

Uralic studies, languages, and researchers

Edited by Sándor Szeverényi

Studia uralo-altaica 54

Redigunt:

Katalin Sipőcz

András Róna-Tas

István Zimonyi

Uralic studies, languages, and researchers

Proceedings of the 5th Mikola Conference
19–20, September 2019

Edited by Sándor Szeverényi

Szeged, 2021

© University of Szeged,
Department of Altaic Studies,
Department of Finno-Ugrian Philology

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by other means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission in writing of the author or the publisher.

Printed in 2021.

Printed by: Innovariant Ltd., H-6750 Algyő, Ipartelep 4.

ISBN 978-963-306-803-8 (printed)

ISBN 978-963-306-804-5 (pdf)

ISSN 0133-4239 (Print)

ISSN 2677-1268 (Online)

Table of contents

Foreword.....	9
<i>Sándor Szeverényi</i>	
Notes on Nicolaes Witsen and his Noord en Oost Tartarye.....	11
<i>Rogier Blokland</i>	
Undiscovered treasures: From the field research archive to the digital database.....	27
<i>Beáta Wagner-Nagy, Chris Lasse Däbritz, and Timm Lehmborg</i>	
On the language use of the first Finnish medical text	45
<i>Meri Juhos</i>	
Sajnovics, the responsible fieldworker	55
<i>Sándor Szeverényi</i>	
The life and work of the Saami theologian and linguist: Anders Porsanger	71
<i>Ivett Kelemen</i>	
The use and semantics of the Northern Mansi diminutive <i>-riś~rəś</i>	81
<i>Bernadett Bíró</i>	
The event of “giving” and “getting” in Siberian Uralic languages	99
<i>Katalin Sipőcz</i>	
A word-formational approach to neologisms in modern Northern Mansi	119
<i>Susanna Virtanen</i>	
Word and stem repetitions in the heroic epic songs collected by Antal Reguly	131
<i>Mária Sipos</i>	
The use of body part terms in expressing emotions in Udmurt	149
<i>Rebeka Kubitsch</i>	
The characteristics of responses given to compliments in Udmurt.....	173
<i>Zoltán Németh</i>	
On some Chuvash–Mari shared lexemes and Agyagási’s “Late Gorodets” hypothesis ..	185
<i>Christopher Culver</i>	

“Сувениры Севера” Minority identity and discourse. Representation of indigenous minorities of Northern Russia in the digital media. The case of Dudinka	201
<i>Zsuzsa Várnai and Ágnes Hámori</i>	
Reconsidering the Nganasan vowel system	229
<i>László Fejes</i>	
New aspects in the study of Mari, Udmurt, and Komi-Permyak: The <i>Typological Database of the Volga Area Finno-Ugric Languages</i>	255
<i>Erika Asztalos, Nikolett F. Gulyás, Laura Horváth, and Bogáta Timár</i>	
Ethnosyntax in Siberian Uralic Languages (a project report)	275
<i>Bernadett Bíró, Katalin Sipőcz, and Sándor Szeverényi</i>	

New aspects in the study of Mari, Udmurt, and Komi-Permyak: The *Typological Database of the Volga Area Finno-Ugric Languages*¹

Erika Asztalos,^{1,2} Nikolett F. Gulyás,²
Laura Horváth,² and Bogáta Timár²

¹Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics, Budapest

²Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest

The present paper provides a brief overview of the state of the art of an ongoing research project, the *Typological Database of the Volga Area Finno-Ugric Languages* focusing on three case studies. The database is a collection of updated research material from three Finno-Ugric languages of the Volga-Kama linguistic area, namely, Meadow Mari (Finno-Ugric, Uralic), Udmurt, and Komi-Permyak (Permic, Uralic). The case studies cover both morphological and syntactic properties of these languages. The paper is structured as follows: in section 1, we introduce the aims of the project and give an overview of the key notions of the database. Then we examine three research topics that are discussed in the database. Section 2 gives an overview of the encoding and usage of predicative possessive constructions in Udmurt. Section 3 addresses the topic of person marking on nominal adpositions in Meadow Mari, Udmurt, and Komi-Permyak. Finally, we examine the feature of reduplication in all three target languages in section 4, then in section 5, we summarize our findings.

1. Introduction

Linguistic databases differ both in their purpose and structure. Our project aims to create an online typological database of some lesser-described Finno-Ugric languages relying on the concepts of previous typological databases including Dryer (2001) and

¹ The authors gratefully acknowledge the following grants: NKFI-125282 “Typological Database of the Volga Area Finno-Ugric Languages”, NKFI-125206 “Nominal Structures in Uralic Languages”, NKFI-129921 “Implications of endangered Uralic languages for syntactic theory and the history of Hungarian”. The present paper also was supported by the NKP-20-4 New National Excellence Program of the Ministry for Innovation and Technology from the source of the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund.

DOI <https://10.14232/sua.2021.54.255-274>

Dryer and Haspelmath (2013). Our goal is to provide useful material for general linguists and typologists, additionally, the typological framework used in the database can broaden the horizon of recent research within Finno-Ugric studies. In other words, we aim to answer old questions of Uralistics with new methods. Among other questions, we focus on the following general issues:

- (i) What are the typologically defined morphological and syntactic features of the analyzed languages?
- (ii) How do these languages fit into the typology of the world's languages?
- (iii) How can the database be suitable for analyzing relevant relationships between languages?

The current project is a follow-up of a previous project called the *Typological Database of the Ugric languages* (Havas et al. 2015), thus the key notions we use have remained the same. The database consists of parameters, i.e. cross-linguistically comparable grammatical properties (e.g. Optative mood) and values that are the set of logically possible variants of a certain parameter (e.g. NoOptInfl: There is no distinct verbal paradigm to express the optative mood; OptInfl: There is a distinct verbal paradigm to express the optative mood). The majority of the parameters have more possible values, so there are non-binary distinctions among them.

As we have already mentioned, the *World Atlas of Language Structures Online* (henceforth WALS, Dryer and Haspelmath 2013) served as a point of departure for our project, but there are several differences between the two databases. While there are 192 parameters (or features) in WALS covering all levels of language from phonology to syntax, our database contains 213 parameters focusing on morphosyntactic phenomena only. WALS includes data from more than 2,600 languages, while our database, which is an intragenetic study, contains data on three related Uralic languages. In the previous project, four additional Uralic languages were studied, see Havas et al. (2015). However, our long-term goal is to broaden the database with data from other Uralic languages. Since the main goal of WALS is to illustrate the structural variation and the areal distribution of this variation cross-linguistically, it is unsurprising that it has fewer up-to-date and well-balanced data from Finno-Ugric languages. Therefore, we aim to include some new data elicited from native speakers and language experts, as well as from the literature. Additionally, we provide a short description of parameters and the relevant value(s) of the target languages with an addition of linguistic examples with interlinear glosses. An additional difference is that our database is available not only in English but in Hungarian and Russian also.

2. Case study 1: Predicative possessive sentences in Udmurt

Two parameters in the database (Habitive constructions and Possessive marking in habitive constructions) are concerned with the morphosyntactic encoding of predicative possessive sentences, including case marking and the syntactic function of the possessor and the possessee, transitivity/intransitivity and the semantics of the predicate, and whether the possessee is marked with a morpheme expressing possession and/or agreement with the possessor. The parameters aim to define the canonical variant of predicative possessive sentences.

According to the literature, in Udmurt, the possessor (if overtly present) is in the genitive case, whereas the possessee (which bears the role of subject) is in the nominative, and it is marked by a possessive suffix agreeing in person and number with the possessor (1). The predicate of the sentence is the existential verb,² which occupies clause-final position:

- (1) Udmurt (Csúcs 1990: 73)
- | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|-------------|
| <i>(tynad)</i> | <i>pinal-jos-yd</i> | <i>vań.</i> |
| you.GEN | child-PL-2SG | be.PRS |
- ‘You have children.’

However, defining the values for the typological parameters of the database also sheds light on the non-canonical variants of the constructions under discussion, and raises the question of how we can account for those variants. In other words, when identifying the values for the parameters one may also have to identify under what conditions the non-canonical variants of the construction occur, and whether they really are non-canonical instances.

Returning to predicative possessive sentences in Udmurt, a more careful examination reveals that their encoding shows some variation in addition to the canonical variant illustrated in (1). First, the existential verb can precede the possessee-subject, as in (2). Second, when the possessor is overtly present in the sentence, the possessive suffix may in some cases be absent (2). Third, there are instances of nominal predicative possessive sentences, that is, the existential verb under certain circumstances may also be absent from the construction (3).

² Udmurt has two existential verbs: one of them, *luyny* ‘to be’ has a full paradigm, while the other, *vań* ‘(there) is’ is strongly defective. Thus, there is no general consensus in Udmurt linguistics as to whether the latter actually counts as a verb. Winkler (2001: 65), for example, takes it for a particle. However, for the sake of simplicity, we will refer in this paper to both elements as existential verbs.

- (2) Udmurt (Asztalos 2018a: 127)

15 ar ortćysa mynam lu-o-z badźym korka.
 15 year after I.GEN be-FUT-3SG big house
 ‘In 15 years I will have a big house.’

- (3) Udmurt (Asztalos 2018a: 125)

saša-len kyk nylpi-jez.
 Sasha-GEN two child-3SG
 ‘Sasha has two children.’

As for the order of the possessee and the verb, Asztalos’s investigations (2018a: 123–130) indicate that in contemporary Udmurt both orders, possessee–verb and verb–possessee, can occur in discourse-neutral contexts. This suggests that the latter variant may also be taken for a canonical manifestation of the construction.

Concerning the omission of the possessive suffix (2), the question arises whether the conditions of omission are similar to those that apply in the case of adnominal possessive constructions. Thus, the parameters under discussion relate to other parameters, which examine the encoding of adnominal possessive constructions. In fact, adnominal possessive constructions are similar to predicative possessive ones in that the possessor, when present, bears the genitive case³ and the possessee, in the vast majority of cases, is marked by a possessive suffix (cf. 4) but may occasionally be absent⁴ (see 5).

³ More precisely, the possessor is in the genitive case if the possessee is not the direct object of the clause, whereas it is in the ablative if the possessee fulfils the role of direct object, as in (i):

- (i) Udmurt (Winkler 2001: 71)

so kolhoz-leś busy-z-e voźmat-i-z.
 s/he kolkhoz-ABL field-3SG-ACC show-PST-3SG
 ‘S/he showed the field of the kolkhoz.’

⁴ Pleshak (2018: 144) claims that dependent-marking (i.e. morphological marking only of the possessor, but not of the possessee) does not occur in Udmurt with internal possessors. However, she also mentions the difficulties one may encounter when trying to distinguish between external and internal possessive constructions, arising from the fact that the two construction types may be marked the same way (Pleshak 2018: 142), and she does not explain on what grounds she excluded constructions similar to (5) from her analysis. At first glance, sentences like (5) could be analysed both as internal (adnominal) and as external possessive constructions, and deciding about their exact syntactic status is left for future research.

- (4) Udmurt (Winkler 2001: 21)
nyl-len derem-ez
 girl-GEN dress-3SG
 ‘a/the girl’s dress’
- (5) Udmurt (Perevoshchikov et al. 1962: 77)
śergej-len mylkyd lobž-ono kad’.
 Sergey-GEN mood fly_away-PTCP.NEC like
 ‘Sergey is in a good mood.’ (lit. ‘Sergey’s mood is about to fly away.’).

Preliminary observations suggest that the conditions for possessive suffix omission are not the same in the case of adnominal and of predicative possessive constructions. In adnominal constructions, omission is mostly possible if the possessee is inalienable (5) (F. Gulyás et al. 2018). The example in (2) suggests that this is not necessarily the case for predicative possessive constructions. Our examples of predicative possessive constructions with the possessive suffix absent mostly come from young speakers of Udmurt, whereas adnominal constructions without a possessive marker have also been cited, e.g. from old folklore texts in the literature. It is thus possible that possessive suffix omission in predicative possessive structures is not conditioned by semantic or grammatical factors but is a relatively recent phenomenon, which is simply due to the influence of Russian.⁵

Verbless predicative possessive sentences are examined in Asztalos (2018b) as a subclass of verbless existential sentences. The results suggest that such sentences are associated with the pragmatic-semantic features of presupposition and exhaustivity, and involve a focused subject, or a subject with a focused modifier. Namely, verbless predicative possessive and existential sentences occur in contexts that presuppose the existence of a set of possible referents within the frame established by the (locative or temporal) adverbial or the possessor present in the sentence. The subject constituent of the existential/predicative possessive sentence identifies exhaustively, within a set of possible referents, that referent (or those referents) to which the proposition holds true. Exhaustive identification means that the proposition only holds true, within the set of possible referents, for this referent. For instance, the sentence in (6) is grammatical in contexts which presuppose that there is someone in the room and asserts that the person in the room is a woman.

⁵ Russian lacks possessive suffixes but otherwise encodes predicative possessive sentences in a similar way to Udmurt (and many other Finno-Ugric languages), the predicate of these sentences being the existential verb and the possessee fulfilling the subject role. On the other hand, the question arises whether possessive suffix omission in adnominal constructions (even if it seems to be an older pattern) may also be at least partly triggered by the influence of Russian.

- (6) Udmurt (Winkler 2011: 141)
komnata-yn kyšnomurt.
 room-INE woman
 ‘There is a woman in the room.’/‘It is a woman who is in the room.’

The sentence in (3) presupposes that Sasha has children, and the numeral modifier *kyk* ‘two’ of the subject states that Sasha has exactly two of them.

However, as verbless predicative sentences contain a focused subject or a subject with a focused modifier, they cannot count as canonical manifestations of predicative possessive sentences in Udmurt. Therefore, such constructions have to be left out when identifying the values for the related typological parameters.

3. Case study 2: Person marking on nominal adpositions in Meadow Mari

The person marking on adpositions is discussed under the parameter 48A in WALS (Bakker 2013), where it examines occurrences both with a pronominal and a nominal complement. It distinguishes four possible values:

- (a) there are no adpositions in the languages
- (b) there is no person marking on adpositions
- (c) person marking only occurs with a pronoun
- (d) person marking occurs with both a pronoun and a noun.

Our database discusses person marking on adpositions with (i) a personal pronominal complement (7), (ii) a non-personal pronominal complement (8), and (iii) a nominal complement (9)–(10).

- (7) Synja Khanty (F. Gulyás 2015)
(mā) šanš-em-n išńi.
 I behind-1SG-LOC window
 ‘There is a window behind me.’
- (8) Northern Mansi (Németh 2015)
ta jot-e
 that with-3SG
 ‘with that’
- (9) Hungarian (obsolete) (F. Gulyás 2015)
a ház-nak mellett-e
 ART house-GEN next_to-3SG
 ‘next to the house’

- (10) Hungarian (personal knowledge)
a lány-om mögött
 ART daughter-1SG behind
 ‘behind my daughter’

This case study only focuses on the latter, with special regards to Meadow Mari. Theoretically, there are two possible ways in which the person marker can occur with a nominal complement. In (9), the person marker on the postposition agrees with the noun, which is therefore always in third person. In (10), the noun displays the function of possessee, and the adposition agrees with the possessor. In this analysis, only the latter is taken into account. We consider the adposition as the head, and the nouns or noun phrases they modify as the complements or objects of the adpositions (Havas 2015). In the description of the parameter, the restriction is made that the person marking must only be realized via affixes and not clitics.

For the parameter, the following values are ascertained:

- NoAdp: The language does not have adpositions.
 AdpNonPM: Person marking cannot be expressed on adpositions.
 AdpNNonPM: Person marking cannot be expressed on nominal adpositions.
 AdpN(PM): Person marking is optional for adpositions when they appear with nouns.
 AdpNPM: Person marking is required for adpositions when they appear with nouns.

Like most Uralic languages, Meadow Mari has adpositions, which are postpositions (Berezcki 1990, Riese et al. 2019, Kangasmaa-Minn 1998). In possessive constructions, person marking is realized by possessive pronouns and possessive suffixes (Alhoniemi 1985: 74–79), both of which can be dropped if the other is present (11)–(12). Co-occurrence of both the possessive suffix and the possessive pronoun is also frequent (13).

- (11) Meadow Mari (Berezcki 1990: 42)
məj-ən šergaš šörtən.
 I-GEN ring silver
 ‘My ring is silver.’

- (12) Meadow Mari (Arkhangelskiy 2019)
marij jəlme verč čon-em koršt-a.
 Mari language for soul-1SG ache-3SG
 ‘My soul aches for the Mari language.’

- (13) Meadow Mari (Alhoniemi 1985: 77)
məj-ən molo šoč-š-em uke.
 I-GEN other be_born-PTCP.ACT-1SG be.NEG
 ‘I have no other child.’

The regular pattern for a possessive construction in Meadow Mari, as well as in Udmurt, is that the noun agrees in person with the possessor, not the adposition. However, instances where the person marker appears on the adposition instead of the noun can be found in all three languages (14)–(16).

- (14) Udmurt (elicited)
kniġa-je ulyś ~ kniġa ulyśty-m
 book-1SG from_under book from_under-1SG
 ‘from under my book’

- (15) Komi-Permyak (elicited)
pyzan bok-a-m
 table next_to-INE-1SG
 ‘next to my table’

- (16) Meadow Mari (elicited)
pakča-t pokšelne ~ pakča pokšelne-t
 yard-2SG in_the_middle yard in_the_middle-2SG
 ‘in the middle of your yard’

This pattern is not possible on every occasion. Whether the person marker can appear on the adposition first and foremostly depends on the adposition itself. Some adpositions do not show person agreement at all, neither with pronominal nor nominal complements (cf. for Meadow Mari, Riese et al. 2019: 163–185).

- (17) Meadow Mari (elicited)
*pört-da marte kaj-en-na ~ *pört marte-da kaj-en-na*
 house-2PL until go-PST2-1PL house until-2PL go-PST2-1PL
 ‘we went up to your house’
- (18) Meadow Mari (elicited)
*məj-ən marte ilə-ne-da gən ~ *məj-ən marte-m ilə-ne-da gən*
 I-GEN until live-DES-2PL if I-GEN until-1SG live-DES-2PL if
 ‘if you want to live as long as me’

Some adpositions do allow person agreement with pronominal complements (19), but do not allow the same with a nominal complement (20).

- (19) Meadow Mari (elicited)
məj-ən nergen voz-en-ət ~ *məj-ən nergen-em voz-en-ət*
 I-GEN about write-PST2-3PL I-GEN about-1SG write-PST2-3PL
 ‘they wrote about me’

- (20) Meadow Mari (elicited)
pij-et nergen šuko kalas-et ~ **pi nergen-et šuko kalas-et*
 dog-2SG about a_lot tell-2SG dog about-2SG a_lot tell-2SG
 ‘you talk a lot about your dog’

Whether an adposition can or cannot show person agreement with a noun has been subject of a number of studies (Schlachter 1960, Rédei 1962, Efremov 1955–56, Saarinen 1991, Kubínyi 2015). In her analysis based on Udmurt, Meadow Mari and Komi-Zyrian texts, Kubínyi (2015) argues that in the Permic languages the main defining factor is the so-called “controlledness”. In that sense, the possession is more “controlled” if the possessee in the “object”-NP (i.e. the possessor and the noun) is an entity controlled immediately by the possessor, and/or the postposition has a spatial value (such as in 14–16). On the other hand, a possession is “uncontrolled” if the possessee is caused or experienced by the possessor, and/or the semantic characteristics of the postposition are temporal or causal-final (20). The adposition tends to agree with the possessor if the possessive construction is controlled. While this correlation is apparent in Permic languages, the same phenomenon is less clearly visible in Meadow Mari (Kubínyi 2015). So if controlledness is not definitive in terms of irregular person marking in Meadow Mari, then what is?

To answer this question, further research should be carried out. Here are some factors that may influence person marking:

- animacy hierarchy
- alienability
- person and number
- frequency of usage
- degree of grammaticalization of the postposition

With such restrictions, the following parameter values have been agreed to be true for Meadow Mari:

- Person marking cannot be expressed on adpositions (17)–(18)
- Person marking cannot be expressed on nominal adpositions (19)–(20)
- Person marking is optional for adpositions when they appear with nouns (16).

However, though these parameter values give a detailed description on the person marking in a given language, by themselves they still do not shed light on the actual problematics of what allows or does not allow the irregular pattern to appear.

Another problem arises with the restriction stated in the parameter description. In order to be taken into consideration, it was required for the person marker to be an affix, not a clitic. In the most widely accepted definition, a clitic is distinguished by its flexibility of attachment, as they attach to the phrase, not the word (Halpern 1998: 101), therefore they can attach to nouns and adpositions alike. As we have seen in (14)–(16), this is exactly the case concerning the languages in question, so it can be argued that the person markers are clitics⁶ rather than affixes under certain circumstances, and, therefore should not be taken into account. Naturally, it is a stretch to state that person markers in the Uralic languages of the Volga–Kama region were clitics, especially given how special (and not completely defined) circumstances need to constellate for such a pattern to appear, yet it is worth pointing out, to show how indefinite the borders of various terms and their definitions can be.

4. Case study 3: Reduplication in the Volga area Finno-Ugric languages

Reduplication can be broadly understood as the productively employed repetition of words or parts of words to form a new constituent with a different grammatical or lexical function (Schwaiger 2015: 468). The phenomenon is quite common cross-linguistically and can be discussed, for instance, within the framework of Morphological Doubling Theory (MDT) and Sign-Based Morphology, (see, for instance, Inkelas and Zoll 2005), or Evaluative Morphology (see, for instance, Körtvélyessy 2015).

According to Inkelas and Zoll (2005: 2), two general approaches to duplication are possible: it can be analyzed as phonological copying or as morpho-semantic (MS) feature duplication. There are a few criteria for classifying the two types. First, while typical phonological copying is motivated by phonological well-formedness, morphological reduplication serves a morphological purpose instead. Second, while phonological copying involves a phonological segment (mora, syllable, or foot), morphological doubling involves a morphological constituent (affix, root, stem, or word that can be truncated to a prosodic constituent) (Inkelas and Zoll 2005: 22). Finally, in morphological doubling, the two copies are not necessarily identical phonologically (Inkelas and Zoll 2005: 3) (although phonological identity may occur in these cases as well, cf. Inkelas and Zoll 2005: 22), while phonological reduplication

⁶ Kubinyi (2015) in fact called the pattern Possessive Clitic Climbing, referring to the person markers as clitics.

necessarily involves phonological identity. What morphological reduplication involves is, however, semantic identity: according to the MDT, the duplicants are required to be identical only semantically (Inkelas and Zoll 2005: 7, 25). Reduplication involving duplicants which are synonymous, antonymous, or semantically closely related is called synonym reduplication in other works (see, for instance, Inkelas 2014: 170). Other subtypes of reduplication are the following: total/full reduplication, partial reduplication, echo reduplication, syntactic doubling (cf. Inkelas 2014: 169–172).

Reduplication can be used to perform a wide range of both derivational and inflectional functions. Reduplication as derivation can change the word class and argument structure, or alter the meaning of a word creating a new lexeme (Inkelas 2014: 174–175). The formation of expressive, evocative or onomatopoeic formations is among the most common functions of reduplication in the languages of our database (see, for instance, Riese 2016, Shlyakhova 2013, Fejes 2016), as well as in the Turkic languages of the area (see, for instance, Iskandarova 2016, Semenova and Ivanova 2016). In the Meadow Mari example (22), reduplication converts an inflected form of a reduplicated verb (< *manaš* 'to say') into a noun. This part of speech-changing process does not seem to be a common productive technique for deriving nouns in Mari, nor is it typical of the other languages of the database:

- (21) Meadow Mari (Riese 2016: 3287)
man-eš ~ *man-eš*
 say-3SG ~ say-3SG
 'gossip'

As an inflectional device, reduplication is frequently employed for encoding plurality in nouns, or less commonly, possession categories; case-marking is an uncommon but attested function of reduplication as well. Reduplication is often used to encode aspectual distinctions: pluractionality of verbs (event pluralization), frequentativity, continuation, progressivity, habituality, imperfectivity, and even perfectivity (cf. Inkelas 2014: 172–176).

Because the derivation-inflection relation also has a cline-like nature itself, there are many examples regarding cases of reduplication that are not so clear-cut: they share the properties of both derivational and inflectional parts of this cline – for instance, diminutives, augmentatives, and other evaluatives (cf. Inkelas 2014: 175–176, Körtvélyessy 2015: 22–31). In this paper, evaluation is treated “as a continuum such that prototypical cases express the meaning of quantity under or above the default value” (Körtvélyessy 2015: 41). The default value is rather a relative concept: these reference points are influenced by extralingual factors: culture, experience and knowledge of the speakers. The default quantity/value is the reference point that is

anchored in categories such as “substance”, “action”, “quality”, and “circumstance”. In this system, diminutives and augmentatives are viewed as deviations from the prototypical value in these cognitive categories (Körtvélyessy 2015: 41–47).

In this paper, we aim to concentrate on the cases of morphological doubling expressing evaluative and aspectual functions of reduplication in the languages of the database.

4.1. Evaluatives

Reduplicative evaluative formations are frequently used by all of the languages of our database. It is a common feature of the Turkic languages of the Volga–Kama region (Bashkir, Chuvash, and Tatar) as well (Semenova and Ivanova 2016: 3464, Iskandarova 2016: 3394–3395, Károly 2016: 3411). Intensification is a very common function of reduplication also cross-linguistically (see, for instance, Štekauer et al. 2012: 123–126).

Reduplication is not regarded as a typical feature of the Uralic proto-language, but it was already used for the expressive intensification of color names and other adjectives in Old Turkic (Erdal 1991: 65). In the languages of our database, reduplication is often used for expressing augmentatives (higher quantity of a quality). Intensification of color names can be employed by total reduplication:

- (22) Udmurt (Kef'makov and Saarinen 1994: 112)

gord ~ *gord*
 red ~ red
 ‘very red’

- (23) Komi-Permyak (elicited)

görd ~ *görd*
 red ~ red
 ‘very red’

- (24) Meadow Mari (Riese 2016: 3287)

kande ~ *kande*
 blue ~ blue
 ‘very blue’

Adverbs and adjectives other than color names can be reduplicated as well:

- (25) Udmurt (Shlyakhova 2013: 1331)

umoj ~ *umoj* *vala-ny*
 good ~ good understand-INF
 ‘to understand very well’

- (26) Komi-Permyak (elicited)

basök ~ *basök*
 beautiful ~ beautiful
 ‘very beautiful’

- (27) Meadow Mari (elicited)

šokšən ~ *šokšən* *öndal-eš*
 warmly ~ warmly hug-3SG
 ‘s/he gives a very warm hug’

In Mari, one special kind of partial reduplication can be used: adjectives beginning with CVC-structure can be reduplicated by doubling the CVC and by the substitution of the second C with *p*. The reduplicant precedes the adjective:

- (28) Meadow Mari (Bradley et al. 2014)

joltaš-em *tap* ~ *taza*
 friend-1SG RED ~ healthy
 ‘my friend is fit as a fiddle’

This kind of partial reduplication is considered to be a feature of Old Turkic (Erdal 1991: 65) and occurs in Mari due to Tatar and Chuvash influence (Riese 2016: 3287), cf. the following Tatar example:

- (29) Tatar (Károly 2016: 3411)

kap ~ *kart*
 RED ~ old
 ‘very old’

Intensification can also be expressed by echo reduplication in at least Udmurt and Meadow Mari. In these cases, the reduplicant follows the “base” (for the terms “base” and “reduplicant”, see Inkelas and Zoll 2005: 7–11), and the beginning of the reduplicant is replaced by a fixed segment (Inkelas 2014: 171):

- (30) Udmurt (Shlyakhova 2013: 1330)

kryž ~ *meryž*
 crookedly ~ RED
 ‘very crookedly’

- (31) Meadow Mari (Riese 2016: 3287)

kadyr ~ *gudyr*
 crooked ~ RED
 ‘very crooked’

Syntactic doubling can also encode evaluation in the languages of the database: the duplicants can be separated by affixes (32)–(33), particles (34), affixes and particles (35), postpositions (36), and conjunctions (37)–(38):

- (32) Udmurt (elicited)
ćeber-leś *ćeber*
 beautiful-ABL beautiful
 ‘very beautiful’
- (33) Komi-Permyak (elicited)
basök-śa *basök*
 beautiful-PRECL beautiful
 ‘very beautiful’
- (34) Meadow Mari (elicited)
motor-at *motor*
 beautiful-PCL beautiful
 ‘very beautiful’
- (35) Udmurt (elicited)
ćeber-leś *no* *ćeber*
 beautiful-ABL PCL beautiful
 ‘very beautiful’
- (36) Meadow Mari (elicited)
motor *deč* *motor*
 beautiful from beautiful
 ‘very beautiful’
- (37) Northern Udmurt (Karpova 2011: 30)
kuź *da* *kuź*
 long and long
 ‘very long’
- (38) Komi-Permyak (Shlyakhova 2013: 1330)
źor *i* *źor*
 unripe and unripe
 ‘very unripe’

4.2. Reduplication as an aspectual device in the languages of the database

As has already been mentioned, reduplication is often used to encode various aspectual values: cross-linguistically, reduplication is not uncommonly linked with imperfective aspectual categories (Inkelas 2014: 173–174, Štekauer, Valera and Körtvélyessy 2012: 126–128). In the languages of our database, in some cases, reduplicated adverbs have an effect on the aspectual system. They can be employed in habitual utterances: Meadow Mari *ugəč ~ ugəč* ‘repeatedly’ ← *ugəč* ‘anew’, Udmurt *vyľys ~ vyľys* ‘repeatedly’ ← *vyľys* ‘anew’.

In some Northern Udmurt dialects, the frequentative suffix *-ly-*, *-l'la-* can be reduplicated “for intensifying the repetition of the event” (Keľmakov and Saarinen 1994: 125), that is, the pluractionality and habitual value of an action:

- (39) Northern Udmurt (Keľmakov and Saarinen 1994: 125)
- | | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| <i>uall'o</i> | <i>pjos-jos</i> | <i>no,</i> | <i>nyl-jos</i> |
| long_time_ago | man-PL | too | girl-PL |
| <i>no</i> | <i>kyrža-l'la-l'la-zy</i> | <i>udmort</i> | <i>krežž-os-ty.</i> |
| too | sing-FREQ-FREQ-PST.3PL | Udmurt | song-PL-ACC |
- ‘A long time ago, men and girls used to sing Udmurt songs.’

In Komi-Permyak, the frequentative suffix itself can be used in the case of both repeated and non-repeated events:

- (40) Komi-Permyak (elicited)
- | | | | |
|---------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|
| <i>körkö</i> | <i>me</i> | <i>ker-l-i</i> | <i>šańga-ez.</i> |
| long_time_ago | I | make-FREQ-PST.1SG | shanga-PL |
1. ‘I once did shangas a long time ago.’
2. ‘A long time ago, I used to make shangas (many times).’

However, with two frequentative suffixes attached to the verbal stem, the event can only be interpreted as a pluractional event, that is, reduplication can prevent ambiguousness:

- (41) Komi-Permyak (elicited)
- | | | | |
|---------------|-----------|------------------------|------------------|
| <i>körkö</i> | <i>me</i> | <i>ker-l-yvl-i</i> | <i>šańga-ez.</i> |
| long_time_ago | I | make-FREQ-FREQ-PST.1SG | shanga-PL |
- ‘A long time ago, I used to make shangas (many times).’

5. Conclusion

In our paper, we have presented the aims, main research questions and linguistic background of the ongoing project *Typological Database of the Volga Area Finno-Ugric Languages*, and provided analyses of three features of the database.

First, we have discussed the properties of the presumably non-canonical cases of the predicative possessive constructions in Udmurt and attempted to specify the conditions under which these cases occur, taking into consideration the word order and differences between predicative and adnominal possessive constructions. In these kinds of sentences, the existential verb can be absent, and/or the possessive suffix is not attached to the possessee. We have found that while in the case of adnominal constructions, the omission of the possessive suffix is linked with the inalienability of the possessee, this does not seem to be the case when using predicative possessives: in the latter case, omission might be due to the influence of Russian on Udmurt. As for the lack of an existential verb in the predicative possessive constructions, it seems to be useful to take into account notions like focus, presupposition, and exhaustivity as well.

Second, we have provided an analysis concerning person marking on adpositions with a nominal complement, concentrating mainly on Meadow Mari. In Meadow Mari adpositional constructions, in some cases, the person marker can appear either on the noun or on the adposition. However, we have found that some adpositions do not allow person agreement, and some allow it only under certain conditions: they show agreement only with pronominal complements and not with nominal ones. We assume that factors other than controlledness, for instance, animacy hierarchy, alienability, frequency of usage, or the degree of grammaticalization of the postposition should be taken into consideration when analyzing the person marking in these constructions.

In our third case study, we have focused on some formal and functional properties of reduplication in Udmurt, Komi-Permyak and Meadow Mari, concentrating on the evaluative and inflection-like functions of reduplication in these languages. Reduplication is often a tool for expressing augmentatives (a higher quantity of a quality) in both the Turkic and Finno-Ugric languages of the Volga–Kama linguistic area. Reduplication has a role in encoding aspectual values as well: in the languages of the database, different aspectual distinctions linked to imperfective aspect (pluractionality, habituality) are marked with reduplicated suffixes and adverbs.

Abbreviations

- 1 first person
- 2 second person
- 3 third person

ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
ACT	active
ART	article
DES	desiderative
FREQ	frequentative
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
INE	inessive
INF	infinitive
LOC	locative
NEC	necessive
NEG	negative
PCL	particle
PL	plural
PRS	present
PST	past
PST2	second past
PTCP	participle
PRECL	preclusive
RED	reduplication
SG	singular

References

- Alhoniemi, Alho 1985. *Mari kielioppi. Apuneuvoja suomalais-ugrilaisten kielten opintoja varten X*. Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen seura.
- Arkhangelskiy, Timofey 2019. Corpora of social media in minority Uralic languages. In: Pirinen, Tommi A., Kaalep, Heiki-Jaan and Tyers, Francis M. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Computational Linguistics for Uralic Languages*. Tartu: Association for Computational Linguistics, 125–140.
- Asztalos, Erika 2018a. *Szórendi típusváltás az udmurt nyelvben* [Typological change in word order in the Udmurt language]. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University PhD dissertation.
- Asztalos, Erika 2018b. *Nonverbal existential sentences in Udmurt*. Poster presentation at Syntax of the World's Languages 8. Paris: Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales. 3–5. September 2018.
<http://ugortip.elte.hu/Volgatip/Nonverbal.pdf>. Date of access: March 28, 2020

- Bakker, Dik 2013. Person marking on adpositions. In: Dryer, Matthew S. and Haspelmath, Martin (eds.) *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://wals.info/chapter/48>. Date of access: March 28, 2020.
- Berezki, Gábor 1990. *Chrestomathia ceremissica*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- Bradley, Jeremy, Riese, Timothy and Guseva, Elina 2014. *Mari–English dictionary*. Vienna: University of Vienna. <http://dict.mari-language.com>. Date of access: August 28, 2018.
- Csúcs, Sándor 1990. *Chrestomathia Votiacica*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2001. *Matthew Dryer's Typological Database*. Buffalo: Department of Linguistics, University at Buffalo. <http://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~dryer/database.htm>. Date of access: October 22, 2019.
- Dryer, Matthew S. and Haspelmath, Martin (eds.) 2013. *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://wals.info/>. Date of access: October 22, 2019.
- Efremov, V. A. 1955. *Poslelogi kak sredstvo vyraženija grammatičeskikh otnošenij v marijskom jazyke*. – Istorija, jazyki literatura mari. Trudy Marijskogo Naučno-Issledovatel'skogo Instituta Jazyka, Literatury i Istorii 7. Joškar-Ola: MarNII, 59–85.
- Erdal, Marcel 1991. *Old Turkic word formation: A functional approach to the lexicon, Vol. 1*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.
- Fejes, László 2016. Permianic. In: Müller, Peter O., Ohnheiser, Ingeborg, Olsen, Susan and Rainer, Franz (eds.) *Word-formation, Vol. 5*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 3260–3274.
- F. Gulyás, Nikolett, Asztalos, Erika, Timár, Bogáta, Horváth, Laura and Szabó, Ditta 2018. *Possessive agreement in Meadow Mari, Udmurt, and Komi-Permyak*. Conference presentation at Syntax of the World's Languages 8. Paris: Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales. September 3–5, 2018. http://ugortip.elte.hu/Volgatip/possessive_agr_fu_sw1_2018.pdf. Date of access: March 28, 2020.
- F. Gulyás, Nikolett 2015. Person marker on nominal adpositions: Hungarian. In: Havas, Ferenc, Csepregi, Márta, F. Gulyás, Nikolett and Németh, Szilvia *Typological Database of the Ugric Languages*. Budapest: ELTE Finnugor Tanszék. <http://en.utdb.nullpoint.info/node/1185>. Date of access: March 28, 2020.

- F. Gulyás, Nikolett 2015. Person marker on nominal adpositions. Synja Khanty. In: Havas, Ferenc, Csepregi, Márta, F. Gulyás, Nikolett and Németh, Szilvia *Typological Database of the Ugric Languages*. Budapest: ELTE Finnugor Tanszék. <http://en.utdb.nullpoint.info/node/1184>. Date of access: March 28, 2020.
- Halpern, Aaron L. 1998. Clitics. In: Spencer, Andrew and Zwicky, Arnold M. (eds.) *The handbook of morphology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 101–122.
- Havas, Ferenc (ed.) 2015. Person marking on nominal adpositions. In: Havas, Ferenc; Csepregi, Márta; F. Gulyás, Nikolett and Németh, Szilvia. *Typological Database of the Ugric Languages*. Budapest: ELTE Finnugor Tanszék. <http://en.utdb.nullpoint.info/content/person-marking-nominal-adpositions>. Date of access: March 28, 2020.
- Havas, Ferenc, Csepregi, Márta, F. Gulyás, Nikolett and Németh, Szilvia 2015. *Typological Database of the Ugric Languages*. Budapest: ELTE Finnugor Tanszék. <http://utdb.elte.hu>. Date of access: October 22, 2019.
- Inkelas, Sharon 2014. Non-concatenative derivation: Reduplication. In: Lieber, Rochelle and Štekauer, Pavol (eds.) *The Oxford handbook of derivational morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 169–189.
- Inkelas, Sharon and Zoll, Cheryl 2005. *Reduplication: Doubling in morphology*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 106. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Iskandarova, Gulnara 2016. Bashkir. In: Müller, Peter O.; Ohnheiser, Ingeborg; Olsen, Susan and Rainer, Franz (eds.) *Word-formation, Vol. 5*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. 3386–3397.
- Kangasmaa-Minn, Eeva 1998. Mari. In: Abondolo, Daniel (ed.) *The Uralic languages*. London and New York: Routledge. 219–248.
- Károly, László 2016. Tatar. In: Müller, Peter O., Ohnheiser, Ingeborg, Olsen, Susan and Rainer, Franz (eds.) *Word-formation, Vol. 5*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 3398–3413.
- Karpova, L. L. 2011. O stepenjah kačestva prilagatelnyh v severnoudmurtskih dialektah. *Uralo-altajskije issledovanija*, 1 (4): 24–33.
- Kel'makov, V. K. and Saarinen, Sirkka 1994. *Udmurtin murteet*. Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 47. Turku and Izhevsk: Turun yliopisto.
- Körtvélyessy, Lívia 2015. *Evaluative morphology from a cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kubinyi, Katalin 2015. *Possessive clitic climbing as a pattern of agreement with the possessor in Permian and Mari postpositional phrases*. XII. International Congress for Finno-Ugric Studies. Poster presentation. Oulu.

- Németh, Szilvia 2015. Person marker on nominal adpositions. Northern Mansi. In: Havas, Ferenc, Csepregi, Márta, F. Gulyás, Nikolett and Németh, Szilvia *Typological Database of the Ugric Languages*. Budapest: ELTE Finnugor Tanszék. <http://en.utdb.nullpoint.info/node/845>. Date of access: March 28, 2020.
- Perevoshchikov, P. N., Vakhrushev, V. M., Alatyrev, V. I., Pozdeeva, A. A. and Tarakanov, I. V. (eds.) 1962. *Grammatika sovremennogo udmurtskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*. Izhevsk: Udmurtskoje knizhnoje izdatelstvo.
- Pleshak, Polina 2018. Adnominal possessive constructions in Mordvin, Mari and Permic. *Eesti ja Soome-Ugri Keeleteaduse Ajakiri*, 9(1): 139–168.
- Rédei, Károly 1962. *Die Postpositionen im Syrjänischen unter Berücksichtigung des Wotjakischen*. Budapest: Akadémiai.
- Riese, Timothy 2016. Mari. In: Müller, Peter O., Ohnheiser, Ingeborg, Olsen, Susan and Rainer, Franz (eds.) *Word-formation, Vol. 5*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 3275–3288.
- Riese, Timothy, Bradley, Jeremy, Schötschel, Monika and Yefremova, Tatiana 2019. *Mari (марий йылме): An essential grammar for international learners [draft version]*. Vienna: University of Vienna. Published online at <http://grammar.mari-language.com>. Date of access: August 08, 2019.
- Saarinen, Sirkka 1991. *Marilaisen arvoituksien kielioppi*. MSFOu 210. Helsinki: SUS. 81–82.
- Schlachter, Wolfgang 1960. *Studien zum Possessivsuffix des Syrjänischen*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Schwaiger, Thomas 2015. Reduplication. In: Müller, Peter O., Ohnheiser, Ingeborg, Olsen, Susan and Rainer, Franz (eds.) *Word-formation, Vol. 1*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 467–484.
- Semenova, G. N. and Ivanova, A. M. 2016. Chuvash. In: Müller, Peter O., Ohnheiser, Ingeborg, Olsen, Susan and Rainer, Franz (eds.) *Word-formation, Vol. 5*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 3451–3467.
- Shlyakhova, S. S. 2013. Study of reduplication in Finno-Ugrian languages of Permic group. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 16: 1329–1333.
- Štekauer, Pavol, Valera, Salvador, and Körtvélyessy, Livia 2012. *Word-formation in the world's languages A Typological survey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Winkler, Eberhard 2001. *Udmurt*. Languages of the World 212. München: Lincom Europa.
- Winkler, Eberhard 2011. *Udmurtische Grammatik*. Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 81. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.