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1 Introduction

- Kazym Khanty, close to Obdorsk Khanty described in (Nikolaeva 1999) but showing several morphological
differences (i.e. number of cases, pronominal paradigms, DOM)
- Data comes from fieldwork (elicitation + texts) with 17 native speakers living in Kazym
- Non-rigid SOV, head-final
- Four morphological cases in total
  - Nouns: NOM=ACC (unmarked), DAT and LOC
  - Personal pronouns distinguish NOM (unmarked), ACC and DAT; impossible in the contexts that require
    Locative

2 Argument alternations in Kazym Khanty:
   general background

There is a -a(j)-/-i(j)- morpheme that has been traditionally defined as passive. The natural context for its
occurrence is answering a general question like What happened? or beginning a story. The demoted participant
bears the Locative case.

(1) ma i puš am-an pur-s-aj-a
    I one time dog-LOC bite-PST-PASS-1SG
    ‘Once I was bitten by a dog’.

Another argument alternation does not involve the -a(j)-/-i(j)- morpheme and has generally been approached
as secundative alternation: IO promotes to the DO position, triggering the object agreement on the finite verb. DO
turns into Locative.

(2) aŋk-em apl-em sołamat-an mä-s-4e
    mother-1SG younger.brother-1SG mash-LOC give-PST-3SG.SG
    ‘My mother gave kasha to my brother (lit. My mother gave my brother with kasha)’.

This can be further passivized:

(3) apl-em aŋk-em-on sołamat-an mä-s
    younger.brother-1SG mother-1SG-LOC mash-LOC give-PST-PASS
    ‘My mother gave kasha to my brother (lit. My brother is given by my mother with kasha)’.

Only dative arguments and high applicatives (in terms proposed by Pylkkänen (2002)) can be promoted to DO;
low applicatives, as well as other lower positions cannot participate in secundative alternation.

(4) pet’aj-en ropit-l ma jaj-am-a
    Peter-2SG work-NPST|3SG I elder.brother-1SG-DAT
    ‘Peter works for my brother’.
While argument alternation supported by the use of -a(j)-/-i(j)- can be associated with topicalization, secundative alternation has been claimed to co-occur with so-called secondary topicalization (Nikolaeva 2001).

3 Non-finite relativization: general information

The two participial forms -om (NFIN.PST) and -ti (NFIN.NPST) are involved almost in any subordinative construction in Kazym Khanty: control clauses, sentential adjuncts and complements, relative clauses. The two forms differ in their temporal (rather than aspectual) interpretation and do not show any differences over their relativizability. Thus, syntactic positions that are directly accessible to relativization are SU, DO, dative Goals, adjuncts (restrictedly), possessors (restrictedly).

- Subject relativization:

(7) aj ikij-a moš moši piraš iki
little man-DAT tale tell.NFIN.NPST old man
‘the old man who tells a fairytale to the boy’

- Direct object relativization

(8) šaš-em ţot-am păsan muş mon-s-em
paternal.grandmother-1SG buy-NFIN.PST table up wipe-PST-1SG.SG
‘I wiped the table that my grandmother bought’.

- Goal relativization

Goals are initially marked with the Dative case. Relativization of goal arguments is somehow restricted and not approved by all of the speakers.

(9) aqk-em kişkaj-ə nurom-a pun-s-le
mother-1SG book-3 shelf-DAT put-NFIN.PST-3SG.SG
‘My mother put her book on the shelf’.

(10) ?aqk-em kişkaj-ə pun-əm nurom-a an juţot-1-əm
mother-1SG book-3 put-NFIN.PST shelf-DAT NEG come-NPST-1SG
‘I can’t reach the shelf that my mother put her book on’.

- Adjunct relativization

Most of the adjuncts initially bear the Locative case. All of them can easily be relativized:

(11) tám čatil-ŋ aj-əm maşaj-əl imiţ-jwa wu-s-le
this day-LOC elder.brother-1SG Mary-3 woman-DAT take-PST-3SG.SG
‘On this day, my brother married Mary (lit. took his Mary as a wife)’.

(12) muş wos-ew-əm ųom-l-ə aj-əm maşaj-əl imiţ-jwa wuj-əm čatil
we village-1PL-LOC remember-NPST-PASS elder.brother-1SG Mary-3 woman-DAT take-NFIN.PST day
‘In our village they remember the day when my brother married Mary’.

Relativization of postpositional complement is hindered. There are two cases when it is acceptable (at least to some extent):

- Arguments encoded with postpositions

(13) ma amp ewosčt păl-əm
I dog from be.afraid-NPST-1SG
‘I am afraid of the dog’.
‘I chased away the dog my sister is afraid of’.

Adjuncts of several postpositions can be relativized iff the head noun is the complement of an identical postposition itself (i.e., Case Matching takes place, as it has been studied in free relatives (Izvorski 1997 ao)):

(15) sašaj-en pāsan ĕpĳ-a ča‘išm-s
    Sasha-2SG table under-DAT hide-PST[3SG]
    ‘Sasha hid under the table’.

(16) *sašaj-en (ēpĳ-e-a) ča‘išm-əm pāsan
    Sasha-2SG (under-3-DAT) hide-NFIN.PST table
    Intended reading: ‘the table under which Sasha hid’

(17) ma sašaj-en ča‘išm-əm pāsan ĕpĳ-a wal-chema-s-əm
    I Sasha-2SG hide-NFIN.PST table under-DAT look-INCH-PST-1SG
    ‘I checked under the table under which Sasha hid’.

Possessor relativization

Most of the possessor-like relations are expressed via juxtaposition. The possessive marking on the head is optional except for pronominal possessors, for which it is obligatory. Only the most salient of the possessor-like relations allow for relativization, as e.g. constructions involving kinship terms.

(18) čil-e-eil amnía woš woš-ti piroš iki
    grandchild-pl-3 Amnya village be-NFIN.PST old man
    ‘the old man whose grandchildren live in Kazym (lit. in the Amnya (river name) village)’

4 Argument alternations within relative clauses

Khanty participles are voice-neutral. When used as passive ones, they do not attach the -a(j)/(-j)- morpheme - argument alternation can only be seen from argument encoding: su demotes to Locative.

(19) a. aŋk-əm ʃot-əm ʃa‘i
    mother-1SG buy-NFIN.PST bread
b. aŋk-əm-ən ʃot-əm ʃa‘i
    mother-1SG-LOC buy-NFIN.PST bread
    ‘the bread that my mother bought’

If the Agent is inanimate, only a passive counterpart can be used:

(20) a. jiŋk-əŋ wuʃ-əm ʃot
    water-LOC take-NFIN.PST house
b. *jiŋk wuʃ-əm ʃot
    water-LOC take-NFIN.PST house
    ‘a house flooded with water’

However, not any relative clause allows for argument alternations. For instance, adjunct or possessor relativization is inncompatible with SU-DO alternation:

(21) a. aŋk-əm ʃa‘i ʃot-ijal-ti ʃapka
    mother-1SG bread buy-FREQ-NFIN.NPST shop
b. *aŋk-əm-ən ʃa‘i ʃot-ijal-ti ʃapka
    mother-1SG bread buy-FREQ-NFIN.NPST shop
    ‘the shop where my mother usually buys bread’

Secundative alternation is also attested within relative clauses. Moreover, in some cases it is required. In particular, to can only be relativized if firstly promoted to DO:
(22) a. up-em ŋuŋi-j-an mij-am amp nųx amt-as
elder.sister-1SG meat-LOC give-NFIN.PST dog up get.happy-PST[3SG]
   b. *up-em ŋuŋi mij-am amp nųx amt-as
elder.sister-1SG meat give-NFIN.PST dog up enjoy-PST[3SG]
   ‘The dog to whom my sister had given meat was happy’.

Combination of secundative alternation and passivization is also legitimate:

(23) up-em ŋuŋi-j-an mij-am amp nųx amt-as
elder.sister-1SG-LOC meat-LOC give-NFIN.PST dog up enjoy-PST[3SG]
   ‘The dog to whom my sister had given meat was happy’.

Predictably, passivization without secundative alternation is banned:

(24) *up-em ŋuŋi mij-am amp nųx amt-as
elder.sister-1SG-LOC meat give-NFIN.PST dog up enjoy-PST[3SG]
   Intended reading: ‘The dog to whom my sister had given meat was happy’.

However, it seems that secundative alternation is only possible when needed: subject relativization does not allow for it.

(25) a. šerk-en išak-4-æ-æ kät’i-j-æ-æ cm jînk mij-am aj ik-el
Sergey-2SG praise-NPST-O-3 cat-3-DAT breast water give-NFIN.PST little man-3
   b. *šerk-en išak-4-æ-æ kät’i-j-æ-æ cm jînk-an mij-am aj ik-el
Sergey-2SG praise-NPST-O-3 cat-3 breast water-LOC give-NFIN.PST little man-3
   ‘Sergey praises the boy who gave milk to his cat’.

Adjunct relativization is also incompatible with secundative alternation:

(26) a. piroš iki χi-h-æ-æ mo’š mo’ši χot
old man grandchild-3-dat tale tell.NFIN.NPST house
   b. *piroš iki χi-h-æ mo’š-æ-æ mo’ši χot
old man grandchild-3-dat tale tell.NFIN.NPST house
   ‘the house where the old man tells fairytales to his grandson’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relativized position</th>
<th>Passivization</th>
<th>Secundative alternation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct object</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect object</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessor</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Internal structure of participial RCs

- Participles have argument structure ⇒ vP;
- Possibility to hold aspectual affixes ⇒ AspP;
- Possible to modify with ‘once’, impossible to modify with ‘later’: the difference between the two forms is more temporal than aspectual (even though in some other close dialects it is aspectual, e.g. in the Shuryshkary one (Muraviev 2017) ⇒ TP?
- Impossible to modify with modal adverbs ⇒ no ModP or higher.
6 Passivization

6.1 Unmarked subjects vs. demoted subjects

Demoted subject of relative clause shows different syntactic behaviour in comparison to unmarked one. I argue that unmarked subjects of relative clauses are possessors.

- Agreement within RC

In a possessive construction, pronominal possessor obligatorily triggers agreement on the possessee. In other cases, agreement is optional.

(27) a. ma _AST-EM
I  house-1SG
b. *ma _AST
I  house
‘my house’

(28) jn _AST-(4)
John  house-3
‘John’s house’

Similarly, pronominal subject of RC triggers possessive agreement marker on the head noun; agreement with non-pronominal subjects is optional.

(29) _AST-
we/she  read-NFIN.NPST book-3
‘the book she is reading’

(30) mašaj-en jrn-om  
Mary-2SG good-DAT sing-NFIN.PST song-3 very ancient
‘The song that Mary sang well is very old’.

Agreement with locative subjects is impossible:

(31) mašaj-en- on jrn-om  
Mary-2SG-LOC good-DAT sing-NFIN.PST song-3 very ancient
‘The song that Mary sang well is very old’.

- Competition from the same structural position

In contrast to passive RC, it is impossible to add another possessor to the structure with unmarked subject.

(32) a. ank-EM  pos-om  jrnas muž sor-s
mother-1SG wash-NFIN.PST dress-up dry-PST[3SG]
b. ank-EM on  pos-om  jrnas muž sor-s
mother-1SG-LOC wash-NFIN.PST dress-up dry-PST[3SG]
‘The dress that my mother washed is dry’.

(33) a. *ank-EM  pos-om  jrnas-EM muž sor-s
mother-1SG wash-NFIN.PST dress-1SG up dry-PST[3SG]
b. ank-EM on  pos-om  jrnas-EM muž sor-s
mother-1SG-LOC wash-NFIN.PST dress-1SG up dry-PST[3SG]
‘My dress that my mother washed is dry’.

- Quantifiers are impossible

Quantifier phrases such as ‘nobody’ or ‘every’ can occur neither as possessors nor as unmarked subjects. The Locative counterpart is grammatical though.
(34) *nrynjugat aj amp(-oł)
   nobody little dog-3
   Intended reading: ‘nobody’s puppy’

(35) a. nrynjugat-an àn łyxt-am an-ọt ma pään ewaıt jira wuị-s-om
   nobody-loc NEG wash-NFIN.PST cup-PL I table from away take-PST-1SG
   ‘From the table the cups that nobody had washed’.

   b. *nrynjugat-an łyxt-am an-ọt ma pään ewaıt jira wuị-s-om
   nobody NEG wash-NFIN.PST cup-PL I table from away take-PST-1SG

   • Manner adverbs can only follow the unmarked subject. Locative subjects can be either preceded or followed by an adverbial modifier.

(36) a. mašaj-en-ọn jcm-a arij-om ar wra katra
   Mary-2SG-LOC good-DAT sing-NFIN.PST song very ancient

   b. jcm-a mašaj-en-ọn arij-om ar wra katra
   good-DAT Mary-2SG-LOC sing-NFIN.PST song very ancient

   c. mašaj-en jcm-a arij-om ar wra katra
   Mary-2SG good-DAT sing-NFIN.PST song very ancient

   d. *jcm-a mašaj-en arij-om ar wra katra
   good-DAT Mary-2SG sing-NFIN.PST song very ancient

   ‘The song that Mary sang well is very old’.

   • In constrast to locative ones, unmarked subjects of RCs can control purpose clauses:

(37) a. ajk-em kor-on punšt-ti pāta lọt-am ůxu wuǐ ůxu wol-m-ọł
   mother-1SG oven-LOC bake-NFIN.NPST for buy-NFIN.PST meat deer meat be-NFIN.PST-3

   b. *ajk-em kor-on punšt-ti pāta lọt-am ůxu wuǐ ůxu wol-m-ọł
   mother-1SG oven-LOC bake-NFIN.NPST for buy-NFIN.PST meat deer meat be-NFIN.PST-3

   ‘The meat bought by my mother was deer meat’.

   • ..and intensifier floating - at least in some cases:

(38) a. pet’aj-en ływ saxt-ọl-a kiškaj-cl łyxt-s-ọl-le
   Peter-2SG s/he INT-3-DAT book-3 read-PST-O-3

   b. pet’aj-en kiškaj-cl ływ saxt-ọl-a łyxt-s-ọl-le
   Peter-2SG book-3 s/he INT-3-DAT read-PST-O-3

   ‘Peter read the book by himself’.

(39) *kiškaj-cl pet’aj-en-ọn ływ saxt-ọl-a łyxt-s-ọl-le
   book-3 Peter-2SG-LOC s/he INT-DAT-3 read-PST-PASS

   Intended reading: ‘The book was read by Peter by himself’.

(40) pet’aj-en kiškaj ływ saxt-ọl-a łyxt-om ɔtat-ọl ajk-ɛl nom-ọl-le
   Peter-2SG book s/he INT-3-DAT read-NFIN.PST day-3 mother-3 remember-NPST-O-3

   ‘Peter’s mother remembers the day when Peter read a book by himself’.

7 Conclusion

• Participial relative clauses in Kazym Khanty exhibit argument alternations: promotion to subject and promotion to object.

• These alternations can only take place when needed:
– Participial relatives are reduced structures that do not exhibit a full-fledged TP; since there is no possibility to assign Case to the Agent participant. There is some evidence for PRO.
– Secundative alternation within RCs can only be done in order to make IO accessible to relativization
  • It might be the case that this is a mechanism that does not involve variation in information structure at all.
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