

Action nominal constructions in Northern Mansi

Abstract of the forthcoming PhD-thesis

Bernadett Bíró

University of Szeged

1. Introduction

In my thesis I examine the Northern Mansi action nominal constructions from a typological point of view.

Nominalizations and action nominal constructions have been central in linguistic research in the past few decades, as they constitute an instance of structures showing categorially ambivalent behavior (c. f. Alexiadou–Rathert 2010, Ylikoski 2009, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993, 2003, 2005, Alexiadou 2001, Laczkó 1997, 1998, 2000a among others).

The main aim of my thesis is to give a detailed overview of the morphology and the syntactical behaviour of Mansi action nominal constructions.

The Mansi (or Vogul) language belongs to the Ugric group of the Finno-Ugric language family, which forms a branch of Uralic languages. According to the latest census data (2002) 11 432 people claimed to be of Mansi nationality, 23% of which spoke Mansi, while practically everybody had proficiency in Russian (Pusztay, 2006).

Today, under the designation Mansi usually the Northern Mansi regional dialect is meant: it is a variety spoken in a few villages by the lower Ob and its western tributaries the Sosva and Sigva rivers in the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous District (*okrug*) of the Tyumen Region (*oblast'*), as well as by the Lozva river in the Ivdel Area of the Sverdlovsk Region. The Southern and Western dialects were already disappearing in the early 20th century, while the Eastern (Konda) dialect had a considerable number of speakers up until the mid-20th century, with even literary works written in it, but practically extinct by today. The fourth dialect, Northern Mansi, is currently threatened by the process of language shift to Russian.

I restrict my analysis to the Northern Mansi dialect only, which is also the basis of the Mansi literary language. My research material is taken from folkloric texts collected by Bernát Munkácsi (Munkácsi, 1892–1896) and Artturi Kannisto (Kannisto–Liimola, 1951–1963) at the end of 19th and at the beginning of 20th century. I also examined relatively newer texts gathered by Valerij Nyikolajevics Csernyecov (collected in 1933–34, unpublished) and Béla Kálmán (collected in the 1970's, Kálmán, 1976) as well as recent texts from *Luima Seripos*, a Mansi language newspaper published since 1989. The size of my

corpus is approximately 1500 pages. The data I used for my analysis includes near 1000 clauses containing action nominal constructions. (I restricted the number of the clauses slightly by taking into account the frequent, very similar constructions only once.)

My analysis is mainly based on the older folkloric texts collected by Munkácsi and Kannisto, that is my findings reflect the synchronic state of the language at the turn of the 19th and 20th century. The reason for this is that there is no available, present-day language material which could be considered as extensive and variable as those collections mentioned above. Another reason is that the language state represented by the folkloric texts is far less influenced by other languages (mainly by Russian) than the present-day Mansi. Thus that language state was much closer to the „original” one, which was rather untinged by language contacts and showed more coherent grammatical picture. I would like to emphasize though, that the designation „original” does not mean any kind of evaluation: I do not consider neither language state better or worse, my intention was only to show the difference between them.

2. Action nominals and action nominal constructions

Action nominal constructions (ANCs) are noun phrases which have an action nominal (AN) (a noun derived from a verb) as their head, and which also contain one or more reflexes of a proposition or a predicate, e. g. *the enemy's destruction of the city* (*the enemy destroyed the city*); *the loud chanting in the quad* (*chanting loudly in the quad*) (Comrie 1976: 178, Comrie–Thompson 1985: 358).

Action nominals constitute a type of lexical nominalization. The term 'nominalization' means in essence 'turning something into a noun' (Comrie-Thompson 1985: 349). Lexical nominalization means the process when a verbal phrase, a verb or an adjective is turning into a noun. The resulting nouns may be the name of the activity or state designed by the verb or adjective (action/state nominals), or may represent one of their arguments. The difference between the nouns of these two groups is that action nominals retain certain properties of the verbs or adjectives they are related to, while the forms in the second group typically behave syntactically like other nouns in the language, bearing only morphological and (often unpredictable and idiosyncratic) semantic relations to the associated verb or adjective (Comrie – Thompson 1985: 349).

Action nominals (*Verbalnomen*, *nazvan'ie d'ejstvija*, *action nominal*, *verbal noun*, *nomen actionis*, *masdar*, and English and Latin *gerund*) traditionally constitute a subgroup of non-finite verb forms. But the exact definition of the term 'action nominal' can be vague and

unclear, as it is also shown in the different names of these word forms (see more e. g. Comrie 1976: 178; Comrie–Thompson 1985: 350–351, 358–360; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993: 6–7; 2005, Ylikoski 2003: 186–194; 2009: 28–32).

Following Koptjevskaja-Tamm I define action nominals as nouns, or such word forms that at least occur in typical nominal positions and show inflectional properties and/or combinability with adpositions typical of nouns. They are derived from verbs in some reasonably productive way, either derivationally or inflectionally, and refer to events and/or facts (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2005). Action nominals clearly refer to events, like verbs do, but in contrast with verbs they do it by giving the events a name. So action nominals combine semantic and discourse features of both verbs and nouns. In their morphology they also combine verbal and nominal features and different languages treat them as being closer to verbs or nouns (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993: 6).

Action nominal constructions typically have some of the syntactic features of both finite sentences and noun phrases with a non-derived noun as their head.

In linguistics there are two different approaches to the internal syntax of action nominal constructions (and also other kind of nominalization): the generative and the typological approach.

In the second half of the 1980's deverbal nouns became central in generative linguistic research. The main target of the analyses was the English nominalizations, one of the most extensive descriptions of which was presented by Grimshaw (1990). Grimshaw argues that the deverbal nouns do not constitute a homogeneous group but they have at least two different types. Nouns, such as *examination*, have two different readings: in (1) this noun refers to an event (event-reading), while in (2) it refers to a concrete entity (non-event reading):

(1) *The examination of the patients took a long time.*

(2) *The examination was on the table.* (C. f. Grimshaw 1990: 49.)

In the event-reading the noun inherits the argument structure of the underlying verb while in the non-event reading it does not. The two types can be distinguished on the basis of various semantic and syntactic criteria, including the possibility of event interpretation, licensing of argument structure, licensing of adverbs and aspectual modifiers, etc. On structural analyses, these differences have been captured in terms of distinct structural representations (Alexiadou 2001; Borer 2003 (cited by Bašić 2010) among others).

Grimshaw differentiates nouns denoting an event („complex event” nouns) and nouns denoting the result/outcome of an event or simply denoting an entity („result” nouns) on the

basis of semantic criteria. In her opinion the basic difference between the two groups is that only the „complex event” nouns can assign theta-roles and only these support the argument structure (Grimshaw 1990).

(On the generative approach see Lees 1960; Chomsky 1970; Jackendoff 1977; Rappaport 1983; Laczkó 1997, 1998, 2000a; Koskinen 1998; Alexiadou 2001, 2010 among others.)

The second approach (Comrie 1976, Comrie-Thompson 1985, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993, 2003, 2005) discusses the internal syntax of action nominal constructions from cross-linguistic and typological points of view. Comrie’s conclusion is that action nominal constructions in different languages can be classified ‘according to the extent to which their internal structure corresponds to that of a nonderived noun phrase, rather than to the internal structure of a sentence with a finite verb.’ (Comrie 1976: 200) Comrie suggests that this classification principle leads us to a continuum between noun phrase-like and sentence-like action nominals. Koptjevskaja-Tamm in her study however shows that although ANCs can be placed on a scale according to the extent of their ‘sentence-likeness’ and ‘NP-likeness’, this scale consists of discrete points, corresponding to well-defined types of ANCs. In her classification she identifies seven nominalization types in different languages (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993: 60).

3. Action nominals in Northern Mansi

There are several derivational suffixes in Northern Mansi which can form also action nominals. The action nominals derived with these suffixes tend to become lexicalized forms, e. g.: *pantil* ‘cover’ < *pant-* ‘to cover’, K¹ *sotəŋ* ‘enchantment’ < *sa:t-* ‘to charm’, *χa:χmil* ‘ascent, rise, slope’ < *χa:ŋχ-* ‘to ascend, to rise’.

In the texts however we find that mainly the non-finites in *-n* and *-m* (sometimes the non-finite in *-ima*), ie. the forms traditionally called present and past participle (and converb) appear as action nominals with “complex event” reading.

Since I have only very few unambiguous examples of the converb in *-im(a)* appearing as action nominal, in my thesis I restrict my analysis only to the deverbal nouns in *-n* and *-m*, e. g.:

(3) *lu:-majt tarä pos - nä - iγ pajt - awe*

1 K = dialect of Konda

horse-liver through cook-AN-TRNS cook-PASS.3SG

'Horse-liver is being cooked as long as it is completely/properly cooked.'

(VNGy² IV: 419)

(4) *po:l̥ - əm tow to:l̥ - ma - tä sujti*

freeze-PTCP.PST branch break-AN-SG<3SG can be heard

'Snapping of the frozen branches can be heard.' (VNGy III: 97)

Interlocking of action nominals and other non-finite verb forms in Northern Mansi is not a unique case, there are several instances crosslinguistically. As a matter of fact we cannot say that there is an exact one-to-one correspondence between non-finite forms (the infinitive, the participle, the converb and the action nominal) and their functions, as it may well be the case that non-finites are most typically used in more than one syntactic function (c. f. Ylikoski 2003: 187). This is the case for example in English, where the non-finite form *crying* can function as a participle, as a converb and as an action nominal as well:

(5) Participle: *The **crying** girl left the room.*

(6) Converb: *The girl left the room **crying**.*

(7) Action nominal: *The girl's **crying** irritates me.*

While for example in Hungarian there can be found three different forms in the same sentences:

(8) A **síró** lány elhagyta a szobát.

(9) A lány **sírva** hagyta el a szobát.

(10) A lány **sírása** zavar engem.

(On the mutual relations of the non-finite verb forms see Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993: 33–45, Ylikoski 2003, Ylikoski 2009: 28–32 among others.)

It seems that in Mansi non-finite verb forms also have more than one syntactic function, in the texts typically constructions with these verb forms appear as substitutes of relative and temporal subordinate clauses.

Action nominals and other non-finite verb forms are usually not distinguished in the literature on Mansi. Constructions containing different non-finites and their different functions (as well as the function of the 'nomen actionis') is presented under the introduction

2 VNGy = Munkácsi, Bernát 1892–1896: *Vogul Népköltési Gyűjtemény I–IV*. MTA, Budapest.

of the non-finite verb forms (c. f. Szabó 1904: 425, 433–436; Sz. Kispál 1966; Rombandeeva 1973: 146–147; Kálmán 1975: 62, 70; Riese 2001b: 65–70). Different authors do not even treat the non-finites uniformly: they discuss them under deverbal nouns (Szabó 1904) or as non-finite verb forms under verbs (Rombandeeva 1973) or under syntax (Riese 2001b) or treat them as separate word class (Kálmán 1976). While presenting the syntax of Mansi, they mention that constructions with non-finites are used instead of subordinate clauses and they also list the most typical constructions. It is mentioned as well that the participles and the converb can function as a noun, i. e. as an action nominal (*nomen actionis*).

Now let us see, what arguments can support that these deverbal forms can stand as action nominals instead of participles in certain cases.

a) Considering their syntactic role, participles and action nominals theoretically can be easily distinguished since the primary function of participles is to serve as an attribute of a noun in a noun phrase (see (11) and (13)); while action nominals constitute the head of the NP (see (12) and (14)):

- (11) *ten'-ut var - nə* *kit χum me:təla:l - s - əm*
 food prepare-PTCP.PRS two man hire-PST-3SG
 'I hired two food-preparing men' (VNGy IV: 331)

- (12) *jäyi-pi:γ - äγən* *porä - ten* *a:st - əs,* *tu:p*
 elder brother-DU<2SG raft-SG<3DU get ready-PAST[3SG] only
nariytaχt - nə - ten *ariγt - əs,* *jäj - ən!*
 push oneself-AN-SG<3DU remain-PAST[3SG] come-IMP[2SG]
 'The raft of your two elder brothers is ready, pushing away (themselves from the bank) is left, come!' (VNGy II: 94-95)

- (13) *am se:l - əm* *puuγ - əm* *ne:ne:n* *ti χu:l'ti;*
 I gain-PTCP.PST wealth-SG<1SG for the two of you so remain
a:ps'i - n *ul* *ʔaultä - ln!*
 younger brother-SG<2SG do not scold-IMP.SG<2SG
 'The fortune that I have gained remains for the two of you; don't scold your younger brother!'

(VNGy IV: 324)

- (14) *aps'i - me:n jäniym - əm - ä va:t ta:l - iy je:mt - s*
younger brother-SG<1DU grow-AN-SG<3SG thirty year-TRNS become-PAST[3SG]
'Our younger brother has become thirty years old [lit. 'in his growth'].'
(VNGy II: 94)

b) The ability of combining with postpositions and case suffixes also supports the claim that these deverbal forms stand as nouns in these clauses and not as attributes (i. e. participles):

- (15) *akw' us-χal jäl - nə - n marγəs at sa:t saj't mi: - γ - əm*
one town-space-between walk-AN-SG<2SG for five hundred rouble give-PRS-1SG
'I give you five hundred roubles for walking there and back' (VNGy IV: 332)

- (16) *am tiγ' joxt - m - am - t no:ηχ-masəpa - nə va:j-sup a:t'im*
I here come-AN-SG<1SG-LOC put on-PTCP.PRS stockings-piece NEG
'When I came here, there was not even a piece of stockings (to put on) here.'
(VNGy IV: 48)

c) The difference between action nominals and participles can be captured in the ability of expressing tense as well. While participles can express relative tense (compared to the finite verb of the sentence), see (17) and (19); action nominals cannot express even relative tense, not without case suffixes or postpositions, see (18) and (20):

- (17) *man ru:piγtə - nə ma:χum; naη ku:s'ej o:l - eγ - in*
we work-PTCP.PRS people you landlord be-PRS-2SG
'we are working people; you are a landlord' (VNGy IV: 334)
'working people' → 'people, who works/is working', it refers to a present time situation simultaneous with that of the finit verb

- (18) *taw se:məl ke:rpä n'a:liη a:l - ä lou tul'äp kitiγ ka:t - nə pu:γ - nä - tä*
(s)he black with iron with arrow case-3SG ten with fingers two hand-LAT take-AN-3SG
ness sunsenti - ləm.

just look-SG<1SG

'I just look (without defiance) that he takes his black iron arrow case in his two hands with ten fingers.' (lit. 'I look his taking of his arrow case') (VNGy IV: 303)

'his taking' → it can refer to a situation simultaneous with or prior to that of the finite verb ('that he takes/is taking it' or 'that he took it')

(19) *ja;* *känk - ən-pa:lt* *mujl - uŋkwə* *jäl - əm* *χum, maj - im*
well elder brother-SG<2SG-to stay-as-a-guest--INF go-PTCP.PST man give-CVB
an'ä - n *tu:p* *a:lenti - lən?!*

pile-SG<2SG hardly lift-SG<2SG

'Well, you, who went to your elder brother to stay as a guest, you can hardly lift the pile [of gifts] you were given?!' (VNGy IV: 330)

lit. 'a stay-as-a-guest went man' → 'man, who went to stay-as-a-guest', it refers to a situation in the past prior to that of the finite verb

(20) *Tarəm piγ numəl* *taräti - m* *ery - ä*

heaven boy from above lower-AN song-SG<3SG

'The song of the lowering of heaven's boy.' (VNGy II. 100)

'lowering' → it can refer to a situation simultaneous with or prior to that of the finite verb ('that he is being lowered' or 'that he was lowered')

On the basis of the examples mentioned above it can be claimed that these deverbal forms can function not only as participles but also as action nominals. The proof for this claim is particularly their syntactic position (attribute vs. head of the noun phrase, combining with case suffixes and postpositions) as well as their inability for expressing tense.

4. Analysis of Northern Mansi action nominal constructions

My analysis of Northern Mansi action nominal constructions is based on the *Leipzig Questionnaire on Nominalizations and mixed categories* (Andrej Malchukov, Maria Koptjevskaja Tamm, Peter Cole, Gabriella Hermon, Jaklin Kornfilt, Bernard Comrie,

lingboard/pdf/Malchukov_MixedCategories_Questionnaire.pdf). This questionnaire discusses the different nominalization patterns, their syntactic, morphological and semantic features crosslinguistically. In my thesis the parameters of the questionnaire and my analyses based on them are completed with other sources as well.

The questionnaire discusses both lexical and clausal nominalization. As is well-known, in the different languages we can find not only terms but also propositions in the argument (NP) positions, e. g. English:

(21) *That Jon won the race came as no surprise.*

(22) *John winning the race came as no surprise.*

(23) *John's winning the race came as no surprise.*

(24) *John's winning of the race came as no surprise.*

(25) *John's refusal came as no surprise.*

The sentential subject in (21) retains all clausal properties, and the abstract noun in (25) shows all features of underived nouns. But the constructions in (22)-(24) display a mixture of verbal (clausal) and nominal properties. For example, the verbal gerund in (23) takes the object in the same form as a finite verb, while the subject is encoded as a possessor (nominal property). Similar constructions can be found in many other languages. For example in Turkish we find a nominalization-participle which takes its complements and adjuncts in the sentential form while the subject appears in the genitive and is crossreferenced by the possessive-style agreement (c. f. Leipzig Questionnaire on Nominalizations and mixed categories):

(26) *kız - in kedi - yi kovala - diğ - in - ı gör - dü - m*
girl-GEN cat-ACC chase-PART-SG<3SG-ACC see-PST-1SG
'I saw that the girl was chasing the cat'

The questionnaire focuses mainly on the forms similar to (22)-(24) and (26) but other types are also taken into account as well.

The main parameters of the questionnaire are as follows:

1. Nominalizations: inventory and function
2. Nominalizations: basic syntax
3. Deverbalization: morphological aspects

4. Deverbalization: syntactic aspects
5. Substantivization: morphological aspects
6. Substantivization: syntactic aspects (encoding of arguments/modifiers)
7. Combination of nominal and verbal categories
8. Problematic cases
9. Word order in nominalization
10. Internal syntax
11. External syntax (complement clauses)
12. Nominalizations in complement clauses: functional distinctions
13. Nominalization markers: other uses.

(The last two parameters of the questionnaire does not concern the „complex event” nouns so they are not included in my analysis.)

The brief summary of my results so far is as follows:

1. Nominalizations: inventory and function

As it was already mentioned above, in Northern Mansi the participles in *-n* and *-m* (sometimes also the converb in *-ima*) can be found in the structures similar to those in the questionnaire. These nominalizations in *-n* and *-m* can appear in complement clauses (27), in adverbial clauses (28) and in (reduced) subject relative clauses (29)-(30).

(27) *ne:n'uli n'ultiylə - nə χontəla:li*

woman-oath swear-AN listen

'(S)he is listening to the swearing of women's oath.' (VNGy III: 152)

(28) *no:ηχ sajkəl - əm - änəl - t voss jäniγ χumi - änl ke:lp-se:ηχw - nə*

up awake-AN-SG<3PL-LOC most big man-SG<3PL blood-anger-LAT

te:liγl - əm

go crazy-PTCP.PST

'When they awoke, the eldest man went crazy in his intoxication.' (VNGy I: 98)

(29) *alil ji - nə touliη to:rəm*

from above come-PTCP.PRS winged god

'a winged god coming from above' (VNGy II: 161)

(30) *χosä ma: jä! - əm pi:kə - m*

long land walk-PTCP.PST little boy-SG<1SG

'my little boy, who has walked faraway lands' (VNGy IV: 63)

2. Nominalizations: basic syntax

Valency of action nominals is one of the central and most intriguing issues concerning the syntax of action nominals. The expression of the subject and the direct object in the action nominal constructions (ANCs) provides perhaps the most interesting evidence for the hybrid verbal-nominal nature of the action nominal.

In some languages encoding of the subject and the direct object in ANCs is completely similar to the syntax of noun phrases. In other languages we find the retaining of the sentential syntax in ANCs. There are also such languages, where the encoding of the core arguments is partly similar to the sentential syntax and partly to that of noun phrases. And finally in some cases the syntax of the ANCs differs from both sentential syntax and the syntax of the noun phrases.

Following Koptjevskaja-Tamm (1999), action nominals derived from intransitive or transitive verbs are called intransitive and transitive action nominals respectively, and I use the following symbols:

S = the single argument of an intransitive verb

A = the agent argument of a transitive verb

P = the patient argument of a transitive verb.

In Northern Mansi in case of intransitive ANCs the unmarked S precedes the action nominal:

(31) *piyris' šis'χ - ənə χalt tu: ta χajt - i*

boy scream-AN during there so run-PRS[3SG]

'while the boy is screaming, (s)he runs there' (VNGy II: 59)

If S is a personal pronoun then usually it is crossreferenced by the possessive style

agreement:

- (32) *ta aj - nə - mem jui-pa:lt, ta untə - nə - mem jui-pa:lt*
that drink-AN-SG<1DU after that sit-AN-SG<1DU after
jol-χuj - uŋkwə-ke pat - nuw - əmem:n ul akw‘ jot χuj - nuw - əmem?!
lie down-INF-if will-COND-1DU do not together lie-COND-1DU
'After we drank, after we sat [lit. 'after that drinking of the two of us, after that sitting of the two of us'], if we lie down, do not we lie down together?!' (VNGy IV: 46)

In transitive ANCs both A and P can be present although it is not too frequent. If both of the core arguments are expressed, then both A and P precede the action nominal (A precedes P), both of them are unmarked and A is crossreferenced by the possessive style agreement:

- (33) *naŋ osmä š'opiytä - nə - n-mu:s osmä joli pa:lt o:s' - nə*
you pillow arrange-AN-SG<2SG-till pillow under be-PTCP.PRS
out - ä-oul - ä kwon ne:ltä - ln!
bow-SG<3SG-tip-SG<3SG out stick-IMP.SG<2SG
'When you arrange the pillows, stick out the tip of his bow being under the pillow!' (VNGy IV: 172)

In the majority of the examples only P is expressed, preceding the action nominal, and A is crossreferenced as mentioned above:

- (34) *joməs rus', joməs man'si tittə - nə - m, ajt - nə - m χaltə*
good russian good mansi feed-AN-SG<1SG water-AN-SG<1SG during
amki akw‘ tot te:γ - əm, amki akw‘ tot aje - γ - im.
myself at the same place eat-1SG myself at the same place drink-1SG
'While I feed the honest Russians, the honest Mansis and give drink to them, I myself also eat there, I myself also drink there.' (VNGy IV: 27)

In most of those cases, where neither A nor P are expressed in ANCs, A is

crossreferenced by the possessive style agreement:

- (35) *toχ n'awlə - nä - t χaltə akw'-mat-ert χuml'ə la:w - i:*
 so thus chase-AN-SG<3SG during suddenly how say-PRS[3SG]
 'As (s)he is chasing him/her so, suddenly how does (s)he says:' (VNGy II: 148)

There are some examples where the crossreferenced argument is not A but P. In my opinion in these examples the action nominal has a passive meaning so P is the emphasized part of the sentence and not the general or indefinite A. This could be the cause for the possessive suffix referring to P instead of A (which is not expressed in the sentence):

- (36) *e:läl' kert - nə - m - t tarä amki ne:-lili - m vi:γ - ləm*
 forward send-AN-SG<1SG-LOC immediately myself woman-soul-SG<1SG take-SG<1SG
 'If I am sent away, I myself take my woman-soul immediately.' (VNGy IV: 76)

If we compare all these examples with the Mansi possessive construction, we could say that both S and A appear as possessors of the action nominal:

- (37) *χum sun-e* (38) *ta aj - nə - me:n (jui-pa:lt)*
 man sledge-SG<3SG that drink-AN-SG<1Du (after)
 'the man's sledge' '(after) our drinking' (= 'after we drank')

As it can be seen, in the Mansi possessive construction the unmarked possessor precedes the possession (there is no genitive case in Northern Mansi) but a possessive suffix is attached to the possession referring to the person and number of the possessor and also to the number of the possession. Similarly to this in ANCs the unmarked S and A precede the action nominal and there is a possessive suffix on the AN agreeing with S or A in person and number. This feature links S and A to noun phrase syntax.

It is more difficult however to determine how P is expressed in ANCs because there is no accusative case-marker in Northern Mansi so the direct objects are unmarked in the sentences. (Except for the personal pronouns.) In examples, where the action nominal has a passive meaning and the possessive suffix on the AN refers to the direct object (P), P appears as the possessor of the AN similarly to S. In the rest of the examples however it cannot be

decided unambiguously, whether P preserves its original case (nominative or unmarked accusative?) or we can say that it appears as a possessor of the AN similarly to S and A.

As mentioned above, unlike nouns, Northern Mansi personal pronouns have an accusative form so ANCs containing pronominal direct objects could help us to find out how P is encoded in the transitive ANCs. Unfortunately I have found quite few examples with pronominal direct objects and even with the help of these examples the question cannot be unambiguously answered. In case of action nominals in *-n* the pronominal P is in the accusative form (39) while in case of ANs in *-m* it can be in the accusative (40) or in the nominative form (41) as well:

- (39) *Tawä purγə - nə ma:'əs sup ju:wʹə raxw - əl jo:ηχta - wə,*
him/her catch-AN for shirt backwards collar-INST turn back-PASS[3SG]
n'arä-pum - iy os toχal'ij jo:ηχta - we - iy; us'ta purγa - wə.
 shoe-hay-DU too so turn back-PASS-3DU then catch-PASS[3SG]
 'For catching him/her, the shirt with its collar is turned backwards, shoe-hay [filling] is also turned backwards; then (s)he can be caught.' [i. e. the corncrake] (VNGy IV: 414)

- (40) *pi:γkwə! am naηən re:χt - əm porä - m - t us't vorti kit*
 little boy I you-ACC give birth-AN time-SG<1SG-LOC right then red two
χapγä-lupta kit päit - äγən o:l - s - eiγ;
 poplar-leaf two face-DU<2SG be-PST-3DU
 'My little boy, when I gave birth to you, your cheeks were just like two red poplar leaves.' (VNGy I: 123)

- (41) *Taw vis's'ental - əm jui-pa:lt χu:-pe:ri-χu: o:jkä ju: ti s'ältəpa:li*
(s)he take away-AN after χū-pēri-χū old man home so enter suddenly
 'After taking him/her away, the old Xū-pēri-χū comes home suddenly. (VNGy III: 383)

In conclusion we can claim that Mansi action nominals have syntactic features to some extent similar to that of noun phrases and to some extent similar to that of sentences with a finite verb. In ANCs S appears as an unmarked possessor or only a possessive suffix refers to

it on the action nominal. With transitive ANs both A and P can appear: A as an unmarked possessor and P in some unmarked case if it is a noun and in accusative or also unmarked if it is a personal pronoun. The order of A and P corresponds to the basic word-order of Mansi (SOV). If only P is expressed in the ANC, we find a similar situation to the one mentioned above: the nominal P is unmarked while the pronominal P can retain its original encoding (the accusative) or it can be unmarked as well. If the transitive action nominal has a passive meaning, then A is not expressed in the ANC and P is crossreferenced in the possessive style agreement.

Appearing of S and A as possessors in ANC links the syntax of the action nominals to the noun phrase, while the fact that P expressed by a personal pronoun preserves its original accusative case links it rather to sentences with a finite verb.

3. Deverbalization: morphological aspects

Concerning verbal categories so far I have examined voice and tense in Mansi ANCs.

As mentioned before (c. f. p. 7–8.), Mansi action nominals are incapable of expressing tense: the past/non-past distinction found in sentences with finite verbs is not retained in ANCs. Mansi action nominals are not able to express even relative tense, at least not without case suffixes or postpositions. Some kind of relative tense can be assigned to them from the context alone or on the bases of common sense in some cases, however this does not mean that tense is preserved in Mansi ANCs.

Regarding the verbal category voice, in my data I have not found any examples of the nominalization of a passive verb. So the active/passive distinction is not retained in Mansi ANCs. It is retained syntactically, though, in those transitive ANCs with a passive meaning, where there is no overt passive agent. In these ANCs P is crossreferenced in the possessive style agreement unlike in 'active' ANCs, where A is crossreferenced. The general or indefinite agent is not expressed in these passive ANCs because the direct object is more important and that is the emphasized part of the sentence (c. f. p. 13.).

It is not a coincidence that action nominals in *-n* and in *-m* with passive meaning cannot be found in great numbers. Most probably the converb was used to express the active/passive distinction as claimed also by Sz. Kispál while examining the occurrence of the converb as a subject: „figyelemre méltó, hogy a tárgyas, ill. tárgyasként használt ige származéka alanyként szenvedő jelentésű, tehát mintha szándékos volna alkalmazása az igenem szempontjából közömbös *m*-igenévvél szemben.” (Sz. Kispál 1966: 332) Dezső Szabó

also mentions earlier that this deverbal noun sometimes can appear as *nomen actionis* and in case of transitive verbs it has a passive meaning (Szabó 1904: 436).

5. Substantivization: morphological aspects

Northern Mansi action nominals can combine with case suffixes and postpositions. Instead of the agreement typical of sentences with a finite verb, in Mansi ANCs we find the possessive style agreement so Mansi action nominals can combine with possessive suffixes, too.

Concerning case suffixes they can combine with the locative (mainly ANs in *-m*) and the translative (mainly ANs in *-n*) case suffix. According to Rombandeeva (Rombandeeva, 1973) they can combine also with the ablative and the lative case suffix, but in my data I have not found any examples for that.

Regarding postpositions, on the bases of my data action nominals in *-n* combine mostly with the postposition *χalt* 'during, when', while ANs in *-m* combine mostly with *jui-pālt* 'after'. (But also action nominals in *-n* combine quite often with *jui-pālt*, and ANs in *-m* combine very often with *χalt*.)

Aside from these two postpositions action nominals in *-n* take *mūs ~ mos* 'till' quite often, and the postpositions *ēli-pālt* 'before', *kastəl* 'till, while', *māγəs* 'for, because, in order to', *palitəl* 'while', *porät* 'while, when', *ōrəmtə* 'while, when', *sis* 'while, when' less often. ANs in *-m* combine very often with *ōrəmtə* 'while, when' and *porät* 'while, when', and less often with the following postpositions: *kēmt* 'when, as', *māγəs* 'for, because, in order to', *mūs ~ mos* 'till', *pasnəl* 'since', *sis* 'while, when'.

Apart from case suffixes and postpositions, Mansi action nominals combine with possessive suffixes very often since these suffixes refer to the subject of the AN and the direct object of the passive AN (see above).

9. Word order in nominalization

The question, whether word order follows nominal or verbal pattern in nominalization is less relevant for consistently head-final (SOV, GEN-N) languages but could be important for other language types. Mansi also belongs to the head-final languages so this parameter is less relevant for it as well. Concerning the word order it can be stated that the arguments of the transitive action nominals follow the basic word order of Mansi (SOV): the subject

precedes the direct object.

References:

- Alexiadou, Artemis (2001): *Functional structure in nominals: nominalization and ergativity*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Bašić, Monika (2010): On the morphological make-up of nominalizations in Serbian. In: Alexiadou, Artemis –Rathert, Monika (eds.), *The Syntax of Nominalizations across Languages and Frameworks*. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin/New York. 39–66
- Borsley, Robert D. – Kornfilt, Jaklin (2000): Mixed and Extended Projections. In: R. Borsley (ed.), *The Nature and Function of Syntactic Categories*. Syntax and Semantics 32. Academic Press, San Diego. 101–131.
- Chomsky, Noam (1970): Remarks on Nominalization. In: Jacobs, Roderick and Rosenbaum, Peter (eds.), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Ginn and co. Waltham, Massachusetts. 184–221.
- Comrie, Bernard (1976): *The Syntax of Action Nominals: A Cross-Language Study*. *Lingua* 40: 177–201.
- Comrie, Bernard – Thompson, Sandra Annear (1985): Lexical nominalization. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description III*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 349–398.
- Givón, Talmi (1990): *Syntax. A Functional-Typological Introduction Volume II*. John Benjamin Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Grimshaw, Jane (1990): *Argument Structure*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1977): *X'-Syntax. A Study of Phrase Structure*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Kannisto, Artturi – Liimola, Matti (1951–1963): *Wogulische Volksdichtung I-VI*. MSFOu. 101, 109, 111, 114, 116, 134.
- Kannisto, Artturi – Liimola, Matti – Eiras, Vuokko (1982): *Wogulische Volksdichtung. Wörterverzeichnis zu den Bänden I-VI*. Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura, Helsinki. MSFOu. 180.
- Kálmán, Béla (1975): *Chrestomathia Vogulica*. Tankönyv-kiadó, Budapest.
- Kálmán, Béla (1976): *Wogulische Texte mit einem Glossar*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Kenesei, István (2000): Szavak, szófajok, toldalékok. In: Kiefer, Ferenc (szerk.), *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan III. Morfológia*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. 75–136

- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (1993): *Nominalizations*. Routledge, London – New-York.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (2003): Action nominal constructions in the languages of Europe. In: F. Plank (ed.), *Noun phrase structure in the languages of Europe*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin. 723–761.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (2005): Action nominal constructions. In: Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Max Planck Digital Library, Munich. Chapter 62.
<http://wals.info/chapter/62>
 (2011. november 7.)
- Koskinen, Päivi (1998): *Features and Categories: Non-finite Constructions in Finnish*. PhD-thesis, University of Toronto.
<https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/twpl/article/view/6514>
 (2011. október 3.)
- Laczkó, Tibor (1997): Action Nominalization and the Possessor Function Within Hungarian and English Noun Phrases. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 44: 413–475.
- Laczkó, Tibor (2000): Az ige argumentumszerkezetét megőrző főnévképzés. In: Kiefer, Ferenc (szerk.), *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan III. Morfológia*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
 293–409.
- Lees, Robert B. (1960): *The Grammar of English Nominalizations*. Mouton, The Hague.
- Malchukov, Andrej – Maria Koptjevskaja Tamm – Peter Cole – Gabriella Hermon – Jaklin Kornfilt – Bernard Comrie (2008): Leipzig Questionnaire on Nominalizations and mixed categories. http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/tools-at-lingboard/pdf/Malchukov_MixedCategories_Questionnaire.pdf
 (2011. július 12.)
- Munkácsi, Bernát (1892–1896): *Vogul Népköltési Gyűjtemény I–IV*. MTA, Budapest.
- Munkácsi, Bernát – Kálmán, Béla (1986): *Wogulisches Wörterbuch*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Pusztay, János (2006): *Nyelvével hal a nemzet. Az oroszországi finnugor népek jelene és jövője 11 pontban*. Teleki László Alapítvány, Budapest.
- Rappaport, Malka (1983): On the nature of derived nominals. In: Levin, Lori – Malka Rappaport – Annie Zaenen (eds.), *Papers in LFG*. Indiana University Linguistic Club, Bloomington. 113–142.
- Riese, Timothy (2001a): Historische Nominalderivation des Wogulischen. *Studia Uralica* 10.

- Harrasowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden. 60–125.
- Riese, Timothy (2001b): Vogul. Languages of the World/Materials 158. Lincom Europa, Muenchen.
- Rombandeeva, Evdokia Ivanovna [Ромбандеева, Евдокия Ивановна] (1973), Мансийский (вогульский) язык. Издательство «Наука», Москва. 65–79.
- Szabó, Dezső (1904): A vogul szóképzés. Nyelvtudományi Közlemények 34: 417–443.
- Sz. Kispál, Magdolna (1966): A vogul igenév mondattana. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Ylikoski, Jussi (2003): Defining non-finites: action nominals, converbs and infinitives. SKY Journal of Linguistics 16: 185–237.
- Ylikoski, Jussi (2009): Non-finites in North Saami. Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia = MSFOu 257.