



НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬСКИЙ  
УНИВЕРСИТЕТ

Uralic Information Centre Talk series, April 2022

# DIAGNOSING AND DISTINGUISHING NORTHERN KHANTY POSS.2SG UNPOSSESSIVES

Stepan Mikhailov

[stepanmihajlov@gmail.com](mailto:stepanmihajlov@gmail.com)

Laboratory of Formal Models in Linguistics, HSE University



# OUTLINE

- I. Introduction
- II. Monosemic vs polysemic views of non-possessive uses
- III. Proper possessive *-en<sup>I</sup>*
- IV. Associative possessives *-en<sup>II</sup>*
- V. Topic marker *-en<sup>III</sup>*
- VI. Proprial article *-en<sup>IV</sup>*
- VII. Directions for future research



# OUTLINE

- I. Introduction
- II. Monosemic vs polysemic views of non-possessive uses
- III. Proper possessive *-en<sup>I</sup>*
- IV. Associative possessives *-en<sup>II</sup>*
- V. Topic marker *-en<sup>III</sup>*
- VI. Proprial article *-en<sup>IV</sup>*
- VII. Directions for future research



# I. INTRODUCING THE NORTHERN KHANTY POSS2 MARKER(S)

Uralic languages typically have **non-possessive uses of possessive markers** in contexts beyond the possessive prototype (Nikolaeva 2003; Fraurud 2001; Simonenko 2017; É. Kiss, Tánczos 2018; a. o.), e. g.

- The topic marker function of the Northern Khanty *-en* [POSS.2SG] (1)

(1)    **amp-en**            ma    pɛλ-am-a            χurət-ti            pit-əs  
dog-POSS.2SG    I        at-POSS.1SG-DAT        bark-NFIN.NPST        become-PST[3SG]

‘{I was walking along the street when I saw a dog.} **The dog** started barking at me’.

Not: ‘your dog’

- Or the proprial article function of the same marker (2) (used with referential human names)

(2)    **wontər-en**            sewr-əs            tut            juχ  
A.-POSS.2SG        cleave-PST[3SG]        fire        wood

‘Andrej cleaved a log’. Not: ‘your Andrej’



# I. INTRODUCING THE NORTHERN KHANTY POSS2 MARKER(S)

I argue that one must distinguish **four markers with the exponent *-en***:

- The proper possessive *-en<sup>I</sup>* (3)

(3)    **nǎŋ**        **kǎt'-en**        moś-λ  
you.SG    cat-POSS.2SG    purr-NPST[3SG]

‘Your cat is purring’.

- The associative possessive *-en<sup>II</sup>* (4)

(4)    **an-en**                    mij-e  
cup-POSS.2SG            give-IMP.SG.SG

{There’s one cup on the table.} ‘Pass me **the cup**’. Not: ‘your cup’

- The topic marker *-en<sup>III</sup>* and the proprial article *-en<sup>IV</sup>* (see above)



# I. METHODOLOGY

Data:

- Mostly real-life elicitation with up to 9 speakers from the Kazym village
- During field trips under Svetlana Toldova (2018-2019, 2021-2022)
- And also field texts collected in Kazym (2018-2019)

Stimuli for elicitation were prepared and presented following the semantic fieldwork methodology of Lisa Matthewson (2004)

This is a work in progress based on my MA thesis (Mikhailov 2021)

All comments are welcome!



# OUTLINE

- I. Introduction
- II. Monosemic vs polysemic views of non-possessive uses**
- III. Proper possessive *-en<sup>I</sup>*
- IV. Associative possessives *-en<sup>II</sup>*
- V. Topic marker *-en<sup>III</sup>*
- VI. Proprial article *-en<sup>IV</sup>*
- VII. Directions for future research



## II. PREVIOUS ACCOUNTS OF NON-POSSESSIVE USES

**Monosemic approaches (Nikolaeva 2003, Fraurud 2001, Körtvély 2010, Gerland 2014, Janda 2015, Simonenko 2017, a. o.)**

Monosemic approaches attempt to derive the non-possessive uses from the basic proper possessive meaning of possessive constructions

or reduce all the uses to some special extended meaning

This is preferable in terms of theoretical parsimony

- e. g. Grice's (1978: 47) modified Occam's razor: «Senses are not to be multiplied beyond necessity»
- Anything that is reducible / derivable from pragmatics does not constitute a separate sense





## II. PREVIOUS ACCOUNTS OF NON-POSSESSIVE USES

### The associative account (Nikolaeva 2003, Körtvély 2010)

For (5) it is suggested that POSS.2SG is used “because I am talking to you about it” (Nikolaeva 1999: 84).

#### (5) PRIURALSK DIALECT OF NORTHERN KHANTY

wanta #(**tām**) **mašinaj-en** jowra mǎnəs<sup>1</sup>  
see this car-2SG awry went.3SG

‘Look, that car (lit. that your car) went awry’. (adapted from Nikolaeva 2003: (15a))

(6) ma **iśi** **taxa:j-e:m-na** il ko:ri-s-ə-m  
me same place-1SG-LOC down fall-PAST-EP-1SG

‘I fell down in the same place (lit.: at the same my place)’. (Nikolaeva 1999: 83)

In both examples the possessives are said to be omissible without affecting at-issue content

- which is not the case for the Kazym data considered here

<sup>1</sup> The transliteration and the glosses in this section are retained from the original works.



## II. PREVIOUS ACCOUNTS OF NON-POSSESSIVE USES

**Monosemic approaches (Nikolaeva 2003, Fraurud 2001, Körtvély 2010, Gerland 2014, Janda 2015, Simonenko 2017, a. o.)**

Monosemic approaches predict that the markers must behave similarly in all uses

- w. r. t. their morphophonological, morphosyntactic, and semantic properties

Any differences from the proper possessive use require special explanation



## II. PREVIOUS ACCOUNTS OF NON-POSSESSIVE USES

**Polysemic approaches (É. Kiss, Tánczos 2018; É. Kiss 2018; Halm 2018; any other works?)**

Recently, works treating several non-possessive uses independently as separate markers, investigating their diachrony

Arguments for independence:

- Lack of agreement with the supposed possessor
- Unavailability of explicit NP-internal possessor
- Attachment of further possessive markers
- Complementary distribution with non-possessive elements (i. e. demonstratives)



## II. PREDICTIONS OF THE MONOSEMIC APPROACH

All things being equal, the non-possessive uses must behave the same as the proper possessive use

	I. PROPER POSSESSIVE <i>-en<sup>I</sup></i>	II. ASSOCIATIVE POSSESSIVE <i>-en<sup>II</sup></i>	III. TOPIC MARKER <i>-en<sup>III</sup></i>	IV. PROPRIAL ARTICLE <i>-en<sup>IV</sup></i>
A. Has the same morphophonology as (I)	—	Yes	Yes	Yes
B. Allows possessive stacking	No	No	No	No
C. Competes with <i>-ew</i> [POSS.1PL]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
D. Agrees with the Addressee in number	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
E. Allows for an explicit Possessor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
F. Triggers uniqueness inferences	Yes/No	Same as (DI)	Same as (DI)	Same as (DI)



## II. ACTUAL DATA OF NORTHERN KHANTY

	1. PROPER POSSESSIVE <i>-en<sup>I</sup></i>	2. ASSOCIATIVE POSSESSIVE <i>-en<sup>II</sup></i>	3. TOPIC MARKER <i>-en<sup>III</sup></i>	4. PROPRIAL ARTICLE <i>-en<sup>IV</sup></i>
A. Has the same morphophonology as (I)	—	Yes	Yes	n/d
B. Allows possessive stacking	No	No	No	No
C. Competes with <i>-ew</i> [POSS.1PL]	Yes	Yes	No	n/d
D. Agrees with the Addressee in number	Yes	Yes	No	No
E. Allows for an explicit Possessor	Yes	<b>Highly Restricted</b>	No	No
F. Triggers uniqueness inferences	No	Yes	Yes	—
G. Covaries with a higher quantifier	Yes	Yes	Yes	No



## II. THE THREE POSS.2SG UNPOSSESSIVES

The data suggest that the three non-possessive uses must be distinguished from the proper possessive use

- As three **unpossessive markers**:
- associative possessive  $-en^{II}$
- topic marker  $-en^{III}$
- proprial article  $-en^{IV}$

**Unpossessives** are markers homonymous with, but synchronically independent from proper possessives

- Distinguished from the later by morphophonological, morphosyntactic, and semantic properties



# OUTLINE

- I. Introduction
- II. Monosemic vs polysemic views of non-possessive uses
- III. Proper possessive *-en<sup>I</sup>***
- IV. Associative possessives *-en<sup>II</sup>*
- V. Topic marker *-en<sup>III</sup>*
- VI. Proprial article *-en<sup>IV</sup>*
- VII. Directions for future research



### III. INTRODUCING THE NORTHERN KHANTY POSS2 MARKERS

(7) illustrates POSS2 marking (sg and pl)

(7) **kāt'-en/-ən**                      moś-λ  
 cat-POSS.2SG/-POSS.2NSG    purr-NPST[3SG]  
 ‘Your (sg./pl.) cat is purring’.

The table here presents the possessive paradigm (with the dual possessee number column omitted)

The second person markers do not distinguish dual and plural number

	SG	PL
1SG	<b>-εm / -əm</b> <b>-POSS.1SG</b>	-λ-am -PL-POSS.1SG
2SG	<b>-en</b> <b>-POSS.2SG</b>	-λ-an -PL-POSS.2SG
3SG	-əλ/-eλ -POSS.3SG	-λ-aλ -PL-POSS.3SG
1DU	-εmən -POSS.1DU	-λ-amən -PL-POSS.1DU
2DU	<b>-ən</b> <b>-POSS.2NSG</b>	-λ-ən -PL-POSS.2NSG
3DU	-ən -POSS.3DU	-λ-ən -PL-POSS.3DU
1PL	<b>-ew</b> <b>-POSS.1PL</b>	-λ-aw -PL-POSS.1PL
2PL	<b>-ən</b> <b>-POSS.2NSG</b>	-λ-ən -PL-POSS.2NSG
3PL	-eλ <b>-POSS.3PL</b>	-λ-aλ -PL-POSS.3PL





### III. PROPER POSSESSIVE **-EN<sup>l</sup>**: EXPLICIT POSSESSOR

The proper possessive *-en<sup>l</sup>* is the only marker allowing **an explicit possessor** in the marked NP

- all the other markers considered here do not admit explicit possessors, which is the main argument for the relational polysemy account adopted here

(8)	i	ma	aśi-εm.	OK( <b>ma</b> )	<b>aśi-εm</b>
	and	I	father-POSS.1SG	I	father-POSS.1SG
	sovhoz-ən	ripak-a		rəpit-əs	
	sovkhov-LOC	fisherman-DAT		work-PST[3SG]	

‘And my father. My father worked as a fisherman in the sovkhov’. (field text)

- (This diagnostic was mentioned in Halm 2018)
- Importantly, **it provides critical evidence against the monosemic accounts to non-possessive uses possessives**



### III. PROPER POSSESSIVE -EN<sup>1</sup>: UNIQUENESS

The English possessive Saxon genitive NPs famously require uniqueness of the NP referent in an argumental position

- (9) (Coppock, Beaver 2015: 417-418)
- a. #**Mary's pet rabbit** is in the cage and **Mary's pet rabbit** is outside the cage. (**contradictory**)
  - b. Some rabbit is in the cage and some rabbit is outside the cage. (not contradictory)

This is not the case in a predicative position

- (10) a. The rabbit in the cage is **Mary's pet** and the rabbit sitting just outside the cage is **Mary's pet**. (**not contradictory**)
- b. The rabbit in the cage is a pet Mary owns and the rabbit sitting just outside the cage is a pet Mary owns. (not contradictory)
  - c. #The rabbit in the cage is the pet Mary owns and the rabbit sitting just outside the cage is the pet Mary owns. (contradictory)

This is explained via the IOTA type-shift (by (op. cit.)) which derives a **unique** individual-denoting NP from the basic predicate-denoting NP (in standard formal-semantic parlance (Heim, Kratzer 1998))



### III. PROPER POSSESSIVE -EN<sup>l</sup>: UNIQUENESS

Crucially, the proper possessive -en<sup>l</sup> does not require uniqueness even in an argumental position.

- (11) **nǎŋ welik-en** tǎm λoλ',  
you bicycle-POSS.2SG this stand[NPST.3SG]  
tuta-šk pa **nǎŋ welik-en** λoλ'  
there-ATT ADD you bicycle-POSS.2SG stand[NPST.3SG]

{A child asks: “where are my bicycles?”. Answer:} ‘Your bicycle is standing here, and another bicycle of yours (lit. more your bicycle) is standing there a bit further’.

Assuming the general framework of (Coppock, Beaver 2015), this suggests that Northern Khanty does not have the IOTA type-shift, which would derive the uniqueness effect if it were observed.

- (This is an important observation for theories of definiteness in articleless languages, see *e. g.* Šimík, Demian (to appear) for similar evidence from Russian and for discussion.)



# OUTLINE

- I. Introduction
- II. Monosemic vs polysemic views of non-possessive uses
- III. Proper possessive *-en<sup>I</sup>*
- IV. Associative possessives *-en<sup>II</sup>***
- V. Topic marker *-en<sup>III</sup>*
- VI. Proprial article *-en<sup>IV</sup>*
- VII. Directions for future research



## IV. ASSOCIATIVE POSSESSIVE *-en<sup>II</sup>*: UNIQUENESS

The associative possessive *-en<sup>II</sup>* **does** require uniqueness.

- (12) **an-#(en)**            mij-e  
cup-POSS.2SG        give-IMP.SG.SG

{At my place / Speaking to a friend at another friend's place. There's only one cup on the table.} 'Pass me the (lit. your) cup'.

- (13) **an-#(en)**            mij-a  
cup-POSS.2SG        give-IMP[SG]

{At my place / Speaking to a friend at another friend's place. There's several cups on the table.} 'Pass me a cup'.

Speaker comment on *-en*: “[the addressee] will then ask ‘which cup?’”.



## IV. ASSOCIATIVE POSSESSIVE -EN<sup>II</sup>: UNIQUENESS

The associative possessive -en<sup>II</sup> **does** require uniqueness

- which is observed also with other person-number combinations

(14) was'aj-en     **put-#(əλ)**     at     mǎ-λ  
V.-POSS.2SG   pot-POSS.3SG   OPT     give-NPST

{The speaker is doing the dishes in the kitchen. There's a single pot left on the table, where Vasya is.

Another person asks:} '— {How should we help you?} — Let Vasya give me the pot'.

Speaker comment: “[əλ is used] because it's the single pot standing near Vasya, [with Ø] it can't be this pot that is standing here, it's some pot that we don't even know [with Ø]”.

Note the speaker comment which suggests that here indeed some non-prototypical (associative) relation is expressed by the marker.



## IV. ASSOCIATIVE POSSESSIVE $-en^{II}$ : EXPLICIT POSSESSOR

Strikingly, the associative possessive  $-en^{II}$  **does not** admit an explicit possessor in the NP.

- (15) (#*nǎŋ*)    **an-en**                    *mij-e*  
you.SG    cup-POSS.2SG                    give-IMP.SG.SG

{There's one cup on the table.} 'Pass me the (lit. your) cup'.

Speaker comment on *nǎŋ*: "it's like 'give me your cup, don't touch grandma's cup', it should really be your cup".

With an explicit possessor the marker must be interpreted as a proper possessive.



## IV. ASSOCIATIVE POSSESSIVE -EN<sup>II</sup>: EXPRESSIBLE RELATIONS

In the typology of possessive marking strategies, two kinds of strategies are typically observed (Karvovskaya 2018):

- **idiosyncratic** (a. k. a. inalienable) which may only express stereotypical relations derived from the marked NPs semantics
- **non-idiosyncratic** (a. k. a. alienable) which may express any contextually-available relation

(16) ADYGHE (< NORTHWEST CAUCASIAN)

a. s-*ŝ*ha

1SG-head

‘my head’

b. s-jə-*ŝ*ha

1SG-POSS-head

‘my head’ (said by a zoologist about a dog’s head) (Gorbunova 2009)





## IV. ASSOCIATIVE POSSESSIVE -EN<sup>II</sup>: EXPRESSIBLE RELATIONS

There is a perfect negative correlation between the presence of an explicit possessor in the NP and the possibility of expressing contextually-dependent non-stereotypical non-NP-based relations (Karvovskaya 2018)

- The proper possessive admits an explicit possessor and bars non-NP-based relations
- The associative possessive may express contextually-dependent relations and does not admit an explicit possessor

(17) was'a, (#nǎŋ) m'ačok-en mij-e  
V. you.SG ball-POSS.2SG give-IMP.SG.SG

{The child picked up a dirty ball from the ground. His parent says:} 'Vasya, give me the ball'.

Speaker comment on *nǎŋ*: "this won't do if it's a dirty ball from the street, [*nǎŋ*] works if it's his ball".



## IV. ASSOCIATIVE POSSESSIVE -EN<sup>II</sup>: ANALYSES

The analyses of the two markers are based on the proposal of Karvovskaya (2018) for idiosyncratic vs non-idiosyncratic possessive strategies.

I assume that:

- both markers correspond to abstract heads in the syntax — POSS and ASSOC
- the particular person-number combination that is observed is a result of agreement of the possessive morpheme with the possessor
- the composition of an NP with POSS with the verb proceeds via the EX type-shift, which is the only type-shift available in Northern Khanty

The comparison of these analytical choices with possible alternatives and an explicit formulation of the analyses is left for future work.



## IV. ASSOCIATIVE POSSESSIVE -EN<sup>II</sup>: ANALYSES

The denotation of the proper possessive is given in (18)

(18)  $\| \text{POSS}_i \|^{g,c} = \lambda P \lambda y \lambda x: \exists z [P(z) \wedge g(i)(z)(y). P(x) \wedge g(i)(x)(y)]$  **defined iff  $g(i)$  is a stereotypical P-based relation**

where  $g$  is an assignment of individuals or relations (in this case) to numerical indices and  $c$  is the utterance context

and the associative possessive in (19)

(19)  $\| \text{ASSOC}_i \|^{g,c} = \lambda P \lambda y: \exists ! x [P(x) \wedge g(i)(x)(y)]. \iota x [P(x) \wedge g(i)(x)(y)]$

The infelicity of bare NPs in contexts where ASSOC is available is due to *Maximize Presupposition!* which requires to choose among alternative sentence minimally differing w. r. t. their presuppositional contents for the sentence with stronger presuppositions (Heim 1991, Coppock, Beaver 2015).



# OUTLINE

- I. Introduction
- II. Monosemic vs polysemic views of non-possessive uses
- III. Proper possessive *-en<sup>I</sup>*
- IV. Associative possessives *-en<sup>II</sup>*
- V. Topic marker *-en<sup>III</sup>***
- VI. Proprial article *-en<sup>IV</sup>*
- VII. Directions for future research

## V. TOPIC MARKER -EN<sup>III</sup>

The topic marker *-en<sup>III</sup>* is used with discourse referents introduced in prior linguistic context and it is barred with novel referents

- (20) ma χot-a λuŋ-s-əm. šāta šǎldat-(#en)<sub>1</sub> oməs-əλ.  
 I house-DAT enter-PST-1SG there.LOC soldier-POSS.2SG sit-NPST[3SG]

‘I entered a house. A/#the soldier<sub>1</sub> was sitting there. ...’

- (21) ma šǎldat-%(en)<sub>2</sub> χuśa wana mǎn-s-əm, puškan-ən  
 I soldier-POSS.2SG to closer come-PST-1SG gun-LOC  
 šǎš-s-əm. šǎldat-#(en)<sub>3</sub> pakn-əs.  
 show-PST-1SG>SG soldier-POSS.2SG become.scared-PST[3SG]

{Cont’d from (20)} ‘I came closer to the soldier<sub>2</sub> and aimed at him with my gun. The soldier<sub>3</sub> got scared’.

(The variation in marking preferences upon second mention is due to the soldier not being topical there. For some speakers, the marker drifts toward a more general anaphoric article)



## V. TOPIC MARKER *-en<sup>III</sup>*: EXPLICIT POSSESSOR AND FEATURE VARIABILITY

The topic marker *-en<sup>III</sup>* **does not** admit an explicit possessor in the NP

- (22) (#*nǎŋ*) **amp-en**            ma    πελ-am-a                    χurət-ti                    pit-əs  
your    dog-POSS.2SG I            at-POSS.1SG-DAT    bark-NFIN.NPST    become-PST[3SG]

‘{I was walking along the street when I saw a dog.} The dog started barking at me’.

Speaker comment on *nǎŋ*: “it’s another dog [than the one mentioned in the first sentence], it’s your dog”.

Unlike the proper and the associative possessives, the topic marker is restricted to POSS.2SG even in case of a plural addressee

- (23) **amp-en/#-ən**                    ma    πελ-am-a                    χurət-ti                    pit-əs  
dog-POSS.2SG/-POSS.2NSG I            at-POSS.1SG-DAT    bark-NFIN.NPST            become-PST[3SG]

{Same as (22), but the speaker is a mother talking to her children.} ‘{...} The dog started barking at me’.



## V. TOPIC MARKER -EN<sup>III</sup>: TOPICALITY

In the field texts almost all instances of POSS2 marking are on topical familiar subjects

- (The following examples are from the Northern Khanty version of the Kolobok fairy-tail.)

The text opens with a description of habitual activities of a married couple

After a description of the husband's routine, the narrative switches to his wife with (24)

- (24) **im-en**            juλən            χotχari            λ'εχət-λ,  
wife-POSS.2SG at.home    floor            wash-NPST[3SG]  
λεtut    wer-əλ,            pəsan-λ  
food    make-NPST[3SG]            do.laundry-NPST[3SG]

‘The wife washes the floors at home, makes food, does the laundry’. (field text)

## V. TOPIC MARKER -EN<sup>III</sup>: TOPICALITY

The wife starts baking a bread, anxiously awaiting it and running around it

In (25) the bread has already been previously mentioned and is marked with POSS.3SG, argued to be an associative possessive in this example

Such associative possessive usage is observed consistently with direct objects in the texts

(25)	śǎlta	in	ńań-əλ	śi	wεr-s-əλλε,	wεr-s-əλλε,	
	then	now	bread-POSS.3SG	DEM	make-PST-3SG.SG	make-PST-3SG.SG	
	pa	iməłtijən	ńań-en	jǎmijewa	nuχ	śi	ji-s,
	ADD	finally	bread-POSS.2SG	nicely	up	EMPH	become-PST[SG]
	wurta		ji-s				
	rosy		become-PST[3SG]				

‘Now then she was running and running around the bread [lit. doing that which she did earlier to the bread] and, finally, the bread raised nicely and became rosy’. (field text)



## V. TOPIC MARKER -EN<sup>III</sup>: TOPICALITY

Upon second mention the bread is in a subject position and, therefore, marked with the topic marker.

(For the link between subjecthood and topicality in Ob-Ugric see Nikolaeva 2001, É. Kiss 2019.)

POSS2 marking consistently arises whenever an aforementioned entity is in a subject position.

(25)	śǎłta	in	<b>ńań-əł</b>	śi	wer-s-əλλe,	wer-s-əλλe,	
	then	now	bread-POSS.3SG	DEM	make-PST-3SG.SG	make-PST-3SG.SG	
	pa	iməłtijən	<b>ńań-en</b>	jāmijewa	nuχ	śi	ji-s,
	ADD	finally	bread-POSS.2SG	nicely	up	EMPH	become-PST[SG]
	wurta		ji-s				
	rosy		become-PST[3SG]				

‘Now then she was running and running around the bread [lit. doing that which she did earlier to the bread] and, finally, the bread raised nicely and became rosy’. (field text)



## V. TOPIC MARKER *-en<sup>III</sup>*: CO-VARIATION

The topic marker *-en<sup>III</sup>* may vary in reference in presence of a higher quantifier in the sentence (see the literature on “donkey sentences”, Heim 1982, Elbourne 2013 and references therein).

- (26) *kašəŋ* *śos* *amp* *šiwəλə-t-εm-ən*  
every hour dog see-NFIN.NPST-1SG-LOC  
***amp-en*** *ma* *peλ-am-a* *χurət-λ*  
dog-POSS.2SG I at-POSS.1SG-DAT bark-NPST[3SG]

‘Every time I meet a dog the dog barks at me. {Sometimes it is a big dog, sometimes it is a smaller dog.}’

## V. TOPIC MARKER $-en^{III}$ : ANALYSIS

Nikolaeva (2001: 7) defines the notion of topicality relevant to our purposes as aboutness whereby “the referent is assumed by the speaker to be a center of current interest about which the assertion is made” and “is represented in short-term memory” (Gundel et al. 1993: 278)

- *i. e.* the referent must be salient

Barlew (2014) analyzes an article of Bulu (< Bantu) as a salient article which incorporates the requirement of salience alongside uniqueness.

Some preliminary data indicate that the topic marker  $-en^{III}$  patterns similarly to the Bulu salient article, so I adopt Barlew’s proposal, with the addition of an intensional argument for modelling the co-variation property (with the intended analysis of the property as in Elbourne 2013).

$$(27) \quad \|-en^{III}\|^{g,c} = \lambda P \lambda s: \exists !x[P(x)(s) \wedge \text{sal}(x, c)]. \iota x[P(x)(s)]$$

where  $\text{sal}(x, c)$  is the property of being a salient discourse referent in context  $c$ ; when defined the function returns the unique  $x$  that is a  $P$  in the situation  $s$



# OUTLINE

- I. Introduction
- II. Monosemic vs polysemic views of non-possessive uses
- III. Proper possessive *-en<sup>I</sup>*
- IV. Associative possessives *-en<sup>II</sup>*
- V. Topic marker *-en<sup>III</sup>*
- VI. Proprial article *-en<sup>IV</sup>***
- VII. Directions for future research



## VI. PROPRIAL ARTICLE -EN<sup>IV</sup>: BACKGROUND

A **proprial article** is hypothesized by Muñoz (2019) to be a special morpheme which **derives individual-denoting terms from proper names**, which are argued to be basically predicative, **in an argumental position**

The use of POSS2 with proper names is restricted precisely to argumental positions

- (28) **wontər-\*(en)**    sewr-əs                    tət            jux  
A.-POSS.2SG    cleave-PST[3SG]    fire            wood

‘Andrej cleaved a log’.

- (29) **mašaj-\*(en)**,    ow-en    pənš-e  
M.-POSS.2SG    door-POSS.2SG    open-IMP.SG.SG

‘Masha, open the door!’



## VI. PROPRIAL ARTICLE **-EN<sup>IV</sup>**: TOPICALITY AND FEATURE VARIABILITY

Unlike the topic marker *-en<sup>III</sup>*, the proprial article *-en<sup>IV</sup>* is not restricted to the topical subject position and is even found with demoted subjects

- (30) *m' ačok-ən*                    ***pet' aj-en-ən***                    *wu-s-i*  
 ball-POSS.2NSG      P.-POSS.2SG-LOC      take-PST-PASS[3SG]

{Vasya and Katya are looking for the ball they like to play with at the kindergarten. The teacher says:}

‘The ball has already been taken by Petya’.

And it does not vary in number with a plural addressee

- (31) *ńawrem-ət, nin*                    ***wəntər-en-ən/\*-ən-ən***                    *lawəλ-aj-əti*  
 child-PL,      you.PL      A.-POSS.2SG-LOC/-POSS.2NSG-LOC      baby.sit[NPST]-PASS-2PL

{Andrej is a caretaker in the kindergarten. The parents are going away for the weekend and they tell their children:} ‘Children, Andrej will look after you’.



## VI. PROPRIAL ARTICLE $-en^{IV}$ : EXPLICIT POSSESSOR

The proprial article  $-en^{IV}$  also does not admit an explicit possessor

- (32) (#nǎŋ)            wəntər-\*(en)            sewr-əs tət    jʌχ  
you                    A.-POSS.2SG            cleave-PST[3SG]    fire wood

‘(#Your) Andrej cleaved a log’.



## VI. PROPRIAL ARTICLE -EN<sup>IV</sup>: CO-VARIATION

Muñoz (2019) also shows that in English a (null) proprial article-marked NP **does not vary in reference** in presence of a higher quantifier, unlike a definite article-marked NP

This prediction is borne out for the Northern Khanty proprial article

(33) kašəŋ oλ      mojləpsi    wɛjλ'                      **was'a**      /                      **#was'aj-en**  
every year    present    take[NPST.3SG]    V.                      /                      V.-POSS.2SG

‘{Every year we give a present to the 4<sup>th</sup> year student who gets the best grades.} Every year the present is taken by a Vasya. Last year it was Vasya Tas'manow and this year it's Vasya Tarlin’.

Recall that the topic marker -en<sup>III</sup> does have the co-variation property

The property, thus, further distinguishes the two markers





## VI. TOPIC MARKER *-en<sup>III</sup>*: CO-VARIATION

The topic marker *-en<sup>III</sup>* may vary in reference in presence of a higher quantifier in the sentence (see the literature on “donkey sentences”, Heim 1982, Elbourne 2013 and references therein)

- (26) *kašəŋ* *śos* *amp* *šiwəλə-t-em-ən*  
every hour dog see-NFIN.NPST-1SG-LOC  
**amp-en** *ma* *peλ-am-a* *χurət-λ*  
dog-POSS.2SG I at-POSS.1SG-DAT bark-NPST[3SG]

‘Every time I meet a dog the dog barks at me. {Sometimes it is a big dog, sometimes it is a smaller dog.}’

## VI. PROPRIAL ARTICLE $-EN^{IV}$ : ANALYSIS

The analysis is exactly that of (Muñoz 2019) (but simplified for expository purposes).

With the crucial property being that the proprial article binds the intensional (world or situation) argument of the NP, so that it cannot be bound to co-vary with a higher quantifier.

(34)  $\| -en^{IV}_i \|^{g,c} = \lambda P_{[[v \rightarrow e] \rightarrow [s \rightarrow [e \rightarrow t]]]}: \forall g', s, x [P(g')(s)(x) \leftrightarrow i \text{ is conventionally allowed to map to } x \text{ on some assignment in } s]. g(i)$

the selectional restriction ensures that the proprial article only admits unmarked and unmodified proper names; the index  $i$  models the reference of proprial article-marked NP to a concrete referent



# OUTLINE

- I. Introduction
- II. Monosemic vs polysemic views of non-possessive uses
- III. Proper possessive *-en<sup>I</sup>*
- IV. Associative possessives *-en<sup>II</sup>*
- V. Topic marker *-en<sup>III</sup>*
- VI. Proprial article *-en<sup>IV</sup>*
- VII. Directions for future research**



## VIII. CONCLUSIONS

I argued for a polysemic account of the four distinct uses of POSS2. The main findings include the following:

- The Kazym dialect of **Northern Khanty has two distinct possessive marking strategies encoded with the same set of markers** but differing in their syntax and semantics — the proper and the associative possessives.
- Crucially, **the latter does not allow explicit possessors which is a problematic observation for monosemic accounts of extended possessives** in previous literature on the topic.
- The topic marker  $-en^{III}$  has been shown to be restricted to topical subjects in the texts and to observe the co-variation property.
- **The proprial article  $-en^{IV}$  has been confirmed to not observe co-variation** unlike the topic marker.

The Kazym dialect of Northern Khanty has at least three **unpossessive** markers.



## VII. SUMMARY OF UNPOSSESSIVE DIAGNOSTICS HERE

	1. PROPER POSSESSIVE <i>-en<sup>I</sup></i>	2. ASSOCIATIVE POSSESSIVE <i>-en<sup>II</sup></i>	3. TOPIC MARKER <i>-en<sup>III</sup></i>	4. PROPRIAL ARTICLE <i>-en<sup>IV</sup></i>
A. Has the same morphophonology as (I)	—	Yes	Yes	n/d
B. Allows possessive stacking	No	No	No	No
C. Competes with <i>-ew</i> [POSS.1PL]	Yes	Yes	No	n/d
D. Agrees with the Addressee in number	Yes	Yes	No	No
E. Allows for an explicit Possessor	Yes	<b>Highly Restricted</b>	No	No
F. Triggers uniqueness inferences	No	Yes	Yes	—
G. Covaries with a higher quantifier	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

- Barlew 2014 — Barlew J. Saliency, uniqueness, and the definite determiner -tè in Bulu // *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*. 2014. 24. 619-639.
- Coppock & Beaver 2015 — Coppock E. & Beaver D. Definiteness и determinacy // *Linguistics и philosophy*. 2015. № 38(5). 377-435.
- É. Kiss 2018 — É Kiss, K. (2018). Possessive agreement turned into a derivational suffix. In *Boundaries crossed, at the interfaces of morphosyntax, phonology, pragmatics and semantics* (pp. 87-105). Springer, Cham.
- É. Kiss 2019 — É. Kiss K. Fused grammatical and discourse functions in Ob-Ugric: Case, agreement, passive // *Proceedings of the Workshop “Clause Typing and the Syntaxto-Discourse Relation in Head-Final Languages”*, Arbeitspapier / Josef Bayer & Yvonne Viesel (eds.). Nr. 130. 2019.
- É. Kiss, Tánczos 2018 — É. Kiss K. & Tánczos O. From possessor agreement to object marking in the evolution of the Udmurt-jez suffix: A grammaticalization approach to morpheme syncretism // *Language*. 2018. 94(4). 733-757.
- Elbourne 2013 — Elbourne, P. (2013). *Definite descriptions* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.
- Fraurud 2001 — Fraurud K. Possessives with extensive use. *Dimensions of possession*, 47. 2001.
- Gerland 2014 — Gerland D. Definitely not possessed? Possessive suffixes with definiteness marking function. // *Frames and concept types*. Springer, Cham, 2014. 269-292.
- Gorbunova 2009 — Gorbunova, I. M. (2009). Possessivnye konstrukcii [possessive constructions]. *Aspekty polisintetizma: Ocerki po grammatike adygejskogo jazyka* [Aspects of polysynthesis: Sketches on the grammar of Adyghe], ed. Ya. G. Testelets, 146-165.
- Gundel et al. 1993 — Gundel, J. K., Hedberg, N., & Zacharski, R. (1993). Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language*, 274-307.
- Halm 2018 — Halm, T. (2018). From possessive suffix to affective demonstrative suffix in Hungarian: a grammaticalization analysis. *Morphology*, 28(4), 359-396.
- Heim 1982 — Heim, I. (1982). *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*. PhD thesis, Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst.

- Heim 1991 — Heim, I. (1991). Artikel und Definitheit. *Semantik: Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung*. A. v. Stechow and D. Wunderlich (eds.), 487-535.
- Heim, Kratzer 1998 — Kratzer, A., & Heim, I. (1998). *Semantics in generative grammar* (Vol. 1185). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Janda 2015 — Janda, G. E. (2015). Northern Mansi possessive suffixes in non-possessive function. *Eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteaduse ajakiri. Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics*, 6(2), 243-258.
- Karvovskaya 2018 — Karvovskaya, L. The typology и formal semantics of adnominal possession. PhD. dis. LOT, Netherlands Graduate School, 2018.
- Körtvély 2010 — Körtvély, E. On the function of possessive suffixes in Tundra Nenets: Possession и semantic-pragmatic definiteness // *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen*. 2010. № 32(33). 321-343.
- Matthewson 2004 — Matthewson L. On the methodology of semantic fieldwork // *International journal of American linguistics*. 2004. 70(4). P. 369-415.
- Mikhailov 2021 — Mikhailov S. Semantics of the Northern Khanty 2SG Possessive and of Related and Competing Markers. MA thesis HSE University, 2021.
- Muñoz 2019 — Muñoz P. The proprial article and the semantics of names. *Semantics and Pragmatics*. 2019. 12. <https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.12.6>
- Nikolaeva 1999 — Nikolaeva, I. *Ostyak*. Lincom Europa, 1999.
- Nikolaeva 2001 — Nikolaeva I. Secondary topic as a relation in information structure. *Linguistics*. 2001. 39(1). 1-49.
- Nikolaeva 2003 — Nikolaeva I. Possessive affixes in the pragmatic structuring of the utterance: Evidence from Uralic. // *International Symposium on Deictic Systems и Quantification in Languages Spoken in Europe и North и Central Asia: Collection of papers*. 2003. 130-145.
- Simonenko 2017 — Simonenko, A. (2017). Towards a semantic typology of specific determiners. In *21st Amsterdam Colloquium* (pp. 425-434).



НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬСКИЙ  
УНИВЕРСИТЕТ

[stepanmihajlov@gmail.com](mailto:stepanmihajlov@gmail.com)