overview of the existing classification of simultaneity relations and set the framework for further analysis and discussion. Section 3 contains a short morphological and semantic description of the relevant forms in the languages under consideration. Section 4 presents the data on the relevant semantic and pragmatic properties of the forms followed by Section 5 with results of the study and discussion.

2. Simultaneity and its subtypes

Temporal constructions as a subject of study lie at the intersection of the semantic domain of temporal relations between the events and the formal domain of complex sentences. It is usually agreed that the main clause event in a complex sentence serves as a temporal reference point for a dependent clause event, which can take place before the reference point

(Anteriority), after the reference point (Posteriority) or coincide with it (Simultaneity). There have been several attempts at classifying the subtypes of these core relations (e.g. Kortmann 1998 and Xrakovskij 2009). Kortmann's classification (1998: 364-368) based on broad data of various means of adverbial subordination across Europe is by far the most detailed and lists the following three subtypes of Simultaneity:

- ***Simultaneity Overlap***: p overlaps with q ('when');
- ***Simultaneity Duration***: p opens up a time interval for the whole or part(s) of which q is true ('while');
- ***Simultaneity Co-Extensiveness***: p opens up a time interval for the whole of which q is true ('as long as').

As one can see from the definitions, this subdivision is based on two semantic parameters: the presence of a time interval which makes a temporal relation more precise (second and third function as opposed to the first) and coverage of this interval by the second event (third function as opposed to the second).

V. Xrakovskij (2009: 30) also distinguishes three subtypes of Simultaneity:

- ***Full Simultaneity***, as in 'When Peter was working, Mary was reading a book';
- ***Partial Simultaneity I***, as in 'When Peter was working, Mary entered the room';
- ***Partial Simultaneity II***, as in 'When Mary entered the room, Peter was working'.

This classification accounts only for the mutual coverage of the events on the time axis but at the same time, it is based not on the abstract notion of an interval as suggested by Kortmann but on the viewpoint of the events which can be determined from the aspectual behavior of the corresponding predicates. While the first function is a result of combining two imperfective events, the second and the third functions result from combining an imperfective event with a perfective event.

One more semantic classification by Nedjalkov (1998: 432) focuses on the ways of expressing adverbial functions and their subtypes in converb forms. All forms are classified according to whether they express only one function (specialized) or multiple functions (contextual), the function of one semantic domain (taxi, i. e. temporal, and non-taxi) or functions from more than one semantic domain (mixed). Forms expressing Simultaneity fall into three classes: contextual mixed converbs, contextual taxi converbs and specialized taxi converbs resulting in the following subtypes:

- ***Mixed converbs of contextual Simultaneity***, expressing Simultaneity proper, Accompanying Circumstance, Contact Anteriority etc;

- *Contextual taxis converbs of Simultaneity and Anteriority;*
- *Specialized taxis converbs of Exact Simultaneity.*

This classification shows that apart from Simultaneity itself simultaneous converbs also tend to express Anteriority and Attendant Circumstance (cf. König 1995: 65-66). The latter function is not usually counted among the temporal functions but appears to be a special pragmatic variation of the Simultaneity function, as in *The boy walks **singing*** where the boldfaced form marks the new rather than the given information in comparison to *The boy sings **while walking***.

While providing a semantic description of temporal relations in a complex sentence one should also consider choosing an appropriate way to name the events in a relation. From our point of view, the definition of a temporal relation should be free of specific syntactic labels, such as “dependent clause” and “main clause” which describe syntactic, not semantic relations in a sentence. Moreover, they apply only to sentences with a clear subordinate relation between the clauses and do not cover cases of coordination or “cosubordination” (cf. Olson 1981, Foley and van Valin 1984). Instead, as suggested in Farr (1999: 177) and Fedden (2007: 387), more neutral labels “marked clause” and “reference clause” can be used, the former denoting a temporally marked clause and the latter — the second clause, to which the temporal marking in the sentence refers.

The data of Finno-Ugric converb forms analyzed here suggest that, while the parameter of viewpoint seems to be of primary importance, it is rather precision of the simultaneous relation and not the mutual coverage of events that is relevant for the discussion of Simultaneity and its subtypes in typological perspective. Furthermore, along with analyzing the semantic nature of the forms, one should also take into account the discourse-pragmatic aspect of the problem.

3. Form and meaning of the simultaneous converbs

The inventory of the verbal forms expressing Simultaneity in Moksha includes converbs in *-əmstə*, *-əmək* and *-əz’*. The converb in *-əmstə* (cf. Koljaděnkov 1962: 324, and Serebrennikov 1967: 216) presented in example (1) below expresses Simultaneity Duration and is historically an relative case form of the infinitive with possessive subject agreement markers.

MOKSHA

- (1) *mon’* *mol’-əm-stə-n* *son* *jařca-s’*
 I.OBL go-INF-EL-1SG.POSS (s)he eat-PST.3SG
 ‘While I was walking, he was eating.’

Moksha has two simple monomorphemic converbs in *-əmək* and *-əz'* (cf. Koljaděnkov 1962: 225–226 and Cygankin 1980: 357–362). The converb in *-əmək* presented in (2) expresses Simultaneity Overlap/Contact Anteriority.

- (2) *s'oran'-əs' ivac' van-əmək langə-zə-n*
 boy-DEF shout:PST.3SG look-CVB top-ILL-1SG.POSS
 'The boy was shouting when he looked at me.'
 'The boy shouted after having looked at me.'

The other simple converb in *-əz'* presented in the example (3), expresses Attendant Circumstance.

- (3) *s'oran'-əs' ivac' langə-zə-n van-əz'*
 boy-DEF shout:PST.3SG top-ILL-1SG.POSS look-CVB.ATTC
 'The boy was shouting and looking at me at the same time.'

Izhma Komi has at least the following four converbs denoting simultaneous relations between events: *-jga/-jgen*, *-jgmoz* and *-jgtjŕ* (see Lytkin 1955: 244–245, Saxarova and Sel'kov 1976: 101–102, and Birjuk et al. 2010: 431–433), all diachronically related to the verbal noun in **-jg*. The first form carries the function of Simultaneity Duration and is derived by means of the instrumental case marker or the possessive marked Inessive case respectively, see (4) below.

IZHMA KOMI

- (4) *tuj kuz'a mun-jg-en / mun-jg-as sja kized-is*
 road along go-CVB-INS / go-CVB-ESS.POSS3SG (s)he cough-PST.3SG
 'While going along the road he coughed.'

The converb forms in *-jgmoz* and *-jgtjŕ* presented in (5) are diachronically “verbal noun + adposition” compounds. The former converb can express Simultaneity Duration or Attendant Circumstance, the latter expresses only the function of Attendant Circumstance.

- (5) *tuj kuz'a mun-jg-moz / mun-jg-tjŕ sja kized-is*
 road along go-CVB-SMLT / go-CVB-ATTC (s)he cough-PST.3SG
 'He coughed, going (meanwhile) along the road.'

Northern Khanty expresses Simultaneity by means of the following three converb forms: *-m-ən*, *-t-ən* and *-man*. The first two forms (cf. Čeremisina and Solovar 1991: c. 758, 759, Nikolaeva 1995: 145 and Val'gamova et al. 2011: 180) are possessive-locative forms of the perfective participle in *-m* and imperfective participle in *-t*. A simple converb in *-man* (cf. Čeremisina and Solovar 1991: 761, Nikolaeva 1995: 146, 147 and Val'gamova et al. 2011: 182) is synchronically a monomorphemic form. Converbs in *-m-ən* (6) and *-man* (7) express the function of Simultaneity Overlap/Contact Anteriority.

NORTHERN KHANTY (Šuryškary dialect)

- (6) *ɫuw ɫajəm-əl pon-m-əl-ən mǎn-əs*
(s)he axe-3SG put-PFV.PTCP-3SG-LOC go-PST.3SG
'Putting down the axe he left.'
'Having put down the axe he left.'

- (7) *ɫuw ɫajəm-əl pon-man mǎn-əs*
(s)he axe-3SG put-CVB go-PST.3SG
'Putting down the axe he left.'
'Having put down the axe he left.'

Converb in *-t-ən*, as shown below in (8) expresses the function of Simultaneity Duration.

NORTHERN KHANTY (Šuryškary dialect)

- (8) *ma xətɬar ɫoxət-t-em-ən joxt-əs pox-em*
I floor wash-IPF.PTCP-1SG-LOC come-PST.3SG boy-1SG
'While I was washing the floor my son came.'

The existence of more than one form expressing the simultaneous relation between the events in one language appears to be not merely a matter of language redundancy. Each form has its own distinct semantic and pragmatic properties, which will be discussed in the following section of the paper.

4. Converb types and parameters of variation

As we noted in section 2 there are two dimensions in which we may consider the simultaneous relation: a semantic dimension and a discourse-pragmatic dimension. From a semantic perspective converb systems of the languages in question display a distinct encoding of Simultaneity Overlap or Contact Anteriority function which will further be called Approximate Simultaneity and Simultaneity Duration function which will be called Precise Simultaneity. This distinction appears to be purely aspectual in nature and can be defined in terms of the acceptability of the event viewpoints for both events in a sentence (section 4.1). The definitions of both types are as follows:

Converbs expressing **Approximate Simultaneity** have no aspectual restrictions;
Converbs expressing **Precise Simultaneity** require at least one event to be imperfective.

From a discourse-pragmatic perspective, both above-mentioned functions stand in an opposition to the Attendant Circumstance function. The former functions I will call Background Simultaneity functions and the latter one Descriptive Simultaneity functions. This dimension though occurs to be more complex depending on at least the following three factors: clause modification type, givenness of the marked event and pragmatic type of the predicates. Clause-modification type specifies the relation of the marked clause to the reference clause and to the context of the utterance and has two values: clause-external and clause-internal (for further

details see section 4.2 below). The factor of marked event givenness distinguishes given, or activated information and new, or not yet activated information (see section 4.3). The last factor distinguishes the predicates which set a frame (i. e. presuppose a certain time, duration, location, orientation etc.) and the ones which don't (see section 4.4). Summarizing the effect of these factors gives us the following distribution of converb forms:

Converbs expressing **Background Simultaneity** require the clause-external modification type, given information in the marked clause and preferably a frame-setting marked predicate;

Converbs expressing **Descriptive Simultaneity** require the clause-internal modification type, new information in the marked clause and preferably a non-frame-setting marked predicate.

4.1. Viewpoint of the events

Event viewpoint as noted inter alia in Nedjalkov (1998: 447) and Xrakovskij (2009: 31-34) is an important parameter of semantic variation that specifies the temporal reference of the form. When at least the marked event occurs to be imperfective, these events are always precisely simultaneous. This happens because, according to the Klein's model of aspect (1994: 4) imperfective topic time contains an intermediate fragment of an event, so the second event within the same topic time cannot stop before or start after it.

In modern linguistic theory, there is a strong tradition to analyze the viewpoint of an event as a sentential property resulting from an aspectual composition combining the aspectual class of the predicate with the properties of its participants and the meaning of the tense-aspect grammatical categories (e.g. Dowty 1977, Krifka 1989). The obvious case of an imperfective event is an event described by a predicate with a salient or even the only possible atelic reading such as Vendlerian activities like 'eat' in (9) or 'scold' in (10) and states like 'sit' in (11). Such events set the context for a Precise Simultaneity relation and are compatible with any of the simultaneous converb forms in the three languages.

NORTHERN KHANTY (Šuryškary dialect)

(9) *pet'a lew-m-at-ən / le-t-at-ən / lew-man* *potərt-əs*
 Pete eat-PFV.PTCP-3SG-LOC / eat-IPF.PTCP-3SG-LOC / eat-CVB talk-PST.3SG
 'Pete talked while eating.'

MOKSHA

(10) *s'uc'-əm-stə / s'uc'-əz'* *s'ora-nc* *son* *ivac'*
 scold-INF-EL / scold-cvb.ATD son-3SG.POSS.SG.GEN (s)he shout:PST.3SG
 'While scolding her son she shouted.'

IZHMA KOMI

- (11) *kerka-jn* *pukal-ig-en / pukal-ig-moz / pukal-ig-tjr* *gazeta* *ljd'd'-is*
house-INE sit-cvb-INS / sit-CVB-SMLT / sit-CVB-ATTC newspaper read-PST.3SG
‘While sitting at home he read a newspaper.’

The prototypical perfective event, in turn, is described by a predicate with a salient or the only possible telic reading such as achievement verbs like ‘shout (once)’ in (12, 14), ‘find’ in (13) and fall in (15-18) below. As these examples show, the majority of forms in question appear to be ungrammatical with this category of events.

For instance, if a perfective marked event is combined with an imperfective reference event which also produces the Exact Simultaneity relation the only acceptable forms are Khanty *-m-ən* converb in (12) and Moksha *-əmstə* converb in (13).

NORTHERN KHANTY (Šuryškary dialect)

- (12) *uw-ɛt-m-at-na / *uw-ɛt-t-at-na / *uw-ɛt-man* *mǎnem*
shout-TR-PFV.PTCP-3SG-LOC / shout-TR-IPF.PTCP-3SG-LOC / shout-TR-CVB I.ACC
šijet-əs
see-PST.3SG
‘When he shouted he was looking at me.’

MOKSHA

- (13) *kn'iga-t'* *mu-m-stə / *mu-z'* *son* *kořta-s'*
book-DEF.SG.GEN find-INF-EL / find-CVB.ATTC (s)he talk-PST.3SG
mart-ən
with-1SG.POSS
‘When he found the book he was talking to me.’

IZHMA KOMI

- (14) **gored-ig-en / *gored-ig-moz / *gored-ig-tjr* *sja* *me* *vjl-am*
shout-cvb-INS / shout-CVB-SMLT / shout-CVB-ATTC (s)he I top-INE.POSS1SG
vid'ed-is
look-PST.3SG
‘When he shouted (once) he was looking at me.’

If both events are perfective, the topic time includes these events in their entirety, so they may not only coincide but also take place in a sequence which can be described as the Approximate Simultaneity relation. A possibility of a non-simultaneous reading can be seen in pragmatically restricted contexts when the two events cannot actually coincide with one another. This is the case for *-m-ən* and *-man* forms in Khanty which mark a precedent perfective event ‘fall’ in the example (15) below, whereas *-t-ən* form is devoid of such interpretation.

NORTHERN KHANTY (Šuryškary dialect)

- (15) *łns'-a* *rǎkən-m-em-na / rǎkən-man / *rǎkən-t-em-na* *nox*
snow-DAT fall-PFV.PTCP-1SG-LOC / fall-CVB / fall-IPF.PTCP-1SG-LOC up
łt-s-əm
stand-PST-1SG
‘Having fallen in the snow, I got up.’

Only the *-mæk* form of all the converbs in Moksha is compatible with consecutive perfective events, cf (16) and (17) below.

MOKSHA

- (16) *pra-mæk* *lov-t'i* *višk-stə* *st'ε-n'*
 fall-CVB snow-DEF.SG.DAT quick-ADV stand-PST.1SG
 'Having fallen in the snow, I quickly got up.'
- (17) **lov-t'i* *pra-m-stə / pra-z'* *višk-stə* *st'ε-n'*
 snow-DEF.SG.DAT fall-INF-EL / fall-CVB.ATTC quick-ADV stand-PST.1SG
 'Having fallen in the snow, I quickly got up.'

As example (18) shows, no such interpretation of this sentence is available for any of the converb forms in Izhma Komi.

IZHMA KOMI

- (18) **lijm* *vjl-as* *us'-ig-en / us'-ig-moz / us'-ig-tjŕ* *bęŕ*
 snow top-ILL.POSS3SG fall-CVB-INS / fall-CVB-SMLT / fall-CVB-ATTC back
suut-i
 stand-PST.1SG
 'Having fallen in the snow, I got up.'

The above survey of possible viewpoint combinations for the converb forms in question reveals six Precise Simultaneity forms: *-t-ən* (Khanty), *-əmstə*, *-əz'* (Moksha), *igX*, *-igmoz*, *-igtjŕ* (Komi) and three Approximate Simultaneity forms: *-m-ən*, *-man* (Khanty), *-əmæk* (Moksha). Most of the Precise Simultaneity forms allow only imperfective marked events except *-əmstə* (along with an approximate *-m-ən* form) which also allow a rare combination of perfective marked event and imperfective reference event.

4.2. Modification type of the marked clause

Another important parameter is the type of the modifying relation between the marked clause and the reference clause. Numerous studies in clause-linkage distinguish between the “background” and the “foreground” type of an adverbial clause (Givón 2001, Thompson et al. 2007, Lehmann 1988). Clauses of the former type, which will be labeled here **external-modifying** following Dooley (2010: 10), as the English purpose clause in (19a) below, are used for establishing links to the global discourse context whereas clauses of the latter type, **internal-modifying**, as in (19d), relate only to the reference clause itself. Superficially these two types of clauses have different preferences in the mutual order of the reference clause and the marked clause (Givón 2001: 334, Dooley 2010: 10). External-modifying clauses tend to occupy the sentence-initial, or topical position while internal-modifying clauses usually occupy the sentence-final position or immediately precede the core of the clause (cf. ungrammaticality of the inverse order in 19b, c).

(19a) *To illustrate this, consider the following passage* (Givón 2001: 334).

(19b) **Consider the following passage to illustrate this* (ibid.).

(19c) **To fix the plumbing then he went out* (ibid.).

(19d) *Then he went out to fix the plumbing* (ibid.).

Yet, when it comes to temporal clauses there appear to be fewer restrictions on the marked clause placement. For example, ‘when’-clauses, as in the English sentences (20a, b) below, freely allow both a preposition and a postposition with little if any difference in the discourse function.

(20a) *When Peter came, Mary left.*

(20b) *Mary left when Peter came.*

A more rigorous criterion for identifying the modification type is the operator scope, as suggested in Dooley (2010: 10). Internal-modifying clauses usually appear in the scope of illocutionary force and negative reference clause operators while external-modifying clauses do not. This criterion has also been discussed in some language-particular descriptions (see for example Rappaport 1984: 113-116, Pazel'skaja and Šluinskij 2007: 56 and Maslova 2003: 374). Considering the sentence (21) below from Moksha and its negative counterparts in (22) and (23), the event of working marked with converb forms in *-əmstə* and *-əmək* retains its positive truth value under sentence negation and is thus outside the scope of negation, whereas the same event marked with converb in *-əz'* changes its truth value to negative and accordingly falls in the scope of the negation with two possible readings: (a) negation of both events and (b) negation of the marked event only.

MOKSHA

(21) *al'ε-z'ə* *mora-j* *rabota-m-stə / rabota-mək / rabota-z'*
father-1SG.POSS.SG sing-NPST.3SG work-INF-EL / work-CVB / work-CVB.ATTC
'Father sings (while) working.'

(22) *al'ε-z'ə* *af* *mora-j* *rabota-m-stə / rabota-mək*
father-1SG.POSS.SG NEG sing-NPST.3SG work-INF-EL / work-CVB
/ #rabota-z'
/ work-CVB.ATTC
'Father doesn't sing while working.'

- (23) *al'ε-z'ə* *af* *mora-j* *rabota-z' / #rabota-mək*
 father-1SG.POSS.SG NEG sing-NPST.3SG work-CVB.ATTC / work-CVB
 / *#rabota-m-stə*
 / work-INF-EL
 a. 'Father doesn't sing and work at the same time.'
 b. 'Father sings without working.'

As examples (24-26) show, the same holds for the Komi converb in *-iga/-igen* as opposed to the converbs in *-igmoz* and *-igtjir*: the former one stays outside the scope of the negative operator and the latter ones fall under the reference clause negation.

IZHMA KOMI

- (24) *me* *s'il-a* *rėbit-ig-en / rėbit-ig-moz / rėbit-ig-tjir*
 I sing-NPST.1SG work-CVB-INS / work-CVB-SMLT / work-CVB.ATTC
 'I sing (while) working.'
- (25) *me* *o-g* *s'ij* *rėbit-ig-en / #rėbit-ig-moz / #rėbit-ig-tjir*
 I NEG.NPST-1 sing work-CVB-INS / work-CVB-SMLT / work-CVB-ATTC
 'I don't sing while working.'
- (26) *me* *o-g* *s'ij* *rėbit-ig-moz / rėbit-ig-tjir / #rėbit-ig-en*
 I NEG.NPST-1 sing work-CVB-SMLT / work-CVB-ATTC / work-CVB-INS
 'I don't sing working at the same time.'
 'I sing without working.'

The distribution of the converb forms in Northern Khanty in this respect is slightly different. As one can see from (27) and (28), both forms mark the event 'work' which stays outside the scope of negation.

NORTHERN KHANTY (Middle-Ob dialect)

- (27) *as'-em* *ropit-m-at-ən / ropit-man* *ari-j-əs*
 father-1SG work-PFV.PTCP-3SG-LOC / work-CVB sing-ST-PST.3SG
 'My father sang while working.'
- (28) *as'-em* *ropit-m-at-ən / ropit-man* *ăt* *ari-j-əs*
 father-1SG work-PFV.PTCP-3SG-LOC / work-CVB NEG sing-ST-PST.3SG
 'My father did not sing while working.'

Yet, in case of *-man*, if the reference event is described by a frame-setting predicate (see the next section 4.2) for the marked event, then the marked event, such as 'sing' in (29), can also fall under the sentence negation.

- (29) *luoxs-ət* *ăt* *măn-s-ət* *juoš* *xuwat* *ari-man*
 friend-PL NEG go-PST-3PL road along sing-CVB
 'Friends did not go along the road singing.'
 'Friends went along the road without singing.'

As we can see, the negation scope test appears to be relatively strong in distinguishing internal-modifying converbs from external-modifying with *-man* form as the only exception displaying an intermediate behavior.

4.3. Givenness of the marked clause

One more parameter which has not been mentioned in discussions of the pragmatic properties of the converbs but is associated with the modification type and also seems to be relevant to this discussion is the givenness of the information in the marked clause. To adequately assess the state of the information in the sentence one generally has to appeal to the context in which this sentence is uttered, which involves analyzing corpus data and/or conducting an experiment. However, the sentence itself may contain certain clues which help identify the state of the information without knowing the context. Since converb clauses in Finno-Ugric languages morphologically and syntactically resemble noun phrases, the most obvious way of telling whether a clause contains a given information is to see whether it allows topical NP morphology such as possessive and definiteness markers.

Given marked clauses in contrast to the new may have topical marking either on the predicate or on its dependent noun phrases. Topical marking of the predicate occurs in form of possessive agreement with its own subject, as is the case for *-jga/-jgen* and *-jgmoz* forms in Komi, *-əmstə* form in Moksha, *-m-ən* and *-t-ən* forms in Khanty (see examples for some of the forms in (30-32) below), which allows to leave out the latter within the marked clause.

IZHMA KOMI

- (30) *s'jil-jg-anjs* *sja* *jękt-is*
sing-CVB-ESS.POSS3PL (s)he dance-PST.3SG
'While they were singing he was dancing.'

MOKSHA

- (31) *mol'-əm-stə-nzə* *mon* *jaŕca-n'*
go-INF-EL-3SG.POSS I eat-PST.1SG
'While he was walking I was eating.'

NORTHERN KHANTY (Šuryškary dialect)

- (32) *manem* *šjįtə-m-əl-na* *uw-əłt-əs*
I.ACC see-PFV.PTCP-3SG-LOC shout-CAUS-PST.3SG
'When seeing me he shouted.'

In Izhma Komi the third person singular possessive marker has grammaticalized into a definiteness marker (cf. Kaškin and Pankova 2011), see (33) below, and it can also be used as a topic marker on the *-jga/-jgen* converb in spite of the actual person and number of the referent. Thus in (34) the marked clause subject, as well as the reference clause subject is first person singular, whereas the converb form carries the topical third person marker *-as*.

IZHMA KOMI

- (33) *eta* *kerka-as*
this house-ESS.POSS3SG
'In this house.'

- (34) *pjzan saj-jn pukal-ig-as me šjd s'o-i*
 table back-ESS sit-CVB-ESS.POSS3SG I soup eat-PST.1SG
 ‘While sitting at the table I was eating soup.’

Other converbs cannot attach possessive agreement markers which alone does not prove their role as forms coding new information but hint at some different discourse-pragmatic behavior.

Topical marking of a dependent NP is attested in Komi and Moksha which have DOM-systems with definite and indefinite direct objects. Moksha has a definite and an indefinite genitive case marker and both can be used with *-əmstə* and *-əmək* converbs, as shown in (35) and (36), whereas *-əz'* converb in (37) does not allow definite genitive marking on the object.

MOKSHA

- (35) *tarelka-n' / tarelka-t' put-əm-stə son mez 'ə-bd'ə az-s'*
 plate-GEN / plat-DEF.SG.GEN put-INF-EL (s)he what-INDEF say-PST
 ‘While putting down the plate he said something.’
- (36) *put-əmək tarelka / tarelka-t' son mez 'ə-bd'ə az-s'*
 put-CVB plate / plate-DEF.SG.GEN (s)he what-INDEF say-PST
 ‘While putting down the plate he said something.’
- (37) *tarelka-n' / *tarelka-t' put-əz' son mez 'ə-bd'ə az-s'*
 plate-GEN / plate-DEF.SG.GEN put-CVB.ATTC (s)he what-INDEF say-PST
 ‘Putting down the plate he said something.’

One could expect that Izhma Komi converbs regarding the other parameter values would also be sensitive to topical dependent marking. Surprisingly, as shown in (38), they appear to have no restrictions on the definite marking of the direct objects allowing definite and unmarked object NP with all three converb forms.

IZHMA KOMI

- (38) *nil-įs šjd-(se) s'o-ig-en / s'o-ig-moz / s'o-ig-tįr*
 girl-POSS3GS soup-ACC.POSS3SG eat-CVB-INS / eat-CVB-SMLT / eat-CVB-ATTC
s'eral-is
 laugh-PST.3SG
 ‘While eating (the) soup the girl was laughing.’

The above examples show that all three languages have converb forms allowing topical predicate or object marking and thus conveying a given information. Every language has at least one form which carries possessive agreement markers and the clearest case of the topical marking is the *-įga/-įgen* form in Komi which bears possessive suffixes not only in their proper function but also as markers of definiteness. Topical object marking is present in Moksha and Komi and while in Moksha it distinguishes the given marked clauses from the new, in Komi it apparently does not depend on the discourse-pragmatic type of the forms.

4.4. Pragmatic type of the marked predicate

Another parameter comes from comparing the functions of Simultaneity and Attendant Circumstance in König (1995: 70). Discussing the differences between these functions König mentions the idea that converbs in the former function tend to mark events which have a conventional time frame, i.e. some pragmatically associated knowledge about their natural time and/or duration. Generally speaking, this frame may include any knowledge inferred from the context or from the world knowledge such as other kinds of circumstances, common sets of participants, or associated events. For instance, uttering a simple sentence like *Peter left* with a polyvalent predicate *to leave* presupposes some information at least about Peter's initial location and direction of motion but possibly also about purpose, time, preceding events etc. By contrast, the sentence *Peter smiled* with a monovalent predicate *to smile* does not set any such frame rather describing some state or property of *Peter*. The most evident examples of paired events only one of which is described by a frame-setting predicate (marked with italics) are events which pragmatically include each other such as 'sleep' + 'snore', 'wash' + 'soap', 'eat' + 'chew'. For instance, Moksha forms in *-əmstə* and *-əmək* are compatible only with the first event of a pair as 'sleep' in (39) below and *-əz'* form — only with the second as 'snore' in (40).

MOKSHA

- (39) *son ud-əm-stə / ud-əmək / *ud-əz'* *kərna-s'*
 he sleep-INF-EL / sleep-CVB / sleep-CVB.ATTC snore-PST.3SG
 'He snored while sleeping.'
- (40) *son ud-əs' kərna-z' / *kərna-m-stə / *kərna-mək*
 he sleep-PST.3SG snore-CVB.ATTC / snore-INF-EL / snore-CVB
 'He slept snoring.'

Some converb forms show intermediate behavior in that they are pragmatically compatible with either of the two events in a pair. For example, while the Khanty *-m-ən* form (as well as *-t-ən*) marks only the frame-setting event, the *-man* form appears to be equally suitable in both contexts (cf. examples 41 and 42).

NORTHERN KHANTY (Šuryškary dialect)

- (41) *pet'a əl-m-əl-ən / əl-man* *türtətl-i-j-əs*
 Pete sleep-PFV.PTCP-3SG-LOC / sleep-CVB snore-ITER-ST-PST.3SG
 'Pete snored while sleeping.'
- (42) *türtətl-i-man / *türtətl-i-m-əl-ən* *pet'a əl-əs*
 snore-ITER-CVB / snore-PFV.PTCP-3SG-LOC Pete sleep-PST.3SG
 'Pete slept snoring.'

Komi converbs display all three kinds of behavior in this context (43, 44). The converb in *-jga/-jgen* is used with frame-setting events, the converb in *-igtjr* appears, on the contrary, with forms that do not set a frame and the converb in *-jgmoz* appears with both.

IZHMA KOMI

(43) *sja uz'-ig-en / uz'-ig-moz / *uz'-ig-tjr xorg-is*
 he sleep-CVB-INS / sleep-CVB-SMLT / sleep-CVB-ATTC snore-PST.3SG
 'He snored while sleeping.'

(44) *sja uz'-is xorg-ig-moz / xorg-ig-tjr / *xorg-ig-en*
 he sleep-PST.3SG snore-CVB-SMLT / snore-CVB-ATTC / snore-CVB-INS
 'He slept snoring.'

As the above examples show, the results of the paired event test almost exactly correspond to the data on the scope of negation from the previous section. The only form with a special behavior is the Komi converb in *-jgmoz* which appears indifferent to frame-setting meanwhile always falling in the scope of the sentence negation.

Distribution of the converb forms with respect to the above-discussed parameters of variation is summed up in table 1 below.

Table 1: Possible viewpoint combinations of the events.

	Northern Khanty			Moksha			Izhma Komi		
	<i>mən</i>	<i>tən</i>	<i>Man</i>	<i>əmstə</i>	<i>əmək</i>	<i>əz'</i>	<i>jga</i>	<i>jgmoz</i>	<i>igtjr</i>
Precise (P), Approximate (A) Simultaneity relation	A	P	A	P	A	P	P	P	P
Background (B), Descriptive (D) relation, neutral (N) > External modification	B	B	N	B	B	D	B	N	D
> Given information in the marked clause	+	+	+/-	+	+	-	+	-	-
> Frame-setting marked event	+	+	+/-	+	+	-	+	+/-	+/-

5. Results and discussion

Comparative data on the distribution of the Simultaneity converbs show that the forms in question vary in function not only in their temporal and aspectual meaning but also in their discourse-pragmatic properties. Semantic type of the converb (Precise or Approximate Simultaneity) depends on whether it requires at least one imperfective event, mainly the marked event, or allows also a combination of two perfective events. Discourse-pragmatic type (Background or Descriptive simultaneity) is identified based on the three parameters: modification type of the marked clause, givenness of the marked clause and the pragmatic type of the marked predicate. Intersection all these parameter values results in a total of five

following subtypes embracing all the logical combinations of the parameter values except Approximate-descriptive which has not been attested in our data:

- **Approximate-background Simultaneity** — Khanty converb in *-m-ən*, Moksha converb *-əmək*;
- **Approximate-neutral Simultaneity** — Khanty converb in *-man*;
- **Precise-background Simultaneity** — Khanty converb in *-t-ən*, Moksha converb in *-əməstə*, Komi converb in *-jga-/jgen*;
- **Precise-neutral Simultaneity** — Komi converb in *-jgmoz*;
- **Precise-descriptive Simultaneity** — Moksha converb in *-əz'*, Komi converb in *-jgtir*.

The majority of analyzed converb forms relate to the Approximate- and Precise-background subtypes reflecting the Kortmann's opposition of the semantically vague Simultaneity Overlap function and the more specific Simultaneity Duration function. Adding the pragmatic dimension to the classification allows us to consider among the Simultaneity subtypes one more important temporal function of Attendant Circumstance, or Precise-new Simultaneity as well as less common, pragmatically intermediate functions as Approximate-neutral and Precise-neutral Simultaneity as a further elaboration on what is considered by Nedjalkov as "Mixed converbs of contextual Simultaneity".

Results of this paper can be applied in the studies of temporal clauses in other Uralic languages as well as in a broader typological research. Yet, they still leave behind a number of perspectives such as syntactic properties of the adverbial clauses, the interaction of converbs with information structure of the sentence and their functioning in the context of narration or in dialogue speech which could provide a better understanding of the phenomena in question.

Nikita Muravyev, Vorochnikovsky per. 5/9-62, 127006 Moscow, Russia.

Email: nikita.muraviev@gmail.com. Tel.: +7 (916) 334-23-18

References

- Birjuk, O. L., Kaškin, E. V., Kuznecova, A. I., Usačeva, M. N. (2010) *Slovar' muževskogo govora ižemskogo dialekta komi-zyrjanskogo jazyka*. Ekaterinburg: Basko.
- Čeremisina, M. I., Solovar V. N. (1991) Zalogovost', perexodnost', prjamoj ob'ekt v jazykax raznyx system. In *Jazyki narodov Sibiri. Grammatičeskie issledovanija*. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 66-84.

- Dooley, Robert. A. (2010) *Exploring Clause Chaining*. SIL Electronic Working Papers in Linguistics. Available online at <https://www.sil.org/resources/publications/entry/7858>. Accessed on 03.02.2018.
- Dowty David R. (1977) *Towards a semantic analysis of verb aspect and the English 'imperfective' progressive*. In *Linguistics and philosophy*. Vol. 1.
- Farr, Cynthia J. M. (1999) *The Interface between Syntax and Discourse in Korafe, a Papuan Language of Papua New Guinea*. Pacific Linguistics, C-148. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Fedden, Sebastian (2007) *A Grammar of Mian*. University of Melbourne. Doctoral thesis.
- Foley, William A., Van Valin Jr., Robert (1984) *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Givón, Talmy (2001). *Syntax: An introduction*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Grammatika mordovskix jazykov. Fonetika. Grafika. Orfografija. Morfologija. Učebnik dlja nacional'nyx otdelenij vuzov*. Edited by D. V. Cygankin. Saransk: Izd-vo Mordov. un-ta, 1980.
- Grammatika mordovskix (mokšanskogo i erezjanskogo) jazykov. Čast' 1: fonetika i morfologija*. Edited by M. N. Koljaděnkov. Saransk: Mordovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo; 1962.
- Haspelmath, Martin and Ekkehard König (eds) (1995). *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kaškin, E. V., Pankova, M. C. (2011) Eksperimental'noe issledovanie upotreblenija posessivnogo sklonenija v ižemskom dialekte komi-zyrianskogo iazyka. In N. N. Kazanskij, ed. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana*, vol. VII, part 3. Saint Petersburg: Nauka. Pp. 82-87
- Klein, Wilhelm (1994) *Time in Language*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Kortmann, Bernd (1998). Adverbial subordinators in the languages of Europe. In J. van der Auwera, P. Ó Baoill, Dónall, eds. *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe. Empirical approaches to language typology 20-3*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1998. Pp. 457-562.
- König, Ekkehard (1995) The meaning of converb constructions // Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König E., eds. *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 57-96.

- Krifka, Manfred (1989). *Nominal reference, temporal constitution and quantification in event semantics*. In R. Bartsch, J. van Benthem P. van Emde Boas, eds. *Semantics and contextual expression*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Lehmann, Christian (1988). *Towards a typology of clause linkage*. In Haiman, J., Thompson, S. A. (eds.). *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins. Pp. 181—226
- Lehmann, Thomas (1989). *A grammar of modern Tamil*. Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture.
- Lytkin, V. I. (1955) *Sovremennyj komi jazyk*, Ch.1. Syktyvkar.
- Maslova, E. (2003) *A Grammar of Kolyma Yukaghir*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nedjalkov, I. P. (1998) Converbs in the languages of Europe. In Johan van der Auwera, Dónall P. Ó Baoill, eds. *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe. Empirical approaches to language typology 20-3*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 421-455
- Nekrasova, O. I. (2015) *Deepričastnye konstrukcii v komi jazyke*. Ph.D. dissertation. Iževsk.
- Nikolaeva, I. A. (1995) *Obdorskij dialekt xantyjskogo jazyka*. Moscow/Hamburg.
- Olson, Michael L. (1981) *Barai clause junctures: Toward a functional theory of interclausal relations*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Australian National University.
- Onishi, Masayuki (1994) *A Grammar of Motuna (Bougainville, Papua New Guinea)*. Australian National University.
- Pazel'skaja, A. G., Šluinskij, A. B. (2007) *Obstožatel'stvennyje predloženiya // Ljutikova E.A i dr. (red.). Mišarskij dialekt tatarskogo jazyka. Očerki po sintaksisu i semantike*. Kazan': Magarif. Pp. 38-82.
- Rappaport, Gilbert. C. (1984) *Grammatical function and syntactic structure: The adverbial participle of Russian*. UCLA Slavic Studies, 9. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers.
- Saxarova, M. A., Sel'kov N. N. (1976) *Ižemskij dialekt komi jazyka*. Syktyvkar.
- Serebrennikov, B. A. (1967) *Istoričeskaja morfologija mordovskix jazykov*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Tipologija taksisnyx konstrukcij*. Edited by V. S. Xrakovskij. Moscow: Znak, 2009.
- Thompson, Sandra A., Longacre, Robert E. Hwang, Shin Ja. *Adverbial clauses*. (2007) Shopen, T., ed. *Language typology and syntactic description: Complex Constructions*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 237—300.
- Val'gamova, S. I., Koškareva N. B., Onina S. V., Šijanová A. A. *Dialektologičeskij slovar' xantyjskogo jazyka (šuryškarskij i priural'skij dialekty)*. Ekaterinburg: Basko, 2011.

Xrakovskij, V. S. (2009) Taksis: semantika, sintaksis, tipologija. In Xrakovskij V. S., ed.

Tipologija taksisnyx konstrukcij. Moscow: Znak.

Ylikoski, Jussi (2001) Converbs in Finnish and Komi: differences and similarities //

Congressus Nonus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum. Pars VI. Tartu. Pp. 420–424.

Appendix: list of abbreviations

ACC — Accusative, ATTC — Attendant Circumstance, CAUS — Causative, CONV — Converb, DAT — Dative, DEF — Definite, DETR — Detranzitivizer, EL — Elative, ESS — Essive, GEN — Genitive, INDEF — Indefinite, INF — Infinitive, INS — Instrumental, IPFV — Imperfective, ITER — Iterative, LAT — Lative, LOC — Locative, NEG — Negation, NPST — Non-past tense, O — Object, OBL — Oblique, PFV — Perfective, PL — Plural, POSS — Possessive, PST — Past tense, PTCP — Participle, S — Subject, SG — Singular, SMLT — Simultaneity, ST — stem, 1, 2, 3 — person.