

Three types of Nominal Coordination in Udmurt

Philipp Weisser, Leipzig University

1. Introduction

The Finno-Ugric languages exhibit a wide range of coordination constructions. This can be observed across languages but also within one and the same language as many Finno-Ugric languages have a number of competing constructions available. In some cases, these constructions can be distinguished by means of the syntactic context in which they occur but in some cases, they also occur as parallel constructions in the language. The goal of this paper is to describe the three different types of coordination in Udmurt, a Finno-Ugric language of the Permian branch. The three different constructions differ with respect to the conjunction and/or the case marking pattern of the respective conjuncts. It will be shown further that the three constructions fall nicely into the categorization by Mitrović & Sauerland (2014) and provide nice evidence for the structure they propose.

2. The three types of Nominal Coordination

2.1 General Properties of the Constructions

Udmurt has three different possibilities to coordinate noun phrases. The construction in (1a) looks like the typical symmetrical pattern known from most European languages. It obligatorily employs the conjunction ‚*no*‘ and all conjuncts bear the expected syntactic case. In (1), we see that the verb ‚*mözm-*‘ governs the ablative and hence both conjuncts in (1a) bear the ablative. This construction is the one that is usually used in present-day language.

The construction in (1b) can be described as the symmetrical ‚*-en*‘-construction. In this construction, which optionally bears the conjunction ‚*no*‘, both conjuncts are marked with the morpheme ‚*-en*‘, glosses as instrumental case, and, in addition, the expected syntactic case, i.e. the ablative. This construction is the least

frequent one and according to Svetlana Edygarova (p.c.) it is associated with fairy tales and generally perceived as archaic. Finally, speakers of Udmurt make use of the asymmetrical *,-en‘*-construction in (1c). In this construction both conjuncts are marked with *,-en‘* as in the symmetrical one but only the final one bears the regular syntactic case. This construction is used in certain dialects of Udmurt.

- (1) a . Mon Petyr-les' no Maša-les' mözm-is'ko.
 1SG Peter-ABL and Masha-ABL miss-PRES
- b. Mon Petyr-en-les' (no) Maša-jen-les' mözm-is'ko
 1SG Peter-INS-ABL and Masha-INS-ABL miss.1SG.PRES
- c. Mon Petyr-en Maša-jen-les' mözm-is'ko
 1SG Peter-INS Masha-INS-ABL miss-1SG.PRES
- 'I miss Peter and Masha.'¹

The regular pattern in (1a) is a relatively new innovation in Udmurt. According to Bartens (2000:100), Finno-Ugric languages did not have conjunctions until very recently. Bartens claims that instead the conjuncts were juxtaposed with identical case marking to express conjunction. The two latter constructions make use of the morpheme *,-en‘* which is also marks instrumental and comitative adjuncts. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that the examples of coordination in (1) are to be distinguished from comitatives as in (2).

- (2) Mon verašk-i todmo-en-im kud-ze uram-in pumita-j
 1SG talk-1SG friend-INS-1SG REL-ACC street-INESS meet.1SG
- 'I and my friend, who I met on the street, talked.'²

In (2), we see several features that distinguish comitative constructions from the three coordination constructions above. First, we see that the noun which is modified by the comitative is not marked with the morpheme *,-en‘*. Only the comitative itself bears instrumental. Second, we see that the verb shows singular agreement indicating that its subject is in this case singular. And third, we find

¹ All Udmurt examples were, unless otherwise stated, provided by Svetlana Edygarova (University of Helsinki).

² adapted from Winkler (2001:75)

that the comitative and the noun it modifies need not be adjacent. In (2), relative clause is extraposed to a position after the matrix verb. Since Udmurt is, as all Eastern Finno-Ugric languages, quite rigidly verb-final, this indicates that the comitative phrase has been moved there. As a consequence, it is no longer adjacent to the noun phrase it modifies. The same is not possible with the coordination strategies above as shown in (3).

- (3) a. *Mon Petyr-en-les' mözm-is'ko Maša-jen-les'.
 1SG Peter-INS-ABL miss-1SG Masha-INS-ABL
- b. *Mon Petyr-en mözm-is'ko Maša-jen-les'.
 1SG Peter-INS miss-1SG Masha-INS-ABL
- 'I miss Peter and Masha.'

Finally, it is to be noted that, according to Bartens (2000), all of the coordination constructions above are possible with more than two conjuncts. She gives no examples though. With the comitative construction, it is not possible to have recursion in the sense that one comitative phrase modifies another one. We can thus conclude that the three strategies are in fact instances of coordination.³

2.2 The inherent symmetry of the asymmetric conjunction construction

We have seen that one of the three constructions used to coordinate noun phrases in Udmurt looks inherently asymmetric at first sight. (4) is another example of this construction parallel to the ones we have seen above.

- (5) Maša-jen Petyr-en-len pi-zy lykt-e.
 Masha-INS Peter-INS-GEN son-3SG come-PRES.3SG
- 'Masha and Peter's son is coming.'

Both conjuncts bear the instrumental marker but it seems that only the final conjunct is marked with the regular syntactic case marker, which is, in this case, the genitive as we are dealing with a conjoined possessor. This construction thus

³ That does, of course, not mean that they are not historically related to the comitative construction. As *Stassen (2000)* and many others have shown, comitatives often grammaticalize into conjunctions. The fact that only animate nouns can be conjoined with the *instrumental* constructions can probably also be attributed to its origins as comitatives.

appears to be in conflict with the generalization made in Weisser (2017a, 2017b) stating that case marking in nominal conjunction is always symmetric.

However, on the basis of the example in (6), we cannot conclude whether the structure is symmetric or asymmetric since some languages have the possibility to mark the whole conjunction with a case marker rather than every single conjunct. The structural ambiguity is given in (7).

- (7) a. [Conj₁ & Conj₂] -CASE
 b. [Conj₁ & Conj₂-CASE]

Either the case marker attaches to the coordination phrase as a whole or it marks the second conjunct. Cliticization of case markers is a widespread phenomenon among world's languages and also found in Finno-Ugrian languages (cf. the so-called CATE-cases in Estonian). For the asymmetric construction above, I will argue that (7a) is the underlying structure. The argument that I will put forward is based on the alternation of possessor case in Udmurt, which is discussed in Edygarova (2009), Assmann et al (2014). Possessors in Udmurt are marked with genitive case unless the head noun they modify bears accusative. Then, the possessor is marked with ablative:

- (8) a. Mon Masha-leš apaj-z-e jarat-is'ko.
 1SG Masha-ABL sister-3SG-ACC love-PRES.1SG
 'I love Masha's sister'
- b. Masha-len apaj-ez Petyr-ez jarat-e.
 Masha-GEN sister-3SG Peter-ACC love-PRES.3SG
 'Masha's sister loves Peter.' Assmann et al (2014)

If we now conjoin an accusative object with the so-called asymmetric coordination construction, we find that narrow scope possessors do not bear ablative. A possessor that takes scope over both conjuncts (and is thus external to the whole conjunction phrase) can bear ablative case.

- (9) a. *Mon Maša-les' nil-ieni-z Petr-les'
 1SG Masha-ABL daughter-INS-3SG Petr-ABL
 pi-jeni-z-e ad'z'-is'ko.
 son-INS-3SG-ACC see-PRES.1SG
 'I see Masha's daughter and Peter's son.'
- b. Mon Maša-les' nil-ieni-z pi-jeni-z-e
 1SG Masha-ABL daughter-INS-3SG son-INS-3SG-ACC
 ad'z'-is'ko.
 see-PRES.1SG
 'I see Masha's daughter and son.'

Narrow scope possessors which are part of one of the conjuncts modify an instrumental case marked NP (9a). A wide scope possessor which modifies the whole coordination, modifies an element bearing accusative (9b). Its possessor can therefore be ablative:

- (10) a. [_{&P} POSS₁-GEN DP₁-INS POSS₂-GEN DP₂-INS] -ACC
 b. POSS-ABL [_{&P} DP₁-INS DP₂-INS] -ACC

The minimal pair in (9) can be explained straightforwardly under the assumption that the accusative is a phrasal clitic. Under the assumption that it attaches to the second conjunct alone, both of the examples in (9) are unexpected. Neither could it be explained why the second narrow scope possessor in (9a) does not bear ablative, nor could it be explained why the wide scope possessor in (9b) bears ablative. I thus conclude that the asymmetric construction is inherently symmetric as well. Thus, we are now in the position to provide abstract representations of the three coordination constructions in Udmurt:

- (13) a. [DP₁-CASE] *no* [DP₂-CASE]
 b. [DP₁-*en*-CASE] (*no*) [DP₂-*en*-CASE]
 c. [DP₁-*en* DP₂-*en*]-CASE

The first construction is identical to well-known examples of coordination in most European languages. Each conjunct is case-marked respectively and coordination

is morphologically expressed by the conjunction *no*. Second, the symmetric *en*-construction marks every conjunct with *-en* and with the syntactic case in addition. The conjunction *no* is optional in this construction. Finally, in the so-called asymmetrical *-en*-construction, both conjuncts are marked for *-en* but none of them is marked with the syntactic case marker. Rather the case attaches to the whole coordination phrase. This construction does not allow for an overt realization of the conjunction. The difference between the two *-en* coordination constructions is thus simply whether the case morphemes of the respective conjuncts cliticize to the whole conjunction or whether each conjunct is case-marked respectively.

3. Modelling the variation

In this section, we will briefly discuss the question how the three different constructions are to be modelled formally. As we will see, the variation provides nice evidence for a recently proposed universal structure to nominal coordination in Mitrović & Sauerland (2014). They propose a structure where each conjunct is headed by a special head they call μ^0 whereas the whole coordination structure is combined via a junctor head J which forms the JP:

$$(11) [_{JP} [_{\mu P} DP_1 \mu] J [_{\mu P} DP_2 \mu]]$$

Languages differ which of the two heads μ^0 or J^0 they realize. English (as most Indo-European languages realizes the J^0 whereas Hungarian realizes the head μ^0 .

- | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| (12) a. | Kate and Mary | English |
| | Kate J Mary | |
| b. | Kati is Mary is | Hungarian |
| | Kate μ Mary μ | Mitrović & Sauerland (2014). |

This structure can be applied to the three different types of nominal coordination in Udmurt without further ado, as Udmurt seems to mix the strategies. The standard pattern is a typical J-type construction as the one from English above whereas the two different instrumental constructions are of the μ -type. The

possible phonological realization of the μ -head is the instrumental case marker *en* whereas the realization of the J-head is the conjunction *no*.

Thus, all of the three coordination constructions fall neatly into the typological classes prediction by Mitrović & Sauerland (2014). Furthermore, Udmurt complies with the predictions about the semantic content of the respective heads. The semantic function of the μ -head is also used in order to express additivity of the type used in instrumental constructions. The function of the J-head is the intersection of the different sets and hence, it is expected that the J-head is also used for other types of conjunction. This is also borne out:

- (17) tol vu-e no limi uš-e
 winter come-3SG.PRES and snow fall-3SG-PRES
 ‘Winter comes and snow falls.’ Winkler (2001:72)

It should also be noted that the diachronic development of coordination in Finno-Ugric provides additional evidence for the typology by Mitrović & Sauerland. Finno-Ugric languages are historically of the μ -type (see Bartens 2000). But recently, quite a number of languages in this family have made the shift towards the J-type. As Mitrović & Sauerland predict, none of these languages reanalyzed a μ -morpheme as an &-head. The neighboring language Mari borrowed the conjunction *da* from Russian (for a brief discussion, see Guseva & Weisser 2017) and even though I do not have any diachronic data at this point a similar situation seems likely for Udmurt *no*.

4. Conclusion

Udmurt has several ways of expressing coordination of nominal phrases. In this short paper I documented three variants which differ from each other in terms of the realization of different coordination morphemes and/or in terms of the associated case pattern. This study thus contributes to the general study of parametrization with respect to nominal conjunction and the accompanying case

marking patterns. It was shown that the three constructions fall neatly into the typology proposed by Mitrović & Sauerland (2014).

References:

Assmann, A., Georgi, D. Klein, T., Weisser, P. (2014): 'Case stacking below the surface: On the possessor case alternation in Udmurt', *The Linguistic Review* 31(3-4), 447–485.

Bartens, R. (2000): *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys*. Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 238. Helsinki. 372 s.

Edygarova, S. (2009): Attributive Possession in Udmurt language. *Linguistica Uralica* XLV, 101-118

Guseva, E. & Weisser, P. (2017): Postsyntactic Reordering in the Mari Nominal Domain - Evidence from Suspended Affixation. To appear in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*

Mitrović, M. & Sauerland U. (2014): Decomposing coordination. *Proceedings of NELS* 44 (2), 39-52

Stassen, L. (2000): AND-Languages and WITH-Languages. *Linguistic Typology* 4. 1-54.

Weisser, P. (2017a): Why is there no such thing as Closest Conjunct Case? In *Proceedings of NELS* 47

Weisser P. (2017b): On the Symmetry of Case in Conjunction. Submitted.