ADNOMINAL POSSESSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN MORDVIN, MARI AND PERMIC

Polina Pleshak
Moscow State University

Abstract. This paper deals with adnominal possessive constructions in Moksha, Erzya, Meadow Mari, Hill Mari, Izhma Komi and Udmurt. The two main constructions that encode possessive relations in all the languages of the sample are the same: Dependent-marking and Double-marking. Izhma Komi also uses Head-marking and Juxtaposition. However, a more fine-grained analysis helps to find out many differences between the languages of the sample. Firstly, restrictions on the use of the genitive case and possessive markers can be slightly different in these languages. Secondly, there are factors that influence marking of NP elements (both the Head and the Dependent) in different ways. These factors are semantic relations, animacy hierarchy and syntactic function of an NP.

Keywords: intragenetic typology, possessive constructions, Dependent-marking, Double-marking, genitive case, possessive marker, semantic relations, animacy hierarchy, Finno-Ugric languages

1. Introduction

1.1. Research goals

The concept of possessiveness has been widely discussed not only in descriptive works dealing with one language (see Szabolcsi 1981 on Hungarian, Taylor 1996 on English, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1995, 1996 on Chukchi and Maltese, Verhaar 1997 on Dutch, among others), but also in typological research on morphological marking of possessors and possessees (Mark 1925; Ultan 1978; Ihsane 2003) and syntactic constructions (Nichols 1988), (Manzelli 1990; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2002, 2003; Graščenkov 2006). Nichols (1988) discusses data from the languages of North America, but her generalizations are claimed to be "applied to language in general" (Nichols 1988: 558). Koptjevskaja-Tamm focuses on the structure of possessive constructions in the languages of Europe.

However, the data of some Finno-Ugric languages spoken in Europe (in particular Mari, Mordvin, and Permic, as well as minority Finnic languages) has been poorly represented. This could be explained by the lack of typologically oriented data on these languages (with the exception of some recent papers, which I will cite, and the description of the Finno-Permic nominal complex in the minimalist framework in Simonenko and Leontjev 2012). From the point of view of general typology, Mari, Mordvin, and Permic possessive constructions are pretty similar. All these languages use the genitive case for the prepositional possessor, and the possessee can bear a possessive marker. The aim of this paper is to show some fine-grained distinctions in possessive marking that can be highlighted within intragenetic typology (Kibrik 1998; De Groot 2013; Miestamo et al. 2015) and to provide the list of parameters that have to be observed to see these distinctions.

1.2. Background

Following Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2002), I define possessive relations through a set of the core meanings: kinship (*girl's mother*), body part (*girl's head*), legal ownership (*girl's house*). Constructions that encode these relations in a language are called possessive in this particular language. If there are other relations encoded in the same constructions, these relations are considered as possessive for this particular language. Regarding the frequency of being possessive in different languages, all the relations can be ranked. Different languages develop different splits on this scale. In this paper, I do not discuss those relations which are marked separately from the core possessive relations and observe only the inner splits within the possessive domain. In the Finno-Ugric languages, the relations in question are mostly "anchoring" in terms of Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2002), which means that the possessor serves as an anchor for identifying the head. Non-anchoring relations, like predestination (*a woman's dress*), material (*a stone wall*) or pseudo-partitive (*a cup of tea*), are encoded with other constructions, which are beyond the scope of this paper.

There are three main types of possessive constructions: adnominal possession (*girl's dog*), predicative possession (*The girl has a dog*), and constructions with external possessor (*I looked him in the eye*), which should be distinguished from the possessor in predicative constructions, though both are actually external. This paper is mainly concentrated on the first type.

1.3. Data

This study is based on data from six Finno-Ugric languages (my sample differs considerably from that of Simonenko and Leontjev 2012). These are two Mordvin languages (Moksha, Erzya), two Mari languages (Hill Mari, Meadow Mari) and two Permic languages (Izhma[1] Komi, Udmurt). The data were taken from different sources. Moksha possessive constructions are briefly mentioned in descriptive grammars (Koljadenkov and Zavodova 1954), (Cygankin 1980, 2000) and (Feoktistov 1963) but in this work I focus on my own elicited field data collected in the villages of Lesnoje Tsibajevo and Lesnoje Ardashevo of the Temnikov district (Mordovia) in 2014–2017. The Erzya data were taken from (Rueter 2005, 2010) and also from some older works on this issue and grammars (Cygankin 1978; Feoktistov 1963). Genitive constructions in Mari are described in (Kangasmaa-Minn 1966), but for Hill Mari I mainly used my own field data collected in the villages of Kuznetsovo and Mikrjakovo (Gornomariysky district, Mari El) in 2016–2017. I studied possessive constructions in Izhma Komi in the village of Samburg (Pur district, Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous District) and compared them to the standard Komi-Zyryan data available in (Nekrasova 2002). The category of possession in Udmurt is analyzed in (Edygarova 2010), and I decided to compare this material with Komi and the other languages from my sample. The examples given below which have no explicit references come from my own fieldwork. The sample includes three languages (Moksha, Hill Mari, and Izhma Komi) on which I have reliable first-hand data, including information on some issues that supplements previous research. The other three languages were added as genetic pairs to make the sample more consistent: Erzya and Moksha form the Mordvin branch, Meadow Mari and Hill Mari form the Mari language branch and Udmurt together with Komi-Zyryan belongs to the Permic branch.

1.4. Challenges and problems

There are two main challenges for the study of possessive constructions in the languages of my sample that require a high degree of accuracy in a typological study, in order to avoid mistakes caused by the

---

1   Izhma Komi is a dialect of Komi-Zyryan which is rather different from the standard language.

surface similarity of different phenomena. These are discourse uses of possessive markers and the lack of clear surface differences between internal and external possessors.

Discourse uses of Uralic possessive markers (dealing with identifiability, topicality, etc.) have been widely discussed (Kuznecova 2003; Nikolaeva 2003; Brykina and Sudobina 2005; Simonenko 2014). The degree of this shift varies across my sample. Thus, in Meadow Mari and Hill Mari, it is a statistical tendency favoured by some factors from information structure rather than a strict grammatical rule (Xomčenkova and Plešak 2017). In Izhma Komi, according to Kaškin (2008), the 3SG possessive marker has undergone a shift to a definiteness marker (1), which leads to its very frequent use determined outside any possessive construction itself.

(1)   Izhma Komi (Kaškin 2008: 37)
    *me   mun-i   ul'ic'a kuz'a i   ad'd'-i   pon ponm-**is***
    1SG walk-PST.1SG street along and see-PST.1SG dog dog-POSS.3SG

    kic'-is   uut-nį
    start-PST.3SG bark-INF

    'I was walking along the street and saw a dog. The dog started to bark.'

To deal with this problem in a typological study of how possessive relations are expressed, a researcher should choose contexts, in which the discourse-based nature of a possessive marker is unlikely.

The syncretism of how internal and external possessors can be marked poses another challenge (also taking into account possessors in predicative constructions and even with less possessive relations). Typologically (Seiler 1983; Heine 1997; Stassen 2009), these constructions are supposed to have different properties, as in the former possessor and possessee constitute an entire NP while in the latter they do not. However, these constructions, in Moksha for example, are difficult to distinguish among due to the same marking strategy, see example (2) with an external possessor and (3), where the genitive possessor can be analyzed both as external and internal, as well as the contradictory results of syntactic tests described by Plešak (2015) and the analysis of this problem by Edygarova (2010: 161) and references therein. In my paper, I concentrate on the surface marking without a detailed account of the syntactic structure (which can be a challenging task for the future).

(2) Moksha
mon'   jalga-z'ə-n'   ul'-i   mašina-c   /
1SG.OBL   friend-1SG.POSS.SG-GEN   be-NPST.3SG   car-3SG.POSS.SG

mašina, a   mon'   aš
car   and   1SG.OBL   NEG.EX

'My friend has a car and me not.'

(3) Moksha
mon'   jalga-z'ə-n'   mašina-c   / *mašina   višk-stə
1SG.OBL   friend-1SG.POSS.SG-GEN car-3SG.POSS.SG   car   quick-ELA

ard-i
go-NPST.3SG

'The car of a friend of mine goes quickly.'

1.5. Structure of the paper

This paper has the following structure. In Section 2, I describe morphological marking of NP elements and enumerate the set of possible constructions. In Section 3, I discuss factors that influence the choice of construction. In Section 4, I draw conclusions.

2. Marking within NPs

2.1. Structural types of prototypical NPs

Nichols (1988) and Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2003) distinguish among seven structural types of possessive constructions. Four of them are present in the Finno-Ugric languages in general.

The basic word order in the Finno-Ugric languages is Dependent + Head. The following structures are presented (see the examples below):
– *Double-marking* with the genitive case on the dependent and possessive marking on the head (11–16);
– *Dependent-marking* with the genitive case on the dependent and without possessive marking on the head (17–21);
– *Head-marking* with the nominative case on the dependent and possessive marking on the head (22);
– *Juxtaposition* with no overt marking (4), (23).

Double-marking is used in all the languages in question. *Dependent-marking* does not occur in constructions with internal possessors in Udmurt. *Head-marking* occurs only in Izhma Komi and is used in a narrow range of cases. At first glance, *Juxtaposition* seems to be somehow present in all these languages, but it is only in Izhma Komi where it encodes core possessive relations, as only in Izhma Komi[2] a juxtaposed dependent can be specific and bear a possessive marker (compare (4) with ungrammatical (5)–(7) for Udmurt, Moksha and Hill Mari; for Erzya see Rueter 2005, and for Meadow Mari see Kangasmaa-Minn 1968).

(4)   Izhma Komi
    bab-i̦s   *kis'-t-i*   *ši̦d*   *vnuk-**i̦s***
    grandmother-POSS.3SG pour-CAUS-PST.3SG soup grandson-3SG.POSS

    tar'elka-e
    plate-ILL

    'Grandmother spooned out some soup onto her grandson's plate.'

(5)   Udmurt (Edygarova 2010: 187)
    vi̦n-jos***   *korka-n*
    younger.brother-PL   house-INE

    Intended meaning: 'in the house of the younger brothers.'

(6)   Moksha
    baba-z'ə*   *kaja-s'*   *lεm*   *vnuk-əc***
    grandmother-1SG.POSS.SG pour-PST.3SG soup grandson-3SG.POSS.SG

    tar'elka-s
    plate-ILL

    Intended meaning:'Grandmother spooned out some soup onto her grandson's plate.'

(7)   Hill mari
    mə̈n' pi-em***   *lapa-vlä-m už-ə̂n-am*
    1SG   dog-POSS.1SG paw-PL-ACC see-PRT-1SG

    Intended meaning: 'I saw the paws of my dog.'

---

2   This is also true for Komi-Zyryan (Nekrasova 2002) but all the statements in the main text of the paper are made for Izhma Komi, since I have consistent field data on it. Some parallels with the standard Komi-Zyryan are provided, but not all the phenomena can be compared so far due to the lack of data.

In Plešak (in press), it is argued that nominative and non-marked dependents in Izhma Komi should be distinguished. Constructions with a non-marked dependent are observable in all six of the languages but they encode relations with a non-specific or generic dependent (non-anchoring relations in terms of Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2003). In most cases, they denote non-anchoring part-whole relations, but I do not aim to discuss this here. It is important that this construction with juxta-position has some semantic restrictions and any nominal inflectional markers on the dependent are impossible (5), (8)–(9).

(8) Moksha
maša kočka-j   ***kelu*** / **kelu-s'*   / **kelu-t   lopa-t*
Mary   gather-NPST.3SG   birch   birch-DEF.SG   birch-PL   leaf-PL

'Mary gathers birch leaves.'

(9) Hill Mari
vedrä / **vedrä-žǝ*   *kǝl'   nör-en,*   *dä   jaklešt-eš*
pail   pail-POSS.3SG   grip   get.wet-PRT.3SG   and   slip-NPST.3SG

'The pail grip has got wet and slips.'

Below, I give examples for all the constructions in all the languages.

Double-marking

(11) Moksha
*mon vas'a-**n'**   šava-n'a-**nc**   šta-jn'ǝ*
1SG   Vasya-GEN   cup-DIM-3SG.POSS.SG.GEN   wash-PST.1SG.OBJ:3SG

'I have washed Vasya's cup.'

(12) Erzya
*fjodor   ivanovic'-**en'**   t'ejt'er'-**ez**-at?*
Fyodor   Ivanovich-GEN   daughter-3SG.POSS-NPST.2SG

'Are you Fyodor Ivanovich's daughter?' (Rueter 2010: 24)

(13) Hill Mari
*vas'a-**n**   äkä-**žǝ**   toklɘ̂-n   kačk-aš šolt-a*
Vasya-GEN   elder.sister-POSS.3SG   tasty-ADV   eat-INF   cook-NPST.3SG

'Vasya's elder sister cooks well.'

(14) Meadow Mari (Kangasmaa-Minn 1966: 61)
    *tarzəž-**ən**   omn'ə-**žə**   pər-en   kaj-a   kudə.bečə-škə*
    servant-GEN   horse-POSS.3SG   enter-CVB   go-NPST.3SG   yard-ILL

    'The servant's horse goes into the yard.'

(15) Izhma Komi
    *veleḍiṣ'-ịs-**len**   kerka-**ịs**   sulal-e   n'eiḷịn*
    teacher-POSS.3SG-GEN   house-POSS.3SG   stand-PRS.3SG   not.far

    'The teacher's house stands nearby.'

(16) Udmurt (Edygarova 2010: 165)
    *boris-**len** ana-**jez**-lị   an'a soku ik   kel'š-em*
    Boris-GEN   mother-POSS.3SG-DAT   Ann then EMPH please-PST2.3SG

    'Boris' mother liked Ann at once.'

   Dependent-marking

(17) Moksha
    *son   put-əz'-n'ə   kl'uč-n'ə-n'   t'ɛd'ɛ-z-ə-**n'***
    3SG   put-PST.3SG.OBJ:3PL   key-DEF.PL-GEN   mother-1SG.POSS.SG-GEN

    sumka-s
    bag-ILL

    'He put the keys into my mother's bag.'

(18) Erzya (Šaxmatov 1910: 314–315, from Rueter 2005: 11)
    *sa-s'   s'eja-**n't'**   azər-əs'*
    come-PST.3SG   goat-DEF.SG.GEN   owner-DEF.SG

    'The goat's owner came.'

(19) Meadow Mari (Kangasmaa-Minn 1966: 83)
    *miša-**n**   βakš-eš   βaš.lij-na*
    Mike-GEN   mill-LAT   meet-PST.3PL

    'We met at Mike's mill.'

(20) Hill Mari
    *pet'a-**n**   mašinä   jam-ə̂n*
    Peter-GEN   car   get.lost-PRT.3SG

    'Peter's car has got lost.'

(21) Izhma Komi

*tuj   vi̮l-i̮n   sulal-e   sos'ed-e-**len**   dad'*
road on-INE stand-PRS.3SG neighbour-POSS.1SG-GEN sledge

'My neighbour's sledge is on the road.'

Head-marking

(22) Izhma Komi

*vas'a   pukal-e   me   ži̮r**j-am***
Vasya sit-PRS.3SG 1SG room-INE.POSS.1SG

'Vasya is sitting in my room.'

Juxtaposition

(23) Izhma Komi

*me   pukal-a   **vas'a**   ži̮rj-yn*
1SG sit-NPST.1SG Vasya   room-INE

'I am sitting in Vasya's room.'

One can see from the examples above that all the languages develop quite the same set of adnominal possessive constructions: Double-marking and Dependent-marking (with two additional patterns in Izhma Komi). The co-occurrence of Double- and Dependent-marking can be due to non-obligatoriness of possessive marking in a particular language. However, as I will show further, a more detailed analysis and a more fine-grained classification sheds light on many differences within our intragenetic sample.

The first thing one should take into account is the marking possibilities of each language: some languages develop more than one genitive, and the domain of each differs from that of a single genitive. The languages also differ in the structure of their possessive paradigms. The languages from my sample differ in marking of both dependent and head. Other things to be considered are differences in how the scale of semantic relations, the animacy hierarchy, and the scale of syntactic relations can be split. Each of these factors will be considered below.

2.1. Marking of dependent

In Mordvin, I consider two declension types (definite and indefinite besides possessive declension)[3]. Genitive dependents of these two types have different syntactic properties. Table 1 presents genitive markers for each language. The syntactic differences between the two Permic genitives are described by Nekrasova (2002) and in grammars (Nekrasova 2000: 65–67; Perevosčikov 1962: 95). To sum up, a special genitive marker (-*lys'* in Izhma Komi, -*les'* in Udmurt) is used for possessees in accusative NPs. It is also labeled alternatively as ABL.

Table 1: Genitive markers

	Erzya	Moksha	Mari	Izhma Komi	Udmurt
def.	*-n't'*	*-t'*		*-(ịs)-len/-(ịs)-lịs'*	
indef.	*-n'*	*-n'*	*-n*	*-len/-lịs'*	*-len/-les'*

It should be noted that the indefinite genitive in Mordvin does not mark anchoring possessors (the exceptions are proper nouns and some pronouns). It is used in generic constructions very similar to those with juxtaposition. Juxtaposition in Mordvin has, in its turn, many semantic restrictions. Compare the Moksha examples (24) and (25) with the genitive of the definite and the indefinite declension respectively (see the similar situation in Erzya, Rueter 2010: 80).

(24)

> *ava-**t'***   *sumka-**c***   *ašč-i*
> woman-DEF.SG.GEN   bag-3SG.POSS.SG   be.situated-NPST.3SG
>
> *morkš-t'*   *lank-sə*
> table-DEF.SG.GEN   on-INE
>
> 'The woman's bag is on the table.'

(25) Moksha

> *ava-**n'***   *sumka-**s'***   *ašč-i*   *morkš-t'*   *lank-sə*
> woman-GEN   bag-DEF.SG   be.situated-NPST.3SG   table-DEF.SG.GEN   on-INE
>
> 'The woman bag (intended for women) is on the table.'
> *'The bag of a woman is on the table.'

---

3   Syntactically definite and possessive genitive of possessors are similar and both denote "anchoring" possessors and trigger possessive markers on the head, so I do not distinguish between them here.

Since pronouns have a slightly different inflectional paradigm than nouns, they should be discussed separately. Pronouns are typically marked with genitive in possessive constructions. The patterns of how genitive can be formed vary across languages (see Table 2).

In Mordvin and Permic, the genitive form of pronouns is fused (with the exception of 3SG in Permic) while in Mari all personal pronouns bear a general genitive suffix. In Permic, pronouns develop a split between the 1st and the 2nd persons, on the one hand, and the 3rd person, on the other hand. The latter coincides with the demonstrative pronoun and bears a general genitive suffix. In Erzya, all possessive pronouns except 1SG bear a possessive suffix.

Table 2: Morphological marking of possessive pronouns

Moksha	GEN-form = oblique stem (in PL = NOM)	*mon'* 1SG.OBL *son'* 3SG.OBL *min'* 1PL.OBL
Erzya	GEN-form = oblique stem + POSS (except 1SG)	*mon'* 1SG.OBL *ton'-t'* 2SG.OBL-POSS2SG
Meadow Mari	GEN-form (Pron+GEN)	*mâj-ân* 1SG-GEN
Hill Mari	GEN-form (Pron+GEN)	*mən'-ən* 1SG-GEN *tədə-n* 3SG-GEN
Izhma Komi	special GEN-form (1st/2nd pers.) / GEN-form (3rd pers.)	*menam* 1SG.GEN *sị-len* 3SG-GEN
Udmurt	special GEN-form (1st/2nd pers.) / GEN-form (3rd pers.)	*mịnam* 1SG.GEN *so-len* 3SG-GEN

2.3. Marking of head

The system of possessive markers varies within my sample. They can differ in the expression of their semantic categories (number, alienability).

2.3.1. Number syncretism in possessive paradigms

In the **Mordvin** languages, possessive affixes are cumulative and express both the number of possessors and the number of possessees (26)–(27), whereas in **Mari** and **Permic** the number of possessors and

the number of possessees are expressed separately through the whole paradigm. Consider some Izhma Komi examples (28)–(31).

(26) Moksha
    mon'   *brad-əz'ə*   *tu-s'*   *oxota-s*
    1SG.OBL   brother-1SG.POSS.SG go-PST.3SG hunting-ILL

    'My brother has gone to hunt.'

(27) Moksha
    mon'   *brad-ən'ə*   *tu-s'-t'*   *ohota-s*
    1SG.OBL   brother-1SG.POSS.PL go-PST.3-PL hunting-ILL

    'My brothers have gone to hunt.'

(28) Izhma Komi
    si̭a *bos'-ema* *men'c'um* *igruška-**es***
    3SG take-PST2 1SG.GEN2   toy-ACC.POSS.1SG

    'He has taken my toy.'

(29) Izhma Komi
    si̭a *bos'-ema* *men'c'um* *igruška-**jas-es***
    3SG take-PST2 1SG.GEN2   toy-PL-ACC.POSS.1SG

    'He has taken my toys.'

(30) Izhma Komi
    si̭a *bos'-ema* *mijanči̭num* *igruška-**num-es***
    3SG take-PST2   1PL.GEN2   toy-POSS.1PL-ACC

    'He has taken our toy.'

(31) Izhma Komi
    si̭a   *bos'-ema* *mijanči̭num* *igruška-**jas-num-es***
    3SG take-PST2   1PL.GEN2   toy-PL-POSS.1PL-ACC

    'He has taken our toys.'

The Mordvin system is even more complex, as the distinction in the number of possessees is observed only with a singular possessor, but not with a plural one. Compare examples with a singular possessor (26)–(27) and with a plural possessor (32)–(33) from Moksha.

(32) Moksha

*min'   brad-**ən'əkə**   tu-s'   ohota-s*
1PL.OBL   brother-1PL.POSS   go-PST.3SG   hunting-ILL

'Our brother has gone to hunt.'

(33) Moksha

*min'   brad-**ən'əkə**   tu-s'-t'   ohota-s*
1PL.OBL   brother-1PL.POSS   go-PST.3-PL   hunting-ILL

'Our brothers have gone to hunt.'

In some dialects of **Erzya**, the 1SG possessor also does not specify the number of possessees. According to Cygankin (1978), the widespread syncretism in Erzya paradigms (34) leads to the use of the definite declension on the head in these cases (since the latter develops an opposition in number) (35).

(34) Erzya (Cygankin 1978: 37)
mon'   kudo-m
1SG.OBL   house-POSS.1SG

'my house'/ 'my houses'

(35)   Erzya (Cygankin 1978: 37)
a. *mon'   kudo-s'*
    1SG.OBL   house-DEF.SG

    'my house'

b. *mon'   kudo-tn'e*
    1SG.OBL   house-DEF.PL

    'My houses'

However, in some dialects one can find a semantic shift from a plurality of possessors to a plurality of possessees. That was mentioned for Mari dialects (Kangasmaa-Minn 1966) as well as for Izhma Komi in Samburg (Plešak, in press). Note that the general plural marker can either be omitted (36) or remain (37)–(38) (compare with regular (39)–(40)).

(36) Meadow Mari (Kangasmaa-Minn 1966: 59)
kuɣəža-n ŭδŭr-ŭšt
king-GEN daughter-POSS.3PL

'King's daughters'

(37) Meadow Mari (Kangasmaa-Minn 1966: 106)
*tšuraj-marij-**ən**   üδər-**əšt-βlak**   šüm-eš piš-šaš*
čurajeva-čeremis-GEN daughter-POSS.3PL-PL heart-LAT stay-PTCP.FUT

ikte uke
one NEG.EX

'There is no one among the daughters of Cheremis people in Churajeva who would please me.'

(38) Izhma Komi
*d'et'ina-**ịs-len**   rẹd-**jas-nys**   ka-ema-s'   c'omj-e*
boy-POSS.3SG-GEN parent-PL-POSS.3PL ascend-PST2-PL chum-ILL

'The boy's parents have gone to the tundra.'

(39) Izhma Komi
*c'el'ad'-**jas-len** c'ac'a-**nịs**   ịs'-is   pos vịl-as*
child-PL-GEN   toy-POSS.3PL fall-PST.3SG floor on-POSS.3SG.ILL

'The children's toy has fallen on the floor.'

(40) Izhma Komi
*c'el'ad'-**ịs-len**   c'ac'a-**jas-ịs** us'-isnịs pos vịl-as*
child-POSS.3SG-GEN toy-PL-POSS.3SG fall-PST.3PL floor on-POSS.3SG.ILL

'The child's toys have fallen on the floor.'

2.3.2. Alienability split

According to Nichols (1988), one of the senses of the term 'inalienable' is a closed set of bound nouns that are necessarily possessed. They are generally of types that are inherently possessed, but the set can be formed on formal grounds; other nouns of the same semantic types may be outside this bound set. Although the inalienable set of nouns in a particular language is unpredictable, the semantic classes of nouns typically included into this set can be represented as an implication hierarchy: kin terms and/or body parts > part–whole and/or spatial relations > culturally basic possessed items (e.g. arrows, domestic animals)

(Nichols 1988: 572). Two languages of my sample have sets of bound nouns that comply with the hierarchy.

In Udmurt, there are different sets of markers for alienable and inalienable possession, according to Edygarova (2010). Although there were some other hypotheses unrelated to semantics (see Lytkin 1970: 228), most of the roots that bear the special suffix belong to the semantic classes of body parts or relational nouns of location. Some kinship terms belong to this class too (Ponaryadov 2018).

(41) Udmurt (Edygarova 2010: 79)
      burd-iz
      wing-POSS.3SG.INAL

      'Its wing'

(42) Udmurt (Edygarova 2010: 49)
      pitran-ez
      wheel-POSS.3SG.AL

      'His wheel'

There is also some evidence for the alienability split in Hill Mari. The examples demonstrate that elder kin have to bear a possessive suffix (43) while younger kin do not (44). Such kinship terms also bear special possessive markers of 1st and 2nd person possessors (Plešak 2017).

(43) Hill Mari
      *mǝn'-ǝn šǝ̂žar-**em**   / šǝ̂žar   jažo-n*
      1sg-GEN   younger.sister-POSS.1SG   younger.sister good-ADV

      tɂmen'-eš
      study-NPST.3SG

      'My younger sister studies well.'

(44) Hill Mari
      *mǝn'-ǝn äkä-**m**   / *äkä   jažo-n   tɂmen'-eš*
      1SG-GEN   elder.sister-POSS.1SG   elder.sister good-ADV study-NPST.3SG

      'My elder sister studies well.'

Udmurt and Hill Mari select words of different semantic classes as inalienable nouns. In Hill Mari, this set is very restricted and includes only a part of kinship terms, whereas in Udmurt it also includes body parts and spatial relations. Nevertheless, both languages fit Nichols' hierarchy.

3. The choice of a construction

In the previous section, I have shown that the languages from my sample vary in possessive marking devices. Apart from this formal variation, the languages from my sample vary in factors influencing the choice of a construction. These factors are the following: semantic relations (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2002), syntactic function/case of the NP (Keenan and Comrie 1977), (Kibrik 2003) and animacy hierarchy (Silverstein 1976). In this section, I will discuss all these factors.

3.1. Semantic relations

The split between possessive and non-possessive relations (see Section 1.2) is the same for all the languages from my sample. A possessive NP with a non-pronominal possessor which is subject in a non-marked context like (45) takes Double-marking in all the six languages. This construction can only encode relations with an anchoring possessor, which has at least a potential referent in this world and can serve as an "anchor" for identifying another related entity (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2002). Depending on the obligatoriness of a possessive marker, some of these relations are also expressed with a Dependent-marking construction. Table 3 shows for all the possessive relations in each language whether the possessive marker is obligatory. It is very important to keep in mind that all the generalizations made in Section 3.1 are true for this particular (subject position) context, as syntactic function of a NP and pronominality of possessor sometimes influence possessive marking, see Sections 3.2 and 3.3.

(45) Hill Mari

ǝdǝr-ǝn täng-žǝ   tǝdǝ-n   do-kâ   xânal-aš
girl-GEN friend-POSS.3SG that-GEN ad-ILL be.on.a.visit-INF

tol-ân
come-PRT.3SG

'A girl's friend has come to see her.'

Table 3: Obligatoriness of a possessive marker[4]

Relation/Language	Moksha	Erzya	Meadow Mari	Hill Mari	Izhma Komi	Udmurt
kinship (*John's father*)	+	–	?	+/–	+	+
social (*John's friend*)	+	–	?	–	+	+
author (*John's book*)	+	–	–	–	–	+
carrier of properties (*Mary's beauty*)	+	–	–	–	–	+
group-member (*school teacher*)	+	–	–	–	–	+
legal ownership (*John's house*)	+	–	–	–	–	+
body part (*John's hand*)	+	–	–	–	+	+
part-whole (*the leg of the chair*)	+	–	–	–	–	+

As can be seen from Table 3, Moksha and Udmurt follow a quite strict Double-marking pattern, while in Erzya it is always possible to omit the possessive marker, which means availability of the Dependent-marking strategy. Hill Mari and Izhma Komi have special restrictions on the semantics of the words that bear an obligatory possessive suffix. In Hill Mari, it should be kin terms, and even within the domain of kinship there are some special restrictions (see section 2.3). Unfortunately, I cannot say anything definite about Meadow Mari. Its descriptions are based on different dialects that vary in this parameter (Kangasmaa-Minn 1966). In Izhma Komi, possessive markers are obligatory with kin, social and body part relations.

---

4   "+" means that a possessive marker is obligatory, "–" means that it is possible but can be omitted, "?" means there is a lack of data on this point.

3.2. Syntactic function/case of a NP

There is a well-known distinction between syntactic and semantic cases going back to (Jakobson 1958/1984; Kurilovič 1962) and relevant for the further discussion. The languages from my sample develop a rich system of semantic cases, but not all of them are frequent or productive. In this article, the label "semantic cases" refers mostly to locative cases, which are used in oblique positions. The factor of syntactic function and case of a NP is crucially important in the Finno-Ugric languages discussed here.

In **Moksha**, a possessive marker cannot be omitted only in three syntactic cases: nominative, genitive and dative[5] (46). In semantic cases (47), a possessive marker in NPs with a nominal possessor is optional (see the discussion about pronominal possessors in Section 3.3). This means that in the oblique position, the strategy of Dependent-marker is possible in Moksha.

(46) Moksha
  s't'ər'-n'ɛ-t'   *kukla-c*   / **kukla-s'*
  girl-DIM-DEF.SG.GEN doll-3SG.POSS.SG   doll-DEF.SG

  ašč-i   *oza-də*   *tabur'etka-t'*   *lang-sə*
  be.situated-NPST.3SG   sit-CVB.POS chair-DEF.SG.GEN   on-INE

  'The girl's doll is sitting on the chair.'

(47) Moksha
  t'ɛči al'ɛ-z'ə-n'   **kucə**   / *kucə-nzə*
  today   father-POSS.1SG.SG.GEN house.INE   house.INE-3SG.POSS

  ul'-i   *ila*
  be-NPST.3SG   party

  'There is a party in the house of my father today.'

In **Erzya**, possessive marking on the head is optional not only in the oblique position, but even in subject position (48).

(48) Erzya (Rueter 2010: 79)
  kudəkel'ks-en't'   *keŋkš-es'*   *apak*   *peksta-l'*
  entrance.hall-DEF.SG.GEN   door-DEF.SG   NEG.PST   heart.CNG-PST2

  'My sister is soft-hearted.'

----

5   There is no accusative case in Moksha.

As follows from (Cygankin 1978), it competes with the definite declension in syntactic cases and with the indefinite declension in semantic cases. The difference between Erzya and Moksha is in the possibility of definite markers on the head of a possessive construction: in Moksha they are impossible here (46).

In **Hill Mari**, the possessive marking is optional both in syntactic (49) and in semantic cases (50). According to Kangasmaa-Minn (1966: 113), different dialects of **Meadow Mari** have different frequency in the occurrence of a person marker on the head. But it seems that none of them has rigid grammatical restrictions on the possessive marking.

(49) Hill Mari
   *tǝn' mǝn'-ǝn sumka-**em-ǝm**   / sumka-**m**   k̂ǝ-š pišt-en-ät*
   you 1SG-GEN bag-POSS.1SG-ACC   bag-POSS.1SG-ACC Q-ILL put-PRT-2SG

   'Where have you put my bag?'

(50) *mǝn'-ǝn sumka-**št-em**   / sumka-**štǝ̂** vǝd   jamdar ki-ä*
   1SG-GEN bag-INE-POSS.1SG   bag-INE   water bottle lie-NPST.3SG

   'There is a bottle of water in my bag.'

Izhma-Komi (as well as the standard Komi-Zyryan) has the most interesting distribution of markedness in different syntactic functions. It distinguishes three main positions: subject, direct object, and other. It has a special genitive marker for a possessor of a direct object (51) and marks the possessor of an oblique NP with nominative instead of genitive (52).

(51) Izhma Komi
   *aj-e-**ḷis'**   / *aj-e-len   / *aj-e*
   father-POSS.1SG-GEN2   father-POSS.1SG-GEN   father-POSS.1SG

   *šuba-**se**   ęšed   meste viḷ-as*
   coat-POSS.3SG.ACC hang.IMP.2SG place on-ILL.POSS.3SG

   'Hang my father's coat on its place!'

(52) Izhma Komi
   *siạ ol-e   aj-**iṣ**   / *aj-iṣ-len   /*
   3SG live-PRS.3SG father-POSS.3SG   father-POSS.3SG-GEN

   aj-iṣ-ḷis'   kerka-in***
   father-POSS.3SG-GEN2 house-INE

   'He lives in his father's house.'

Udmurt opposes direct objects to all the other syntactic functions (without any special opposition involving obliques, in contrast to Izhma Komi). A possessor is marked in Udmurt with the genitive case (and never with the nominative case): GEN2 for direct objects (53) and GEN for the other syntactic ranks (54).

(53)   Udmurt (Edygarova 2010: 162)

    peţ̮ir *masa-**les'** ki-z-e*   *čepi̮lt-i-z*
    Peter Mary-ABL hand-3SG-ACC pinch-1PST-3SG

    'Peter pinched Mary's hand.'

(54)   Udmurt (Edygarova 2010: 162)

    peţ̮ir *masa-**len** azbar-a-z*   *pi̮r-e*
    Peter Mary-GEN yard-ILL-3SG enter-PRS.3SG

    'Peter enters Mary's yard.'

As it can be seen from this section, the languages from my sample vary in the strategies they use to distinguish different syntactic functions. Whereas both Mari (Hill and Meadow) and Erzya do not distinguish direct and oblique positions in possessive constructions, Moksha, Udmurt and Izhma Komi do. In Moksha, this distinction concerns obligatoriness of possessive marking in different syntactic functions. Udmurt and Izhma Komi develop a system of differential possessor marking, where Udmurt opposes direct object position to the others, whereas Izhma Komi distinguishes three positions: subject, direct object and oblique.

3.3. Animacy hierarchy

The animacy hierarchy proposed by Silverstein (1976) is relevant for many linguistic phenomena, and possessive encoding is no exception. The main split is between pronominal and nominal possessors, which is discussed in 3.3.1. There is also some evidence on animacy split in Moksha[6] (see 3.3.2 and 3.3.3).

---

6   All generalizations made in Sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 are based on Moksha data, but there is no contradictory evidence for Erzya.

3.3.1. Pronominal possessors

Pronominal possessors vary not only in their morphological marking, as we have seen in Section 1, but also in their syntactic properties.

In **Moksha**, a possessive marker is less obligatory in oblique cases with a 3SG possessor (55) (also 3PL in some idiolects). A head with substantive possessors is normally non-marked, while 3SG pronouns are compatible with the possessive marking of the head as the preferred option, but allow its omission. Possessive pronouns of the 1st and the 2nd persons always require possessive marking (56). The same pattern seems to hold in **Izhma Komi** (57)–(58).

(55) Moksha

*ton   n'ɛj-əv-at   pɛk   mazi-stə   **son'**   panar-sə-nzə   /*
2SG   see-PASS-NPST.2.SG very   pretty-ELA   3SG.OBL   dress-INE-3SG.POSS

^{OK}*panar-sə*
dress-INE

'You look very pretty in her dress.'

(56) Moksha

*son oza-də   **mon'**   l'ɛpə   kr'eslə-sə-n   / *kr'eslə-sə*
3SG sit-CVB.POS 1SG.OBL soft   armchair-INE-1SG.POSS   armchair-INE

'He is sitting in my soft armchair.'

(57) Izhma Komi

*mort-i̇s   pukal-e   **me** komnata-am   / *komnata-i̇n*
man-POSS.3SG sit-PRS.3SG 1SG room-INE.POSS.1SG   room-INE

'The man is sitting in my room.'

(58) Izhma Komi

*me pukal-a   **si̇**   komnata-i̇n / ?komnata-as*
1SG sit-NPST.1SG 3SG room-INE   room-INE.POSS.3SG

'I sit in the man's room.'

In **Erzya**, **Mari** and **Udmurt**, pronominal possessors develop the same patterns as substantives (possessive marking is never obligatory); see examples from Erzya (59)–(60).

(59) Erzya (Abramov 1988, cited from Rueter 2010: 79)
*mon'   sazor-**os'**   čevt'e s'ed'ej,*
1SG.GEN little.sister-DEF.SG soft   heart

'My little sister is soft-hearted.'

(60) Erzya (Šaxmatov 1910, cited from Rueter 2005: 11)
*sa-s'   s'eja-n't'   azyr-**ys'***
come-PST.3SG goat-3SG.GEN   owner-DEF.SG

'The goat's owner came.'

3.3.2. Personal names (proper nouns)

The system of two genitive cases in **Mordvin** coming from different declension types was described in the Section 2.1. It was claimed that indefinite genitive cannot encode an anchoring possessor in **Mordvin,** with the exception of proper nouns and some pronouns. Proper nouns referring to people trigger the indefinite declension (not only in the position of a possessor [Kaškin, in prep.]), but at the same time demand a possessive marker on the head (61). The same thing concerns animate indefinite (*kijə bəd'ə* 'someone') (62) and interrogative pronouns (*kijə* 'who') (64), as well as demonstrative pronouns (*t'ɛ* 'this') (63).

(61) Moksha
*pet'ɛ s'ɛz'-əz'ə   vas'ɛ-**n'**   s'ɛn'gər'ɛ*
Peter tear-PST.3SG.OBJ:3SG Vasya-GEN green

panar-ənc   / **panar-t'*
shirt-3SG.POSS.SG.GEN   shirt-DEF.SG.GEN

'Peter tore Vasya's green shirt.'

(62) Moksha
*maṛtə-nt   jora-s'   koṛta-ms ki**n'**   bəd'ə*
with-2PL.POSS want-PST.3SG speak-INF who.GEN INDEF

d'ɛd'a-c   / **d'ɛd'ɛ*
mother-3SG.POSS.SG   mother

'Someone's mother wanted to speak with you.'

(63) Moksha

*t'ɛ-**n'*** *panar-ənc*   / **panar-t'*   *mon*
this-GEN   shirt-3SG.POSS.SG.GEN   shirt-DEF.SG.GEN 1SG

ton'-d'ejə-t   *nɛ-fn'-in'ə*
2SG.OBL-PRON.DAT-2SG.POSS see-CAUS.FREQ-PST.1SG.OBJ:3SG

'I have shown you the dress of that one'.

3.3.3. Animacy split

Following the remarks made in the previous section concerning indefinite genitive and animate pronouns in Mordvin, I will add two more details. The first one is that only animate pronouns do not bear the definite declension (compare animate (64) and inanimate (65) interrogatives), which means animacy split.

(64) Moksha

kin' *šava-n'a-nc*   / **šava-n'ɛ-t'*   *ton*
who.OBL cup-DIM-3SG.POSS.SG.GEN   cup-DIM-DEF.SG.GEN 2SG

sɛv-it'
take-PST.2SG.OBJ:3SG

'Whose cup have you taken?'

(65) Moksha

*mej-**t'***   *tarad-ənc*   / **tarat'-t'*
what-DEF.SG.GEN branch-3SG.POSS.SG.GEN   branch-DEF.SG.GEN

čapəd'-əz'?
cut-PST.3PL.OBJ:3

'The branch of what have they cut?'

The second observation is that the presence of an indefinite quantifier makes it possible to mark a possessor with indefinite genitive (which is impossible in other cases; see Section 2). However, it is possible only with animate possessors (66). Inanimate possessors require a definite marker even with an indefinite modifier (67).

(66) Moksha
*kodamə bəd'ə s't'ər'-n'ɛ-**n'** / s't'ər'-n'ɛ-**t'**   jalga-c*
which   INDEF girl-DIM-GEN   girl-DIM-DEF.SG.GEN friend-3SG.POSS.SG

poməgə-s'   mon'-d'ejə-n   kunda-ms katə-n'ɛ-t'
help-PST.3.SG 1SG.OBL-PRON.DAT-1SG.POSS catch-INF cat-DIM-DEF.SG.GEN

'A friend of some girl helped me to catch the kitten.'

(67) Moksha
*kodamə bəd'ə morkš-**t'**   / *morkš-ən' pil'gə-n'a-c*
which   INDEF table-DEF.SG.GEN   table-GEN leg-DIM-3SG.POSS.SG

val'anda-s' balkon-cə
lie-PST.3SG   balcony-INE

'A leg of some table was lying on the balcony.'

The distinction between pronominal and substantive possessors is relevant only for Moksha and Izhma Komi. Both Mordvin languages also distinguish persons vs. non-persons and animate vs. inanimate entities in the choice of a genitive marker.

Table 4 provides a summary for two parameters: syntactic function/case of a NP and pronominality of a possessor.

Table 4: Marking of Head and pronominal and nominal Dependent in direct and indirect cases[7]

	NP in direct cases				NP in oblique cases			
	POS-pron		POS-subst		POS-pron		POS-subst	
	Dep	Head	Dep	Head	Dep	Head	Dep	Head
Moksha	spec-GEN[8]	+	GEN	+	spec-GEN	(+)	GEN	−
Erzya	spec-GEN	−	GEN	−	spec-GEN	−	GEN	−
Mead. Mari	GEN	?	GEN	?	GEN	−	GEN	−
Hill Mari	GEN	(−)	GEN	(−)	GEN	−	GEN	−
Izhma Komi	spec-GEN	+	GEN	−	NOM	(+)	NOM	*
Udmurt	spec-GEN	+	GEN	+	GEN	+	GEN	+

---

7   Like in the Table 3, "+", "–" and "?" mark obligatoriness of possessive marking; "*" means "prohibited"; (+) and (−) mean that there were some particular exceptions from the general pattern, which are described above and are not shown in the table to avoid it being overloaded.

8   "Spec-gen" means special genitive form for possessors.

4. Conclusions

Considering all the data presented above, I claim that although the Finno-Ugric languages from my sample vary only slightly in the set of constructions, as the main possessive constructions in all of them are Double-marking and Dependent-marking with also Head-marking and Juxtaposition in Izhma Komi, they still can be relevant for typology: they not only develop different grammatical categories expressed in possessive encoding (such as definiteness in Mordvin or alienability in Udmurt), but also vary in the set of factors that influence the choice of a construction, as well as in the outcome of a particular factor in a given language.

The largest set of possessive constructions is developed in **Izhma Komi** having six strategies. The possessor marking (two types of genitive and nominative) depends on the syntactic function of the entire NP. That means two Double-marking and one Head-marking constructions. As possessive marking is not obligatory in Izhma Komi, three more strategies (without possessive marking on the head) are available: two Dependent-marking constructions and Juxtaposition. The **Mordvin** languages have four strategies to encode possessive relations: two Double-marking constructions with two types of genitive (depending on the animacy splits) for direct positions and two Dependent-marking ones for obliques. Due to their less rich morphological possibilities, the **Mari** languages develop only two types of constructions: Double-marking and Dependent-marking. **Udmurt** also has two possessive structures, as possessive agreement is obligatory in it: these are Double-marking constructions with two types of genitive depending on the syntactic function of an entire NP.

My data confirm the generalizations made in (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2002) concerning the influence of such factors as semantic relations (relevant in Izhma Komi and Mari, where only in some relations from the top of the scale possessive agreement is obligatory), animacy (some animacy splits in the Mordvin languages), alienability (Udmurt and Hill Mari). However, the variation between Double-marking and Dependent-marking still needs more research. At the same time, my material highlights the factor of syntactic function which has been widely discussed in linguistics, but never, as far as I know, with respect to possessive constructions.

Syntactic function/case of a NP is the only factor relevant to all the languages of my sample. In Moksha and Mari, it affects the obligatoriness of possessive marking (possessive agreement is optional in the oblique), in Erzya it restricts the use of a definite marker, and in

Permic it determines the case of a dependent. The Permic languages do not distinguish all direct and oblique positions, but follow a special marking pattern of a direct object. The latter provides the only distinction in Udmurt, whereas Izhma Komi distinguishes three positions: subject, direct object and oblique.

This research shows that a detailed analysis of a sample formed by closely related languages that have similar sets of basic constructions helps to confirm and refine typologically relevant factors of variation.

Acknowledgement

Address
    Pleshak Polina
    Dimitrova, 6-1-38
    192239, Saint-Petersburg, Russia
E-mail: polinapleshak@yandex.ru

References

Abramov, Kuz'ma (1988) *Purgaz*. Saransk: Mordovskoj knižnoj izdatel'stvas'.

Brykina, Maria M. and Aleksandra N. Sudobina (2005) *Diskursivnyje funkcii posessivnyh pokazatelej v ural'skix jazykax.* [Discourse functions of possessive markers in Uralic languages.] Fourth Typological School (21–28 September, Erevan). Moskva: Moscow State University.

Cygankin, Dmitrij V. (1978) "Kategorija prinadležnosti i ee osobennosti v dialektax erzja-mordovskogo jazyka". *Finno-ugristika. Mežvuzovskij tematičeskij sbornik naučnyx rabot.* Vyp. 1, 116–149. Saransk: Mordovskij gos. Universitet im. N. Ogarjeva.

Cygankin, Dmitrij V. (1980) *Grammatika mordovskix jazykov.* [A grammar of the Mordvin languages.] Saransk: Izdatel'stvo Mordovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.

Cygankin, Dmitrij V. (2000) *Mordovskije jazyki glazami učenogo lingvista.* [The Mordvin languages from the point of view of a linguist scholar.] Saransk: Krasny Oktjabr'.

De Groot, Casper (2013) "The typology of Uralic essive". *Tomsk Journal of Linguistics and Anthropology* 2, 2, 119–123.

Edygarova, Svetlana (2010) *Kategorija posessivnosti v udmurtskom jazyke.* [The category of possessiveness in Udmurt.] University of Tartu PhD thesis. Tartu: Tartu University Publishers.

Feoktistov, Alexander P. (1963) *Kategorija pritjažatel'nosti v mordovskix jazykax.* [The category of possessiveness in Mordovian languages.] Saransk: Mordov. kn. izd-vo.

Graščenkov Pavel V. (2006) *Sintaksis i tipologija genitivnoj gruppy.* [Syntax and Typology of the Genitive NP.] Doctoral dissertation. Moskva: Moscow State University.

Heine Bernd (1997) *Possession: cognitive sources, forces, and grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ihsane, Tabea (2003) "A typology of possessive modifiers". In Martine Coene and Yves d'Hulst, eds. *From NP to DP*, 23–42. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jakobson, Roman (1958/1984) "Morfologičeskie nabljudenija nad slavjanskim skloneniem (sostav russkix padežnyx form)". [Morphological observations on Slavic declension (the structure of Russian case forms.] In *Russian and Slavic grammar: studies 1931–1981*, 106–133. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyyer.

Kangasmaa-Minn, Eeva (1966–1969) *The syntactical distribution of the Cheremis genitive.* Turku: Kirjapaino Polytypos.

Kangasmaa-Minn, Eeva (1968) "The category of the adnominal genitive in Cheremis". In *Congressus secundus internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum: Helsingiae habitus 23.–28.8.1965*, 235–238. Helsinki.

Kaškin, Egor V. (2008) "Osobennosti upotreblenija posessivnyx pokazatelej v ižemskom dialekte komi-zyrjanskogo jazyka". [Aspects of the use of possessive markers in Izhma Komi.] In Nikolaj N. Kazanskij, ed. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 4, 81–85. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka.

Kaškin, Egor. V. (in prep) "Opredelitel'noje sklonenije". [Definite declension.] In *Èlementy grammatiki mokšanskogo jazyka.*

Keenan, Edward L. and Bernard Comrie (1977) "Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar". *Linguistic Inquiry* 8,1, 63–99.

Kibrik, Alexander E. (1998) "Does intragenetic typology make sense?". In Winfried Boeder, Christoph Schroeder, Karl Heinz Wagner, and Wolfgang Wildgen, eds. *Sprache in Raum und Zeit. In memoriam Johannes Bechert*, 61–68. Tübingen: Günter Narr.

Kibrik, Aleksandr E. (2003) *Konstanty i peremennyje jazyka.* [Constants and variables of language.] Sankt-Peterburg: Aleteja.

Koljadenkov, Mixajl N. and Raisa A. Zavodova (1954) *Grammatika mordovskix (mokšanskogo i èrzjanskogo) jazykov.* Part II: *Sintaksis.* [A grammar of Mordvin (Moksha and Erzya). Vol 2: Syntax.] Saransk: Mordovskoje knižnoje izdatel'stvo.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (1995) "Possessive and relational forms in Chukchi". In Frans Plank, ed. *Double-case: agreement by Suffixaufnahme*, 301–321. New York: Oxford University Press.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (1996) "Possessive NPs in Maltese: alienability, iconicity and grammaticalization". In Alexander Borg and Frans Plank, eds. *The Maltese NP meets typology.* (Rivista di Linguistica, 8:1), 245–274.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (2002) "Adnominal possession in the European languages: form and function". *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 55, 141–172.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (2003) "Possessive noun phrases in the languages of Europe". In Frans Plank, ed. *Noun phrase structure in the languages of Europe*, 621–722. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kurilovič, Eži (1962) "Problema klassifikacii padežej". [The problem of case classification.] *Očerki po lingvistike*, 175–203. Moskva: Izd-vo inostr. lit.

Kuznecova, Ariadna I. (2003) "Kumuljaciya grammatičeskix značenij v aggljutinativnyx pokazateljax: dejktičeskie funkcii possessiva v ural'skix jazykax". In Pirkko Suihkonen and Bernard Comrie, eds. *International Symposium on Deictic Systems and Quantification in Languages spoken in North and Central Asia.* Collection of papers, 249–259. Iževsk: Udmurt State University; Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.

Lytkin, Vasilij I. (1970) "O vokalizme nepervogo sloga finno-ugorskix jazykov". [On the vocalism of the non-first syllable in Finno-Ugric languages.] *Sovetskoe Finno-Ugrovedenie* 4, 221–238.

Manzelli, Gianguido (1990) "Possessive adnominal modifiers". In Johannes Bechert, Giuliano Bernini, and Claude Buridant, eds. *Towards a typology of european Languages*, 63–111. (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, 8.) Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mark, Julius (1925) *Die Possessivsuffixe in den uralischen Sprachen.* (Mèmoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 54.) Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Miestamo, Matti, Anne Tamm, and Beáta Wagner-Nagy, eds. (2015) *Negation in Uralic languages.* (Typological Studies in Language, 108.) Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nekrasova, Galina A. (2000) "Emakyv". [Substantive.] In Galina V. Fedjuneva, ed. *Önija komi kyv. Morfologija.* [Modern Komi. Morphology]. Syktyvkar: Komi kn. izd-vo.

Nekrasova, Galina A. (2002) *Sistema L-ovyx padežej v permskix jazykax: proisxoždenie i semantika.* [The system of L-cases in the Permian languages: origin and semantics.] Syktyvkar: Komi NC UrO RAN Publ.

Nichols, Johanna (1986) "Head-marking and dependent-marking grammar". *Language* 66, 56–119.

Nichols, Johanna (1988) "On alienable and inalienable possession". In William Shipley, ed. *In honor of Mary Haas*, 557–610. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nikolaeva, Irina (2003) "Possessive affixes as markers of information structuring: evidence from Uralic". In Pirkko Suihkonen and Bernard Comrie, eds. *International Symposium on Deictic Systems and Quantification in Languages spoken in North and Central Asia.* Collection of papers, 130–145. Iževsk: Udmurt State University; Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.

Perevosčikov, Peter N. (1962) *Grammatika sovremennogo udmurtskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija.* [Grammar of modern Udmurt: phonetics and morphology.] Iževsk: Udmurtskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.

Plešak, Polina S. (2015) "O statuse possessora v mokšanskoj IG". [On the status of the possessor in the Moksha NP.] In D.F. Mišenko, ed. *Dvenadcataja konferencija po tipologii i grammatike dlja molodyx issledovatelej. Tezisy dokladov,* 73–76. Sankt-Peterburg: Nestor-Istorija.

Plešak, Polina S. (2017) "Nekotoryje morfosintaksičeskije osobennosti gornomari-jskix terminov rodstva (na materiale govorov s. Kuznecovo i s. Mikrjakovo)". [Some morphosyntactic properties of kinship terms in Hill Mari (based on data from the villages of Kuznetsovo and Mikrjakovo).] In *Čtenija k 85-letiju so dnja roždenija A.I. Kuznecovoj, Moskva, MSU, Filologičeskij fakul'tet.* Available online at <http://otipl.philol.msu.ru/library/seminars/aik85konf/Pleshak.pdf>. Accessed on 28.10.2018.

Plešak, Polina S. (in press) "Posessivnyje konstrukcii v samburgskom komi". [Posses-sive constructions in Samburg Komi.] *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana*.

Ponaryadov, Vadim (2018) "On alternate suffix vowels in Udmurt". *Ural-Altaic Studies* 1, 28, 69–77.

Rueter, Jack (2005) "Conflicting Evidence for the Erzian Genitive". In Cornelius Hasselblatt, Eino Koponen, and Anna Widmer, eds. *Lihkkun lehkos! Beiträge zur Finnougristik aus Anlaß des sechzigsten Geburtstages von Hans-Hermann Bartens*, 277–296. (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, 65.) Harrassowitz Verlag: Wiesbaden.

Rueter, Jack (2010) *Adnominal person in the morphological system of Erzya.* (Suoma-lais-ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia, 261.) Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Šaxmatov, Aleksej A. (1910) *Mordovskij ètnografičeskij sbornik.* [Mordvin ethno-graphic collection.] Sankt Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk.

Seiler, Hansjakob (1983) *Possession as an operational dimension of language.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Silverstein, Michael (1976) "Hierarchy of features and Ergativity". In R. M. W. Dixon, ed. *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*, 112–171. Canberra: Australian National University.

Simonenko, Alexandra (2014) "Microvariation in Finno-Ugric possessive markers". In Hsin-Lun Huang, Ethan Poole, and Amanda Rysling, eds. *Proceedings of the 43rd annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 43)*. Vol. 2, 127–140. Amherst: University of Massachusetts.

Simonenko, Aleksandra P., and Aleksandr P. Leontjev (2012) "Morfosintaksis imen-nogo kompleksa". [Morphosyntax of the noun complex.] In Ariadna I. Kuznecova, ed. *Finno-ugorskije jazyki: fragmenty grammatičeskogo opisanija. Formalnyj i funkcionalnyj podxody*, 259–337. [Finno-Ugric languages: fragments of gram-matical description: formal and functional approaches.] Moskva: Russkije slovari.

Stassen, Leon (2009) *Predicative possession.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Szabolcsi, Anna (1981) "The possessive construction in Hungarian: a configurational category in a non-configurational language". *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scien-tiarum Hungaricae* 31, 261–280.

Taylor, John R. (1996) *Possessives in English: an exploration in cognitive grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ultan, Russell (1978) "Toward a typology of substantival possession". In Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson, and Edith A. Moravcsik, eds. *Universals of human language*. Vol. 4: *Syntax*, 11–49. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Verhaar, John W. M. (1997) "Head-marked possessive phrases in Dutch", *Leuven Contributions in Linguistics and Philology* 86, 89–108.

Xomčenkova, Irina A., and Polina S. Plešak (2017) "Diskursivnyje funkcii posses-
sivnogo pokazatelja 3SG v gornomarijskom jazyke (na materiale govora s. Kuzne-
covo)". [Discourse functions of the 3SG possessive marker in Hill Mari (based on
the data from the village of Kuznecovo).]. In *Čtenija k 85-letiju so dnja roždenija
A.I. Kuznecovoj* (*MSU, 3–4 of March, 2017*). Moskva, MSU, Filologičeskij
fakul'tet. Available online at <http://otipl.philol.msu.ru/library/seminars/aik85konf/
Khomchenkova_Pleshak.pdf>

**Аннотация. Полина Плешак: Посессивные конструкции в мордов-
ских, марийских и пермских языках.** В данной статье обсуждаются
результаты исследования приименных посессивных конструкций в мок-
шанском, эрзянском, луговом марийском, горномарийском, ижемском
коми и удмуртском. Две основные стратегии, кодирующие посессивные
отношения во всех рассматриваемых языках, – зависимостное марки-
рование и двойное маркирование, а также дополнительно вершинное
маркирование и конструкция с соположением в ижемском коми. Однако
более детальный анализ позволяет выявить большое количество разли-
чий между языками выборки. Во-первых, как генитив, так и посессивные
показатели имеют разные области применения в разных языках. Во-вто-
рых, существуют факторы, по-разному влияющие на маркирование чле-
нов ИГ (как вершины, так и зависимого). Таковыми являются семантиче-
ские отношения, иерархия одушевлённости и синтаксическая позиция ИГ.

Ключевые слова: внутригенетическая типология, посессивные кон-
струкции, зависимостное маркирование, двойное маркирование, генитив,
посессивный показатель, семантические отношения, иерархия одушев-
лённости, финно-угорские языки

**Kokkuvõte. Polina Pleshak: Adnominaalsed possessiivkonstruktsioonid
mordva, mari ja permi keeltes.** Artikkel käsitleb adnominaalseid posses-
siivkonstruktsioone mokša, ersa, niidumari, mäemari, ižmakomi ja udmurdi
keeltes. Kaks põhikonstruktsioone, mis possessiivseid suhteid väljendavad, on
kõikides käsitletud keeltes samad: laiendi markeerimine ja topeltmarkeering.
Ižmakomi keeles kasutatakse ka põhja markeerimist ja jukstapositsiooni. Peene-
koelisem analüüs aitab aga käsitletavate keelte vahel leida rohkelt erinevusi.
Esiteks võivad nendes keeltes mõneti erineda genitiivi ja possessiivmarkerite
kooskasutuse piirangud. Teiseks on faktoreid, mille mõju tõttu markeeritakse
NP elemente erinevalt (seda nii põhisõna kui ka laiendi puhul). Need faktorid
on semantilised suhted, elususe hierarhia, ja NP süntaktiline funktsioon.

Märksõnad: intrageneetiline tüpoloogia, possessiivkonstruktsioonid, laiendi
markeering, topeltmarkeering, genitiiv, possessiivmarker, semantilised suhted,
elususe hierarhia, soome-ugri keeled