

Adnominal Person
in the Morphological System of Erzya

SUOMALAIS-UGRILAISEN SEURAN TOIMITUKSIA
MÉMOIRES DE LA SOCIÉTÉ FINNO-OUGRIENNE

* 261 *

Jack Rueter

Adnominal Person
in the Morphological System of Erzya

SOCIÉTÉ FINNO-OUGRIENNE
HELSINKI 2010

Jack Rueter: *Adnominal Person in the Morphological System of Erzya*
Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 261
Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne

Layout Jack Rueter

Copyright © 2010 Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura —
Société Finno-Ougrienne — Finno-Ugrian Society
& Jack Rueter

Orders — Tilaukset

Tiedekirja
Kirkkokatu 14
FI-00170 Helsinki
www.tiedekirja.fi
tiedekirja@tsv.fi
FAX +358 9 635 017

ISBN Print 978-952-5667-23-3
ISBN Online 978-952-5667-24-0
ISSN 0355-0230

Vammalan Kirjapaino Oy
Sastamala 2010

Abstract

This dissertation is a synchronic description of adnominal person in the highly synthetic morphological system of Erzya as attested in extensive Erzya-language written-text corpora consisting of nearly 140 publications with over 4.5 million words and over 285,000 unique lexical items.

Insight for this description have been obtained from several source grammars in German, Russian, Erzya, Finnish, Estonian and Hungarian, as well as bounteous discussions in the understanding of the language with native speakers and grammarians 1993–2010.

Introductory information includes the discussion of the status of Erzya as a language, the enumeration of phonemes generally used in the transliteration of texts and an in-depth description of adnominal morphology. The reader is then made aware of typological and Erzya-specific work in the study of adnominal-type person.

Methods of description draw upon the prerequisite information required in the development of a two-level morphological analyzer, as can be obtained in the typological description of allomorphic variation in the target language. Indication of original author or dialect background is considered important in the attestation of linguistic phenomena, such that variation might be plotted for a synchronic description of the language.

The phonological description includes the establishment of a 6-vowel, 29-consonant phoneme system for use in the transliteration of annotated texts, i.e. two phonemes more than are generally recognized, and numerous rules governing allophonic variation in the language.

Erzya adnominal morphology is demonstrated to have a three-way split in stem types and a three-layer system of non-derivative affixation. The adnominal-affixation layers are broken into (a) declension (the categories of case, number and deictic marking); (b) nominal conjugation (non-verb grammatical and oblique-case items can be conjugated), and (c) clitic marking. Each layer is given statistical detail with regard to concatenability.

Finally, individual subsections are dedicated to the matters of: possessive declension compatibility in the distinction of sublexica; genitive and dative-case paradigmatic defectivity in the possessive declension, where it is demonstrated to be parametrically diverse, and secondary declension, a proposed typology “modifiers without nouns”, as compatible with adnominal person.

Acknowledgements

Research and documentation of a language has many requirements, which are best met with the help of others. In addition to the previous work done by grammarians, teachers, speakers, writers and lexicographers in the language of study, there are the individuals: mentors, teachers, acquaintances, etc. who have all had an undeniable impact on the formulation and articulation of the various stages in the process, as well as the end result. I wish to express my warm thanks to the people who helped me achieve my goal: Pirkko Suihkonen who originally got me involve in work with text corpora, and has seen to it that I continue and improve my skills by keeping involved; Kimmo Koskenniemi, Miikka Silfverberg, Trond Trosterud and Tommi Pirinen for our discussions and work with finite-state technology; Dmitry Tsygankin, Aleksandr Feoktistov, Alho Alhoniemi, Nina Adushkina, Nina Agafonova, Mikhail Mosin and Mikhail Bryzhinski for the endless hours consumed in contemplation of Erzya morphology, possession and the language in general; Seppo Kittilä for discussions over early morning coffee, lent books and thoughts on possession; The external examiners, Niina Nujanžina-Aasmäe and Daniel M. Abondolo who helped me improve the quality of this dissertation by offering well-merited suggestions, and Anna Kurvinen for ideas on how to improve the layout of this book. And I would like to express a special thanks to my professor, Fred Karlsson, for his support in all phases of the writing.

I am deeply indebted to the Finno-Ugrian Society, in Helsinki, for their support in my studies and work with the language, as well as the publication of this treatise in one of their series.

I would like to thank the Finnish Academy of Sciences, who through the Eino Jutikkala Fund, made my work possible for the entire year of 2009.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the Rector of the University of Helsinki for the Dissertation Completion Grant, which made my work possible March—May 2010.

Finally, I would like to thank my family, especially my wife, Olga, whose native-language and linguistics background in combination with unlimited support and understanding have allowed me the freedom to complete this treatise of the Erzya language.

Contents

Abstract	V
Acknowledgements	VI
List of Hierarchies and Tables	IX
Abbreviations	XV
0. Purpose	1
0.1. General outline	2
1. Introduction	3
1.1. Introduction to Erzya	3
1.2. Introduction to person	27
1.3. Research in the Erzya category of adnominal person	35
1.3.1. Background	35
1.3.2. The category of adnominal person in contemporary grammars of Erzya	38
2. Methodology and Corpora	45
2.1. Corpora	46
2.2. Phonological phenomena of modern Erzya	48
2.3. Morpho-semantic evaluation of stems and affixes	49
2.4. Compatibility of case and adnominal-person morphology	49
2.5. The semi-automatic parser	51
2.6. Sublexicon-case alignments and variation in adnominal person	54
2.7. Defectivity in the genitive slot of the possessive declension	54
2.8. Secondary declension	55
3. Phonology	57
3.1. Phonemes in Erzya transliteration	57
3.2. Phonetic phenomena behind allomorphic variation	62
3.2.1. Vowel harmony	62
3.2.2. Palatal harmony	64
3.2.3. Devoicing	66
3.2.4. Voicing	67
3.2.5. Loss of affix-initial V	67
3.2.6. Stem-final vowel loss	68

4.	Morphology	69
4.1.	Nominal-type word-stem morphology	69
4.2.	Affixes	74
4.2.1.	Case	74
4.2.1.1.	Core cases	75
4.2.1.2.	Local cases	84
4.2.1.3.	Attributive Cases	94
4.2.2.	Number	104
4.2.3.	Deictic markers	108
4.2.3.1.	Possessor-index markers	109
4.2.3.1.1.	First person	112
4.2.3.1.2.	Second person	116
4.2.3.1.3.	Third person	118
4.2.3.2.	Definite markers	127
4.2.4.	Nominal conjugation markers	129
4.2.5.	The clitic <i>-Gak</i>	132
4.3.	Adnominal-type person in parts of speech	134
4.3.1.	Possessive declension compatibility for distinguishing parts of speech	136
4.3.2.	Attested parts of speech and sublexica	149
4.3.3.	Drawing conclusions	157
4.4.	Paradigm defectivity in Erzya possessor indexing	164
4.4.1.	Background	164
4.4.2.	A dialect attesting [±NUMBER] and [±KIN] parameters	166
4.4.3.	Distinct common-noun referents indefinite genitive forms in literature	168
4.4.4.	Orkino	169
4.4.5.	Recent grammatical presentation of the possessive declension	171
4.5.	Adnominal syntax and secondary declension	174
4.5.1.	Background	174
4.5.2.	Compatibility of ZERO marking and adnominal-person	188
4.5.3.	Compatibility of possessive-declension modifiers with ZERO marking strategy	191
4.5.4.	Personal and reflexive/intensive pronouns and secondary declension	193
5.	Conclusions	207
	Erzya Source Literature (Corpora)	213
	Reference Bibliography	225

List of Hierarchies and Tables

Hierarchies

Hierarchy 1.1	The inalienability hierarchy	33
Hierarchy 1.2	Saliency hierarchies of accessibility	34
Hierarchy 1.3	The accessibility marking scale	34

Tables

Table 1.1	Statistics on headword entries in <i>Mordwinisches Wörterbuch</i> I–IV	7
Table 1.2	Major consonant allophones in the Erzya language	15
Table 1.3	Major vowel allophones in the Erzya language	16
Table 1.4	Indefinite declension table for complex NP heads <i>kudo</i> ‘house; home’	17
Table 1.5	Nominative-case forms for the Erzya <i>kudo</i> ‘home; house; room’ and <i>t'ev</i> ‘task; thing’ as a possessum	18
Table 1.6	Varied parts of speech with adnominal cross-referential person marking	18
Table 1.7	Indefinite declension cases attested in modifier vs. complement position	22
Table 1.8	Indicative present paradigm of the Erzya verb <i>palams</i> ‘to kiss’	23
Table 1.9	Single-word elliptic question with object pronoun in subject function	28
Table 1.10	Single-word elliptic answer with object pronoun in subject function	29
Table 1.11	Dependent vs. independent possessive pronoun	29
Table 1.12	The indicative present conjugation of the verb <i>to be</i> as attested in some languages of Europe	30
Table 1.13	Adnominal possessive constructions as attested in some languages of Europe ‘my house, our house, etc.’	31
Table 1.14	Possessor indices in Erzya as can be derived from Gabelentz (1839: 253–257)	36
Table 1.15	Possessor indices in Erzya deriving from Paasonen (1953: 04-05)	37

Table 1.16	Neutral personal pronoun paradigm in the five most frequent cases	39
Table 1.17	Cross-referential adnominal person markers in the nominative	39
Table 1.18	Kin terms as possessa of singular possessors in the nominative, genitive and dative cases according to Adushkina (2000: 97)	40
Table 1.19	Possessa other than kin terms in the first person singular possessive declension according to Adushkina (2000: 97)	40
Table 1.20	Possessa other than kin terms in the first person singular possessive	41
Table 1.21	Personal pronouns in genitive case used as modifiers	41
Table 1.22	Genitive-case reflexive/intensive personal pronouns singular with varied concatenation strategies	42
Table 2.1	The MINORITY CORPUS	48
Table 2.2	Ten most frequent word forms in the Erzya majority corpus of 4.5 million words	49
Table 2.3	Derivation of nominative-case predicate-person patterns	50
Table 2.4	Example of an analyzed text fragment	52
Table 2.5	Examples of items requiring manual disambiguation in this treatise	54
Table 3.1	Vowel phonemes attested in the first syllable	57
Table 3.2	Consonants: 29 consonant phonemes	58
Table 3.3	Attestation of phonetic alveolar nasal before velar plosive in Erzya	58
Table 3.4	Pronunciation of Russian <i>ʉ</i> by Erzya speakers unfamiliar with Russian	59
Table 3.5	Attestation of unrounded high central and front vowels in Erzya	60
Table 3.6	Word-initial single alveolars followed by vowels in unique word forms of the Erzya corpora	60
Table 3.7	Vowel phonemes attested in Erzya word stems (6)	61
Table 3.8	Consonant phonemes attested in Erzya (29)	61
Table 3.9	Sets used in the description of Erzya vowel harmony	62
Table 3.10	Range of vowel harmony in Erzya affixes	63

Table 3.11	Sets used in the description of Erzya palatal harmony	64
Table 3.12	Range of palatal harmony in Erzya affixes	65
Table 3.13	Devoicing of affixal onset plosives following voiceless consonants and plosives	67
Table 4.1	Nominal stem types in Erzya	72
Table 4.2	Stem variation in NOUNS2 nominal stem type	73
Table 4.3	Nominative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions	76
Table 4.4	Nominative forms from the possessive declensions	77
Table 4.5	Genitive forms from the definite and indefinite declensions	78
Table 4.6	Possessor indexing for the genitive parse of non-kin and kin terms in Erzya	78
Table 4.7	Dative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions	81
Table 4.8	Dative forms for the defective possessive declension	82
Table 4.9	Ablative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions	84
Table 4.10	Inessive forms from the definite and indefinite declensions	85
Table 4.11	Elicative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions	86
Table 4.12	Illative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions	88
Table 4.13	Possessor indexing for the illative case	88
Table 4.14	Lative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions	89
Table 4.15	Prolative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions	90
Table 4.16	Locative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions	92
Table 4.17	Temporalis forms from the indefinite declension	93
Table 4.18	Translative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions	94
Table 4.19	Comparative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions	95
Table 4.20	Ablative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions	96
Table 4.21	Comitative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions	97
Table 4.22	Indefinite declension table	98
Table 4.23	Definite plural declension table	99
Table 4.24	Definite singular declension table	100
Table 4.25a	Possessive declension for nominative, genitive, dative and illative possessa	101
Table 4.25b	Possessive declension for genitive possessa	102

Table 4.25c	Possessive declension for dative possessa with no distinction in number of possessa	103
Table 4.25d	Possessive declension for illative possessa with no distinction in number for possessa	103
Table 4.26	Cases attested with 1SG adnominal marking with the word <i>kudo</i> ‘house; home’	109
Table 4.27	Cases attested with 3SG adnominal marking with the word <i>kudo</i> ‘house; home’	110
Table 4.28	Cases attested with 3SG adnominal marking with the word <i>śelme</i> ‘eye’	111
Table 4.29	Possessor indexing for a 1SG parse	113
Table 4.30	Possessor indexing for a 1PL parse	114
Table 4.31	Possessor indexing for a 1SG parse	116
Table 4.32	Possessor indexing for a 2PL parse	117
Table 4.33	Possessor indexing for a 3SG parse	119
Table 4.34	Possessor indexing for a 3PL parse	119
Table 4.35	Possessive suffixes used in all cases except for the dative	123
Table 4.36	Possessive indices on dative-case possessa-targets	125
Table 4.37	Possessive suffixes genitive in kin terms	126
Table 4.38	Variation between linking-vowel strategies in modern and presently dialect (old literary) declension of nouns	127
Table 4.39	Definite declension markers	128
Table 4.40	Attestation of case in four declension arrays	129
Table 4.41	Nominal conjugation markers with attestation for various targets	130
Table 4.42	Attestation of nominal conjugation in four declension arrays	131
Table 4.43	- <i>Gak</i> clitic	132
Table 4.44	Morphematic representation of the - <i>Gak</i> enclitic	133
Table 4.45	Reflexive stem declension with independent case forms whereas the nominative-case form is suppletive and the <i>eś</i> form is a dependent absolutive form	139
Table 4.46	Minimalizing quantifier <i>śkamo-</i> and the comitative case in possessive declension	147

Table 4.47	Universal pronoun <i>vešeme</i> ‘all’ in attested case slots of the possessive paradigms	154
Table 4.48	Selective interrogative/relative pronoun with partitive reference associated with plural person indexing	154
Table 4.49a	Dative-case personal pronouns, reflexive/intensive pronouns and reflexive/intensive stems (Majority corpus)	155
Table 4.49b	Dative-case personal pronouns, reflexive/intensive pronouns and reflexive/intensive stems (Minority corpus)	156
Table 4.50	Personal pronouns attested for abessive case in possessive declension	156
Table 4.51	Reflexive personal pronouns attested for abessive case in possessive declension	157
Table 4.52	Noun-focus interrogative pronouns in the possessive declension	157
Table 4.53a	Possessive declension illative <i>langs</i> ‘onto’ Pop+Poss	158
Table 4.53b	Possessive declension illative <i>langs</i> ‘onto’ Genitive Pronoun + Pop+Poss	158
Table 4.54a	Possessive declension illative <i>ejs</i> ‘into; up to’ Pop+Poss	159
Table 4.54b	Possessive declension illative <i>ejs</i> ‘into; up to’ Genitive Pronoun + Pop+Poss	159
Table 4.55a	Possessive declension illative <i>tarka</i> ‘place’ Noun+Poss	159
Table 4.55b	Possessive declension illative <i>tarka</i> ‘place’ Genitive Pronoun + Noun+Poss	159
Table 4.56a	Possessive declension illative <i>sams</i> ‘to arrive’ Noun+Poss	160
Table 4.56b	Possessive declension illative <i>sams</i> ‘to arrive’ Genitive Pronoun + Noun+Poss	160
Table 4.57a	Possessive declension illative <i>čĭ</i> ‘day; sun’ Noun+Poss	161
Table 4.58a	Possessive declension illative <i>žepe</i> ‘pocket’ Noun+Poss	161
Table 4.58b	Possessive declension illative <i>žepe</i> ‘pocket’ Genitive Pronoun + Noun+Poss	161
Table 4.59	Possessive declension attestation of discernible sublexica	162
Table 4.60	Nizhnep’yanski dialect forms for <i>kudo</i> ‘house’, <i>skal</i> ‘cow’ and <i>tejtér</i> ‘daughter’ possessa in the nominative and genitive of the possessive declension (preliminary)	166

Table 4.61	The 2SG possessor and kin terms in Orkino according to Shakhmatov	169
Table 4.62	The 1SG possessor and kin terms in Orkino according to Shakhmatov	170
Table 4.63a	Possessor indexing on the possessum (possessor = <i>moń</i> ‘1sg’, and possessa in <i>valma</i> ‘window’, <i>vele</i> ‘village’)	171
Table 4.63b	Possessor indexing on the possessum (possessor = <i>toń</i> ‘2sg’, and possessa in <i>vakan</i> ‘bowl’, <i>pań</i> ‘barrel’)	171
Table 4.63c	Possessor indexing on the possessum (possessor = <i>sonze</i> ‘3sg’, and possessa in <i>lom</i> ‘meadow’, <i>lem</i> ‘name’)	172
Table 4.64	Distinction for grammatical number of possessed possessa apparent only in 1SG marking	172
Table 4.65	Genitive-case personal pronouns with SOD secondary nominative forms or according to Evsev'ev the possessive pronouns in the definite declension	183
Table 4.66	Secondary declension	185
Table 4.67	Personal pronouns in genitive used as modifiers	193
Table 4.68	Genitive-form (neutral) personal pronouns with definite declensions	194
Table 4.69	Genitive-form reflexive/intensive personal pronouns with definite declensions	196
Table 4.70	Genitive-case personal pronouns with distal demonstrative pronoun marking	198
Table 4.71	Singular genitive-case reflexive/intensive pronouns with zero-marking strategy in all persons	199
Table 4.72	Genitive-form reflexive/intensive pronouns with SOD marking strategy	200
Table 4.73	Genitive-case reflexive/intensive stems with zero-marking	202
Table 4.74	Genitive-case reflexive/intensive stems with SOD marking	203
Table 4.75	Genitive-form personal pronouns in fused head constructions “STEM-REFL+POSS.GEN+DEM-DIST+Cx(+DEF)”	204
Table 4.76	Attestation of two modifier-without-noun marking strategies for three sets of pronouns	204
Table 4.77	Genitive forms of personal pronouns, reflexive/intensive pronouns and reflexive/intensive stems	205
Table 4.78	Mordva 3SG pronouns á la Zaicz (2006: 197)	206

Abbreviations

1P	First Person	ELA	Elative
1PL	First Person Plural	GEN	Genitive
1SG	First Person Singular	ILL	Illative
2P	Second Person	IMP	Imperative
2PL	Second Person Plural	IND	Indicative
2SG	Second Person Singular	INDEF	Indefinite
3P	Third Person	INE	Inessive
3PL	Third Person Plural	INF	Non-finite in <i>-Om</i>
3SG	Third Person Singular	INTER	Interrogative
A	Adjective	INTERJ	Interjection
ABE	Abessive	IRR	Irrelevant
ABL	Ablative	LAT	Lative
ABS	Absolutive	LOC	Locative
ADV	Adverb	LV	Linking Vowel
APPROX	Approximative	MWN	Modifier without noun
ARG1	Primary Argument	N	Noun
ARG2	Secondary Argument	NA	Not attested, Not applicable
ASSOC	Associative	NEG	Negation
ATTR	Attribute	NOM	Nominative
AUX	Auxiliary	NB	Number
CARD	Cardinal	NP	Noun Phrase
CDX	Non-concatenable case and deictic marker	N-STAND	Non-Standard language
CLT	Clitic	NUM	Numeral
COLL	Collective	Nx	Number Marker
COM	Comitative	O	Object
COMP	Comparative	OBL	Oblique
CONJ	Conjunction	OVS	Object verb subject word order
CONTR	Contrastive	P	Person
CONNEG	Connegative	PERS	Personal
Cx	Case Marker	PL	Plural
DAT	Dative	POP	Adposition
DECL	Declension	POR	Possessor
DEF	Definite	POS	Part of speech
DEM	Demonstrative	POSS	Possessor Index
DES	Desiderative	PRED	Predication Marker
DIM	Diminutive	PRES	Present
DIST	Distal	PRET^I	Preterit I
DISTR	Distributive	PRET^{II}	Preterit II
Dx	Definiteness Marker	PRO-ADV	Pro-adverb

PRO-DET	Pro-determiner	SOD	Speaker-oriented demonstrative
PROH	Prohibitive		
PROL	Prolative	SOV	Subject object verb word order
PRON	Pronoun		
PRO-N	Pro-noun	STAND	Standard language
PRO-Q	Pro-quantifier	SVO	Subject verb object word order
PROX	Proximal		
PRP	Proper noun	TEMP	Temporalis
PRT	Particle	TRNSL	Translative
PTC-OZ	Past participle, Gerund in <i>-Ož</i>	Tx	Tense Marker
		v	Verb
PUM	Possessum/possessa	VI	Intransitive verb
Q	Quantifier	VT	Transitive verb
REFL	Reflexive/Intensive	wo	Word Order
REL	Relative	X	Unspecified agent argument in object conjugation
S	Subject		
SG	Singular		

0. Purpose

This study is dedicated to morphological adnominal person in Erzya with an outline of language-internal understanding of the phenomenon cluster as attested in present-day grammars and native writings, all presented, where possible, to the broadest readership – the English-reading world – who even today know little of the Erzya people and their language.

The Author sets the following goals:

- Provide an ample introduction to the Erzya language with consistently annotated, contextually sufficient examples from the literary or spoken language.
- Provide an adjusted and attested phonological account of the Erzya language compatible with the range and manifestation of adnominal-person marking. (See specifics in (3.) Phonology)
- Provide a morphological presentation of adnominal person within the scope of co-occurring inflexional phenomena, i.e. adnominal-person morphology as described in Erzya grammars. (See specifics in 4. MORPHOLOGY)
- Provide attestation and statistics for adnominal and adnominal-type person, both morphological and lexical, in the Erzya noun phrase, quantifiers, adpositional phrase and non-finite constructions in *-Om*.
- Investigate controversy in grammatical descriptions and phenomena attested in the research corpora, for example, the bearing of kin-term (high-animacy two-argument) semantics on the defectivity of the genitive paradigm in the possessive declension. (See specifics in (4.4.) PARADIGM DEFECTIVITY IN ERZYA POSSESSOR INDEXING.)
- Provide an attested account of contextual secondary declension with which to resolve controversies in the distinction between reflexive/intensive and genitive-form personal pronouns with secondary declension. (See specifics in (4.5.) ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND DISTINGUISHING PERSONAL PRONOUN PARADIGMS.)
- Provide data for an Erzya contribution to the typology of non-predication function person: The role of adnominal and adnominal-type person in Erzya adnominal, adpositional and non-finite syntax.

0.1. General outline

This treatise of adnominal person in the morphological system of Erzya approaches the problem from a morphological, compositional point of departure. Chapter 2 will establish a database to serve as the empirical basis of the study and source of word forms. It will provide a detailed outline of matters, such as morphological analysis, declension types, clause-constituent phrase syntax, as well as motivations and means of attestation for person. Chapter 3 will provide a qualification of phonemes used in transcription and phonological phenomena pertinent to the construction of an automatic two-level morphological parser, such as the one used in the analysis of a portion of the corpora. Sections (4.1.–4.2.) will give a description of the morphological composition of declinable words, and a description of the semantic notions involved in the division of Erzya stems for establishing declension classes pertinent to the study of adnominal-type person. Section (4.3.) will establish sublexica within the Erzya-language range of adnominal-person marking and provide data on compatibility of adnominal-person marking with case and part of speech. Section (4.4.) will deal with paradigm defectivity in Erzya possessor indexing (the genitive and dative slots of the possessive declension). And Section (4.5.) will address adnominal syntax and contextual secondary declension. Chapter 5 will then provide conclusions pertinent to the role of adnominal-person marking in the morphology of Erzya.

On transcription

The transcription used in this treatise of Erzya adheres to a relatively phonematic rendering of the Uralic Phonetic Alphabet. The liminal consonants phonetically represented as *k̄*, *m̄*, *p̄*... are rendered here as *k*, *m*, *p*... Although a high percentage of voice and palatal harmony can be predicted in the native Erzya vocabulary, it must be stressed that we are mainly dealing with the written registers of a living language, i.e. by dropping all word forms beginning with *b*, *d*, *z*, *ž* and *g*, typically non-native, we would lose one seventh of the entire text. Hence alveolars are mechanically rendered with palatal marking even where palatalization is predictable from context; voiced consonants are given as such even when voicing is contextually conditioned as in the Erzya word *tovžuro* <= *tov* ‘flour; dough’ + *šuro* ‘grain, cereal’. Likewise, the unrounded high central vowel *ɨ* and the velar nasal *ŋ* are mechanically rendered in all positions while the unrounded mid central vowel *ɛ*, which lacks attestation as a phoneme, is not (see Chapter 3).

1. Introduction

1.1. Introduction to Erzya

Location

The Erzya [*eřza*] are one of the two prominent “Mordvin” nations settled in what today is known as the Volga Region. The exonym and rather pejorative term “Mordvin” is used in the majority Russian language and by Russian authorities when making reference to representatives of the Erzya, Moksha [*mokšə*], Shoksha [*šokšə*], Teryukhan [*teřuxan*] and Qaratay [*mukšə*] peoples. Due to this ambiguity in the language of documentation, the individual groups have seldom been consistently distinguished in statistics and census questionnaires. For most practical purposes, the Qaratay, as we know them today, are a relatively integrated portion of the Tatar-speaking community and the Teryukhan, likewise, a relatively integrated portion of the Russian-speaking community, whereas the Erzya, Shoksha and Moksha all boast native speakers of their respective indigenous languages. According to historic documentation, the conglomerate term “Mordvin” has been used in reference to populations in Russia over the past few centuries that are scattered from near Nizhny Novgorod (Erzya: *Obran oš*) 56°20' N, in the north; to Novy Uzensk 50°27' N, in the south; Spassk, Penza Oblast 43°11' E, in the west, and Zlatoust' 59°40' E, in the east (see Sarv 2002). Somewhat extended western boundaries indicated by Kuussaari (1935: Kartta VII, XII) identify settlement activities in the vicinity of Tula (37°37' E), and probable traditional hunting range as far west as Bryansk (34°22' E). Thus indigenous settlements of the Erzya, Shoksha and Moksha speakers can be found on the territories of the Republic of Mordovia and the adjacent oblasts and republics of Nizhny-Novgorod, Chuvashia, Ulyanovsk, Tatarstan, Bashkortostan, Samara, Orenburg, Penza, Saratov and Tambov with newer, scattered settlements and populations in regions of the former Russian Empire and Soviet Union, as far east as Kamchatka, and beyond the borders of today's Russia in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Estonia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Turkmenistan, the Ukraine and Uzbekistan (see http://www.ethnologue.com/show_country.asp?name=RUE).

Statistically, there has been a marked fall in the Erzya population. Based on data from the latest All-Russian census (2002) the “Mordvin” population is recorded as 0.84 million. If we adhere to the commonly held belief that the Erzya comprise two-thirds of that total, or a generous half a million people, we will arrive at the equivalent of a native-speakers' figure estimated on the basis of the “Mordvin” population count of 1,153,516 in the 1989 census (cf. Lallukka 1992; Bartens 1999: 10; Estill 2004: 21). A slightly higher figure is provided by the Ethnologue report online with a world-wide Erzya population of 696,630. On the basis of these figures, we can hypothesize drastic mortality rates, language change, or change in social climate, which would be cause for

non-disclosure of ethnic background. The Erzya population is scattered, such that, while the Republic of Mordovia attests to a relative density of Erzya settlements, they only comprise about one sixth of the Republic population; the Republic is the home of less than thirty percent of the population subsumed by the term “Mordvin”, and that population makes up only one third of the Republic population. In the Mordovian Republic, the Moksha population makes up approximately one half of the so-called Mordvin population while the Erzya and Shoksha make up the other half – the Shoksha are generally dealt with as speakers of a Western (in the western part of the Republic, cf. Ethnologue) Erzya dialect that has been exposed to extensive Moksha influence, although there are certain aspects of the Shoksha idiom and culture that might be used to distinguish them as equals with the Erzya and Moksha (D. Tsygankin, p.c., n.d.).

As a minority in a republic in close proximity to the nation's capital, the Erzya have continually been faced with assimilative pressure. With the end of the 1980s a strengthening of cultural and linguistic awareness in the Baltic States was observed, which might be seen as symptomatic of what was happening in the Soviet Union as a whole, especially in the non-central regions of what is now the Russian Federation. Thus it comes as no surprise that ethnic awareness from the Erzya aspect was a grass-roots affair stemming from outside the center-oriented Republic of Mordovia, in fact, it came from places such as Buguruslan, where cultural and lingual plurality are accepted, everyday elements of life (V. Tingayev, p.c., 2002). From the beginning of the new millennium, however, centralization and a call for unity have become ever more prominent; where before (1989 census) people were proud to disclose their ethnic origins, now (2002 census) only people actively aware of an ethnic background other than that of the default Russian tend to be counted as non-Russians. In the Republic of Mordovia indication of ethnic background is no longer given in the internal registration document “passport”, which contains information on employment, marital status, domicile, etc.; Tatarstan, for example, still provides information on ethnic background.

When my first son was born in the year 2000, in Saransk, Mordovia, there were two doctors present – one a Russian and the other an Erzya. The Russian asked me what nationality I intended to write down for my new-born son, to which, I replied that I understood the policy was to get away from making specific mention of ethnic background. The Russian doctor persisted, however, that indeed you can have ethnic background registered, and after a pause he added: Write “Russian”. I calmly responded by stating that I did not understand his logic; to me the child from an Erzya mother on one side and a father of U.S.A. citizenship from a multi-ethnic background on the other could only be registered as “Tatar” (The Russian Federation is the home of approximately 5.35 million Tatars). This response, naturally, took the one doctor like a bucket of cold water, whereas the other was humored by both the twist of the story and his colleague's reaction. But, perhaps, there was some logic to the choice of Tatar or the closely related Bashkir, namely, they embody a formidable presence opposing a monolithic, central-oriented Russian Federation and, where there are two self-aware cultural-lingual groups, e.g. Bashkortostan, third-tier ethnic groups are more tolerated. Erzya-speaking settle-

ments can be located throughout the Volga Region, but officially they might be difficult to locate or enumerate; in the majority Russian language and most census statistics there have nearly always been figures for the pejorative, cumulative Mordvin while the autonyms Erzya, Moksha, Shoksha, Teryukhan and Qaratay receive little mention.

Traditionally, the “Mordvins” have gained their wealth in the forests and fertile fields of the southerly forest zone. They are known for their honey production, furs and falconry, but economic growth has been achieved through conversion to agriculture, which, unfortunately for them, made them desirable targets for taxation and conquest. In the year 1221, their western neighbor Yuri Vsevolodovich, prince of Vladimir-Suzdal, decided to erect a fortress on their territory at what is now known as Nizhny-Novgorod (Erzya: *Obran oš*). Eight years later, in 1229, the Erzyans under prince Purgas attempted to retake this land, but to no avail; in 1236 the “Mordvin” homelands along with the Volga-Bulgar State all fell to the Mongol-Tatars and remained a dependency until 1552 (further literature: Bryzhinski, M. 1983: *Porovt*; Abramov 1988: *Purgaz*). While the Bulgars and Tatars both regarded the “Mordvins” as a source of taxes and therefore left them to maintain their own social structures and settlements in the deep forests, the same cannot be said of their Russian neighbors (cf. Sarv 2002). Thus the Erzya can be plotted in the mutual periphery of Slavic and Turkic cultures, Islamic, Christian and perhaps Hindu religions; and their traditional settlements span parts of the traditional Russian dialect break-down of the easternmost central and southern variants.

The ethnonym *Erzya* [*eřza* ~ *æřzæ*] has been aligned by some with the people “Arisa” mentioned in the Khazar King Joseph's letter, dated 961 (cf. Klima 1995; Tsygankin 2000: 15; Official site of the Chuvash Republic: <http://gov.cap.ru/hierarchy_cap.asp?page=../86/3743/1046/1050>). This was one of the many people who paid tribute to the Khazar King, but, as Tsygankin notes, no etymology has been given for the word. The exonym *Mordvin*, however, can be traced back to *Mordens*, one of the people defeated by Ermanaricus ([Jordanes' *Getica* 551: XXIII, 116]). This word, however, only has a mutual cognate candidate in the Erzya and Moksha languages in the form *mirde* ‘husband, male spouse’ (cf. Zaicz 1998, 2006), whereas dialects of the Moksha language also attest to compound word forms where the final element is *mor*, e.g. *ćora mor* ‘man (lit. singular of man-folk)’, *ava mor* ‘woman (lit. singular of woman-folk)’ (cf. Bryzhinski 1991: *Эрямодо надобия* 134).

The Erzya language

The Erzya language is a Volga-Finnic language of the Uralic language family, with closely related kindred in Moksha and the geographically closely situated but more distantly related Hill and Meadow Mari languages. Due to the sparse distribution of Erzya and Moksha settlements, there are few settlements where the two languages are used as a means of mutual communication, and such places are invariably beyond the reaches of the Republic of Mordovia (D. Tsygankin, p.c., 1997). According to popular belief, the Moksha language attests a high percentage of Turkic loanwords not found in the

Erzya language, and the Erzya language has a higher percentage of Russian loanwords. While the former claim might readily be observed in texts, e.g. Paasonen (SUSA XV,2 1897: 1–64) indicates 193 glosses of Turkic origin from which nearly 60% are attested in Erzya and over 85% in Moksha, the question of Slavic versus Russian-language influence and interaction with first-nation languages from a diachronic perspective has yet to be posed in the study of Erzya lexica, e.g. *kravat* ‘bed (Russian dialect variation in the palatalization of final “t”)’ (cf. Ryabov 1931); *kopjor* ‘dill (Russian *ukrop*, Bulgarian *kopur*, Czech *kopr*)’, and *koridor* ~ *kalidor* ‘corridor (variation in the representation of the liquids *l* and *r* also attested in the majority Russian language and other minority languages such as Komi (cf. Kalima 1910: 59))’.

Since contact between the Erzya and Moksha languages is relatively limited, and their native speakers might resort to using a third, standardized language (Russian) for mutual communication with speakers of the other language, the concept of people speaking in “Mordvin” is close to that of a Dane and a Swede speaking **at** each other in their own respective languages, and having someone claim that they are speaking *Skandinaviska*. But there actually are at least two schools of thought on the question of how many “Mordvin” languages there are, and the development of a mutually comprehensible Erzya-Moksha literary language is an interesting concept that has appeared and reappeared. Although the portions of the Bible have been translated into Erzya and Moksha, a tradition commenced at the beginning of the nineteenth century, plans were made in the 1920s (Bartens 1999: 22) to establish a mutual literary language for Erzya and Moksha alike. By 1928 two subcommittees had been established, one Erzya and the other Moksha, who inadvertently retained two literary languages, the Moksha language based on the Krasnoslobodsk dialect, and the Erzya language based on the dialect spoken in Kozlovka, i.e. the Kozlovka of today’s Atyashevo raion in the Republic of Mordovia. Initial documentation of this Erzya dialect was provided by the Russian linguist Bubrikh, a student of Shakhmatov, in 1930, and an extensive grammar including reference to this language variant was contributed by the ethnographer, historian, enlightener, Evsev’ev, a native Erzya and Chuvash speaker, originally from Malye Karmaly, Chuvashia, in 1928–29. In the 1930s, however, the Kozlovka-Mokshalei (Central-dialect) base of the language was broadened to include more features from the Insar or Western dialect, which meant development away from the Alatyř’ or Northwestern dialect, familiar in the Erzya literature of the nineteenth century (see more on dialects below). In the late 1980s, when, at the end of the Soviet Era, new efforts were made to translate the Bible, an attempt was made to develop a mutual vocabulary for the two languages to be used in translations of Biblical texts, but once again, the languages were seen to be too distantly related for such an undertaking, a mutual vocabulary would only estrange the readership (N. Adushkina, p.c., 1995).

Presently there are measures being taken in Saransk, the capital of Mordovia, to manufacture an artificial “Mordvin” language. This initiative is not one made by the Writers’ Union, nor is it tailored by native school teachers, rather it is one of people who do not themselves actively contribute to the literatures of either language, but do

have a strong sway in the influence of publication finances. They profess an attitude aligned with the thinkings of a young Feoktistov (1960: 63–82), who alluded to an extremely high percentage of mutual comprehensible language material in the Erzya novel “Lavginov” by Kolomasov, and the sympathies of some linguistic thinking in Hungary. Keresztes (e.g. 1990, 1995: 47–55) outlines a closeness between the languages of Erzya and Moksha, but he offers little concrete data to verify this closeness. Gheno (1995: 57–61) makes reference to Keresztes and indicates a 54.04% of mutual vocabulary in a quantity of 1062 glosses. This percentage, might be promising for planned language development over 200 years (the Norwegian policy for a mutual “samnorsk” was abandoned December 13, 2002), but a glance at the mutual vocabularies of Erzya and Moksha indicated by larger dictionaries of the languages appear to show much less cohesion between them, see table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Statistics on headword entries in *Mordwinisches Wörterbuch* I–IV

Entries	Erzya		Moksha		Mutual		
	Figures	%	Figures	%	Gross total	Figures	%
Headwords	22,620	61.6%	18,271	49.8%	36,689	4,202	11.5%
First headwords of root articles	4,470	64.3%	2,911	41.9%	6,955	456	6.5%
Mutual roots	5,100	73.3%	4,592	66%	6,955	2916	41.9%
Mutual roots less Russian cognates	3,011	69.4%	3,108	71.6%	4,338	1,781	41%
Mutual roots less Tatar cognates	5,021	75.4%	4,485	67.3%	6,659	2,847	42.8%
Mutual roots without Russian or Tatar cognates	2,934	69.5%	3,003	71.1%	4,223	1,714	40.6%
Minimal mutual roots ratio to root total	2,934	42.2%	3,003	43.2%	4,223	1,714	24.6%

The *Mordwinisches Wörterbuch* (a dialect dictionary of the Erzya and Moksha languages (1990–1996), based on the extensive collections of Heikki Paasonen; henceforth “MW”) contains over 2700 pages of dialect representations from the two languages in approximately 36,689 articles of which about 61.6% exhibit Erzya attestations of word forms and 49.8% exhibit Moksha attestations. Since the word articles are written with etymological cohesion between the two languages, we should expect a high percentage of mutual intelligibility, but only about 11.5% of the word articles contain attestation from both languages. Inspection for alignment of first headwords in stem entries indicates only 6.5% of mutual vocabulary, but if we assume mutually comprehensible morphology for the two languages and count root articles attesting headword articles from both languages, we will arrive at a mutual vocabulary of only 41.9%. In reducing the

number of roots by the number of Russian cognates we find a nearly one percent drop in mutual vocabulary, whereas an analogous removal of Tatar cognates renders a one percent rise. Finally, if we remove all roots with either Russian or Tatar cognates the mutual vocabulary drops to 40.6%, which, in fact, only represents 24.6% of the 6,955 roots attested in the dictionary.

More recently both maximalist and minimalist approaches have been offered for attestation of mutual vocabulary. Luutonen, Mosin and Shchankina (Reverse Dictionary of Mordvin, 2004) have produced a list of over 75,000 words from the two languages, but partially due to the rigid reverse-alphabetizing a mutual lexicon of only about 9% is attested, and this is only on the morphological and part-of-speech levels, i.e. no specific semantics are involved. Polyakov & Rueter (2004) published a brief morphology and three-language dictionary Erzya-Moksha-Russian Moksha-Erzya-Russian, but the dictionary has only about 3500 entries with a focus on maximalizing the representation of mutually comprehensible vocabulary. Needless to say, the cohesion of the two languages is difficult to attest on the basis of lexical research conducted thus far.

Erzya dialects

According to Tsygankin (2000b: 20–21) research in Erzya dialectology is extremely disproportionate. At present it may be stated that extensive work has been conducted in the research of Erzya-language forms spoken in the Republic of Mordovia. Outside of the Republic, however, the language and its variants have not received that same attention. In fact, at present there are no publications on the dialects spoken in the Ulyanovsk, Kuibyshevsk or Orenburg Oblasts, where a considerable portion of the Erzya-speaking population is settled. Hence, comparative linguistics dealing with the development of a literary language and its representation of phenomena attestable in the greater Erzya language is profoundly limited.

The division of Erzya dialects according to Bubrikh distinguishes five basic dialect types. The dialects can be presented as: (1) the Central or Kozlovka-Mokshalei dialects; (2) the Western or Insar dialects; (3) the Northwestern or Alatyry' dialects; (4) the Southeastern or Sura dialects, and (5) the mixed or Drakino-Shoksha dialects (see Feoktistov 1990: XXXIV-XLII; Tsygankin 2000b: 19–40; Ermuškin 2004: 5–10, as well as individual treatises: Davydov 1963: 118–233 (Bol'she-Ignatovski dialect – Alatyry'); Markov 1961: 7–99 (Prialytyski dialect – Alatyry'); Nad'kin 1968: 3–198 (Nizhnep'yanski – Alatyry'); Ob''edkin 1961: 100–196 (Staro-Turdakovski dialect – Insar); Tsygankin 1961: 294–395 (Shugurova dialect – Sura); Yakushkin 1961: 197–293 (Drakinski dialect – Drakino-Shoksha)). The problem is that this set of dialect types is little more than a depiction of the phonetic characteristics of the various Erzya dialects on the territory of the Republic of Mordovia, where, as stated above, only about one third of the Erzya are settled, and it has little to offer for the task of differentiating between the local dialects of the Erzya language on the basis of morphology (cf. Tsygankin 2000: 21).

Erzya-language in publications and its development as a literary language

Over a period of about 300 years, the Erzya language has developed from its debut in glosses, appearance in translated texts, and first-nation folk literature to original fiction and non-fiction of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The “Mordvin” word lists of Nicolaes Witsen ([1692] 1705), which, from a modern perspective, might be recognized as representing mainly dialects of the Moksha language (see Feoktistov & Saarinen 2005: 13), mark the beginning of an era for recognizable words in print. The 1700s see additional publications with more vocabularies: Strahlenberg (1730), Damaskin (1785) and Pallas (1787-89), to mention a few. The first publication with long connected texts in the Erzya language, however, does not appear until the Erzya translation of the Gospel comes out in 1821, and the remainder of the New Testament is published in 1827. Original Erzya-language texts date from the publication of *Образцы мордовской народной словесности I and II* (‘Samples from Mordvin Folk Literature’) in Kazan (1882–1883), but the publication of original Erzya-language literature does not actually gain momentum until the 1920s when it suddenly sees a large-scale influx in the media and the schools, in fact, most treaties of the history of the written language regard the post-revolutionary years as the birth time of a widely published Erzya literary language, whereas, actually speaking, the orthographic norms, adhered to even today, can be observed to correlate directly to those used in the texts of 1882–1883, and subsequent mainly ecclesiastical publications. The Erzya media begins growing in the 1920s and has built itself a reputation by the early 1930s (cf. Dyomin 2001); therefore it would be pertinent to speak of first-language orthography standards dating back to the 1880s, but first-language popular media to the 1920s.

In the 1920s, the Erzya language appears across the Soviet Union in Simbirsk, Samara, Moscow and other centers. Growth can be observed in the late twenties and early thirties with a wealth of new writers coming from outside of what is today known as the Republic of Mordovia. The development of the literary language, based on a dialect from within the Autonomous Region at Kozlovka, as declared by a group of teachers and enthusiasts in Moscow in the mid-1920s, sets a normative framework for Evsev'ev's extensive grammar “Основы мордовской грамматики, Эрзянь грамматика” (‘The rudiments of Mordvin grammar (in Russian)’, ‘Erzya Grammar (in Erzya)’), it also provides Bubrikh with a purpose for field work resulting in a description of the phonetics and morphology of the Erzya dialect at Kozlovka (1930). Despite the fact that the Central Kozlovka dialect had been declared the basis of the literary standard in the mid 1920s, publications in Saransk showed almost indifference to that form of the language in the 1930s. Efforts appear to have been made to reduce variation in the word stems, and when the language standard materials of 1955 are published, no mention at all is made of the Central dialect. Although, students of the language today (information from own teaching experience in Saransk 1998–2004) are often aware of the existence of a Kozlovka standard, they seldom have any actual knowledge of the variety of language spoken there.

From the late 1930s with the purges of 1937–38 to the end of the Stalin Era a re-orientation towards a centralized, Russian majority-oriented society is established. This can be observed in orthographic and lexical developments, on the one hand, and the translation of Russian literature into Erzya, on the other, whereas the development of the Erzya language comes to a virtual standstill. The late 1950' sees the re-emergence of a regular Erzya-language literary-social journal “Suran' tolt” ‘Lights/fires on the Sura’, the rehabilitation of cultural figures, and literature illustrating Erzya life as an active peripheral part of development leading to achievements in the U.S.S.R. The “Suran' tolt” journal can be seen as a symptom of the re-emergence of literary regularity, the addressing of themes other than the omnipresent Patriotic War, and this development is complemented by the presence of semiweekly newspapers. Thus the Erzya language continues to evolve with writers from various dialect backgrounds, each adding his or her own bit of variation to the literary language. The quarterly eventually began to appear 11–12 times a year, and in time changed its name back to the original *Syatko* ‘Spark’ of the 1920s and 1930s.

From the late 1960s and early 1970s, native-language orientation in the schools begins to lose its favorability (oral information from the Mordovia and Komi Republics) – apparently this was a tendency in different parts of the U.S.S.R. Needless to say, this time period saw the decline of subjects taught in Erzya in the schools, with only the native language itself retained as a relatively standard subject in the upper grades of the village schools, whereas the first four grades were generally the ones where the first-nation Erzya children were afforded instruction in their native language in the village setting.

In the 1980s we see a new emergence of Erzya awareness. The children's supplement *pionereñ vajgel* ‘The voice of the pioneers’ in the *Syatko* journal begins appearing as an independent publication and changes its name to *čilisema* ‘Dawn’. Grass-roots awareness brings a rebirth of interest in the language; many closed regions are opened to foreigners, and scholars are encouraged to involve themselves in international projects, e.g. “Ersäläis-suomalainen sanakirja” by Jaana Niemi and Mikhail Mosin (1995), and the subsequent “Suomalais-ersäläinen sanakirja” by Alho Alhoniemi, Nina Agafonova and Mikhail Mosin (1999).

In the 1990s and beginning of the new millennium, first-language instruction for subjects other than the native language became an issue. What started out in village primary schools brought about a new trend in publication practices, and now use of other new media is spreading, i.e. the scattered population of Erzya speakers actively utilize services offered by mobile phones and the Internet in Erzya. The publication of readers in environmental studies and mathematics has been announced for the lower grades, as well as a complete curriculum for Erzya language in the primary and secondary schools. Two encyclopedic works of over 1000 pages each have been translated and printed in the Erzya language. Although very few of these books were actually printed – perhaps 2000–3000 each, their mere existence provides the language with esteem that is necessary for establishing its value as a medium of cultural cohesion.

Only recently (2009), a four-year project has received support from the Republic of Mordovia to concoct a mutual Mordvin language for the internationally recognized two separate languages of Erzya and Moksha (cf. ISO 639; <<http://mariuver.wordpress.com/2009/02/06/mordovskii-jazyk/>>). The outcome of such a project might simply be that the two standards lose all funding and the position of the majority language, Russian, would be further instilled while Erzya and Moksha would lose all credibility as official languages, compare Ahlqvist's understanding of Erzya and Moksha mutual comprehension, below.

“Om dessa tvänne dialekters olikhet sinsemellan är här icke stället att tala; som ett kriterium deröfver må gälla den omständighet, att en Ersän ej förstår sin mokschanska broders tal annorlunda än såsom ett slags karrikatur öfver sitt eget tungomål och att de sinsemellan vanligen nyttja Ryskan såsom medel att göra sig begripliga för hvarandra; I allmänhet sagdt är denna olikhet dock knappt store än den emellan Finskan och Estniskan.” (Ahlqvist 1859: 3)

‘There is no room here to discuss the differences between these two dialects; one criterion for that might be the state of affairs that an Erzya understands the speech of his Moksha friend's as nothing other than some kind of jest making of his own language, and that ordinarily they use Russian as a mutual means of making themselves understood; generally speaking, this difference is scarcely more than that between Finnish and Estonian.’ (The free translation from Swedish is my own).

The Erzya language is threatened as an entity on the official front: Only time will tell, whether this language will be allowed to contribute to our understanding of the world around us through its own independent maintenance and development as a medium and repository of cultural wealth and knowledge. As a written medium, this independent role has developed for nearly 200 years, so, perhaps, it is unlikely to fall over night.

Research in the Erzya language

Over the years of its development as a literary language – 1821 to the present – the Erzya language has attracted the attention of scholars near and far. The first grammar of the Erzya language (written by C. von der Gabelentz 1838–39) was based on the language used in the first Erzya translation of the Gospel, published in 1821 and compared with what was available (see Mithridates 1, 549. IV, 236 ff. in Gabelentz 1839: 238). Even though Gabelentz found much fault with the language of the translation, his grammatical observations, based on what today would be termed parallel-corpus findings, are remarkable, and definitely indicative of not only a seasoned linguist's interpretation of the Erzya language in the Biblical texts, but also a description of phonetic, morphological and lexical phenomena still of interest in the language today. As an attempt to overcome the burden of information disseminated to the contrary, let's take a look at what Gabelentz actually wrote (cf. Evsev'ev 1963: 316 citing [Ahlqvist 1861]).

“Noch muss ich der Quelle erwähnen, aus welcher ich geschöpft habe: es ist dies die mordwinische Uebersetzung der vier Evangelien, welche im J. 1821 in St. Petersburg auf Kosten der russischen Bibelgesellschaft gedruckt worden ist. Leider ist davon nicht viel Löbliches zu sagen. Der Uebersetzer mag wohl die Sprache praktisch, erlernt haben und derselben nach Dolmetscherart vollkommen mächtig gewesen seyn; allein er hat sie auf unwissenschaftliche und unkritische Weise gehandhabt. Nicht allein, dass von einer Orthographie bei ihm eigentlich gar nicht die Rede seyn kann, er hat auch bei dem Gebrauch der grammatischen Formen sich Ungenauigkeiten erlaubt, die vielleicht im gemeinen Leben vorkommen mögen, die aber in der Schrift, und noch dazu in einer Bibelübersetzung, nicht gestattet werden sollten. Dabei ist er um die Reinheit der Sprache wenig besorgt gewesen; auch wo ihm ein oder mehrere gute mordwinische Ausdrücke zu Gebote standen, hat er unbekümmert russische Wörter eingemischt, die ebenfalls theils wohl durch täglichen Verkehr sich in die Umgangssprache eingeschlichen haben mögen, theils vielleicht, als rein biblisch, sich nur mit einiger Mühe durch ein entsprechendes heimisches Wort ersetzen liessen. Könnte man dies aber auch noch allenfalls hingehn lassen, so ist es doch in der That unerträglich, dass sogar eine Menge Partikeln aus dem Russischen entlehnt worden sind. For those who only have a slight conception of the peculiarities presented by the use or rather non-use of particles. Wer nur einigermaßen weiss, welche Eigentümlichkeiten gerade der Gebrauch oder vielmehr Nichtgebrauch der Partikeln in den finnisch-tatarischen Sprachen darbietet, wird sich eine Vorstellung davon machen können, wie diese russischen Fremdlinge sich hier ausnehmen, und welchen Einfluss ihr Gebrauch selbst auf die Construction und den Styl ausüben muss. Sollten auch — was merkwürdig genug wäre — jene russischen Partikeln wirklich in die Umgangssprache aufgenommen worden seyn, so hatte ein richtiger Takt den Uebersetzer bewegen müssen, sie aus der Schrift zu entfernen. Da sie aber nun einmal gebraucht worden sind, so habe ich freilich nicht umhin gekonnt, sie auch in dieser Grammatik anzuführen; allein sie sind, ein Luxus, dessen die Sprache entrathen kann.” (Gabelentz 1839: 237–38)

‘Still, I must mention the source which I have drawn upon: it is the Mordvinian translation of the Gospel, which was printed in 1821 in St. Petersburg at the expense of the Russian Bible Society. Unfortunately, there is not much praiseworthy to be said of it. The translator may well have learned the language in practice, and he may have attained an interpreter-like fluency in it, but he has wielded the language in an unscientific and uncritical manner. Not only is there a lack of orthographic consistency, but the translator has taken liberties with grammatical forms, which might, in deed, occur in ordinary life, but which in writing and especially in the translation of the Holy Scriptures should not be allowed. He has shown little concern for the purity of the language, and even where he has had several good Mordvinian phrases to choose from, he has carelessly mixed in Russian words, which may well have slipped into the text from everyday vernacular usage, or, perhaps, he has just found it difficult to replace a purely biblical word with the corresponding native words. And even if one were to allow for these shortcomings, it is still intolerable that such an amount of particles have been directly borrowed from the

Russian. Anyone who even has the slightest knowledge of what peculiarities are presented by the use, or rather non-use of particles in the Finno-Tatar languages can imagine how to do away with these Russian strangers here, and can comprehend what effect their use might have on the construction and style. And even if it were the case – strange as it may seem – that these Russian particles have actually been incorporated into the vernacular, the proper stance of the translator would be to remove them from the Scriptures. Since they have only been used once, I cannot help but admit that they have been cited in this grammar; they are, however, a luxury which the language can do without. (This rough translation is my own.)’

Since the translation of the Gospel was prepared in Kazan (present-day Tatarstan), it comes as no surprise that the language in the first Erzya Gospel might deviate from the language variants spoken in the Mordovian Republic of today. Certain orthographic renditions in the text, however, would indicate that several forms of the language are represented, and therefore one might assume the participation of several people in this first translation of the Gospel, see examples below.

- (1) саземсь *sažems* ‘to take’ (Mark 3: 20) ~ MW: Kad, Kal, Kažl, Šir (Shoksha)
саймексь *sajmeks* ‘to take’ (John 5: 10) ~ MW: VVr (Alatyr’ dialect)
саемсь *sajems* ‘to take’ (John 11: 57) ~ MW: Ba, Bugur, Hl, Jeg, Mar, NSurk, SŠant, Večk (Elsewhere)
- (2) нейсы *nej+si* see_V+IND.PRES.PRED-2SG>3PL ‘you see them’ (Mark 13: 2) ~ Keresztes 1999: 214 (NW and NE dialects)
нейсамискь *nej+samišk* see_V+IND.PRES.PRED-2>1P ‘you see me/us (at least one of the arguments is not in the singular)’ (John 14: 19) ~ Keresztes 1999: 245 (S dialect)
- (3) тятямокь *täta+mok* father_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG ‘our father’ (Luke 3: 8, 11: 2) ~ Kozlovka (Bubrikh 1930); Alatyr’ (cf. Davydov 1963; Nad’kin 1968)
Тятянокь *täta+nok* father_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.PL ‘our fathers’ (John 4: 20) ~ dialects with no distinction for number in 1PL indexing.

Infinitive forms of the three renditions of the infinitive ‘to take’ in (1) demonstrate word forms that, according to MW, would encompass most dialect variation of today, from the Shoksha areas of the west where the verb has a *-ž-* in its stem, to the *-mks* translative infinitive of certain Alatyr’ subdialects, and finally to the form familiar from the literary standard *sajems* ‘to take’. The conjugation forms in (2), according to dialect variation shown by Keresztes (1999: 214) would appear to represent language variant from opposite ends of the dialect continuum. And finally the differentiation of singular and plural possessa of the first person plural possessor as demonstrated in (3) would correlate to Alatyr’-dialect paradigms and the tendencies in some parts of the Kozlovka-Mokshalei dialect.

Subsequent descriptions of the Erzya language demonstrate higher proficiency of the writers in the language. F. J. Wiedemann published a second grammar of the Erzya language in 1865, where he was able to extrapolate upon the findings of Gabelentz (1839), the Moksha grammar of Ornatov (1838) and Ahlqvist (1861), as well as to utilize native-language informants living in Estonia. This Erzya grammar and short vocabulary (approx. 3,650 Erzya headwords and 6300 German) along with that of Ahlqvist's Moksha grammar were then the basis of a grammar of the Mordvin languages by Budenz (1869). In 1903 came the study of Mordvin phonetics by Paasonen, a second edition to his dissertation of 1983, followed by a chrestomathy (1909). The following year saw the appearance of a very extensive collection of folklore with a grammar section dedicated to a small dialect area by Shakhmatov (1910). The first grammar written by a native speaker was completed for print in 1928 by M. E. Evsev'ev.

After the death of Evsev'ev in 1931, work in grammar has continued to this very day. Important native authors include: A. P. Ryabov; M. N. Kolyadyonkov; A. P. Feoktistov; D. V. Tsygankin; G. I. Ermushkin; N. S. Alyamkin; L. P. Vodyasova, N. Aasmäe and M. D. Imaikina, to name a few, and non-natives: D. V. Bubrikh, V. A. Serebrennikov; A. Alhoniemi, R. Bartens, K. Heikkilä, E. Itkonen, M. Kahla, P. Ravila, P. Saukkonen, G. Stipa; L. Keresztes, E. Mészáros, K. Rédei, G. Zaicz; V. Hallap, V. Pall; E. Lewy. Each generation has produced a variety of grammar writers: some who have underlined the language usage of particular authors with a tendency toward prescriptive grammar writing, and others who have painstakingly described very specific areas of the language.

The Erzya literary language of today

Erzya is known for its virtually free word stress, phonetic features, such as, vowel and palatal harmony, voicing, etc., ample regular inflection and postpositions, and relatively free word order with variation between SOV and SVO. Sentence stress is the predominant cause of stress variation in Erzya words, whereas Erzya words can take main stress on all feet (cf. also Ryabov 1935; Estill 2004). The phonology of the language, most recently described by Imaikina (2008), suggests certain shortcomings in the use of an unmodified Cyrillic alphabet. The morphology displays extensive declensional and conjugational possibilities, as well as combinations of the two. This is a feature which, in some instances, can be set in contrast with syntactic expressions of the same semantics; genitive-form personal pronouns can, to some extent, be used alternately or in tandem with possessor indexing, and nominal conjugation is sometimes subject to variation in independent versus dependent person marking. Word order in Erzya has always presented a problem due to its variation, this problem seems to be rooted in strategies involving inflectional marking, NP presence and discourse function.

Phonology

The standard Erzya language is written with an unmodified Cyrillic alphabet, and this leads scholars to enumerate twenty-seven consonant phonemes instead of twenty-eight and five vowels instead of six (cf. Zaicz 1998: 185; Bartens 1999: 27; Imaikina 2008). These figures include the phonemes *f*, *x* and *ɨ* (attested in the dialects to various extents are typical of loanwords), and *ŋ*, which is indigenous and forms some minimal pairs with *n* and *ń* before velar plosives (see major consonant and vowel allophones below, and also section 3.1.)

Table 1.2 Major consonant allophones in the Erzya language

			Labial		Coronal		Dorsal	
			Bilabial	Labio-dental	Alveolar	Post-Alveolar	Palatal	Velar
Stops	Nasals		<i>m</i>		<i>n</i>		<i>ń</i>	<i>ŋ</i>
	Plosives	Voiceless	<i>p</i>		<i>t</i>		<i>tʲ</i>	<i>k</i>
Affricates		Voiced	<i>b</i>		<i>d</i>		<i>dʲ</i>	<i>g</i>
		Voiceless			<i>c</i>	<i>č</i>	<i>č</i>	
Fricatives		Voiced			<i>dz</i>	<i>dž</i>	<i>dž</i>	
		Voiceless		<i>f</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>x</i>
Approximants		Voiced		<i>v</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>ž</i>	<i>ž</i>	<i>ɣ</i>
			<i>w</i>				<i>j</i>	
Liquids	Laterals				<i>l</i>		<i>lʲ</i>	
	Trills		<i>ʙ</i>		<i>r</i>		<i>ɾ</i>	

In the discussion of allophonic variation in the framework of this thesis the uppercase letters *O*, *A*, *N*, *T* and *D* are used to indicate archiphonemes whose reflexes on the surface level are determined by their phonetic contexts. In affix-initial position the archiphoneme *O* has a reflex in *o* when the preceding stem ends in a vowel, whereas it appears as a mid vowel with front/back harmony qualities determined by the preceding phonetic context if the stem ends in a consonant. (This archiphonic choice is in contrast with the encoding used by some Western scholars, who would include the linking vowel as a part of the stem – perhaps an etymological solution –, and the Saransk scholars, who have determined that the linking vowel, a phonetically dependent segment, should be separated from both the stem and the affixes. (Cf. Keresztes 1990: 75, and Hamari 2007: 54: *riveže-ńtʲ* ‘fox_N+GEN.DEF.SG, whereas this author would attach the linking vowel to the affix *riveže-enʲtʲ*, and the Saransk School would advocate a rendition in *riveže-e-ńtʲ*.) The archiphoneme *A* has reflexes in *a* and *o* according to a progressive dissimilatory mid/

low harmony. Finally, the *N*, *T* and *D* archiphonemes all have reflexes in palatalized/non-palatalized forms determined by vowel and palatal-harmony context, whereas it will be noted that there exist surface-level palatalized *ń* and *t'* phonemes without non-palatalized counterparts. (There are no archiphonemes *R*, *L* and *S* in this treatise, whereas liquids tend to retain a distinction palatalized/non-palatalized in inflection (cf. Imaikina 2008: 185) and the alveolar fricative alone appears to have retained its proto-language palatalized/non-palatalized distinction. (See table 3.6 and preceding discussion, cf. Abondolo 1987: 219-233.)

Allophonic variation can be attributed to several features. These include: palatal harmony and progressive voicing. Although the phonematic distinction *n* versus *ń* is attested in word-initial position, e.g. *naka* ‘here you go!’ *ńaka* ‘doll’, it is quite marginal. There appears to be a greater presence of back/front allomorphs, such as those found in the 1SG possessor index *-ON*, e.g. *skalon* ‘my cows’ and *lišmeń* ‘my horses’. The indefinite genitive in *-Oń*, having no allomorphic variation, renders forms, such as *skaloń* ‘of a cow; of cows’ and *lišmeń* ‘of a horse; of horses’. Thus we are provided with attestation for separate nasal phonemes: *n/ń* \leq *N* and *ń*. This attestation of allophonic variation, generally limited to stops (*N*, *T*, *D*), leaves a phonetic gap, namely, non-palatalized alveolar stops in front-vowel contexts, where the presence of a non-palatalized stop would indicate a recent Russian loan word, e.g. *fen* ‘fan’, *kit* ‘whale’, and *šved* ‘Swede’. The notion of progressive voicing affects onset consonants both word-initially and internally, such that, at the beginning of a word voicing of plosives, affricates and fricative is either indicative of loanword origin, as in, *dźudo* ‘judo’ or the presence of a preceding voiced consonant, not necessarily in the same phrase, e.g. [*kudow zjʹt*] *home_N.LAT arrive_V.IND.PRETL.PRED-2SG* ‘are you back home’. Here the voiced [z] is the result of progressive voicing. Finally the polemics of [w] versus [v] can be observed in the fact that the pronunciation of labiodentals in native words is limited to onset position, before non-labial vowels, in the rime the tendency is to use [w].

Table 1.3 Major vowel allophones in the Erzya language

	Front	Central	Back
High	<i>i</i>	<i>ɨ</i>	<i>u</i>
Mid	<i>e</i>	<i>ɛ</i>	<i>o</i>
Low		<i>a</i>	

Consideration of the Erzya vowel allophones involves the two separate questions of the high central vowel and the mid central vowel. While the mid central vowel *ɛ* might be attested after the alveolar fricative and post-alveolars in sequences, such as, *s + ɛ* or with intermittent consonant *s + [t | k] + ɛ* it is only attested as forming near minimal pairs, e.g. [*šeskɛ*] ‘right then’ versus [*šesk'e*] ‘mosquito’. The high central vowel *ɨ*, on the contrary, can be attested without preceding alveolars, e.g. *pjrad'ems* ‘to puff’, see attestations in chapter 3.

Morphology

Declension

A set of at least fifteen different morphemes can be attested as co-occurring with complex NPS in grammatical (subject, direct object, indirect object and complement), local and modifier functions, see table 1.4.

Table 1.4 Indefinite declension table for complex NP heads *kudo* ‘house; home’

Label	Example	Gram.	Local	Modifier
NOM	<i>kudo</i>	‘home/house’	+	
GEN	<i>kudo+ń</i>	‘of [home a/the house]’		+
DAT	<i>kudo+ńeń</i>	‘for the home’	+	
ABL	<i>kudo+do</i>	‘about [home a house]’	+	
INE	<i>kudo+so</i>	‘[at home in a/the house]’	+	+
ELA	<i>kudo+sto</i>	‘from [home a/the house]’	+	+
ILL	<i>kudo+s</i>	‘into a/the house’	+	+
LAT	<i>kudo+v</i>	‘home (GOAL)’		+
PROL	<i>kudo+va</i>	‘[in around the house in homes] [+DISTR]’		+
TRNSL	<i>kudo+ks</i>	‘home/house (complement position)’	+	+
COMP	<i>kudo+ška</i>	‘the size of a house’	+	+
ABE	<i>kudo+vtomo</i>	‘without a home/house’		+
COM	<i>kudo+ńek</i>	‘with the whole house’		+
LOC	<i>mastor+o</i>	‘on the ground’		+
TEMP	<i>varma+ńe</i>	‘when it's windy’		+

Erzya has three different declension types. All three types can be used in the marking of definite referents to different degrees. There are (i) the indefinite declension, used mainly with proper and personified nouns, as well as, indefinite nouns (see table 1.4), the morphological deictic marking types of (ii) the possessive declension, used mainly with inferential and singleton-set definiteness, and (iii) the definite declension, used to mark a large number definiteness types including neutral deictic and topicality.

The possessive declension, central to this thesis, refers to the set of affixes used in the head marking of the Erzya possessive construction. Typologically speaking, the Erzya possessive construction attests head marking in contexts where the controller is definite. If the controller of the possessor-indexed head appears in the same NP as a dependent, then it will be marked in the genitive, hence the language is seen as a manifestation of double-marked possessive constructions, which means that the type value given ignores the presence of NON-DEFINITE CONTROLLERS, on the one hand, and the possessive constructions with DEFINITE-MARKED HEADS, on the other. The cross-referential adnominal-person markers can be polyexponential. While they indicate three persons and two numbers of the controller/possessor in the marking of possessa, quantifiers,

adverbial/adpositions and non-finites, some of the cross-referential markers can also indicate grammatical number of the nominative-case possessum, see table (1.5).

Table 1.5 Nominative-case forms for the Erzya *kudo* ‘home; house; room’ and *t'ev* ‘task; thing’ as a possessum

POR		Possessa			
		SG		PL	
1	SG	<i>kudo+m</i>	<i>t'ev+em</i>	<i>kudo+n ~ kudo+m</i>	<i>t'ev+eń ~ t'ev+em</i>
	PL	<i>kudo+nok</i>	<i>t'ev+eńek</i>	<i>kudo+nok</i>	<i>t'ev+eńek</i>
2	SG	<i>kudo+t</i>	<i>t'ev+et'</i>	<i>kudo+t</i>	<i>t'ev+et'</i>
	PL	<i>kudo+ɲk</i>	<i>t'ev+eɲk</i>	<i>kudo+ɲk</i>	<i>t'ev+eɲk</i>
3	SG	<i>kudo+zɔ</i>	<i>t'ev+eze</i>	<i>kudo+nzɔ</i>	<i>t'ev+enze</i>
	PL	<i>kudo+st</i>	<i>t'ev+est</i>	<i>kudo+st</i>	<i>t'ev+est</i>

These same adnominal cross-referential markers can be attested word forms with case affixes, see table (1.6). In the non-core cases, the adnominal-person affixes are monoexponential, i.e. in these cases the literary language makes no distinction for the grammatical number of the possessum, and the adnominal-person markers are readily distinguished from both stem and other concatenative affixes.

Table 1.6 Varied parts of speech with adnominal cross-referential person marking

POR		NOM.SG	NOM.PL	INE	NUM-COLL-ASSOC	POP	INF+ILL
		‘home; house; room’			‘three’	‘with’	‘to arrive’
1	SG	<i>kudo+m</i>	<i>kudo+n ~ kudo+m</i>	<i>kudo+so+n ~ kudo+so+m</i>	<i>kolmo+ńe+ń ~ kolmo+ńe+m</i>	<i>marto+n ~ marto+m</i>	<i>sa+m+oz+on ~ sa+m+oz+om</i>
	PL	<i>kudo+nok</i>	<i>kudo+nok</i>	<i>kudo+so+nok</i>	<i>kolmo+ńe+ńek</i>	<i>marto+nok</i>	<i>sa+m+oz+onok</i>
2	SG	<i>kudo+t</i>	<i>kudo+t</i>	<i>kudo+so+t</i>	<i>kolmo+ńe+t'</i>	<i>marto+t</i>	<i>sa+m+oz+ot</i>
	PL	<i>kudo+ɲk</i>	<i>kudo+ɲk</i>	<i>kudo+so+ɲk</i>	<i>kolmo+ńe+ɲk</i>	<i>marto+ɲk</i>	<i>sa+m+oz+oɲk</i>
3	SG	<i>kudo+zɔ</i>	<i>kudo+nzɔ</i>	<i>kudo+so+nzɔ</i>	<i>kolmo+ńe+nze</i>	<i>marto+nzɔ</i>	<i>sa+m+oz+onzɔ</i>
	PL	<i>kudo+st</i>	<i>kudo+st</i>	<i>kudo+so+st</i>	<i>kolmo+ńe+st</i>	<i>marto+st</i>	<i>sa+m+oz+ost</i>

Of the parts of speech mentioned above, certain ones of them appear in contexts where instead of dependent marking of the possessor, it is also possible to use independent personal markers, i.e. personal pronouns. In certain circumstances it is possible or even obligatory that both the possessor and the possessum be marked, see below.

The definite declension consists of morphemes for two numbers marking nouns and non-finites. All items marked plural bear double marking for number, i.e. the word *skal* ‘cow’, when rendered in the indefinite nominative plural *skal+t* ‘cows’, receives one marker, the *-T*, and when it is rendered with the definite plural as in the nominative *skal+t+ne* ‘the/those/these cows’, an additional *-Ne* marker +DEF.PL.NOM is present.

- (4) a. *skal*
 COW_N.NOM.SG(INDEF)
 ‘cow’
- b. *skal+t*
 COW_N.NOM.PL(INDEF)
 ‘cow’
- c. *skal+ozo*
 skal_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG
 ‘his/her cow’
- d. *skal+onzo*
 COW_N+POSS-3SG>[NOM.PL|GEN]
 ‘his/her cow’s (genitive)’, ‘his/her houses/homes’
- e. *skal+os*
 COW_N+NOM.DEF.SG
 ‘this/that/the cow’
- f. *skal+t+ne*
 COW_N+PL+DEF.PL.NOM
 ‘these/those/the cows’

The definite markers in Erzya and Moksha are purported to be counter-examples to the notion that definiteness marking only occurs as an areal feature (cf. Lyons 1999: 49). Curiously, however, Lyons mentions the term North Russian dialects, on the same page, having the same kind of phenomenon. Erzya and Moksha differ from Mari and the Permic languages, most often indicated when making reference to “North Russian dialects”, in that Erzya and Moksha not only have possessor indexing familiar from the Uralic languages but inflectional definite marking, as well. Treatises comparing North Russian dialects with the Permic languages and Mari are generally interested in the definite function of the possessor indices in these Uralic languages, and since Erzya and Moksha are not examples of what happens in other languages, they tend to be ignored (cf. Tikhonova 1966).

In Erzya declension there are few instances of agreement inside the NP, usually it is only the head of the NP that declines in the various cases. In grammatical number, however, a determiner can also be marked (see Rueter ON QUANTIFICATION IN THE ERZYA LANGUAGE, forthcoming). Once the head of the NP has been declined, which may involve case, number and definite or cross-referential person marking, it is still possible for a given word form to be augmented through further affixation, e.g. secondary declension,

nominal conjugation with or without subsequent enclitic marking. A noun declined in the inessive case, for example, can appear in the position of spatial modifier in a NP or in the position of predication target at the clausal level, e.g. *přa+so+nzo* head_N+INE+POSS-3SG ‘on his/her head’, *přa+so+nzo+l't* head_N+INE+POSS-3SG+PRETII.PRED-3PL ‘they were on his/her mind’ (Bargova 1997: *Вечкемань усяят* 30). Another alternative that presents itself stems from the tendency to drop predictable head nouns, which results in the modifier (nearest final position in the NP) becoming the NP main item (cf. Gil WALS: 61 ADJECTIVES WITHOUT NOUNS). Since most modifiers can stand alone when a predictable head noun is dropped, and word forms correlating to several of the cases can function as modifiers – we might choose to decline the modifiers (cf. Evsev'ev 1963: 101–103; Col-linder 1969: 231; Egorova 1976; Keresztes 2005; Rueter On Modifiers without Nouns in Erzya, forthcoming). (See also section 4.5.)

- (5) a. *ašo kudo+ś*
 white_A.ABS house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
 ‘the white house’
- b. *ašo Ø+ś*
 white_A.ABS Ø_N+NOM.DEF.SG
 white_A+NOM.DEF.SG
 ‘the white [one]’
- (6) a. *kil'ej+eń kudo+ś*
 birch_N+GEN house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
 ‘the house of birch’
- b. *kil'ej+eń+śe Ø+ś*
 birch_N+GEN+PRON-DEM-DIST Ø_N+NOM.DEF.SG
 birch_N+GEN+PRON-DEM-DIST:N+NOM.DEF.SG
 ‘that [one] of birch’
- (7) a. *pakśa+so kudo+ś*
 field_N+INE house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
 ‘the house in the field’
- b. *pakśa+so Ø+ś*
 field_N+INE Ø_N+NOM.DEF.SG
 field_N+INE+NOM.DEF.SG
 ‘the [one] in the field’

-
- (8) a. *kurg+so+nzo* *čubar+ońt'*
 mouth_N+INE+POSS-3SG sand_N+GEN.DEF.SG
 ‘the sand in his mouth’
- b. *kurg+so+nzo* *Ø+ńt'*
 mouth_N+INE+POSS-3SG Ø_N+GEN.DEF.SG
 mouth_N+INE:N+GEN.DEF.SG
 (Abramov 1971: 297) ‘that in his [Idemevś (lit. wild spirit)] mouth’

In (5–8) we will observe three different instances of modifiers becoming the main items of their respective NPS, and thus undergoing secondary declension. In (5) we witness a qualifying, color modifier, and in (6) an indefinite genitive plus distal-demonstrative combination. In (7–8) there are two instances of inessive declensions used in modifying position: the indefinite inessive, and the possessive 3SG inessive. In Erzya, there are several cases in the indefinite declension that can be used as NP modifiers and are therefore possible candidates for secondary-declension main items. Table (1.7) provides a list of indefinite case forms which can be attested in both NP-modifier and predicate position.

Table 1.7 Indefinite declension cases attested in modifier vs. complement position

Case	Premodifier	Predicate
ABE	<i>kudo+vtomo psaka</i> house/home_N+ABE cat_N.ABS 'homeless cat'	<i>psakaś kudo+vtomo</i> cat_N.NOM.SG.DEF house/home_N+ABE 'the cat [is] homeless'
CMP	<i>vaz+oška kiska</i> calf_N+CMP dog_N.ABS 'dog the size of a calf'	<i>kiskaś vaz+oška</i> dog_N.NOM.SG.DEF calf_N+CMP 'the dog [is] as big as a calf'
ELA	<i>Turku+sto professoroś</i> Turku_N+ELA professor_N.NOM.SG.DEF 'the professor from Turku'	<i>professoroś Turku+sto</i> professor_N.NOM.SG.DEF Turku_N+ELA 'the professor [is] from Turku'
GEN	<i>Purgaz+oń</i> Purgaz_N-PROP+GEN <i>kudoś</i> house/home_N.NOM.SG.DEF 'Purgaz's house'	<i>te</i> this_PRON-DEM-PROX <i>kudoś Purgaz+oń</i> house/home_N.NOM.SG.DEF Purgaz_PRP+GEN 'this house [is] Purgaz's'
ILL	<i>jarsa+m+s kšim</i> eat_V+INF+ILL bread_N.POSS-1SG <i>araś</i> non-existent_PTC.IND.PRES.PRED-3SG 'I don't have bread to eat'	<i>kši+m kad+ija</i> bread_N+POSS-1SG leave_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-1SG>3SG <i>čokšne+s jarsa+m+s</i> evening_N+ILL eat_V+INF+ILL 'I left my bread for evening to eat'
INE	<i>pakša+so lomań</i> field_N+INE human_N.ABS 'a/the person in the field'	<i>lomań+eś pakša+so</i> human_N+NOM.DEF.SG field_N+INE 'the person [is] in a/the field'
NOM-ABS	<i>kiska l'evks</i> dog_N.ABS offspring_N.NOM.SG 'puppy'	<i>te kiska</i> this_PRON-DEM-PROX dog_N.NOM.SG 'this [is] a dog'
LOC	<i>ikel+e pe+ś</i> ahead_ADV+LOC end_N.NOM.SG.DEF 'the front end'	<i>pe+ś ikel+e</i> end_N+NOM.SG.DEF ahead_ADV+LOC 'the/this/that end is ahead'
PROL	<i>pakša+va mol+ema+ńt'</i> field_N+PROL go_V+N+GEN.SG.DEF <i>końdamo</i> like_PP.ABS 'like going through a field'	<i>ki+ś</i> road_N+NOM.DEF.SG <i>mol+ś pakša+va</i> go_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG field_N+PROL 'the road went through a/the field'
TRNSL	<i>kudo+ks čočko</i> house/home_N+TRNSL log_N.NOM.SG 'a/the log for [building] a house'	<i>rama+ś čočk+t</i> buy_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG log_N.NOM.PL <i>od kudo+ks</i> new_A.ABS house/home_N+TRNSL 'he/she/it bought logs for [b.] a new house'

Conjugation

Erzya features two conjugation paradigms for its finite verbs: a subject conjugation and a definite/perfect-aspect object conjugation. Hence the indicative present paradigm of the verb *palams* ‘to kiss’, preferred initially in the Moksha verb paradigms of Ahlqvist (1859: 24–43) to the macabre frequentative forms of the verb *kalmams* ‘to bury’ utilized by Ornatov (1838: 32–51), comprises 21 separate word forms: six from the subject conjugation, nine from the third person object category, and three each from the first and second person object categories (cf. Keresztes 1999; Trosterud 2006: 253–258). As might be observed below (example (21) of the introduction) in the presentation of the sentence *inženť šimd’iž vinado* ‘The guest was given liquor to drink’ the verb forms associated with third person plural *šimd’iž*, *palasamiž*, *palatadiž* and *palasiž* might all be used in constructions with non-referential subjects (personal observation from translation of texts with students of Finnish in Saransk 1998–2004). Hence these first and second person object forms might be considered default in contrast to the specifically individuated argument-semantics of the singulative forms: 1SG>2SG, 2SG>1SG, 3SG>1SG and 3SG>2SG. Hence the notations PRED-X>1P and PRED-X>2P will be used to indicate default first and second person object conjugation where ARG1, ARG2 or both ARG1 and ARG2 have plural referents.

Table 1.8 Indicative present paradigm of the Erzya verb *palams* ‘to kiss’

ARG1	Subject conjugation	ARG2 (agent person) Object conjugation					
		1SG	1PL	2SG	2PL	3SG	3PL
1SG	<i>pal+an</i>	NA	NA	<i>pala +samak</i>		<i>pala+samam</i>	
1PL	<i>pala+tano</i>	NA	NA	<i>pala+samiž</i>			
2SG	<i>pal+at</i>	<i>pala +tan</i>		NA	NA	<i>pala +tanzat</i>	
2PL	<i>pala+tado</i>	<i>pala+tadiž</i>		NA	NA	<i>pala+tadiž</i>	
3SG	<i>pal+i</i>	<i>pala +sa</i>	<i>pala+sīnek</i>	<i>pala+sak</i>		<i>pala+sī</i>	
3PL	<i>pal+i+ť</i>	<i>pala +sīñ</i>		<i>pala+sīť</i>	<i>pala+sījk</i>	<i>pala+sīñze</i>	<i>pala+sīž</i>

For those who like intransitive clauses with marking on elements other than a finite verb, Erzya provides a number of opportunities. Nominal-conjugation marking can be attested with any number of targets including the nominative of nouns (all three declensions) (9–11), modifier adjectives and pronouns (12–13), some local and modifier cases

(14–15), the same predication marking can be attested for some non-finites (16) and quantifiers (17) (cf. Evsev'ev 1963: 115–125, 137–138, 148–149, 156, 190, 292, 294, 303; Bartens 1999: 169).

- (9) a. *ton* *komand'ir+at.*
 you_PRON-PERS-2SG **commander_N.NOM.SG+IND.PRES.PRED-2SG**
 'you're a commander (class member)'
- b. *ton* *komand'ir.*
 you_PRON-PERS-2SG **commander_N.NOM.SG**
 'you're commander (capacity in inferential setting)'
- (10) *fjodor* *ivanovič+eń*
 Fyodor_PRP.NOM.SG Ivanovich_PRP+GEN
téj'ér+ez+at? – *d'ivažev+ś*
daughter_N+POSS-3SG>NOM+IND.PRES.PRED-2SG? be-taken-aback_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG
komzolov. *vaj,* *ež+i'ń*
 Komzolov_PRP.NOM.SG. **oh_INTERJ,** **not_V-NEG-IND.PRET.I+PRET.I.PRED-1SG>2SG**
soda, *ton* *kona+ś*
 recognize/know_V.CONNEG, you_PRON-PERS-2SG.NOM.SG **which_PRON-INTER+NOM.DEF.SG**
 – *pokš+oś* *e'li* *viškińe+ś?*
 – **big_A+NOM.DEF.SG** **or_CONJ** **little_A+NOM.DEF.SG?**
 (Doronin 1993: 18) 'Are you Fyodor Ivanovich's daughter? asked Komzolov in astonishment. My, I didn't recognize you, which one are you, the big one or the little one?'
- (11) *l'is+i* *mon* *vele+se* *vašeńse*
 come out_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG I_PRON-PERS-1SG.NOM **village_N+INE** **first_NUM.ABS**
lomań+ś+an
person_N+NOM.DEF.SG+IND.PRED-1SG
 'It turns out, I'm number one in the village (on the fly Atyashevo, 2002)'
- (12) *maz+at,* *maz+at,*
beautiful_A+IND.PRES-PRED-2SG, **beautiful_A+IND.PRES-PRED-2SG,**
teke *nolše+ž* *vaz+at*
 like_CONJ **lick_V+PTC-OZ** **calf_N+IND+IND.PRES.PRED-2SG**
 (children's heckle) 'you're cute, you're cute, you're like a licked calf (new-born calf, wobbly legs and all)'
- (13) *ńej+at* *kodamo* *rudazov+an,*
 see_V+IND.PRES-PRED-2SG **how_PRON-INTER-A.ABS** **filthy_A.NOM.SG+IND.PRES.PRED-1SG,**
ton+gak *nej* *ištam+at.*
 you_PRON-PERS-2SG.NOM+CLT **now_ADV** **like-that_PRON-A.NOM.SG+IND.PRES.PRED-2SG**
 (Motorkin 1997: 151) 'Do you see how dirty I am, now you are like that too.'

- (14) *ko+s+at?*
wh-spatial_PRON-INTER+INE+IND.PRES.PRED-2SG
 ‘where are you’
- (15) *koda a koda*
 how_PRON-INTER-ADV-MANNER not_PRT-NEG how_PRON-INTER-ADV-MANNER
vańo l’el’a+m mińek
 Vanyo_PRP+ABS elder-brother/cousin_N+POSS-1SG>NOM.SG we_PRON-PERS.GEN.POSS-1PL
raške+ste+ĭ.
family_N+ELA+IND.PRETII.PRED-3SG
 (Bargova 1997: 108) ‘No matter how you looked at it, my cousin Vanyo was from our family’
- (16) *and+om+s+at?*
feed_V+INF-OM+ILL+IND.PRES.PRED-2SG
 ‘Shall I get you something to eat? (deliberative)’
- (17) *grėbńev marto pikse+ĭano*
 Grebnev_PRP.ABS with_POP go-through-thick-and-thin_V+IND.PRES.PRED-1PL
ve tarka+so veĭe+ška ije+ĭ,
 one_NUM-CARD.ABS place_N+INE five_NUM-CARD+APPROX.ABS year_N+PL.NOM,
še+ks vajgel’enze końa+s
 that_PRON-DEM+TRNSL voice_N+POSS-3SG>GEN according-to_POP+ILL
tonad+ĭń ĉarĭkod+em+e,
 get-used-to_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-1SG understand_V+INF+LOC
kodamo jožo+z0, nej
 what-kind-of_PRON-INTER-A.ABS feeling_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG, now_ADV-TEMP
son avol’
 it_PRON-PERS.NOM not_PRT-NEG-CONTRAST
par+t+ne+dė+ĭ
good_A.N+PL+DEF.PL+ABL+IND.PRETII.PRED-3SG
 (Tikshaikin 2010: 38) ‘Now, we’ve been working together, Grebnev and I, for about five years, so I have come to understand what kind of mood he’s in by [the sound of] his voice, and this time it wasn’t one of his better ones.’

Aware of these salient features of the language as a background, Erzya could be said to feature a relatively productive inflectional system with ample allomorphic variation and regular affix-meaning cumulation, which might promote discussions in the definition of derivation versus declension and conjugation.

Word order

Syntactically, Erzya appears to use grammatical and oblique case marking to indicate core functions, and not word order. Person cross-referential marking on the finite verb, or other points of predication, appear to supersede Subject and Object arguments. In a given context bound person agreement markers allow for three positions on the Subject/Object reference cline, i.e. (a) NP, (b) Pronoun and (c) ZERO. Because of this it is often difficult to ascertain whether Erzya is SOV or SVO, i.e. Ermuškin (2004: 155) states that in the Srednetyoshski dialect an object with definite or possessive marking will, due to its definiteness, precede the verb, whereas an indefinite object with no marking will follow the verb. Finally, definiteness appears to have an effect on word order such that the ZERO marked indefinite subject and object with indefinite nominative marking (ZERO) appear right of a concurrent definite argument. This, in presentational type clauses on the one hand, may also result in VS and OVS word orders. Use of anaphoric person agreement, it would seem, renders the presence of more than one grammatical case form infrequent in some genres. Furthermore prosodic and word order variation renders Erzya an even more desirable object of research – something that can be approached through corpora both written and spoken.

In his discussion of the Srednetyoshski dialect, Ermuškin (2004: 155–156) points out variation in word order on the basis of the definiteness of a given NP. While the definite topical subject precedes the verb so does the definite object, and in the absence of a subject the definite topical object also precedes the finite verb. This account of Erzya word order can readily be applied to other spoken variants of the language as well, although definiteness is not the only grounds for a noun or pronoun to be placed left of the finite verb.

- (18) *ve'giz+eš* *sala+š* *řeve*
 wolf_N+NOM.DEF.SG steal_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG sheep_N.NOM.SG
 (Ermuškin 2004: 155) ‘The wolf stole a sheep.’
- (19) *ćora+š* *lišme+nze* *ki'd+iže*
 man_N+NOM.DEF.SG horse_N+POSS-3SG harness_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG>3SG
 (Ermuškin 2004: 155) ‘The man harnessed his horse.’
- (20) *son* *šeja+ńt'* *šimd+iže*
 he/she_PRON-PERS-3SG.NOM goat_N+GEN.DEF.SG water_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG>3SG
 (Ermuškin 2004: 155) ‘She watered the goat.’
- (21) *inže+ńt'* *šimd+iž* *vina+do*
 guest_N+GEN.DEF.SG provide-with-drink_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3PL>3P liquor_N+ABL
 (Ermuškin 2004: 155) ‘The guest was given liquor to drink.’

Erzya is very context-oriented, i.e. the statement about the wolf stealing a sheep in the SVO order would serve as an answer to the question: “What happened while I was away?” If we were to invert this order to SOV, however, *vergiześ řeve salaś* might qualify as an answer to the question: “Why are you building a fence?” But what happens when a setting is given and both the subject and object are included in the new information? Here, where there is no marking to differentiate the subject and object, it appears that word order takes over and *s* is required to precede *o* while the finite verb is still allowed freedom of movement, see (22).

- (22) a. *viř* *udal+o* *pakśa+so+ńt'* *ćora+t*
 woods_N+GEN.DEF.SG behind_POP+LOC field_N+INE+DEF.SG man/boy_N+PL.NOM
van+št' *alaśa+t*
 watch_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3PL horse_N+PL.NOM
 (Raptanov 1985: 121) ‘In the field beyond the woods boys were herding/tending horses.’

- b. *viř* *udal+o* *pakśa+ńt'* *ke'le+s*
 woods_N+GEN.DEF.SG behind_POP+LOC field_N+GEN.DEF.SG width_N+ILL
kol.roz+t *modamar'+t* *put+řt'*
 collective-farm_N+PL.NOM potato_N+PL.NOM put_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3PL
 (UPTMNE 5: 172) ‘In the field beyond the woods collective farm workers are planting potatoes.’

In summary, the Erzya language has rich inflectional systems for both declension and conjugation. It also has dependent versus independent adnominal-person marking variation, inflectional deictic marking varying between neutral/definite and personal, as well as, a relatively free word order. All of these serve to indicate the feasibility of the Erzya language as an object of cross-referential person studies, among many others.

1.2. Introduction to person

The notion of person in linguistics is generally perceived as a grammatical category, and as such, it might be given equal attention as are given the grammatical categories and notions of gender, number, case, tense, definiteness, etc. Person distinguishes between the speaker, the addressee and the one spoken of. This is, of course, an oversimplification, because we can perceive, if not identify, a difference between whether reference is being made to the speaker by means of a noun or an adnominal-person marker (personal pronoun, cross-referential adnominal-person marker). When using nouns, and especially proper nouns, to indicate the SPEAKER, ADDRESSEE OR OBJECT OF DISCOURSE, a superficial familiarity with the context will reveal the identity of each. Use of personal pronouns or cross-referential markers, however, requires a deeper contextual awareness, which al-

allows the listener to identify the actual referents indicated by the shifting discourse roles of these person markers. Depending on the language in question, this might entail two active participants, the speaker and the addressee, or these same active participants plus the NON-PARTICIPANT ROLE, who is neither speaker nor addressee, of whom the participants speak. Thus the roles of person can be defined as: (i) the active participant SPEAKER, or FIRST PERSON, the originator of an utterance or source of information flow; (ii) the active participant ADDRESSEE, or SECOND PERSON, the one to whom the flow of information is directed (listener, reader, intended audience), and (iii) a third party, the THIRD PERSON, i.e. the one spoken of.

These three roles are often associated with the category of grammatical number, which allows for differentiation in number of speakers, addressees and objects of discussion, on the one hand, and deictic shifters, such as, the spatial *this*, *that*, *these*, *those*, *here* and *there*, and the temporal *now* and *then*, on the other. Hence one might see the deictic centers in *I*, *here* and *now* shifting from: one referent to another as the role of speaker is transferred from one person to another (such as is observed in dialogue); one spatial setting to another (with relative transfer of discourse location), or one temporal setting to another (in the flow of time).

The person morpheme

Person can be observed in many manifestations. According to Siewierska (2004: 16) the basic division of person markers with regard to morphological form is that between independent and dependent person markers, whereas the terms free, full, self/standing, cardinal, focal, strong, long and disjunctive are also used in reference to the independent markers, and the terms reduced, bound, defective, deficient and conjunctive are used in reference to the dependent markers. Criteria commonly used for facilitating a split in this terminology consist of (i) the morphological characteristic [\pm SEPARATE WORD]; (ii) the prosodic characteristic [\pm PRIMARY STRESS], and (iii) the syntactic ability to constitute an entire or elliptical utterance [\pm WHOLE UTTERANCE]. Siewierska notes a dichotomy in the possibility to use English personal pronouns in single-word utterances such that object forms are readily used as syntactically independent constituents, whereas subject forms are not. Hence the question “Who(m) are they going to ask?” can readily be answered using a simple, object pronoun, for instance “Me”, “Her” or “Us”, in a single-word reply. It should also be noted, however, that it is the object and not subject personal pronoun in English that can be used in this fashion, thus a single-word elliptic question with a personal pronoun coreferencing the subject, see tables (1.9) and (1.10), would, in a descriptive grammar of the English language, actually employ an object pronoun.

Table 1.9 Single-word elliptic question with object pronoun in subject function

- a. He said that he would do it?
- b. (Who) him?

(Siewierska 2004: 17 [(2)])

While Siewierska has not explicitly indicated that the object and subject functions are attributed to the same single-word forms, the adjacency of her two tables illustrating subject-function compatibility, as seen in (1.9, line b), and subject-form incompatibility, as seen in (1.10, line b), draws an implicit connection.

Table 1.10 Single-word elliptic answer with object pronoun in subject function

- a. Who wrote that?
- b. *I. / *He. / *We.
- c. I did. / He did. / We did.
- d. Me. / ? Him. / ? Us.

(cf. Siewierska 2004: 17 (4))

Siewierska notes that an isolated subject pronoun, such as those found in (table 1.10, line b), would not suffice for an answer, but instead if the subject pronoun were to be used, an alignment with an auxiliary verb would be required, hence we have the acceptable answers in (table 1.10, line c). In (1.10, line d) I have taken the liberty to provide object-pronoun equivalents for elliptic answers paralleling the object-form strategy found in (Table 1.9, line b); whereas the first answer, *Me*, seems relatively acceptable in my own native knowledge of English, the second two, *Him* and *Us*, strike me as less so. Hence questions may also arise regarding the acceptability of person-marker forms in relation to the specific person and number of an individual marker/pronoun, where person strategies obtaining in the singular, for instance, do not reflect those of the plural, and vice versa.

In addition to the verbal argument personal pronouns, Siewierska also indicates the existence of two varieties of the so called POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS in English, one set consisting of the syntactically dependent determiners, such as, *my*, *your*, *our*, *their*, and the other the syntactically independent possessive pronouns, such as, *mine*, *yours*, *ours*, *theirs*. This pair indicates that English has a semi-regular dichotomy with regard to the feature [\pm SYNTACTICALLY INDEPENDENT], and that therefore (table 1.11, line c) provides a felicitous answer to (table 1.11a) but (table 1.11, line b) does not.

Table 1.11 Dependent vs. independent possessive pronoun

- a. Who are we going to invite, your mother or my mother?
- b. *My.
- c. Mine.

(Siewierska 2004: 17 (3))

In her typology of person, Siewierska adheres to the importance of how pronouns are normally viewed as independent words. Following from this adherence to consistency with “normal view” Siewierska therefore opts to make the dependent versus independent split at the morphophonological level. This is a well-merited choice, but even the relatively simple personal system of English attests certain discrepancies with regard to

the concept of independent forms, let us observe the reflexive pronouns, for instance, *myself*, *yourself*, *himself*, *herself*, *itself*, *ourselves*, *yourselves* and *themselves*. While most educated native speakers might be familiar with additional forms, such as *hisself* and *theirselves*, these forms are most likely to be rejected as non-standard forms. There are, however, situations in the English grammar where these very “non-standard” forms are the only ones eligible for grammatically acceptable constructions, see (23–24), where the former is a quotation from Agatha Christie, and the latter an excerpt from a letter my mother recently wrote me with a subsequent indirect quotation.

(23) “one choked **his little self**”
(Agatha Christie, AND THEN THERE WERE NONE)

(24) a. *We’re being **our usual busy selves**.*
(Mom’s letter March, 2010)

b. *They’re being **their usual busy selves**.*
(Indirect quotation of 24a)

It appears that once the third person reflexive pronouns are rendered as noun phrases, they are forced to behave as such with morpho-syntactically acceptable forms.

Personal pronouns and cross-referential markers

Person, although, frequently associated with conjugation in verbs, at the clause level, is well represented at the phrasal level, as well, where it might cross-reference a possessor, the object of a non-finite construction, an adpositional complement, etc. Thus, in addition to the cross-referencing of syntactic subject in a nominative-case personal pronoun or on a finite-verb form, as one might encounter in the conjugations of various languages in Europe, see table (1.12), below, there are also cross-referencing strategies for expressing the person of the possessor, see table (1.13). (It should be noted that the Hungarian 3^p forms *van* and *vannak* are used in locative predication, but not equative.)

Table 1.12 The indicative present conjugation of the verb *to be* as attested in some languages of Europe

	Swedish	German	French	Hungarian	Finnish
1	SG (<i>jag</i>) <i>är</i>	(<i>ich</i>) <i>bin</i>	(<i>je</i>) <i>suis</i>	(<i>én</i>) <i>vagyok</i>	(<i>minä</i>) <i>olen</i>
	PL (<i>vi</i>) <i>är</i>	(<i>wir</i>) <i>sind</i>	(<i>nous</i>) <i>sommes</i>	(<i>mi</i>) <i>vagyunk</i>	(<i>me</i>) <i>olemme</i>
2	SG (<i>du</i>) <i>är</i>	(<i>du</i>) <i>bist</i>	(<i>tu</i>) <i>es</i>	(<i>te</i>) <i>vagy</i>	(<i>sinä</i>) <i>olet</i>
	PL (<i>ni</i>) <i>är</i>	(<i>ihr</i>) <i>seid</i>	(<i>vous</i>) <i>êtes</i>	(<i>ti</i>) <i>vagytok</i>	(<i>te</i>) <i>olette</i>
	SG (<i>han/hon/</i> <i>den/det</i>) <i>är</i>	(<i>er/sie/es</i>) <i>ist</i>	(<i>il/elle</i>) <i>est</i>	(<i>ő</i>) <i>van</i>	(<i>hän/se</i>) <i>on</i>
3	PL (<i>de</i>) <i>är</i>	(<i>sie</i>) <i>sind</i>	(<i>ils/elles</i>) <i>sont</i>	(<i>ők</i>) <i>vannak</i>	(<i>he/ne</i>) <i>ovat</i>

Within the confines of the European continent alone, variations exist between strategies of person marking at the clause level, whereas some languages allow for cross-referencing of the person roles both on the predication target, e.g. affixal marking of syntactic-subject person on the finite verb, and in the independent personal pronouns, there are others which have dropped their affixal marking altogether. Among the languages where both lexical and affixal marking are manifest, there is variation of different sorts governing the distribution of these two marking strategies. In a similar vein, the possessive phrase may also attest to variation in adnominal-person marking strategies from language to language. Where one language may allow for the simultaneous use of lexical and affixal marking of person, others lack the affixal marking. Some languages employ pronouns reflecting the morphological structuring of their NP counterparts while others attest to possessive-pronoun strategies, divorced of their NP counterparts.

Table 1.13 Adnominal possessive constructions as attested in some languages of Europe
'my house, our house, etc.'

		Swedish	German	French	Hungarian	Finnish
1	SG	<i>(mitt) hus</i>	<i>(mein) Haus</i>	<i>(ma) maison</i>	<i>(én) házam</i>	<i>(minun) taloni</i>
	PL	<i>(vårt) hus</i>	<i>(unser) Haus</i>	<i>(notre) maison</i>	<i>(mi) házunk</i>	<i>(meidän) talomme</i>
2	SG	<i>(ditt) hus</i>	<i>(dein) Haus</i>	<i>(ta) maison</i>	<i>(te) házad</i>	<i>(sinun) talosi</i>
	PL	<i>(ert) hus</i>	<i>(euer) Haus</i>	<i>(votre) maison</i>	<i>(ti) házatok</i>	<i>(teidän) talonne</i>
3	SG	<i>(hans/hennes/dess) hus</i>	<i>(sein/ihr) Haus</i>	<i>(sa) maison</i>	<i>(ő) háza</i>	<i>(hänen) talonsa</i>
	PL	<i>(deras) hus</i>	<i>(ihr) Haus</i>	<i>(leur) maison</i>	<i>(ő) házuk</i>	<i>(heidän) talonsa</i>

Typologies relevant to this treatise

In the World Atlas of Language Structure (henceforth WALS), Bickel and Nichols define a typology for LOCUS OF MARKING IN POSSESSIVE NOUN PHRASES (WALS feature/chapter 24), wherein four strategies are presented: (i) head marking; (ii) dependent marking; (iii) double marking, and (iv) no marking, see (25–28).

(25) Head marking

s'adyúm'ə gâam'a

1SG.brother 3SG.house

'my brother's house' (lit. 'my-brother his-house')

[Acoma (Keresan; New Mexico; Miller 1965: 177)]

- (26) Dependent marking
loem-an k'orni
 lion-GEN baby.animal
 'lion cub', 'lion's cub' (lit. 'of-lion cub')
 [Chechen (Nichols, own data)]
- (27) Double marking
cuku-ŋ hu:ki-ʔ-hy:
 dog-GEN tail-3SG
 'dog's tail' (lit. 'of-dog its-tail')
 [Southern Sierra Miwok (Miwok-Costanoan; California; Broadbent 1964: 133)]
- (28) No marking
jərəkəpai tuwa.ɔ
 crocodile tail
 '(a/the) crocodile's tail' (lit. 'crocodile tail')
 [Tiwi (isolate; northern Australia; Osborne 1974: 74)]

In a further typology, obligatory possessive inflection (WALS feature/chapter 58), Bickel and Nichols discuss the phenomenon of bound nouns obtaining in some languages of the world which cannot be used in the language without special marking. They note that nouns of certain semantic reference entail an inherent argument structure, i.e. English words for body parts or kinship relations attest to obligatory possessors, and in languages where head-marking strategies are observed for possessive phrases there are those languages with nouns attesting obligatory possessive inflection.

Cross-referential adnominal-person marking, however, can be attested on adpositions (Bakker WALS feature/chapter 48). In this typology Bakker places great importance on the delimitation of what actually qualify as adpositions. Among the phenomena he chooses to disregard are nominal strategies used to express locality, see (29). Thus the resulting definition of adposition appears to indicate lexemes without noun correlates.

- (29) *ya nai-sa*
 1SG rib-LOC
 'beside me' [Tauya (MacDonald 1990: 283)]

Gil provides a typology ADJECTIVES WITHOUT NOUNS (WALS feature/chapter 61), in which he analyzes the behavior of adjectives within the noun phrase, where they typically function as attributes to nouns, see (30a). He mentions that under certain conditions where the modified noun is absent either due to its unimportance or its contextual reconstructibility, the adjective remains as the main lexical item within the noun phrase, denoting the understood object, see (30b).

(30) a. *I want the **red** apple.* (Gil WALS feature/chapter 61)

b. *I want the **red one**.* (Gil WALS feature/chapter 61)

Gil's typology enumerates three central encoding possibilities: (i) adjectives do not occur without nouns; (ii) adjectives may occur without marking, and (iii) adjectives occurring without the nouns they modify may not occur in bare forms. Central to this treatise will be the contemplation and illustration of MODIFIERS WITHOUT NOUNS (MWN), see section 4.5. ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND SECONDARY DECLENSION, whereas adnominal person markers like many other modifiers may become the main lexical item within an NP.

Hierarchies

In her treatment of person agreement, Siewierska (2004: 138–172) exhibits the possessed noun hierarchy: inalienable > alienable, which states that if a language has person agreement marking on alienable nouns, there is also person agreement marking attested on the inalienable nouns, whereas the converse does not necessarily hold. An inalienability hierarchy (Siewierska 2004: 143 [Nichols (1988: 572; 1992: 160)]) is also presented that provides an indication of which referent types supersede others in interpretation as inalienable, see hierarchy (1.1)

Hierarchy 1.1 The inalienability hierarchy

body parts and/or kinship terms > part-whole > spatial relations > culturally basic possessed items > other

(see Siewierska 2004: 143 [Nichols (1988: 572; 1992: 160)])

Under the function of person forms, Siewierska (2004: 173–213) outlines the general approach to referential expressions adopted within cognitive discourse analysis with particular focus on the assumed relationship between the cognitive status of discourse referents in the memory store of the addressee and morpho-syntactic encoding. Notions of ACCESSIBILITY levels are presented, wherein person forms are seen as representative of mid-high or high accessibility, and where the distinction between types of person forms in distribution follows from parameters determining levels of cognitive accessibility. Person forms like other deixis markers are utilized by the discourse participants to maintain activation or saliency levels of referents in the unfolding development of a given discourse. Here deictic markers, and in this instance person forms, afford the participants clarity in minimal morpho-syntactic encoding of discourse referents, whereas minimal encoding implies the forefrontedness of a given referent. (See discussion of special 1sg>gen forms with kin terms in sections (2.7.) and (4.4).)

In some interpretations accessibility is shown to depend upon a range of hierarchies addressing notions of entity saliency – inherent and discourse-related. Inherent saliency is affected by the knowledge of the discourse participants or interlocutors –

their personal experiences, affections, etc., and discourse saliency is sensitive to levels of importance, frequency, newness, etc. of the referential constituent, see hierarchies in hierarchy (1.2).

Hierarchy 1.2 Saliency hierarchies of accessibility

- a. Speaker > addressee > non-participant (3rd person)
- b. High physical salience > low physical salience
- c. Topic > non-topic
- d. Grammatical subject > non-subject
- e. Human > animate > inanimate
- f. Repeated reference > few previous references > first mention
- g. No intervening/competing referents > many intervening/competing referents

(see Siewierska 2004: 175)

These accessibility hierarchies can be examined for their relationship to morpho-syntactic encoding demonstrated in the accessibility marking scale, hierarchy (1.3), where the level of morpho-syntactic marking increases in correlation to the decrease in accessibility of the target referent. (See section 4.4 PARADIGM DEFECTIVITY IN ERZYA POSSESSOR INDEXING, where high position of the possessor in the SALIENCE HIERARCHIES OF ACCESSIBILITY when associated with the high inalienability of the possessum may correlate with the accessibility marking scale. For more on defectivity see Karlsson 2000.)

Hierarchy 1.3 The accessibility marking scale

zero < reflexives < person affixes < person clitics, unstressed pronouns < stressed pronouns < stressed pronouns plus gesture < proximal demonstrative (+NP) < distal demonstrative (+NP) < proximal demonstrative + (NP) + modifier < distal demonstrative + (NP) + modifier < first name < last name < short definite description < long definite description < full name < full name + modifier

(see Siewierska 2004: 176 [Ariel 1990])

Interim summary

In linguistics, person can be divided into three roles: speaker (first person); addressee (second person), and non-participant (third person). These roles can, in turn, be associated with the grammatical category of number, and as deictic shifters they can be associated with transfer in both spatial and temporal settings.

There are typologies that can readily be applied to this treatise: (i) Different cross-referential person forms can be distinguished for different syntactic positions, and these may also be subject to variation with regard to structure complexity. They may also vary in distribution strategies in accordance with whether they are predicate-function with clausal-argument cross-reference, or they have a possessive-construction orientation.

(ii) There are many interpretations of what an adposition is, and therefore certain delimitations might be observed in the inspection of person-marking compatibility with adpositions. (iii) Notions of modifiers without nouns (henceforth *MWN*) might be dealt with in the inspection of adnominal person marking.

There are hierarchies applicable to marking strategies with regard to alienability of a possessum, salience of a discourse referent and scale of accessibility prominence correlating to minimal marking strategies.

1.3. Research in the Erzya category of adnominal person

Research in the Erzya category of adnominal person is based on descriptive grammars of the language, as well as, various treatises of possession, non-finites, argument agreement, and secondary declension, spanning the time from the publication of the first grammar of Erzya (Gabelentz 1839) to the present. This tradition has long established two means for the indication of adnominal person, which are *AFFIXES* and *INDEPENDENT PERSONAL PRONOUNS*, the former of which is the focus of this treatise.

Within the range of morphological adnominal-person marking there are five major clusters that may be identified as targets: (i) *NOUN PHRASES*; (ii) *QUANTIFIERS*; (iii) *PERSONAL PRONOUNS*; (iv) *ADPOSITIONAL PHRASES*, and (v) *NON-FINITE PHRASES* in *-Om*. Noun and non-finite phrases exhibit variation in adnominal person marking with strategies allowing for lexical, affixal or both types simultaneously. Quantifiers attest to an obligatory affixal marking of the controller/possessor and disallow lexical marking of cross-referential adnominal person. Personal pronouns disallow affixal marking in the nominative, whereas in the oblique cases the standard language attests obligatory adnominal-person affixes. And adpositions observe a strategy of complementary distribution, whereby they have a strong tendency towards either affixal marking or lexical indication of a complement, be that a genitive-case personal pronoun or a complement NP – in either the absolutive (nominative singular equivalent form) or the genitive (indefinite, definite singular or definite plural).

1.3.1. Background

Affixal marking of adnominal person, elsewhere referred to as controller/possessor indexing or adnominal-type cross-referential marking (due to a range that cannot be delimited with simple parts-of-speech categorization), is held by this author to be one of the three declension types permeating the clause-constituent noun, quantifier, adpositional and non-finite phrases of the Erzya language. This declension type is generally referred to as the *POSSESSIVE DECLENSION*, a term contrived from its representation in the noun phrase, the traditionally perceived range of case marking. As early as the first grammar of the Erzya language *Versuch einer Mordwinischen Grammatik* ‘Attempt at a Mordvin

Grammar' (Gabelentz 1839) controller/possessor indices for three persons and two numbers of the possessor with occasional distinction nominative singular vs. nominative plural and oblique-case forms, see table (1.14), here and henceforth the notation NA will indicate either NOT ATTESTED OR NOT APPLICABLE.

Table 1.14 Possessor indices in Erzya as can be derived from Gabelentz (1839: 253–257)

P	NB	NOM	OBL	Case forms specifically attested by Gabelentz							
				NOM	GEN	DAT	ABL	INE	ELA	ILL	PROL
1	SG	<i>-Om</i>	<i>-ON</i>	+	+	NA	+	+	+	+	NA
	PL	<i>-NOk ~ -mOk</i>	<i>-NOk</i>	+	NA	NA	+	+	NA	+	NA
2	SG	<i>-OT</i>	<i>-OT</i>	+	+	NA	NA	+	+	+	NA
	PL	<i>-Oŋk</i>	<i>-Oŋk</i>	+	NA	NA	NA	+	+	+	NA
3	SG	<i>-OzO ~ -OnzO</i>	<i>-OnzO</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA
	PL	<i>-Ost</i>	<i>-Ost</i>	+	+	NA	NA	+	+	+	+

According to Gabelentz there is a distinction between nominative and oblique cases in the first and third persons, whereas other persons have not been specified, and therefore the nominative/oblique orientation in the table has been assumed by this author on the basis of tables and examples provided in Gabelentz (1839). The dative, naturally, must not be overlooked, as Gabelentz has also discerned a dative form of the 3SG possessor index, which directly correlates to *-Onsteń* of the modern literary language.

While Gabelentz limited his studies specifically to the linguistic phenomena found in the Gospel, Wiedemann had no qualms of producing full-fledged, hypothetical paradigms where modern knowledge of the language would call for at least some restraint (see also Keresztes 1999: 128, where Keresztes remarks on the seemingly artificial optative paradigm according to Wiedemann (1865: 75).) Wiedemann claims (1865: 52–53) what appear to be regularly formulated dative forms in the possessive declension for all six persons, respectively, *-nen*, *-nent*, *-nenze*, *-nenek*, *-nenk*, *-nenst*. In addition, in parentheses, the 2SG *-ten* and 3SG *-nsten* forms are given, which actually correspond to dative forms attested in the possessive paradigms of the modern Erzya language. In fact if we augment these two parenthetical forms to the 1SG of Wiedemann's six-member paradigm forms *-nen*, we will arrive at the three singular person dative forms provided in the most recent Erzya grammar (2000: 6, 95–100) for nouns; these can be represented in the morphophonemic notations 1SG *-Neń*, 2SG *-Teń*, and 3SG *-Onsteń*. (See section 4.4. PARADIGM DEFECTIVITY IN ERZYA POSSESSOR INDEXING.) The six-member paradigm, however, should not be entirely overlooked; it appears to derive from the personal-pronoun paradigm, although it fails to appear elsewhere in the language. (See table (1.16), below)

The next grammar of descriptive import is the *Mordwinische Chrestomathie* 'Mordvin Chrestomathy' by Paasonen (1909). Here Paasonen gives explicit dialect readings for some forms with implicit standard forms. In table (1.15) we will observe: (i) an *N* element that does not appear in all slots of the paradigm; (ii) absence of dative forms for the plural persons, and (iii) an absence of genitive forms for the possessa of the 1PL and 2PL.

- b. *mon* *večk+sa* *ava+t'*
 I_PRON-PERS-1SG.NOM love_V+IND.PRES.PRED-1SG>3SG mother_N+POSS-2SG>[KIN]GEN
 (Shakhmatov 1910: 798) ‘I love your mother.’

Upon establishing the parametric distinction [\pm KIN], Shakhmatov then exhibits a set of kin terms featuring special genitive and dative forms in the cross-referential person markers of the 1SG and 2SG. This parametric distinction has been retained in subsequent descriptions of the language, although there is some variation in its attestation. Evsev'ev (1963: 111–112), for example, gives a slightly slacker notion of kin or someone closely associated/related to the speaker in conjunction with the genitive-case possessa of the 1SG possessor, but leaves the 2SG marking open to all nouns. In the most recent grammar of Erzya, Adushkina illustrates the genitive and dative-case word forms of kin possessa as symmetric, but this appears only as a tendency in modern Erzya literature.

Evsev'ev identifies several declension types which can be directly associated with NP head dropping and the contextual secondary declension of modifiers, these include the definite declension of adjectives, cardinal numerals, indefinite genitive, translative, inessive and comparative, as well as, genitive-case personal pronouns, (cf. Evsev'ev 1963: 51, 101–103, 126, 129–132, 134–135, 162). Morphologically, the indefinite-genitive forms require a distal-demonstrative element *-še-* before subsequent declension, and this appears to the same strategy Evsev'ev applies to his definite “possessive pronouns”, which are best described as a concatenation GENITIVE-CASE PERSONAL PRONOUN + DISTAL DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN + SECONDARY DECLENSION.

1.3.2. The category of adnominal person in contemporary grammars of Erzya

The category of adnominal person in the most recent grammar of Erzya, *Erźań kel', morfologija* ‘The Erzya language, morphology’, henceforth (EKM 2000), is addressed in association with five different parts of speech. This is due to the scope of adnominal-type person, namely, noun phrases, non-finite phrases and adpositional phrases. Hence adnominal-type person is dealt with in nouns under the grammatical category of possession (Adushkina 2000: 89–102), in numerals (Kharitonova 2000: 115–123), in pronouns (Agafonova 2000: 124–145), in verbs under infinitive and gerunds (Tsyпкаikina 2000: 154–155, 225–227), and in postpositions (Buzakova 2000: 249–254). In addition to its extensive range, adnominal person can be attested morphologically in two manifestations, i.e. adnominal person is expressed lexically in the form of the genitive-case personal pronouns, which in a majority of clause-constituent phrases will appear as a genitive-form modifier, and morphologically in cross-referential person marking, where it manifests itself in a head-marking strategy postposed on that head. The category of adnominal person in Erzya attests to three persons in two numbers, with no indication of inclusive-exclusive semantics.

Personal pronouns

The extension of personal pronouns distinguishes a class of six stems adhering to mutually applicable declension schemes for the various inflections. In practice this involves a two-way split in the pronoun stems, namely, there is the grammatical stem of the nominative case, on the one hand, and the oblique stem of the genitive case, on the other. In a paradigmatic presentation of personal pronouns, shown below, the oblique cases can be schematized in the following: GENITIVE STEM + CX FORM + CROSS-REFERENTIAL ADNOMINAL-TYPE MARKER, whereas the cross-referential marker is in agreement for person and number with the semantics of the pronominal stem.

Table 1.16 Neutral personal pronoun paradigm in the five most frequent cases

		NOM	GEN PRON + POSS	DAT	ABL PRON.GEN + CX + POSS	ABE
1	SG	<i>mon</i>	<i>moń</i>	<i>mońeń</i>	<i>mońdeń</i>	<i>mońtemeń</i>
	PL	<i>miń</i>	<i>mińek</i>	<i>mińeńek</i>	<i>mińdeńek</i>	<i>mińtemeńek</i>
2	SG	<i>ton</i>	<i>toń ~ tońt'</i>	<i>tońet'</i>	<i>tońdet'</i>	<i>tońtemet'</i>
	PL	<i>tjń</i>	<i>tjńk</i>	<i>tjńeńk</i>	<i>tjńdeńk</i>	<i>tjńtemeńk</i>
	SG	<i>son</i>	<i>sonze</i>	<i>sońenze</i>	<i>sońdenze</i>	<i>sońtemenze</i>
3	PL	<i>sjń</i>	<i>sjńst</i>	<i>sjńenst ~ sjńest</i>	<i>sjńdest</i>	<i>sjńtemest</i>

Cross-referential adnominal person

Cross-referential adnominal-type person markers can readily be attested for the same distribution found in the grammatical categories of person and number in the personal pronouns, i.e. there are six distinguishable morpheme sets. By morpheme sets it is meant that there are, in fact, more notions to be morphologically distinguished in the workings of the cross-referential markers. One such matter is the distinguishing of a singular possessum in the nominative case when dealing with first and third person singular cross-referential markers, see table (1.17).

Table 1.17 Cross-referential adnominal person markers in the nominative

		POSSESSUM NOM.SG	POSSESSA NOM.PL
POR			
1	SG	<i>-Om</i>	<i>-ON</i>
	PL	<i>-ONOk</i>	<i>-ONOk</i>
2	SG	<i>-OT</i>	<i>-OT</i>
	PL	<i>-Ońk</i>	<i>-Ońk</i>
3	SG	<i>-OzO</i>	<i>-OnzO</i>
	PL	<i>-Ost</i>	<i>-Ost</i>

The genitive and dative cases of the possessa introduce further peculiarities into the possessive declension. Adushkina (2000: 96–98) implies that there are, in fact, no genitive or dative forms for the cross-referential markers in possessive constructions involving plural possessors, and a majority of the possessive constructions involving singular possessors. Special genitive and dative forms for marking the possessa of first or second person singular possessors are given for kin terms, and it is noted that the third person singular cross-referential markers allow other nouns as well, see table (1.18). (According to the Saransk School, the linking vowel, found between the word stem and the first consonant of a given affix, is not actually part of the affix, and therefore Adushkina has separated her linking vowels (see discussion of allophones following table 1.2).)

Table 1.18 Kin terms as possessa of singular possessors in the nominative, genitive and dative cases according to Adushkina (2000: 97)

	Possessors				
	1SG		2SG	3SG	
	Possessum	Possessa		Possessum	Possessa
NOM	<i>sazor-o-m</i>	<i>sazor-o-n</i>	<i>sazor-o-t</i>	<i>sazor-o-zo</i>	<i>sazor-o-nzo</i>
GEN	<i>sazor-o-ń</i>		<i>sazor-o-t'</i>	<i>sazor-o-nzo</i>	
DAT	<i>sazor-o-ńeń</i>		<i>sazor-o-teń</i>	<i>sazor-o-nsteń</i>	

In table (1.19) it will be noted that marking differentiation in the grammatical category of number only exists in the nominative, whereas both the genitive and the dative morphemes are common to both singular and plural.

Table 1.19 Possessa other than kin terms in the first person singular possessive declension according to Adushkina (2000: 97)

	Possessum		Possessa	
NOM	<i>val'ma-m</i>	<i>ve'le-m</i>	<i>val'ma-n</i>	<i>ve'le-ń</i>
GEN	–	–	–	–
DAT	–	–	–	–
ABL		<i>val'ma-do-n</i>		<i>ve'le-de-ń</i>
INE		<i>val'ma-so-n</i>		<i>ve'le-se-ń</i>
ELA		<i>val'ma-sto-n</i>		<i>ve'le-ste-ń</i>
ILL		<i>val'ma-zo-n</i>		<i>ve'le-ze-ń</i>
PROL		<i>val'ma-va-n</i>		<i>ve'le-va-n</i>
COMP		<i>val'ma-ška-n</i>		<i>ve'le-ška-n</i>
ABE		<i>val'ma-vtomo-n</i>		<i>ve'le-vteme-ń</i>

In table (1.19), featuring common nouns, there is a structural flaw apparent in the treatment of the two common nouns *val'ma* ‘window’ and *ve'le* ‘village’, namely, there is no attested differentiation for number of possessa given beyond the nominative, and therefore one might reformulate this table in the following paradigm (see table 1.20). The implicit absence of genitive forms in Adushkina's presentation of the possessive

declension is echoed in Pall's brief discussion of the possessive declension, as well (Pall 1996: 13-14). With the exception of the 3SG and possibly 1SG forms there is no formal distinction between word forms with functions generally attributed to the nominative and genitive cases. (See section 4.2.1.1. Core Cases, below for further discussion.)

Table 1.20 Possessa other than kin terms in the first person singular possessive

	NOM.SG	NOM.PL	GEN	DAT	ABL
<i>val'ma</i> 'window'	<i>val'ma+m</i>	<i>val'ma+n</i>	–	–	<i>val'ma+do+n</i>
<i>ve'le</i> 'village'	<i>ve'le+m</i>	<i>ve'le+ñ</i>	–	–	<i>ve'le+d'e+ñ</i>
INE	ELA	ILL	PROL	COMP	ABE
<i>val'ma+so+n</i>	<i>val'ma+sto+n</i>	<i>val'ma+z+on</i>	<i>val'ma+va+n</i>	<i>val'ma+ška+n</i>	<i>val'ma+vtomo+n</i>
<i>ve'le+se+ñ</i>	<i>ve'le+ste+ñ</i>	<i>ve'le+z+eñ</i>	<i>ve'le+van</i>	<i>ve'le+ška+n</i>	<i>ve'le+vt'eme+ñ</i>

Agafonova (2000: 136–141) indicates a number of definite and indefinite pronouns which are feasibly declined in the possessive declension. Thus she indicates not only the presence of definite pronoun forms, such as, *lija+m* other_PRON-DET+POSS-1SG, *e'va+m* each_PRON-DET+POSS-1SG and *išt'amo+m* like-this_PRON-DET+POSS-1SG, but also indefinite pronouns, such as, *koi-meže+m* something_PRON-INDEF+POSS-1SG and *ka'na-kodamo+m* some-kind-of_PRON-INDEF+POSS-1SG. Agafonova (143–145) also provides genitive forms of the personal and reflexive/intensive pronouns, which can be inflected in the definite declension, see tables (1.21–1.22).

Table 1.21 Personal pronouns in genitive case used as modifiers

Neutral	Reflexive/intensive
<i>moñ</i> I_PRON-PERS-1SG.GEN	<i>mon+ś+eñ</i> I_PRON-PERS-1SG.REFL+POSS-1SG>GEN
<i>toñ</i> you_PRON-PERS-2SG.GEN	<i>ton+ś+eť</i> you_PRON-PERS-2SG.REFL+POSS-2SG>GEN
<i>sonze</i> he/she/it_PRON-PERS-3SG.POSS-3SG.GEN	<i>son+ś+enze</i> he/she/it_PRON-PERS-3SG.REFL+POSS-3SG>GEN
<i>miñek</i> we_PRON-PERS-1PL.POSS-3SG.GEN	<i>miñ+ś+eñek</i> we_PRON-PERS-1PL.REFL+POSS-1PL>GEN
<i>tijñk</i> you_PRON-PERS-2PL.POSS-2PL.GEN	<i>tijñ+ś+eñk</i> you_PRON-PERS-2PL.REFL+POSS-2PL>GEN
<i>siñst</i> they_PRON-PERS-3PL.POSS-3PL.GEN	<i>siññ+ś+est</i> they_PRON-PERS-3PL.REFL+POSS-3PL>GEN

In the transition from genitive-form reflexive/intensive pronouns, however, the first and second person singular forms lose their possessive markers and therefore the 1SG and 2SG concatenation scheme would indicate GENITIVE-CASE PERSONAL PRONOUN + DISTAL DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN + SECONDARY DECLENSION, instead of the expected GENITIVE-FORM REFLEXIVE/INTENSIVE PERSONAL PRONOUN + SECONDARY DECLENSION, cf. Evsev'ev (1963: 162–163). (In this author's transcription of the Cyrillic script the genitive-form stems in the 1SG and 2SG personal pronouns are marked palatalized *ñ*.)

Table 1.22 Genitive-case reflexive/intensive personal pronouns singular with varied concatenation strategies

	Singular NP head		
	1SG	2SG	3SG
SG			
NOM	<i>moń+še+ś</i>	<i>toń+še+ś</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+ś</i>
GEN	<i>moń+še+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+eńt'</i>
DAT	<i>moń+še+ńteń</i>	<i>toń+še+ńteń</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+eńteń</i>
ABL	<i>moń+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+d'e+ńt'</i>
INE	<i>moń+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+se+ńt'</i>
ELA	<i>moń+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+ste+ńt'</i>
PROL	<i>moń+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+va+ńt'</i>
TRNSL	<i>moń+še+ks</i>	<i>toń+še+ks</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+ks</i>
COMP	<i>moń+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+ška+ńt'</i>
ABE	<i>moń+še+vt'eme+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+vt'eme+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+vt'eme+ńt'</i>

(cf. Agafonova 2000: 143–144)

Possession

Possessor indexing is used with a variety of possessa including: (i) kinship terms indicating close relatives (32); (ii) nouns designating body parts (33); (iii) nouns designating apparel (34); (iv) nouns designating physical, psychological states and various phenomena ascribed to activities of the human organism (35), and (v) nouns designating measurements and other qualities of objects (36) (cf. Tikhonova 1980: 183–187). (For other reading in Erzya possession, see Feoktistov 1963, Tikhonova 1974, Tsygankin 1978 and Kudashova 2002.)

- (32) *ava+zo+jak,* *kaťa* *baba,*
mother_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG+CLT *Katya_N-PRP.ABS* *old-lady_N.NOM.SG,*
sa+ś *ćora+nsteń* *l'ezda+m+o,*
arrive_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG **son_N+POSS-3SG>DAT** *help_V+INF-LOC,*
son+gak *ul'ne+ś* *pek*
he/she_PRON-PERS-3SG.NOM+CLT *be_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG* *very_ADV*
kol *mekš+t'+ńe+ń* *mel'ga* *jaka+m+ńt'*
skilled_A.NOM.SG *bee_N+PL+DEF.PL+GEN* *after_POP* *walk_V+N-OM+GEN.DEF.SG*
kuvall, *atá+nsteń* *ešto*
according_POP, **old-man_N+POSS-3SG>DAT** *already_ADV-TEMP*
l'ezdakšno+ś
help_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG

(Tikhonova 1980: 183: [Èrkai]) ‘Even his mother, Gramma Katya, came to help her son, she too was very good at working with bees, she had helped her old man [when he was around].’

- (33) *ked'+eń* *čama+m*
hand/arm_N+POSS-1SG>NOM.PL **face_N+POSS-1SG>NOM.SG**
š'akšnokšn+ǰń *to+so* *e'rekšija+ń*
 wash_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-1SG>3PL there_PRON-DEM+INE quicksilver_N+GEN
ved'+se
 water_N+INE
 (Tikhonova 1980: 184: [Pyatayev, È.] 'I've washed my hands and face there in the crystal-clear waters')
- (34) *peťa* *dĭ* *miša* *kajše+št'*
 Petya_N-PRP.NOM.SG and_CONJ Misha_N-PRP.NOM.SG take-off_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3PL
ponks+ost **-panar+ost** *šulm+iž*
pants_N+POSS-3PL-shirt_N+POSS-3PL **tie_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3PL>3P**
p'ra+z+ost *dĭ* *valg+št'*
 head_N+ILL+POSS-3PL and_CONJ go-down_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3PL
ved'+eń'eń
 water_N+DEF.SG.DAT
 (Tikhonova 1980: 184: [Abramov, K.] 'Petya and Misha took off their clothes, tied them on their heads and went down to the water.'
- (35) *pařak,* *te* *tej+ež+gak* *ańšak*
 perhaps_ADV, this_PRON-DEM.NOM.SG do_V+PTC-OZ+CLT only_ADV
še+ń *kis,* *štobu* *miřal* *dĭ*
 that_PRON-DEM+GEN for_POP.ILL, so-that_CONJ Mikhal_N-PRP.NOM.SG and_CONJ
anka **keńarks+ost** *kijak* *marto*
 Anka_N-PRP.NOM.SG **joy_N+POSS-3PL** anybody_PRON-INDEF.NOM.SG with_POP
avol'+t' *javo*
 not_V-AUX-NEG-CONJ+PL share_V.CONNEG
 (Tikhonova 1980: 184: [Èrkai, N.] 'Maybe, this had actually been done so that Mikhal and Anka would not share their jubilation with anyone.'
- (36) *ton,* *jefim* *ivanovič,* *davaj*
 you_PRON-PERS-2SG.NOM, Yefim_N-PRP.NOM.SG Ivanovich_N-PRP.NOM.SG, give_PRT-IMP
užeře+ńt' *moń+eń,* *te*
 ax_N+GEN.DEF.SG I_PRON-PERS-1SG.DAT.POSS-1SG, this_PRON-DEM.ABS
tev+eš *moń.* *ańšak* *jovt+ĭk,*
 thing_N+GEN.DEF.SG I_PRON-PERS-1SG.NOM. only_ADV tell_V+IMP.PRED-2SG>3SG,
kodamo *[stol'+eńt']* **kele+ze**
 what-kind-of_PRON-INTER-A.NOM.SG [table_N+GEN.DEF.SG] **width_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG**
dĭ **kuvalmo+zó** *karm+i* *ul'+em+e*
 and_CONJ **length_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG** begin_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG be_V+INF+LOC
 (Tikhonova 1980: 185: [Èrkai 1969: 40]) '[Okay] Yefim Ivanovich, hand me that ax, this is my job. Just tell [me] how wide and long it is going to be.'

Controller/possessor indexing is not limited to the semantics of possession rather this indexing strategy is used with contextually unique target referents, as well, which have been addressed as items unique to a given situation or the universe. This uniqueness or high physical salience, is perhaps parallel to the very same deictic marking strategy found in the indication of book prices, see (37), when the price of a book is given in Erzya on the cover of the book, we find the word followed subsequently by the price value, ‘price’ is an integral attribute or dimension of the referent ‘book’.

- (37) *pit'ne+ze*
 price_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG
 ‘its price’

In a parallel to the high physical salience attested in (37), we will note that an integral part of a stream, may well be the temperature of the water in it – where high physical salience is especially well perceived if the water is exceptionally cold, see (38). (See discussion in section 4.2.3.1.3. THIRD PERSON.)

- (38) *koda* *pojg+it'* *sizrań+ev?*
 how_PRON-INTER end-up_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-2SG Syzran_N-PRP+LAT?
mir'de+m *to+sto+ń,* – *vera*
 husband_N+POSS-1SG>NOM.SG there_PRON-DEM+ELA+GEN, – Vera_N-PRP.NOM.SG
kaj+ińže *tuf'l'a+t'ńe+ń* *dĭ*
 take-off_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG>3PL slipper_N+PL+DEF.PL+GEN and_CONJ
eskel'da+ś *čud'ikeŕks+eńteń.* – *vaj,*
 stride_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG stream_N+DEF.SG.DAT. – oh_INTERJ,
kodamo *kel'me* *ved'+eze!*
 what-kind-of_PRON-INTER-A cold_A.NOM.SG **water_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG**
 (Altyskin 1986: 28) ‘How did you end up in Syzran? / My husband [is] from there, – Vera took off her slippers and stepped into the stream. My, this water is cold!’

Cross-referential adnominal-person marking in Erzya is manifest in the range of noun phrases, personal pronouns and quantifiers, as well as, adpositional and non-finite phrases. Although certain parallels can be drawn between these five subranges with regard to concatenation ordering, there are other parameters, too. These might include the optionality of morphological marking, the variation between morphological and lexical marking of adnominal person, the defectivity of the genitive and dative slots of the possessive declension, and the disparity of concatenation in secondary declension strategies.

2. Methodology and Corpora

Outline of methodology

This chapter will describe the methodology followed in the study of adnominal person in the morphological system of Erzya and address various theoretical issues encountered therein.

The steps in such a study can be enumerated in the following:

I A database has been established to serve as the empirical basis of study. This consists of compiling materials representative of work in Erzya grammar and two text corpora of the Erzya written language. The sources of grammars, descriptions and treatises of the language span the era 1839 to 2010, and they comprise works by authors both native and non-native. The written sources, consisting of mainly original Erzya literature from the 1880s to the present, have been subdivided into a so called MAJORITY CORPUS, comprising a total of 142 documents, and a subset thereof consisting of 9 documents, the MINORITY CORPUS, which has been semi-automatically parsed with a two-level analyzer constructed according to the descriptions afforded in steps (II-III) and subsequently disambiguated manually.

II A description will be given of the phonological phenomena attested in the orthography of the literary language which will include an attestable enumeration of phonemes in the language and ones utilized in the treatise. Additionally, regular-expression notations illustrating relevant sound variation applicable to two-level allomorphic description will also be given.

III A description of stem types associated with the range of adnominal-person marking will be given with a subsequent morpho-semantic inspection of all affixes associated with these stem types, i.e. case, deictic marking (possessive and definite declension), nominal conjugation and enclitic marking, such as would provide necessary information for the construction of a two-level semi-automatic parser for use in the disambiguation of the MINORITY CORPUS.

IV The 13 case forms compatible with adnominal-person marking, as outlined in the morpho-semantic inspection, will be used in combination with frequency data to establish sublexica pertinent to the study of adnominal-person marking.

V A two-level semi-automatic parser has been constructed, utilizing the descriptions afforded in II-III, for rendering a parsed version of the MINORITY CORPUS, which was then manually disambiguated so that comparative data could be obtained for the inspection of some, otherwise, ambiguous paradigm cells obtaining in the MAJORITY CORPUS.

VI Statistics will be given for variations in the compatibility of sublexicon-case alignments extracted in step IV with morphological versus lexical adnominal person based on data from both corpora.

VII An inspection will be made of defectivity focusing on the genitive slot of the possessive declension.

VIII An inspection will be made of adnominal-person marking and its compatibility with two strategies of contextual secondary declension, *MWN*.

In practice, these steps are not disjoint, but are necessarily overlapping to some degree. In the following sections I will discuss the choices made in this methodology in greater detail.

2.1. Corpora

In order to facilitate a representative illustration of the Erzya language, there are certain facets of the language that can be best attested on the basis of a majority corpus. This means that morphological and orthographical practices of the language should be documented on the basis of positive evidence, i.e. the presence of morphological forms, as well as the compiling of attested morphological paradigms and syntax data. To this end a majority corpus, consisting of 140 publications in Erzya rendered in XML format, has been established along with a semi-automatically parsed and manually disambiguated minority corpus representing the writings of six Erzya authors. Since the establishment of the majority corpus involves the scanning and proof-reading of all 140 texts (see <<http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/~rueter/rsc/rueter-ErzyaSource.xml>>), it can be characterized as time-consuming, the criteria for selection of a representative minority corpus, however, are best outlined below.

In an endeavor to delimit literary corpora illustrative of the grammar and usage pool sources available in a recently established literary medium (Erzya 1821 to present), it is necessary that specific parameters be set. Such delimiters entail: (1) the language of origin; (2) the point on the revision-editing cline represented by the text, and (3) the availability of additional materials for author inspection in the complete text corpora.

By means of the language of origin parameter we are able to discriminate in favor of original native texts, which might help to avoid the frequency of translation flaws, i.e. translanguing interference, resulting in statistical skewing of usage strategies involving what would otherwise be considered native-language phenomena. This delimitation does not, however, rule out the establishment of translation corpora, since these are useful in parallel corpora research, whose results can aid in the advancement of translation strategy and stylistic instruction. Furthermore, translated literature might be the only domain attesting genres depictive of user targeted (dogmatic), user oriented (access) literature in the original language.

In an effort to establish variants of the written language similar or adjacent to those represented in interactional communication, i.e. dialogue as conceived by an individual

native speaker, we will give a preference to **manuscripts**, as representative of original but possibly revised renditions of an individual language user's conception of language in context. The language found in this first phase of the writing process would presumably differ from that found in edited versions, where the written product is subject to the coordinated efforts of at least two individuals, whereas revised versions of published materials often witness the incursion of evaluating peers, ideologists, etc. It should be noted, however, no matter how many times a piece is rewritten, proof-read and edited, it must to some extent retain something original from its author, and therefore, regardless of whether the publisher was a typography, journal, publishing company or other, the name of the author should be included whenever it is available. (There is a tendency in modern research of the Erzya and Moksha language to leave the authors unmentioned if they happen to be published in a journal. This, of course, is like indicating the name of a prominent journal when it has published an excerpt from Shakespeare's works, instead of Shakespeare himself.) The indication of authors helps in the identification of synchronic-geographical parameters that might readily correlate with treatises on Erzya dialect research. Awares of the relatively short history of written Erzya, it would appear that a dialect-synchronic framework of Erzya studies might be more feasible than a hypothetical-diachronic framework (cf. Aasmäe 2007: 269-270).

Original publications undergo the scrutiny of possible proof-readers and editors, who subject the writing to the standardization efforts of their own, persons conceivably representing a different language background to that of the author. Since any amount of scrutiny from a second party may bring about alterations, so called enhancements and embellishments, in the individual's integrational efforts, we must assume that we are no longer dealing with a language form entirely within the individual's competence of integrational language. Original publications are, however, the written form to be presumed closest to the original manuscript, and any subsequent publications or editions will be assumed to depart even further from that origin.

When writings are subjected to further self-introspection, scrutiny and editing as is likely in the case of **second printings and editions**, they have often undergone adjustments involving alterations in word usage, syntactic structure, and, perhaps, even thematical development. This type of alteration may enhance the artistic value of the literary work, but it divorces it from the original individual effort at integrational communication on an individual level. Refined literary works might then make their own category of text corpora. Hence it might be argued that there is always a difference between an original writing by a refined author and the refined text of an original author.

By delimiting the Erzya literary corpora of manuscripts and first printings of native writings further with a quantity factor of 100,000 words, we limit ourselves to a set of mature writers, who over time have published at least two large pieces of literature. Here Kirillov, whose available materials consist of collected works and a translation from the majority Russian language, will serve as a conceivably skewed sub-subset:

- Abramov, Kuz'ma G. (1914–2008)
- Bryzhinski, Mikhail I. (1951)
- Doronin, Aleksandr M. (1947)
- Kutorkin, Andrei D. (1906–1991)
- Shcheglov, Aleksandr S. (1916–1989)
- Kirillov, Pyotr S. (1910–1955)

Table 2.1 The MINORITY CORPUS comprises the following publications:

Erzya writer	Original language	Publication status	Year of acquisition	Title – genre	Words total
Abramov	Erzya	First printing	1988	Purgaz – novel	131,162
Bryzhinski	Erzya	Manuscript	2006	Kirdažt – ethnofantastics	50,666
Bryzhinski	Erzya	First printing	1991	Eřamodo nadobija – short stories, essays	46,903
Bryzhinski	Erzya	First printing	1983	Polovt – short story	36,993
Doronin	Erzya	First printing	2001	Kužma Aleksej – novel	102,819
Kutorkin	Erzya	First printing	1987	Lažņića Sura, III – novel	94,665
Shcheglov	Erzya	First printing	1980	Kavksť čačož, I – novel	94,450
Kirillov	Erzya	Second printings	1997	(Selected writings)	78,620
Kirillov	Russian	First printing	1951	(Bubenov: “Belaya beryoza”) Ašo kilej – novel	179,256
Total words					815,534

2.2. Phonological phenomena of modern Erzya

This portion will include the establishment of a set of phonemes in the Erzya language, and a description of their interaction in the phonetic processes. First, attestations of phoneme status will be made for one additional vowel and consonant in the modern Erzya language. The former attestation will require a scrutiny of majority-corpus word forms for minimal-pair attestation in WORD STEMS, whereas the latter will involve the scrutiny of WORD STEMS VERSUS WORD STEM + [DECLENSION | ENCLITIC MARKING] schemes. Second, outlines will be provided for phenomena central to the orthographic workings of the written language, e.g. vowel harmony, palatal harmony, devoicing, voicing, loss of affix-initial *v*, stem-final vowel loss.

2.3. Morpho-semantic evaluation of stems and affixes

The morpho-semantic description of stems and affixes comprises the establishment of three noun-stem types and the inspection of affixes used in the three layers of noun inflection. Three noun-stem types can be derived from declension notations provided in the latest Erzya-Russian dictionary ЭРЗЯНЬ-РУЗОНЬ ВАЛКС (henceforth ERV 1993). Case forms, definitions and attestation involve work with several grammars of the Erzya language, and majority-corpus attestation of data is provided, where possible, for morphemes with refuted or dubious attestation in grammars.

2.4. Compatibility of case and adnominal-person morphology

The majority corpus will be searched for co-occurrences of case and adnominal-person marking. This is achieved by counting unique word forms in the corpus, and then filtering for those forms with morphological case and person marking. A list of unique word forms with their correlating frequency counts will be derived from the majority corpus using the following commands:

```
$ cat corpus.txt | tr '\ ' '\n' | egrep -f cyrillics.regex | sort | uniq -c | sort -nr >
```

This will produce a read-out of word forms, written in Cyrillics, with a number corresponding to the number of hits for each pattern. Thus the ten most frequent word forms in the majority corpus of about four and a half million words, of which there are about 286,876 unique word forms, can be exhibited in table (2.2), whereas the transcription and parse columns have been added by this author to facilitate better comprehension by the reader.

Table 2.2 Ten most frequent word forms in the Erzya majority corpus of 4.5 million words

Order	Frequencies	Word forms	Transcription	Parse
1	94,620	ды	<i>dḱ</i>	and/but_CONJ
2	70,586	а	<i>a</i>	not_PRT-NEG but_CONJ
3	30,881	сон	<i>son</i>	he/she/it_PRON-PERS-3SG.NOM
4	21,242	марто	<i>marto</i>	with_POP
5	20,923	эзь	<i>ež</i>	not_V-AUX.PRETI.PRED-3SG
6	18,507	те	<i>te</i>	this_PRON-DEM.NOM.SG
7	18,125	кода	<i>koda</i>	how_PRON-INTER when_PRON-REL
8	17,457	лангс	<i>lang+s</i>	on/at_POP+ILL
9	16,803	мерсь	<i>meř+ś</i>	say_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG
10	16,386	Сон	<i>son</i>	he/she/it_PRON-PERS-3SG.NOM

In table (2.2) it will be noted that the 3SG personal pronoun appears in both line 3 and line 10. The upper-case form of this personal pronoun in line (10) indicates that the word form was located in sentence-initial position; this provides an insight into sentence-structure that is especially utilized in the attestation of adposition and adnominal-person form variation.

Once the word forms and frequencies have been extracted, a filter consisting of word-final inflections equivalent to cross-referential person markers followed by optional nominal predication markers and finally an optional clitic will be used in combination with an immediately preceding case marker. The REGEX below provides an example of how co-occurrence for the nominative and person patterns, the most ambiguous, will be derived.

Table 2.3 Derivation of nominative-case predicate-person patterns

```

1SG = (а|я|о|ё|е|э|и|ы|у|ю)м(гак|ан(гак)|ат(как)|та(нд)о(як)|(о)е)линь(гак)|(о)е)
лит(ьяк|ьяк|ьяк)|(о)е)ль(гак)|(о)е)линек(ак|как)|(о)е)лиде(як)|(о)е)льт(ьяк|ьяк))(<|$| )
##

1SG = (а|я|о|ё|у|ю)н(гак|ан(гак)|ат(как)|та(нд)о(як)|(о)линь(гак)|(о)
лит(ьяк|ьяк|ьяк)|(о)ль(гак)|(о)линек(ак|как)|(о)лиде(як)|(о)льт(ьяк|ьяк))(<|$| )
##

1SG = (е|э|и|ы)н(ьяк|ян(гак)|ят(как)|тя(нд)о(як)|(е)линь(гак)|(е)лит(ьяк|ьяк)|(е)
ль(гак)|(е)линек(ак|как)|(е)лиде(як)|(е)льт(ьяк|ьяк))(<|$| )
##

2SG = (а|я|о|ё|у|ю)т(как|ан(гак)|ат(как)|та(нд)о(як)|(о)линь(гак)|(о)
лит(ьяк|ьяк|ьяк)|(о)ль(гак)|(о)линек(ак|как)|(о)лиде(як)|(о)льт(ьяк|ьяк))(<|$| )
##

2SG = (е|э|и|ы)т(ьяк|ян(гак)|ят(как)|тя(нд)о(як)|(е)линь(гак)|(е)лит(ьяк|ьяк)|(е)
ль(гак)|(е)линек(ак|как)|(е)лиде(як)|(е)льт(ьяк|ьяк))(<|$| )
##

3SG.NOM.SG = (а|я|о|ё|е|э|и|ы|у|ю)з((о)э)(як)ан(гак)|ат(как)|(о)э)линь(гак)|(о)э)
лит(ьяк|ьяк|ьяк)|(о)э)ль(гак))(<|$| )
##

3SG = (а|я|о|ё|е|э|и|ы|у|ю)нз((о)э)(як)от(ак|как)|эт(ьяк|ьяк)|ан(гак)|ат(ак|ка
к)|ота(нд)о)этя(нд)о(як)|(о)э)линь(гак)|(о)э)лит(ьяк|ьяк)|(о)э)ль(гак)|(о)э)
ли(нек(ак|как)|де(як)|(о)е)льт(ьяк|ьяк))(<|$| )
##

1PL = (а|я|о|ё|у|ю)нок(ак|как|ан(гак)|ат(как)|та(нд)о(як)|олинь(гак)|олит(ьяк|ьяк
ак)|оль(гак)|олинек(ак|как)|олиде(як)|ольт(ьяк|ьяк))(<|$| )
##

1PL = (е|э|и|ы)(нек[^<аяёюу]*нэк)(ак|как|ан(гак)|ат(как)|та(нд)о(як)|елинь(га
к)|елит(ьяк|ьяк)|ель(гак)|елинек(ак|как)|елиде(як)|ельт(ьяк|ьяк))(<|$| )
##

```

```

2PL = (а|я|о|ё|е|э|и|ы|у|ю)нк(|ак|как|ан(|гак)|ат(|ак|как)|та(н|д)о(|як)|о|е)
линь(|гак)|о|е)лит(ь|як|ькак)|о|е)ль(|гак)|о|е)линек(|ак|как)|о|е)лиде(|як)|о|е)
льт(ь|як|ькак)(<|$$| )
##
3PL = (а|я|о|ё|е|э|и|ы|у|ю)(ст)(|как|ан(|гак)|ат(|как)|та(н|д)о(|як)|о|э)линь(|гак)|о|э)
лит(ь|як|ькак)|о|э)ль(|гак)|о|э)линек(|ак|как)|о|э)лиде(|як)|о|э)льт(ь|як|ькак)(<|$$| )

```

Data extracted with this set of regular expressions will be used for establishing sublexica typically associated with adnominal person. Sublexicon distinctions will show close adherence to the parts of speech established by Mariya Imaikina (2000: 56–59), where she enumerates ten different parts of speech: NOUNS, ADJECTIVES, NUMERALS, PRONOUNS, VERBS, ADVERBS, POSTPOSITIONS, CONJUNCTIONS, PARTICLES, and INTERJECTIONS. Additional semantic characteristics will be taken into consideration to provide a more concise description of adnominal-person morphology.

The data may tend to provide ambiguous readings for the first and second persons singular of the nominative and genitive case candidates, due to the readings indefinite genitive for *-нь -Oñ* and indefinite nominative plural for *-мь/-м -T*. The reading INDEF. GEN for *-нь <= -Oñ* can be contrasted with the reading POSS-1SG>PL/OBL *-нь <= -ON*; and the reading PL for *-мь/-м <= -T* can be contrasted with the readings POSS-2SG *-мь/-м <= -OT* and POSS-2SG>[+KIN]GEN *-мь <= -t*. (This is a counter to the assumption that *-мь/-м* can be reduced to *T* representation (cf. Abondolo 1987: 219-233).) These two ambiguous sets also illustrate limitations in “egrep” strategy attestation and provide an indication as to why certain strategies of avoiding 1SG and 2SG morphemes might be merited, for example, automatic parsing strategies involving other persons.

2.5. The semi-automatic parser

In a morphological analysis of the Erzya language one must bear in mind the extent of synchronic inflectional mechanisms utilized by the collective of speakers and writers of the language. By defining DECLINABLE WORDS as words that can take case marking in the same manner as nouns, with semantic limitations, we will arrive at subsets of the Erzya lexicon enumerated in nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, non-finites, spatial adverbials and adpositions. These subsets of the Erzya lexicon attest to varied implementations of the three declension types, i.e. the INDEFINITE, the DEFINITE and the POSSESSIVE DECLENSIONS.

The methodological principles required for the description of the possessive declension in Erzya parallel work in the MORPHO-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF THE HUNGARIAN NOUN PHRASE by Moravcsik (2003). Her work is quite compatible with the preparatory morpho-semantic evaluation required in the construction of a finite-state two-level morphological parser, such as implemented in the Open Morphology of the Helsinki Finite-State Transducer (<<http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/kieliteknoogia/tutkimus/hfst/>>),

henceforth HFST. (See also Krister Lindén, Miikka Silfverberg and Tommi Pirinen 2009.) The two descriptions, it should be noted, have different scopes, and although a semi-automated analysis of Erzya, the language of study, might attest to a finer granularity in subdivisions of the lexicon made possible by co-occurrence constraints inherent in the morphological concatenation strategies of the language, disambiguation for homonymous forms would be the target of a clausal syntactic description and/or manual disambiguation of a given analyzed text.

The construction of an HFST-based morphological analyzer involves establishing morpho-syntactic building blocks and structural rules that will insure the well-formedness of a non-contextual word form through the delimitation of co-occurrence in phonemes, morphemes and sememes, and the delimitation of linear ordering. An implementation of such delimitation strategies can be outlined in the following sets and formulations, which correspond to the description of Erzya rendered in sections (3.–4.3.): (i) an alphabet of the Erzya language, i.e. phonological and graphical representations thereof (alphabet); (ii) sets of letters representing various phonetic/graphic feature groups inherent to phonetic contexts (sets); (iii) phonetic/graphic contexts intrinsic to allomorphic variation in the working of rules (contexts); (iv) rules which allow or disallow co-occurring phonetic/graphic contexts (rules); (v) part-of-speech groups with morpho-semantic granularity inherent in the derivation of well-formed lexemes (root-lexicon), and (vi) continuation lexicon strategies providing for proper linear ordering of the morphemes in a given word (continuation lexicon). Thus the extensible structural information and sets utilized in the construction of the two-level parser allow for addressing matters of cumulative expression, extended exponence, morpheme co-occurrence and linear ordering simultaneously, and therefore provides implementational force, to the otherwise parallel description afforded in the information extracted from Hungarian by Moravcsik, see sample parse table (2.4).

Table 2.4 Example of an analyzed text fragment

Ton ramik ašo el'i seń paćańt? – Ašońt'. (Cf. Egorova 1976)

‘Did you buy the white or the blue kerchief? – The white [one].’

XML input file for erzya.fst:

```
<p>
<sent><txt>Тон рамик ашо эли сэнь пацяньт?</txt></sent>
<sent><txt>Ашонть.</txt></sent>
</p>
```

Output:

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="utf-8"?>
<p>
<sent>
<txt><const type="text" wordForm="Тон">
<parse id="тон">+Pron+Pers+2Sg+Nom+NoPredx+NoClitic</parse>
</const>
```

```

<const isa="ws" type="wb"/>
<const type="text" wordForm="рамик">
<parse id="рамамс">+Verb+Orth_morph+Imp+23+NoClitic</parse>
<parse id="рамамс">+Verb+Orth_morph+Ind+PretI+23+NoClitic</parse>
</const>
<const isa="ws" type="wb"/>
<const type="text" wordForm="ашо">
<parse id="ашо">+NCom+Inanim+Cnt+Cx+Indet+Sg+Nom+0Suf+NoPredx+NoClitic</parse>
<parse id="ашо">+Adj+Cx+Indet+Sg+Nom+0Suf+NoPredx+NoClitic</parse>
</const>
<const isa="ws" type="wb"/>
<const type="text" wordForm="эли">
<parse id="эли">+Conjunction</parse>
</const>
<const isa="ws" type="wb"/>
<const type="text" wordForm="сэнъ">
<parse id="сэнъ">+Adj+Cx+Indet+Sg+Nom+0Suf+NoPredx+NoClitic</parse>
<parse id="сэнъ">+NCom+Inanim+Cnt+Cx+Indet+Sg+Nom+0Suf+NoPredx+NoClitic</parse>
</const>
<const isa="ws" type="wb"/>
<const type="text" wordForm="пацянтъ">
<parse id="паця">+NCom+Inanim+Cnt+NoLVStem+Cx+Det+Sg+Gen+NoClitic</parse>
</const>
<const isa="?" type="punct"/></txt>

<txt><const type="text" wordForm="Ашонтъ">
<parse id="ашо">+NCom+Inanim+Cnt+NoLVStem+Cx+Det+Sg+Gen+NoClitic</parse>
<parse id="ашо">+Adj+NoLVStem+Cx+Det+Sg+Gen+NoClitic</parse>
</const>
<const isa="." type="punct"/></txt></sent>
</p>

```

Manual disambiguation

Once the corpora have been automatically parsed there are a number of disambiguation problems to be dealt with. Whereas most personal pronoun forms have singleton parses, the ambiguous form *siń* has two alternative readings: one is the third person plural ‘they’ and the other a finite verb form ‘I arrived’, see table below. Further ambiguity can be detected in the pronouns/adpositions, such as that found in *teń* with the readings genitive-form proximal demonstrative pronoun ‘of this; this (object)’, and dative of the first person singular ‘to me’, see tables (2.5) and (4.49a-b).

Table 2.5 Examples of items requiring manual disambiguation in this treatise

Homonyms	Ambiguous parses
<i>siń</i>	they_PRON-PERS.NOM arrive_V.PRET.I.PRED-1SG
<i>teń</i>	to/for_PRON-DAT.POSS-1SG this_PRON-DEM-SG.GEN

2.6. Sublexicon-case alignments and variation in adnominal person

The sublexica distinguished in section 2.4. will be used in the inspection of case and adnominal person compatibility in the majority and minority corpora. Here the words attested for high statistic frequency with POSSESSIVE DECLENSION, that is, case and adnominal person compatibility, will be inspected for compatibility with lexical adnominal person. Thus claims made of free variation in adnominal-person form might be afforded statistical data for more extensive understanding of the phenomena involved, and parallels may be drawn between same-case inflections of word forms in different parts of speech.

2.7. Defectivity in the genitive slot of the possessive declension

Defectivity as discussed in Karlsson (2000) is a phenomenon that is not specific to the Finnish language. In fact, defectivity in Erzya is not unknown; Keresztes (1999: 128-130) comments on the apparently artificial optative paradigms of Wiedemann and Budenz, perhaps he means that both grammar writers have analogically formed paradigms.

In this treatise of Erzya, defectivity is seen in the genitive and dative slots of the possessive declension charts, where the two instances can be distinguished as separate phenomena. There are differences in morphological representation, on the one hand, and disparity in the definition of what a kin term is in the 1SG and 2SG contexts. The genitive case of the possessive declension can be conflated with that of the nominative in plural persons and 2SG in the modern literary language, and there is variation in the 1SG possessive declension; as such the addition of two more markers, 1SG and 2SG for

special kin terms, constitutes a surplus of genitive marking. The dative case of the possessive declension, on the contrary, is only attested in the two special kin-term forms of the 1SG and 2SG possessive declension and the 3P (see DATIVE in subsection 4.2.1.1. CORE CASES.) When we address the matter of functions attributed to the genitive, see GENITIVE in section 4.2.1.1. CORE CASES, we will note that it can be associated with the functions of POSSESSOR, ADPOSITION COMPLEMENT and FINITE-VERB ARGUMENT form with person agreement in the object conjugation, and therefore we can attest a presence of genitive forms for the grammatical categories of person and number, albeit only the 3SG marker offers indisputable proof for this, and then only with singular possessa. Thus the special markers for the 1SG and 2SG genitive slots of kin terms are additions to the six or seven genitive forms already present, i.e. some variants of the language, especially Alatyř'-dialect types, distinguish number in the 1SG genitive, as well as 2SG, 1PL and even 3PL. The dative, however, does not attest to an underlying set of six adnominal-person markers, instead there are only three markers that are frequently quoted in the grammars of the language. Hence the dative case of the possessive declension attests to a dearth of markers, as opposed to the surplus attested for the genitive case. Upon closer inspection of the Shakhmatov's attestation of 1SG and 2SG kin terms, it becomes apparent that 1SG kin terms indicate distinct, singular referents – usually elder than ego – and 2SG kin terms indicate shared-information referents that could be interpreted with little ambiguity by the merits of 2SG possessive declension or definite declension. Finally, whereas 1SG special genitive marking appears wide-spread, the 2SG kin-term strategies are less so. Hence, it has been hypothesized that use of special forms for the two persons 1SG and 2SG will not be equally attestable in the written corpora.

This section will place special emphasis on the description of defectivity in the genitive case of the possessive declension, utilizing dialect attestations and treatises to enhance the picture provided in grammars of the language and the majority corpus. It will, where possible, attempt to illuminate the workings of dative paradigm defectivity, as well.

2.8. Secondary declension

Secondary declension is a phenomenon of the noun phrase, and may best be described as the contextual dropping of a predictable head noun, such that, one of its modifiers becomes the main item of the NP, and thus we can speak of MWN (modifiers without nouns), cf. Gil (WALS feature/chapter 61 [Adjectives without nouns]). Here, modifiers will be scrutinized for compatibility with two different strategies of MODIFIER-WITHOUT-NOUN marking (henceforth MWN), ZERO marking versus SPEAKER-ORIENTED DEMONSTRATIVE marking (henceforth SOD). Subsequently, a description will be given of adnominal-person-marking compatibility with the two strategies of MWN, whereas word items will be examined for compatibility with secondary declension in possessive-declension forms, on the one hand, and possessive-declension word forms will be examined for compatibility with secondary declension of any form, on the other.

3. Phonology

Our understanding of form is readily developed by considering: (1) phonemes in Erzya transliteration, and (2) phonetic phenomena behind allomorphic variation.

3.1. Phonemes in Erzya transliteration

The discussion of Erzya phonetics will be limited to the phenomena attested in the written corpora, a subset of all Erzya language publications since 1821 (see corpora, 2.1.), that have a bearing on allophonic and allomorphic variation in word forms where adnominal-type cross-referential person marking can occur. For this reason special attention may be afforded items which, otherwise, are foregone in grammars of the language.

According to the most recent treatise of Erzya phonetics “Неень шкань эрзянь кельсь, фонетика” (‘The modern Erzya language, phonetics’ / ‘The Erzya language is a modern one, phonetics’) by Maria D. Imaikina, the language can be phonematically represented with 5 vowels and 28 consonants: <а, э, и, о, у>, <б, в, г, д, д', ж, з, з', й, к, л, л', м, н, н', п, р, р', с, с', т, т', ф, х, ц, ц', ч, ш> (Imaikina 2008: 91, 294). This, in fact, represents the same school of thought as what is found in a fairly recent non-native grammar of the Erzya and Moksha language by Raija Bartens *Mordvalaiskielten rakenne ja kehitys* (‘The Structure and Development of the Mordvin Languages’), henceforth (Bartens 1999), see the tables, which are borrowed from Bartens, below. (If we count the consonants, however, we will notice there are actually 29 and not the 28 mentioned in the text.)

Table 3.1 Vowel phonemes attested in the first syllable

	Front	Central	Back
High	<i>i</i>		<i>u</i>
Mid	<i>e</i>		<i>o</i>
Low		<i>a</i>	

(cf. Bartens 1999: 27)

Table 3.2 Consonants: 29 consonant phonemes

	Labial	Alveolar	Post-alveolar	Palatal	Velar
Plosives	<i>p</i>	<i>t</i>		<i>tʰ</i>	<i>k</i>
	<i>b</i>	<i>d</i>		<i>dʰ</i>	<i>g</i>
Affricates		<i>c</i>	<i>č</i>	<i>č</i>	
S(h)ibilants		<i>s</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>š</i>	
		<i>z</i>	<i>ž</i>	<i>ž</i>	
Fricatives	<i>(f)</i>				<i>(x)</i>
	<i>v</i>			<i>j</i>	
Nasals	<i>m</i>	<i>n</i>		<i>ɲ</i>	<i>(ŋ)</i>
Laterals		<i>l</i>		<i>lʲ</i>	
		<i>r</i>		<i>ɹ</i>	

(cf. Bartens 1999: 27)

The only conflict between these two enumerations of phonemes is found in the twenty-ninth consonant of Bartens's table, the velar nasal *ŋ*. This disparity might be due to the fact that the written standard of modern Erzya is based on a non-extended Cyrillic alphabet, which has no marking for a velar nasal. Imaikina appears to totally ignore the existence of a velar nasal phoneme, and Bartens provides the explanation that *ŋ* appears in a very small area in the Northwestern (Alatyr') dialect type (see Bartens 1999: 27). Virtually all velar nasals in the Erzya literary language occur in the coda followed by a velar plosive. Elsewhere the velar nasal of the Northwest dialect type has assimilated to the velar-labial and palatal glides. Hence the contention is that the phonetic velar nasal found before velar plosives is allophonic, and therefore it can be represented by the alveolar nasal *n* phoneme. This, in fact, should be the conclusion – provided there are no instances of phonetic alveolar nasals *n* and *ɲ* directly preceding the velar plosives *k* and *g*. In the spoken language, there is actually a particle with an onset rounded velar nasal *ŋot* ‘so [you see]’ (Niina Nujanžina-Aasmäe, p.c., 2009; cf. Nad'kin 1968: 177). There are minimal pairs to demonstrate the presence of non-velar nasals preceding velar plosives, see table (3.3).

Table 3.3 Attestation of phonetic alveolar nasal before velar plosive in Erzya

Cyrillics			Phonetic representation	
Headword	Word form	Gloss	Headword	Word form
ян	ян+га	path_N+PROL	<i>jan</i>	<i>jana</i>
янгамс	янга+Ø	break_V+CONNEX	<i>janɡams</i>	<i>janɡa</i>
ён	ён+кс ~ ён+окс	good_A+TRNSL, side_N+TRNSL	<i>jon</i>	<i>jonks ~ jonoks</i>
ёнкс	ёнкс	side/direction_N.NOM.SG	<i>jonks</i>	<i>jonks</i>

The number of minimal pairs of this type are extremely limited since this appears to be a phenomenon on the grammaticalization cline, where the word *jonks* ‘side; direc-

tion; region' is a derived form from *jon* 'side' and the derivation morpheme *-ks*, which appears to be graphically identical to on variant of the translative, thus we can observe phonetic disambiguation that does not show at the orthographic level. This is an instance of stem retention where a stem consonant observes paradigmatic consistency throughout declension, conjugation and, ultimately, clitic marking. Therefore the attestation of a velar phoneme hinges on the merits of the minimal pair *not* 'note' versus *ȳot* 'so', and the junctures with the sequence: adjacent stem alveolar nasal and affixal velar stop, as well as nasal-stop + velar-plosive sequences attested in recent Russian loanwords in [nk] versus Erzyafied loans and native stems in [ŋk].

If we go back to the treatment of Erzya phonetics in the 1920s and 1930s, we will note that Evsev'ev (1929) and Bubrikh (1930) focus some attention on the phonetically attested unrounded high and mid central vowels. Evsev'ev contemplates the unrounded high central vowel in Russian loan words and the fact that Mordvins less familiar with Russian tend to replace this vowel with an unrounded high front vowel, see table below. Bubrikh notes that there are no minimal pairs for unrounded high and mid vowels following alveolars and post-alveolars. His arguments are that in Erzya-type pronunciation post-alveolars are never followed by front variants of the high and mid vowels, and that with alveolar consonants the palatalized ones co-occur with front variants of the unrounded high and mid vowels while non-palatalized ones co-occur with central variants (cf. Bubrikh 1930: 5, 10).

Table 3.4 Pronunciation of Russian *ы* by Erzya speakers unfamiliar with Russian

Russian	Erzya pronunciation	Gloss
мы	ми	we_PRON-PERS-1PL
мыло	мило	soap_N
мышь	мишь	mouse_N
вы	ви	you_PRON-PERS-2PL
вышивка	вишивка	embroidery_N
рыба	риба	fish_N
был	бил	was_V.PAST.MASCULINE

(Evsev'ev 1963: 26)

In short Bubrikh claimed that the allophones front *i* and central *ɨ* could be represented by an unrounded, high front phoneme *i*, and likewise the allophones front *e* and central *ɛ* could be represented by an unrounded, mid front phoneme *e*. Evsev'ev, on his part, contended that Erzyas unfamiliar with the Russian language would pronounce an unrounded front high vowel instead of the Russian central vowel after labials and even the alveolar trill. This argumentation has been seized at by Western scholars, as well, and might go uncontested if it were not for the fact that the Soviet and Post-Soviet Eras have brought Russian, majority language literacy to virtually all speakers of Erzya, and that there is minimal pair evidence for unrounded high front and central vowels in Erzya word roots, but not derivation, see table (3.5), below.

Table 3.5 Attestation of unrounded high central and front vowels in Erzya

Word	Gloss	Word	Gloss
<i>ir̥nems</i>	‘to howl menacingly’	<i>ir̥nems</i>	‘to howl, to yowl’
<i>viška</i>	‘antenna’	<i>viška</i>	‘little’
<i>vij</i>	‘ugh, yuck’	<i>vij</i>	‘might, strength’
<i>bižnems</i>	‘to buzz (of a bumble bee)’	<i>bižnems</i>	‘to whine (of a mosquito)’
<i>m̥ir</i>	‘ideophonic (purring sound)’	<i>m̥ir</i>	‘peace’
<i>kiŋgama</i>	‘curry comb, brush’	<i>kiŋgams</i>	‘clean of (twigs, knots)’

Since unrounded high front and central vowels can be attested for at least affected and loan vocabulary, the question remains, whether there is also evidence for two non-back central vowel phonemes. A quick check of the corpora showed that there were 326,948 unique word forms in the corpora, and that a total of 284,293 unique word forms contain non-alveolar consonants. Of these 1,424 unique word forms contain instances of non-alveolar consonants followed by the high central vowel *ɨ* and 191 unique word forms attest instances of non-alveolar consonants followed by the mid central vowel *ə*. Instances with a mid central vowel *ə* included the pronunciation of acronyms and interjections otherwise the majority of instances were due to typographical errors; no minimal pairs were attested, and the pronunciation of acronyms can also be illustrated using the unrounded high central *ɨ*. Assuming that numbers of fifteen or less might be indicative of a single headword representation or merely typographical errors, the grapheme *ə* will be observed to occur regularly only after alveolar fricatives in word-initial position. These fricatives – it will be noted – appear to be the only consonants with robust minimal pairs to attest phonematic palatal/non-palatal alveolar distributions that can, through comparative linguistics be traced back to the Pre-Mordvinic proto-languages (Tsygankin, p.c.). The nasal stop, it will be noted, has a very low attestation as non-palatal before non-back vowels and palatal before back vowel, a fact which is reflected in some free morph and inflectional combinations, e.g. *Иванны́зэ* ‘Ivan's wife’ from *Иван* ‘Ivan’ + *ни́зэ* ‘wife; his wife’; *эйкакш+т+нэ* child_{N+PL+DEF.PL}, see palatal harmony below.

Table 3.6 Word-initial single alveolars followed by vowels in unique word forms of the Erzya corpora

Al-veo-lar	<i>a</i>	<i>ɨ</i>	<i>y</i>	<i>ə</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>ɤ</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>ju</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>ë</i>	Total
<i>m</i>	4082	318	1985	11	4093	218	650	772	5023	219	17371
<i>ð</i>	478	110	787	5	1122	71	878	25	807	137	4420
<i>n</i>	3965	14	1975	15	1840	82	1116	48	3066	15	12136
<i>ç</i>	110	68	8	0	82	542	986	253	808	809	3666
<i>s</i>	4403	1619	2326	1375	3978	1087	2092	1544	4171	1515	24110
<i>z</i>	1618	133	68	236	267	218	80	12	409	72	3113
<i>p</i>	3316	112	1129	13	1847	180	947	62	1324	0	8930
<i>l</i>	4451	473	768	7	2653	88	2665	254	4219	183	15761
Total	22423	2847	9046	1662	15882	2486	9414	2970	19827	2950	89507

For purposes of phonetic transcription in this dissertation we will use a set of 29 consonants and 6 vowels in the presentation of both word stems and inflections, see tables (3.7, 3.8).

Table 3.7 Vowel phonemes attested in Erzya word stems (6)

	Front	Central	Back
High	<i>i</i>	<i>ĩ</i>	<i>u</i>
Mid	<i>e</i>		<i>o</i>
Low		<i>a</i>	

Table 3.8 Consonant phonemes attested in Erzya (29)
Alveolars

	Labials	Labio-dentals	Non-palatalized	Palatalized	Post-Alveolars	Palatal	Velars
Plosives	<i>p</i>		<i>t</i>	<i>tʲ</i>			<i>k</i>
	<i>b</i>		<i>d</i>	<i>dʲ</i>			<i>g</i>
Nasals	<i>m</i>		<i>n</i>	<i>nʲ</i>			<i>ŋ</i>
Affricates			<i>c</i>	<i>cʲ</i>	<i>č</i>		
Fricatives		<i>f</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>sʲ</i>	<i>š</i>		<i>χ</i>
		<i>v</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>zʲ</i>	<i>ž</i>		
Tremulants			<i>r</i>	<i>rʲ</i>			
Laterals			<i>l</i>	<i>lʲ</i>			
Approximate						<i>j</i>	

The labio-dental phoneme *v* has two basic allophones: in the coda position it is realized as a labial approximant, when followed by a non-labial vowel in onset position the phonetic realization is that of a labio-dental fricative.

The bilabial tremulant, indicated with *tpr* in the literature, appears to be limited to three word stems, *bu* ‘halt! (to a horse)’; *buga* ‘(cow call)’ (MW III: 1902b); and the motherese *buav* ‘outside (LAT)’. This phoneme is extremely limited lexically and has therefore been left out of the treatise.

The two phonemes advocated in this treatise of Erzya, the unrounded central high vowel *ĩ* and the velar nasal *ŋ*, are marginal. The vowel *ĩ* is phonematic in word stems only, and the attestation of alveolar non-palatal nasal *n* before velar stops is manifest only at the juncture of stems and case or clitic marking, on the one hand, and new Russian loanwords, on the other. The identification of these two additions, however, is analogous to the identification of both palatal and non-palatal alveolar stops, while the presence of a non-palatal alveolar stop in a front-vowel context virtually always indicates the relative newness of a Russian loanword, e.g. *student* ‘student’, *kit* ‘whale’ and *člen* ‘member’; their coda-position stops are non-palatal, and can readily be identified as non-Erzya on the basis of this criterion (cf. also Abondolo 1987).

3.2. Phonetic phenomena behind allomorphic variation

Allomorphic variation in Erzya can readily be attributed to vowel harmony, palatal harmony, devoicing, voicing, loss of affix-initial *V* of the abessive, and stem-final vowel loss.

3.2.1. Vowel harmony

Vowel harmony in Erzya is front/back harmony affecting the mid vowels, represented orthographically in Erzya by *ə*, *e* and *o*. In the standard language this harmony is basically triggered by the preceding vowel or consonant qualities, such that, palatalized alveolars, the palatal glide and front vowels co-occur with subsequent front vowels *ə* and *e*, while back vowels followed by non-palatalized consonants trigger back vowel harmony in *o*. Not all instances of front mid vowels have back-vowel counterparts, so it can be assumed that vowel harmony in the mid vowels is the reflex of a phoneme different from those found in the dative *-нень/-нэнь*, comitative *-нек/-нэк* and definite plural *-не/-нэ*, to name a few.

The target of vowel harmony can be located in four positions. It can be in (1) the affix-initial position when the affix requires a vowel and the preceding stem has no overt vowel to provide, e.g. genitive *-Oni*, second person singular possessive suffix *-OT*; (2) affix-internal position, e.g. the first vowel in the abessive *-VTOMO*; (3) affix-final position, e.g. inessive *-sO*, and (4) as a stand-alone affix in the locative *-O*. Since vowel harmony is a progressive phenomenon, we just have to look to the preceding, left context, which is always the trigger, and close assimilation appears to provide the best characterization of this phenomenon in the literary language.

To describe the left context we will declare relevant sets of vowels and consonants:

Table 3.9 Sets used in the description of Erzya vowel harmony

Short	Abbreviation	Specifics	Sets
Back Trigger Vowels	BTV	Vowels triggering subsequent back vowel harmony =	[a я o ö y ю]
Front Trigger Vowels	FTV	Vowels triggering subsequent front vowel harmony =	[e ə и ы]
Front Trigger Consonants less <i>лб</i>	FTC	Consonants and digraphs other than <i>лб</i> triggering subsequent front vowel harmony =	[й дъ зъ нь рѣ сѣ тѣ цѣ]
Nonpalatal Consonants	NPC	Consonants that do not cause front vowel harmony, i.e. all consonants but <i>й</i> =	[б в г д ж з к л м н п р с т ф х ц ш щ]
All Consonants	AC	All consonants and digraphs, i.e. FTC, NPC plus <i>лб</i> =	[й дъ зъ лѣ нѣ рѣ сѣ тѣ цѣ б в г д ж з к л м н п р с т ф х ц ш щ]

The front orthographic variants *ə* and *e* of the unrounded mid front vowel phoneme will always be chosen if the left context can be described by:

- (a) FTV [FTC | NPC | ль] AC*
- (b) BTV FTC AC*
- (c) BTV ль [derivational consonant cluster] AC*

The back orthographic variant *o* will be chosen after all other left contexts:

- (d) BTV NPC+
- (e) BTV ль [non-derivational consonant cluster] AC*

The range of vowel harmony is illustrated in the table below, where a majuscule archi-phoneme *O* indicates the target vowel.

Table 3.10 Range of vowel harmony in Erzya affixes

Morpheme	Gloss	Position in affix			
		Affix-initial	Affix-internal	Affix-final	Stand-alone
- <i>Онъ</i>	GEN	+	-	-	-
- <i>Ов</i>	LAT	+	-	-	-
- <i>Ом, -Он, -Онъ</i>	POSS-1SG	+	-	-	-
- <i>Онень</i>	POSS-1SG>DAT	+	-	-	-
- <i>Онк</i>	POSS-2PL	+	-	-	-
- <i>ОТ, -Отъ</i>	POSS-2SG	+	-	-	-
- <i>ОТень</i>	POSS-2SG>DAT	+	-	-	-
- <i>Онстэнь</i>	POSS-3.DAT	+	-	-	-
- <i>Ост</i>	POSS-3PL	+	-	-	-
- <i>Оль</i>	PRETII.PRED.3SG	+	-	-	-
- <i>Окс</i>	TRNSL	+	-	-	-
- <i>ОНОк, -НОк</i>	POSS-1PL	±	+	-	-
- <i>Ос</i>	ILL	±	-	-	-
- <i>ВТОМО</i>	ABE	-	+	+	-
- <i>ДО</i>	ABL	-	-	+	-
- <i>стО</i>	ELA	-	-	+	-
- <i>сО</i>	INE	-	-	+	-
- <i>ОЗО, -ОнЗО</i>	POSS-3SG	+	-	+	-
- <i>О</i>	LOC	-	-	-	+

3.2.2. Palatal harmony

Palatal harmony in Erzya affects the alveolar stops in affix onset, i.e. orthographically the neutral plosives *T* and *D*, as well as the nasal *N* are realized with subsequent palatal marking in *ь*, *е* and *я*. Since there are other affixes ending in *-Ohь* ‘GEN; POSS-1SG>GEN (with kin and relation terms)’, and *-Omb* ‘POSS-2SG>GEN (with kin and relation terms)’ but these are never realized as non-palatal variants in the standard language, we might assume that the neutral stops, phonematically represented with majuscule archiphonemes in *-ON* and *-OT*, are non-palatalized phonemes with allophonic variation in *t / t’*; *d / d’*, and *n / n’* respectively. Hence the Erzya literary language provides marginal evidence in rebuttal to the experimental minimalization of consonant phonemes (cf. Abondolo 1987).

Palatal harmony is triggered by the left context, and the sets applicable to vowel harmony can be extended by more specific articulation point sets, see table (3.11), below.

Table 3.11 Sets used in the description of Erzya palatal harmony

Short	Abbreviation	Specifics	Sets
Non-Palatalized Alveolar Consonants	AlvC	Alveolar consonants with no subsequent marking for palatalization =	[д з л н р с т ц]
Labial Consonants	LabC	Labial consonants =	[п б ф в м]
Velar Consonants	VelC	Velar Consonants =	[к г х]
Post-Alveolar Consonants	P-AlvC	Post-Alveolar Consonants =	[ч ш ж щ]
Non-Alveolar Consonants	N-AlvC	LabC, P-AlvC and VelC =	[п б ф в м ч ш ж щ к г х]

The neutral alveolar stops affected by palatal harmony are followed by palatal marking when the left context can be described by:

- (a) FTV
- (b) BTV
- (c) FTV AC* N-AlvC

Palatalization does not occur in the alveolar stops when the left context is:

- (d) AlvC

Synchronic variation can be observed in the palatalization of alveolar stops when the left context is the following:

(e) BTV NPC* N-AlvC

The range of palatal harmony is illustrated in the table below, where the majuscule archiphonemes *T* and *N* indicate the target alveolar stops.

Table 3.12 Range of palatal harmony in Erzya affixes

Morpheme	Gloss	Harmony trigger	
		Preceding vowel	Preceding consonant
<i>-T</i>	PL	+	+
<i>-Tano</i>	PRES.PRED-1PL	+	+
<i>-Tado</i>	PRES.PRED-2PL	+	+
<i>-Tan</i>	PRES.PRED-1SG>2SG	+	+
<i>-Tanzat</i>	PRES.PRED-3SG>2SG	+	+
<i>-Tadjž</i>	PRES.PRED-X>2P	+	+
<i>-OT</i>	POSS-2SG	+	-
<i>-ON</i>	POSS-1SG	+	-
<i>-Ne</i>	DEF.PL	±	+

The fact that the *-Ne* ‘DEF.PL’ marker, in affix-onset position, is conditioned by the preceding vowel, is related to the position this affix holds on the grammaticalization cline. As discussed above, the mid non-back vowel has two allophones in front *e* and central *ɛ*. Since there is an extremely low attestation of a hypothetical mid central phoneme, on the basis of corpus material, it might be surprising to note that the mere back-vowel in the left context is sufficient to prevent the phonetic palatalization of *N* after a non-alveolar consonant even though it is followed by a front vowel. Double is the surprise, however, when the non-alveolar consonant has been dropped both in speech and in the orthography, e.g. the NOUNS2 declension type [*ištʌtne*] *уцм̄я+т+н̄э* like-this/that_{PRON-DEF+PL+DEF.PL}, which is the regular declension of [*ištʌmo*] *уцм̄я.мо* like-this/that_{PRON-DEF.ABS} such that the stem-final mid vowel has been dropped and the labial nasal, as well, see section (4.1.) NOMINAL-TYPE WORD-STEM MORPHOLOGY.

Palatal harmony contributes to ambiguity in front-vowel contexts in the interpretation of surface coda *-ń* and *-tʃ*. Adnominal 1SG *-ON* marking is realized in coda *-ń* and thus is a homonym of the realization of the indefinite declension genitive *-Onʃ*, which is also used in marking the genitive case on distinct, singular referents, especially proper nouns and possessa of the 1SG possessor, see (1–2). (See also sections 4.2.3.1.1. FIRST PERSON, 4.2.3.1.2 SECOND PERSON and 4.4. PARADIGM DEFECTIVITY IN ERZYA POSSESSOR INDEXING.) Adnominal 2SG *-OT* marking is realized in coda *-tʃ* and thus is a homonym of the realization of the 2SG possessive declension kin-term genitive *-Otʃ* and sometimes the nominative plural in *-T*, see (3–4).

- (1) a. *ćora+ON* => *ćoran*
son_N+POSS-1SG>NOM.PL ~ son_N+POSS-1SG>GEN.PL
- b. *ćora+Oń* => *ćorań*
son_N+GEN ~ son_N+POSS-1SG>[KIN]GEN
- (2) a. *ńi+ON* => *ńiń*
wife_N+POSS-1SG>NOM.PL ~ wife_N+POSS-1SG>GEN
- b. *ńi+Oń* => *ńiń*
wife_N+GEN ~ wife_N+POSS-1SG>[KIN]GEN
- (3) a. *ćora+T* => *ćorat*
son_N+PL.NOM
- b. *ćora+Oł'* => *ćorat'*
son_N+POSS-2SG>[KIN]GEN
- c. *ćora+OT* => *ćorat*
son_N+POSS-2SG>NOM ~ son_N+POSS-2SG>GEN
- (4) a. *mińde+T* => *mińdł' ~ mińdet'*
husband_N+PL.NOM
- b. *mińde+Oł'* => *mińdet'*
husband_N+POSS-2SG>[KIN]GEN
- c. *mińde+OT* => *mińdet'*
husband_N+POSS-2SG>NOM ~ husband_N+POSS-2SG>GEN

3.2.3. Devoicing

In the modern Erzya standard, synchronic devoicing affects the voiced alveolar plosive *d* and the voiced velar plosive *g* in affix onset position. The term “synchronic devoicing” is used to illustrate the fact that in intervocalic position the reflex of these plosives is voiced. Hence, when the reflex is not voiced following a non-voiced consonant, the phenomenon can be regarded as synchronic devoicing, although “diachronic voicing” might also be forwarded (cf. Bartens 1999: 37–41; Abondolo 1987), see examples below.

Table 3.13 Devoicing of affixal onset plosives following voiceless consonants and plosives (cf. Imaikina 2008: 134)

	Ablative <i>-DO</i>	Prolative <i>-Ga</i>
<i>kudo</i> ‘house; home’	<i>kudo+do</i>	<i>kudo+va</i>
<i>klass</i> ‘classroom; class’	<i>klass+to</i>	<i>klass+ka</i>
<i>zal</i> ‘hall; living-room’	<i>zal+do</i>	<i>zal+ga</i>
<i>ked’</i> ‘hand; arm’	<i>ked’te</i> [ket’e]	<i>ked’ga</i>
<i>krug</i> ‘circle’	<i>krug+do</i>	<i>krug+ka</i> [kruk:a]

In practice it is sufficient to characterize the left-context trigger of this phenomenon by the following two statements:

(a) Voiceless consonant

(b) Voiced plosive of same articulation point

The range of the devoicing phenomenon is also minimal, whereas it involves the morphemes: ablative *-DO* and prolative *-Ga*.

3.2.4. Voicing

In colloquial speech and especially in older texts, there is also a voicing phenomenon affecting the *T* of the predicate markers *-Tano* ‘PRES.PRED-1PL’, *-Tado* ‘PRES.PRED-2PL’, *-Tan* ‘PRES.PRED-1SG>2SG’, *-Tanzat* ‘PRES.PRED-3SG>2SG’ and *-Tadž’* ‘PRES.PRED-X>2P’. This phenomenon is triggered by the [+VOICED] feature of the adjacent consonant in the left context. Hence, the literary *mol’+tano* go_V+IND.PRES.PRED-1PL is pronounced [mol’dano], by some. The phenomenon of progressive voicing in Erzya permeates the oral and literary language, as it is attested at the boundary of stem and conjugational inflections, free morph + free morph lexemes, as well as syntactic collocations.

3.2.5. Loss of affix-initial V

The loss of affix-initial *V* affects the abessive morpheme *-VTOmO*, such that *V* is lost when the preceding stem ends in a consonant.

3.2.6. Stem-final vowel loss

Stem-final vowel loss affects affix-final and root-final vowels alike. It can be observed in two different ranges:

- (a) Stem and affix-final vowels are dropped in contemporary Erzya when followed by the present predicate cross-reference markers for the first and second persons singular, e.g. *vadřá+at vadřat* ‘you are nice’, which is the rendering of *vadřá* ‘fine/nice’ and *-at* ‘PRES.PRED-2SG’. (See folklore, old literary, and Alatyř’ subdialects *vadřajat*)
- (b) There are three nominal stem types in Erzya, of which one can be recognized by synonymous variation in the presence or absence of a stem-final mid vowel before the voiceless-onset affixes plural *-T*, inessive *-sO*, elative *-stO* and illative *-s*, see nominal stem types below.

Above we have provided a phonetic characterization of the most salient phonetic features in the Erzya language. These are features with a bearing on allomorphic variation in the inflection of the language, and they should be sufficient although not exhaustive for the description of adnominal person in Erzya. A set of (6) six vowel and (29) twenty-nine consonant phonemes has been enumerated for Erzya, which is two more than the assessment provided by Imaikina (2008), such that unrounded high central *ĩ* and velar nasal *ŋ* have been attested with the help of minimal pairs. Sound rules have been given in the form of left-context descriptions, compatible with the automatic two-level parser rules used in the treatment of the minimal corpus. The vowels and consonants of the Erzya language have been broken down into sets compatible with the workings of (1) vowel harmony, (2) palatal harmony, (3) devoicing, (4) voicing, (5) loss of affix-initial V and (6) stem-final vowel loss.

4. Morphology

Our understanding of form is readily developed by considering: (i) allomorphic variation in nominal-type word stems and declensions; (ii) linear ordering of inflectional markers, and (iii) co-occurrence.

Morphemes

Allomorphic variation

Allomorphic variation in Erzya affects subgroups of nearly all ten parts of speech established in EKM 2000. The phonological workings of this variation have been demonstrated above in section 3.1. PHONOLOGICAL PHENOMENA BEHIND ALLOMORPHIC VARIATION. In this section we will describe the previously established targets of this variation in separate subsections. (4.1.) NOMINAL-TYPE WORD-STEM MORPHOLOGY will provide an outline to define Erzya word-stem types which are applicable to inflections for the range: nouns, numerals, pronouns, adverb/adpositions and non-finites in *-OmA*. Section (4.2.) AFFIXES will then be divided into the subsections: (4.2.1.) CASE; (4.2.2.) NUMBER; (4.2.3.) DEICTIC MARKERS; (4.2.4.) NOMINAL CONJUGATION MARKERS, and (4.2.5.) THE CLITIC *-Gak*. Section (4.3.) ADNOMINAL-TYPE PERSON IN PARTS OF SPEECH will receive further specification in subsections: (4.3.1.) POSSESSIVE DECLENSION COMPATIBILITY FOR DISTINGUISHING PARTS OF SPEECH, where case form attestation plays a major role; (4.3.2.) ATTESTED PARTS OF SPEECH AND SUBLEXICA; (4.3.3.) DRAWING CONCLUSIONS. Section (4.4.) PARADIGM DEFECTIVITY IN ERZYA POSSESSOR INDEXING inspects the status of 1SG and 2SG genitive marking with regard to the KIN TERM parameter. And section (4.5.) ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND SECONDARY DECLENSION describes the compatibility of adnominal person with secondary declension.

4.1. Nominal-type word-stem morphology

When establishing nominal-type word stems, it might occur to one to follow the three-vowel split system observed for verbs in the Finnish and apparently the Estonian Schools of Mordvin studies (cf. Raviła 1929: 104-105; Pall 1996: 22; Bartens 1999: 122; Hamari 2007: 66). The verbs, it is maintained, can be divided into three groups on the basis of which vowel precedes the *ms* segment in the infinitive: *a* (*pala-ms* ‘to kiss’), *o* (*vano-ms* ‘to watch’) or *e* (*ñil’e-ms* ‘to swallow’). The problem with this three-way split is that, while *a*-stem verbs always retain their vowel in IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG marking, the two mid-vowel-stem verbs given lose theirs, hence *pala+ś* kiss_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG shows vowel retention, whereas *van+ś* watch_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG and *ñil+ś* swallow_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG do not. What makes this awkward from a point of concatenation is that there are also mid-vowel verb stems that retain their vowels, e.g. *pid’ems* ‘to cook’: *pid’e+ś* cook_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG and *udoms* ‘to sleep’: *udo+ś* sleep_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG.

In the most recent Erzya-Russian dictionary (Эрзянь-рузонь валкс, 1993), henceforth (ERV 1993) a vertical separator “|” is implemented to indicate a breaking point in the headword where inflexion of the various word types can readily be conjugated or declined. In the instance of verb headwords, this means that an additional indication of the indicative preterit I third person singular will be given, and in the case of noun headwords the indefinite nominative plural; for some reason, however, adjectives and other modifiers are not systematically marked.

The role of the vertical separator in verb headwords is to indicate whether the vowel occurring before the *ms* infinitive marker is, in fact, a stem vowel or a linking vowel; the IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG marker *-ś* has no affix-initial vowel (see also Tsyпкаikina 2000: 156).

On the basis of the above, we can hypothesize two verb-stem types, i.e. verbs that retain their stem vowels in the IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG slot, and those that do not. Thus the verbs *palams* ‘to kiss’, *pid’ems* ‘to cook’ and *udoms* ‘to sleep’ belong to one group, and *vanoms* ‘to watch’ and *ńil’ems* ‘to swallow’ to the other. A second hypothesis we can make is that the infinitive marker is, in fact, *-Oms* with an archiphoneme *O* to indicate that a vowel must always be present; in the literary language that is (cf. Evsev’ev 1963: 286). Evsev’ev indicates that there are certain verb stems that lose their mid-vowel in dialect representation of the infinitive, e.g. *mol’ems* ~ *mol’meks* ‘to go’ and *kadoms* ~ *kadmoks* ‘to leave (VT)’, while others do not: *udoms* ~ *udomks* ‘to sleep’. (Trosterud (2006: 250) offers a phonetic solution to stem-vowel deletion before consonant-initial suffixes. He recognizes an important role played by consonant clusters but does not see the correlation to the stem-vowel versus linking-vowel dichotomy.)

The dichotomy “stem vowel versus linking vowel” can be further developed upon perusal of the Erzya-Russian dictionary. There are, in fact, three types of verbs to be attested, i.e. *sodloms*: *-ś* ‘to tie’ (verbs with linking vowels), *sodalms*: *-ś* ‘to know; to recognize’ (verbs with stem vowels), and *kundatolms*: *-tś* ‘to become tied (of the tongue)’ (verbs with stem vowels and additional *T* morphology). The third verb type, originally brought to my attention by Salo (cf. Salo, forthcoming), takes an additional *T* before the IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG marker. A parallel to this morphological variation between *m* and *T* can be observed in the attestation of two noun forms in Kozlovka dialect: *utom* ‘storehouse’: *utotso* ‘in the storehouse’ and *kaštom* ‘oven’: *kaštotso* ‘in the oven’ (cf. Bubrikh 1930: 33).

The third verb type is not adhered to by all speakers of the language, such that Imaikina (originally from an Insar or Western dialect background, but with a lifetime in university-level Mordvin studies) indicates two separate reflexes for the verb *satoms* ‘to be enough’: *satotś* (2008: 96) and *satś* (ibid. 282) ‘suffice_V.IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG’, whereas the Russian-language treatise of Erzya verbs published by Mészáros ignores it altogether (cf. 1999: 116-120).

The Erzya literary language attests to a system of three verb types as depicted in ERV (1993). Therefore, the three verb types described by the Finnish School, especially the *o* and *e* verb-type descriptions of the Erzya, have little to do with the synchronic state of the language, although they may offer partial insight into language history.

In nouns the vertical separator “|” serves to mark the removal of the Cyrillic soft sign before the plural marker *T*, on the one hand, and some instances of mid vowels, on the other, whereas low stem vowels are never elided in conjugation or declension, and therefore a correlation between verb and nominal-type stems might be posited (cf. Zaicz 1998: 188–189).

Let us then address the nominal stem type, if we can, according to the same criteria as were used with verb stems. Nominals can also be divided into three types. The stem types do not directly parallel those of the verbs, though. The nominal stem types are based almost entirely upon the phonetic qualities of the indefinite nominative singular form. The first split is made on the basis of whether the headword ends in a vowel or a consonant. The merits of such a split will be seen in the number of affixes, described below, that require the presence of a vowel between the consonants of an immediately preceding stem and the first consonant of the affix. Let us observe the variation in the nominative definite singular marker allomorphs *-oś*, *-eś* and *-ś* <= *-Oś*: *oš+oś* ‘town_N+NOM.DEF.SG’ and *kel+eś* ‘tongue_N+NOM.DEF.SG’ versus *kudo+ś* ‘house_N+NOM.DEF.SG’ and *vel’e+ś* ‘village_N+NOM.DEF.SG’. The vowel-final versus consonant-final division of stems is then followed by two more, one concerning the consonant-final and the other the vowel-final headwords.

In consonant-final nominal-type headwords the presence of a word final s(h)ibilant can bring about synonymous variation in the declension tables. If the headword-final consonant is a s(h)ibilant, then there is a tendency for a linking vowel to occur between the stem-final s(h)ibilant and an affix-initial s(h)ibilant, e.g. in the illative, the word *karks* ‘belt’ gains what here will be termed an optional stem vowel in *o* before the illative marker *-s* is added, thus *karks+(o)s* belt_N+ILL. This, it must be stressed, is a tendency that affects all stem-final s(h)ibilants *c*, *s*, *z*, *č*, *ś*, *ž*, *č*, *š*, *ž* in combination with the affix-initial *s* of the illative, inessive and elative, as well as the *š* of the comparative. Therefore synonymous variation can be observed, such as that found in the indefinite illative declension for *potmaks* ‘bottom’ with evidence in favor of the linking-vowel strategy *potmaksos* 184 occurrences and *potmakss* 28, but also the adposition *vel’kses* 255 and *vel’kss* 211 both interpreted as ‘over/above_POP.ILL’. Hence phonological variation in the presence versus absence of a stem vowel, because of its seemingly non-semantic character, can automatically be ascribed to all stems ending in s(h)ibilants. This non-semantic variation might be dealt with in two manners: it might be simply described as morphophonemic variation, or if we choose to inspect its discourse-level variation, we might plot it in the continuation lexicon of concatenation, so that it can be automatically parsed. Similar synonymous variation can also be observed in the combination of other consonant-final stems followed by translative case marker *ks*. Both subtypes are open to native and loanword stems.

In the vowel-final set of all nominal-type headwords special attention must be given to a subset with headword-final mid vowels. The subset affected comprises those which alternately exhibit a loss of that stem-final mid vowel before certain affixes beginning with voiceless alveolar consonants, especially the plural marker in *-T* and the spatial cases *-s* illative, *-sO* inessive and *-stO* elative. In the table below we will observe

the three different stem types NOUNS1 in (a, b) (consonant-final stems), NOUNS1S in (c, d, whereas this subset of NOUNS1 is entirely predictable), NOUNS2 in (e, f) (nominal stem type with synonymous stem-vowel variation) and NOUNS3 in (g, h, i) (nominal stem type with stem vowel retention).

The table illustrates possible homonymy that occurs between plural marking *T* and possessive cross-referential 2SG marker *OT* in the three stem types. No homonymy occurs in NOUNS1 stems; possessor index markers in the modern literary language always require linking vowels (see section 4.2.3.1. POSSESSOR-INDEX MARKING). Optional homonymy is observed in NOUNS2 stems, and total homonymy in NOUNS3 stems. In the most recent grammar (EKM 2000), NOUNS2 stems are treated as invariable NOUNS3 stems. This reflects one of the prescriptive norms proposed in the most recently printed orthographic norms “Эрзянь кельсэ сёрмадомань, кортамонь, пунктуациянь лувтне” ‘Orthography, Speech and Punctuation Norms in the Erzya Language’, henceforth (EKS 1995: 34). For an extensive presentation of nominal stem variation in declension (cf. Evsev’ev 1963: 56–101; Abondolo 1987).

Table 4.1 Nominal stem types in Erzya

	Head-word	Gloss	INDEF.ILL	INDEF.NOM.PL	POSS-2SG> NOM-GEN
NOUNS1	a мар	mound	марс	март	марот
	b умарь	apple; strawberry	марьс	умарть	умареть
NOUNS1S	c потмакс	bottom	потмаксос ~ потмаксс	потмакст	потмаксот
	d велькс	above; cover; cream	вельксэс ~ вельксс	велькст	вельксэть
NOUNS2	e кург о	mouth	кургс ~ кургос	кургт ~ кургот	кургот
	f пенг е	fire wood	пенгс ~ пенгес	пенгть ~ пенгеть	пенгеть
	g кудо	home; house; room	кудос	кудот	кудот
NOUNS3	h пизэ	nest	пизэс	пизэть	пизэть
	i паця	handkerchief	пацяс	пацят	пацят

The NOUNS2 stem type, it will be noted, attests synonymic variation in its indefinite nominative plural forms. This stem type has received attention in various grammars beginning with Evsev’ev ([1929] 1963: 82–83). As noted above at least some prescriptive grammar writers have decided to remove the NOUNS2 stem type from the agenda of Erzya morphology, even though it is extensively attested in the written language. See table below for disambiguated statistics on vowel versus consonant-stem in the expression of plural in the NOUNS2 stem type, where nine of the most frequently attested headwords are given with possessive second person singular versus indefinite nominative plural readings.

Table 4.2 Stem variation in NOUNS2 nominal stem type

Headword	Vowel retention			Vowel loss		Total
	Form	+POSS-2SG	+PL	Form	+PL*	
сельме eye_N	сельметь	291	10	сельмть	238	539
паро	парот favor/wealth/steam_N	104	6	парт good_A/steam	396	506
пенге firewood_N	пенгеть	4	7	пенгть	269	280
пильге leg/ foot_N	пильгеть	151	7	пильгть	97	255
чувто tree_N	чувтот	NA	15	чувтт	236	251
ойме soul_N	ойметь	193	45	оймть	11	249
курго mouth_N	кургот	131	5	кургт	51	187
пандо hill_N	пандот	NA	11	пандт	175	186
пеке stomach_N	пекеть	120	8	пекть	39	167
Total		994	114		1512	2620

The nominal stems demonstrated above will be rendered in three separate types on the basis of two parameters: (i) presence of stem-final vowel in headword, and (ii) retention of stem-final vowel before plural marker in *-T*. Although there are tendencies in the written language towards possessive second person singular versus nominative plural differentiation in some of the NOUNS2 stems, it appears that not all people in typesetting adhere to the same norms (something indicative of dialect variation). Vowel retention in some of the stems may be found in bahuvrihi type constructions, such as *vařga kurgot* ‘blabber-mouths (glove_N.NOM.SG mouth_N.NOM.PL)’, or, perhaps, emphatic and dialect variation. Vowel loss occurs with the plural marker *-T*, but this same form or possibly a homonym is also used in the formation of adverbs, e.g. *veřev pandt* ‘up-hill (up_ADV. LAT hill_N.PL/DISTR: GOAL and LOC)’. For accuracy the NOUNS2 stems could be regarded as a closed set, which for all practical purposes it is, but the following regular-expression descriptions of stem type will be helpful in the locating of plausible yet unidentified members.

[FTV] [[п|т|к|ц|ч] | м б | [в|с|ш] т | [р|ль|н] д | [сь|ш] к | [в|р|ль|н] г | [ть|дь|рь|ль] м | в ш] е

[BTV] [[п|т|к|ц|ч] | м б | [в|с|ш] т | [р|л|н] д | [с|ш] к | [в|р|л|н] г | [т|д|р|л] м | в ш] о

With retrospect to the consonant-cluster delimitations suggested by Trosterud (2006: 250), it should be noted that certain stems, e.g. *kel'm|e* ‘cold; frost’ and *kel'me|ms* ‘to get cold; to freeze’ do not necessarily follow identical patterns. And thus it is the nominal type stem NOUNS2 that consonant-cluster delimitations might be concentrated on.

4.2. Affixes

Affixes here are a subset of all morphemes attested in the word forms set as the range of adnominal-type cross-referential person, i.e. affixes might be contrasted with stems. Stems, it must be remembered, comprise not only the stereo-typical headword stems, but, in the highly synthetic Erzya language, previously inflected forms, as well. Hence nominal inflection can, roughly speaking, be broken into three linear-ordered groups of affixes expressing: (i) the categories and notions of case, number and definiteness with occasional looping (secondary declension); (ii) nominal conjugation, and (iii) the clitic. While the first group, consisting of three subgroups, has specific ordering for various combinations of its categories and notions, the second and third group are simple in nature, and as single-set groups do not allow secondary affixation. Specifics on ordering of elements in group (i) can be given according to the following rule of thumb:

An ordering distinction: Definite plural versus other:

If there is a definite plural marker, it will precede case marking, i.e. plural marker *-T* (Number marker, *Nx*) is followed by definite plural marker *-Ne*, which is then followed by any overt case marking (*Cx*).

In the absence of definite-plural marking, a distinction will be made between cumulative-expression (non-concatenable case and deictic marker, *CDx*) and case marking. Cumulative expression, characteristic of the core cases nominative, genitive and dative, consists of simple affixation strategies by definition, while concatenation of case marker (*Cx*) followed by ZERO or deictic marker (*Dx*) is the strategy of the remaining cases.

[*Nx + Cx* | *CDx* | *Cx + Dx*]

4.2.1. Case

The term case is often associated with noun phrases and the marking of syntactic arguments, e.g. subject, direct object and indirect objects. In Finno-Ugrian languages, however, there is an extension for including local cases, and some others as well. In the Erzya grammar tradition, the term “case” is generally used when speaking of dependent morpho-syntactic constituents, even ones with ZERO-markers, that correlate with syntactic-semantic relations, such as those of arguments or adjuncts. The term “case” has been used sparingly of only some of the morphologically dependent markers, whereas the term “case-like adverbial markers” has been applied to other markers with little if any argumentation. Evsev'ev, apparently unable to deal with inflectional homonymy, interprets the lative case *-Ov* of Ahlquist (1861), Paasonen (1909) and Shakhmatov (1910) as synonymous with the denominal derivation morpheme for adjectives *-Ov*,

and therefore speaks of adverbial markers (see Evsev'ev 1963: 55). Since the modern tradition (cf. Bartens 1999; Grebneva 2000) makes a division between core cases, local cases and attributive cases, but sets no guidelines regarding accurate definition of case, this author has opted to define case according to the following morpho-syntactic criteria: (i) morphological marking (inclusive ZERO-marking); (ii) element complexity, and (iii) clausal or phrasal syntactic function (arguments and adjuncts).

Morphological marking

Element complexity

Syntactic function

Including the ZERO-morpheme of the nominative case, there are fifteen morphemes attested with modified phrasal constituents in the Erzya language (cf. Rueter 2009a). The use of syntactic function as a criterion has allowed us to cope with a range comprising parts of speech, such as nouns, numerals, pronouns and adverbs/adpositions, on the one hand, and the sub-class of non-finites in *-Om-*, on the other. Thus this definition provides us with a maximal access to morphemes that might be associated with possessive declension, and therefore be of interest in a treatise of adnominal-type person. The most recent grammar of the Erzya language, it will be noted, limits itself to twelve cases in the discussion of nouns and six when treating reflexive/intensive personal pronouns (cf. Agafonova 2000: 125–145; Grebneva 2000: 73–88). Cases of disputed status, but included by this author, are the LOCATIVE *-O*, COMITATIVE *-Nek*, and TEMPORALIS *-Ne*. (See also Danilov 1969; Bartens 1999: 99-100, 164)

In this subsection we will briefly define the three case divisions: core cases, local cases, and attributive cases while each individual case morpheme will be described with the following elements: (i) name; (ii) morpheme; (iii) statement of range where the case is attested, and (iv) notes on declension type limitations. When ambiguities of form versus function present themselves, separate treatment will be offered at the end of the section, i.e. the direct-object function is attested for both the nominative and the genitive. In other instances, grammars have neglected or questioned the pertinence of a given inflectional item, i.e. the translative can indeed appear in the definite singular declension (EKM 2000).

4.2.1.1. Core cases

In the Erzya grammar tradition, four case names are mentioned in association with the core cases: nominative, genitive, dative and ablative. Thus the inessive, in *-sO*, is foregone here despite the fact that in the adpositional form *ejse* ‘in’ it is, without doubt, frequently used as a marker of the imperfect direct object, see inessive in subsection (4.2.1.2.) LOCAL CASES.

Nominative

The NOMINATIVE case in Erzya, which in the indefinite declension is marked with the so-called ZERO morpheme, can be detected through the presence of other morphemes as well. Hence, while the same word form can be homonymous for both an indefinite nominative singular headword and an absolutive form, which would be associated with the modifier position of an NP or the adpositional complement, the indefinite nominative plural will be recognized by its plural *-T* marker (see 4.2.2. Number); the definite singular by its portmanteau or polyexponential allomorphs *-ś, -oś, -eś => -Oś*, and the definite plural by its lack of marking after the definite plural allomorph *-ńe, -ne => -Ne*.

Table 4.3 Nominative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions

Gloss	STEM TYPE	NOM.SG	NOM.DEF.SG	PL.NOM	PL.+DEF.PL
<i>kal</i> ‘fish’	NOUNS1	<i>kal</i>	<i>kal+oś</i>	<i>kal+t</i>	<i>kal+t+ne</i>
<i>kel</i> ‘tongue; language’	NOUNS1	<i>kel</i>	<i>kel+eś</i>	<i>kel+t</i>	<i>kel+t+ńe</i>
<i>karks</i> ‘belt’	NOUNS1S	<i>karks</i>	<i>karks+oś</i>	<i>karks+t</i>	<i>karks+t+ne</i>
<i>piks</i> ‘rope’	NOUNS1S	<i>piks</i>	<i>piks+eś</i>	<i>piks+t</i>	<i>piks+t+ne</i>
<i>śoks</i> ‘autumn’	NOUNS1S	<i>śoks</i>	<i>śoks+eś</i>	<i>śoks+t</i>	<i>śoks+t+ńe</i>
<i>kurgo</i> ‘mouth’	NOUNS2	<i>kurgo</i>	<i>kurgo+ś</i>	<i>kurg+t ~ kurgo+t</i>	<i>kurg+t+ne ~ kurgo+t+ńe</i>
<i>tĩnge</i> ‘garden plot; thresh- ing floor’	NOUNS2	<i>tĩnge</i>	<i>tĩnge+ś</i>	<i>tĩng+t ~ tĩnge+t</i>	<i>tĩng+t+ńe ~ tĩnge+t+ńe</i>
<i>kudo</i> ‘house; home; room; container’	NOUNS3	<i>kudo</i>	<i>kudo+ś</i>	<i>kudo+t</i>	<i>kudo+t+ńe</i>
<i>pize</i> ‘nest’	NOUNS3	<i>pize</i>	<i>pize+ś</i>	<i>pize+t</i>	<i>pize+t+ńe</i>

In the possessive declension there is only one place where an explicit distinction can be made for case of the possessum, and that is *-OzO* the 3SG with a singular possessum reading. The form of the plural *-OnzO* with 3SG possessor-index marking has an ambiguous reading with the genitive common to non-kin terms.

Table 4.4 Nominative forms from the possessive declensions

POR	PUM	<i>kal</i> ‘fish’	<i>kel</i> ‘tongue; language’	<i>lela</i> ‘big brother’	<i>pile</i> ‘ear’
1SG	SG	<i>kal+om</i>	<i>kel+em</i>	<i>lela+m</i>	<i>pile+m</i>
	PL	<i>kal+on ~ kal+om</i>	<i>kel+eń ~ kel+em</i>	<i>lela+n ~ lela+m</i>	<i>pile+ń ~ pile+m</i>
1PL	SG = PL	<i>kal+onok</i>	<i>kel+eńek</i>	<i>lela+nok</i>	<i>pile+ńek</i>
2SG	SG = PL	<i>kal+ot</i>	<i>kel+et</i>	<i>lela+t</i>	<i>pile+t</i>
2PL	SG = PL	<i>kal+oyk</i>	<i>kel+eyk</i>	<i>lela+ɣk</i>	<i>pile+ɣk</i>
3SG	SG	<i>kal+ozo</i>	<i>kel+eze</i>	<i>lela+zō</i>	<i>pile+ze</i>
	PL	<i>kal+onzō</i>	<i>kel+enze</i>	<i>lela+nzō</i>	<i>pile+nze</i>
3PL	SG = PL	<i>kal+ost</i>	<i>kel+est</i>	<i>lela+st</i>	<i>pile+st</i>

The main functions of the nominative are the marking of: (i) the subject (in all three declensions); (ii) The subject complement; (iii) The direct object (indefinite declension only), referred to by Bubrikh (1947: 13) as the accusative, which can also be used in the expression of measure, see (1).

- (1) *mol+em+s kavto vajgel'be+t*
 go_V+INF+ILL two_NUM.ABS verst_N+PL.NOM.
 (Bubrikh 1947: 13) ‘to go two versts’

The indefinite nominative singular has a homonym in the absolutive form (cf. Bubrikh 1947). This absolutive, which functions as indefinite adpositional complement, and the analogous NP modifier, does not appear in the plural. It therefore lends itself to contextual disambiguation as a separate element type, despite the fact that in the function of adpositional complement it is in complementary distribution with the definite singular and plural, as well as, the genitive of the possessive declension.

Genitive

The GENITIVE case in Erzya does not have consistent marking. It is marked with *-ń*, *-oń*, *-eń* => *-Oń* in the indefinite and definite plural declensions, whereas the definite singular attests it as a ZERO marker with the definite marker used for the oblique cases in *-ńit*, *-ońit*, *-eńit* => *-Ońit* (cf. EKM 2000; Pall 1996; Imaikina 1996a: 52, 62-64).

Table 4.5 Genitive forms from the definite and indefinite declensions

	GEN	GEN.DEF.SG	PL+DEF.PL+GEN
<i>kal</i> ‘fish’	<i>kal+oń</i>	<i>kal+ońt’</i>	<i>kal+t+ne+ń</i>
<i>kel</i> ‘tongue; language’	<i>kel+eń</i>	<i>kel+eńt’</i>	<i>kel+t+ńe+ń</i>
<i>karks</i> ‘belt’	<i>karks+oń</i>	<i>karks+ońt’</i>	<i>karks+t+ne+ń</i>
<i>piks</i> ‘rope’	<i>piks+eń</i>	<i>piks+eńt’</i>	<i>piks+t+ne+ń</i>
<i>śokś</i> ‘autumn’	<i>śokś+eń</i>	<i>śokś+eńt’</i>	<i>śokś+t+ńe+ń</i>
<i>kurgo</i> ‘mouth’	<i>kurgo+ń</i>	<i>kurgo+ńt’</i>	<i>kurg+t+ne+ń ~ kurgo+t+ńe+ń</i>
<i>tĩnge</i> ‘garden plot; threshing floor’	<i>tĩnge+ń</i>	<i>tĩnge+ńt’</i>	<i>tĩng+t+ńe+ń ~ tĩnge+t+ńe+ń</i>
<i>kudo</i> ‘house; home; room; container’	<i>kudo+ń</i>	<i>kudo+ńt’</i>	<i>kudo+t+ńe+ń</i>
<i>pize</i> ‘nest’	<i>pize</i>	<i>pize+ńt’</i>	<i>pize+t+ńe+ń</i>

The possessive declension sees the use of oblique-case possessive markers for all three persons in singular and plural with a small group of kin terms taking special markers for 1SG and 2SG, see table (4.6) (see also Rueter 2005).

Table 4.6 Possessor indexing for the genitive parse of non-kin and kin terms in Erzya

		NON-KIN	KIN		
POR	PUM	<i>skal</i> ‘cow’	<i>ked’</i> ‘hand; arm’	<i>teta</i> ‘father’	<i>tejter’</i> ‘daughter; girl’
1SG	SG	<i>skal+om ~ skal+on</i>	<i>ked+em</i>	<i>teta+ń</i>	<i>tejter’+eń ~ tejter’+em</i>
	PL	<i>skal+on ~ skal+om</i>	<i>ked+eń ~ ked+em</i>		<i>tejter’+eń ~ tejter’+em</i>
1PL		<i>skal+onok</i>	<i>ked+eńek</i>	<i>teta+nok</i>	<i>tejter’+eńek</i>
2SG		<i>skal+ot</i>	<i>ked+et’</i>	<i>teta+t’</i>	<i>tejter’+et’</i>
2PL		<i>skal+ońk</i>	<i>ked+eńk</i>	<i>teta+ońk</i>	<i>tejter’+eńk</i>
3SG		<i>skal+onzo</i>	<i>ked+enze</i>	<i>teta+nzo</i>	<i>tejter’+enze</i>
3PL		<i>skal+ost</i>	<i>ked+est</i>	<i>teta+st</i>	<i>tejter’+est</i>

While the back-vowel context of the kin term *teta* ‘father’ provides evidence for a palatal stop morpheme in the 1SG and 2SG cells, front-vowel contexts are ambiguous. The genitive form of the 1SG index used with kin terms is identical to that of the indefinite declension, and, as seen in the gloss *tejter’* ‘daughter’, might be treated as other non-kin terms, see (2) where the indefinite genitive is also used in implicitly 3SG readings. Adushkina (2000: 94) provides for a difference between singular and plural possessa, e.g. *tejter’+em vajgel’eze* daughter_N+POSS-1SG>GEN.SG voice_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG ‘my daughter’s voice’ contrasted with *tejter’+eń oršamo+st* daughter_N+POSS-1SG>GEN.PL clothes_N+POSS-3PL ‘my daughters’ clothes’. This might be taken as disagreement with what she writes three pages later (2000: 97) about the word *sazor+oń* ‘my little sister/s/sisters’. (For specifics, see section 4.4. PARADIGM DEFECTIVITY IN ERZYA POSSESSOR INDEXING.)

- (2) a. *kolmo* *téjtér+eń* *peł+d'e* *nućka+nzo*
 three_NUM-CARD.ABS **daughter**_N+GEN from_POP+ABL grandchild_N+POSS-3SG>PL/OBL
tełe+ń *peřt'* *jakś+it'*
 winter_N+GEN through_POP walk-around_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3PL
sonze *koda+ź* *ćulka+so.*
 he/she/it_PRON-PERS.GEN.POSS-3SG knit_V+PTC-OZ.ABS stocking_N+INE
 (Abramov 1967:) 'Grandchildren on by [her] three daughters have been walking
 around all winter in stockings she had knitted.'
- b. *moń* *sazor+oś* *čevt'e* *śed'ej,*
 I_PRON-PERS-1SG.GEN little-sister_N+NOM.DEF.SG soft_A.ABS heart_N.NOM.SG,
karm+i *kir'd+em+e+t'* *eś*
 start_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG hold_V+INF+LOC+POSS-2SG own_PRON-REFL.ABS
téjtér+eń *tarka+s...*
daughter_N+GEN instead/place_POP+ILL
 (Abramov 1988:) 'My little sister is tender-hearted, she will keep you as [though you
 were her] own daughter.'
- c. *ńe+t'* *vełe+t'+ńe+se* *eś*
 these_PRON-DEM+PL.NOM village_N+PL+DEF.PL+INE own_PRON-REFL.ABS
lomań+est *marto* *eńa+śt'* *obran+oń*
 person_N+POSS-3PL with_POP live_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3PL Obran_PRP+GEN
ćora+nzo, *nućka+nzo,*
 son_N+POSS-3SG>PL/OBL, grandchild_N+POSS-3SG>PL/OBL,
nućkińe+nze, *sodamo+nzo* *dj*
 great-grandchild_N+POSS-3SG>PL/OBL, son-in-law_N+POSS-3SG>PL/OBL and_CONJ
sodamo+ń *t'et'a+t,* *ava+t.*
son-in-law_N+GEN father_N+PL.NOM, mother_N+PL.NOM
 (Abramov 1988:) 'In those villages with their own people, dwelt Obran's sons, grand-
 children, great-grandchildren, sons-in-law and mothers and fathers of sons-in-law.'

The special genitive form of the 2SG, as was noted, is only unambiguously attested in back-vowel contexts. Some dialects, i.e. Shoksha-Drakino, as well as, Shugurova (Sura subdialect) (Tsygankin 1961: 347) attest a definite singular genitive form in *-t'*. This 2SG reading might, at least, be ambiguous. (See more specifics section 4.4. PARADIGM DEFECTIVITY IN ERZYA POSSESSOR INDEXING.)

The main function of the genitive case is the marking of: (i) the possessor (in all three declensions for both attributive and predicative position); (ii) the direct object; (iii) the adpositional complement, and (iv) the NP non-anchor modifier. It should be noted that the definiteness/topicality of a given referent may be grounds for indefinite marking, i.e. proper names and pronouns appear more frequently in the indefinite declension, whereas common nouns might in main-clause argument function require definite or pos-

sessive marking. The functions of possessor (i) and NP modifier (iv) overlap in ways similar to the possessive *of* in English. Dictionaries from the Russian grammar tradition tend to hypothesize an adjective form homonymous to the indefinite genitive. The referents of these genitive-form modifiers are non-anchoring (cf. Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2008) and indicate: material (3a), place (3b), time (3c), purpose (3d), meronymy (part to whole) (3e), and holonymy (whole to part) (2f), which in Erzya are used in syntactic constructions analytic to those used with possessor referents (3g). Compare examples (3a-g), where the indefinite genitive is used as a modifier, more pertinent discussion will be found in section 4.5.

- (3) a. *večkića+ń vanovt+to+ńt' ej+eń ojme+ś –*
 lover_N+GEN look_N+ABL+DEF.SG ice_N+GEN soul_N+NOM.DEF.SG
sol+i, čuvto+ń+še+ś –
 melt_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG wood/tree_N+GEN+PRON-DEF+NOM.DEF.SG
pal+i, kšni+ń+še+ś –
 burn_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG, iron_N+GEN+PRON-DEF+NOM.DEF.SG
čevtem+i
 soften_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG
 (Zhuravlov 1999: 119) ‘A lover's look will melt the soul of ice, ignite the one of wood, and soften the one of iron.’
- b. *tē+ń+se+jak oš+oń lomań+eś žar+s*
 this_PRON-DEM+GEN+INE+CLT town_N+GEN person_N+NOM.DEF.SG much_PRON-Q+ILL
javov+i vele+ń+še+ste+ńt'.
 differ-from_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG village_N+GEN+PRON-DEF+ELA+DEF.SG
 (Platonov 1975: 51) ‘In this way too, a city person still differs from one from a village.’
- c. *iše+ń kandst+oś l'ija+l,*
 yesterday_N/ADV+GEN burden_N+NOM.DEF.SG different_A.NOM.SG+IND.PRETII.PRED-3SG,
tēči+ń+še+ś l'ija
today_N/ADV+GEN+PRON-DEF+PL+DEF.PL.NOM different_A.NOM.SG
 (Abramov 1964: 252) ‘Yesterday's burden was different, the one of today's is different.’
- d. *oj+eń pař+eś med'+eń+še+ńt'*
butter_N+GEN barrel_N+NOM.DEF.SG **honey_N+GEN+PRON-DEF+GEN.DEF.SG**
kořa+s še+d'e od.
 in-relation-to_POP+ILL more_PRON-DEF+ABL new_A.NOM.SG
 ‘The butter tub is newer than the honey [tub].’
- e. *řeve+ń stada+ś skal+oń+še+ńt'*
 sheep_N+GEN herd_N+NOM.DEF.SG cow_N+GEN+PRON-DEF+GEN.DEF.SG
kořa+s viškińe.
 in-relation-to_POP+ILL little_A.NOM.SG
 ‘The sheep herd is smaller than the cow [herd].’

- f. *břigada+ń* *právt+oś* *vastov+ś*
brigade_N+GEN leader_N+NOM.DEF.SG meet_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG
oś+oń+še+ńt' *marto*
town_N+GEN+PRON-DEM+GEN.DEF.SG with_POP
 'The head of the brigade met with the mayor (lit. the one that is [head] of the town).'
- g. *ki+ń* *šapka+ńt'* *jomavt+ijjk* —
who_PRON-INTER+GEN cap_N+GEN.DEF.SG lose_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-2PL>3P
ivan+oń+še+ńt' *il'i*
Ivan_N-PRP+GEN+PRON-DEM-DISTAL+GEN.DEF.SG or_CONJ
petá+ń+še+ńt'?
Petya_N-PRP+GEN+PRON-DEM-DISTAL+GEN.DEF.SG
 (Evsev'ev 1963: 126) 'Whose cap did you lose: Ivan's or Petya's?'

At the NP level this case lends itself to the implementation of secondary declension as addressed in section 4.5. ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND SECONDARY DECLENSION.

Dative

The DATIVE case in Erzya does not have consistent marking. While the allomorphs *-ńeń*, *-neń* => *-Neń* are used in both the indefinite and definite plural declensions, the polyexponential allomorphs *-ńteń*, *-ońteń*, *-eńteń* => *-Ońteń* are used in the definite singular – some derive the latter form from definite singular oblique marker *-Ońt'* and the dative stem *-Teń* (cf. Evsev'ev 1963: 77), see table 4.7.

Table 4.7 Dative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions

Gloss	DAT	DEF.SG.DAT	PL+DEF.PL+DAT
<i>kal</i> 'fish'	<i>kal+neń</i>	<i>kal+ońteń</i>	<i>kal+t+ne+ńeń</i>
<i>kel</i> 'tongue; language'	<i>kel+ńeń</i>	<i>kel+eńteń</i>	<i>kel'+t+ńe+ńeń</i>
<i>karks</i> 'belt'	<i>karks+neń</i>	<i>karks+ońteń</i>	<i>karks+t+ne+ńeń</i>
<i>piks</i> 'rope'	<i>piks+neń</i>	<i>piks+eńteń</i>	<i>piks+t+ne+ńeń</i>
<i>śokś</i> 'autumn'	<i>śokś+ńeń</i>	<i>śokś+eńteń</i>	<i>śokś'+t+ńe+ńeń</i>
<i>kurgo</i> 'mouth'	<i>kurgo+ńeń</i>	<i>kurgo+ńteń</i>	<i>kurg+t+ne+ńeń</i> ~ <i>kurgo+t+ńe+ńeń</i>
<i>t'ingje</i> 'garden plot; threshing floor'	<i>t'ingje+ńeń</i>	<i>t'ingje+ńteń</i>	<i>t'ingje+t+ńe+ńeń</i> ~ <i>t'ingje+t+ńe+ńeń</i>
<i>kudo</i> 'house; home; room; container'	<i>kudo+ńeń</i>	<i>kudo+ńteń</i>	<i>kudo+t+ńe+ńeń</i>
<i>pize</i> 'nest'	<i>pize+ńeń</i>	<i>pize+ńteń</i>	<i>pize+t+ńe+ńeń</i>

When addressing the issue of possessive declension, however, grammars of Erzya only give forms for the singular persons, and therefore the dative declension is considered defective. The forms generally given for the dative are *-ńeń*, *-neń*, *-ońeń*, *-eńeń* => *-ONeń* POSS-1SG>DAT, *-teń*, *-teń*, *-ońeń*, *-eńeń* => *-OTEń* POSS-2SG>DAT and *-nsteń*, *-onsteń*, *-ensteń* => *-Onsteń* POSS-3SG>DAT, with a limitation to the range the first and second

persons, i.e. POSS-1SG>DAT and POSS-2SG>DAT are, according to modern grammarians, limited to kindred-term stems, whereas the POSS-3SG>DAT is open to common nouns as well. Evsev'ev (1963: 111) only set a kindred-term limitation for the POSS-1SG>DAT, hence (table 4.8) the word *lišme* 'horse' with a preceding question mark has been given in the 2SG>DAT cell (for a more in-depth discussion of kindred terms, see section 4.4.)

Table 4.8 Dative forms for the defective possessive declension

Gloss	DAT	1SG>DAT	2SG>DAT	3SG>DAT
<i>teta</i> 'father'	<i>teta+ńeń</i>	<i>teta+ńeń</i>	<i>teta+teń</i>	<i>teta+nsteń</i>
<i>sazor</i> 'younger sister'	<i>sazor+neń</i>	<i>sazor+neń</i>	<i>sazor+oteń</i>	<i>sazor+onsteń</i>
<i>lišme</i> 'horse'	<i>lišme+ńeń</i>	NA	[?] <i>lišme+teń</i>	<i>lišme+nsteń</i>
<i>kudo</i> 'house; home; room; container'	<i>kudo+ńeń</i>	NA	NA	<i>kudo+nsteń</i>

Upon closer inspection of text corpora, it will be noted that the POSS-3SG>DAT affix *-Onsteń* is subject to variation in the literature. This variation is attested at two separate levels, i.e. at the semantic level this affix is used to index both singular and plural possessors, and morphologically, some writers use forms that explicitly indicate singular and plural possessors, *-Onstenze* and *-Onstest*, respectively, see examples (4–5), below, from Glukhov (Malye Karmaly, Chuvashia, Erzya: *čarmun*) and Kutorkin (Studenets, Chuvashia). Although these forms will certainly be considered by some to be dialect forms with secondary possessor marking, see examples below.

- (4) *palko koma+ś, varšta+ś*
 Palko_N bend-over_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG, take-a-look_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG
potmar al+ov di salava
 bench_N.ABS under_POP+LAT and_CONJ with-stealth_ADV
teta+nste+nze: ud+iť.
 father_N+POSS-3.DAT+POSS-3SG: sleep_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3PL
 (Glukhov 1929: 131) 'Palko bent over, took a look under the bench and stealthfully [said] to his father: they're sleeping.'
- (5) *kudikelks+eńť keykš+eś apak*
 entrance-hall_N+GEN.DEF.SG door_N+NOM.DEF.SG not_PTC-PRT-NEG
peksta+l. udal+će
 close_V-CONNeg+IND.PRET.II.PRED-3SG back_ADV-SPAT+PRON-DEF.ABS
kudo+ńeń sova+šť vete+ńe+st
 room_N+DAT.DEF.SG enter_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3PL five_NUM+COLL-ASSOC+POSS-3PL
miličioner+t+ne, prok uč+ića+nste+st.
 militia_N+PL+DEF.PL.NOM, as-thought_CONJ await_V+PTC-PRES+POSS-3.DAT+POSS-3PL
 (Kutorkin 1987: 108) 'The door to the entrance hall was not closed, [so/and] the five militia came into the back room, as though they were expected.'

- (6) *mařa* *kuřma* *marto* *še+d'e+jak* *pek*
 Marya_PRP.NOM.SG Kuz'ma_PRP.ABS with_POP more_PRON-DEM+ABL+CLT very_ADV
čara+m+o *karma+šť* *ava+st* *peřka.*
 spin_V+N-OM+LOC begin_V+IND.PRETĪ.PRED-3PL mother_N+POSS-3PL around_POP.
korta+šť *siř* ***ava+nsteń***
 speak_V+IND.PRETĪ.PRED-3PL they_PRON-PERS-3PL.NOM **mother_N+POSS-3.DAT**
druk – *kapřa+šť.*
 suddenly_ADV hurry_V+IND.PRETĪ.PRED-3PL
 (Chesnokov 1974: 88) ‘Marya and Kuz'ma started spinning around their mother even more. Suddenly, they spoke to their mother; they were in a hurry.’

In a recent translation by the seasoned journalist and translator Vasili Dyomin (*Kuřka eřzań paz* ‘Kuz'ka the Erzyan God’ 2008) we can attest a second person plural form *-Onsteńk*. This form can readily be analyzed as an analogous construction that might be parsed *+Onste+ńk* *+POSS-3.DAT+POSS-2PL*. Dyomin's use of this form would clearly indicate the feasibility of the construction in the spoken language of Ses'kina, perhaps not too far removed from the Alatyř' sub-dialects of Glukhov and Kutorkin.

- (7) *meř+ede* *eř* ***kořajka+nsteńk.***
 tell_V+IMP.PRED-2PL own_PRON-REFL.ABS **wife_N+POSS-2PL>DAT,**
čora+nsteńk, ***tějtěř+ensteńk,*** ***nučka+nsteńk,***
son_N+POSS-2PL>DAT, **daughter_N+POSS-2PL>DAT** **grandchild_N+POSS-2PL>DAT,**
třa+m+s *saj+eř* ***táka+nsteńk*** – *veře* *buj+eń*
 raise_V+N-OM+ILL take_V+PTC-OZ **tyke_N+POSS-2PL>DAT** – all_Q-UNIV clan_N+GEN
lomań+ensteńk *ki+ńeń+gak* *a* *panž+om+s*
person_N+POSS-2PL>DAT who_PRON-REL+DAT+CLT not_PRT-NEG open_V+N-OM+ILL
ozno+ma *tarka+nok* – *řepeř'a+nok*
 pray_V+N-MA.ABS place_N+POSS-1PL – grove_N+POSS-1PL.
 (Dyomin 2008: *Kuřka eřzań paz*) ‘Tell your own wives, your sons, your daughters, your grandchildren, your foster children – all the people of your clan not to show our places of worship – our sacred groves.’

On the basis of the literary corpora we might be able to hypothesize the indexing of five possessor persons; the only one missing is the first person plural.

The primary functions expressed by the dative case are: (i) addressee; (ii) recipient; (iii) goal (potential controller); (iv) actors A and s of non-finite verbs; (v) temporal termination point, and (vi) spatial goal.

Ablative

The ABLATIVE case in Erzya can be represented by the allomorphs *-do*, *-d'e*, *-de*, *-to*, *-t'e*, *-te* => *-DO* in all declension types.

Table 4.9 Ablative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions

Gloss	ABL	ABL.DEF.SG	PL+DEF.PL+ABL
<i>kal</i> 'fish'	<i>kal+do</i>	<i>kal+do+ńt'</i>	<i>kal+t+ne+d'e</i>
<i>kel'</i> 'tongue; language'	<i>kel+d'e</i>	<i>kel+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>kel+t'+ńe+d'e</i>
<i>karks</i> 'belt'	<i>karks+to</i>	<i>karks+to+ńt'</i>	<i>karks+t+ne+d'e</i>
<i>piks</i> 'rope'	<i>piks+te</i>	<i>piks+te+ńt'</i>	<i>piks+t+ne+d'e</i>
<i>śokś</i> 'autumn'	<i>śokś+t'e</i>	<i>śokś+t'e+ńt'</i>	<i>śokś+t'+ńe+d'e</i>
<i>kurgo</i> 'mouth'	<i>kurgo+do</i>	<i>kurgo+do+ńt'</i>	<i>kurgo+t+ne+d'e</i> ~ <i>kurgo+t'+ńe+d'e</i>
<i>t'inge</i> 'garden plot; threshing floor'	<i>t'inge+d'e</i>	<i>t'inge+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>t'ing+t'+ńe+d'e</i> ~ <i>t'inge+t'+ńe+d'e</i>
<i>kudo</i> 'house; home; room; container'	<i>kudo+do</i>	<i>kudo+do+ńt'</i>	<i>kudo+t'+ńe+d'e</i>
<i>pize</i> 'nest'	<i>pize+d'e</i>	<i>pize+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>pize+t'+ńe+d'e</i>

The main functions of the ablative are the marking of: (i) the object of discussion; (ii) spatial source in delimitation constructions; (iii) cause; (iv) standard for comparison of inequalities; (v) separation; (vi) the partial object in various verbs indicating “intake”, i.e. eating, drinking, breathing, seeing, and (vii) the subject of quantification – although the nominative is used as well. (See Rueter “On Quantification in the Erzya language”, forthcoming);

4.2.1.2. Local cases

Local cases in Erzya comprise a selection of eight spatio-temporal affixes with targets in the range noun-phrase head, quantifiers, adverb/adposition and non-finite in *-Om*. Nuances commonly conveyed by these cases include orientation, i.e. source, location and goal. Whereas the inessive, elative, illative and prolative are well attested in the entire range, the lative, locative and temporalis have very low attestation, for example, the temporalis is only found in the indefinite declension, and the locative is limited in range to the adverbs/adpositions and non-finites.

Inessive

The INESSIVE case in Erzya can be represented by the allomorphs *-so*, *-se*, *-oso*, *-ese* => *-(O)sO* in all declension types; the linking vowel is not obligatory, rather it appears to be associated with stem-affix alignment.

Table 4.10 Inessive forms from the definite and indefinite declensions

Gloss	INE	INE.DEF.SG	PL+DEF.PL+INE
<i>kal</i> ‘fish’	<i>kal+so</i>	<i>kal+so+ńt’</i>	<i>kal+t+ne+se</i>
<i>kel’</i> ‘tongue; language’	<i>kel’+se</i>	<i>kel’+se+ńt’</i>	<i>kel’+t’+ńe+se</i>
<i>karks</i> ‘belt’	<i>karks+so</i>	<i>karks+so+ńt’</i>	<i>karks+t+ne+se</i>
<i>piks</i> ‘rope’	<i>piks+se</i>	<i>piks+se+ńt’</i>	<i>piks+t+ne+se</i>
<i>śokś</i> ‘autumn’	<i>śokś+se</i>	<i>śokś+se+ńt’</i>	<i>śokś+t’+ńe+se</i>
<i>kurgo</i> ‘mouth’	<i>kurg+so</i> ~ <i>kurgo+so</i>	<i>kurg+so+ńt’</i> ~ <i>kurgo+so+ńt’</i>	<i>kurg+t+ne+se</i> ~ <i>kurgo+t’+ńe+se</i>
<i>t’ing’e</i> ‘garden plot; threshing floor’	<i>t’ing+se</i> ~ <i>t’ing’e+se</i>	<i>t’ing+se+ńt’</i> ~ <i>t’ing’e+se+ńt’</i>	<i>t’ing+t’+ńe+se</i> ~ <i>t’ing’e+t’+ńe+se</i>
<i>kudo</i> ‘house; home; room; container’	<i>kudo+so</i>	<i>kudo+so+ńt’</i>	<i>kudo+t’+ńe+se</i>
<i>pize</i> ‘nest’	<i>pize+se</i>	<i>pize+se+ńt’</i>	<i>pize+t’+ńe+se</i>

The main functions of the inessive are the marking of: (i) location of an action of event; (ii) instrument; (iii) spatio-temporal location, and (iv) direct object imperfect aspect. This case is attested in both nominal and clausal syntax. At the NP level this case lends itself to the implementation of secondary declension as addressed in section 4.5. ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND SECONDARY DECLENSION. (See also Danilov 1973; Bubrikh 1947: 15.)

Elative

The ELATIVE case in Erzya can be represented by the allomorphs *-sto*, *-ste*, *-osto*, *-este* => *-(O)stO* in all declension types; the linking vowel is not obligatory, rather is appears to be associated with stem-affix alignment.

Table 4.11 Relative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions

	ELA	ELA.DEF.SG	PL+DEF.PL+ELA
<i>kal</i> ‘fish’	<i>kal+sto</i>	<i>kal+sto+ńt’</i>	<i>kal+t+ne+ste</i>
<i>kel</i> ‘tongue; language’	<i>kel+ste</i>	<i>kel+ste+ńt’</i>	<i>kel+t’+ńe+ste</i>
<i>karks</i> ‘belt’	<i>karks+sto</i>	<i>karks+sto+ńt’</i>	<i>karks+t+ne+ste</i>
<i>piks</i> ‘rope’	<i>piks+ste</i>	<i>piks+ste+ńt’</i>	<i>piks+t+ne+ste</i>
<i>śokś</i> ‘autumn’	<i>śokś+ste</i>	<i>śokś+ste+ńt’</i>	<i>śokś+t’+ńe+ste</i>
<i>kurgo</i> ‘mouth’	<i>kurg+sto</i> ~ <i>kurgo+sto</i>	<i>kurg+sto+ńt’</i> ~ <i>kurgo+sto+ńt’</i>	<i>kurg+t+ne+ste</i> ~ <i>kurgo+t’+ńe+ste</i>
<i>tįnge</i> ‘garden plot; threshing floor’	<i>tįng+ste</i> ~ <i>tįnge+ste</i>	<i>tįng+ste+ńt’</i> ~ <i>tįnge+ste+ńt’</i>	<i>tįng+t’+ńe+ste</i> ~ <i>tįnge+t’+ńe+ste</i>
<i>kudo</i> ‘house; home; room; container’	<i>kudo+sto</i>	<i>kudo+sto+ńt’</i>	<i>kudo+t’+ńe+ste</i>
<i>pize</i> ‘nest’	<i>pize+ste</i>	<i>pize+ste+ńt’</i>	<i>pize+t’+ńe+ste</i>

The ELATIVE case with the morpheme *-(O)stO* has the semantic functions of source and location. Semantic source can be attested for the spatio-temporal notions of (i) spatial source (8), (ii) abstract space, capacity (10), (iii) material (11), (iv) spatio-temporal source in origin-point strategy for indicating span/duration – used in conjunction with illative form (12), and (v) semantic location is attested for temporal notions (13).

- (8) a. *kudo+sto+ńt’*
house_N+ELA+DEF.SG
‘out of the house’
- b. *kudo+ńt’* *ej+ste*
house_N+DEF.SG away-from_POP+ELA
‘away from the house’
- (9) *ava+sto+nzo*
mother_N+ELA+POSS-3SG
‘from its/his/her mother’
- (10) *právt+sto*
boss_N+ELA
‘from/in the position of boss’
- (11) *śija+sto*
silver_N+ELA
‘out of silver’

- (12) a. *vel'e+ste* *vel'e+s*
 village_N+ELA village_N+ILL
 'from village to village'
- b. *śokśe+ste* *tundo+s*
 autumn_N+ELA spring_N+ILL
 'from autumn to spring'
- (13) a. *eřva* *čĭ+ste*
 every_Q.ABS day_N+ELA
 'every day'
- b. *eřva* *sa+m+sto+nzo*
 every_Q.ABS arrive_V-INF+ELA+POSS-3SG
 'every time he/she arrived'

Variation in meaning above can best be associated with the semantics of the word stem. When the referent is a space that can serve as a location the notion of spatial source as in *kudostońt'* 'out of the house' comes without any implications. When speaking of a capacity, the excessive interpretation *přavtsto* 'from the capacity of boss' is also readily accepted. Materials, too, can serve as sources, thus *śijasto* 'out of silver'. When nouns are not the location of activities or event, rather reference points, source and reference point provide the notion of separation, on the one hand, and the point of origin in the establishment of spans through time or space, i.e. *vel'este vel'es* 'from village to village' and *śokśeste tundos* 'from autumn to spring'. Temporal reference point and location can also be attested in deverbal morphemes, whereas the deverbal nouns in *-OmA* have a high tendency of indicating temporal reference point, while non-finite elative forms in *-OmstO* are highly attested for indicating an ongoing process (see Bubrikh 1947: 16; Alyoshkina 2000: 222–228; Rueter: power-point presentation "Non-finite elative '-mstO' in Erzya", Tallinn: Finiteness and non-finiteness 11/25/2009, 2009b). Finally, the elative is attested in both nominal and clausal syntax. At the NP level this case lends itself to the implementation of secondary declension as addressed in section 4.5. ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND SECONDARY DECLENSION.

Illative

The ILLATIVE case in Erzya can be represented by the morpheme *-s*, *-os*, *-es* => *-(O)s* in the indefinite and definite plural declensions, and the voiced allomorph *-z*, *-oz*, *-ez* => *-(O)z* variants are regularly used in the possessive declension; the linking vowel is not obligatory, rather it appears to be associated with stem-affix alignment. The definite singular, however, is problematic, i.e. despite erroneous attestation (Ryabov 1935: 23§), the morpheme has not been attested elsewhere.

Table 4.12 Illative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions

	ILL	ILL.DEF.SG > DEF. SG.DAT	PL+DEF.PL+ILL
<i>kal</i> ‘fish’	<i>kal+s</i>	The analogical functions of the *ILL.DEF. SG are usually taken by the DEF.SG.DAT.	<i>kal+t+ne+s</i>
<i>kel</i> ‘tongue; language’	<i>kel+s</i>		<i>kel+t*ńe+s</i>
<i>karks</i> ‘belt’	<i>karks+s ~ karks+os</i>		<i>karks+t+ne+s</i>
<i>piks</i> ‘rope’	<i>piks+s ~ piks+es</i>		<i>piks+t+ne+s</i>
<i>śokś</i> ‘autumn’	<i>śokś+s ~ śokśe+s</i>		<i>śokś+t*ńe+s</i>
<i>kurgo</i> ‘mouth’	<i>kurg+s ~ kurgo+s</i>		<i>kurg+t+ne+s ~ kurgo+t*ńe+s</i>
<i>tįnge</i> ‘garden plot; threshing floor’	<i>tįng+s ~ tįnge+s</i>		<i>tįng+t*ńe+s ~ tįnge+t*ńe+s</i>
<i>kudo</i> ‘house; home; room; container’	<i>kudo+s</i>		<i>kudo+t*ńe+s</i>
<i>pize</i> ‘nest’	<i>pize+s</i>		<i>pize+t*ńe+s</i>

The illative is not compatible with the definite singular declension. Information to the contrary is provided by Ryabov (1935) *kudo+zonít* house_N+ILL.DEF.SG ‘into the house’, but perhaps this is merely a hypercorrect form of the Alatyř'-dialect 2SG possessor index, which would be *kudo+z+ont* house_N+ILL+POSS- 2SG ‘into your house’ (note the absence of palatalization on the 2SG marker).

Table 4.13 Possessor indexing for the illative case

POR		<i>skal</i> ‘cow’	<i>ked</i> ‘hand; arm’	<i>tęta</i> ‘father’	<i>tejtęr</i> ‘daughter; girl’
1	SG	<i>skal+oz+on ~</i>	<i>ked+ez+eń ~</i>	<i>tęta+z+on ~</i>	<i>tejtęr+ez+eń ~</i>
		<i>skal+oz+om</i>	<i>ked+ez+em</i>	<i>tęta+z+om</i>	<i>tejtęr+ez+em</i>
2	PL	<i>skal+oz+onok</i>	<i>ked+ez+eńek</i>	<i>tęta+z+onok</i>	<i>tejtęr+ez+eńek</i>
	SG	<i>skal+oz+ot</i>	<i>ked+ez+et</i>	<i>tęta+z+ot</i>	<i>tejtęr+ez+et</i>
3	PL	<i>skal+oz+onk</i>	<i>ked+ez+enk</i>	<i>tęta+z+onk</i>	<i>tejtęr+ez+enk</i>
	SG	<i>skal+oz+onz</i>	<i>ked+ez+enze</i>	<i>tęta+z+onz</i>	<i>tejtęr+ez+enze</i>
	PL	<i>skal+oz+ost</i>	<i>ked+ez+est</i>	<i>tęta+z+ost</i>	<i>tejtęr+ez+est</i>

The main functions of the illative are the marking of: (i) spatial goal (into); (ii) spatio-temporal termination point (also used in strategies indicating span/duration – used in conjunction with ablative and relative forms), and (iii) purpose, object to be acquired. This case is attested in both nominal and clausal syntax.

Lative

The LATIVE case in Erzya can be represented by the allomorphs *-v*, *-ov*, *-ev*, *-ej* => *-Ov* in the indefinite and definite plural declension types, it has no definite singular form, and where a possessive declension would be expected it is homonymous with the locative (see Bartens 1970; 1979: 25–26).

- (15) a. — *moń+gak* *led+ma+v* *marto+ŋk*
 I_PRON-PERS-1SG.GEN+CLT mow_V+N+LAT with_POP+POSS-2PL
saj+samiž?
 take_V+IND.PRES.PRED-X>1P ?
 (Kutorkin 1976: 80) ‘Will [you] take me with you haying?’

- b. *mikaj* *t'eta+nzo* *marto*
 Mikai_PRP.NOM.SG father_N+POSS-3SG>OBL with_POP
purna+šć *rator* *lej* *čire+v*
 get-ready-to-go_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3PL Alatyř'_PRP.ABS river_N.ABS edge_POP+LAT
bojar+neń *t'ikše* *led+em+e.*
 boyar_N+DAT hay_N.NOM.SG mow_V+INF+LOC.
 (Abramov 1973: 174) ‘Mikai and his father were getting ready to got to the banks of the Alatyř' to make hay for the Boyar.’

Lative-case phrases are attested at both the NP and clausal levels.

Prolative

The PROLATIVE case in Erzya can be represented by the allomorphs *-ga*, *-ka*, *-va* => *-Ga* in all declension types.

Table 4.15 Prolative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions

	PROL	PROL.DEF.SG	PL+DEF.PL+PROL
<i>san</i> ‘vein; sinew’	<i>san+ga</i>	<i>san+ga+ńć</i>	<i>san+t+ne+va+neń</i>
<i>ineved</i> ‘sea’	<i>ineved+ga</i>	<i>ineved+ga+ńć</i>	<i>ineved+t+ne+va</i>
<i>potmaks</i> ‘bottom’	<i>potmaks+ka</i>	<i>potmaks+ka+ńć</i>	<i>potmaks+t+ne+va</i>
<i>čud'ikerks</i> ‘stream’	<i>čud'ikerks+ka</i>	<i>čud'ikerks+ka+ńć</i>	<i>čud'ikerks+t+ne+va</i>
<i>kurgo</i> ‘mouth’	<i>kurgo+va</i>	<i>kurgo+va+ńć</i>	<i>kurg+t+ne+va</i> ~ <i>kurgo+t+ne+va</i>
<i>t'inge</i> ‘garden plot; threshing floor’	<i>t'inge+va</i>	<i>t'inge+va+ńć</i>	<i>t'ing+t+ne+va</i> ~ <i>t'inge+t+ne+va</i>
<i>kudo</i> ‘house; home; room; container’	<i>kudo+va</i>	<i>kudo+va+ńć</i>	<i>kudo+t+ne+va</i>
<i>pize</i> ‘nest’	<i>pize+va</i>	<i>pize+va+ńć</i>	<i>pize+t+ne+va</i>

The main functions of the prolativ are the marking of:

(i) Distributional spatial locative for use with themes in motion and stationary:

- (16) a. *tél+ína+t* *veřgiz+t* *čijň+it'* ***viř+ga,***
 winter_N+TEMP+PL wolf_N+PL.NOM run-around_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3PL **forest_N+PROL,**
pakša+va
field_N+PROL
 (cf. Ermuškin 2004: 76) 'In the winter time, there are wolves running around in the forests and fields.'

- b. *nej* *jut+an* *těta+ń* ***kudo+va***
 now_ADV+TEMP go/move_V+IND.PRES.PRED-1SG father_N+GEN **house_N+PROL**
 (cf. Ermuškin 2004: 76–77) 'Now I'm walking around in [my] father's house.'

(ii) Transitional point in space:

- (17) *těta+ń* ***keřkš+ka*** *liš+em+ste* *moń* *kerš*
 father_N+GEN **door_N+PROL** exit_V+INF+ELA I_PRON-PERS-1SG.GEN left_A.ABS
pil'gińe+m *šiv+eze*
 foot/leg_N.DIM+POSS-1SG>NOM.SG break_V+OPT.PRED-3SG
 (cf. Ermuškin 2004: 79) 'When I go out through my father's door, may my left leg break.'

(iii) Distributional spatial goal:

- (18) *lovco+ńt'* ***šakš+ka*** *peštl'+ik*
 milk_N+GEN.DEF.SG **crock_N+PROL** fill_V+IMP.PRED-2SG>3SG
 (Evsev'ev 1963: 66) 'Pour the milk in crocks.'

(iv) Approximate spatial termination point:

- (19) *mež+d'e* *pel'+em+s* *t'e*
 what_PRON-INTER+ABL be-afraid-of_V+INF+ILL this_PRON-DEM.ABS
lej+se+ńt' – *ved+eš* *kumanža* ***vid+ga.***
 river_N+INE+DEF.SG water_N+NOM.DEF.SG knee_N.ABS **adjacency_POP+PROL**
 (Abramov 1971: 192) 'What is there to be afraid of in this river: the water [comes] up to the knees'

(v) Approximate temporal locative:

- (20) *čopoda+va tu+ś viř+ev*
dark_N+PROL set-out-for_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG forest_N+LAT
 (cf. Evsev'ev 1963: 66) 'In the darkness [before sun-up], he/she set out for the forest.'

(vi) Causative, purpose:

- (21) *miń vačkod'+ińek eřa+m+ga.*
 we_PRON-PERS-1PL.NOM beat_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-1PL **live_V+INF+PROL**,
śisēm ćora+ń šač+om+ga
 seven_NUM-CARD.ABS son_N+GEN be-born_V+INF-PROL
 (Evsev'ev 1963: 66) 'We rang (the bell) for living, for the birth of seven sons.'

(vii) Material measured:

- (22) *avoľ śupav šuro+va, śupav ćora*
 not_PRT-NEG-CONTR rich_A.NOM.SG **grain_N+PROL**, rich_A.NOM.SG man_N.ABS
kaka+va
child_N+PROL
 (Evsev'ev 1963: 65) '[He is] not rich due to grain, [but] rich due to sons.'

The prolativ is attested in both nominal and clausal syntax. At the NP level this case lends itself to the implementation of secondary declension as addressed in section 4.5. ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND SECONDARY DECLENSION.

Locative

The LOCATIVE case in Erzya can be represented by the allomorphs *-o*, *-e* => *-O* in the indefinite and possessive declension types. This form is only attested in adverbials, postpositions and non-finites, some grammars refer to it as the nominative. The case appears to have phonological restrictions. It can appear after the nasals *n* and *m*, and the liquids *l* and *r*; this and the fact that sibling cases of the locative are all based on a consonant stem would indicate that, diachronically speaking, the vowel is secondary (cf. Bartens 1979: 25–26).

Table 4.16 Locative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions

	LOC	DEF.SG.DAT	PL+DEF.PL+DAT
<i>al-</i> 'beneath, below'	<i>al+o</i>	NA	NA
<i>ikeľ-</i> 'front'	<i>ikeľ+e</i>	NA	NA
<i>jon</i> 'direction'	<i>jon+o</i>	NA	NA
<i>veř-</i> 'up above'	<i>veř+e</i>	NA	NA
<i>moľem-</i> 'to go'	<i>moľem+e</i>	NA	NA

The main function of this form is the expression of relative spatial location in adverbs and adpositions. The *-Om+O* non-finite might be added to this group on the grounds of inflectional and semantic relations, see also (Bartens 1979: 25–26). Inflectional parallels can be observed between word forms such as *al+o* ‘under; below’ and *al+ks* ‘space located under or below’, on the one hand, and *jarsa+m+o* ‘to eat (of)’ and *jarsa+m+s* ‘to eat (of)’ with a dialect variant *jarsa+m+ks*, which might also be used in the meaning ‘something to be eaten’ (N. Bryzhinskaya, p.c., 2007). At the NP level this case lends itself to the implementation of secondary declension as addressed in section 4.5. ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND SECONDARY DECLENSION.

Temporalis

The TEMPORALIS case in Erzya can be represented by the allomorphs *-ńe*, *-ne* => *-Ne* in the indefinite declension only, a limitation noted by Gabelentz (1839: 247).

Table 4.17 Temporalis forms from the indefinite declension

	TEMP	DEF.SG.DAT	PL+DEF.PL+DAT	POSS
<i>davol</i> ‘storm’	<i>davol+ne</i>	In the deictic declensions the relative case is used to express virtually the same nuance.		
<i>šokś</i> ‘autumn’	<i>šokś+ńe</i>			
<i>valdo</i> ‘light’	<i>valdo+ńe</i>			
<i>pińge</i> ‘life time; century’	<i>pińge+ńe</i>			
<i>Mašta</i> ‘Shrove tide’	<i>Mašta+ńe</i>			
<i>pižeme</i> ‘rain’	<i>pižeme+ńe</i>			

Its main function is the marking of temporal location.

- (23) *umok* *uš* *piłge+nze*
 long-ago_ADV-TEMP already_ADV leg/foot_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG
karma+št' *kel'me+m+e,* *dı* *paro,*
 begin_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3PL get-cold_V+INF+LOC, and_CONJ good_A.NOM.SG,
ıştámo ***pukštord+ı*** ***jakšam+ne,***
 like-this/that_PRON-DEF.ABS crackle_V+PTC-PRES-SHORT.ABS freeze_N+TEMP,
ašt'e+m+s *lembe* *tulup* *pot+so,*
 be-in-one-place_V+INF+HILL warm_A.ABS sheepskin-coat_N.ABS inside_POP+INE,
žardo *ełe+se+t'* *oza+do* *muža+ń*
 when_PRON-REL lap_N+INE+POSS-2SG sit-down_V+ABL Nuzha_PRP+GEN
palaga.
 Palaga_PRP.NOM.SG
 (Kutorkin 1997: 91) ‘His legs had already begun to get cold long ago, so what, in crackling freezing weather like this, you should be wrapped up in a sheepskin coat when you have Nuzha's Palaga sitting in your lap.’

(Translative definite and possessive declension forms are extremely low-frequency; they have been included in older grammars of Erzya, but some modern speakers do not acknowledge their existence. Low frequency could be due to the fact that the translative is generally a case of the complement, such that topic marking is not expected.)

The main functions of the translative case are the marking of: (i) object complement (cf. Bartens 1999: 98–99); (ii) similative; (iii) goal (change of state), and (iv) terminal point in change of state plotting, in conjunction with relative source case. This case is attested in both nominal and clausal syntax. At the NP level this case lends itself to the implementation of secondary declension as addressed in section 4.5. ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND SECONDARY DECLENSION.

Comparative

The COMPARATIVE case in Erzya can be represented by the morpheme *-ška*, *-oška*, *-eška* => *-(O)ška* in all declension types; the linking vowel is not obligatory, rather it appears to be associated with stem-affix alignment. This case is given in the latest Erzya Grammar (2000) with a definite plural declension (Grebneva 2000: 106), unfortunately it is not attested in the majority corpus.

Table 4.19 Comparative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions

	COMP	COMP.DEF.SG	PL+DEF.PL+COMP
<i>ksnav</i> ‘pea’	<i>ksnav+ška</i>	<i>ksnav+ška+ńt’</i>	<i>ksnav+t+ne+ška</i>
<i>kodgemeń</i> ‘sixty’	<i>kodgemeń+ška</i>	<i>kodgemeń+ška+ńt’</i>	<i>kodgemeń+t+ńe+ška</i>
<i>vaz</i> ‘calf (young cow)’	<i>vaz+oška</i>	<i>vaz+oška+ńt’</i>	<i>vaz+t+ne+ška</i>
<i>saldjřks</i> ‘salt bowl’	<i>saldjřks+eška</i>	<i>saldjřks+eška+ńt’</i>	<i>saldjřks+t+ne+ška</i>
<i>pando</i> ‘hill’	<i>pando+ška</i>	<i>pando+ška+ńt’</i>	<i>pand+t+ne+ška ~ pando+t+ńe+ška</i>
<i>tįnge</i> ‘garden plot; threshing floor’	<i>tįnge+ška</i>	<i>tįnge+ška+ńt’</i>	<i>tįng+t+ńe+ń eń~ tįnge+t+ńe+ška</i>
<i>kudo</i> ‘house; home; room; container’	<i>kudo+ška</i>	<i>kudo+ška+ńt’</i>	<i>kudo+t+ńe+ška</i>
<i>pińeme</i> ‘oat’	<i>pińeme+ška</i>	<i>pińeme+ška+ńt’</i>	<i>pińeme+t+ńe+ška</i>

The main functions of the comparative case are the marking of: (i) the standard of equal comparison, and (ii) spatio-temporal approximation. This case is attested in both nominal and clausal syntax.

Bartens (1999: 80) considers the comparative to be a mere derivational suffix used for producing adjectives to designate the standard of comparison in equals, e.g. *vazo+ška kiska* calf_N+COMP dog_N.NOM.SG ‘a dog the size of a calf’, and *ažija+ška kal* thill_N+COMP fish_N.NOM.SG ‘a fish as thick as a thill (the Erzya are familiar with draught animals)’. The counter-examples to this come from subject complement usage

where the standard of equal comparison can, in fact, appear in the definite singular declension when no generic interpretation is intended, see (25) and (26) with a possessive declension.

- (25) *mordovija+ń rator íejńe+ška+ńt, avoľ*
 Mordovia_PRP+GEN Alatyř'_N.ABS **little-river_N+COMP+DEF.SG**, not_PRT-NEG-CONTR
še+dě pokš.
 that_PRON-DEF+ABL big_A.NOM.SG
 (Doronin 1994: 106) 'The size of the little Alatyř' River in Mordovia, not any bigger.'
- (26) *seř+eze teta+ška+nzo, no še+dě*
 height_N+POSS-3SG>NOM **father_N+COMP+POSS-3SG**, but_CONJ that_PRON-DEM+ABL
šumbra di, keveř+íca šar
 healthy/stout_A.NOM.SG and_CONJ, roll_V+PTC-PRES-LONG.ABS ball_N.NOM.SG
buto, bojka.
 as-though_PRT, quick_A.NOM.SG
 (Kutorkin 1969: 28) 'He is tall like his father, but stouter and quick like a rolling ball.'

One peculiarity might be attributed to the possessive declension found in (24), namely, a parallel is drawn between *his height* [the boy's] and *his father* as opposed to *his father's*, which would indicate *height* as a possessum for both the boy and his father. At the NP level this case lends itself to the implementation of secondary declension as addressed in section 4.5. ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND SECONDARY DECLENSION.

Abessive

The ABESSIVE case in Erzya can be represented by the allomorphs *-vtomo*, *-vteme*, *-tomo*, *-teme*, *-teme* => *-VTOmO* in all declension types.

Table 4.20 Ablative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions

	ABE	ABE.DEF.SG	PL+DEF.PL+ABE
<i>kal</i> 'fish'	<i>kal+tomo</i>	<i>kal+tomo+ńt'</i>	<i>kal+t+ne+ vteme</i>
<i>kel</i> 'tongue; language'	<i>kel+teme</i>	<i>kel+teme+ńt'</i>	<i>kel+t+ńe+ vteme</i>
<i>karks</i> 'belt'	<i>karks+tomo</i>	<i>karks+tomo+ńt'</i>	<i>karks+t+ne+ vteme</i>
<i>piks</i> 'rope'	<i>piks+teme</i>	<i>piks+teme+ńt'</i>	<i>piks+t+ne+ vteme</i>
<i>šokś</i> 'autumn'	<i>šokś+teme</i>	<i>šokś+teme+ńt'</i>	<i>šokś+t+ńe+ vteme</i>
<i>kurgo</i> 'mouth'	<i>kurgo+vtomo</i>	<i>kurgo+vtomo+ńt'</i>	<i>kurg+t+ne+vteme ~ kurgo+t+ńe+vteme</i>
<i>tĩnge</i> 'garden plot; threshing floor'	<i>tĩnge+vteme</i>	<i>tĩnge+vteme+ńt'</i>	<i>tĩng+t+ńe+vteme ~ tĩnge+t+ńe+vteme</i>
<i>kudo</i> 'house; home; room; container'	<i>kudo+vtomo</i>	<i>kudo+vtomo+ńt'</i>	<i>kudo+t+ńe+ vteme</i>
<i>pize</i> 'nest'	<i>pize+vteme</i>	<i>pize+vteme+ńt'</i>	<i>pize+t+ńe+ vteme</i>

The main function of the abessive case is the marking of lack/absence of something, whereby it is given with an interpretation of MANNER OR STATE OF ONE OF THE ARGUMENT COMPLEMENTS. This case is attested in both nominal and clausal syntax. At the NP level this case lends itself to the implementation of secondary declension as addressed in section 4.5. ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND SECONDARY DECLENSION.

Comitative

The COMITATIVE case in Erzya can be represented by the allomorphs *-ńek*, *-nek* => *-Nek* in the indefinite and definite plural declension types, reference is also made to its reflex in collective numerals of the possessive declension (cf. Tsygankin 1961:346; Nad'kin 1968: 51, 57; Danilov 1969: 171–174).

Table 4.21 Comitative forms from the definite and indefinite declensions

	COM	COM.DEF.SG > <i>marto</i>	PL+DEF.PL+COM
<i>kal</i> 'fish'	<i>kal+nek</i>	<i>Only attested</i>	<i>kal+t+ne+ńek</i>
<i>kel</i> 'tongue; language'	<i>kel+ńek</i>	<i>in dialects with DET+COM</i>	<i>kel+t+ńe+ńek</i>
<i>karks</i> 'belt'	<i>karks+nek</i>	<i>ordering (cf.</i>	<i>karks+t+ne+ńek</i>
<i>piks</i> 'rope'	<i>piks+nek</i>	<i>Nad'kin 1968: 51,</i>	<i>piks+t+ne+ńek</i>
<i>śokś</i> 'autumn'	<i>śokś+ńek</i>	<i>57)</i>	<i>śokś+t+ńe+ńek</i>
<i>pando</i> 'hill'	<i>pando+ńek</i>		<i>pand+t+ne+ńek ~ pando+t+ńe+ńek</i>
<i>tįnge</i> 'garden plot; threshing floor'	<i>tįnge+ńek</i>		<i>tįng+t+ńe+ń en ~ tįnge+t+ńe+ńek</i>
<i>kudo</i> 'house; home; room; container'	<i>kudo+do</i>		<i>kudo+t+ńe+ńek</i>
<i>pize</i> 'nest'	<i>pize+de</i>		<i>pize+t+ńe+ńek</i>

The main function of the comitative is the marking of universal quantification + with. This case is subject or object oriented. Nad'kin (1968: 51, 57) also attests this case in the definite plural declension of some of the Alatyř' subdialects.

Ambiguity is attested with the adnominal cross-referential person marker *-ONOk*, for more specifics, see (4.2.3.1.1.) FIRST PERSON.

Interim summary

On the basis of the discussion of cases, above, we can render the following declension tables with allomorphs and examples in the indefinite, definite and possessor-index forms.

Table 4.22 Indefinite declension table

Label	Form(s) Standard phonetic	Cyrillics		Example	
NOM	Ø	Ø	+Ø	<i>kudo</i>	‘home/house’
GEN	+ń, +oń, +eń	+нь, +онь, +ень, +энь	+Oń	<i>kudo+ń</i>	‘of [home a/the house]’
DAT	+ńeń, +neń, +ońeń, +eńeń	+нень, +нэнь, +онень, +енень, +энень	+ONEń	<i>kudo+ńeń</i>	‘for the home’
ABL	+do, +de, +de, +to, +te, +te	+до, +де, +дэ, +то, +те, +тэ	+DO	<i>kudo+do</i>	‘about [home a house]’
INE	+so, +se	+со, +сэ	+sO	<i>kudo+so</i>	‘[at home in a/the house]’
ELA	+sto, +ste	+сто, +стэ	+stO	<i>kudo+sto</i>	‘from [home a/the house]’
ILL	+s	+с	+s	<i>kudo+s</i>	‘into a/the house’
LAT	+v, +ov, +ev, +j	+в, +ов, +ев, +эв, +й	+Ov	<i>kudo+v</i>	‘home (GOAL)’
PROL	+ga, +ka, +va	+га, +ка, +ва	+Ga	<i>kudo+va</i>	‘[in around the house in homes] [+DISTR]’
LOC	+o, +e	+о, +е	+O	<i>mastor+o</i>	‘on the ground’
TEMP	+ńe, +ne	+не, +нэ	+Ne	<i>varma+ńe</i>	‘when it's windy’
TRNSL	+ks, +oks, +eks	+кc, +окc, +екc, +экc	+Oks	<i>kudo+ks</i>	‘home/house (comple- ment position)’
COMP	+ška	+шка	+ška	<i>kudo+ška</i>	‘the size of a house’
ABE	+vtomo, +vte me, +tomo, +te me, +te me	+втомo, +теме, +томo, +теме, +тэме	+VTOmO	<i>kudo+vtomo</i>	‘without a home/house’
COM	+ńek, +nek	+нек, +нэк	+Nek	<i>kudo+ńek</i>	‘with the whole house’
Total allo- morphs	41	45			

The allomorphs occurring in the cases are attributed to the following qualities of the preceding constituent: (i) front-back vowel harmony; (ii) palatal harmony; (iii) vowel versus consonant stem; (iv) voiced versus voiceless in consonant stem; (v) avoidance of velar adjacency, optional vowel loss in stem type NOUNS2, see Nominal-type word stems, above. All told there are 41 phonetic, and 45 Cyrillic allomorphs associated with the 15 subcategories of case.

Table 4.23 Definite plural declension table

Label	Form(s)			Example
	Standard phonetic	Cyrillics		
NOM	Ø	Ø	<i>kudoťne</i>	‘the/these/those houses’
GEN	+ <i>Oń</i>	+ <i>нь</i>	<i>kudoťne+ń</i>	‘of the houses’
DAT	+ <i>ńeń</i>	+ <i>нень</i>	<i>kudoťne+ńeń</i>	‘for the homes’
ABL	+ <i>dě</i>	+ <i>де</i>	<i>kudoťne+dě</i>	‘about the [homes houses]’
INE	+ <i>se</i>	+ <i>сэ</i>	<i>kudoťne+se</i>	‘in the [homes houses]’
ELA	+ <i>ste</i>	+ <i>стэ</i>	<i>kudoťne+ste</i>	‘from the [homes houses]’
ILL	+ <i>s</i>	+ <i>с</i>	<i>kudoťne+s</i>	‘into the houses’
LAT	+ <i>v</i>	+ <i>в</i>	<i>oštne+v</i>	‘to/toward the cities’
PROL	+ <i>va</i>	+ <i>ва</i>	<i>kudoťne+va</i>	‘[in around the houses in the homes]’
LOC	NA	NA		
TEMP	NA	NA		
TRNSL	+ <i>ks</i>	+ <i>кс</i>	<i>kudoťne+ks</i>	‘homes/houses (complement position)’
COMP	+ <i>ška</i>	+ <i>шка</i>	<i>kudoťne+ška</i>	‘the size of those houses’
ABE	+ <i>v’eme</i>	+ <i>в’еме</i>	<i>kudoťne+v’eme</i>	‘without the homes/houses’
COM	+ <i>ńek</i>	+ <i>нек</i>	<i>kudoťne+ńek</i>	‘with [all] the houses (dialect, see Nad’kin 1968)’
Total allomorphs	13	13		

In the definite plural declension only one allomorph is available for each case. Thus with no attestation for the translative, locative and temporal cases there is a total of 13 forms including ZERO for the 13 attested cases.

Table 4.24 Definite singular declension table

Label	Form(s) Standard phonetic	Cyrillics	Example	
NOM	+ś, +oś, +eś	+сь, +ось, +эсь, +есь	<i>kudo+ś</i>	‘home/house’
GEN	+ńt', +ońt', +eńt'	+нтъ, +онтъ, +ентъ, +энтъ	<i>kudo+ńt'</i>	‘of the house’
DAT	+ńteń, +n'teń, +ońteń, +eńteń	+нтень, +онтень, +ентень, +энтень	<i>kudo+ńteń</i>	‘for the home’
ABL	+do+ńt', +d'e+ńt', +de+ńt', +to+ńt', +t'e+ńt', +te+ńt'	+до+нтъ, +де+нтъ, +дэ+нтъ, +то+нтъ, +те+нтъ, +тэ+нтъ	<i>kudo+do+ńt'</i>	‘about the house’
INE	+so+ńt', +se+ńt'	+со+нтъ, +сэ+нтъ	<i>kudo+so+ńt'</i>	‘[at home in a/the house]’
ELA	+sto+ńt', +ste+ńt'	+сто+нтъ, +стэ+нтъ	<i>kudo+sto+ńt'</i>	‘from [home a/the house]’
ILL	NA	NA		(use dative case or POP)
LAT	NA	NA		
PROL	+ga+ńt', +ka+ńt', +va+ńt'	+га+нтъ, +ка+нтъ, +ва+нтъ	<i>kudo+va+ńt'</i>	‘[in around the house in homes] [+DISTR]’
LOC	NA	NA		
TEMP	NA	NA		(use dative or relative cases)
TRNSL	+ks+ońt', +ks+eńt', +oks+ońt', +eks+eńt'	+кс+онтъ, +окс+онтъ, +екс+энтъ, +экс+энтъ	<i>řita+ks+ońt'</i>	‘like Rita’
COMP	+ška+ńt'	+шка+нтъ	<i>kudo+ška+ńt'</i>	‘the size of the/this/that house’
ABE	+vtomo+ńt', +vteme+ńt', +tomo+ńt', +teme+ńt', +teme+ńt'	+втомo+нтъ, +втеме+нтъ, +томo+нтъ, +теме+нтъ, +тэме+нтъ	<i>kudo+vtomo+ńt'</i>	‘without the home/house’
COM	NA	NA		
Total allo- morphs	28	31		

The allomorphs occurring in the cases are attributed to the following qualities of the preceding constituent: (i) front-back vowel harmony; (ii) palatal harmony; (iii) vowel versus consonant stem; (iv) voiced versus voiceless in consonant stem; (v) avoidance of velar adjacency, optional vowel loss in stem type NOUNS2, just as in the indefinite declension, above. Since there is a deviation in definite singular marking for nominative and oblique cases, the variation in the nominative singular has been noted here. A great

reduction in attested cases is apparent, with most functions of the illative being taken over by the dative morphology or adpositional usage. All told there are 32 phonetic, and 35 Cyrillic allomorphs associated with the 10 attested subcategories of case.

Table 4.25a Possessive declension for nominative, genitive, dative and illative possessa

PUM NB	POR	Form(s) Standard phonetic	Cyrillics		Example	
SG	1SG.	<i>+m, +om, +em</i>	<i>+М, +ОМ, +ЭМ, +ем</i>	<i>+Om</i>	<i>kudo+m</i>	‘my home/ house’
	3SG	<i>+zo, +ze, +ozo, +eze</i>	<i>+зо, +зэ, +озо, +езэ, +эзэ</i>	<i>+OzO</i>	<i>kudo+zo</i>	‘his/her/ its home/ house’
PL	1SG	<i>+n, +ń, +on, +eń, +m, +om, +em</i>	<i>+н, -нь, +он, +еń, +эń, +ом, +эм, +ем</i>	<i>+ON, +Om</i>	<i>kudo+n</i>	‘my homes/ houses’
	3SG	<i>+nzo, +nze, +onzO, +enze</i>	<i>+нзо, +нзэ, +онзо, +ензэ, +энзэ</i>	<i>+OnzO</i>	<i>kudo+nzo</i>	‘his/her/ its homes/ houses’
SG/PL	2SG	<i>+t, +t', +ot, +et'</i>	<i>+т, +ть, +от, +еть, +эть</i>	<i>+OT</i>	<i>kudo+t</i>	‘your home/ house’
	1PL	<i>+nok, +ńek, +onok, +eńek</i>	<i>+нок, +нек, +онок, +енок, +нек</i>	<i>+ONOk</i>	<i>kudo+nok</i>	‘our home/ house’
	2PL	<i>+ɲk, +oɲk, +eɲk</i>	<i>+нк, +онк, +енк, +энк</i>	<i>+Oɲk</i>	<i>kudo+ɲk</i>	‘your home/ house’
	3PL	<i>+st, +ost, +est</i>	<i>+ст, +ост, +ест, +эст</i>	<i>+Ost</i>	<i>kudo+st</i>	‘their home/ house’

Table 4.25b Possessive declension for genitive possessa

PUM NB	POR	Form(s)			Example	
		Standard phonetic	Cyrillics			
SG/ PL KIN	1SG	+ń, +oń, +eń	+нь, +онь, +ень, +энь	+Oń	<i>ava+ń</i>	‘my mother’s’
	2SG	+ť, +ot’, +et’	+ть, +оть, +еть, +эть	+Ot’	<i>ava+ť</i>	‘your mother’s’
SG	1SG	+m, +om, +em, +n, +ń, +on, +eń	+oM, +эм, +eM, +н, +нь, +он, +ень, +энь	+Om, +ON	<i>kudo+m</i>	‘my home/ house’
PL	1SG	+n, +ń, +on, +eń, +m, +om, +em	+н, -нь, +он, +ень, +энь, +oM, +эм, +eM	+ON, +Om	<i>kudo+n</i>	‘my homes/ houses’
SG/ PL	2SG	+t, +ť, +ot, +et’	+т, +ть, +от, +еть, +эть	+OT	<i>kudo+t</i>	‘your home/ house’
	3SG	+nzo, +nze, +onzo, +enze	+нзо, +нзэ, +онзо, +ензэ, +энзэ	+OnzO	<i>kudo+nzo</i>	‘his/her/ its homes/ houses’
	1PL	+nok, +ńek, +onok, +eńek	+нок, +нек, +онок, +енек, +энек	+ONOk	<i>kudo+nok</i>	‘our home/ house’
	2PL	+ňk, +oňk, +eňk	+нк, +онк, +енк, +энк	+Oňk	<i>kudo+ňk</i>	‘your home/ house’
	3PL	+st, +ost, +est	+ст, +ост, +ест, +эст	+Ost	<i>kudo+st</i>	‘their home/ house’

Table 4.25c Possessive declension for dative possessa with no distinction in number of possessa

POR	Form(s)		Example
	Standard phonetic	Cyrillics	
1SG	+neń, +ńeń, +ońeń, +eńeń	+нэнь, -нень, +онень, +енень, +эньень	+ONeń <i>ava+ńeń</i> ‘to my mother’
2SG	+teń, +ťeń, +oťeń, +eťeń	+тэнь, +тень, +отень, +етень, +энеть	+OTeń <i>ava+ťeń</i> ‘to your home/ house’
3	+nsteń, +onsteń, +ensteń	+нстэнь, +онстэнь, +енстэнь, +энстэнь	+Onsteń <i>ava+nsteń</i> ‘to his/ her/its/ their mother’
1PL	suppleted by other declensions or adpositional constructions		
2PL	+nsteŋk, +onsteŋk, +ensteŋk (Only one attestation)	+нстэнк, +онстэнк, +енстэнк, +энстэнк	+Onsteŋk <i>ava+nsteŋk</i> ‘to your mother’

Table 4.25d Possessive declension for illative possessa with no distinction in number for possessa

POR	Form(s)		Example
	Standard phonetic	Cyrillics	
1	SG +z+on, +z+eń, +oz+on, +ez+eń, +z+om, +z+em, +oz+om, +ez+em	+з+он, +з+энь, +оз+он, +ез+энь, +эз+энь, +з+ом, +з+эм, +оз+ом, +ез+эм, +эз+эм	<i>kudo+z</i> +on ‘in my house’
	PL +z+onok, +z+eńek, +oz+onok, +ez+eńek	+з+онок, +з+энек, +оз+онок, +ез+энек, +эз+энек	<i>kudo+z</i> +onok ‘our home/ house’
2	SG +z+ot, +z+eť, +oz+ot, +ez+eť	+з+от, +з+эть, +оз+от, +ез+эть, +эз+эть	+Oz+ <i>kudo+z</i> +ot ‘your home/ house’
	PL +z+oŋk, +z+eŋk, +oz+oŋk, +ez+eŋk	+з+онк, +з+энк, +оз+онк, +ез+энк, +эз+энк	<i>kudo+z</i> +oŋk ‘your home/ house’
3	SG +z+onzо, +z+enze, +oz+onzо, +ez+enze	+з+онзо, +з+энзэ, +оз+онзо, +ез+энзэ, +эз+энзэ	<i>kudo+z</i> +onzо ‘his/her/ its homes/ houses’
	PL +z+ost, +z+est, +oz+ost, +ez+est	+з+ост, +з+эст, +оз+ост, +ез+эст, +эз+эст	<i>kudo+z</i> +ost ‘their home/ house’
Total allo-morphs	103	129	

The allomorphs occurring in the cases are attributed to the following qualities of the preceding constituent: (i) front/back vowel harmony; (ii) palatal harmony; (iii) vowel versus consonant stem, and (iv) voiced versus voiceless in consonant stem. Although this table provides explicit information for only four sets of case allomorphs, it can be used for predicting the forms present in the remainder of the cases in the possessive declension (the ablative, inessive, elative, prolativ, locative, translative, comparative, abessive and comitative); the lative and temporalis are not attested in this declension.

Nearly all nominative cells have equivalents in the genitive-slot cells. Instead of minimalizing the number of slots on morphological grounds (1SG–2SG and 1PL–3PL homonymy in nominative and genitive case), this author has chosen to utilize 3SG analogy, which morphologically distinguishes the functions of the genitive from those of the nominative; at least in the singular form of the possessum. The possessor-index used with non-core cases, and therefore present in the 9 cases enumerated above, is equivalent in form to that of the nominative plural reading, i.e. the 3SG *-OnzO* is the morpheme attested in non-core cases, whereas both 1SG *-ON* and *-Om* are attested in non-core cases of modern literature. (It will be noted that the 1SG *-ON* marker is never attested for functions associated with the nominative singular.) Dative-case marking in the third person is applicable to both singular and plural, so no differentiation has been made; only the 1PL cell has no dative attestation of any sort. (Genitive and dative paradigm defectivity will be dealt with in chapter 5.) No separate marker is available for the lative, but if one wanted to attest it, all of its forms would be ambiguous with locative-case forms, that is, there would be 12 phonetic and 12 Cyrillic allomorphs to add the sum of core-case and illative allomorphs, where there are 103 phonetic, and 129 Cyrillic allomorphs, and the non-core-case allomorphs, where there would be 26 phonetic, and 27 Cyrillic allomorphs for a total of 141 phonetic and 168 Cyrillic allomorphs in a total of 13 attested subcategories of case.

4.2.2. Number

The grammatical category of number in Erzya is represented both morphologically and lexically. While verbal conjugations feature morphological agreement strategies for cross-referenced entities, it is the NPS that feature both morphological and lexical means for differentiating grammatical number. Thus, grammatical number will be seen in the three declension types of NPS, and certain pronouns (personal and demonstrative).

The morphological expression of grammatical number in the declension of noun heads is subject to a semantic notion of [+COUNT] and the declension type. Hence, assuming the referent can be individuated, there are limitations to which cells of the three declension types make a distinction for number. While the definite declension features a composite expression of plural in *+T+Ne +PL+DEF.PL* for all attested cases, and an unambiguous expression of singular in *+Oś* for the nominative and *+Oñt'* for the oblique cases, the indefinite declension only attests plural marking in the nominative *+T +PL*. (cf.

also Lyons 1999: 70–71 [Feoktistov 1966:177–98; Spenser 1992:313–41]) The possessive declension provides for two separate expressions of grammatical number, i.e. there is the grammatical number associated with the referent of the possessor, on one hand, and the referent of the possessum, on the other. Whereas all three persons distinguish for number of the possessor, there are only two persons which distinguish for number of the possessum, which is evident in the nominative alone. The only unambiguous singular marking attested is that of the third person singular, $+OzO$ $+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG$; the 1SG possessor-index can only partially be disambiguated. While the plural possessa reading of 1SG possessor-index can be matched with the literary variants $-ON$ and $-Om$, which are illustrative of dialect variation; the $-ON$ cross-referential marker is not compatible with singular nominative possessa, where only marking in $-Om$ would be acceptable. Thus adnominal number marking in Erzya is declension and case dependent (cf. Feoktistov 1966: 108, 204, 1975: 289–93; Aikhenvald and Dixon 1998: 68); only the nominative allows for a choice of number in all three declensions.

The plural marker $-T$ of the indefinite nominative and the entire definite declension has attested ambiguity. While the indefinite nominative singular is homonymous with the absolutive used in compound words and as the adpositional complement (cf. Buzakova 2000: 83, 87–89), the indefinite nominative plural is limited to the syntactic core roles of subject and object. There is, however, one ambiguous construction that can be described; $tešt+t' potso$ 'star_N+PL inside_POP.INE' or $tešt\emptyset potso$ 'star_N.(stem-vowel loss between voiceless stops) inside_POP.INE' (M. Imaikina, p.c., 2002). In the instance of the indefinite nominative, the plural marker can also be homonymous with the 2SG possessor index, whereas, in the definite declension, the PL $-T$ marker always co-occurs with the definite plural marker in $-Ne$ in the 13 cases it can be attested with; there is no attestation for the locative and temporalis in combination with definite plural marking (see more detail in 4.2.1 and 4.2.3.).

The Erzya grammar tradition posits $-N-$ as a plural marker in the possessive declension, a fact that is more readily attested in some dialects than in others (cf. Gabelentz 1839:253–254; Paasonen 1953: 04-05; Bubrikh 1930: 27, 29; Feoktistov 1963: 100–103; Nad'kin 1968: 58–59, 60; also Korhonen 1986: 147; Bartens 1999: 102–103). The modern literary language only has two persons where grammatical number can be distinguished: the 1SG and the 3SG, but this distinction is not unproblematic. The 3SG marker has two forms, of which the nominative singular is distinctive, with no $-N-$, while all other case attestations of it are $-OnzO$, which is also the form used with the nominative plural. Thus it is the nominative singular form of the possessum, the one without the $-N-$, that is marked, and not the other way around. In the 1SG an analogical situation can be observed, namely, only the nominative singular cell cannot contain the $-N-$ element, i.e. the nominative singular possessum is always marked $-Om$. Hence, when the dialect of a given writer differentiates between singular and plural possessa with 1SG possessor indexing, i.e. $-Om$ $POSS-1SG>NOM.SG$ is in opposition with $-ON$ of the $POSS-1SG>NOM.PL$, then the marker used in the $NOM.PL$ reading is always the same as that used in the oblique cases. Despite the various prescriptive grammars advocating a distinction for number

in the marking of possessa with 1SG possessor indexing, most recently EKM (2000: 55), there are numerous publications where *-Om* marking is used throughout the first person singular paradigm of the possessive declension regardless of grammatical number of the possessum. Hence, only the NOM.SG reading of the 3SG possessor index in *-OzO* is unambiguous in its marking for grammatical number. (For treatment of the possessive declension, see section 4.3.2.1.)

In the Dative-case form of the possessive indices no distinction is necessarily made for number of possessor. Although, native speakers might generally maintain that the morpheme *-Onsteń* should be glossed as POSS-3SG>DAT, there is evidence in the majority corpus that the gloss might be generalized to POSS-3.DAT, refer back to examples (3–5) in subsection (4.2.1.1.) CORE CX, DATIVE.

The lexical expression of grammatical number is limited to the plural personal and definite pronouns, e.g. *miń* ‘we’, *tiń* ‘you (PL)’, *siń* ‘they’, *ńe* ‘these, those’ and *nona-* ‘the others’. The personal pronouns with first and second person plural readings are generally used for singular speakers and addressees when they are acting on behalf of one or more explicitly identifiable referents (see also ASSOCIATIVE ELDER NOUNS and ASSOCIATIVE COLLECTIVE QUANTIFIERS in section (4.3.)).

It will also be noted that the plural morpheme *-T* familiar from the indefinite and definite declensions appears in the 3PL of both the verbal and nominal conjugations and the readings adnominal versus verbal plural are difficult to distinguish, see examples.

- (27) *sońenze* *ul'ńe+ś* *jalat'eke,*
 he_PRON-PERS-3SG.DAT.POSS-3SG *be*_V.IND.PRET I.PRED-3SG indifferent_A,
kona *čvto-ńt'* *al*o* *jutavt+om*s*
 which_PRON-REL.ABS tree_N+GEN.DEF.SG under_POP.LOC spend_V+INF+ILL
ve+ńt' - *veše* *čvvt+t+ne*
 night_N+GEN.DEF.SG - all_Q.ABS tree_N+PL+DEF.PL
rodńa+t+ońt' *vejket'ste.*
 kinsman_N+PL+IND.PRET II.PRED-3PL equally_ADV.ELA
 (Bryzhinski M.: Kirdazht) ‘He [Kechai] could care less, what tree he spent the night under; all the trees were equally kinsmen [to him].’

Possessor-index strategies involving singular versus plural marking can be associated with the explicit discourse roles, on the one hand, and semantic group-membership alignment, on the other. Hence associative collective numerals appear with singular adnominal person marking, e.g. *kolmo+ńe+nze* three_NUM+ASSOC-COLL+POSS-3SG ‘the three of them (lit. the three of him/her)’, which makes reference to a definite third person and two previously unknown referents associated with that person. In an analogous manner, two siblings, when speaking amongst themselves – each speaking in the first person singular – will regularly make reference to otherwise mutual fathers, mothers, brothers, etc. by means of 1SG possessor indexing. Semantic group-membership alignment comes into play when dealing with kin terms; while dictionaries of the Erzya language might attest to single lexical items, such as *balduz* ‘wife's sister’ and *bal'ža*

‘wife's brother’, these are not used by all speakers, nor are they generalized to indicate other referent types. Thus the referents for ‘brother's wife’ and ‘sister's husband’ are not necessarily indicated by use of separate lexical items, instead a possessor-index variation between singular and plural number of the possessor is sufficient to distinguish between ‘daughter-in-law, son's wife’ and ‘son-in-law, daughter's husband’. Hence, while *sodamo+m* son-in-law_N+POSS-1SG ‘my son-in-law’ is what a parent would use to indicate the husband of his or her daughter, a sibling would use the term *sodamo+nok* son-in-law_N+POSS-1PL ‘my brother-in-law (lit. our son-in-law)’ to indicate that very same male referent. In contrast, it should be noted that this household-reference strategy used in target-possessum marking of same-generation and younger-generation human referents, has different pragmatic usages when the target-possessum referent is of an older generation. Hence, while the 1SG possessor indexing of the human referent *teta* ‘father’ in *tetam* ‘my father’ can only be understood as referring to the father of the singular speaker/controller, regardless of the listener (sibling, mother, stranger alike), the 1PL possessor index might be utilized by the mother to indicate the father of the household or the speaker(s) imparting information with regard to the plural-value entity/controller. Naturally, this latter plural-value entity/controller interpretation, or proprietorship as it were, is also utilized in addresses made on behalf of a congregation.

Interim summary of number

The grammatical category of number can be described at both a morphological and a lexical level.

At the morphological level, the parameter involved is a dichotomy: (i) case division nominative versus oblique, and (ii) the selection of declension types: indefinite, definite and possessive. In the nominative case, number is explicitly indicated in both the indefinite and definite declensions, whereas the possessive declension, already burdened by expression of the grammatical number and person of the possessor, only exhibits minimal indication of number for the target possessum. The 3SG possessor index of the nominative singular deviates in morphophonemic structure from the correlating morpheme, compatible with the nominative plural and oblique cases, while the 1SG possessor index, prescribed in modern grammars for use with oblique cases (not dative) and the nominative and genitive plural in *-N*, can never be used for marking the nominative singular target. Other persons of the possessive declension make no distinction between the dichotomies (case) nominative versus genitive and (number) singular versus plural on the target of possessor-index marking. In the oblique cases, the indefinite declension makes no distinction for the grammatical category of number. Hence, only the definite declension regularly distinguishes for number in the oblique case. The dative-case of the 3SG possessive declension cell has been observed to exhibit indifference to number in the arguments of the possessive relation, i.e. the *-Onsten* form is, in fact, third person form used for expression of the dative case functions attributed to it, but without a distinction for grammatical number, be it that of the possessor or the possessum.

At the lexical level, the six personal pronouns are represented by two rhyming sets of three pronouns. The distinction for number is indicated by an otherwise irregular dichotomy *o* versus *i/ĭ*, such that, *mon*, *ton* and *son* indicate first, second and third persons singular respectively, and *miń*, *tiń*, *siń* first, second and third persons plural.

There is evidence of possible extended exponence in the concatenation of a declension segment with plural marking and a subsequent conjugational segment. This phenomenon, however, shows variation from author to author and context to context, such that, it is still a topic of discussion among professional users of the language.

Finally, it is maintained that the grammatical number of the possessor/controller may be utilized to distinguish between generations in household contexts, proprietorship, and mutual plural versus singulative possessor/controller reference.

4.2.3. Deictic markers

In this treatment of the Erzya language the possessive and definite declensions will be grouped under the hyponym deictic markers. The term “deictic markers” is a cover term for the inflectional morphemes contrasted with the ZERO of the indefinite declension. Thus the possessive declension comprises manifestations of personal deixis, which might be definite, indefinite or adjectival, and the demonstrative deixis, which might be definite, demonstrative, topicalizing or generic. The possessive declension, due to certain morphologically and semantically motivated variation, has been assessed separately for (a) nominative, (b) genitive, (c) dative and (d) other cases above in subsection (4.2.1.) CASE as have the definite singular and plural declensions, which have no ambiguity for case differences, or the grammatical category of number. Therefore this subsection will concentrate on the usage of adnominal-person indexing versus definite marking.

As has become apparent in Erzya case morphology, above, there are three declension types – the indefinite, the definite and the possessive. While the indefinite declension might readily be associated with indefinite referents and intrinsically definite referents, e.g. qualified nouns, proper nouns and pronouns, the definite and possessive declensions lend themselves to the marking of other definite referents. Definite declension marking, when used with intrinsically definite referents, is seen to imply notions of demonstrative usage or topicality; with common-noun referents, however, this declension generally indicates definiteness or generic topicality. Possessive declension marking, or possessor indexing generally indicates association with anchored discourse referents, hence it allows for notions of inferentiality and can be applied to referents both definite and indefinite. Notions associated with individual person and number combinations will be dealt with in the appropriate subsections.

4.2.3.1. Possessor-index markers

Adnominal cross-referential person marking

The possessor-index markers, or the cross-referential adnominal-person markers of the possessive declension, are attested in a large range of the parts of speech with varied functions. For this reason I have occasionally used the longer term *ADNOMINAL-TYPE* to insure the interpretation of an extension beyond the part of speech most commonly known as nouns. Adnominal-type cross-referential person marking can be broken into 2 varieties of manifestation in a given clausal constituent, it can be marked with: (i) an affixal or possessive declension, and (ii) a lexical or genitive-form personal pronoun, or a combination of the two. While affixal marking of adnominal person, as demonstrated in the tables below, appears to have a relatively even distribution across case and declension, lexical marking seems to prefer a nearly complementary-distribution strategy in the declension forms of the possessa. The expression of core cases shows an affinity with the deictic declensions while the local cases are frequently associated with the indefinite declension. (The notation *NA*, below, has two readings: “not applicable” and “not attested”. The reader will note that the “not applicable” reading is associated with the cells rendered incompatible through discrepancies in number values for the definite declension.)

Table 4.26 Cases attested with 1SG adnominal marking with the word *kudo* ‘house; home’

	Possessive Decl	Genitive-form personal pronoun indicates adnominal person			
		Indef Decl	Possessive Decl	Definite SG	Definite PL
NOM.SG	<i>kudo+m</i>	NA	<i>moń kudo+m</i>	<i>moń kudo+ś</i>	NA
NOM.PL	<i>kudo+n</i>	NA	<i>moń kudo+n</i>	NA	<i>moń kudo+ł+ńe</i>
GEN.SG	<i>kudo+m</i>	NA	<i>moń kudo+m</i>	<i>moń kudo+ńt'</i>	NA
GEN.PL	<i>kudo+n</i>	NA	<i>moń kudo+n</i>	NA	NA
DAT	NA	NA	NA	<i>moń kudo+ńt'eń</i>	NA
ABL	<i>kudo+do+n</i>	NA	NA	NA	NA
INE	<i>kudo+so+n</i>	<i>moń kudo+so</i>	NA	NA	NA
ELA	<i>kudo+sto+n</i>	<i>moń kudosto</i>	NA	NA	NA
ILL	<i>kudo+z+on</i>	<i>moń kudo+s</i>	NA	NA	NA
LAT	NA	<i>moń kudo+v</i>	NA	NA	NA
PROL	<i>kudo+va+m</i>	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table (4.26) provides us with what might be considered further along as skewed. No evidence is given NP complexity, nor, would it seem, is there paradigmatic representation of the forms most commonly exhibited for the Erzya word *kudo* ‘house; home’ and the thirteen cases attested with at least some targets of the possessive declension. I therefore provide a second set of tables (4.27–28) to illustrate the paradigm of the 3SG possessa as well. The contents of (4.27–28) differ from those of (4.26) in that there are definite

declension forms of the inessive and elative cases. This might help us to perceive definite marking as compatible with more of the cases. The presence of genitive-form 3SG personal pronoun *sonze* is attested at 17,887 hits, and its sibling the genitive-form 1SG personal pronoun *moń* is attested at 12,196 hits, which indicates the number of unique contexts might be higher. The absence of indefinite declension compatibility in the core-case cells of both the first and third persons singular would seem to imply that core-case constituents modified with adnominal person take obligatory deictic marking. Hence the absence of obligatory adnominal-person affixes in non-finites would speak on behalf of a non-core-case interpretation of the non-finite locative in *-Om+O*. (For more discussion on the non-finites, see section 4.3.5.)

Table 4.27 Cases attested with 3SG adnominal marking with the word *kudo* ‘house; home’

	Possessive Decl	Genitive-form personal pronoun indicates adnominal person			
		Indef Decl	Possessive Decl	Definite SG	Definite PL
NOM.SG	<i>kudo+zō</i>	NA	<i>sonze kudo+zō</i>	<i>sonze kudo+ś</i>	NA
NOM.PL	<i>kudo+nzo</i>	NA	<i>sonze kudo+nzo</i>	NA	<i>sonze kudo+ť+ńe</i>
GEN.SG	<i>kudo+nzo</i>	NA	<i>sonze kudo+nzo</i>	<i>sonze kudo+ńť</i>	NA
GEN.PL	<i>kudo+nzo</i>	NA	<i>sonze kudo+nzo</i>	NA	NA
DAT	NA	NA	NA	<i>sonze kudo+ńťeń</i>	NA
ABL	<i>kudo+do+nzo</i>	NA	NA	NA	NA
INE	<i>kudo+so+nzo</i>	<i>sonze kudo+so</i>	NA	<i>sonze kudo+so+ńť</i>	NA
ELA	<i>kudo+sto+nzo</i>	<i>sonze kudo+sto</i>	NA	<i>sonze kudo+sto+ńť</i>	NA
ILL	<i>kudo+z+onzo</i>	<i>sonze kudo+s</i>	NA	NA	NA
LAT	NA	<i>sonze kudo+v</i>	NA	NA	NA
PROL	<i>kudo+va+nzo</i>	NA	NA	NA	NA

The word *kudo* ‘house; home’, which has its most prominent form in *kudov* ‘home (lative)’ appearing 5475 times in the Erzya majority corpus, might most readily be associated with the notions of single-member sets and spatial settings. In contrast, the word *śelme* ‘eye’, with its most prominent form *śelmenze* ‘his/her/its eye(s) (core but not NOM.SG)’ appearing 2946 times, is inherently plural and, what’s more, a body part, which might increase the probability of double marking for adnominal person, a strategy for contrastive marking. (See more details in section 4.3.2. NOUNS and ADPOSITIONS.)

Table 4.28 Cases attested with 3SG adnominal marking with the word *śel'me* 'eye'

	Possessive Decl	Genitive-form personal pronoun indicates adnominal person			
		Indef Decl	Possessive Decl	Definite SG	Definite PL
NOM.SG	<i>śel'me+ze</i>	NA	<i>sonze śel'me+ze</i>	<i>sonze śel'me+ś</i>	NA
NOM.PL	<i>śel'me+nze</i>	NA	<i>sonze śel'me+nze</i>	NA	<i>sonze śel'm+t+ńe</i>
GEN.SG	<i>śel'me+nze</i>	NA	<i>sonze śel'me+nze</i>	<i>sonze śel'me+ńt'</i>	NA
GEN.PL	<i>śel'me+nze</i>	NA	<i>sonze śel'me+nze</i>	NA	<i>sonze śel'm+t+ńe+ń</i>
DAT	NA	NA	NA	<i>sonze śel'me+ńt'eń</i>	<i>sonze śel'm+t+ńe+ńeń</i>
ABL	<i>śel'me+d'e+nze</i>	NA	NA	NA	<i>sonze śel'm+t+ńe+d'e</i>
INE	<i>śel'm+se+nze</i>	<i>sonze śel'm+se</i>	<i>sonze śel'm+se+nze</i>	<i>sonze śel'm+se+ńt'</i>	<i>sonze śel'm+t+ńe+se</i>
ELA	<i>śel'm+ste+nze</i>	<i>sonze śel'm+ste</i>	<i>sonze śel'm+ste+nze</i>	<i>sonze śel'm+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>sonze śel'm+t+ńe+ste</i>
ILL	<i>śel'm+z+enze</i>	<i>sonze śel'm+s</i>	<i>sonze śel'm+z+enze</i>	NA	<i>sonze śel'm+t+ńe+s</i>
LAT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
PROL	NA	<i>sonze śel'me+va</i>	NA	NA	NA
TRNSL	NA	<i>sonze śel'me+ks</i>	NA	NA	NA

On the basis of tables (4.26–28) and the morphological information afforded in section 4.2.1. Cx, above, we can draw preliminary conclusions about the nature of affixal and lexical adnominal-person marking. Expression of adnominal person can be indicated by the following means:

- Affixal means (possessive declension)
- Lexical means (genitive form personal pronouns)
- A combination of the two

Affixal indication of adnominal person is subject to morphological and semantic/discourse incompatibility observed in case endings with consonants in the coda, on the one hand, and the notions of indefinite/generic, on the other.

- Morphological limitations: (lative)
- Semantic limitations: (translative, temporalis)

Lexical indication of adnominal person implies a three-way split in declension compatibility whereby certain cases show affinities for specific declension types:

Nominative and genitive: (possessive and definite declension)

Dative: (definite declension)

Remaining cases:

Indefinite declension {all};

Possessive declension {all but: lative, temporalis};

Definite declension singular {all but: illative, lative, locative, temporalis, comitative},
and

Definite declension plural {all but: locative, temporalis}

These preliminaries do not, however, answer the question of low attestation for the dative case, nor do they answer those of mutual compatibility of lexical and affixal marking strategies, matters dealt with more rigorously in sections 4.3. ADNOMINAL PERSON IN PARTS OF SPEECH, and 4.4. PARADIGM DEFECTIVITY IN ERZYA POSSESSOR INDEXING. Let it suffice here, that we illustrate the forms and basic uses of the adnominal-person affixes in the order of person 1–3.

4.2.3.1.1. First person

In the first translation of the Gospel and subsequently the first grammar of the Erzya language there is evidence for at least a partial distinction for number in the possessor/controller and target-possessum. In the modern literary language, however, only the distinction for number of the possessor/controller is disambiguously maintained. While the distinction for number of the target-possessum of a plural possessor/controller has never been a predominant feature of literary texts, even when that target is a nominative singular, the same distinction for number in the target-possessum is still forwarded by modern prescriptive grammars despite the fact that there appears to be a dearth of consistency in modern publications.

First person singular

The first person singular distinguishes for number in the nominative singular target-possessum, such that, only the *-Om* form can be used for marking it. This distinction for number in the possessum is minimal; most publications are inconsistent in usage due to dialect-background discrepancies between writers, subsequent proof-readers and editors. The maximal indexing associated with the core-case 1sg possessor include *-Om*, *-ON* in the nominative and genitive, as well as the marginal *-Oń* of the genitive for some kin terms, with *-ONeń* of the dative with those same kin terms. The remainder of the cases are marked with either *-Om* or *-ON*, the latter of which, a prescriptive form, is forwarded in most modern grammars (see table 4.29).

Table 4.29 Possessor indexing for a 1SG parse

	NON-KIN		KIN		DAT	ABL	
	NOM	GEN	GEN	GEN			
‘cow’	<i>skal+om</i>	<i>skal+on</i> ~ <i>skal+om</i>	<i>skal+om</i> ~ <i>skal+on</i>	<i>skal+on</i> ~ <i>skal+om</i>	NA	NA	<i>skal+do+n</i> ~ <i>skal+do+m</i>
‘hand; arm’	<i>ked+em</i>	<i>ked+eń</i> ~ <i>ked+em</i>	<i>ked+em</i>	<i>ked+eń</i> ~ <i>ked+em</i>	NA	NA	<i>ked+d’e+ń</i> ~ <i>ked+d’e+m</i>
‘house; home; room; container’	<i>kudo+m</i>	<i>kudo+n</i> ~ <i>kudo+m</i>	<i>kudo+m</i>	<i>kudo+n</i> ~ <i>kudo+m</i>	NA	NA	<i>kudo+do+n</i> ~ <i>kudo+do+m</i>
‘father’	<i>teta+m</i>	<i>teta+n</i>	NA	NA	<i>teta+ń</i>	<i>teta+ńeń</i>	<i>teta+do+n</i> ~ <i>teta+do+m</i>
‘elder sis- ter; aunt’	<i>paťa+m</i>	<i>paťa+n</i> ~ <i>paťa+m</i>	NA	NA	<i>paťa+ń</i>	<i>paťa+ńeń</i>	<i>paťa+do+n</i> ~ <i>paťa+do+m</i>
‘daughter; girl’	<i>tejtér</i> +em	<i>tejtér+eń</i> ~ <i>tejtér+em</i>	<i>tejtér</i> +em	<i>tejtér</i> +eń ~ <i>tejtér</i> +em	<i>tejtér</i> +eń	<i>tejtér</i> +ńeń	<i>tejtér+d’e+ń</i> ~ <i>tejtér</i> +d’e+m
‘son; boy; man’	<i>ćora+m</i>	<i>ćora+n</i> ~ <i>ćora+m</i>	<i>ćora+m</i>	<i>ćora+n</i> ~ <i>ćora+m</i>	? <i>ćora+ń</i>	<i>ćora+ńeń</i>	<i>ćora+do+n</i> ~ <i>ćora+do+m</i>
‘mother’	<i>ava+m</i>	<i>ava+n</i> ~ <i>ava+m</i>	NA	NA	<i>ava+ń</i>	<i>ava+ńeń</i>	<i>ava+do+n</i> ~ <i>ava+do+m</i>
‘woman’	<i>ava+m</i>	<i>ava+n</i> ~ <i>ava+m</i>	<i>ava+m</i>	<i>ava+n</i> ~ <i>ava+m</i>	NA	NA	<i>ava+do+n</i> ~ <i>ava+do+m</i>

The 1SG parse exhibits the greatest diversity of all adnominal-person paradigms. It involves the categories of number and case, as well as the distinction of a specific noun subclass. Here number of the possessa might be distinguished in the nominative and genitive cases, and in an extreme description of the grammar all but the dative case differentiates number of the 1SG possessum/possessa (cf. Грамматика мордовского языка 1962: 94). A specifically singular, singulative form, might be attested in the nominative, where, regardless of dialect, only the POSS-1SG>NOM.SG affix *-Om* is attested. Elsewhere (other cases and number), there is dialect variation between the use of the affixes *-ON* versus *-Om*. Some dialects consistently mark all possessa with the *-Om* affix regardless of number or case of the possessum concerned, and hence there are writers who make no distinction at all for number in the possessa (especially speakers of the Sura and Insar dialects). Other dialects (especially the Alatyř dialects) differentiate number in the nominative and genitive where the *-Om* specifically indicates singular while *-ON* is retained for default, i.e. nominative and genitive plural as well as other cases. A third

strategy involves the marking of singular possessa with *-Om* in all but the dative case and using *-ON* to mark plural possessa (a subdialect of the Alatyř' type, cf. GMYa 1962 I: 94; Bartens 1999: 104–105). The dative and genitive cases can be distinguished from all the others in that they introduce the use of affixes homonymous to those of the indefinite declension, such that certain kin terms are compatible with indefinite-identical genitive and dative forms. Thus, in the genitive, a diversity is attested involving ambiguous nominative-genitive forms, on the one hand, and indefinite-identical genitive marking, on the other. In the dative, however, the only referents that might be attested for 1SG marking are purportedly kin terms. (For more specifics and an in-depth discussion see sections (4.3.2.) NOUNS, and (4.4.) PARADIGM DEFECTIVITY IN ERZYA POSSESSOR INDEXING.)

First person plural

The 1PL possessor index is *-ONOk* in the nominative and genitive; no special genitive or dative forms are attested. Hence there is syncretism in the possessor-index marking of the nominative and genitive cases. Elsewhere in the possessive declension the adnominal-person affix is consistent with that in the nominative/genitive forms (see table 4.30).

Table 4.30 Possessor indexing for a 1PL parse

	NOM	GEN	ABL	INE
<i>skal</i> 'cow'	<i>skal+onok</i>	<i>skal+onok</i>	<i>skal+do+nok</i>	<i>skal+so+nok</i>
<i>ked'</i> 'hand; arm'	<i>ked'+eńek</i>	<i>ked'+eńek</i>	<i>ked'+te+ńek</i>	<i>ked'+se+ńek</i>
<i>kudo</i> 'house; home; room; container'	<i>kudo+nok</i>	<i>kudo+nok</i>	<i>kudo+do+nok</i>	<i>kudo+so+nok</i>
<i>teta</i> 'father'	<i>teta+nok</i>	<i>teta+nok</i>	<i>teta+do+nok</i>	<i>teta+so+nok</i>
<i>paťa</i> 'elder sister; aunt'	<i>paťa+nok</i>	<i>paťa+nok</i>	<i>paťa+do+nok</i>	<i>paťa+so+nok</i>
<i>tejt'er</i> 'daughter; girl'	<i>tejt'er+eńek</i>	<i>tejt'er+eńek</i>	<i>tejt'er+de+ńek</i>	<i>tejt'er+se+ńek</i>
<i>ava</i> 'mother; woman'	<i>ava+nok</i>	<i>ava+nok</i>	<i>ava+do+nok</i>	<i>ava+so+nok</i>

The 1PL parse of the literary standard consists of the simple *-ONOk* affix, regardless of number, case or semantic notions entailed in the target-possessum. The *-OmOk* markers of the singular target-possessum, nominative, first attested by Gabelentz (1839: 253) are no longer of consequence in the standard language, although they are characteristic of the Kozlovka dialect, which in the mid 1920s had been forwarded as the basis of the literary norm (see contradictory information: contra Evsev'ev 1963 [1929]: 109; pro Bubrikh 1930: 27. Personal information from 2004 indicates that Bubrikh was probably right; in present day Kozlovka, Atyashevo, a *-OmOk* marker strategy is attestable for nominative possessa *kudo+mok* house_N+POSS-1PL>NOM.SG 'our one house'). The dative slot of the 1PL morphological paradigm is empty, but the functions generally attributed to the dative might be realized through lexical expression of adnominal person in combination with the definite dative, or ambiguous nominative/genitive morphological marking of the target-possessum in combination with the postposition *turtov* 'for'.

Special usage

In addition to the indication of prominent discourse anchor/controller, the 1SG and 1PL markers are frequently used to enhance feelings of intimacy, manifest forms of address. Hence the vocative function of what most generally would be construed as nominative forms are attested with possessor indexing (cf. Wiedemann 1865: 45; Tikhonova 1980: 186; Ermuškin 2004: 81). Although Tikhonova wrote of use with kin terms, her own examples indicate no such limitations, see (28). Empathy is simultaneously indicated by the presence of a diminutive morpheme, as well.

- (28) a. *ton,* *nudejne+m,* *šed'a+k*
 you_PRON-PERS-2SG.NOM little-reed_N+POSS-1SG>NOM.SG, play_V+IMP.PRED-2SG
vešela+sto *še+d'e*
 merry_A+ADV-MANNER that_PRON-DEF+ABL
 (Tikhonova 1980: 186: [Gaini, P.]) 'You, my little reed whistle, sing / more merrily!'
- b. *coriŋge+m* *te+j* *sa+k*
 son_N-DIM+POSS-1SG this_ADV-SPAT+LAT come_V+IMP.PRED-2SG
 (Ermuškin 2004: 81) 'come here, my son'

Ambiguity

Ambiguity is attested with the adnominal-type cross-referential person marker *-ONOk* in front-vowel contexts, see ambiguities found in Danilov's treatise of the Erzya comitative (1969).

- (29) *vejke+ńek* *-vejke+ńek* *ež+ińek*
 one_NUM+POSS-1PL -one_NUM+POSS-1PL not_V-NEG-PRET I+IND.PRET I.PRED-1PL
soda
 know_V.CONNEG
 (Danilov 1969: 172) 'we did not know one another'
- (30) *vejke+ńek* *tu+i* *vř+ev,*
 one_NUM+POSS-1PL depart_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG forest_N+LAT,
omboće+ńek *pakša+v,* *a* *ejkakš+t'ńe*
 second_NUM-ORD+POSS-1PL field_N+LAT, but_CONJ child_N+PL+DEF.PL.NOM
čavo *kudo+so* *škamo+st*
 empty_A.ABS house_N+INE alone_PRON-PERS-Q+POSS-3PL
 (Danilov 1969: 172) 'one of us will go to the woods, the other of us [will go] to the field, but the children [will be] in the empty house alone.'

4.2.3.1.2. Second person

In the second person a distinction is made for number in the possessor/controller of the possessive construction. Thus the partial distinction for number in the nominative-case target-possessum apparent in the first and second persons of the literary language only has relevance in the Alatyř' dialect type (Nad'kin 1968; Feoktistow 1990: XXXVI-XXXVIII; Ermuřkin 2004).

Second person singular

Although some treatises of the Erzya language make reference to an *-n-* constituent preceding the final *-T* of the singular possessor/controller index slots of the paradigm other than the nominative singular, this is not a characteristic of the modern literary language (cf. Paasonen 1953). The *-ONT* allomorph of the literary *-OT* marker is characteristic of the Alatyř' dialect type, and there it is manifest in all but the nominative singular slot of the 2SG possessive paradigm, where the *n*-less form *-OT* is used. In addition to the *-OT* form used in all slots of the paradigm for 2SG possessor/controller indexing, special *-Ot'* genitive and *-O'ten* dative forms are forwarded in most modern grammars for use with kin terms (see table 4.31). (For a more in-depth treatment of kin terms, see also section 4.4. PARADIGM DEFECTIVITY IN ERZYA POSSESSOR INDEXING.)

Table 4.31 Possessor indexing for a 1SG parse

	NON-KIN		KIN		ABL	INE
	NOM	GEN	GEN	DAT		
'cow'	<i>skal+ot</i>	<i>skal+ot</i>	NA	NA	<i>skal+do+t</i>	<i>skal+so+t</i>
'hand; arm'	<i>ked+et'</i>	<i>ked+et'</i>	NA	NA	<i>ked+d'e+t'</i>	<i>ked+se+t'</i>
'house; home; room; container'	<i>kudo+t</i>	<i>kudo+t</i>	NA	NA	<i>kudo+do+t</i>	<i>kudo+so+t</i>
'father'	<i>teta+t</i>	NA	<i>teta+t' ~ tetat</i>	<i>teta+teń ~ tetat'et' ~ tetat'e</i>	<i>teta+do+t</i>	<i>teta+so+t</i>
'elder sister; aunt'	<i>paťa+t</i>	NA	<i>paťa+t'</i>	<i>paťa+teń ~ paťa+te</i>	<i>paťa+do+t</i>	<i>paťa+so+t</i>
'daughter; girl'	<i>tejteř+et'</i>	<i>tejteř+et'</i>	<i>tejteř+et'</i>	<i>tejteř+eteń ~ tejteř+et'et'</i>	<i>tejteř+d'e+t'</i>	<i>tejteř+se+t'</i>
'son'	<i>ćora+t</i>	NA	<i>ćora+t'</i>	<i>ćora+teń</i>	<i>ćora+do+t</i>	<i>ćora+so+t</i>
'boy; man'	<i>ćora+t</i>	<i>ćora+t</i>	NA	NA	<i>ćora+do+t</i>	<i>ćora+so+t</i>
'mother'	<i>ava+t</i>	na	<i>ava+t'</i>	<i>ava+teń</i>	<i>ava+do+t</i>	<i>ava+so+t</i>
'woman'	<i>ava+t</i>	<i>ava+t</i>	NA	NA	<i>ava+do+t</i>	<i>ava+so+t</i>

The dative slot of the 2SG possessive paradigm attests to at least a three-way variation in today's Erzya literature. While written literature bears witness to the variants *-O'eń*, *-O'eł* and *-O'e*, there are now new Erzya-language media existing on the world-wide web, and with them has come an Erzya version of Skype, which attests to an interesting 2SG dative form in *-Onste+t'*, see (31). This form, it would appear, is analogically based on the third person dative form in *-Onsteń*, *-Onste+nze*, and *-Onste+st*, see below.

- (31) *jov'le+k* *Skype+d'e+ńt'* *jalga+nstet'*
 tell_V.IMP.PRED-2SG Skype_PRP+ABL+DEF.SG friend_N+POSS-2SG>DAT
 <<http://wap.erzianj.borda.ru/?1-18-40-00000022-000-0-0>>
 'Tell a friend of yours about Skype'

Second person plural

The possessor/controller index found in the 2PL possessive paradigm is simply *-Oŋk*, see table (4.32). There are no special genitive forms attested for kin terms, nor do any of the grammars make mention of dative forms. Instead, all genitive and nominative functions are attributed to the ambiguous *-Oŋk* form, and dative functions are dealt with in the same fashion as in the first person plural (above), and the third person plural (below), i.e. definite dative or *turtov* 'for' adposition strategies.

Table 4.32 Possessor indexing for a 2PL parse

	NOM	GEN	ABL	INE
'cow'	<i>skal+oŋk</i>	<i>skal+oŋk</i>	<i>skal+do+ŋk</i>	<i>skal+so+ŋk</i>
'hand; arm'	<i>ked'+eŋk</i>	<i>ked'+eŋk</i>	<i>ked'+te+ŋk</i>	<i>ked'+se+ŋk</i>
'house; home; room; container'	<i>kudo+ŋk</i>	<i>kudo+ŋk</i>	<i>kudo+do+ŋk</i>	<i>kudo+so+ŋk</i>
'father'	<i>t'eta+ŋk</i>	<i>t'eta+ŋk</i>	<i>t'eta+do+ŋk</i>	<i>t'eta+so+ŋk</i>
'elder sister; aunt'	<i>paťa+ŋk</i>	<i>paťa+ŋk</i>	<i>paťa+do+ŋk</i>	<i>paťa+so+ŋk</i>
'daughter; girl'	<i>t'ejt'eř+eŋk</i>	<i>t'ejt'eř+eŋk</i>	<i>t'ejt'eř+d'e+ŋk</i>	<i>t'ejt'eř+se+ŋk</i>
'mother; woman'	<i>ava+ŋk</i>	<i>ava+ŋk</i>	<i>ava+do+ŋk</i>	<i>ava+so+ŋk</i>

Although the prescriptive grammars and most literature provide no indication of dative forms for the 2PL possessive paradigm, it must be assumed that the spoken language does provide strong analogies for its formulation. Thus the morpheme *-Onste+ŋk* -POSS-3.DAT+POSS-2PL employed by Vasili Dyomin in a recent translation (2008) might come as no surprise to us when used with kin terms. The question whether this is an actual spoken form is, perhaps, not as relevant as whether it can be readily understood by the readership. Hence the underlying morpheme *-Onste* with the reading -POSS-3SG>DAT has been reinterpreted to a possessive-declension dative affix, which can regularly be inflect for person, and in this context the 2PL possessor-index. (See the dative in 4.2.1.1. CORE CASES, above.)

Special usage

In addition to possessor/controller indexing strategies associated with the second person singular and plural, the second person singular can be used in Erzya to indicate an entity whose identity is extractible from shared knowledge of a more general situation (N. Agafonova, p.c., n.d.). Along this same vein we will observe the use of 2SG in generalizations, for example (32).

- (32) *lomań+eń paro laŋg+s kurgo+t*
 person_N+GEN property_N.ABS on_POP+ILL mouth_N+POSS-2SG
il'a+k av'ńe.
 no_V-PROH+2SG>3SG open_V+CONNeg
 (Tikhonova 1980: 186) 'Don't covet another's property. (lit. don't open your mouth for other's property.)'

4.2.3.1.3. Third person

In the third person a distinction is made for number in the possessor/controller of the possessive construction. Although there is evidence of a distinction in the category of number for the nominative-case target-possessum for both singular and plural possessor/controller indices in the Alatyř' dialect type, only the 3SG possessor/controller index maintains this difference in the literary language (cf. Paasonen 1953; Nad'kin 1968; Feoktistow 1990: XXXVI-XXXVIII; Adushkina 2000; Ermuškin 2004).

Third person singular

The third person singular distinguishes for number in the nominative singular target-possessum, such that only the *-OzO* form can be used for marking it. The nominative plural target-possessum marked, on the contrary, is *-OnzO* in the modern literary language, and therefore identical in form to that of the genitive case, regardless of grammatical number. Thus the distinction for number of the possessum is morphologically limited to the explicitly singulative nominative form *-OzO*, whereas only syntactic context can disambiguate the case and number values of the *-OnzO* morpheme, which is used to index the 3SG possessor/controller in all other cases except the dative. In the dative case the literary standard prescribes the morpheme *-Onsteń* but in actual publication this form is paralleled with colloquial forms in *-OnstO* and *-Onstenze*. The latter of these colloquial forms is specifically 3SG and as such it is possible to discover that the *-Onsteń* form of the literary standard is, in fact, a third-person marker with no transparent indication of number for either the possessor/controller or the target-possessum. Unlike the 1SG and 2SG, the 3SG of the literary language appears to have no limitations with regard to noun subclass and the usage of genitive or dative case forms, see table (4.33), and also section (4.4.) PARADIGM DEFECTIVITY IN ERZYA POSSESSOR INDEXING.

Table 4.33 Possessor indexing for a 3SG parse

	NOM		GEN	DAT	ABL
	SG	PL			
‘cow’	<i>skal+ozo</i>	<i>skal+onzo</i>	<i>skal+onzo</i>	<i>skal+onsteń</i>	<i>skal+do+nzo</i>
‘hand; arm’	<i>pil’ge+ze</i>	<i>pil’ge+nze</i>	<i>pil’ge+nze</i>	<i>pil’ge+nsteń</i>	<i>pil’ge+de+nze</i>
‘village’	<i>vele+ze</i>	<i>vele+nze</i>	<i>vele+nze</i>	<i>vele+nsteń</i>	<i>vele+de+nze</i>
‘father’	<i>teta+zo</i>	<i>teta+nzo</i>	<i>teta+nzo</i>	<i>teta+nsteń</i>	<i>teta+do+nzo</i>
‘elder sister; aunt’	<i>paťa+zo</i>	<i>paťa+nzo</i>	<i>paťa+nzo</i>	<i>paťa+nsteń</i>	<i>paťa+do+nzo</i>
‘daughter; girl’	<i>tejtér</i> <i>+eze</i>	<i>tejtér</i> <i>+enze</i>	<i>tejtér</i> <i>+enze</i>	<i>tejtér</i> <i>+ensteń</i>	<i>tejtér+de+nze</i>
‘son; boy; man’	<i>ćora+zo</i>	<i>ćora+nzo</i>	<i>ćora+nzo</i>	<i>ćora+nsteń</i>	<i>ćora+do+nzo</i>
‘mother; woman’	<i>ava+zo</i>	<i>ava+nzo</i>	<i>ava+nzo</i>	<i>ava+nsteń</i>	<i>ava+do+nzo</i>

Infrequent literary variants of the 3SG dative as indicated in section (4.2.1.1.) CORE CASES, above, lead us to the realization that the dative morpheme *-Onsteń* is, in fact, a third person dative marker, whereas it can be used in indexing strategies for both singular and plural possessor/controller marking.

Third person plural

The possessor/controller index found in the 3PL possessive paradigm is simply *-Ost*, see table (4.34). As in the 3SG there are no special genitive or dative forms attested for kin terms, in fact, no modern grammars make mention of a dative form. Instead, all genitive and nominative functions are attributed to the ambiguous *-Ost* form, and dative functions are dealt with in the same fashion as in the first and second person plural above, i.e. definite dative or *turtov* ‘for’ adposition strategies, as well as the affixal means, ambiguous for the third person in general.

Table 4.34 Possessor indexing for a 3PL parse

	NOM	GEN	ABL	INE
‘cow’	<i>skal+ost</i>	<i>skal+ost</i>	<i>skal+do+st</i>	<i>skal+so+st</i>
‘foot; leg’	<i>ked+est</i>	<i>ked+est</i>	<i>ked+te+st</i>	<i>ked+se+st</i>
‘village’	<i>vele+st</i>	<i>vele+st</i>	<i>vele+de+st</i>	<i>vele+se+st</i>
‘father’	<i>teta+st</i>	<i>teta+st</i>	<i>teta+do+st</i>	<i>teta+so+st</i>
‘elder sister; aunt’	<i>paťa+st</i>	<i>paťa+st</i>	<i>paťa+do+st</i>	<i>paťa+so+st</i>
‘daughter; girl’	<i>tejtér+est</i>	<i>tejtér+est</i>	<i>tejtér+de+st</i>	<i>tejtér+se+st</i>
‘mother; woman’	<i>ava+st</i>	<i>ava+st</i>	<i>ava+do+st</i>	<i>ava+so+st</i>

Special usage

The possessor/controller indexing strategies readily associated with the third person singular and plural can be further augmented by notions of vocative function and contextual definiteness. The vocative function attributed to the third-person form parallels the first person vocative in such a way that the addressee is not abruptly confronted by “HEY YOU” moment of the *-Kaj* vocative, rather he or she is woven into the fabric of the conversation as a rhematic component. For a concrete illustration of such a usage, I can draw upon personal experience in which my wife was busy doing something in one room while the baby and I were in the other. I was writing something when the baby suddenly cried out and my wife, seizing the moment of deixis, addressed me as *t'et'a+zo* father_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG (lit. ‘his/her/its father’), see (33).

- (33) *t'et'a+zo*, *meže* *tejev+š?*
 father_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG, what_PRON-INTER.NOM.SG happen_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG
 ‘Hey dad, what’s happened?’

This usage of the third-person-singular marker *-OzO* in forms of address, as mentioned by Markov (1961: 42–43) is considered by some to be non-standard (Markov, *ibid.*). In discussions with modern speakers and professional writers of the language (L. Sedoikin, p.c., 2002) this form of address is considered to be less abrupt, i.e. an alternate form of address might involve the vocative *-aj* rendered in *babaj* ‘hey, granny!’ and *pat'aj* ‘hey, big sister!’. Hence, should one encounter an elderly woman while walking down the lane in an Erzyan village (Kabayevo, Erzya: *Koba'le*), the un abrupt form of address *baba+zo* ‘his/her grandmother’ involving the 3SG possessor index would indicate familiarity of the speaker with a grandchild of the addressee and therefore impart a soft rhematic introduction ‘It’s so and so’s **grandma**’, see (34–35) from Markov, as well.

- (34) *baba+zo*, *[j]ort+sa*
 grandmother_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG, throw_V+IND.PRES.PRED-1SG>3SG
 (cf. Markov 1961: 43) ‘Grandma, shall I throw it away?’
- (35) *pa't'a+zo*, *[ž]ńardo* *ram+at*
 elder-sister_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG, when_PRON-INTER buy_V+IND.PRES.PRED-2SG
te+nze *kańvetka+t*
 to_POP+POSS-3SG candy_N+PL.NOM
 (cf. Markov 1961: 43) ‘Auntie, when are you going to buy him/her candy?’

The use in vocative function appears compatible with discourse deixis. Both (34) and (35) apply the third person singular possessor index in a way that indicates the prominence of the possessor/controller. This prominence is perhaps parallel to the very same deictic marking strategy found in the indication of book prices, for example, when the price of a book is given in Erzya on the cover of the book, we find the word *pit'ńe+ze*

price_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG ‘its price’ followed subsequently by the price value, a parallel of the cognate Hungarian *ára XXX* with the same gloss (personal information).

As we progress toward contextual definiteness, i.e. the definiteness construed by some in reference to universally unique items or phenomena, we will encounter what superficially would be treated as the definite function of the possessor index. In this function the affix is attested with nouns indicating natural phenomena and divisions in time, such as ‘the sun’, ‘time’, ‘the moon’, see (36–38).

- (36) *čĭ+ze* *mańej+ste* *van+ś*
sun_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG clear_A+ADV-MANNER look_V+IND.PRETĪ.PRED-3SG
meńel+ste+ńt’ *viř+eś* *čatmoń+eź*
 sky_N+ELA+DEF.SG. forest_N+NOM.DEF.SG be-quiet_V+PTC-Oz
il’ta+ś *oboz+ońt’.*
 accompany_V+IND.PRETĪ.PRED-3SG convoy_N+GEN.DEF.SG.
 (Tikhonova 1980: 185, Ęrkai, N. 1969: 20) ‘The sun looked brightly [down] from the sky. The forest quietly saw the convoy along.’
- (37) *ška+zo* *pek* *kurok+sto*
time_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG very_ADV quick_A+ADV-MANNER
tu+ś *kiřakst+om+o,* *buto* *tundo+ń*
 leave_V+IND.PRETĪ.PRED-3SG slide_V+INF+LOC, as-if_CONJ spring_N+GEN
ľembe *dĭ* *valdo* *čĭ+ś*
 warm_A.ABS and_CONJ light_A.ABS sun_N+NOM.DEF.SG
sonze *panś...*
 it/he/she_PRON-PERS-3SG.POSS-3SG drive_V+IND.PRETĪ.PRED-3SG
 (Tikhonova 1980: 185: [Ęrkai, N.]) ‘Time began to fly quickly, just as though the warm and bright spring spring sun were driving it.’
- (38) *kov+ozo* *salava* *van+ś*
moon_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG secretly_ADV-MANNER look_V+IND.PRETĪ.PRED-3SG
veľe+ńt’ *laĭg+s*
 village_N+GEN.DEF.SG at_POP+ILL
 (Tikhonova 1980: 185: [Ęrkai, N.]) ‘The moon looked upon the village in secret.’

It will be noted that in all three instances (36–38) there are elements prominent to the discourse that might be seen to supersede the universally unique elements. In (36) I have accessed a larger context, not offered by Tikhonova, which illustrates the contextually definite referent *meńel+ste+ńt’* ‘from the sky’ in contrast with the subject of the following sentence *viř+eś* ‘the forest’. In this context the referent *čĭ+ze* ‘the sun (lit. his/her/its sun)’ appears to be given less discourse prominence, it is not set in contrast with the other elements, i.e. the universal uniqueness of the referent *čĭ+ze* ‘the sun’ requires that it be lowered to a less conspicuous position to avoid topic interpretation. Similarly, *ška+zo* ‘time’ in (37) and *kov+ozo* ‘the moon’ in (38) might be construed as universally unique

elements that are presented with the unabrupt non-topicalizing form of the 3SG marker, an anti-prominence marker, of sorts, in narrative writing.

Ermuškin (2004: 81) defines the definite use of the third-person-singular marker as indicative of the state of an object at a given moment. Thus instead of reading a narrative, we are presented with circumstances in which speaker and listener, alike, are simultaneously observing the same phenomenon, the prominent deictic circumstances involved in the price printed on the a book cover, see (39–43).

- (39) *čĭ+ze* *liś+ś*
 sun/day_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG come-out_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG
 (Ermuškin 2004: 81) ‘the sun came out’
- (40) *kov+zo* *valdo*
 moon_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG light/bright_A.NOM.SG
 (Ermuškin 2004: 81) ‘the moon is bright’
- (41) *varma+zo* *lembe*
 wind_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG warm_A.NOM.SG
 (Ermuškin 2004: 81) ‘the wind is warm’
- (42) *ška+zo* *lamo*
 time_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG a-lot_Q.ABS
 (Ermuškin 2004: 81) ‘it is late’
- (43) ...*a* *čĭ+ze* *ej* *čopot+i...*
 but_CONJ sun/day_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG just_PRT grow-dark_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG
paz+oń *čĭ+ze* *čopot+ś...*
 God_N+GEN sun/day_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG grow-dark_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG
 (Ermuškin 2004: 200 [Korino Shatkovski Raion, Nizhegorodski Oblast, Makarova
 Anna Mikhailovna, 55 years old, September 1964]) ‘...but the day was just growing
 dark... God's day had darkened...’

The second line of (43) indicates that the referent *paz* ‘God’ might actually be the possessor/controller of universally unique referents like *čĭ+ze* ‘his/her sun’, an interpretation found in Erzya literature, as well (Evsev'ev 1931: 48, 55, 265; UPTMN 7.1: 149; Shcheglov 1980: 64).

Summary of adnominal-person markers

The possessor indices are best illustrated in three sets, of which one deals with the nominative singular possessum reading, the second the nominative plural reading and the bulk of all cases, and the third limits itself entirely to the dative case. The merits of this division can be seen in the illustrated distinctions varying between person and number of the possessor in relation to number and case of the possessum, i.e. while number may

appear to condone a nominative/genitive syncretism for first person possessor based on a mutual literary and dialect/non-standard background, this would not be the same reading as arrived at in the second and third person possessors. Here the first two groups are joined to better facilitate a visual attestation of divergencies.

Table 4.35 Possessive suffixes used in all cases except for the dative

POR	PUM	Forms		Cyrillics	Example	
		Phonetic	STAND			
1SG	NOM /			+м, +ом, +ем, +эм	<i>kudo+m</i>	'my home/house'
	GEN.SG	+m, +om, +em				
	OTHER	+n, +on, +ń, +eń	+m, +om, +em	+м, +ом, +ем, +эм, +н, +он, +нь, +ень, +энь		
1PL	NOM /	+nok, +onok, +ńek, +eńek, +nek	+mok, +omok, +mek, +emek	+нок, +нек, нэк, +онок, +енок, +энок; +мок, +мек, +омок, +емек, +эмек	<i>kudo</i> <i>+nok</i>	'(of) our home/ house'
	GEN.SG					
	OTHER	+nok, +onok, +ńek, +eńek, +nek		+нок, +нек, нэк, +онок, +енок, +энок	<i>kudo</i> <i>+nok</i>	'our homes/ houses'
2SG	NOM.SG	+t, +ot, +t', +et'		+т, +ть, +от, +еть, +эть	<i>kudo+t</i>	'your home/ house'
	GEN.SG					
	OTHER	+t, +ot, +t', +et'	+nt, +ont, +ńt', +eńt'	+т, +ть, +от, +еть, +эть; +нт, +нтъ, +онт, +ентъ, +энтъ	<i>kudo+t</i>	'your homes/ houses', 'of your home(s)/ house(s)'
2PL		+ŋk, +oŋk, +eŋk		+нк, онк, +енк, +энк	<i>kudo+ŋk</i>	'your home/ house'
3SG	NOM.SG	+zo, +ozo, +ze, +eze	+so, +se	+зо, +озо, +зэ, +езэ, +эзэ; +со, +сэ	<i>kudo+zo</i>	'his/her/its home/house'
	GEN.SG					
	OTHER	+nzo, +onzo, +nze, +enze		+нзо, +онзо, +нзэ, +ензэ, +энзэ	<i>kudo</i> <i>+nzo</i>	'his/her/its homes/houses', 'of his/her/its home(s)/house(s)'
3PL		+st, +ost, +est	+nst, +onst, +enst	+ст, +ост, +ест, +эст; +нст, +онст, +енст, +энст	<i>kudo+st</i>	'their home/ house'
Subtotals		39	16	58	11	
Total allomorphs		55		69		
Unique allomorphs		43		54		

Concatenation of case and person can be seen to follow a two-way split for constituent ordering, i.e. synchronically, the core cases adhere to a STEM + POSSESSOR-INDEX scheme, where the possessor index is attested for cumulative exponence in the expression of both number and person of the possessor and perhaps number and case of the possessum, whereas other cases generally follow a concatenation scheme STEM + CX + POSSESSOR INDEX. While concatenation strategies of the nominative and genitive are rendered as ambiguous, due to the absence of any discernible case morpheme, the dative lends itself to a diachronic interpretation of STEM + POSSESSOR INDEX + CX, a fact which would lead to a diachronic three-way split in constituent ordering (STEM + POSSESSOR INDEX (nominative and genitive), STEM + POSSESSOR INDEX + CX (dative), STEM + CX + POSSESSOR INDEX (others)) (cf. Comrie 1981: 120). The remainder of the cases attested with adnominal-person marking comprise 13 cases: the ABLATIVE, INESSIVE, ELATIVE, ILLATIVE, PROLATIVE, TRANS-LATIVE, COMPARATIVE, ABESSIVE, LOCATIVE and COMITATIVE, i.e. the sum total enumeration lacks only the LATIVE and TEMPORALIS of the 15 cases attested in the indefinite declension, see section 4.2.1. CASE.

In treatises of possessive endings, grammars of Erzya often show a dichotomy for the category of number. In the most recent grammar, Adushkina (2000: 89–102) speaks of a differentiation between singular and plural possessa associated with the possessive suffixes for 1SG and 3SG, but what the grammarians write and publishers print deviate from one another. In fact the *N* of the 3SG +*ONzO* occurs in all positions except the nominative singular, i.e. it occurs in the singular genitive as well as the plural nominative and genitive functions. The *N* of the 1SG is indeed attested on all targets except the nominative singular possessum, whereas the so-called singular *-Om* can occur in all positions, for some speakers or writers of the language, regardless of what grammarians say to the contrary (see 4.2.2. NUMBER). Thus it is not the presence but the absence of the *-N-* which is of morphological importance, namely, the *N* forms do not occur in the nominative singular of the possessum. The *-N-* forms of the 3PL can also be attributed this same interpretation, whereas the 2PL form appears to have no dialect or old-literary parallels, this may be due to its relative infrequency, as it is the least frequent of the six person indices.

Table 4.36 Possessive indices on dative-case possessa-targets

POR	Phonetic		Cyrillics		Example	Gloss	
	STAND	N-STAND	STAND	N-STAND			
1	SG	+ńeń, +neń, +ońeń, +eńeń		+нень, +нэнь, +онень, +енень, +эньень		<i>ava+ńeń</i>	'to my mother'
		PL	NA	NA			
2	SG	+t'eń, +teń, +o'teń, +e'teń	+t'e, +te, +o't, +ete, +t'e't, +t'e't, +o't'e't, +e't'e't, +nste't, +onste't, +enste't	+тень, +тэнь, +ом- ень, +емень, +эмень	+те, +тэ, +оме, +еме, +эте, +тесть, +тэть, +ометь, +ететь, +этеть, +нстэть, +он- стэть, +энстэть, +енстэть	<i>ava+t'e't</i>	'to your mother'
		PL	+nsteńk, +onsteńk, +ensteńk		+нстэнк, +онстэнк, +енстэнк, +энстэнк	<i>ćora +nsteńk</i>	'to your son/sons'
3	SG	+nsteń, +onsteń, +ensteń	+nste, +onste, +en- ste, +nsto, +onsto, +nstenze, +onstenze, +enstenze	+нстэнь, +онстэнь, +енстэнь, +энстэнь	+нстэ, +онстэ, +енстэ, +энстэ, +нсто, +онсто, +нстэ́нзэ, +онстэ́нзэ, +енстэ́нзэ, +энстэ́нзэ	<i>kudo +nsteń</i>	'for his/ her/its home/ house'
		PL	+nsteń, +onsteń, +ensteń	+nstenst, +onstenst, +enstenst	+нстэнь, +онстэнь, +енстэнь, +энстэнь	+нстэ́нст, +онстэ́нст, +енстэ́нст, +энстэ́нст	<i>t'e'ta +nsteń</i>
Sub-totals		14	25	21	29		
Total allo-morphs		39		50			
Unique allo-morphs		36		42			

Grammars of Erzya entertain forms for singular person such that the first and second person singular with genitive case readings are limited in usage to kin terms, see Adushkina (2000: 97), whereas the third person singular is generally recognized as open with regard to stem semantic constraints. The plural is generally ignored, save for the fact that analytic equivalents might be indicated for functions of the dative. While the third

person plural cross-reference marker *-Onsteń* with a dative case reading can readily be attested in written literature, it is only recently that evidence has been found for a second person plural morpheme *-Onsteyk*, as well. Diachronically, however, it should be noted that the stem of the POSS-3SG>DAT *-Onste-*, consisting of a possessor-index marker *-OnzO* and that the dative morpheme in *-Te*, is used in the derivation of the two specifically plural person forms *-Onsteyk* POSS-2PL>DAT and *-Onstenst* POSS-3PL>DAT, to name but two.

Some of the dialects and supposedly the literary norm distinguish kin terms with first and second person singular possessive markers in combination with the genitive (see Shakhmatov 1910: 798; Adushkina 2000: 97 and 94). The peculiarity of this affix is that both alveolars are palatal regardless of the preceding back vowel, i.e. in back vowel context this ending forms a minimal pair with a non-palatal form *sazor+on* ‘my younger sisters’.

Table 4.37 Possessive suffixes genitive in kin terms

Person	Forms				Example
	Phonetic		Cyrillics		
	STAND	N-STAND	STAND	N-STAND	
1SG	+ń, +oń, +eń	+m, +om, +em, +n, +on	+нб, +оһб, +еһб, +эһб;	+М, +ОМ, +ЕМ, +ЭМ, +Н, +ОН	<i>teta+ń</i> ‘of my father's’
2SG	+t', +ot', +et'	+t, +ot	+тб, +отб, +етб, +этб;	+m, +om	<i>lela+t'</i> ‘of your big brother's’, ‘of your big brothers’
Subtotals	6	7	8	8	
Total allomorphs	13		16		

In front vowel contexts no minimal pair is attested, and even Adushkina's own example (44), reproduced below, deviates from her prescriptive stance. The prescribed genitive form is homonymous for the singular and plural of kin terms, such that *tejteře+ń* would gloss as both ‘my daughter's’ and ‘my daughters’, but as evidenced from Adushkina's own example, adherence to this norm falters.

- (44) *tejteře+m* *vajgele+ze* *mařavi*
 daughter_N-KIN+POSS-1SG voice_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG be-heard_V.IND.PRES.PRED-3SG
 (Adushkina 2000: 94) ‘My daughter's voice [is audible | can be heard]’

The allomorphs attested in published literature for non-dative case tally at 43 phonetic allomorphs and 54 Cyrillic allomorphs, which can then be added to the unique 36 phonetic and 42 Cyrillic allomorphs of the dative case tables for a total of 79 phonetic and 96 Cyrillic allomorphs total.

All told there are ninety-two phonetic, and one hundred and twelve Cyrillic allomorphs associated with the seventeen subcategories of possessive person.

4.2.3.2. Definite markers

The definite markers of the standard Erzya literary language can be divided into sets by number and case. In the definite singular declension there are two separate markers: one for the nominative in *-Oś* and the other for the oblique cases in *-Ońt'*. In the plural, the definite plural marker in *-Ne* is always preceded by a separate *-T* plural marker familiar from both the indefinite nominative plural and the 3PL of the verbal and adnominal conjugations (see also 4.2.2.).

In the older literary language and especially the Northwestern or Alatyř' dialects the nominative singular marker can be represented by the shorter *-ś*, lacking a linking vowel in combination with consonant-final stems, and the oblique singular cases are represented by the marker *-śt'*. Hence one might immediately observe morpheme ambiguity with the indicative preterit I 3SG and 3PL forms of the verbal conjugation, i.e. in consonant-final stems of noun declension the Alatyř'-type dialects attest to a linking-vowel strategy whose contextual motivation lies in the varied incompatibility of adjacent voiceless s(h)ibilants at the stem-affix juncture, see table (4.38).

Table 4.38 Variation between linking-vowel strategies in modern and presently dialect (old literary) declension of nouns

	Literary	Dialect	Literary	Dialect	Literary	Dialect
NOM	<i>tol</i> 'fire'	<i>tol</i>	<i>oś</i> 'town'	<i>oś</i>	<i>san</i> 'sinew; vein'	<i>san</i>
NOM.DEF.SG	<i>tol+oś</i>	<i>tol+ś</i>	<i>oś+oś</i>	<i>oś+oś</i>	<i>san+oś</i>	<i>san+ś</i>
GEN.DEF.SG	<i>tol+ońt'</i>	<i>tol+śt'</i>	<i>oś+ońt'</i>	<i>oś+ośt'</i>	<i>san+ońt'</i>	<i>san+śt'</i>

The definite declension is best broken down into singular and plural subsets. The plural marker *T* + definite plural *Ne* combination provides — for almost all practical purposes — a parallel stem to that of the indefinite declension. With the exception of the TEMPORALIS and LOCATIVE case forms, twelve cases can be attested in literary sources and a thirteenth in dialect material (see section 4.2.1.3. ATTRIBUTIVE CASES). The singular definite declension is limited to eleven case forms, i.e. there is no attestation in the present or older literary language for the case forms LATIVE, LOCATIVE, COMITATIVE, TEMPORALIS.

Table 4.39 Definite declension markers

	Allomorphs					
	Phonetic		Cyrillics			
	STAND	N-STAND	STAND	N-STAND		
NOM.DEF.SG	+ś, +oś, +eś		+сь, +ось, +есь, +эсь		<i>kudo+ś</i>	‘the/this/that home/house’
OBL.DEF.SG	+ńt’, +ońt’, +eńt’	+śt’, +ośt’, +eśt’; +t’	+нтъ, +онтъ, +ентъ, +энтъ	+сть, +остъ, +естъ, +эсть;	<i>kudo+ńt’</i>	‘the/this/that home/house (GEN)’
DEF.SG.DAT	+ńteń, +ońteń, +eńteń	+śteń, +ośteń, +eśteń; +teń	+нтенъ, +онтенъ, +ентенъ, +энтенъ	+ть +стенъ, +остенъ, +естенъ, +эстенъ	<i>kudo+ńteń</i>	‘to the home/ house’
DEF.PL	+ńe, +ne	NA	+не, +нэ	NA	<i>kudo+ńe</i>	‘the/these/those homes/houses’
Subtotals	11	8	12	9		
Total Allomorphs	18		20			

In Erzya literature there are usually only four morphemes for the four different paradigmatic positions although a fifth and sixth one can be attested in earlier literature, i.e. the genitive and dative singular forms.

All told there are eighteen phonetic, and twenty Cyrillic allomorphs associated with the four subcategories of definite markers.

Let us now inspect the declension types, INDEF, POSSESSIVE and DEFINITE, the last of which might, for concatenational reasons, be split into SINGULAR and PLURAL, attest inflection in 15, 13, 10 and 13 cases, respectively (see table 4.40).

Table 4.40 Attestation of case in four declension arrays

	Indefinite	Possessive	Definite Singular	Definite Plural
NOM	+	+	+	+
GEN	+	+	+	+
DAT	+	+	+	+
ABL	+	+	+	+
INE	+	+	+	+
ELA	+	+	+	+
ILL	+	+	NA	+
LAT	+	NA	NA	+
PROL	+	+	+	+
LOC	+	+	NA	NA
TEMP	+	NA	NA	NA
TRNSL	+	+	+	+
COMP	+	+	+	?
ABE	+	+	+	+
COM	+	+	NA	Dialect

4.2.4. Nominal conjugation markers

The next position in the concatenation of affixes involves the predicate-person paradigm. The predicate-person paradigm or NOMINAL CONJUGATION MARKERS are morphologically representative of the same elements attested in the indicative present and preterit II persons of subject-conjugation paradigms. These markers are attested for an extensive range of parts of speech including nouns, demonstratives, adjectives, quantifiers, non-finites, spatial adverbs and postpositions, on the one hand, and for co-occurrence with grammatical markers of NUMBER and CX, as well as the POSSESSIVE and DEFINITE DECLENSIONS, on the other (cf. Agafonova 2000: 145; Buzakova 2000: 251; Imaikina 2000: 64, 232; Kharitonova 2000: 116; Mosin 2000: 109–110; Bartens 1999: 148; Kolyadyonkov 1959: 18, 26–27, 35–37, 44–45, 190; Evsev'ev 1963: 52, 62, 115–125, 137, 148, 156, 161, 190, 287, 290, 292, 294, 303). The following table (4.41) will provide a rudimentary presentation of the nominal conjugation with attestation for grammatical markers indicating two tenses, three persons and two numbers.

Table 4.41 Nominal conjugation markers with attestation for various targets

	PREL	Allomorphs		Cyrillics					
		Phonetic		STAND	N-STAND			STAND	N-STAND
	1SG			<i>+an</i>		<i>+ан, +ян</i>		<i>t'etaz+an</i>	'I'm his/her father'
	1PL			<i>+tano, +t'ano</i>	<i>+tam, +t'am, +tanok, +t'anok, +tank, +t'ank</i>	<i>+mano, +мяно; +там, +тям, +танок, +мянок, +танк, +тянк</i>		<i>eřza+tano</i>	'We are Erzyas'
PRES	2SG			<i>+at</i>		<i>+ат, +ят</i>		<i>Kobaľeň+at</i>	'Are you from Kobale?'
	2PL			<i>+tado, +t'ado</i>		<i>+тадо, +тядо</i>		<i>andoms +tado</i>	'Do you need to be fed?'
	3SG			\emptyset		\emptyset		<i>lomaň+\emptyset</i>	'He/she is a person'
	3PL			\emptyset		\emptyset		<i>kosot+\emptyset</i>	'Where are they?'
	1SG			<i>+l'in, +ol'in, +el'in,</i>		<i>+линь, +олинь, +елинь, +элинь</i>		<i>od+ol'in</i>	'I was young'
	1PL			<i>+l'inek, +el'inek, +ol'inek</i>	<i>+l'nek, +el'nek, +ol'nek</i>	<i>+линек, +ольнек, +олинек, +елинек, +элинек;</i>	<i>+льнек, +ольнек, +ельнек, +эльнек</i>	<i>kudo+so +l'ide</i>	'Were you at home?'
PRETII	2SG			<i>+lit', +ol'it', +el'it',</i>		<i>+лить, +олить, +елить, +элить</i>		<i>iřtamo čora+ś+el'it'</i>	'you were that kind of a man'
	2PL			<i>+l'ide, +ol'ide, +el'ide</i>	<i>+l'de, +ol'de, +el'de</i>	<i>+лиде, +олиде, +елиде, +элиде;</i>	<i>+льде, +ольде, +ельде, +эльде</i>	<i>iřtaška+l'it'</i>	'you were this big'
	3SG			<i>+l', +ol', +el',</i>		<i>+ль, +оль, +ель, +эль</i>		<i>avol' par+t+ne +de+l'</i>	'he/she/it was not [one] of the good ones'
	3PL			<i>+l't', +ol't', +el't'</i>		<i>+лть, +ольть, +ельть, +эльть</i>		<i>škamo+st +ol't'</i>	'they were on their own'
	Subtotal			26	12	33	15		
	Total allomorphs				38		48		
	Unique allomorphs				37		47		

The target types illustrated here include: a nominative singular possessum *tetazan* ‘I’m his/her father’; an indefinite nominative, which might be rendered both singular and plural *erźatano ~ erźattano* ‘we are Erzyas’; an indefinite genitive form of a place name *Kobaľeňat?* ‘Are you from Kobale?’; an illative infinite *andomstado?* ‘Do you need to be fed?’; an inessive form *kosat?* ‘Where are you?’; an adjective *odol’iń* ‘I was young’; a nominative definite singular *išťamo ćoraśel’it’* ‘you were that kind of a man’; an indefinite comparative *išťaskaľit’* ‘you were this big’; a definite plural ablative target *avol’ partnedel’* ‘it was not of the better ones’, and a minimalizing quantifier *śkamostol’t’* ‘[they] were by themselves’.

All told there are thirty-seven phonetic, and forty-seven Cyrillic allomorphs associated with the twelve subcategories of adnominal predicate person.

Adnominal conjugation, which otherwise is the focus of a doctoral dissertation (Turunen: 2010 “Nonverbal predication in Erzya: Studies on morpho-syntactic variation and part of speech distinctions”), has been outlined according to source grammars and attestation from corpus and field work. It can be plotted in table (4.42), case slots not attested in table (4.40) are marked IRR for irrelevant to attestation. There is only one case attesting nominal conjugation in all four arrays (the nominative), only one with three attestations, five with two arrays, and four with one array. The indefinite declension shows attestation for nominal conjugation in eleven cases, the possessive declension in five cases, definite singular in one case, and the definite plural in four cases. That means a total of 21 attestations out of a hypothetical 31.

Table 4.42 Attestation of nominal conjugation in four declension arrays

	Indefinite	Possessive	Definite Singular	Definite Plural	Total
NOM	+	+	+	+	4
INE	+	+	NA	+	3
GEN	+	+	NA	NA	2
PROL	+	+	NA	NA	2
LOC	+	+	IRR	IRR	2
ABL	+	NA	NA	+	2
ELA	+	NA	NA	+	2
ILL	+	NA	IRR	NA	1
TRNSL	+	NA	NA	NA	1
COMP	+	NA	NA	NA	1
ABE	+	NA	NA	NA	1
DAT	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
LAT	NA	IRR	IRR	NA	0
TEMP	NA	IRR	IRR	NA	0
COM	NA	NA	IRR	NA	0
Total	11	5	1	4	21

Table 4.44 Morphematic representation of the *-Gak* enclitic

	Phonetic		Cyrillics		
	STAND	N-STAND			
No clitic	∅		∅	<i>kudo</i>	‘home/house’
Clitic	<i>+gak,</i> <i>+kak, +jak</i>	<i>+ak</i>	<i>+гак, +как,</i> <i>+як</i>	<i>+ак</i>	<i>kudo+jak</i> ‘home/house too’
Subtotal	4	1	4	1	
Total allomorphs	5		5		

All told there are five phonetic, and five Cyrillic allomorphs associated with the two subcategories of clitic, i.e. [\pm PRESENCE].

Interim summary of affixes

Adnominal-type affixation can be broken down into three phases of concatenation, i.e. declension, conjugation and clitic marking:

Declension, the segment of greatest variety, is attested for the presence of morphological markers indicating the grammatical categories of case (maximal fifteen), number (two) and deixis – possessive (seventeen) and definite (four). While the category of number is apparent in the nominative case of all three declension types with certain limitations in the possessive declension, only the definite declension tables show a regular rendering of number in all attested cases of the declension charts. Due to predictable noun-head deletion strategies attested in Erzya, eight of the case forms, which occur as modifiers in the NP, may be further subjected to the phenomenon of secondary declension as addressed in section 4.5. ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND SECONDARY DECLENSION.

Conjugations comprise twelve morphological markers for the indication of the grammatical categories of predicate person (three), number (two) and tense (two). Here the ZERO-marker is used to cross-reference indicative present 3SG, which is simultaneously the same marking used with non-predicative-position elements, by the same token the *-T* plural marker of the 3PL might syntactically cross-reference either the indicative present 3PL in predicate position or certain non-topic arguments of the finite verb.

Enclitic marking comprises a simple dichotomy, in which either the enclitic is present or is not.

4.3. Adnominal-type person in parts of speech

ADNOMINAL-TYPE PERSON here is the cover-term used to represent what elsewhere might be referred to as possessor/controller indexing, cross-referential adnominal-person marking, possessive declension, etc. Thus it is implied that the phenomenon might be manifest in parts of speech other than what are found in noun phrases. This is, in fact, the situation. The affixes used for possessor indexing in nouns can be attested in other parts of speech that are not found in NPS. We will assume that the stem types demonstrated in section 4.1. NOMINAL-TYPE WORD-STEM MORPHOLOGY can be applied not only to nouns, but equally to all other parts of speech, where the possessive declension obtains. Thus, in this section, we will make an inspection of the various parts of speech and their co-occurrence with the three layers of Erzya adnominal concatenation: POSSESSIVE DECLENSION, NOMINAL CONJUGATION and CLITIC MARKING. In the first subsection we will inspect the compatibility of the morphologically explicit possessive declension with the various parts of speech, at which time small subsets of these parts of speech, sublexica, will be forwarded to provide a more specific illustration of the word forms encountered. The inspection for possessive declension compatibility will be facilitated through a subdivisoning according to case, whereas frequency will then help in distinguishing the prominent sublexica in the parts of speech.

Cases = nominative, genitive, dative, ablative, inessive, elative, illative, prolative, locative, translative, comparative, abessive, comitative

Parts of speech = nouns, quantifiers, pronouns, adpositions and non-finites in *-Om-*

The resulting information on the compatibility of adnominal-person marking will then establish a base for further inspection of the Erzya lexicon. It will provide us with data concerning concatenational dimensions of the various word types as well as inflections. These concatenational dimensions will give us an insight into the workings of obligatory possessive marking, the morpho-syntactic compatibility of declension and conjugation or clitic marking, or both, and the phenomena of PARADIGM DEFECTIVITY and SECONDARY DECLENSION, dealt with in sections (4.4.) and (4.5.) respectively.

The manifestation of cross-referential adnominal-person marking in the Erzya language can be given a slight delimitation through the introduction of the notion OBLIGATORY POSSESSIVE MARKING. This notion, however, must first be broken down into more primitive features, i.e. we can speak of adnominal-person affixation that is present or absent, in a word [\pm EXPLICIT], and this parameter can further be coordinated according to the notion of [\pm OBLIGATORY].

\pm Explicit adnominal-person marking

\pm Obligatory

These parameters according to which the first allows for the presence/absence of adnominal-person marking, e.g. in Erzya the kin term *t'eta* 'father' can appear both with and without cross-referential marking: *t'eta* father_N.NOM.SG and *t'eta+zo* father_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG, and the latter, which ascribes the \pm obligatoriness of the first parameter. Thus where the word for "father" *t'eta* may, according to context and semantics, occur with or without cross-referential marking, there are words that are obligatorily targets of adnominal-person marking, on the one end of the spectrum, and others that may never be targets of adnominal-person marking, at the other extreme, see (46–50).

(46) a. *t'et'+ide+nze*

father_N-KIN-ELDER+ASSOC+POSS-3SG

(cf. Bartens 1999: 107; Tsygankin 1961: 357; Evsev'ev 1963: 40) 'his/her/its father and others with him'

*b. *t'et'+ide*

father_N-KIN-ELDER+ASSOC

'father and others with him'

(47) a. *ejste+de+nze*

from_POP.ELA+ABL+POSS-3SG

'from him/her/it'

*b. *sonze**ejste+de*

he/she/it_PRON-PERS-3SG.GEN.POSS-3SG from_POP.ELA+ABL

'from him/her/it'

(48) a. *nil'e+ne+st*

four_NUM+ASSOC-COLL+POSS-3PL

'the four of them'

*b. *sinst**nil'e+ne*

they_PRON-PERS-3PL.GEN.POSS-3PL four_NUM+ASSOC-COLL

'the four of them'

*(49)a. *pačk+onzo*

through_POP+POSS-3SG

'through it/him/her'

b. *sonze**pačk*

he/she/it_PRON-PERS-3SG.GEN.POSS-3SG through_POP

'through it/him/her'

- (50) a. *t'e+nze*
 to_POP.DAT+POSS-3SG
 'to it/him/her'
- b. *sońenze* (<= *soń+d'e+nze*) (Feoktistov, p.c.)
 he/she/it_PRON-PERS-3SG.DAT.POSS-3SG
 'to it/him/her'

The notion, here, of obligatory possessive marking is the morphological offshoot of the treatise of OBLIGATORILY POSSESSED NOUNS OR BOUND NOUNS as provided by Bickel and Nichols (WALS chapter 58), where it is noted that many languages with head-marked possession have some nouns that obligatorily require possessive marking and cannot be used without it, whereas these BOUND NOUNS OR OBLIGATORILY POSSESSED NOUNS are contrasted with OPTIONALLY POSSESSED NOUNS. As demonstrated in (46–48), some word forms are only valid with morphological concatenations of person, while (49) indicates that only lexical person is possible, and (50) demonstrates the grammaticalization of extended exponence in the personal pronouns. Thus a further inspection will be made of the distribution of adnominal person lexical versus morphological.

The parts of speech attested as compatible with adnominal-person marking will then be further inspected for compatibility with nominal conjugation and clitic marking (with or without nominal conjugation).

4.3.1. Possessive declension compatibility for distinguishing parts of speech

In this section possessive declension case will be utilized to identify various sublexica. (See 1.1 THE INALIENABILITY HIERARCHY, above.) The names of these subgroups of the Erzya lexicon will be given in order of highest frequency for first attested member in each individual sublexicon. For each mentioned sublexicon, examples of representative word forms will be provided with translations in order of occurrence.

Nominative case compatibility with parts of speech

In the initial inspection of the nominative I have resolved to utilize the specifically singular (singulative) form of the 3SG adnominal marker. This choice has eliminated problems with ambiguous readings requiring context to distinguish between case or number of a given possessum. It has, however, required that I consider certain word types with obligatory adnominal-person marking separately, namely, there are associative nouns with variant interpretations, e.g. *tetiden' ~ tetidem* 'my father and those with him' may receive two glosses (see NOUNS in section 4.3.2. ATTESTED PARTS OF SPEECH AND SUBLEXI-

CA). (For further reading see Klement'eva 2004: 12, 36, 37; Bartens 1999: 107; Davydov 1963: 166; Tsygankin 1961: 357; Bubrikh 1953: 78; Evsev'ev 1963: 40)

While the nominative case attests to no personal pronouns, adpositions (which by definition lack a nominative form (see ADPOSITIONS in section 4.3.2. ATTESTED PARTS OF SPEECH AND SUBLEXICA), there is prominent evidence for a variety of nouns, including quality nouns, such as color, flavor, warmth, etc. In order of frequency of the first sublexicon member, we can establish:

PHYSICAL OR MENTAL STATE (*mel* 'mind', *jožo* 'feeling, contact point', *vij* 'strength', *ojme* 'soul', *obuća* 'character'),

KIN TERMS and other high-animacy 2-argument referents (*ava* 'mother', *teta* 'father', *ni* 'wife', *ćora* 'son', *mirde* 'husband', *jalga* 'comrade', *tejt'er* 'daughter', *le'la* 'elder brother, uncle', *baba* 'grandmother', *paća* 'elder sister, aunt'),

BODY PARTS (*ćama* 'face', *šedej* 'heart', *p'ra* 'head', *rungo* 'body', *kurgo* 'mouth', *peke* 'stomach', *ked* 'hand, arm', *pil'ge* 'foot, leg', *mešt'e* 'chest', *sudo* 'nose'),

RELATIONAL SPATIAL nouns (*potmo* 'inside', *lanjo* 'upper surface', *alks* 'base', *potmaks* 'bottom', *boka* 'side', *ćiře* 'edge', *ikel'ks* 'front', *udalks* 'back', *vel'ks* 'covering'),

PRODUCT OR EMISSION (*vajgel* 'voice', *tev* 'work', *val* 'word', *ćiře* 'smell', *sulej* 'shadow, reflection'),

TEMPORAL SETTINGS (*ška* 'time', *ći* 'day', *e'amo* 'life'),

SPATIAL SETTINGS (*tarka* 'place', *kudo* 'house, home', *ve'le* 'village', *pi're* 'garden, orchard'),

UNIVERSAL QUANTIFIER (*vešemeze* 'all told'),

DOMESTIC ANIMALS (*lišme* 'horse', *kiska* 'dog', *skal* 'cow', *alaša* 'horse', *ajgor* 'stallion', *vašo* 'foal', *a'akš* 'rooster', *psaka* 'cat')

INTRANSITIVE DEVERBAL NOUNS [activity] (*udoma* 'to sleep', *kortamo* 'to speak', *šimema* 'to drink', *bažamo* 'to intend to', *jovtn'ema* 'to tell', *lekšema* 'to breathe', *kemema* 'to believe', *samo* 'to arrive', *pejd'ema* 'to laugh', *tujema* 'to depart'),

TRANSITIVE DEVERBAL NOUNS [activity] (*učoma* 'to wait', *tejema* 'to make', *š'navtoma* 'to raise', *tonavtoma* 'to teach', *ćarkodema* 'to comprehend', *mujema* 'to find', *pañema* 'to drive; to bake', *ve'amo* 'to lead'), [actor] (*vanst'ića* 'to guard', *id'ića* 'to protect', *ki'd'ića* 'to hold', *večkića* 'to love', *tonavt'ića* 'to teach', *polavt'ića* 'to replace', *uč'ića* 'to wait', *nejjića* 'to see', *teji* 'to make', *kuč'ića* 'to send').

MEASUREMENTS (*ser* ‘height’, *kele* ‘width’, *kuvalmo* ‘length’, *stalmo* ‘weight’, *ečke* ‘thickness’, *ije* ‘age’, *pitnie* ‘value’, *paro* ‘virtue’, *šupavčiči* ‘wealth’, *lembe* ‘warmth’, *tańšt* ‘flavor’, *ašo* ‘white’),

APPAREL (*panar* ‘shirt’, *šive* ‘collar’, *šapka* ‘hat’, *oršamo* ‘clothing’, *pača* ‘kerchief’, *kartuz* ‘cap with visor’, *pl’atija* ‘dress’, *pidžak* ‘coat’, *karks* ‘belt’),

TOOLS (*lokšo* ‘whip’, *penč* ‘spoon’, *šalgo* ‘pike’, *peľuma* ‘scythe’, *piks* ‘rope’, *užeře* ‘ax’ *kajga* ‘violin’, *krandaz* ‘wagon’)

INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN (*meže* ‘what’)

ASSOCIATIVE ELDER NOUNS (*aviden* ‘my mother and those with her’)

PROPER NAMES (*ľuda* ‘Lyuda’, *vaďim* ‘Vadim’)

PROPER-NAME TOPIC DERIVATIONS [in *ńize*] (*listarńize* ‘Listar's wife’).

As noted below nominative and genitive marking in all persons other than 3SG are literally ambiguous to automated morphological parsing, so the sublexicon data are applicable to the combined nominative-genitive group. The sequence of sublexica begins in accordance with the inalienability hierarchy with kin terms and body parts highest on the agenda. These are followed by spacial relations and settings with product or emissions. The highest of the obligatorily marked sublexica is that of the universal quantifier, which is followed by a domestic animals sublexicon. The two sublexica of deverbal nouns, it will be noted, favor intransitive over transitive verbs. Deverbals derived from intransitive stems reference activities and the possessor index markers are unambiguously s-oriented. Those derived from transitive stems are ambiguous; stems referencing activities might have P or A orientation in their possessor indexes, whereas possessor indexing on actor-reference nouns inadvertently specify patient-orientation of the possessor. Subsequent possessa fall into the sublexica measurements, apparel and tools, with only minimal attestation for interrogative pronouns, obligatorily marked associative elder nouns and proper names. Obligatory adnominal-person marking is seen in the personal pronouns and quantifiers.

Genitive case compatibility with parts of speech

The subset of lexical elements attested with the non-ambiguous reading of nominative singular 3SG adnominal-person morpheme can be utilized in the distinction of sublexica common to both the nominative and the genitive. By the same token word items not encountered in the 3SG>NOM.SG parse might be considered either plural in nature or particular to the genitive/oblique range of case. Most lexical items which are typically

plural belong to the sublexica body parts or physical and mental states. Hence the only new words to be attested from the ambiguous plural include the words *čer* ‘hair’, *kež* ‘fury’, *pej* ‘tooth’, *sakal* ‘beard’.

Typically plural (*šelme* ‘eye’, *ked* ‘hand, arm’, *pilge* ‘foot, leg’, *turva* ‘lip’, *čer* ‘hair’, *lavtov* ‘shoulder’, *kež* ‘fury’, *pej* ‘tooth’, *sakal* ‘beard’).

The sublexica with NO NOMINATIVE FORM READINGS are most prominently represented by the personal and reflexive-stem pronouns. Whereas personal pronouns are generally accepted to show obligatory possessive marking after their case marking, this marking strategy is shared by the genitive, as well, which might be characterized as either oblique marking on the word stem, or diachronically an indefinite genitive with subsequent possessive marking. The reflexive-stem pronouns, however, have been presented in declension charts with an erroneous *eś* nominative form, common to all, whereas this paradigm lacks a sibling in the nominative; *eś* might be dealt with as a dependent absolutive form (cf. Agafonova 2000: 142–143; Bartens 1999: 113; GMYa 1980: 191; Zaicz 2006: 197), see table (4.45). Here are adjustments for dependent and independent reflexive reading as well as an attestation for 2SG translative case, see (51).

Table 4.45 Reflexive stem declension with independent case forms whereas the nominative-case form is suppletive and the *eś* form is a dependent absolutive form

PERS	INDEPENDENT FORMS							
	Sup-pletive NOM	GEN/ OBL	DAT	ABL	PROL	TRNSL	COMP	ABE
1SG	<i>monś</i>	<i>ešeń</i>	<i>ešteń</i>	<i>ešteđeń</i>	<i>eškan</i>		<i>ešeškan ~ ešškan</i>	<i>eštemeń</i>
1PL	<i>mińś</i>	<i>ešeńek</i>	<i>ešteńek</i>	<i>ešteđeńek</i>	<i>eškanok</i>		<i>ešeškanok ~ ešškanok</i>	<i>eštemeńek</i>
2SG	<i>tonś</i>	<i>ešet</i>	<i>ešteť</i>	<i>ešteđeť</i>	<i>eškat</i>	<i>eškset</i>	<i>ešeškat ~ ešškat</i>	<i>eštemeť</i>
2PL	<i>tjńś</i>	<i>ešeńk</i>	<i>ešteńk</i>	<i>ešteđeńk</i>	<i>eškajk</i>		<i>ešeškanjk ~ ešškanjk</i>	<i>eštemeńk</i>
3SG	<i>sonś</i>	<i>ešeńze</i>	<i>ešteńze</i>	<i>ešteđeńze</i>	<i>eškanzo</i>		<i>ešeškanzo ~ ešškanzo</i>	<i>eštemeńze</i>
3PL	<i>sjńś</i>	<i>ešeť</i>	<i>ešteť</i>	<i>ešteđeť</i>	<i>eškast</i>		<i>ešeškast ~ ešškast</i>	<i>eštemeť</i>

- (51) *azd+an,* *ki+ks*
 not-know_V+IND.PRES.PRED-1SG, who_PRON-REL+TRNSL
tu+ś *toń* *te*
 depart_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG you_PRON-PERS-2SG.GEN this_PRON-DEM-PROX.ABS
ćora+ś, *bul'čom,* *eś+ks+et,*
 son_N+NOM.DEF.SG, as-though_PRT, self_REFL-STEM+TRANS+POSS-2SG,
inė+ń *astaj.*
 great_ADJ:N+GEN Astai_PRP.NOM.SG
 (Radayev 1991: 19) 'I don't know who this son of your resembles, it seems as though,
 you yourself, revered Astai.'

Obligatory adnominal-person marking is explicitly attested in the genitive forms of the 3SG, 1PL, 2PL and 3PL personal pronouns. (See also INDISCERNIBLE CX below.)

Dative case compatibility with parts of speech

In the initial inspection of the dative I have resolved to utilize the 3SG adnominal marker as it is purported to be compatible with both kin terms and other targets, as well. This choice has eliminated problems with ambiguous reading requiring context to distinguish between indefinite dative reading and 1SG readings.

KIN TERMS and other high-animacy 2-argument referents (*ava* 'mother', *teťa* 'father', *ńi* 'wife', *jalga* 'comrade', *ćora* 'son', *tejt'er* 'daughter', *mir'de* 'husband', *paťa* 'elder sister, aunt', *baba* 'grandmother', *leťa* 'elder brother, uncle'),

BODY PARTS (*pil'e* 'ear', *pra* 'head', *sedej* 'heart', *šel'me* 'eye'),

TRANSITIVE DEVERBAL NOUNS [actor] (*vet'ića* 'to lead', *uskića* 'to haul', *ilt'ića* 'to escort', *id'ića* 'to protect', *tonavt'ića* 'to teach', *uč'ića* 'to wait', *nej'ića* 'to see', *teji* 'to make', *kuč'ića* 'to send').

INTRANSITIVE DEVERBAL NOUNS [activity] (*lišema* 'to come out', *sovamo* 'to enter', *eramo* 'to live'),

PRODUCT OR EMISSION (*val* 'word', *poem* 'poem', *vajgel* 'voice', *čijne* 'smell'),

GROUP OF MEMBERSHIP (*šemija* 'family', *raške* 'nation', *brigada* 'brigade', *ušmo* 'army'),

PROPER NAMES (*matra* 'Matrya', *kaťa* 'Katya', *vera* 'Vera', *doškeńize* 'Doshke's wife', *šima* 'Sima')

PROPER-NAME TOPIC DERIVATIONS [in *nize*] (*murzańize* ‘Murza's wife’, *somańize* ‘Syoma's wife’, *listarńize* ‘Listar's wife’, *doškeńize* ‘Doshke's wife’),

MINIMALIZING QUANTIFIER (*škamonsteń* ‘by his/her/its self’).

A subsequent inspection was made of dative-case possessa with 2SG readings:

KIN TERMS and other high-animacy 2-argument referents (*teta* ‘father’, *ava* ‘mother’, *leľa* ‘elder brother, uncle’, *paľa* ‘elder sister, aunt’, *pokšta* ‘grandfather’, *pola* ‘spouse’, *tet’at-avat* ‘father-n-mother’, *baba* ‘grandmother’, *mirde* ‘husband’, *ćora* ‘son’, *avavt* ‘mother-in-law (husband's mother)’).

There was also evidence for another group, the TRANSITIVE DEVERBAL NOUNS [actor] (*kućića* ‘to send’). This might in its own right pose the question of the role of argument structures involved in dative marking.

The Dative adposition in *teń* 1SG, *tet’* ~ *teńt’* 2SG, *tenze* 3SG, *teńek* 1PL, *teńk* 2PL and *test* ~ *tenst* 3PL, has a very high frequency, but unlike other adpositions this paradigm, featuring obligatory adnominal-person marking, has a counterpart in the personal-pronoun declension chart, namely, *mońeń* 1SG, *tońet’* 2SG, *sońenze* 3SG, *mińeńek* 1PL, *tĩńek* 2PL and *sińest* ~ *sińenst* 3PL.

The use of dative-case possessor indexing is typical of kin terms and body parts, as might be predicted from their robustness in nominative and genitive marking and their correlation with 1.1 THE INALIENABILITY HIERARCHY. Unexpected, perhaps, is the presence of the sublexicon deverbal transitive-stem actors, which might also be regarded as a sublexicon of inalienable secondary arguments. The possessor/patient is also extremely high on the SALIENCE HIERARCHIES OF ACCESSIBILITY (1.2). Obligatory adnominal-person marking is seen in the personal pronouns.

Ablative case compatibility with parts of speech

The ablative case attests:

PERSONAL PRONOUNS (*sońdenze* 3SG, *mońdeń* 1SG, *tońdet’* 2SG, *mińdeńek* 1PL, *sińdest* 3PL, *tĩńdeńk* 2PL),

REFLEXIVE-STEM PRONOUNS (*ešteńdenze* 3SG, *ešteńdet’* 2SG, *ešteńdeń* 1SG),

REFLEXIVE PERSONAL PRONOUNS (*monšteńdeń* 1SG, *sonšteńdenze* 3SG),

ADPOSITIONS (*ejs* ‘into’, *vakss* ‘next to’, *malas* ‘into the vicinity of’, *karšos* ‘against’, *końas* ‘according to’),

INTRANSITIVE DEVERBAL NOUNS (*tujemado* ‘to depart’, *eřamodo* ‘to live’, *samodo* ‘to arrive’, *kulomado* ‘to die’, *lišemado* ‘to come out’, *jakamodo* ‘to walk, to visit’),

BODY PARTS (*přa* ‘head’, *kel* ‘tongue’, *šelme* ‘eye’, *piłge* ‘foot, leg’, *sur* ‘finger’),

PRODUCT OF EMISSION (*řev* ‘work’, *vajgel* ‘voice’, *řum* ‘noise’, *čijě* ‘smell’, *struja* ‘ray’),

KIN TERMS and other high-animacy 2-argument referents (*teta* ‘father’, *ćora* ‘son’, *ava* ‘mother’, *jalga* ‘comrade’, *ni* ‘wife’, *mirde* ‘husband’, *tejteř* ‘daughter’, *aluř* ‘dear, fellow’),

SPATIAL SETTINGS (*tarka* ‘place’, *vele* ‘village’, *eřamo* ‘life’, *kudo* ‘house, home’),

TRANSITIVE NON-FINITES (*noldamodo* ‘to release’, *ilřamodo* ‘to escort’, *sajemado* ‘to take’, *řadomado* ‘to finish’, *lovnomado* ‘to read’, *tejemado* ‘to make’).

Obligatory adnominal-person marking is seen in the personal pronouns.

Inessive case compatibility with parts of speech

The inessive case attests:

ADPOSITIONS (*ejs* ‘in’, *vakso* ‘next to’, *kise* ‘for’, *malaso* ‘near’),

RELATIONAL SPATIAL nouns (*lanjo* ‘upper surface’, *potmo* ‘inside’, *pe* ‘end’, *jutko* ‘space between’, *velks* ‘cover’, *koj* ‘custom’, *lad* ‘manner’, *jožo* ‘contact point’, *kunřka* ‘center’, *boka* ‘side’),

BODY PARTS (*ked* ‘hand, arm’, *přa* ‘head’, *šelme* ‘eye’, *piłge* ‘foot, leg’, *sur* ‘finger’, *šedej* ‘heart’, *meřte* ‘chest’, *mel* ‘mind’, *turva* ‘lip’, *pulo* ‘tail’),

MEASUREMENTS (*ser* ‘height’, *kuvalmo* ‘length’, *kele* ‘width’),

SPATIAL SETTINGS (*tarka* ‘place’, *vele* ‘village’, *kudo* ‘house, home’, *pakřa* ‘field’, *eřamo* ‘life’, *řkola* ‘school’, *řabra* neighbor),

APPAREL (*řepe* ‘pocket’, *ořa* ‘sleeve’, *palka* ‘stick’),

PRODUCT OR EMISSION (*val* ‘word’, *śorma* ‘letter’, *moro* ‘song’, *arśema* ‘thought’, *śtix* ‘poem’, *t’ev* ‘work’),

there is minimal use of KIN TERMS (*ćora* ‘son’, *t’eta* ‘father’).

Obligatory adnominal-person marking is seen in presentations of the personal pronouns in grammars, but not here.

Elicative case compatibility with parts of speech

The elative case attests:

ADPOSITIONS (*ejste* ‘out of’, *vakssto* ‘away from’, *malasto* ‘from near by’),

RELATIONAL SPATIAL nouns (*lango* ‘upper surface’, *jutko* ‘space between’, *potmo* ‘inside’, *pe* ‘end’, *č’ire* ‘edge’, *ekše* ‘shelter of’, *jožo* ‘point of contact’, *vel’ks* ‘covering’),

BODY PARTS (*ked* ‘hand, arm’, *p’ra* ‘head’, *kurgo* ‘mouth’, *šel’me* ‘eye’, *čama* ‘face’, *ko’na* ‘forehead’, *śedej* ‘heart’, *pil’ge* ‘foot, leg’, *meš’te* ‘chest’, *ki’rga* ‘throat’),

KIN TERMS and other high-animacy 2-argument referents (*jalga* ‘comrade’, *kaka* ‘child’, *ava* ‘mother’, *oja* ‘close friend’, *ćora* ‘son’, *t’eta* ‘father’, *sazor* ‘little sister’, *pakša* ‘child’, *aluž* ‘dear, fellow’),

SPATIAL SETTINGS (*tarka* ‘place’, *kudo* ‘house, home’, *pize* ‘nest’, *mastor* ‘land, country, earth’, *vel’e* ‘village’, *jon’ks* ‘area, region’, *pire* ‘garden, orchard’),

TEMPORAL SETTINGS (*ška* ‘time’, *č’i* ‘day’, *on* ‘dream’, *pijge* ‘life time’),

APPAREL [containers] (*žepe* ‘pocket’, *sumka* ‘purse’, *karks* ‘belt’, *portfel’* ‘suitcase’, *mešok* ‘bag’, *kotom* ‘haversack’, *čil’im* ‘pipe’, *pojgo* ‘bosom’, *šapka* ‘hat’),

INTRANSITIVE NON-FINITES (*tujemste* ‘to depart’, *mol’emste* ‘to go along’, *jutamsto* ‘to pass’, *ul’emste* ‘to be’, *lišemste* ‘to come out’, *samsto* ‘to arrive’, *erámsto* ‘to live’, *sovamsto* ‘to enter’, *čačomsto* ‘to be born’, *udomsto* ‘to sleep’),

TRANSITIVE NON-FINITES (*il’tamsto* ‘to escort’, *vanomsto* ‘to watch’, *kunsolomsto* ‘to listen’, *panžomsto* ‘to open’, *lovnomsto* ‘to read’, *ńejemste* ‘to see’, *t’ejemste* ‘to make’, *sajemste* ‘to take’, *noldamsto* ‘to release’, *vastomsto* ‘to meet’),

PERSONAL PRONOUNS (*moństen’* ‘[[beginning] with me’),

INTERROGATIVE PRO-N (*mežeste* ‘from what’),

UNIVERSAL QUANTIFIER (*vešemste* ‘of all’).

Obligatory adnominal-person marking is seen in the personal pronouns.

Illative case compatibility with parts of speech

The illative case is attested with NOUNS, QUANTIFIERS, PERSONAL PRONOUNS, ADPOSITIONS, and NON-FINITES in *-m+Oz+*. It is most prominent in RELATIONAL SPATIAL nouns, adpositions (with no paradigmatic nominative forms), body parts, spatial setting, temporal settings, apparel but only slightly attested in personal pronouns.

RELATIONAL SPATIAL nouns (*laygo* ‘upper surface’, *jutko* ‘space between’, *velks* ‘covering’, *pe* ‘end’, *potmo* ‘inside’, *ekše* ‘shelter of’, *boka* ‘side’, *čjře* ‘edge’, *jon* ‘direction’, *potmaks* ‘bottom’),

ADPOSITIONS (*ejs* ‘up to’, *vakss* ‘next to’, *malas* ‘to the vicinity of’),

BODY PARTS (*mel* ‘mind’, *prá* ‘head’, *ked* ‘hand, arm’, *čama* ‘face’, *pil’e* ‘ear’, *šelme* ‘eye’, *kurgo* ‘mouth’, *kirga* ‘throat’, *pil’ge* ‘foot, leg’),

SPATIAL SETTINGS (*tarka* ‘place’, *kudo* ‘house, home’, *pize* ‘nest’, *vele* ‘village’),

APPAREL (*žepe* ‘pocket’, *kartuz* ‘cap with visor’, *karks* ‘belt’, *pojgo* ‘bosom’),

INTRANSITIVE DEVERBAL NOUNS [activity] (*vastoma* ‘to meet’, *samo* ‘to arrive’, *kuloma* ‘to die’, *kortamo* ‘to speak’, *tujema* ‘to depart’, *pramo* ‘to fall’, *eřamo* ‘to live’),

TRANSITIVE DEVERBAL NOUNS [activity] (*putoma* ‘to place’),

TEMPORAL SETTINGS (*čj* ‘day’, *ije* ‘year’, *pinje* ‘life time’, *nedla* ‘week’, *kov* ‘month’, *eřamo* ‘life’),

PRODUCT OR EMISSION (*řev* ‘work’, *val* ‘word’, *vajgel* ‘voice’, *čjře* ‘smell’, *sul’ej* ‘shadow, reflection’),

PERSONAL PRONOUNS (*mońzeń* 1SG, *tońzet* 2SG, *mińzeńek* 1PL),

CARDINAL NUMERAL (*kolmozonok* ‘the three of us’),

MINIMALIZING QUANTIFIER (*škamozot* ‘for you [SG] alone’).

Obligatory adnominal-person marking is seen in the personal pronouns.

Prolative case compatibility with parts of speech

The prolative case is attested with NOUNS, REFLEXIVE-STEM PRONOUNS, ADPOSITIONS, and NON-FINITES in *-mga*. The most prominent of the nouns are RELATIONAL SPATIAL nouns, usually classified in Erzya grammars as postpositions, BODY-PARTS nouns and SPATIAL SETTINGS. The relational spatial nouns can be distinguished from other words used as adpositions by means of a parameter [\pm HAS NOMINATIVE FORM].

ADPOSITIONS (*pačka* ‘through’, *ezga* ‘along’, *vakska* ‘past’, *trokska* ‘across’, *alga* ‘under’, *peřkava* ‘around’, *malava* ‘in the vicinity of’, *valmalga* ‘at the window’),

RELATIONAL SPATIAL nouns (*jutko* ‘space between’, *lango* ‘upper surface’, *potmo* ‘inside’, *velks* ‘covering’, *čire* ‘edge’, *jon* ‘direction’, *prava* ‘top’, *jožo* ‘point of contact’),

REFLEXIVE-STEM PRONOUNS (*eškanzo* 3SG, *eškast* 3PL, *eškan* 1SG, *eškat* 2SG, *eškanok* 1P),

BODY PARTS (*čama* ‘face’, *prá* ‘head’, *rungo* ‘body’, *lavtov* ‘shoulder’, *kúrga* ‘throat’, *mešte* ‘chest’, *koňa* ‘forehead’, *šćoka* ‘cheek’, *šelme* ‘eye’, *kurgo* ‘mouth’, *pil’e* ‘ear’),

SPATIAL SETTINGS (*tarka* ‘place’, *kudo* ‘house, home’, *ki* ‘road’, *šled* ‘path’, *kardaz* ‘yard’, *vařa* ‘burrow’, *ugol* ‘corner’),

TRANSITIVE DEVERBAL NOUNS [activity] (*šnamga* ‘to praise’, *ojmavtomga* ‘to placate’, *ledštamga* ‘to remember’, *idemga* ‘to protect’, *vastomga* ‘to meet’),

INTRANSITIVE DEVERBAL NOUNS [activity] (*eřamga* ‘to live’, *lovomga* ‘to consider’, *jakamga* ‘to visit’).

Obligatory adnominal-person marking is seen in the reflexive-stem pronouns.

Locative case compatibility with parts of speech

The locative case is attested only for some adpositions, relational-spatial nouns and *-Om+O* declensions of transitive verbs. Assuming a division of adpositions from relational spatial nouns, where adpositions do not have nominative-case forms, a further division can be made on the basis of whether the spatial cases are indicated by a locative-ablative-lative-prolative or an inessive-relative-illative-prolative paradigm. It is this former set consisting of stems ending in *-r-*, *-ř-*, *-l-*, *-l’-*, *-n-* that takes the locative-case marker in *-O*.

Translative case compatibility with parts of speech

All instances of the translative case in the possessive declension are minimal. It is represented by individual instances in three types of personal pronouns:

PERSONAL PRONOUNS (*tońkset'* 2SG),

REFLEXIVE-STEM PRONOUNS (*ešket'* 2SG),

REFLEXIVE PERSONAL PRONOUNS (*monšekseń* 1SG).

Obligatory adnominal-person marking is seen in the REFLEXIVE-STEM, REFLEXIVE-PERSONAL and PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

Comparative case compatibility with parts of speech

The comparative case has a very low attestation in the possessive declension. As a marker for the standard of equal comparison it may come as no surprise that the only sublexicon attested with more than two hits was the quantifying expression *pel'eškanzo* 'about half of it' 10 hits, with its sibling adnominal-person cells. By searching for word forms without ambiguous 1sg -*N* and 2sg -*T* readings, indefinite genitive and indefinite nominative plural, respectively, I was further able to discern traces of the REFLEXIVE-STEM and PERSONAL PRONOUN paradigm, as well as the KIN-TERM, BODY-PART and SPATIAL-SETTING sublexica, each with only one hit per word form.

Abessive case compatibility with parts of speech

In examining the word forms attested with morphological marking for both abessive case and adnominal person, it became apparent that the two sublexica with most frequent attestation for this compatibility are representative of the same part of speech, namely, personal pronouns.

PERSONAL PRONOUNS (*tońtemet'* 2SG, *sońtemenze* 3SG, *mońtemeń* 1SG, *sińtemest* 3PL, *tińtemeňk* 2PL, *mińtemeňek* 1PL),

REFLEXIVE-STEM PRONOUNS (*eštemeń* 1SG, *eštemenze* 3SG),

REFLEXIVE PERSONAL PRONOUNS (*sońštemenze* 3SG, *mońštemeń* 1SG, *tońštemet'* 2SG, *sińštemest* 3PL, *mińštemeňek* 1PL, *tińštemeňk* 2PL),

KIN TERMS and other high-animacy 2-argument referents (*mińde* 'husband', *teta* 'father', *ni* 'wife', *ava* 'mother', *azor* 'master').

The abessive case of the possessive declension attests to compatibility with REFLEXIVE PERSONAL PRONOUNS (both simple reflexive-stem and pronoun + reflexive-stem strategies), PERSONAL PRONOUNS and KIN TERMS.

Comitative case compatibility with parts of speech

In the possessive declension the comitative case is compatible with quantifiers alone. These quantifiers can be broken into two subgroups of what is known elsewhere as associative-collective numerals (see Rueter, On quantification in Erzya, forthcoming), i.e. the more common *kolmo+ńe+nze* three_NUM-CARD+COM+POSS-3SG ‘the three of them (discourse anchor + two others)’, and the approximative *śado+ška+ńe+st* hundred_NUM-CARD+COM+POSS-3PL ‘about one hundred of them (discourse anchor + associated others in sum of approximately 100)’. This two-way split is also applicable to the interrogative question word *żaro* ‘how many’, which is rendered in variations of *żaróńenze* ‘how many of them’ and *żaroškańenze* ‘about how many of them’. Additional quantifying pronouns are attested, including *lamo+ńe+st* ‘a lot of them’, *alamo+ńe+st* ‘few of them’ and *żarija+ńe+st* ‘a few of them’, and the minimalizing *śkam+ńe+nze* ‘all by him/her/itself’. The last pronoun, it will be noted, has counter parts without the *ńe* element, see table (4.46), and therefore its attestation for comitative-case compatibility may be due to stem semantics.

Table 4.46 Minimalizing quantifier *śkamo-* and the comitative case in possessive declension

Controller	Simple reflexive stem		personal pronoun + reflexive stem + case + adnominal person		Diminutive Comitative	+	Hits	Total
	Neutral	Hits	?Comitative	Hits				
1	SG	<i>śkamo+n</i>	461	<i>śkam+ńe+ń</i>	7	<i>śkam+ńi+ńe+m</i>	1	469
	PL	<i>śkamo+nok</i>	62	<i>śkam+ńe+ńek</i>	0	<i>śkam+i[ńe+]ńek</i>	0	62
2	SG	<i>śkamo+t</i>	486	<i>śkam+ńe+t'</i>	1	<i>śkam+ńi+ńe+t'</i>	1	488
	PL	<i>śkamo+ńk</i>	37	<i>śkam+ńe +ńk</i>	1		0	38
3	SG	<i>śkamo+nzo</i>	1620	<i>śkam+ńe +nze</i>	113	<i>śkam+ińe+nze</i>	0	1733
	PL	<i>śkamo+st</i>	148	<i>śkam+ńe +st</i>	12	<i>śkam+ińe+st</i>	0	160
Total			2814		134		2	2950

The comitative case of the possessive declension has direct parallels in ASSOCIATIVE-COLLECTIVE NUMERALS and QUANTIFIER PRONOUNS (both interrogative and indefinite, as well as the *śkamo-* minimalizing quantifier ‘[person] alone’) This juncture of case and adnominal-person marking requires obligatory possessive marking.

Indiscernible case

This subsection is reserved for treatment of adnominal-person targets whose morphological case is synchronically indiscernible.

The adposition *marto* ‘with’ is comitative in meaning, whereas its morphological composition is obscure.

ADPOSITIONS (*marto* ‘with’)

The minimalizing quantifier *škamonzo* ‘by his/her/its self’ like the associative-collective numbers with the notion of universal quantifiers seem to function as quantifying appositions (see Rueter, On quantification in Erzya, forthcoming), and although they do demonstrate some rudimentary case forms in the literary corpora (illative, dative, ablative), the 3SG form for what ought to be a nominative equivalent appears in oblique-case form. This oblique-case form, it will be noted, allows for both contextual secondary declension (see section 4.5. ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND SECONDARY DECLENSION), and nominal conjugation.

MINIMALIZING QUANTIFIER (*škamonzo* 3SG)

Partitive-function is attested in some pronouns with plural-person marking, here too there is evidence of rudimentary declension in the literary corpora.

RECIPROCAL PRONOUNS (*vejkest-vejkest* 3PL ‘each other’, *vejkeńek-vejkeńek* 1PL ‘each other’, *vejkenk-vejkenk* 2PL ‘each other’),

SELECTIVE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS (*konast* 3PL ‘which of them’, *konayk* 2PL ‘which of you’, *konanok* 1PL ‘which of us’),

BINARY PRONOUNS (*vejkest ... omboćest* 3PL ‘one of them ... the other’, *vejkenk ... omboćeyk* 2PL ‘one of you ... the other’, *vejkeńek ... omboćeńek* 1PL ‘one of us ... the other’),

UNIVERSAL QUANTIFIERS (*vešemest* 3PL ‘all of them’, *vešemenk* 2PL ‘all of you’, *vešemeńek* 1PL ‘all of us’),

CARDINAL NUMERALS (*kolmost* 3PL ‘the three of them’).

Obligatory adnominal-person marking is observed in the quantifiers.

Interim summary of sublexicon prominence

The inalienability hierarchy appears to correlate most strongly with possessa bearing core-syntax roles. While kinship terms and human body part are most robustly attested with possessor indexing and nominative, genitive or dative case marking, These sublexica are less robust in other case forms. Adpositions and spatial relations gain prominence in the local cases with a representation of body parts, as well. This latter sublexicon is favored over kin terms, which would appear to indicate a reversal of the inalienability hierarchy (cf. 1.1 THE INALIENABILITY HIERARCHY). Pronouns are most apparent in the ablative and abessive, whereas the translative, comparative and comitative/associative collective are minimally attested for any target.

The absence of personal pronouns from the core-case groups is best explained by the fact that the genitive-case personal pronouns are genitive modifiers. As genitive modifiers they might appear with zero marking as subject complements in the focus, i.e. when they are used in belong-to possessive constructions (cf. Heine 1997: 25-26, 29-33; Hamari 2007: 53). In the topic, however, these genitive modifiers are generally subject to speaker-oriented demonstrative derivation, and therefore cannot be dealt with here (see section 4.5. ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND SECONDARY DECLENSION).

4.3.2. Attested parts of speech and sublexica

In the previous section (4.3.1. POSSESSIVE DECLENSION COMPATIBILITY FOR DISTINGUISHING PARTS OF SPEECH), we have introduced various sublexica displaying compatibility with possessive declension in the thirteen cases attested for possessive declension in section 4.2. AFFIXES. This subsection will consist of the cumulative enumeration of all sublexica indicated with a focus on the attestation of easily delimited pronouns. Then, we will continue with the inspection of prominent representatives of the various sublexica (by merit of frequency), for variation patterns in attestation with lexical versus morphological adnominal-person marking in the illative case.

Nouns

Noun sublexica were attested for nine non-ambiguous case forms. Although non-ambiguous nominative singular reading is attested for the 3SG *-OzO* morpheme, nominative plural as well as genitive singular and plural readings of its *-OnzO* counterpart dictated a conflation of nominative and genitive-case attestation in this treatise. The locative case attested in the relational-spatial noun *jon* ‘direction’ rendered in *jon+o* ‘in [X’s] direction’ also requires manual disambiguation when a controller/possessor index is present. No comitative case forms were attested for nouns in the possessive declension.

Below is a list of sublexica associated with possessive declension, in which two sets, proper-name topic derivations and associative elder nouns, both require obligatory adnominal-person marking. The list is given in conformity with the accessibility hierarchy, whereas the sublexicon ARGUMENT ACTORS FROM TRANSITIVE VERBS has been set off as a prominent set of non-kin two-argument nouns, which will serve, in future treatises of the language, as distinct referents available for so-called kin-term interpretations (see also section 4.4.).

PROPER NAMES (*luda* ‘Lyuda’, *matra* ‘Matrya’, *kata* ‘Katya’, *šima* ‘Sima’, *vad'im* ‘Vad-im’, *vera* ‘Vera’)

PROPER-NAME TOPIC DERIVATIONS [in *núze*] (*doškeńize* ‘Doshke's wife’, *listarńize* ‘Listar's wife’, *murzańize* ‘Murza's wife’, *šomańize* ‘Syoma's wife’) – This set requires obligatory possessor indexing

ASSOCIATIVE ELDER NOUNS (*avideń* ‘my mother and those with her’) – This set requires obligatory possessor indexing

KIN TERMS and other high-animacy 2-argument referents (*aluž* ‘dear, fellow’, *ava* ‘mother’, *azor* ‘master’, *baba* ‘grandmother’, *ćora* ‘son’, *jalga* ‘comrade’, *kaka* ‘child’, *lela* ‘elder brother, uncle’, *mird'e* ‘husband’, *ni* ‘wife’, *oja* ‘close friend’, *pakša* ‘child’, *paťa* ‘elder sister, aunt’, *sazor* ‘little sister’, *tejt'er* ‘daughter’, *leťa* ‘father’)

ARGUMENT ACTORS FROM TRANSITIVE VERBS (*id'ica* ‘to protect’, *il'ica* ‘to escort’, *kir'd'ica* ‘to hold’, *kuč'ica* ‘to send’, *nejića* ‘to see’, *polavtića* ‘to replace’, *teji* ‘to make’, *tonavtića* ‘to teach’, *uč'ica* ‘to wait’, *uskića* ‘to haul’, *vanstića* ‘to guard’, *večkića* ‘to love’, *vefića* ‘to lead’)

BODY PARTS (*čama* ‘face’, *čer* ‘hair’, *ked* ‘hand, arm’, *kel* ‘tongue’, *kirga* ‘throat’, *końa* ‘forehead’, *kurgo* ‘mouth’, *lavtov* ‘shoulder’, *mešte* ‘chest’, *pej* ‘tooth’, *peke* ‘stomach’, *pil'e* ‘ear’, *pil'ge* ‘foot, leg’, *pra* ‘head; top’, *pulo* ‘tail’, *rungo* ‘body’, *sakal* ‘beard’, *sudo* ‘nose’, *sur* ‘finger’, *sedej* ‘heart’, *sel'me* ‘eye’, *štoka* ‘cheek’, *turva* ‘lip’)

MEASUREMENTS (*ašo* ‘white’, *ečke* ‘thickness’, *kele* ‘width’, *kuvalmo* ‘length’, *lembe* ‘warmth’, *pit'ne* ‘value’, *paro* ‘virtue’, *sal* ‘salt’, *ser* ‘height’, *stalmo* ‘weight’, *šupavč'i* ‘wealth’, *tańst'* ‘flavor’)

PHYSICAL OR MENTAL STATE (*jožo* ‘feeling, contact point’, *kež* ‘fury’, *koj* ‘custom’, *mel* ‘mind’, *obuća* ‘character’, *ojme* ‘soul’, *vij* ‘strength’)

PRODUCT OR EMISSION (*ašema* ‘thought’, *čije* ‘smell’, *moro* ‘song’, *poem* ‘poem’, *tev* ‘work’, *struja* ‘ray’, *sulej* ‘shadow, reflection’, *šorma* ‘letter’, *šlix* ‘poem’, *šum* ‘noise’, *vajgel* ‘voice’, *val* ‘word’)

APPAREL (*čilim* ‘pipe’, *karks* ‘belt’, *kartuz* ‘cap with visor’, *kotom* ‘haversack’, *mešok* ‘bag’, *oršamo* ‘clothing’, *paća* ‘kerchief’, *oža* ‘sleeve’, *palka* ‘stick’, *panar* ‘shirt’, *pidžak* ‘coat’, *platiya* ‘dress’, *pojgo* ‘bosom’, *portfel* ‘suitcase’, *sumka* ‘purse’, *šive* ‘collar’, *šapka* ‘hat’, *žepe* ‘pocket’)

TOOLS (*kajga* ‘violin’, *krandaz* ‘wagon’, *lokšo* ‘whip’, *pe'luma* ‘scythe’, *penč* ‘spoon’, *piks* ‘rope’, *šalgo* ‘pike’, *užere* ‘ax’)

DOMESTIC ANIMALS (*ajgor* ‘stallion’, *alaša* ‘horse’, *atakuš* ‘rooster’, *kiska* ‘dog’, *lišme* ‘horse’, *psaka* ‘cat’, *skal* ‘cow’, *vašo* ‘foal’)

RELATIONAL SPATIAL NOUNS (*alks* ‘base’, *boka* ‘side’, *čije* ‘edge’, *ekše* ‘shelter of’, *ikelks* ‘front’, *jožo* ‘contact point’, *jon* ‘direction’, *jutko* ‘space between’, *kunška* ‘center’, *lanjo* ‘upper surface’, *pe* ‘end’, *potmaks* ‘bottom’, *potmo* ‘inside’, *udalks* ‘back’, *velks* ‘covering’)

SPATIAL SETTINGS (*e'amo* ‘life’, *jonks* ‘area, region’, *kardaz* ‘yard’, *kudo* ‘house, home’, *mastor* ‘land, country, earth’, *pakša* ‘field’, *pire* ‘garden, orchard’, *pize* ‘nest’, *šled* ‘path’, *škola* ‘school’, *šabra* ‘neighbor’, *tarka* ‘place’, *ugol* ‘corner’, *va'á* ‘burrow’, *ve'le* ‘village’)

TEMPORAL SETTINGS (*čij* ‘day’, *e'amo* ‘life’, *ije* ‘year’, *kov* ‘month’, *ned'la* ‘week’, *on* ‘dream’, *pijge* ‘life time’, *ška* ‘time’)

GROUP OF MEMBERSHIP (*brigada* ‘brigade’, *raške* ‘nation’, *šemija* ‘family’, *ušmo* ‘army’)

Adnominal person marking in the nominative and genitive cases follows three out of four possible patterns. The patterns of adnominal-person marking include: (i) simple possessive declension (by far the commonest pattern); (ii) genitive-case personal pronoun + possessum in possessive declension, and (iii) genitive-case personal pronoun + possessum in definite declension. It appears that any instances of the hypothetical pattern (iv) genitive-case personal pronoun + possessum in indefinite declension, is indicative of an incomplete (compound) word.

Adpositions

Adpositions are attested for six cases: ablative, inessive, elative, illative, prolativ and locative with the comitative-function adposition *marto* ‘with’ in an indiscernible case. Certain adpositions require obligatory possessor indexing, e.g. *ejstedenze* ‘of him/her/it’ (note extended exponence in the case marking), *tenze* ‘to him/her/it’ (counter part of dative form personal pronouns). Several spatial adpositions are also attested as spatial adverbs, e.g. words such as *vakska* ‘past’ can be used with implicit complements. Hence this is an example of a two-argument word which does not require an explicit complement, and in this way might be compared with transitive verbs that can also appear with implicit object readings, “to read”, for example (cf. Rueter 2007).

ADPOSITIONS (*alo* ‘under’, *aldo* ‘from under’, *alga* ‘under’; *ejs* ‘into’, *ejse* ‘in’, *ejste* ‘out of’, *ezga* ‘along’; *ikel'de* ‘from in front of’, *karšos* ‘against’; *kořas* ‘according to’; *kise* ‘for’; *malas* ‘into the vicinity of’, *malaso* ‘near’, *malasto* ‘from near by’, *malava* ‘in the vicinity of’; *marto* ‘with’; *pačka* ‘through’, *pel'de* ‘from’, *peřkava* ‘around’, *pil'galdo* ‘from under foot’), *te-* ‘to’, *vakss* ‘next to’, *vakssso* ‘next to’, *vakssto* ‘away from’, *vakska* ‘past’; *udaldo* ‘from behind’, *trokska* ‘across’, *val'malga* ‘at the window’)

Non-finites

The non-finite morpheme is subject to limited declension, as indicated by the attestation of a 7-slot paradigm represented in (52).

- (52) +*Om+s*, +*Om+O*, +*Om+dO*, +*Om+sO*, +*Om+stO*, +*Om+ga*, +*Om+ks*
 +INF+ILL, +INF+LOC, +INF+ABL, +INF+INE, +INF+ELA, +INF+PROL, +INF+TRNSL

Due to the defectivity of the inflectional paradigm of this derivation type and its conformity with relative-space adverb/adposition paradigm patterns, i.e. the dearth of core-case slots versus abundance of local-case slots, see (53–54), and the syntactic functions these two word types share, a parallel might be drawn between them.

- (53) *al+ov*, *al+o*, *al+do*, *al+ga*,
 under_POP+LAT, under_POP+LOC, under_POP+ABL, under_POP+PROL,
al+ks
 under-side_POP+TRNSL-N

- (54) *vaks+s*, *vaks+so*, *vaks+sto*, *vaks+ka*
 next-to_POP+ILL, next-to_POP+INE, next-to_POP+ELA, next-to_POP+PROL

INTRANSITIVE DEVERBAL (*bažam-* ‘to intend to’, *čačom-* ‘to be born’, *eřam-* ‘to live’, *jakam-* ‘to walk, to visit’ *jovtńem-* ‘to tell’, *jutam-* ‘to pass’, *kemem-* ‘to believe’, *kor-tam-* ‘to speak’, *kulom-* ‘to die’, *leksěm-* ‘to breathe’, *lišem-* ‘to come out’, *mol'em-* ‘to move, to go’, *pejdem-* ‘to laugh’, *pramo* ‘to fall’, *putom-* ‘to place’, *sam-* ‘to arrive’, *šimem-* ‘to drink’, *tujem-* ‘to depart’, *udom-* ‘to sleep’, *sovam-* ‘to enter’, *ul'em-* ‘to be’)

TRANSITIVE DEVERBAL (*čarķodem-* ‘to comprehend’, *idem-* ‘to protect’, *il'tam-* ‘to escort’, *kunsolom-* ‘to listen’, *lovom-* ‘to consider’, *lovnom-* ‘to read’, *ledšřam-* ‘to remember’, *mujem-* ‘to find’, *ńejem-* ‘to see’, *noldam-* ‘to release’, *ojmavtom-* ‘to placate’, *panžom-* ‘to open’, *pańem-* ‘to drive; to bake’, *pradom-* ‘to finish’, *sajem-* ‘to take’, *šnam-* ‘to praise’, *šřavtom-* ‘to raise’, *tejem-* ‘to make’, *tonavtom-* ‘to teach’, *učom-* ‘to wait’, *vastom-* ‘to meet’, *vanom-* ‘to watch’, *veřam-* ‘to lead’)

The non-finite morpheme in Erzya might readily be seen as an abstract noun with little if any parameters with which to set it apart from other nouns. The *-Oms* formative, most commonly referred to as the illative infinitive or first infinitive, has parallels in two different forms: the illative and the translative. All semantic uses of the seven cases can be paralleled with the cases of other common nouns.

Quantifiers

In the definition of case, the 3SG forms *-OzO* and *-OnzO* have been rigorously used to establish paradigms of certain words. Thus there are cardinal numerals and universal quantifiers which attest case variations, such as nominative, illative, elative, etc. The partitive function of these quantifiers is shared by the selective interrogative pronouns in *kona* ‘which’, the reciprocal-function recursive numeral “one” *vejke* with possessive declension, and the binary-function selectors ‘one of X ... and ... the other of X’. At the same time there are associative-collective numerals and their corresponding pronouns (interrogative and indefinite) (see Rueter On quantification in Erzya, forthcoming), which have been analyzed as possessive-declension comitative forms. Finally, the minimalizing quantifiers, which, like the associative-collectives, exhibit the presence of separate cases, an indication of grammaticalization. Unlike the cardinal numerals and universal quantifiers, the associative-collectives and minimalizing quantifiers require obligatory controller indexing.

CARDINAL NUMERALS (*kolmost* 3PL ‘the three of them’, *kolmozonok* ‘the three of us’),

UNIVERSAL QUANTIFIER (*vešemeze* ‘all told’, *vešemest* 3PL ‘all of them’, *vešemenjk* 2PL ‘all of you’, *vešemeńek* 1PL ‘all of us’),

Table 4.47 Universal pronoun *vešeme* ‘all’ in attested case slots of the possessive paradigms

		NOM		ABL		ILL		ELA	
		Form	Hits	Form	Hits	Form	Hits	Form	Hits
1SG		<i>vešemem</i>	1	NA		NA		NA	
1PL		<i>vešemeńek</i>	3	NA		NA		NA	
2SG		<i>vešemet'</i>	NA	NA		NA		NA	
2PL		<i>vešemeńk</i>	1	NA		<i>vešemezeńk</i>	2	NA	
3SG	NOM.SG	<i>vešemeze</i>	335	NA		NA		NA	
	OTHERS	<i>vešemenze</i>	5	NA		NA		NA	
3PL		<i>vešemest</i>	34	<i>vešemedest</i>	3	<i>vešemezest</i>	1	<i>vešemstest</i>	1

SELECTIVE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS (*konast* 3PL ‘which of them’, *konajk* 2PL ‘which of you’, *konanok* 1PL ‘which of us’),

Table 4.48 Selective interrogative/relative pronoun with partitive reference associated with plural person indexing

		NOM/GEN		ILL	
		Form	Hits	Form	Hits
1	PL	<i>konanok</i>	9		
2	PL	<i>konajk</i>	22		
3	PL	<i>konast</i>	16	<i>konazost</i>	1

RECIPROCAL PRONOUNS (*vejkest-vejkest* 3PL ‘each other’, *vejkeńek-vejkeńek* 1PL ‘each other’, *vejkeńk-vejkeńk* 2PL ‘each other’),

BINARY PRONOUNS (*vejkest ... omboćest* 3PL ‘one of them ... the other’, *vejkeńk ... omboćeńk* 2PL ‘one of you ... the other’, *vejkeńek ... omboćeńek* 1PL ‘one of us ... the other’),

ASSOCIATIVE-COLLECTIVE NUMERALS (*kolmońest* 3PL ‘the three of them’, *kolmońenze* ‘the three of them (lit. the three of him/her/it)’),

MINIMALIZING QUANTIFIER (*škamonzo* 3SG, *škamozot* ‘for you [SG] alone’, *škamodonzot* ‘3SG. ABL.’).

Pronouns

Pronouns attesting possessive declension can be divided into 3 groups. There are the personal pronouns with 11 cases, and their reflexive/intensive pronoun counterparts with only seven (nominative, genitive, dative, ablative, translative, comparative and abessive). Next come the interrogative pronoun *meže* ‘what’, which can be possessed. Finally, come the definite and indefinite pronouns, such as *istamo* ‘like this/that’, *erva* ‘each’, *lija* ‘other’, etc., which according to Agafonova (2000: 136–141) can take all forms of the possessive declension, but this is, in fact, a matter of secondary declension. Data on personal and reflexive/intensive pronouns is of importance in that it allows us to observe correlations we will want to look back on in section 4.5. ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND SECONDARY DECLENSION.

PERSONAL PRONOUNS, OBLIQUE CASES (e.g. ABL: *soúdenze* 3SG, *moúdeń* 1SG, *toúdet* 2SG, *miúdeńek* 1PL, *súndest* 3PL, *túndenk* 2PL),

Table 4.49a Dative-case personal pronouns, reflexive/intensive pronouns and reflexive/intensive stems (Majority corpus)

P	PRON	Adposition, e.g. <i>tenze</i> ‘to him/her/it’		REFL/intensive PRON		REFL/intensive stem		Total		
		Plain	Clitic	Plain	Clitic	Plain	Clitic		Plain	Clitic
1	SG	6248	346	(9915	136)	62	NA	300	37	6993 (17,044)
	PL	1798	90	(2136	NA)	7	7	102	13	2017 (4153)
2	SG	3513	196	(6243	NA)	43	16	264	35	4067 (10,310)
	PL	764	50	(1745	NA)	5	2	47	5	873 (2618)
3	SG	3397	156	(11,625	NA)	72	23	1141	94	4883 (16,508)
	PL	986	57	(2753	NA)	17	NA	213	20	1293 (4046)
Total		16,706	895	(34,417	136)	206	48	2067	204	20,126 (54,679)

It is necessary that we compare tables (4.49a) and (4.49b). The former contains data derived from the majority corpus of over 4.5 million words, but it has one pair of cells which cannot be taken into consideration (ambiguous cells darkened), namely, the 1SG cells of the adposition *ten* ‘to me’. This cell has a homonym in the genitive form of the singular proximal demonstrative pronoun, which is also realized as *ten*. Therefore we must utilize the data available from the minority corpus of approximately 745,000 words, which has been semi-automatically parsed and manually disambiguated. Most salient is the fact that the corpora attest no instances of the adposition *tenze* ‘to him/her/it’ with an enclitic. The figures in table (4.49a) have additional sums in parentheses, which indicate extremely high occurrence of unstressed-pronoun usage in 3P, whereas contrastive stressed pronouns are preferred for “us” with 1P.

Table 4.49b Dative-case personal pronouns, reflexive/intensive pronouns and reflexive/intensive stems (Minority corpus)

P	PRON, e.g. <i>sońenze</i> ‘to him/her/it’		Adposition, e.g. <i>t'enze</i> ‘to him/her/it’		REFL/intensive PRON, e.g. <i>sońštenze</i> ‘to his / her / its self’		REFL/intensive stem, e.g. <i>eštenze</i> ‘to his / her / its self’		Total	
	Plain	Clitic	Plain	Clitic	Plain	Clitic	Plain	Clitic		
1	SG	1015	56	520	NA	13	NA	35	5	1644
	PL	331	29	264	NA	1	4	14	5	648
2	SG	610	24	908	NA	14	3	45	9	1613
	PL	99	11	254	NA	NA	NA	4	NA	368
3	SG	570	30	1997	NA	10	2	228	24	2861
	PL	13	NA	538	NA	2	NA	40	4	597
Total		2638	150	4481	0	40	9	366	47	7731

In comparing tables (4.49a-b) with (4.50–51) we notice the absence of an unstressed pronoun space altogether for the abessive slot which is 3P and 2P oriented in the dative slot. The dative indeed provides an interesting variation, namely, the “giving case”, as it were, proves to be more of a “receiving” 1SG-oriented case in the contrastive, stressed pronoun, whereas the unstressed, non-contrastive pronouns show 3SG orientation, cf. statistics on the genitive-case pronouns in table (4.76).

Table 4.50 Personal pronouns attested for abessive case in possessive declension personal pronoun + case + adnominal person

Controller			Hits	Enclitic attestation	Hits	Total
1	SG	<i>mon+ťeme+ń</i>	35		0	35
	PL	<i>miń+ťeme+ńek</i>	6	<i>miń+ťeme+ńek+kak</i>	2	8
2	SG	<i>toń+ťeme+ť</i>	62		0	62
	PL	<i>tjń+ťeme+ŋk</i>	11	<i>tjń+ťeme+ŋk+kak</i>	3	14
3	SG	<i>soń+ťeme+nze</i>	50	<i>soń+ťeme+nze+jak</i>	5	55
	PL	<i>sjń+ťeme+st</i>	31	<i>sjń+ťeme+st+kak</i>	3	34
Total			195		13	208

REFLEXIVE-STEM PRONOUNS (e.g. PROL: *eškanzo* 3SG, *eškast* 3PL, *eškan* 1SG, *eškat* 2SG, *eškanok* 1P),

REFLEXIVE PERSONAL PRONOUNS (e.g. ABE: *sońštenze* 3SG, *mońšteněń* 1SG, *tońšteněť* 2SG, *sjńštenest* 3PL, *mińšteněnek* 1PL, *tjńšteněŋk* 2PL),

Table 4.51 Reflexive personal pronouns attested for abessive case in possessive declension

Controller		Simple reflexive	personal pronoun + reflexive stem + case + adnominal person	Hits	Enclitic attestation	Hits	Total
		stem	person				
1	SG	<i>eś+łeme+ń ~ eše+vłeme+ń</i>	<i>mon+ś+łeme+ń ~ mon+ś+łeme+m</i>	2	95	0	97
	PL		<i>miń+ś+łeme+ńek</i>	0	26	3	29
2	SG		<i>ton+ś+łeme+ł'</i>	0	93	0	93
	PL		<i>tjń+ś+łeme+ɲk</i>	0	12	0	12
3	SG	<i>eś+łeme+nze</i>	<i>son+ś+łeme+nze</i>	1	172	17	190
	PL		<i>śjń+ś+łeme+st</i>	0	58	4	62
Total				3	456	24	483

INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN (*meżeze* ‘what of his/hers/its’)

Table 4.52 Noun-focus interrogative pronouns in the possessive declension

		NOM/GEN	Hits	ELA	Hits
		Form		Form	
1	SG	<i>meżem</i>	22	NA	
	PL	<i>meżeńek</i>	22	NA	
2	SG	<i>meżeł'</i>	50	NA	
	PL	<i>meżeɲk</i>	15	NA	
	SG	NOM.SG	<i>meżeze</i>	53	NA
3	OTHER	<i>meżenze</i>	22	<i>meżestenze</i>	1
	PL	<i>meżest</i>	38	NA	

4.3.3. Drawing conclusions

The parts of speech associated with the possessive declension can be broken into groups on the basis of case compatibility. Some cases appear to have nearly exclusive association with various parts of speech, i.e. the nominative coding and noun, comparative, translative and abessive with personal pronouns and reflexive pronouns, comitative and quantifiers, locative with adpositions and relational spatial nouns. But it appears the inessive, elative, illative and prolicative cases are open to the greater part of these word groups. Therefore it is interesting to see how different parts of speech behave in a spatial case, such as the illative.

Tables (4.53–58) have been set up to indicate varieties of adnominal-person marking, namely, in tables with sub-letter “a” we will have a word with possessive declension marking immediately following the illative-case morpheme, and in tables with sub-letter “b” there will be a personal pronoun in the genitive preceding a head with indefinite il-

lative marking. As we move from high frequency to low, we will note that the tendency is for the sub-letter “a” type STEM + CX + POSS to surpass the occurrence levels of the sub-letter “b” type PRON-PERS.GEN + STEM+ CX. Each table has four columns indicating position of either the individual word form or the genitive-case pronoun and word form. The first column indicates how many times the item appears as the singular element of a sentence, whereas the subsequent three columns assume that there are at least two elements in the sentence. The second column indicates how many times the item appears sentence initially; the third column indicates how many times it appears medially (there are at least 3 elements in this type of sentence), and the fourth column indicates how many times the item occurs sentence-finally. At the end and below there is an additional column and row for providing tallies in bold-face.

Table 4.53a Possessive declension illative *lang*s ‘onto’ Pop+Poss

POR		Single-word	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
1	SG	0	8	245	93	346
	PL	1	9	93	30	133
2	SG	0	5	212	72	289
	PL	0	0	35	13	48
3	SG	0	53	1085	406	1544
	PL	0	17	419	116	552
Total		1	92	2089	730	2912

Table 4.53b Possessive declension illative *lang*s ‘onto’ Genitive Pronoun + Pop+Poss

POR		Single-phrase	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
1	SG	2	32	131	56	221
	PL	1	4	55	17	77
2	SG	1	25	58	20	104
	PL	0	5	21	4	30
3	SG	0	74	129	69	272
	PL	0	33	75	18	126
Total		4	173	469	184	830

In tables (4.53a) we can see that the adposition *lang*s ‘onto, at’ has a pronounced difference between 1SG and 3SG attestation in medial position, whereas table (4.53b) actually indicates a higher instance of 1SG in the same medial position. If we compare this ratio with the adposition *ejs* ‘into, up to’ illustrated in tables (4.54a-b) we will notice that the contrast even in the medial position alone illustrates a difference in person orientation, i.e. in table (4.53a) a 1 to 5 ratio correlates to a 1 to 10 ratio in table (4.54a). Both (4.53a) and (4.54a) have relatively low attestation for sentence-initial or final position, whereas their counterparts in (4.53b) and (4.54b) show higher ratio in initial and final position.

Table 4.54a Possessive declension illative *ejs* ‘into; up to’ Pop+Poss

POR		Single-word	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
1	SG	0	1	55	16	72
	PL	0	0	11	5	16
2	SG	0	1	52	18	71
	PL	0	0	4	3	7
3	SG	0	60	552	190	802
	PL	0	16	187	44	247
Total		0	78	861	276	1215

Table 4.54b Possessive declension illative *ejs* ‘into; up to’ Genitive Pronoun + Pop+Poss

POR		Single-phrase	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
1	SG	0	2	14	2	18
	PL	0	0	2	3	5
2	SG	0	1	8	2	11
	PL	0	0	1	0	1
3	SG	0	13	27	15	55
	PL	0	9	16	5	30
Total		0	25	68	27	120

As in the preceding relational spatial derivation *langs* ‘onto’, and adposition *ejs* ‘into; up to’, the word *tarka* ‘place’ illustrates the same kind of behavior: 3SG prominence in the morphological expression of person, but unlike them this noun exhibits less contrast between sentence position.

Table 4.55a Possessive declension illative *tarka* ‘place’ Noun+Poss

POR		Single-word	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
1	SG	0	4	31	15	50
	PL	0	0	6	2	8
2	SG	1	3	35	18	57
	PL	0	0	5	1	6
3	SG	0	50	303	190	543
	PL	0	11	90	31	132
Total		1	68	470	257	796

Table 4.55b Possessive declension illative *tarka* ‘place’ Genitive Pronoun + Noun+Poss

POR		Single-phrase	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
1	SG	0	3	13	6	22
	PL	0	0	1	0	1
2	SG	0	3	6	5	14
	PL	0	0	1	0	1
3	SG	0	15	20	5	40
	PL	0	5	13	5	23
Total		0	26	54	21	101

The deverbal form *sams* ‘to arrive’ in tables (4.56a-b) provides us with a point in time expression, something different from the spatial dimensions offered heretofore. While the total frequency is much lower than the spatial expression, we suddenly notice a lower contrast between person and position. We can see that the ratios for person and position in table (4.56a) are reminiscent of the ratios illustrated in the sub-letter “b” tables (4.53–55), whereas table (4.56b) seems already too low for pertinent reading.

Table 4.56a Possessive declension illative *sams* ‘to arrive’ Noun+Poss

POR		Single-word	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
1	SG	0	11	18	3	32
	PL	0	4	10	1	15
2	SG	0	9	16	4	29
	PL	0	2	4	0	6
3	SG	0	33	38	16	87
	PL	0	11	22	3	36
Total		0	70	108	27	205

Table 4.56b Possessive declension illative *sams* ‘to arrive’ Genitive Pronoun + Noun+Poss

POR		Single-phrase	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
1	SG	0	0	4	2	6
	PL	0	1	0	0	1
2	SG	0	1	0	0	1
	PL	0	0	0	0	0
3	SG	0	1	8	0	9
	PL	0	2	1	0	3
Total		0	5	13	2	20

Unlike other charts, table (4.57a) has no lexical counterpart for marking person, and nearly all attestations are for 3SG. This is symptomatic of the fact that the word form *čič+ze+nze* day_N+ILL+POSS-3SG ‘per day’ is actually an expression of duration. This usage deviates, however, from what was seen in table (4.56a-b) where the deverbal is also an expression of time, namely, *sams* ‘to arrive’ is not usually conceived as a process but as a completed event. Also the absence of a 3PL reading contrasted with the nearly monolithic 3SG tells us that we might be dealing with an element unique to all kinds of contexts predictable in literature – an item or phenomenon unique to the universe (see 4.2.3.1.3. THIRD PERSON).

Table 4.57a Possessive declension illative *čĭ* ‘day; sun’ Noun+Poss

POR		Single-word	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
1	SG	0	0	2	0	2
	PL	0	0	0	1	1
2	SG	0	0	0	0	0
	PL	0	0	0	0	0
3	SG	0	8	50	4	62
	PL	0	0	0	0	0
Total		0	8	52	5	65

The word *žepe* ‘pocket’, in tables (4.58a-b), is grouped in the sublexicon for apparel, but we might choose to reanalyze it as a container, which would correlate better with the illative usage. For the first time the 3PL reading surpasses that of the 3SG. The correlation between 1SG and 2SG in medial position is close to that found in all the other tables. The word *žepe* ‘pocket’ is also shown to correlate in its ratios with other expressions of non-temporal space.

Table 4.58a Possessive declension illative *žepe* ‘pocket’ Noun+Poss

POR		Single-word	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
1	SG	0	0	10	2	12
	PL	0	0	1	0	1
2	SG	0	0	10	4	14
	PL	0	0	0	1	1
3	SG	0	0	9	2	11
	PL	0	2	61	34	97
Total		0	2	91	43	136

Table 4.58b Possessive declension illative *žepe* ‘pocket’ Genitive Pronoun + Noun+Poss

POR		Single-phrase	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
1	SG	0	0	1	1	2
	PL	0	0	0	0	0
2	SG	0	1	2	0	3
	PL	0	0	0	0	0
3	SG	0	0	0	0	0
	PL	0	1	0	0	1
Total		0	2	3	1	6

The compatibility of noun, adposition and non-finite stems with illative-case possessive declension indicates variation in ratios for person, position and morphological versus lexical marking of adnominal person, all of which point to a high preference for morphological marking of person. The complete absence of a lexical marking strategy for the item *čĭ* ‘day’ would appear to indicate the necessity of more work in the matter

	GEN/ OBL	NOM	DAT	ABL	ELA	ILL	INE	PROL	COMP	ABE	TRNSL	LOC	COM	Total
POP	NA	NA	NA	+	+	+	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5
min Q	+	NA	+	+	NA	+	NA	4						
Q	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	+	NA	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	+	4
Grp	+	+	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4
Tmp	+	+	NA	NA	+	+	NA	4						
Inter Pron	+	+	+	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4
UQ	+	+	NA	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3
Dom	+	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3
Meas	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3
PRP	+	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3
Top deriv	+	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3
Ac-tors	+	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3
Tools	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2
Phys	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2
Total	25	20	17	13	13	12	8	7	6	3	3	2	1	130

(Short notation used in table (4.59): App = apparel; Assoc elder = associative elder term; Body = body parts; Meas = measurements; Dom = domestic animals; Em = product or emission; Grp = group of membership; Inter Pron = Interrogative pronoun; min Q = minimalizing quantifier; Phys = physical and mental states; Rel = relational spatial; Spat = spatial setting; Tmp = temporal setting; Top deriv = proper-name Topic derivation; UQ = universal quantifier)

Obligatory adnominal-person marking was attested in four parts of speech, nouns, quantifiers, pronouns and adpositions. In the grammars items with obligatory adnominal-person marking are usually shown to have smaller morphological case inventories, for variation (consult table 4.59), otherwise refer to listing of sublexica with simple examples.

4.4. Paradigm defectivity in Erzya possessor indexing

4.4.1. Background

Erzya grammarians of the past century have used the notion KIN TERM to help explain the special marking used on genitive and dative-case possessa in contexts where 1SG and 2SG cross-referential morphemes would be expected, see special forms below. Typologically speaking, kin terms as possessa could conceivably be the targets of special forms, as they appear extremely high (cf. 1.1 THE INALIENABILITY HIERACHY), forwarded in Siewierska (2004: 143) and provided in the hierarchies of section 1. (See also Rijkhof, *inalienables*, 2002: 86–92.) This in combination with the saliency of the 1st and 2nd person pronouns (cf. 1.2 SALIENCE HIERARCHIES OF ACCESSIBILITY) might be reflected in morphological marking (cf. 1.3 THE ACCESSIBILITY MARKING SCALE).

Genitive

-*Oń* +POSS-1SG>[KIN]GEN

-*Oť* +POSS-2SG>[KIN]GEN

Dative

-*Neń* +POSS-1SG>[KIN]DAT

-*Teń* +POSS-2SG>[KIN]DAT

Morphologically speaking, we can immediately observe that the morphemes used in 1SG contexts are identical to the forms of their corresponding cases in the indefinite declension. A little knowledge of Erzya language variation in the marking of the oblique cases of the definite declension, e.g. the Shoksha-Drakino dialect groups, as well as some of the Sura subdialects, specifically Shugurova (see Tsygankin 1961: 347), will show a definite singular genitive form in *-ť* and even definite singular dative forms in *-ťi(j)*. The question then presents itself as to why these forms should be treated as anything other than what they appear to be. Is there any reason that a possessum representing a referent from the top of the animacy hierarchy (kin term) might be allowed to go unmarked when its controller/possessor is from even higher on the same hierarchy, i.e. the pronouns are higher up on the hierarchy than nouns, and it is the 1SG and 2SG we are talking of here.

In the Erzya sub-dialect spoken in Orkino, originally documented in Shakhmatov's collection of folklore and grammatical description, the notion of KIN TERM (Shakhmatov 1910: 797–798) is first forwarded to explain variation in the choice of genitive and dative forms of the possessa marked with 1SG and 2SG cross-referential morphemes. Shakhmatov provides a minimal pair cross-referential marking strategy for the word *ava* ‘lady; mother’, by which the object-marked possessum with 2SG cross-referential marking varies in form according to the parametric feature [\pm KIN] of the referent, see (55a-b).

- (55) a. *mon* *večk+sa* *ava+t*
 I_PRON-PERS-1SG.NOM love_V+IND.PRES.PRED-1SG>3SG **lady_N+POSS-2SG**
 (Shakhmatov 1910: 798) ‘I love your old lady.’
- b. *mon* *večk+sa* *ava+t'*
 I_PRON-PERS-1SG.NOM love_V+IND.PRES.PRED-1SG>3SG **mother_N+POSS-2SG>[KIN]GEN**
 (Shakhmatov 1910: 798) ‘I love your mother.’

Upon establishing the parametric distinction [\pm KIN], Shakhmatov then exhibits a set of kin terms featuring special genitive and dative forms in the cross-referential person markers of the 1SG and 2SG. This parametric distinction has been retained in subsequent descriptions of the language, although there is some variation in its attestation. Evsev'ev (1963: 111–112), for example, gives a slightly slacker notion of kin or someone closely associated/related to the speaker in conjunction with the genitive-case possessa of the 1SG possessor, but leaves the 2SG marking open to all nouns. This would imply that the well-travelled Evsev'ev, originally from a Chuvash-Erzya home in Malye Karmaly in present Chuvashia (Erzya: *čarmun*) where an Alatyř'-type dialect is spoken, cf. Keresztes 1999: 23, would have been familiar with both forms to some extent and that he would have recognized the alleged 2SG forms as consistent with definite markers. Thus Evsev'ev includes the form *lišme+tėń* with the contextual gloss *horse_N+POSS-2SG>DAT*, even though a second gloss *horse_N+ DAT.DEF.SG* would have well suited it in sentence-initial topic position.

- (56) *lišme+tėń* *maks+ńń* *pińeme+t'*
horse_N+POSS-2SG>DAT give_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-1SG **oats_N+NOM.PL**
horse_N+DAT.DET.SG
 (Evsev'ev 1963: 112) ‘The/your horse, I gave [him] oats.’

The contention is that Evsev'ev did not recognize the 2SG forms for anything other than a definite form, something belonging to the shared knowledge of the speaker and the addressee. Varieties of the Erzya language where the special 2SG forms of the genitive and dative possessive declensions of the literary language might be homonymous with corresponding forms of the definite declension can be attested in the Shugurova dialect (a Sura-dialect, cf. Tsygankin 1961: 294–395) and the Drakinski dialect (Drakino-Shoksha, cf. Yakushkin 1961: 197–293). At this time, it will serve us well to familiarize ourselves with a well documented variant of an Alatyř' dialect spoken in Nizhnep'yanski.

4.4.2. A dialect attesting [\pm NUMBER] and [\pm KIN] parameters

The Nizhnep'yanski dialect attests parametric features in its possessive declension including [\pm NB] and [\pm KIN] (cf. Nad'kin 1968: 3–198). Nad'kin describes a dialect in which all singular persons share a possessive declension distinction observed in 3SG of the literary language, i.e. they distinguish NOM.SG from NOM.PL, GEN.SG, GEN.PL, see table (4.60).

Table 4.60 Nizhnep'yanski dialect forms for *kudo* 'house', *skal* 'cow' and *tejt'er* 'daughter' possessa in the nominative and genitive of the possessive declension (preliminary)

POR		Possessa			
		NOM.SG	NOM.PL	GEN.SG	GEN.PL
		<i>kudo+m</i>	<i>kudo+n</i>	<i>kudo+n</i>	<i>kudo+n</i>
1	SG	<i>skal+om</i>	<i>skal+un</i>	<i>skal+un</i>	<i>skal+un</i>
		<i>tejt'er+em</i>	<i>tejt'er+iń</i>	<i>tejt'er+iń</i>	<i>tejt'er+iń</i>
		<i>kudo+t</i>	<i>kudo+nt</i>	<i>kudo+nt</i>	<i>kudo+nt</i>
2	SG	<i>skal+ot</i>	<i>skal+unt</i>	<i>skal+unt</i>	<i>skal+unt</i>
		<i>tejt'er+et'</i>	<i>tejt'er+ińt'</i>	<i>tejt'er+ińt'</i>	<i>tejt'er+ińt'</i>
		<i>kudo+zO</i>	<i>kudo+nzo</i>	<i>kudo+nzo</i>	<i>kudo+nzo</i>
3	SG	<i>skal+zO</i>	<i>skal+unzo</i>	<i>skal+unzo</i>	<i>skal+unzo</i>
		<i>tejt'er+ze</i>	<i>tejt'er+inze</i>	<i>tejt'er+inze</i>	<i>tejt'er+inze</i>

(cf. Nad'kin 1968: 60–61)

According to Nad'kin, these genitive singular forms are homonymous with the genitive and nominative plural forms. Hence, although we will have to take Nad'kin's word for this interpretation in the example for the 1SG *kudo+n* house/home_{N+POSS-1SG}, it becomes obvious in the second and third persons that the forms *skal+unt* cow_{N+POSS-2SG} and *tejt'er+inze* daughter/girl_{N+POSS-3SG}, which without context might be glossed as plural possessa, are used here to indicate singular possessa. The interpretation *skal+unt* cow_{N+POSS-2SG>GEN.SG} emanates from the fact that it is used in a possessive construction to mark the possessor and the possessum of said construction is in turn marked with a 3SG cross-referential marker in *-OzO* rendering *odar+zO* udder_{N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG}. The interpretation *tejt'er+inze* daughter/girl_{N+POSS-3SG>GEN.SG} is licensed by object marking on the finite verb, indicative of a singular object.

- (57) *kudo+n* *vaks+ne*
 house_N+POSS-1SG>GEN next-to_POP+INE
 (Nad'kin 1968: 60) 'next to my house'
- (58) *skal+unt* *odar+zo*
 house_N+POSS-2SG>GEN udder_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG
 (Nad'kin 1968: 60) 'your cow's udder'
- (59) *jomavt+iže* *tejtér+inze*
 lose_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG>3SG daughter_N+POSS-3SG>GEN
 (Nad'kin 1968: 60) 'he lost his daughter'

With regard to kin terms, Nad'kin (1968: 61) specifies that the term *paťa* 'older sister' has two different forms as an object when there is cross-referential marking for a 1SG possessor. Whereas the explicit marking of the forms *paťa+n̄* older-sister_N+POSS-1SG>[KIN]GEN.SG and *paťa+n* older-sister_N+POSS-1SG>KIN.GEN.PL are accompanied by object cross-referencing on the verbs, grammatical number in the possessa of the 2SG and 3SG is implicit and disambiguation is dependent upon the object cross-referencing strategy on the finite verbs, see (60–62).

- (60) a. *večk+sak* *paťa+n̄*
 love_V+IND.PRES.PRED-2SG>3SG older-sister_N+POSS-1SG>[KIN]GEN.SG
 (Nad'kin 1968: 61) 'you love my older sister'
- b. *večk+s̄i* *paťa+n*
 love_V+IND.PRES.PRED-2SG>3PL older-sister_N+POSS-1SG>GEN.PL
 (Nad'kin 1968: 61) 'you love my older sister'
- (61) a. *večk+sazo* *paťa+nt*
 love_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG>3SG older-sister_N+POSS-2SG>GEN
 (Nad'kin 1968: 61) 'he loves your older sister'
- b. *večk+s̄ižé* *paťa+nt*
 love_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG>3PL older-sister_N+POSS-2SG>GEN
 (Nad'kin 1968: 61) 'he loves your older sisters'
- (62) a. *večk+sak* *paťa+nzo*
 love_V+IND.PRES.PRED-2SG>3SG older-sister_N+POSS-3SG>GEN
 (Nad'kin 1968: 61) 'you love his/her older sister'
- b. *večk+s̄i* *paťa+nzo*
 love_V+IND.PRES.PRED-2SG>3PL older-sister_N+POSS-3SG>GEN
 (Nad'kin 1968: 61) 'you love his/her older sisters'

It can therefore be assumed that in the Nizhnep'yanski sub-dialect, and perhaps other variants of the language, kin-term parameters of the genitive case apply only to the 1SG marking strategy, and then only when the referent is distinct – singular. In a language variant where special 1SG marking strategies become apparent only at the juncture of two high points of the animacy hierarchy, i.e. a 1SG possessor, on the one hand, and a distinct/singular kin-term referent, on the other, such that KIN TERM might best be regarded as a two-argument noun, such as those found in deverbal ACTOR NAMES, one might readily conclude that genitive forms, which are identical to those in the indefinite declension, actually are indefinite declension forms.

4.4.3. Distinct common-noun referents indefinite genitive forms in literature

Hypothetically, one would need to find contexts in which the possessum referent is high on the animacy hierarchy and distinct. One would, preferably, also hope to find contexts which were not 1SG-oriented. In the language of Erzya literature such contexts can be attested, see (63–64).

- (63) *viŕste meŕ'em+s, lubaša a pek*
 direct_A.ELA say_V+INF+ILL Lyubasha_PRP.NOM.SG not_PRT-NEG much_ADV
večk+el'ize sŕe paŕa+nŕ,
 love_V.IND.PRETII.PRED-3SG>3SG old_A.ABS elder-sister_N+GEN.DEF.SG
še+ks a pek
 that_PRON-DEM-DIST+TRNSL not_PRT-NEG much_ADV
kunsolo+š+kak ejse+nze. viška
 listen-to_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG+CLT in_POP.INE+POSS-3SG. litte_A.ABS
ping+ste teŕa+zo l'ija+sto
 age_N+ELA father_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG other_PRON-DEF+ELA
kadn+il'ize ašŕe+m+e sŕe paŕa+nŕ
 leave_V+IND.PRETII.PRED-3SG>3SG sit_V+INF+LOC old_A.ABS elder-sister_N+GEN
ejkakš+t+ne+nŕ marto.
 child_N+PL+DEF.PL+GEN with_POP.
 (Abramov 1974: 54) 'Frankly speaking, Lyubasha didn't like the [her] much, [and] therefore she didn't listen to her much. In [Lyuba's] childhood her[Lyuba's] father would leave her[Lyuba's] to sit with [Lyuba's] aunt's children on occasion.'

- (64) *markin+t+ne+ńeń* *ašće+m+e* *šabra+ń* *vele+ste*
 Markin_PRP+PL+DEF.PL+DAT sit_V+INF+LOC neighbor_N.GEN village_N+ELA
tago *sa+ś* *šeróga+ń* *ava+nzo*
 again_ADV come_V.IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG Seryoga_PRP+GEN mother_N+POSS-3SG
sazor+oń *tejtér+eś* *frośa*.
 little-sister_N+GEN daughter_N+NOM.DEF.SG Frosya_PRP.NOM.SG.
 (Martynov 1984:) ‘Once again, Frosya, the daughter of Seryoga’s mother’s little sister came from the neighboring village to stay with the Markins.’

In both examples indefinite genitive forms are used on nouns indicating kin[+DISTINCT] referents, which contextually would have been possessa eliciting 3SG controller/possessor or indexing. So what were the bases for Shakhmatov’s hypothesis?

4.4.4. Orkino

Shakhmatov (1910) introduced a [±KIN] parameter for distinguishing the semantics involved in morphological variation attested for kin-term possessa. In the subdialect spoken in Orkino, definite genitive singular marking in the oblique cases involves the morpheme *-Ońt’* and, in addition to that, there are also *-Ot’* markers attested for the 2SG possessor-index genitive form of kin terms. Shakhmatov was able to enumerate several genitive-form possessa of 2SG possessors, e.g. *avat’* ‘your mother’s’, *ta’at’* ‘your father’s’, *pa’at’* ‘your elder sister’s’, *suva’at’* ‘your match-maker’s’, *sazyryt’* ‘your little sister’s’, *sazyrnyt’* ‘your little sister’s’, *la’at’* ‘your elder brother’s’, *mačkat’* ‘your mother-in-law’s’, *ba’kat’* ‘your father-in-law’s’, but the ones actually indicated in context are of specific interest. They are given in tables (4.61), below, with reference to the three syntactic functions of the genitive as discussed in section (4.1. CORE CASES), i.e. object of the finite verb, adposition complement and marker of the possessor.

Table 4.61 The 2SG possessor and kin terms in Orkino according to Shakhmatov

Gloss	NOM.SG	GEN.SG (object)	GEN.SG (adposition complement)	GEN.SG (possessor)
mother	<i>avat</i>	<i>avat’</i>	<i>avat’</i>	NA
lady [-KIN]	<i>avat</i>	<i>avat</i>	NA	NA
father	<i>ta’at</i>	<i>ta’at’</i>	<i>ta’at’</i>	NA
son-in-law	<i>sodamyt</i>	<i>sodamyt’</i>	<i>sodamyt’</i>	NA
husband’s younger brother or brother-in-law	NA	NA	<i>al’ńit’</i>	NA
younger brother	NA	NA	<i>bratyt’</i>	NA
son	NA	<i>ćorat’</i>	NA	NA
elder brother	NA	NA	NA	<i>la’at’</i>

(cf Shakhmatov 1910: 797–798)

The two tables provide deviant illustrations of the [\pm KIN] parameter. The illustration of the 2SG table (4.61) gives one the impression that there actually might be evidence in support of Shakhmatov's proposal for a [\pm KIN] parameter. The enumeration for kin terms with 2SG marking seems to provide a maximal variety, but the same cannot be said of the 1SG enumeration. The 1SG enumeration as seen in table (4.62) may be further delimited with a parameter indicating either [+ELDER-THAN-1SG] or [+DISTINCT], which would parallel the findings of Nad'kin in the Nizhnepr'yanski dialect. Thus the question to be answered is do so-called kin-term distinctions attested by Shakhmatov for 2SG genitive marking strategies correlate to those of 1SG. Contexts provided by Shakhmatov do exemplify patterns for the three functions of the genitive, but there is no reference made to possessa, i.e. all instances given are inadvertently singular.

Table 4.62 The 1SG possessor and kin terms in Orkino according to Shakhmatov

Gloss	NOM.SG	GEN.SG (object)	GEN.SG (adposition complement)	GEN.SG (possessor)	GEN (indefinite)
mother	<i>avam</i>	<i>avań</i>	<i>avań ~ avam</i>	NA	<i>avań</i>
father	<i>ta'am</i>	<i>ta'ań</i>	<i>ta'ań</i>	NA	<i>ta'ań</i>
elder sister	NA	<i>pa'ań</i>	NA	NA	NA
grandmother	NA	<i>babań</i>	NA	NA	NA
elder brother	NA	<i>la'ań</i>	NA	NA	<i>la'ań</i>
grandfather	<i>pokščam</i>	NA	NA	NA	<i>pokščań</i>
elder brother (diminutive)	NA	NA	<i>pa'kam</i>	NA	NA
mother (diminutive)	NA	NA	<i>afkam</i>	NA	<i>afkań</i>
younger sister	NA	<i>sazyrym</i>	NA	NA	NA
younger brother	NA	<i>bratym</i>	NA	NA	NA
wife	NA	<i>kožajkam</i>	NA	NA	NA
child	NA	<i>äjd'im</i>	NA	NA	NA
son-in-law	NA	<i>sodamym</i>	NA	NA	na

Shakhmatov indicates that the genitive forms of some kin-term possessa with 1SG cross-reference marking are homonymous with that of the indefinite genitive forms of the same words. In the table it will be observed that such a statement only applies to referents with an [+ELDER-THAN-1SG/DISTINCT] feature in the role of object, whereas the syntactic role of adpositional complement appears to be volatile with regard to this parameter, and the role of possessor is fully unattested.

Inspection of the dative forms indicates that they can be given parallel treatment, i.e. 2SG forms in *-t'ij*, as indicated by Shakhmatov, have no [\pm ELDER-THAN-POSSESSOR] parameter. Thus we observe *ta'a+ta'ij* father_N-KIN+POSS-2SG>DAT 'to your father', *ava+ta'ij* mother_N-KIN+POSS-2SG>DAT, *suva.xa+ta'ij* match-maker/mother-in-law_N-KIN+POSS-2SG>DAT, and *sazyr+y't'ij* little-sister_N-KIN+POSS-2SG>DAT. In the presentation of 1SG possessa, it will be noted, the word forms quoted are taken from the kin terms adhering to the [+ELDER-THAN-POSSESSOR] / [+SINGULAR/DISTINCT] parameter, e.g. *ava+ńiń* mother_N-KIN-ELDER+POSS-1SG>DAT, *pa'a+ńiń* elder-sister_N-KIN-ELDER+POSS-1SG>DAT, *afka+ńiń*

mother_{N-KIN-ELDER.DIM+POSS-1SG>DAT}, and *tatka+niń* father_{N-KIN-ELDER.DIM+POSS-1SG>DAT}. Hence, in Orkino the 1SG markers for kin terms with the feature [+ELDER-THAN-POSSESSOR] in both genitive and dative are attested as being the homonymous with those of the indefinite genitive and dative respectively, see discussion in section 4.2.1.1. CORE CASES.

4.4.5. Recent grammatical presentation of the possessive declension

In the most recent morphology of the Erzya language, Adushkina (2000: 89–102) provides a description of the possessive declension. She provides possessive declension charts for all persons (here I will cite only three), which indicate an absence of genitive and dative forms in all but the 3SG declension, see tables (4.63a-c).

Table 4.63a Possessor indexing on the possessum (possessor = *moń* ‘1sg’, and possessa in *valma* ‘window’, *vele* ‘village’)

	Singular		Plural	
NOM	<i>valma+m</i>	<i>vele+m</i>	<i>valma+n</i>	<i>vele+ń</i>
GEN	–	–	–	–
DAT	–	–	–	–
ABL	<i>valma+do+n</i>			<i>vele+de+ń</i>
INE	<i>valma+so+n</i>			<i>vele+se+ń</i>
ELA	<i>valma+sto+n</i>			<i>vele+ste+ń</i>
ILL	<i>valma+zo+n</i>			<i>vele+ze+ń</i>
PROL	<i>valma+va+n</i>			<i>vele+va+ń</i>
COMP	<i>valma+ška+n</i>			<i>vele+ška+ń</i>
ABE	<i>valma+vtomo+n</i>			<i>vele+vteme+ń</i>

(Adushkina 2000: 97)

Table 4.63b Possessor indexing on the possessum (possessor = *toń* ‘2sg’, and possessa in *vakan* ‘bowl’, *pań* ‘barrel’)

NOM	<i>vakan+ot</i>	<i>pań+et</i>
GEN	–	–
DAT	–	–
ABL	<i>vakan+do+t</i>	<i>pań+de+t</i>
INE	<i>vakan+so+t</i>	<i>pań+se+t</i>
ELA	<i>vakan+sto+t</i>	<i>pań+ste+t</i>
ILL	<i>vakan+oz+ot</i>	<i>pań+ez+et</i>
PROL	<i>vakan+ga+t</i>	<i>pań+ga+t</i>
COMP	<i>vakan+ška+t</i>	<i>pań+ška+t</i>
ABE	<i>vakan+tomo+t</i>	<i>pań+teme+t</i>

(Adushkina 2000: 97–98)

While the dash in the 1SG and 2SG genitive and dative cannot be understood as ditto marking – that would mean that the genitive and dative are construed as homonyms of the nominative – we can assume that there is a conflation of nominative and genitive case forms in all but the 3SG.

Table 4.63c Possessor indexing on the possessum (possessor = *sonze* ‘3sg’, and possessa in *lom* ‘meadow’, *lem* ‘name’)

NOM	<i>lom+ozo</i>	<i>lem+eze</i>	<i>lom+onzo</i>	<i>lem+enze</i>
GEN		<i>lom+onzo</i>		<i>lem+enze</i>
DAT		<i>lom+onsteń</i>		<i>lem+ensteń</i>
ABL		<i>lom+do+nzo</i>		<i>lem+de+nze</i>
INE		<i>lom+so+nzo</i>		<i>lem+se+nze</i>
ELA		<i>lom+sto+nzo</i>		<i>lem+ste+nze</i>
ILL		<i>lom+oz+onzo</i>		<i>lem+ez+enze</i>
PROL		<i>lom+ga+nzo</i>		<i>lem+ga+nzo</i>
COMP		<i>lom+ška+nzo</i>		<i>lem+ška+nzo</i>
ABE		<i>lom+tomo+nzo</i>		<i>lem+leme+nze</i>

(Adushkina 2000: 98)

This conflation of nominative and genitive is best observed in table (4.64), where Adushkina, illustrates the ability of Erzya to indicate possessor function in words with possessor indexing. Here she also indicates a distinction for grammatical number in the 1SG marking of the possessor, i.e. *-Om* indicates singular and *-ON* plural possessa.

Table 4.64 Distinction for grammatical number of possessed possessa apparent only in 1SG marking

POR		Possessor-function possessum	Possessum of possessum	Possessor-function possessa	Possessum of possessa
1	SG	<i>fejter+em</i>		<i>fejter+eń</i>	
	PL	<i>fejter+eńek</i>		<i>fejter+eńek</i>	
2	SG	<i>fejter+et'</i>	<i>vajgel+eze</i>	<i>fejter+et'</i>	<i>oršamo+st</i>
	PL	<i>fejter+eńk</i>		<i>fejter+eńk</i>	
3	SG	<i>fejter+enze</i>		<i>fejter+enze</i>	
	PL	<i>fejter+est</i>		<i>fejter+est</i>	
		‘daughter’	voice_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG	‘daughter’	clothing_N+POSS-3PL

(cf. Adushkina 2000: 94)

Since the word *tejtér* ‘daughter; girl’ might readily be construed as depicting a two-argument referent, a kin term, Adushkina's demonstration of grammatical number appears to be in conflict with the special genitive forms of the 1SG and 2SG possessor indices, see restatement of these.

Genitive

-*On* +POSS-1SG>[KIN]GEN

-*Ot* +POSS-2SG>[KIN]GEN

Attestation of one disambiguous gloss (*tetà* ‘father’)

Treatment of kin-term phenomena is extremely limited in the grammars of the language, which is probably due to the disparity of the referent sets indicated by the 1SG and 2SG persons. Hence, where proper nouns are sufficiently distinct to allow for indefinite-marking strategies (see section 4.2.1.1.), kin terms, especially distinct ones, can also allow for indefinite marking, even when the contextual controller/possessor is lower on the animacy hierarchy than 1SG.

The majority corpus attests to a high frequency of indefinite genitive forms of the two distinct two-argument kin terms *ava* ‘mother’ 1222 hits and *tetà* ‘father’ 932 hits, the former of which can also be glossed as a one-argument noun ‘woman’. Whereas the word form *tetà+ń* father_N+GEN has high-frequency attestation with postpositions and possessa, e.g. *tetà+ń marto* ‘with [my] father’ 51 hits, *tetà+ń čijenze* ‘the smell of [my] father’ 20 hits, there are only 3 hits for the sequence *tetà+m marto* ‘with my father’, which is the highest attestation of a nominative-equivalent form with a function attributed to the genitive. Interestingly enough these three hits come in publications written by speakers of Alatyř'-type dialects (Doronin 1993; Bargova 1997). Could these be instances of over-zealous proof-readers with different dialect backgrounds, or should they be considered hypercorrect forms attributed to the authors themselves? The special 2SG genitive form in *tetà+t* has a slightly lower attestation, e.g. *tetà+t marto* ‘with your/the father’ 20 hits, *tetà+t čijenze* ‘the smell of your/the father’ 14 hits, and there are only 2 hits for the sequence *tetà+t marto* ‘with your father’, both from Doronin (1996, 2001), who, in this instance, would be using the forms of his own dialect, which do not feature a special 2SG form.

In conclusion

The [\pm KIN] parameter, hypothesized by Shakhmatov in 1910 in his treatise of the Orkino dialect, is still attested in grammar writing of today. Whereas both 1SG and 2SG marking can be readily associated with indefinite and dialect-form definite declensions, respectively, there are still matters to be researched. To what extent can nouns indicating distinct, high-animacy referents yet not proper nouns or specifically kinship terms be declined in indefinite word forms? What are the actual dialects and sub-dialects

where genitive and dative marking receive special declensional forms? Are the same distributions applicable to 1SG genitive marking applicable to the dative as well? How can these differences/similarities in distribution be compared to those of 2SG, which, as we have noted, is not attested in all the same language variants as those where special 1SG marking obtains.

4.5. Adnominal syntax and secondary declension

This section describes the morphological phenomena involved in Erzya secondary declension. The discussion developed sets out to illustrate that, whereas various modifiers can become main items in an NP when the contextually predictable head noun is dropped, there are two basic strategies for marking MWN (modifiers without nouns): (i) ZERO marking, and (ii) SOD (Speaker-Oriented Demonstrative) marking. Grammars of Erzya present both of these strategies to different degrees, but usually their treatment of MWN is delivered in several separate sections with no connections drawn. The treatment of genitive-case personal pronouns has been associated with SOD strategies in Evsev'ev's grammar of Erzya (1963[1928/29]), whereas Agafonova (2000) presents personal pronouns and reflexive/intensive pronouns with ZERO marking. Upon closer scrutiny it becomes apparent that Agafonova's reflexive/intensive pronoun charts include members from two different paradigms; the reflexive/intensive paradigms are intermingled with genitive + SOD strategies. (Cf. GMYa 1962 I: 232; GMYa 1980: 267; Mosin & Bajushkin 1983: 116; Pall 1996: 18-19; Zaicz 2006) Thus after presenting background information on secondary declension, and demonstrating that both marking strategies are attested with locative modifiers, I provide an overview on the compatibility of various modifier types with secondary declension. And this I follow up with a morphological inspection of the genitive-form personal and reflexive/intensive pronouns as rendered in MWN or secondary-declension forms.

4.5.1. Background

In my article ON QUANTIFICATION IN THE ERZYA LANGUAGE (Rueter, forthcoming), I have noted that Erzya nominal-syntax structure entails symmetric marking of case. Case marking in turn requires the choice of one declension type from a selection of three, whereupon it is rendered with postposed orientation on the phrase-final head, or in the absence of this constituent, on the final constituent of the phrase. Thus, in addition to the simple noun phrase consisting of only a head noun, the Erzya NP can also be represented by numerous combinations of premodifiers with and without an NP head. First let us examine the simple head-noun NPS and NPS with single modifier, see (65).

- (65) *kudo+ś*
house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
'the/that/this house/home'

Head nouns can be preceded by single modifiers representing adjectives, quantifiers, spatial modifiers and determiners.

Adjective + Noun + Cx

- (66) *pokš kudo+ś*
big_A.ABS house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
'the/that/this big house'

- (67) *jakśteře kudo+ś*
red_A.ABS house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
'the/that/this red house'

Quantifying modifier + Noun + Cx

- (68) *źaro vina+ś*
that-much_Q.ABS liquor_N+NOM.DEF.SG
'the much liquor'

Spatial modifier + Noun + Cx

- (69) *oš+so kudo+ś*
town_N+INE house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
'the/that/this house in town'

Determiner + Noun + Cx

- (70) *išťamo kudo+ś*
such_PRO-DEF.ABS house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
'such a house'

- (71) *te kudo+ś*
this_PRO-DEM-PROX.ABS house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
'this house'

- (72) *ńe* *kudo+t'ńe*
 this_PRO-DEM-PROX.ABS house/home_N+PL+DEF.PL.NOM
 'these houses'

Genitive modifier + Noun + Cx

- (73) a. *vania+ń* *kudo+ś*
 Vanya_PRP+GEN house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
 'Vanya's house'
- b. *čuvto+ń* *kudo+ś*
 wood_N+GEN house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
 'the/that/this wooden house'
- c. *sonze* *kudo+ś*
 he/she/it_PRON-PERS-3SG.GEN.POSS-3SG house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
 'the/that/this wooden house'

In examples (66–73) we can observe simple modifier structures in:

NP = N, A + N, Q + N, SPATIAL + N, DET + N and GEN-ATTR + N

Alternate ordering of head and modifier(s) will induce the addressee to perceive a complete sentence, although in context NP looking sequences can also be interpreted as complete sentences. Hence the upper-case letters in (76–77) indicate non-neutral, perhaps focus, predicate position.

- (74) *kudo+ś* *pokš*
 house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG big_A.NOM.SG
 'the/that/this house [is] big.'

- (75) *kudo+ś* *oš+so*
 house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG town_N+INE
 'the/that/this house [is] in town.'

- (76) *POKŠ* *kudo+ś*
 big_A.NOM.SG house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
 '[now] this house is BIG'

- (77) *OŠ+SO* *kudo+ś*
 town_N+INE house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
 '[now] this house in IN TOWN'

Let us now observe a combination including both spatial and adjectival modifiers. Here it will be observed that the adjective directly precedes the NP head, and that the spatial modifier is also preposed in Erzya, preceding the adjective. The inessive marking in the locative modifier is indicative of an inessive NP *ošso* ‘in town’ that premodifies the noun phrase *pokš kudoś* ‘the big house’.

- (78) *oš+so* *pokš* *kudo+ś*
 town_N+INE big_A.ABS house/home_N+NOM.DEF.SG
 ‘the/that/this big house in town’

Noun Phrase Constituent Ordering

The basic constituent ordering in the noun phrase can be outlined as determiner + quantifier + adjective + noun. This outline may appear oversimplified, but it seems to address a large portion of noun phrases in the Erzya corpora. Thus symmetry in NP expansion strategies goes generally uncompromised, i.e. the modified NPs can be further modified with quantifiers, determiners and even NPS or adpositional phrases in modifier-case forms (e.g. GEN, INE, ELA, PROL, COMP, ABE, TRNSL, LOC). Adjectives can co-occur with quantifiers or determiners or both, see (79–81).

- (79) a. *kavto* *pokš* *kudo+so*
 two_NUM-CARD.ABS big_A.ABS house/home_N+INE
 ‘in two big houses’
- b. *kavto* *pokš* *kudo+t*ńe+se*
 two_NUM-CARD.ABS big_A.ABS house/home_N+PL+DEF.PL+INE
 ‘in the/those/these two big houses’
- (80) a. *te* *pokš* *kudo+so+ńt’*
 this_PRON-DET.ABS big_A.ABS house/home_N+INE+DEF.SG
 ‘in this big house’
- b. *ńe* *pokš* *kudo+t*ńe+se*
 these_PRON-DET-PL.ABS big_A.ABS house/home_N+PL+DEF.PL+INE
 ‘in these big houses’
- *(81)a. *te* *kavto* *pokš* *kudo+so+ńt’*
 this_PRON-DET-SG.ABS two_NUM-CARD.ABS big_A.ABS house/home_N+INE+DEF.SG
 ‘in the/that/this two big house’

- b. *ńe* *kavto* *pokš* *kudo+t'ńe+se*
 these_PRON-DET-PL.ABS two_NUM-CARD.ABS big_A.ABS house/home_N+PL+DEF.PL+INE
 ‘in the/those/these two big houses’

In the examples above the grammatical category of number has an influence on the distribution of determiners, quantifiers and the remainder of the NP. A numeral (two and above) can co-occur with a head in an indefinite declension form, or it can appear with a head in a definite declension form, i.e. the NP *kavto kudoso* ‘in two houses’ differs from the NP *kavto kudońńese* ‘in the two houses’ in matters of definiteness. Since definiteness is an entailment of demonstrative pronouns, it will be noted that quantifiers indicating numbers larger than one can only co-occur with the plural demonstrative pronoun *ńe* ‘these (anaphoric)’ and not its singular counterpart *tě* ‘this’, see (81).

Another qualification of constituent order addresses the genitive attributes, usually indicating material and spatio-temporal source, purpose, and meronymy. Both adjectives and genitive attributes can be used separately as modifiers, but when they co-occur, the symmetric strategy assists greatly in disambiguation, see (82–85), i.e. the ordering *koške tumoń* ‘dry oak’ sets off a premodifying genitive attribute NP to *peŋgt'* ‘fire-wood’ while the reverse ordering *tumoń koške* ‘of oak, dry’ indicates that the head has two modifiers – an adjective *koške* ‘dry’ and a preceding genitive attribute *tumoń* ‘of oak’ NP. Let it suffice that we observe the following examples, derived from (Kolyadyonkov 1940: 24, 52; Bartens 1999: 111).

- (82) *tumo+ń* *peŋgt'*
 oak_N+GEN fire-wood_N+ PL.NOM
 ‘oak(en) fire-wood’
- (83) *koške* *peŋgt'*
 dry_A.ABS fire-wood_N+ PL.NOM
 ‘dry fire-wood’
- (84) *koške* *tumo+ń* *peŋgt'*
 dry_A.ABS oak_N+GEN fire-wood_N+PL.NOM
 ‘fire-wood cut from dry oak’
- (85) *tumo+ń* *koške* *peŋgt'*
 oak_N+GEN dry_A.ABS fire-wood_N+ PL.NOM
 ‘dry oak fire-wood’

In a similar vein we can attest other NP modifiers and their placement before the head noun in examples from Mikhail Bryzhinski, see (86–87).

- (86) *kečaj* *son+ś+kak* *ež*
 Kechai_N-PRP.NOM.SG himself_PRON-PERS-3SG+REFL+CLT not_V-NEG-PRET.I.PRED-3SG
soda, *ko+v* *eskel'i*
 know_V.CONNEG where_PRON-INTER-SPATIAL+LAT stride_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG
viř+ga+ňt', *seřej* *dj* *veté* *-koto*
 forest_N+PROL+DEF.SG, tall_A.ABS and_CONJ five_NUM-CARD.ABS **six**_NUM-CARD.ABS
sel'eň *ečkelma+so* *śado* *ije+ň*
fathom_N+GEN **thickness**_N+INE **hundred**_NUM-CARD.ABS **year**_N+GEN
čuvt+tt+ne+ň *jutko+va*
tree_N+PL+DET.PL+GEN among/between_POP+PROL
 (Bryzhinski, M. Kirdazht manuscript) 'Even Kechai himself didn't know where he
 was walking through the forest, among the tall trees five [or] six fathoms around and
 hundreds of years old.'
- (87) *kolmo* *čič'* *tīnejk*
 three_NUM-CARD.ABS day_N+PL.NOM you_PRON-PERS-2PL.DAT.POSS-2PL
ež *pečtavo* *alaša+ň* *pulo+ň*
 not_V-NEG-PRET.I.PRED-3SG cross_V.CONNEG **horse**_N+GEN **tail**_N+GEN
kele+se *te* *lej+eš!*
width_N+INE **this**_PRON-DEM.ABS **river**_N+NOM.DET.SG
 (Bryzhinski, M. 1983: 90) 'For three days you have not managed to cross this river that
 is the breadth of a horse's tail!'

Hence we can assume that in addition to the following ordering for NPS, there might also be room for double or triple embedding. Thus the simplex NP consists of possible determiners, quantifiers and adjectives, and a complex NP might consist of an NP embedded in either an NP or adpositional phrase in one of the modifier cases. Evidence from Bryzhinski's texts indicates even more complexity, see below.

Simple NP = (DETERMINER) (QUANTIFIER) (ADJECTIVE) NOUN

NP with single embedding

= NP [GEN | INE | ELA | PROL | COMP | ABE | TRNSL] + NP

= Adpositional phrase[INE | ELA | PROL | COMP | LOC] + NP

NP with double embedding

veté-koto sel'eň ečkelma+so čuvto

= NP[NP[NP[Q N_[GEN]] + N_[INE]] + N]

alaša+ň pulo+ň kele+se te lej

= NP[NP[NP[NP[N_[GEN]] + N_[GEN]] + N_[INE]] + DET N]

Symmetric case marking and head noun deletion

Case marking symmetry in Erzya, it must be stressed, is so persistent that the markers might also be viewed as enclitics. If, for example, the NP head is contextually predictable, it may also be deleted, whereupon the modifier closest to the NP-final position becomes the new locus for case marking, see (88), and compare with (66–73), above. Other attestations of this phenomenon, known here as SECONDARY DECLENSION, can be found in (Evsev'ev 1963: 51, 101–103, 126, 129–132, 134–135, 162; Collinder 1969: 231; Imaikina 1996: 27–32; Grebneva 2000: 107–108; Agafonova 2000: 139–141, 143–145; Ermuškin 2004: 54; Keresztes 2005: 369–379; Zaicz 2006: 194–197 (who even mentions, without example, tertiary declension); Gil WALS feature/chapter 61 ADJECTIVES WITHOUT NOUNS.)

Adjective + Ø + Cx

- (88) a. *pokš+oš*
 big_A.ABS+N.NOM.DEF.SG
 (Bargova 1996: 68) ‘the/that/this big one’

- b. *jakštěre+ś*
 red_A.ABS+N.NOM.DEF.SG
 (Lukyanov 1955: 9) ‘the/that/this red one’

Quantifying modifier + Ø + Cx

- c. *žaro+ś*
 that-much_Q.ABS liquor_N+NOM.DEF.SG
 (Abramov 1980: 18) ‘that much’

Spatial modifier + Ø + Cx

- d. *oš+so+t+ńe*
 town_N+INE+N.PL+ DEF.PL.NOM
 (Abramov 1988: 359) ‘the/those/these ones in town’

Determiner + Ø + Cx

- e. *ištamo+ś*
 such_PRO-DEF.ABS+N.NOM.DEF.SG
 (Bryzhinski I. 1955: 74) ‘one such ...’

*f. *té+ś*

this_PRO-DEM-PROX.ABS+N.NOM.DEF.SG

‘this one’

Genitive modifier + Ø + Cx

*g. *vańa+ń+eś*

Vanya_PRP+GEN+N.NOM.DEF.SG

‘Vanya's one’

*h. *čuvto+ń+eś*

wood_N+GEN+N.NOM.DEF.SG

‘the/that/this wooden one’

i. *sonze+ś*

he/she/it_PRON-PERS-3SG.GEN.POSS-3SG+N.NOM.DEF.SG

(Kirillov 1987: 74) ‘his/hers/its’

As can be observed in (88) predictable, definite head-noun deletion is not an option attested for all NP types. While head deletion affords *ístamo* ‘such’ the role of definite pronoun, an analogous solution is not available for the demonstrative pronoun *te* ‘this’. The indefinite genitive modifiers, although unable to accommodate for this specific variety of predictable head-noun deletion, have means to compensate, e.g. the genitive-form modifier fuses orthographically with the equivalent of the speaker-oriented (distal) demonstrative pronoun *še* ‘that’ before undergoing declension, which is not always demonstrative in type (cf. Ermuškin 2004: 57; Evsev'ev 1963: 126). (See also 89–92 and section 4.2.1.1. GENITIVE.)

Genitive modifier + Pron-dem-dist + Ø + Cx

(89) *tíšaj+eń+še+ś*

Tishai_PRP+GEN+PRON-DEM-DIST+N.NOM.DEF.SG

(Abramov 1989: 78) ‘the/that/this one of Tishai's’

(90) *čuvto+ń+še+ś*

wood_N+GEN+PRON-DEM-DIST+N.NOM.DEF.SG

(Zhuravlov 1999: 119) ‘the/that/this [wooden one | one of wood]’

(91) *ked'eze* *ćora+ń+še+d'e* *staka*

hand_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG man_N+GEN+PRON-DEM-DIST+N.ABL heavy_A.NOM.SG

(Abramov 1987: 41) ‘her [Maryusha's] hand was heavier than that of a man's (Maryusha hit Vasya unexpectedly hard)’

- (92) *pa'ák, né+t' l'ed'st+ema+t'né+d'e*
 maybe_PRT, these_PRON-DEM-PROX+PL remember_V+N+PL+DEF.PL+ABL
ma'áv+i te+ní sók's+eń
 feel_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG to_POP+POSS-1SG autumn_N+GEN
pizeme+ś tundo+n'še+ks
 rain_N+NOM.DEF.SG spring_N+GEN+PRON-DEM-DIST+N.TRNSL
 (Chetvergov 1992: 91) 'Maybe, it's these memories that make the autumn rain feel like
 spring [rain] to me'

Rueter (2003: 165–166) provides an extensive enumeration of semantic properties associated with the target of genitive marking including: material, place, time, purpose, individual-to-group and group-to-inferable-capacity. This collection of semantic properties attributed to the target of genitive marking can be augmented with that of the animate possessor, as noted by Evsev'ev (1963: 126), see (93).

- (93) *ki+ní šapka+n't' jomavt+i'ŋk —*
 who_PRON-INTER+GEN cap_N+GEN.DEF.SG lose_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-2PL>3
ivan+oń+še+n't' il'i
 Ivan_N-PRP+GEN+PRON-DEM-DISTAL+GEN.DEF.SG or_CONJ
pet'a+n'še+n't'?
 Petya_N-PRP+GEN+PRON-DEM-DISTAL+GEN.DEF.SG
 (Evsev'ev 1963: 126) 'Whose cap did you lose: Ivan's or Petya's?'

With the addition of the possessor function, on the one hand, and the possibility of indefinite declension, on the other, we can establish the morphological indefinite genitive as a modifier phrase followed by a SOD PRONOUN, which has a syntax-motivated parameter for overriding the demonstrative-declension requirement. Since the indefinite genitive modifier can be used with both referential and non-referential nouns, our next question is whether the genitive construction can be attested for personal pronouns, as well. In fact, Evsev'ev (1963: 162) describes possessive pronouns in the definite declension with regular morphology that correlates directly to the SOD pronoun strategy attested in (93), compare table (4.65).

Table 4.65 Genitive-case personal pronouns with SOD secondary nominative forms or according to Evsev'ev the possessive pronouns in the definite declension

P		Semi phonetic Orthographic	Morphologic	Gloss
1	SG	МОНЬДЗЕСЬ	<i>moń+še+ś</i>	PRON-PERS-1SG.GEN+DEM-DIST+N.NOM.DEF.SG
	PL	МИНЕК-СЕСЬ	<i>mińek+še+ś</i>	PRON-PERS-1PL.GEN.POSS-1PL+DEM-DIST+N.NOM.DEF.SG
2	SG	ТОНЬТЬ-ЦЕСЬ	<i>tońt+še+ś</i>	PRON-PERS-2SG.GEN.POSS-2SG+DEM-DIST+N.NOM.DEF.SG
	PL	ТЫҢК-СЕСЬ	<i>tɨŋk+še+ś</i>	PRON-PERS-2PL.GEN.POSS-2PL+DEM-DIST+N.NOM.DEF.SG
3	SG	СОНЗЭ-ЦЕСЬ	<i>sonze+še+ś</i>	PRON-PERS-2SG.GEN.POSS-2SG+DEM-DIST+N.NOM.DEF.SG
	PL	СЫНСТ-СЕСЬ	<i>sinst+še+ś</i>	PRON-PERS-2PL.GEN.POSS-2PL+DEM-DIST+N.NOM.DEF.SG

(Adapted from Evsev'ev 1963: 162)

One peculiarity here, however, is that Evsev'ev does not provide a 3SG pronoun form corresponding to that of *sonze+ś* 'his/hers/its' as shown above in (88i).

Evsev'ev (1963: 101–103, 126, 129–132, 134–135, 162) deals with the phenomenon of noun-head deletion in three separate instances. His first mention of it addresses the variety in which words declined in the indefinite inessive, translative and comparative cases can be inflected a second time in the demonstrative declension, see *Склонение определенных имен...* 'Declension of definite nouns...'; this variety is observed in the inessive word form *oš+so+ś* town_N+INE+N.NOM.DEF.SG 'the one in town'. The second mention introduces both the adjective-modifier *ašo+ś* white_A+N.NOM.DEF.SG 'the white one' and the indefinite-genitive modifier form *čuvto+ń+še+ś* wood/tree_N+GEN+PRON-DEM-DIST+N.NOM.DEF.SG 'the wooden one, the one of wood'. In dealing with the latter Evsev'ev considers the segments *+še+ś* to be a reduplicated *ś* element, a view held by some scholars even today. This interpretation might be countered. In regular declension of the ablative no linking vowel is present, whereas this derivation is regularly represented in *+še+d'e+*. The third mention of the phenomenon deals with genitive-form personal pronouns *tɨŋk+še+ś* you_PRON-PERS-2PL.GEN.POSS-2PL+PRON-DEM-DIST+N.NOM.DEF.SG 'the/that/this one of yours'. Instead of repeating the idea of a reduplicated *ś* segment, Evsev'ev volunteers a vernacular Russian-language parallel in *vaš-to* where the Russian possessive pronoun *vaš* 'your (2PL)' is combined with the demonstrative particle *to* 'that' or *et* 'this' (cf. Lyons 1999: 48–49). This clarification by Evsev'ev speaks in favor of the distal-demonstrative interpretation and can be supported with evidence in Erzya of other demonstratives used in post-genitive-modifier position, see *te* 'this' in (94) and *šet'e* 'and/now this' in (95). (The editors of MW have considered the 1SG form *mońciť'ĩnt'* to be an analogy of the 2SG *tońciť'ĩnt'*. It is, but then it is not a genitive form of the reflexive/intensive 2SG pronoun with secondary genitive definite singular declension, rather the genitive form of the 2SG personal pronoun followed by a speaker-oriented contextual demonstrative in *šet'e*, followed by the secondary genitive definite singular declension.)

- (94) *ruz+oń* *koj-kona* *govor+t+ne+s+kak*
 Russian_N+GEN some_PRON-INDEF.ABS dialect_N+PL+DEF.PL+ILL+CLT
sova+ś *finno-ugra+ń* *t'e*
 enter_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG Finno-Ugrian_N+GEN this_PRON-DEM-PROX.ABS
val+oś “*mečka*” *forma+so –*
 word_N+NOM.DEF.SG “*mechka*_N.ABS” form_N+INE –
 “*Tevks* *marto* *avaka* *ovto*” *smušt+se*.
 “off-spring_N.ABS with_POP female_N.ABS bear_N.ABS” meaning_N+INE
 (Bryzhinski M 1991: 157) ‘This Finno-Ugrian word, in the form “*mechka*”, has even become part of the lexicon in some Russian dialects in the sense “sow bear with cub(s)”.’
- (95) [*mońciťińt’*]
a *moń+še+te+ńt’*
 but_CONJ I_PRON-PERS-1SG.GEN+PRON-SOD+PRON-DEM-PROX+GEN.DEF.SG
viř *ava+neń* *usk+ik*
 forest_N.ABS mother_N+DAT haul_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-2SG>3SG
 (MW 1992: 1282) ‘but mine, you’ve taken to the Mother of the Woods.’

Interim conclusions

In Erzya there are two modifier-without-noun marking strategies, and in Evsev'ev's grammar these have not been joined in one section, nor have they in grammars since then. On the basis of what has been demonstrated above with regard to declension in NPS where the head noun has been deleted in contextual circumstances allowing for predictable identification, we can draw the following interim conclusions on what modifiers are attested in SECONDARY DECLENSION and their types:

ZERO = Simple shift of declension locus to main item of NP:

Adjectives: *ašo skal+oś* ‘the white cow’ => *ašo+ś* ‘the white one’

Quantifiers: *žaro vina+ś* ‘so much liquor’ => *žaro+ś* ‘so much’

Spatial modifiers: *oššo lomań+t+ńe* ‘the people in the town’ => *oššo+t+ńe* ‘the ones in town’

Determiners: *išťamo bočka+ś* ‘a barrel like that’ => *išťamo+ś* ‘one like that’

Genitive-form personal pronouns: *sonze křepešt+eś* ‘his/her/its stronghold’ => *sonze+ś* ‘his/hers/its’

SOD PRONOUN *-še* = Speaker-oriented (distal) demonstrative pronoun following main item of NP and subsequent shift of declension locus to that pronoun:

Nouns in indefinite genitive: *kšńi+ń kojme+ś* ‘the shovel of iron’ => *kšńi+ń+še+ś* ‘the iron one’

Genitive-form personal pronoun: *moń kudo+ś* ‘my house; that house of mine’ => *moń+še+ś* ‘mine; that one of mine’

- (97) *štópa* *pškad'ś* *alamo+s* *ašt'e+ž,*
 Styopa_PRP.NOM.SG say_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG a-little_Q+ILL sit_V+PTC-Oz,
žardo *pořev+št'* *dĭ*
 when_PRON-ADV-TEMP finish-chewing_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3PL and_CONJ
ńil'ev+št' *kurg+so+nzo+t'ńe.*
 get-swallowed_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3PL **mouth_N+INE+POSS-3SG+N.PL+DET.PL.NOM**
 (Abramov 1971: 70) 'Styopa responded after sitting for a little while when the ones in
 his mouth had been chewed and swallowed.'

Subsequent searches for distal-demonstrative secondary-declension derivations are perhaps less fruitful in the written corpora, see (98), but there are indications in descriptions of the language, and personal information on variants of the spoken language that would indicate a tangible presence of the demonstrative derivation type in Erzya.

- (98) – *ažo* *ved'* *mel'ga!* *dĭ* *avol'*
 go!_PRT-IMP.2SG water_N.ABS after_POP! but/and_CONJ not_PRT-NEG-CONTR
mala+so *lišmapřa+ńteń,* *vasol+o+ńteń.*
 near_ADV-SPAT+INE spring_N+DAT.DEF.SG, **far-away_ADV-SPAT+LOC+N.DAT.DET.SG**
 – *meks* *vasol+o+ńteń?*
 why_PRON-INTER.TRNSL **far-away_ADV-SPAT+LOC+N.DAT.DET.SG?**
mala+so+će+se+ńt' *ved'eś* *śed'e*
near-by_ADV+INE+PRON-DEM-DIST+N.INE+DET.SG water_N+NOM.DEF.SG more_PRON-DEM-
 DIST.ABL
paro!
 good_A.NOM.SG
 (Kirillov 1987: 154) '– Go get [some] water! But not [don't go] to the spring near by,
 the one far away.
 – Why the one far away? The water in the one near by is better.'

In addition to the spatial adverb demonstrated in (98), we will observe that Collinder (1969: 231) speaks of hypostatization with certain case forms (inessive, prolativ, abessive, comparative). Collinder shows hypostatization, another term to indicate the phenomenon of secondary declension, to be manifest in more elaborate word forms. The forms in context provide hypothetical formulations for scrutiny, see (99).

- (99) a. *pel'an* *kudo+so+n+že+de+ńt'*
pel'an *kudo+so+n+še+de+ńt'* (Rueter)
 fear_V+IND.PRES.PRED-1SG house_N+POSS-1SG+PRON-DEM-DIST+N.ABL+DEF.SG
 'I am afraid of the person who is in my house' (Collinder 1969: 231)

- b. *pel+an* *kudo+so+nzo+se+de+ńt'*
pel+an *kudo+so+nzo+še+d'e+ńt'(Rueter)*
 fear_v+IND.PRES.PRED-1SG house_N+POSS-1SG+PRON-DEM-DIST+N.ABL+DEF.SG
 'I am afraid of the person who is in his house' (Collinder 1969: 231)

In (99a) we have a possessum *kudo* 'house' in the inessive case with 1SG possessor indexing followed by a hypostatizing demonstrative construction, and the same formulation is repeated again in (99b). Even if these formulations might be limited in the written corpora, the mere fact that they have been attested and/or hypothesized encourages us to delve deeper. We must formulate the following questions for compatibility with adnominal person marking:

Are both varieties of secondary declension compatible with adnominal person marking?

What modifiers are compatible with adnominal person and simple locus shift?

What modifiers are compatible with adnominal person and demonstrative derivation?

Are there any instances of ambiguity with other constructions?

Hypothesis

In response to the first question, the answer has already been given; the genitive-form personal pronouns beginning with the third person singular attest to that. Regarding the *-še-* segment as representative of the distal demonstrative pronoun, which is a speaker-oriented pronoun, it will be hypothesized that the demonstrative derivation will be used less frequently with modifiers that exhibit compatibility with both varieties of secondary declension or hypostatization. Finally, disparity in concatenation strategies of personal pronoun paradigms as provided by Agafonova (2000: 143–145) and Evsev'ev (1963: 153–154, 162) in contrast with Zaicz (2006: 196–197) are indicative of possible ambiguity between reflexive/intensive and demonstrative derivation forms.

4.5.2. Compatibility of ZERO marking and adnominal-person

In this section we will focus our attention on the question: which modifier types can be subjected to contextual secondary declension with adnominal-person marking. This means we will be asking ourselves what variety of adjective, quantifier, determiner, spatial and genitive modifiers show an indication of both adnominal person and hypostatization.

MODIFIER (PRON-DEM-DIST) + POSS

Adjectives

Adjectives in Erzya as stated by Mosin (2000: 108–111) can be divided into modifiers (i) characterizing qualities, and (ii) indicating relations. While modifiers characterizing qualities (expressions of color, measure, age, flavor, etc.) can be compared, those indicating relations cannot. Examples are also forwarded of adjectives undergoing hyposatization involving the demonstrative declension, e.g. *od* ‘new’, *od+oš* ‘the new one’, but no reference is made to the possibility of secondary declension in combination with adnominal person.

Initial searches in the Erzya majority corpus bore no indication of compatibility between quality-characterizing adjectives and adnominal-person marking in instances of contextual secondary declension. For this reason, two loose filters were constructed: one which allowed word forms ending in feasible possessive declension endings with allowance for possible nominal conjugation and clitic marking, and the second filter screened the result of this feed allowing only word forms with adjective roots. In this manner the nearly 300,000 unique word forms of the corpora were filtered down to 4379 hits, which were then manually scrutinized by the researcher.

It soon became apparent, however, that many Erzya words double as adjectives and nouns. Occasional ZERO-derivation relations between adjectives and nouns can be divided into two groups. First, there are the words of quality, e.g. *valdo* ‘(a.) light’ \Leftrightarrow ‘(n.) light’, *lembe* ‘warm’ \Leftrightarrow ‘warmth’, *mazi* ‘beautiful’ \Leftrightarrow ‘beauty (measurable quality)’, which demonstrate, or so it would seem, that qualities are integral notions attributed to individuals, and therefore possessor/controller indexing of such qualities would inadvertently bring us back to the head noun of the NP. Hence, relative qualities as indicated by measurement, color and flavor receive treatment in section 4.3.1 NOUNS. Second, there are pairs in which the adjective characterizes a quality or relation, whereas the noun indicates a referent that can be characterized by that adjective, e.g. *pokš* ‘big’ \Leftrightarrow ‘leader’, *piže* ‘green’ \Leftrightarrow ‘copper’, *gúdoj* ‘bay’ \Leftrightarrow ‘bay (horse)’, *trodovoj* ‘labor, work’ \Leftrightarrow ‘employment history book’. These two groups contribute to a majority of the ambiguous adjective + adnominal-person affixation readings; no instances of contextual secondary declension were discerned.

Quantifiers

Quantifiers with adnominal-person marking, such as numerals, might readily be detected in a superficial scan of the unique word forms in the corpora. The most frequent forms are those of the associative-collective numerals dealt with in QUANTIFIERS section 4.3.2. ATTESTED PARTS OF SPEECH AND SUBLEXICA. Two other groups can be discerned, one consists of ordinal numerals, which will be dealt with below in the section on determiners, and the other, only attested by singular instances, cardinal numerals (also dealt with in section 4.3.2.).

Determiners

Determiners are attested in the language with contextual secondary declension. The most prominent of these are the pronouns *l'ija* ‘another, the remainder’, *eřva* ‘each’, *iřtamo* ‘this/that kind of’ described by Agafonova (2000: 136–141). While Agafonova provides paradigms for these three determiners in eight morphological forms, the instances of these forms available in the Erzya majority corpus indicate that they are, in fact, manifestations of contextual secondary declension, see (100–101).

- (100) — *še+jak* *eřav+i* *meř+em+š:*
 that_PRON-DEM-DIST.NOM.SG+CLT have-to_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG say_V+INF+ILL:
a klub+onok, a meže+ńek
 not_PRT-NEG club_N+POSS-1PL, not_PRT-NEG what_PRO-N-INTER+POSS-1PL
l'ija+nok.
other_PRON-DET+N.POSS-1PL.
 (Abramov 1961: 400) ‘And it should also be said: not our club, not anything else we have.’

- (101) *ře* *ńej* *kije*
 this_PRON-DEM-PROX.NOM.SG now_ADV-TEMP who_PRON-INTER.NOM.SG
sa+ř? *raške+ńek* *jutk+sto*
 arrive_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-1SG family_N+POSS-1PL among_POP+ELA
kińgak ***iřtamo+zo***
 anyone_PRON-INDEF.GEN.CLT **this/that-kind-of_PRON-DET-A.N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG**
araš... ” *– pul'kav+iř*
 not-exist_A.IND.PRES.PRED-3SG... ” – bubble_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3PL
ařsema+t'ńe *přa* *pot+so*
 thought_N+PL+DEF.PL.NOM head_N.ABS within_POP+INE
 (Ganchin 2009: 8: 38) ‘Now, who has come [to visit]? Nobody in our family has that kind of [thing/car] – the thoughts in her head bubbled.’

Additional determiners can be discerned in word forms derived with the morpheme *-še* ~ *-će*, i.e. ordinal numerals and a limited number of other related words.

- (102) *koda* *kort+iř,* *mejel'će+nze*
 as_PRO-ADV-MANNER speak_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3PL, the-last_DET+N.POSS-3SG.GEN
maks+iř
 give_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG
 (syatko 2003–9:) ‘As they say, he [Kamil'] will give his last.’

- (103) *čorjē+ś* *še* *čj+ste+ñt'*
 boy_N+NOM.DEF.SG that_PRON-DEM-DIST.ABS day_N+ELA+DEF.SG
vačo+do+l. *kuvat'*
 hungry_V-PRT+ABL+IND.PRETII.PRED-3SG. long-time_ADV-TEMP
oža+ś - *nosk+ś*
 keep-busy_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG puff_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG
krandazke+se+ñt', *el'* *targav+ś*
 little-wagon_N+INE+DEF.SG, just_PRT manage-to-pull_V+IND.PRETI.PRED-3SG
vašeñce *pilge+ze,* *mejle*
 first_DET.ABS leg_N+POSS-3SG>NOM.SG, later_ADV-TEMP
omboće+ze.
second_DET.ABS+N.POSS-3SG>NOM.SG
 ([Chilisema 1999 №4 Latvian fairytale]) 'The little boy was hungry that day. For a long time he kept himself busy and pattered around with the little wagon, he just managed to pull out his first leg and then his second.'

Determiners in the form of adjective-equivalent pronouns and ordinal numerals can be discerned in the corpora.

Spatial modifiers

Spatial modifiers, containing the morpheme *-še ~ -će*, a distal demonstrative pronoun equivalent, have been targeted for attestation with adnominal-person marking. This word type includes correlating pairs, such as *al+o* 'below' <=> *al+će* 'the lower', *veř+e* 'up high' <=> *veř+će* 'the upper ...', *vasol+o* 'far away' <=> *vasol+će* 'the ... far away', which would parallel the morphology observed above with the word forms *mejel'+e* 'then, later' <=> *mejel'+će* 'the last'. No instances were attested in the corpora.

Genitive modifiers

Hypothetically, this group would comprise noun or pronoun forms in the genitive, which might optionally have a distal demonstrative pronoun element worked into the morphology. This formulation is not attested for the indefinite and definite genitive declensions, but it is evidenced in Agafonova's declension charts of genitive-case personal and reflexive/intensive pronouns (see Agafonova 2000: 143–145).

Interim summary

Only determiners of the adjective or ordinal-numeral-equivalent variety attest to contextual secondary declension of modifiers with a ZERO marking strategy and adnominal-person marking.

4.5.3. Compatibility of possessive-declension modifiers with ZERO marking strategy

In this section our attention will be focused on the question: which modifier types can be marked for adnominal person and subsequently subjected to contextual secondary declension. This means we will be asking ourselves what variety of adjective, quantifier, determiner, spatial and genitive modifiers show affixal adnominal person followed by an indication of hypostatization.

MODIFIER + POSS + DECLENSION

Adjectives, Quantifiers and Determiners

Possessor/controller indexing of adjectives, quantifiers and non-spatial/genitive determiners do not appear in modifier position. (See discussion in SYMMETRIC CX MARKING AND HEAD NOUN DELETION (88–95) and subsequent INTERIM CONCLUSIONS.)

Spatial modifiers

The inessive case provides a source for demonstrating the two marking strategies, i.e. (97) provides zero marking in *kurg+so+nzo+t'ńe* mouth_N+INE+POSS-3SG:N+PL+DEF.PL.NOM and (99b) SOP marking in *kudo+so+nzo+śe+d'e+ńt'* house_N+POSS-1SG+PRON-DEM-DIST+N.ABL+DEF.SG.

Genitive modifiers

Genitive modifiers with adnominal-person marking are manifest in two parts of speech, possessed nouns, e.g. *ava+nzo+t'ńe+ń* mother_N+POSS-3SG.GEN+N.PL+DEF.PL+GEN, and the personal pronouns, which exhibit extended exponence in the marking of person and number in oblique case forms, see (104–105).

(104)a. *m'ńek+t'ńe*

we_PRON-PERS-1PL.GEN.POSS-1PL:N+NOM.DEF.PL

b. *m'ń+śe+ńek+t'ńe*

we_PRON-PERS-1PL+REFL+GEN.POSS-1PL:N+ NOM.DEF.PL

c. *eśe+ńek+t'ńe*

we_PRON-PERS-1PL+REFL+GEN.POSS-1PL:N+ NOM.DEF.PL

4.5.4. Personal and reflexive/intensive pronouns and secondary declension

According to Agafonova (2000: 143–145) the genitive forms of the personal pronouns and reflexive/intensive personal pronouns are used in the role of possessive pronouns. This statement can be augmented to contain both reflexive/intensive stem and reflexive/intensive pronouns, see table (4.67).

Table 4.67 Personal pronouns in genitive used as modifiers

Neutral pronouns		Reflexive/intensive pronouns		Reflexive/intensive stems	
	PRON-PERS				
<i>moń</i>	1SG.GEN	<i>mon+ś+eń</i>	1SG.REFL+POSS-1SG>GEN	<i>eś+eń</i>	REFL+POSS-1SG>GEN
<i>mińek</i>	1PL.POSS-1PL.GEN	<i>miń+ś+eńek</i>	1PL.REFL+POSS-1PL>GEN	<i>eś+eńek</i>	REFL+POSS-1PL>GEN
<i>toń</i>	2SG.GEN	<i>ton+ś+eł</i>	2SG.REFL+POSS-2SG>GEN	<i>eś+eł</i>	REFL+POSS-2SG>GEN
<i>tijńk</i>	2PL.POSS-2PL.GEN	<i>tijń+ś+eńk</i>	2PL.REFL+POSS-2PL>GEN	<i>eś+eńk</i>	REFL+POSS-2PL>GEN
<i>sonze</i>	3SG.POSS-3SG.GEN	<i>son+ś+enze</i>	3SG.REFL+POSS-3SG>GEN	<i>eś+enze</i>	REFL+POSS-3SG>GEN
<i>sijńst</i>	3PL.POSS-3PL.GEN	<i>sijń+ś+est</i>	3PL.REFL+POSS-3PL>GEN	<i>eś+est</i>	REFL+POSS-3PL>GEN

All of these genitive-form pronouns can function as modifiers, and therefore they are candidates to secondary declension. As Agafonova states it the genitive-form personal pronouns can take definite morphemes, and be declined like nouns. Thus Agafonova presents noun-declension tables of the genitive-form pronouns, both of which appear to forward a zero-marking strategy not attested with Evsev'ev, see table (4.68).

Table 4.68 Genitive-form (neutral) personal pronouns with definite declensions

				Singular NP head		
				1SG	2SG	3SG
NOM		<i>moń+eś</i>		<i>toń+eś</i>		<i>sonze+ś</i>
GEN		<i>moń+eńt'</i>		<i>toń+eńt'</i>		<i>sonze +eńt'</i>
DAT		<i>moń+eńteń</i>		<i>toń+eńteń</i>		<i>sonze +eńteń</i>
ABL		<i>moń+de+ńt'</i>		<i>toń+de+ńt'</i>		<i>sonze +de+ńt'</i>
INE		<i>moń+se+ńt'</i>		<i>toń+se+ńt'</i>		<i>sonze +se+ńt'</i>
ELA		<i>moń+ste+ńt'</i>		<i>toń+ste+ńt'</i>		<i>sonze +ste+ńt'</i>
PROL		<i>moń+ga+ńt'</i>		<i>toń+ga+ńt'</i>		<i>sonze +ga+ńt'</i>
TRNSL		<i>moń+ks+eńt'</i>		<i>toń+ks+eńt'</i>		<i>sonze +ks+eńt'</i>
COMP		<i>moń+ška+ńt'</i>		<i>toń+ška+ńt'</i>		<i>sonze +ška+ńt'</i>
ABE		<i>moń+ťeme+ńt'</i>		<i>toń+ťeme+ńt'</i>		<i>sonze +vťeme+ńt'</i>
				1PL	2PL	3PL
SG						
NOM		<i>mínek+eś</i>		<i>tíjk+eś</i>		<i>sínst+eś</i>
GEN		<i>mínek+eńt'</i>		<i>tíjk+eńt'</i>		<i>sínst+eńt'</i>
DAT		<i>mínek+eńteń</i>		<i>tíjk+eńteń</i>		<i>sínst+eńteń</i>
ABL		<i>mínek+te+ńt'</i>		<i>tíjk+te+ńt'</i>		<i>sínst+te+ńt'</i>
INE		<i>mínek+se+ńt'</i>		<i>tíjk+se+ńt'</i>		<i>sínst+se+ńt'</i>
ELA		<i>mínek+ste+ńt'</i>		<i>tíjk+ste+ńt'</i>		<i>sínst+ste+ńt'</i>
PROL		<i>mínek+ka+ńt'</i>		<i>tíjk+ka+ńt'</i>		<i>sínst+ka+ńt'</i>
TRNSL		<i>mínek+eks</i>		<i>tíjk+eks</i>		<i>sínst+eks</i>
COMP		<i>mínek+ška+ńt'</i>		<i>tíjk+ška+ńt'</i>		<i>sínst+ška+ńt'</i>
ABE		<i>mínek+ťeme+ńt'</i>		<i>tíjk+ťeme+ńt'</i>		<i>sínst+ťeme+ńt'</i>
				Plural NP head		
NOM		<i>moń+e+ťne</i>		<i>toń+e+ťne</i>		<i>sonze+ťne</i>
GEN		<i>moń+e+ťne+ń</i>		<i>toń+e+ťne+ń</i>		<i>sonze+ťne+ń</i>
DAT		<i>moń+e+ťne+ńeń</i>		<i>toń+e+ťne+ńeń</i>		<i>sonze+ťne+ńeń</i>
ABL		<i>moń+e+ťne+de</i>		<i>toń+e+ťne+de</i>		<i>sonze+ťne+de</i>
INE		<i>moń+e+ťne+se</i>		<i>toń+e+ťne+se</i>		<i>sonze+ťne+se</i>
ELA		<i>moń+e+ťne+ste</i>		<i>toń+e+ťne+ste</i>		<i>sonze+ťne+ste</i>
PROL		<i>moń+e+ťne+va</i>		<i>toń+e+ťne+va</i>		<i>sonze+ťne+va</i>
TRNSL		<i>moń+e+ťne+ks</i>		<i>toń+e+ťne+ks</i>		<i>sonze+ťne+ks</i>
COMP		<i>moń+e+ťne+ška</i>		<i>toń+e+ťne+ška</i>		<i>sonze+ťne+ška</i>
ABE		<i>moń+e+ťne +vťeme</i>		<i>toń+e+ťne+vťeme</i>		<i>sonze+ťne+vťeme</i>

	Plural NP head		
NOM	<i>mínek+t+ne</i>	<i>tíjk+t+ne</i>	<i>sinst+t+ne</i>
GEN	<i>mínek+t+ne+ń</i>	<i>tíjk+t+ne+ń</i>	<i>sinst+t+ne+ń</i>
DAT	<i>mínek+t+ne+neń</i>	<i>tíjk+t+ne+neń</i>	<i>sinst+t+ne+neń</i>
ABL	<i>mínek+t+ne+d'e</i>	<i>tíjk+t+ne+d'e</i>	<i>sinst+t+ne+d'e</i>
INE	<i>mínek+t+ne+se</i>	<i>tíjk+t+ne+se</i>	<i>sinst+t+ne+se</i>
ELA	<i>mínek+t+ne+ste</i>	<i>tíjk+t+ne+ste</i>	<i>sinst+t+ne+ste</i>
PROL	<i>mínek+t+ne+va</i>	<i>tíjk+t+ne+va</i>	<i>sinst+t+ne+va</i>
TRNSL	<i>mínek+t+ne+ks</i>	<i>tíjk+t+ne+ks</i>	<i>sinst+t+ne+ks</i>
COMP	<i>mínek+t+ne+ška</i>	<i>tíjk+t+ne+ška</i>	<i>sinst+t+ne+ška</i>
ABE	<i>mínek+t+ne+vt'eme</i>	<i>tíjk+t+ne+vt'eme</i>	<i>sinst+t+ne+vt'eme</i>

(see Agafonova 2000: 143–145) this author's annotation

The genitive-form neutral personal pronouns with definite declensions can be formulated as follows with the variable *Y*:

1SG and 2SG:

Singular head = PRON-PERS-*Y*.GEN+CX+DEF
 Plural head = PRON-PERS-*Y*.GEN+PL+DEF+CX

3SG, 1PL, 2PL and 3PL:

Singular head = PRON-PERS-*Y*+POSS-*Y*.GEN+CX+DEF
 Plural head = PRON-PERS-*Y*+POSS-*Y*.GEN+PL+DEF+CX

In earlier forms of the literary language and, naturally, some of the Erzya dialects, the 2SG pronoun also had possessive marking in the formulation of the genitive form *ton't*. Assuming the first and second persons singular are both lacking possessive marking, whereas it could be argued that the 1SG form actually contains the same genitive marking as that reserved for distinct kin terms, that is indefinite genitive marking, we can render a mutual formulation for all persons with parentheses.

Singular head = PRON-PERS(+POSS-*Y*).GEN+CX+DEF
 Plural head = PRON-PERS(+POSS-*Y*).GEN+PL+DEF+CX

Next Agafonova presents the reflexive/intensive pronoun paradigm which actually indicates suppletion in the 1sg and 2sg forms, where instead of a genitive-case reflexive/intensive pronoun we encounter a genitive-case neutral personal pronoun with SOD marking, see table (4.69) where the suppletive cells have been darkened. (In this author's transcription of the Cyrillic script the genitive-form stems in the 1SG and 2SG personal pronouns are marked palatalized *ń*.)

Table 4.69 Genitive-form reflexive/intensive personal pronouns with definite declensions

	Singular NP head		
	1SG	2SG	3SG
SG			
NOM	<i>moń+še+ś</i>	<i>toń+še+ś</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+ś</i>
GEN	<i>moń+še+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+eńt'</i>
DAT	<i>moń+še+ńteń</i>	<i>toń+še+ńteń</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+eńteń</i>
ABL	<i>moń+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+d'e+ńt'</i>
INE	<i>moń+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+se+ńt'</i>
ELA	<i>moń+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+ste+ńt'</i>
PROL	<i>moń+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+va+ńt'</i>
TRNSL	<i>moń+še+ks</i>	<i>toń+še+ks</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+ks</i>
COMP	<i>moń+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+ška+ńt'</i>
ABE	<i>moń+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+v'teme+ńt'</i>
	1PL	2PL	3PL
PL			
NOM	<i>miń+ś+eńek+eś</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+eś</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+eś</i>
GEN	<i>miń+ś+eńek+eńt'</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+eńt'</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+eńt'</i>
DAT	<i>miń+ś+eńek+eńteń</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+eńteń</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+eńteń</i>
ABL	<i>miń+ś+eńek+te+ńt'</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+te+ńt'</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+te+ńt'</i>
INE	<i>miń+ś+eńek+se+ńt'</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+se+ńt'</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+se+ńt'</i>
ELA	<i>miń+ś+eńek+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+ste+ńt'</i>
PROL	<i>miń+ś+eńek+ka+ńt'</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+ka+ńt'</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+ka+ńt'</i>
TRNSL	<i>miń+ś+eńek+eks</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+eks</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+eks</i>
COMP	<i>miń+ś+eńek+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+ška+ńt'</i>
ABE	<i>miń+ś+eńek+t'eme+ńt'</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+t'eme+ńt'</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+t'eme+ńt'</i>
	Plural NP head		
SG			
NOM	<i>moń+še+t'ńe</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'ńe</i>
GEN	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+ń</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+ń</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'ńe+ń</i>
DAT	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'ńe+ńeń</i>
ABL	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+d'e</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+d'e</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'ńe+d'e</i>
INE	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+se</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+se</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'ńe+se</i>
ELA	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+ste</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+ste</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'ńe+ste</i>
PROL	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+va</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+va</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'ńe+va</i>
TRNSL	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+ks</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+ks</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'ńe+ks</i>
COMP	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+ška</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+ška</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'ńe+ška</i>
ABE	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+v'teme</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+v'teme</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'ńe+v'teme</i>

PL			
NOM	<i>miń+ś+eńek+t'ńe</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+t'ńe</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+t'ne</i>
GEN	<i>miń+ś+eńek+t'ńe+ń</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+t'ńe+ń</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+t'ne+ń</i>
DAT	<i>miń+ś+eńek+t'ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+t'ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+t'ne+ńeń</i>
ABL	<i>miń+ś+eńek+t'ńe+de</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+t'ńe+de</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+t'ne+de</i>
INE	<i>miń+ś+eńek+t'ńe+se</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+t'ńe+se</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+t'ne+se</i>
ELA	<i>miń+ś+eńek+t'ńe+ste</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+t'ńe+ste</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+t'ne+ste</i>
PROL	<i>miń+ś+eńek+t'ńe+va</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+t'ńe+va</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+t'ne+va</i>
TRNSL	<i>miń+ś+eńek+t'ńe+ks</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+t'ńe+ks</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+t'ne+ks</i>
COMP	<i>miń+ś+eńek+t'ńe+ška</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+t'ńe+ška</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+t'ne+ška</i>
ABE	<i>miń+ś+eńek+t'ńe+vt'eme</i>	<i>tĩń+ś+eńk+t'ńe+vt'eme</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+t'ne+vt'eme</i>

(see Agafonova 2000: 143–145) with this author's annotation

An initial formulation of Agafonova's forms in the reflexive/intensive table (4.69) reveals a similar break in the distribution of person, i.e. 1SG and 2SG versus 3SG, 1PL, 2PL and 3PL.

1SG and 2SG:

Singular head = PRON-PERS-Y.GEN+PRON-DEM-DISTAL+CX+DEF

Plural head = PRON-PERS-Y.GEN+PRON-DEM-DISTAL +PL+DEF+CX

3SG, 1PL, 2PL and 3PL:

Singular head = PRON-PERS-Y+REFL+POSS-Y.GEN+CX+DEF

Plural head = PRON-PERS-Y+REFL+POSS-Y.GEN+PL+DEF+CX

This break, as noted above, appears to involve morphological confusion or suppletion. Where the 3SG and 3PL persons attest to a genitive-form reflexive/intensive personal pronoun base for their definite forms, the 1SG and 2SG attest to a totally different structure, namely, a genitive-case neutral personal pronoun with a distal demonstrative pronoun as its base, i.e. the SOD strategy for marking MWN.

If we apply the SOD strategy of the 1SG and 2SG to the other persons, we will arrive at a paradigm parallel to what is attested above for indefinite genitive nouns, see (89–92), with the morphological difference arising in the presence of adnominal-type cross-referential marking before the demonstrative pronoun reflex *-še-*. In fact, it seems that this is precisely the paradigm that Evsev'ev indicates (see 1963: 162) when he refers to the *Определенная форма притяжательных местоимений* 'definite form[s] of the possessive pronouns', see table (4.70).

Table 4.70 Genitive-case personal pronouns with distal demonstrative pronoun marking

	Singular NP head		
	1SG	2SG	3SG
SG			
NOM	<i>moń+še+ś</i>	<i>toń+še+ś</i>	<i>sonze+še+ś</i>
GEN	<i>moń+še+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+ńt'</i>	<i>sonze+še+ńt'</i>
DAT	<i>moń+še+ńt'eń</i>	<i>toń+še+ńt'eń</i>	<i>sonze+še+ńt'eń</i>
ABL	<i>moń+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>sonze+še+d'e+ńt'</i>
INE	<i>moń+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>sonze+še+se+ńt'</i>
ELA	<i>moń+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>sonze+še+ste+ńt'</i>
PROL	<i>moń+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>sonze+še+va+ńt'</i>
TRNSL	<i>moń+še+ks+eńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+ks+eńt'</i>	<i>sonze+še+ks+eńt'</i>
COMP	<i>moń+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>sonze+še+ška+ńt'</i>
ABE	<i>moń+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>	<i>toń+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>	<i>sonze+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>
	1PL	2PL	3PL
PL			
NOM	<i>mińek+še+ś</i>	<i>tij̣k+še+ś</i>	<i>şinst+še+ś</i>
GEN	<i>mińek+še+ńt'</i>	<i>tij̣k+še+ńt'</i>	<i>şinst+še+ńt'</i>
DAT	<i>mińek+še+ńt'eń</i>	<i>tij̣k+še+ńt'eń</i>	<i>şinst+še+ńt'eń</i>
ABL	<i>mińek+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>tij̣k+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>şinst+še+d'e+ńt'</i>
INE	<i>mińek+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>tij̣k+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>şinst+še+se+ńt'</i>
ELA	<i>mińek+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>tij̣k+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>şinst+še+ste+ńt'</i>
PROL	<i>mińek+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>tij̣k+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>şinst+še+va+ńt'</i>
TRNSL	<i>mińek+še+ks</i>	<i>tij̣k+še+ks</i>	<i>şinst+še+ks</i>
COMP	<i>mińek+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>tij̣k+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>şinst+še+ška+ńt'</i>
ABE	<i>mińek+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>	<i>tij̣k+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>	<i>şinst+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>
	Plural NP head		
SG			
NOM	<i>moń+še+t'ńe</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe</i>	<i>sonze+še+t'ńe</i>
GEN	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+ń</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+ń</i>	<i>sonze+še+t'ńe+ń</i>
DAT	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>sonze+še+t'ńe+ńeń</i>
ABL	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+d'e</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+d'e</i>	<i>sonze+še+t'ńe+d'e</i>
INE	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+se</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+se</i>	<i>sonze+še+t'ńe+se</i>
ELA	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+ste</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+ste</i>	<i>sonze+še+t'ńe+ste</i>
PROL	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+va</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+va</i>	<i>sonze+še+t'ńe+va</i>
TRNSL	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+ks</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+ks</i>	<i>sonze+še+t'ńe+ks</i>
COMP	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+ška</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+ška</i>	<i>sonze+še+t'ńe+ška</i>
ABE	<i>moń+še+t'ńe+v'teme</i>	<i>toń+še+t'ńe+v'teme</i>	<i>sonze+še+t'ńe+v'teme</i>

PL			
NOM	<i>mínek+še+t+né</i>	<i>tíjk+še+t+né</i>	<i>šinst+še+t+né</i>
GEN	<i>mínek+še+t+né+ń</i>	<i>tíjk+še+t+né+ń</i>	<i>šinst+še+t+né+ń</i>
DAT	<i>mínek+še+t+né+ńeń</i>	<i>tíjk+še+t+né+ńeń</i>	<i>šinst+še+t+né+ńeń</i>
ABL	<i>mínek+še+t+né+d'e</i>	<i>tíjk+še+t+né+d'e</i>	<i>šinst+še+t+né+d'e</i>
INE	<i>mínek+še+t+né+se</i>	<i>tíjk+še+t+né+se</i>	<i>šinst+še+t+né+se</i>
ELA	<i>mínek+še+t+né+ste</i>	<i>tíjk+še+t+né+ste</i>	<i>šinst+še+t+né+ste</i>
PROL	<i>mínek+še+t+né+va</i>	<i>tíjk+še+t+né+va</i>	<i>šinst+še+t+né+va</i>
TRNSL	<i>mínek+še+t+né+ks</i>	<i>tíjk+še+t+né+ks</i>	<i>šinst+še+t+né+ks</i>
COMP	<i>mínek+še+t+né+ška</i>	<i>tíjk+še+t+né+ška</i>	<i>šinst+še+t+né+ška</i>
ABE	<i>mínek+še+t+né+vt'eme</i>	<i>tíjk+še+t+né+vt'eme</i>	<i>šinst+še+t+né+vt'eme</i>

Now, if we reconsider the 1SG and 2SG in table (4.69) on the basis of the 3SG, 1PL, 2PL and 3PL reflexive/intensive zero-marking strategy exhibited in PRON-PERS +REFL+POSS-Y.GEN+, we will arrive at forms such as *ton'ít'ít'* rendered by this author as *ton+ś+et'eńt'* (cf. MW IV: 2315b) see also (95), above.

Table 4.71 Singular genitive-case reflexive/intensive pronouns with zero-marking strategy in all persons

	1SG	2SG	3SG
SG			
NOM	<i>mon+ś+eń+eś</i>	<i>ton+ś+et'eś</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+ś</i>
GEN	<i>mon+ś+eń+eńt'</i>	<i>ton+ś+et'eńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+eńt'</i>
DAT	<i>mon+ś+eń+eńteń</i>	<i>ton+ś+et'eńteń</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+eńteń</i>
ABL	<i>mon+ś+eń+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>ton+ś+et'd'e+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+d'e+ńt'</i>
INE	<i>mon+ś+eń+se+ńt'</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+se+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+se+ńt'</i>
ELA	<i>mon+ś+eń+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+ste+ńt'</i>
PROL	<i>mon+ś+eń+ga+ńt'</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+ka+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+va+ńt'</i>
TRNSL	<i>mon+ś+eń+eks</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+eks</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+ks</i>
COMP	<i>mon+ś+eń+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+ška+ńt'</i>
ABE	<i>mon+ś+eń+vt'eme+ńt'</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+vt'eme+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+vt'eme+ńt'</i>
PL			
NOM	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+t'nie</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+e+t'nie</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'nie</i>
GEN	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+t'nie+ń</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+e+t'nie+ń</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'nie+ń</i>
DAT	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+t'nie+ńeń</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+e+t'nie+ńeń</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'nie+ńeń</i>
ABL	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+t'nie+d'e</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+e+t'nie+d'e</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'nie+d'e</i>
INE	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+t'nie+se</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+e+t'nie+se</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'nie+se</i>
ELA	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+t'nie+ste</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+e+t'nie+ste</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'nie+ste</i>
PROL	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+t'nie+va</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+e+t'nie+va</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'nie+va</i>
TRNSL	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+t'nie+ks</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+e+t'nie+ks</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'nie+ks</i>
COMP	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+t'nie+ška</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+e+t'nie+ška</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'nie+ška</i>
ABE	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+t'nie+vt'eme</i>	<i>ton+ś+et+e+t'nie+vt'eme</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+t'nie+vt'eme</i>

Thus we have arrived at three formulations for genitive-case personal and reflexive/intensive pronouns with definite declension. There is a zero-marker strategy for both the genitive-case personal pronoun and reflexive/intensive pronoun, and a SOD marker strategy for genitive-case personal pronouns. This means that another table, table (4.72) must be rendered for reflexive/intensive pronouns with a SOD marking strategy.

Table 4.72 Genitive-form reflexive/intensive pronouns with SOD marking strategy

	Singular NP head		
	1SG	2SG	3SG
SG			
NOM	<i>mon+ś+eń+še+ś</i>	<i>ton+ś+eť+še+ś</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+še+ś</i>
GEN	<i>mon+ś+eń+še+ńt'</i>	<i>ton+ś+eť+še+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+še+ńt'</i>
DAT	<i>mon+ś+eń+še+ńt'eń</i>	<i>ton+ś+eť+še+ńt'eń</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+še+ńt'eń</i>
ABL	<i>mon+ś+eń+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>ton+ś+eť+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+še+d'e+ńt'</i>
INE	<i>mon+ś+eń+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>ton+ś+eť+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+še+se+ńt'</i>
ELA	<i>mon+ś+eń+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>ton+ś+eť+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+še+ste+ńt'</i>
PROL	<i>mon+ś+eń+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>ton+ś+eť+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+še+va+ńt'</i>
TRNSL	<i>mon+ś+eń+še+ks</i>	<i>ton+ś+eť+še+ks</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+še+ks</i>
COMP	<i>mon+ś+eń+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>ton+ś+eť+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+še+ška+ńt'</i>
ABE	<i>mon+ś+eń+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>	<i>ton+ś+eť+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>
	1PL	2PL	3PL
PL			
NOM	<i>miń+ś+eńek+še+ś</i>	<i>tjń+ś+eɲk+še+ś</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+še+ś</i>
GEN	<i>miń+ś+eńek+še+ńt'</i>	<i>tjń+ś+eɲk+še+ńt'</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+še+ńt'</i>
DAT	<i>miń+ś+eńek+še+ńt'eń</i>	<i>tjń+ś+eɲk+še+ńt'eń</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+še+ńt'eń</i>
ABL	<i>miń+ś+eńek+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>tjń+ś+eɲk+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+še+d'e+ńt'</i>
INE	<i>miń+ś+eńek+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>tjń+ś+eɲk+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+še+se+ńt'</i>
ELA	<i>miń+ś+eńek+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>tjń+ś+eɲk+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+še+ste+ńt'</i>
PROL	<i>miń+ś+eńek+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>tjń+ś+eɲk+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+še+va+ńt'</i>
TRNSL	<i>miń+ś+eńek+še+ks</i>	<i>tjń+ś+eɲk+še+ks</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+še+ks</i>
COMP	<i>miń+ś+eńek+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>tjń+ś+eɲk+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+še+ška+ńt'</i>
ABE	<i>miń+ś+eńek+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>	<i>tjń+ś+eɲk+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>

	Plural NP head		
SG			
NOM	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+łńe</i>	<i>ton+ś+eł+śe+ł+ńe</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+śe+ł+ńe</i>
GEN	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+ł+ńe+ń</i>	<i>ton+ś+eł+śe+ł+ńe+ń</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+śe+ł+ńe+ń</i>
DAT	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+ł+ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>ton+ś+eł+śe+ł+ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+śe+ł+ńe+ńeń</i>
ABL	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+ł+ńe+dę</i>	<i>ton+ś+eł+śe+ł+ńe+dę</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+śe+ł+ńe+dę</i>
INE	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+ł+ńe+se</i>	<i>ton+ś+eł+śe+ł+ńe+se</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+śe+ł+ńe+se</i>
ELA	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+ł+ńe+ste</i>	<i>ton+ś+eł+śe+ł+ńe+ste</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+śe+ł+ńe+ste</i>
PROL	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+ł+ńe+va</i>	<i>ton+ś+eł+śe+ł+ńe+va</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+śe+ł+ńe+va</i>
TRNSL	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+ł+ńe+ks</i>	<i>ton+ś+eł+śe+ł+ńe+ks</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+śe+ł+ńe+ks</i>
COMP	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+ł+ńe+ška</i>	<i>ton+ś+eł+śe+ł+ńe+ška</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+śe+ł+ńe+ška</i>
ABE	<i>mon+ś+eń+e+ł+ńe+vłeme</i>	<i>ton+ś+eł+śe+ł+ńe+vłeme</i>	<i>son+ś+enze+śe+ł+ńe+vłeme</i>
PL			
NOM	<i>miń+ś+eńek+śe+ł+ńe</i>	<i>tjń+ś+ejk+śe+ł+ńe</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+śe+ł+ńe</i>
GEN	<i>miń+ś+eńek+śe+ł+ńe+ń</i>	<i>tjń+ś+ejk+śe+ł+ńe+ń</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+śe+ł+ńe+ń</i>
DAT	<i>miń+ś+eńek+śe+ł+ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>tjń+ś+ejk+śe+ł+ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+śe+ł+ńe+ńeń</i>
ABL	<i>miń+ś+eńek+śe+ł+ńe+dę</i>	<i>tjń+ś+ejk+śe+ł+ńe+dę</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+śe+ł+ńe+dę</i>
INE	<i>miń+ś+eńek+śe+ł+ńe+se</i>	<i>tjń+ś+ejk+śe+ł+ńe+se</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+śe+ł+ńe+se</i>
ELA	<i>miń+ś+eńek+śe+ł+ńe+ste</i>	<i>tjń+ś+ejk+śe+ł+ńe+ste</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+śe+ł+ńe+ste</i>
PROL	<i>miń+ś+eńek+śe+ł+ńe+va</i>	<i>tjń+ś+ejk+śe+ł+ńe+va</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+śe+ł+ńe+va</i>
TRNSL	<i>miń+ś+eńek+śe+ł+ńe+ks</i>	<i>tjń+ś+ejk+śe+ł+ńe+ks</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+śe+ł+ńe+ks</i>
COMP	<i>miń+ś+eńek+śe+ł+ńe+ška</i>	<i>tjń+ś+ejk+śe+ł+ńe+ška</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+śe+ł+ńe+ška</i>
ABE	<i>miń+ś+eńek+śe+ł+ńe+vłeme</i>	<i>tjń+ś+ejk+śe+ł+ńe+vłeme</i>	<i>siń+ś+est+śe+ł+ńe+vłeme</i>

We now have four specific declension tables drafted (4.68, 4.70–72) demonstrating the hypothetical combinations of genitive-case personal pronouns and reflexive/intensive pronouns with two marking strategies for MWN. We will now apply these same combinations with reflexive/intensive stems in tables (4.73–75), and address the matter of corpora attestation.

Table 4.73 Genitive-case reflexive/intensive stems with zero-marking

	1SG	2SG	3SG
SG			
NOM	<i>eś+eń+eś</i>	<i>eś+et+eś</i>	<i>eś+enze+eś</i>
GEN	<i>eś+eń+eńt'</i>	<i>eś+et+eńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+eńt'</i>
DAT	<i>eś+eń+eńteń</i>	<i>eś+et+eńteń</i>	<i>eś+enze+eńteń</i>
ABL	<i>eś+eń+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+et+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+d'e+ńt'</i>
INE	<i>eś+eń+se+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+et+se+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+se+ńt'</i>
ELA	<i>eś+eń+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+et+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+ste+ńt'</i>
PROL	<i>eś+eń+ga+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+et+ka+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+va+ńt'</i>
TRNSL	<i>eś+eń+ks+eńt'</i>	<i>eś+et+eks+eńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+ks+eńt'</i>
COMP	<i>eś+eń+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+et+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+ška+ńt'</i>
ABE	<i>eś+eń+t'eme+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+et+t'eme+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+vt'eme+ńt'</i>
PL			
NOM	<i>eś+eń+e+t'ńe</i>	<i>eś+et+t'ńe</i>	<i>eś+enze+t'ńe</i>
GEN	<i>eś+eń+e+t'ńe+ń</i>	<i>eś+et+e+t'ńe+ń</i>	<i>eś+enze+t'ńe+ń</i>
DAT	<i>eś+eń+e+t'ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>eś+et+e+t'ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>eś+enze+t'ńe+ńeń</i>
ABL	<i>eś+eń+e+t'ńe+d'e</i>	<i>eś+et+e+t'ńe+d'e</i>	<i>eś+enze+t'ńe+d'e</i>
INE	<i>eś+eń+e+t'ńe+se</i>	<i>eś+et+e+t'ńe+se</i>	<i>eś+enze+t'ńe+se</i>
ELA	<i>eś+eń+e+t'ńe+ste</i>	<i>eś+et+e+t'ńe+ste</i>	<i>eś+enze+t'ńe+ste</i>
PROL	<i>eś+eń+e+t'ńe+va</i>	<i>eś+et+e+t'ńe+va</i>	<i>eś+enze+t'ńe+va</i>
TRNSL	<i>eś+eń+e+t'ńe+ks</i>	<i>eś+et+e+t'ńe+ks</i>	<i>eś+enze+t'ńe+ks</i>
COMP	<i>eś+eń+e+t'ńe+ška</i>	<i>eś+et+e+t'ńe+ška</i>	<i>eś+enze+t'ńe+ška</i>
ABE	<i>eś+eń+e+t'ńe+vt'eme</i>	<i>eś+et+e+t'ńe+vt'eme</i>	<i>eś+enze+t'ńe+vt'eme</i>
Genitive-form personal pronouns in fused head constructions “STEM-REFL-GEN+POSS+CX(+DEF)”			
	1PL	2PL	3PL
SG			
NOM	<i>eś+eńek+eś</i>	<i>eś+eńk+eś</i>	<i>eś+est+eś</i>
GEN	<i>eś+eńek+eńt'</i>	<i>eś+eńk+eńt'</i>	<i>eś+est+eńt'</i>
DAT	<i>eś+eńek+eńteń</i>	<i>eś+eńk+eńteń</i>	<i>eś+est+eńteń</i>
ABL	<i>eś+eńek+t'e+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eńk+t'e+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+est+te+ńt'</i>
INE	<i>eś+eńek+se+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eńk+se+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+est+se+ńt'</i>
ELA	<i>eś+eńek+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eńk+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+est+ste+ńt'</i>
PROL	<i>eś+eńek+ka+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eńk+ka+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+est+ka+ńt'</i>
TRNSL	<i>eś+eńek+eks</i>	<i>eś+eńk+eks</i>	<i>eś+est+eks</i>
COMP	<i>eś+eńek+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eńk+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+est+ška+ńt'</i>
ABE	<i>eś+eńek+t'eme+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eńk+t'eme+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+est+t'eme+ńt'</i>

PL			
NOM	<i>eś+eńek+t'ńe</i>	<i>eś+eńk+t'ńe</i>	<i>eś+est+t'ne</i>
GEN	<i>eś+eńek+t'ńe+ń</i>	<i>eś+eńk+t'ńe+ń</i>	<i>eś+est+t'ne+ń</i>
DAT	<i>eś+eńek+t'ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>eś+eńk+t'ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>eś+est+t'ne+ńeń</i>
ABL	<i>eś+eńek+t'ńe+d'e</i>	<i>eś+eńk+t'ńe+d'e</i>	<i>eś+est+t'ne+d'e</i>
INE	<i>eś+eńek+t'ńe+se</i>	<i>eś+eńk+t'ńe+se</i>	<i>eś+est+t'ne+se</i>
ELA	<i>eś+eńek+t'ńe+ste</i>	<i>eś+eńk+t'ńe+ste</i>	<i>eś+est+t'ne+ste</i>
PROL	<i>eś+eńek+t'ńe+va</i>	<i>eś+eńk+t'ńe+va</i>	<i>eś+est+t'ne+va</i>
TRNSL	<i>eś+eńek+t'ńe+ks</i>	<i>eś+eńk+t'ńe+ks</i>	<i>eś+est+t'ne+ks</i>
COMP	<i>eś+eńek+t'ńe+ška</i>	<i>eś+eńk+t'ńe+ška</i>	<i>eś+est+t'ne+ška</i>
ABE	<i>eś+eńek+t'ńe+vt'eme</i>	<i>eś+eńk+t'ńe+vt'eme</i>	<i>eś+est+t'ne+vt'eme</i>

Table 4.74 Genitive-case reflexive/intensive stems with SOD marking

	1SG	2SG	3SG
SG			
NOM	<i>eś+eń+še+ś</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+ś</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+ś</i>
GEN	<i>eś+eń+še+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+ńt'</i>
DAT	<i>eś+eń+še+ńt'eń</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+ńt'eń</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+ńt'eń</i>
ABL	<i>eś+eń+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+d'e+ńt'</i>
INE	<i>eś+eń+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+se+ńt'</i>
ELA	<i>eś+eń+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+ste+ńt'</i>
PROL	<i>eś+eń+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+va+ńt'</i>
TRNSL	<i>eś+eń+še+ks+eńt'</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+ks+eńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+ks+eńt'</i>
COMP	<i>eś+eń+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+ška+ńt'</i>
ABE	<i>eś+eń+še+vt'eme+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+vt'eme+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+vt'eme+ńt'</i>
PL			
NOM	<i>eś+eń+še+t'ńe</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+t'ńe</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+t'ńe</i>
GEN	<i>eś+eń+še+t'ńe+ń</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+t'ńe+ń</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+t'ńe+ń</i>
DAT	<i>eś+eń+še+t'ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+t'ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+t'ńe+ńeń</i>
ABL	<i>eś+eń+še+t'ńe+d'e</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+t'ńe+d'e</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+t'ńe+d'e</i>
INE	<i>eś+eń+še+t'ńe+se</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+t'ńe+se</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+t'ńe+se</i>
ELA	<i>eś+eń+še+t'ńe+ste</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+t'ńe+ste</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+t'ńe+ste</i>
PROL	<i>eś+eń+še+t'ńe+va</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+t'ńe+va</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+t'ńe+va</i>
TRNSL	<i>eś+eń+še+t'ńe+ks</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+t'ńe+ks</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+t'ńe+ks</i>
COMP	<i>eś+eń+še+t'ńe+ška</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+t'ńe+ška</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+t'ńe+ška</i>
ABE	<i>eś+eń+še+t'ńe+vt'eme</i>	<i>eś+eł+še+t'ńe+vt'eme</i>	<i>eś+enze+še+t'ńe+vt'eme</i>

Table 4.75 Genitive-form personal pronouns in fused head constructions

"STEM-REFL+POSS.GEN+DEM-DIST+Cx(+DEF)"

	1PL	2PL	3PL
SG			
NOM	<i>eś+eńek+še+ś</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+ś</i>	<i>eś+est+še+ś</i>
GEN	<i>eś+eńek+še+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+est+še+ńt'</i>
DAT	<i>eś+eńek+še+ńteń</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+ńteń</i>	<i>eś+est+še+ńteń</i>
ABL	<i>eś+eńek+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+d'e+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+est+še+d'e+ńt'</i>
INE	<i>eś+eńek+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+se+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+est+še+se+ńt'</i>
ELA	<i>eś+eńek+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+ste+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+est+še+ste+ńt'</i>
PROL	<i>eś+eńek+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+va+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+est+še+va+ńt'</i>
TRNSL	<i>eś+eńek+še+ks</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+ks</i>	<i>eś+est+še+ks</i>
COMP	<i>eś+eńek+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+ška+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+est+še+ška+ńt'</i>
ABE	<i>eś+eńek+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>	<i>eś+est+še+v'teme+ńt'</i>
PL			
NOM	<i>eś+eńek+še+t+ńe</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+t+ńe</i>	<i>eś+est+še+t+ńe</i>
GEN	<i>eś+eńek+še+t+ńe+ń</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+t+ńe+ń</i>	<i>eś+est+še+t+ńe+ń</i>
DAT	<i>eś+eńek+še+t+ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+t+ńe+ńeń</i>	<i>eś+est+še+t+ńe+ńeń</i>
ABL	<i>eś+eńek+še+t+ńe+d'e</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+t+ńe+d'e</i>	<i>eś+est+še+t+ńe+d'e</i>
INE	<i>eś+eńek+še+t+ńe+se</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+t+ńe+se</i>	<i>eś+est+še+t+ńe+se</i>
ELA	<i>eś+eńek+še+t+ńe+ste</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+t+ńe+ste</i>	<i>eś+est+še+t+ńe+ste</i>
PROL	<i>eś+eńek+še+t+ńe+va</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+t+ńe+va</i>	<i>eś+est+še+t+ńe+va</i>
TRNSL	<i>eś+eńek+še+t+ńe+ks</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+t+ńe+ks</i>	<i>eś+est+še+t+ńe+ks</i>
COMP	<i>eś+eńek+še+t+ńe+ška</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+t+ńe+ška</i>	<i>eś+est+še+t+ńe+ška</i>
ABE	<i>eś+eńek+še+t+ńe+v'teme</i>	<i>eś+eŋk+še+t+ńe+v'teme</i>	<i>eś+est+še+t+ńe+v'teme</i>

Attestation of two marking strategies for three genitive pronouns was conducted according to a simple question of whether any case form other than the nominative singular indefinite declension occurred in the corpora. Table (4.76) illustrates the findings.

Table 4.76 Attestation of two modifier-without-noun marking strategies for three sets of pronouns

	Personal pronoun	Reflexive/intensive pronoun		Reflexive/intensive stem			
		Zero	DEM	Zero	DEM	Zero	DEM
1	SG	NA	+	NA	+	NA	+
	PL	+	+	+	NA	+	+
2	SG	+	+	+	NA	+	+
	PL	+	+	+	NA	+	NA
3	SG	+	NA	+	NA	+	NA
	PL	+	+	NA	NA	+	NA

The only paradigm of minimal attestation was that for the combination reflexive/intensive pronoun with SOD marking. This, however, is not surprising, as the genitive-case reflexive/intensive pronouns are low frequency, see table (4.77), where, for purposes of comparison, I have provided statistics for plain genitive forms and genitive forms with clitics.

Table 4.77 Genitive forms of personal pronouns, reflexive/intensive pronouns and reflexive/intensive stems

		Personal pronoun		Reflexive/intensive pronoun		Reflexive/intensive stem		Total
		Plain	Clitic	Plain	Clitic	Plain	Clitic	
1	SG	12,196	521	145	37	929	44	13,872
	PL	8723	120	77	5	707	19	9651
2	SG	7578	157	160	39	931	32	8897
	PL	2233	39	27	5	180	3	2487
3	SG	17,887	265	338	28	4238	74	22,830
	PL	7528	92	71	1	1453	12	9157
Total		56,145	1194	818	115	8438	184	66,894

With an attested system of genitive-case personal pronouns, reflexive/intensive pronouns and reflexive/intensive stems in combination with two strategies for modifier-without-noun marking, we arrive at the six tables (4.68, 4.70–75) with attestation in table (4.76). But what is there to say of the 3SG concatenation demonstrated by Zaicz (2006: 197), where he has apparently made an analogical paradigm according to a different interpretation of the genitive-case pronouns 1SG and 2SG plus SOD strategy seen in table (4.69), *mońśeś* ‘mine (in subject function)’ and *tońśeś* ‘yours (in subject function)’? According to what can be seen in his table – reproduced below in (4.78) (with darkening in the cells of inconsistent concatenation, whereas the columns have been assigned Latin numerals for ease of location, by this author) – Zaicz has apparently interpreted the forms in column II as definite declensions of the reflexive/intensive pronouns. Can such forms be attested in the Erzya corpora?

Table 4.78 Mordva 3SG pronouns á la Zaicz (2006: 197)

		<i>PRO.s3</i> '(s)he'	<i>Possessive.PRO.s3</i> 'his/hers'	<i>REFLEX.PRO.s3</i> 'him/herself'	
		I	II	III	IV
NOM	N	<i>son</i>	<i>son-s^jes^j</i>	~ <i>son-zes^j</i>	<i>es^j</i>
GEN	G/A	<i>son-ze</i>	<i>son-s^jen^ʃt^ʃ</i>	~ <i>son-zen^ʃt^ʃ</i>	<i>es^j-enze</i>
DAT	Dat/All	<i>son^ʃ-enze</i>	<i>son-s^ʃen^ʃt^ʃen^ʃ</i>	~ <i>son-zen^ʃt^ʃen^ʃ</i>	<i>es^ʃ-t^ʃenze</i>
INE	Ine	<i>son^ʃ-senze</i>	<i>son-sesen^ʃt^ʃ</i>	~ <i>son-zesen^ʃt^ʃ</i>	<i>es^ʃ-senze</i>
ELA	Ela	<i>son^ʃ-stenze</i>	<i>son-stesen^ʃt^ʃ</i>	~ <i>son-stesen^ʃt^ʃ</i>	<i>es^ʃ-stenze</i>
ILL	Ill	<i>son^ʃ-zenze</i>	<i>son^ʃ-zesen^ʃt^ʃ</i>	~ <i>son^ʃ-zesen^ʃt^ʃ</i>	<i>es^ʃ-senze</i>
PROL	Prol	<i>son^ʃ-ganzo</i>	<i>son^ʃ-gan^ʃt^ʃ</i>	~ <i>son-gan^ʃt^ʃ</i>	<i>es^ʃ-kanzo</i>
ABL	Abl	<i>son^ʃ-d^ʃenze</i>	<i>son^ʃ-d^ʃen^ʃt^ʃ</i>	~ <i>son^ʃd^ʃen^ʃt^ʃ</i>	<i>es^ʃ-t^ʃed^ʃenze</i>
TRNSL	(Trans	<i>son^ʃ-ksenze</i>	<i>son^ʃ-ksen^ʃt^ʃ</i>	~ <i>son-ksen^ʃt^ʃ</i>	<i>es^ʃ-ksenze)</i>
ABE	Abe	<i>son^ʃ-t^ʃemenze</i>	<i>son^ʃ-t^ʃemen^ʃt^ʃ</i>	~ <i>son^ʃt^ʃemen^ʃt^ʃ</i>	<i>es^ʃ-t^ʃemenze</i>
COMP	Cfv	<i>son^ʃ-škanzo</i>	<i>son^ʃ-škan^ʃt^ʃ</i>	~ <i>son-škan^ʃt^ʃ</i>	<i>es^ʃ-škanzo</i>

First of all, it cannot be over-stressed that the Erzya language attests to genitive-case pronouns, which correlate in modifier function with genitive-case nouns, and that there are no pronoun forms which correlate in marking to the head noun they modify, i.e. this system does not parallel that of the German *deine Mutter* 'your mother' versus *dein Vater* 'your father' where the shape of the pronoun is dictated by its head, and therefore I do not speak of possessive pronouns. Second, the genitive form in column one is realized phonetically without palatalization due to the following alveolar fricative, but the quality of the following front mid vowel *e* indicates that there was a fronting trigger, probably a palatalized *n̄* as is the case in the closely related Moksha language. Third, the only 3SG forms in the majority corpus beginning in *son^ʃse-* and therefore addressing all members construed for column II, are the reflexive/intensive pronouns illustrated in table (4.71), which are readily spotted due to the obligatory adnominal-person marking. Fourth, only the first four rows of column III adhere to the concatenation scheme genitive-case pronoun plus definite declension. Of course, this conception of the Erzya system is not original with Zaicz, the Grammar of Mordvin Languages (1980: 267) implies that there exist definite-declension forms of the Erzya reflexive/intensive pronouns, and an earlier version (GMYa 1962 I: 232) even provides a single 3SG form **son^ʃseš*, but then the authors only explicitly show the paradigms of the 1SG and 2SG persons, whereas the 3SG paradigm provided in parallel to those of the other singular genitive pronouns is realized in *sonzeš* the zero-marking strategy for MWN (see GMYa 1962 I: 232). If they had attempted to attest such forms from any of the other persons, their search would have proven fruitless, and I would be denied the opportunity to correct these misconstructions of the Erzya language used in literature.

5. Conclusions

In the introduction I have discussed the prominent issues of Erzyan languagehood, where it is spoken and its use as a medium of literary communication. I have provided examples of phenomena obtaining in the language striving toward consistent and contextually sufficient renditions of the literary and, on occasion, the spoken language. Great stress has been placed on the attestability of phenomena in a majority corpus, where authors and specific pages in publications are afforded their own place in the description of the language. The identification of individual writers is seen as a necessary building block in the analysis of variation in morphological phenomena attested in the language. Writers of this relatively new written medium hale from various dialect backgrounds, as do their editors and proof-readers. The identification of synchronic-geographical parameters that can be attested might, in fact, prove more relevant than hypothetical-diachronic parameters that cannot.

Phonology

An adjusted and attested phonological account of the modern Erzya language was made on the basis of the majority corpus with the consultation of native speakers of the language. As is the case with most languages there are phonemes whose prominence varies from native to loanwords. Assuming that native speakers and writers do not automatically register their usage of etymologically native versus loan vocabulary, and natural language also entails use of affected words, this treatise of Erzya has adhered to a system of six vowel phonemes (see table 3.7) and twenty-nine consonant phonemes (see table 3.8) partially represented in the unmodified Cyrillic script of thirty-three characters. The additional vowel phoneme unrounded high central *ɨ* is marginal but can be attested in minimal pairs in native and loan word stems, but not in affixes or at the stem-affix juncture (see table 3.5). The additional consonant phoneme velar nasal *ŋ* is attested in minimal pairs where the alveolar nasal occurs before velar plosives (in loan words and in stem-affix junctures) and word initially (see table 3.3). The unrounded mid central vowel *ɛ*, however, was determined to be an allophone of two separate phonemes: the unrounded mid front vowel *e* and the unrounded high central vowel *ɨ* (in Russian-language acronyms). Finally, the bilabial trill *ʙ*, which appears only word-initially in three word roots, has not appeared in the examples of this dissertation.

Six prominent phenomena contributing to allomorphic variation in the morphological system of Erzya were outlined, of which three are especially important to this treatise of morphology in that they are ubiquitous or contribute to ambiguity in the system:

(a) Vowel harmony affects allomorphic variation in nineteen morphemes of adnominal declension with target vowels attested in four affix positions: affix-initial, affix-internal, affix-final and stand-alone.

(b) Palatal harmony contributes to ambiguity in front-vowel contexts in the interpretation of surface coda *-ń* and *-ť*. Adnominal 1SG *-ON* marking is realized in coda *-ń* and thus is a homonym of the realization of the indefinite declension genitive *-Oń*, which is also used in marking the genitive case on distinct, singular referents, especially proper nouns and possessa of the 1SG possessor. Adnominal 2SG *-OT* marking is realized in coda *-ť* and thus is a homonym of the realization of the 2SG possessive declension kin-term genitive *-Oť* and sometimes the nominative plural in *-T*. (See section 3.2.2. PALATAL HARMONY (1–4).)

(c) Stem-final vowel loss causes ambiguity in *a*-final stems at two junctures. (Cf. sections 3.2.6 STEM-FINAL VOWEL LOSS, 4.2.3.1.1. FIRST PERSON, 4.2.3.1.2. SECOND PERSON 4.2.4. NOMINAL CONJUGATION MARKERS and 4.4. PARADIGM DEFECTIVITY IN ERZYA POSSESSOR INDEXING.) Inflection involving the indefinite nominative plural morpheme in *-T* is realized in a word form homonymous to the nominal conjugation form of that same stem in the indicative present 2SG, see (1). Likewise, inflection involving the 1SG possessive declension nominative-plural or oblique morpheme in *-ON* is realized in a word form homonymous to a nominal conjugation form of that same stem in the indicative present 1SG, see (2).

(1) a. *ava+T* => *avat*
 mother_N+PL.NOM

b. *ava+at* => *avat* (folklore, old literary, and Alatyr' subdialects *avajat*)
 mother_N+IND.PRES.PRED-2SG

(2) a. *ćora+ON* => *ćoran*
 son_N+POSS-1SG>PL.NOM

b. *ćora+an* => *ćoran* (folklore, old literary, and Alatyr' subdialects *ćorajan*)
 son_N+IND.PRES.PRED-1SG

Morphology

Morphology saw the establishment of four separate inflectional levels: the word stem, declension, conjugation and clitic marking. Each was inspected and provided with morphological, semantic and statistic data relevant to subsequent inspection. Morphological criteria were then used in the investigation of sublexica prominent in various case slots. Inconsistencies in the possessive declension slots 1SG and 2SG were investigated. And finally, a phenomena called secondary declension, a phenomena involving the dropping of a contextually retrievable head noun in an NP and the raising of one of the retained modifiers to main-item status.

Nominal-type inflectional STEM TYPES were established as three: stems ending in consonants (N1) – with a subgroup discerned in s(h)ibilant-final stems (N1S); stems ending in mid vowels that attest to optional stem-final vowel loss in specific declension cells (N2), and stems ending in vowels that are not optionally dropped before affix-initial onset consonants (N3).

N1 = *kev* ‘stone’; *kal* ‘fish’; *sod* ‘soot’

N1S = *piks* ‘rope’; *kijaks* ‘floor’; *oš* ‘town, city’

N2 = *paygo* ‘mushroom; bonnet’; *elde* ‘mare’; *valdo* ‘light (a.; n.)’

N3 = *kudo* ‘home; house; room; container’; *vele* ‘village’; *ava* ‘woman; mother’

The concatenation of Erzya adnominal morphology can be broken down into three layers: declensions (4.2.1. CASE, 4.2.2. NUMBER and 4.2.3. DEICTIC MARKERS), adnominal conjugation (4.2.4 NOMINAL CONJUGATION MARKERS) and clitic marking (4.2.5 THE CLITIC -GAK). Due to ZERO-marking strategies in many slots of inflection, adnominal morphology also requires an understanding of nominal-type word-stem morphology, which can be utilized in all layers of adnominal inflection. The declension types, INDEF, POSSESSIVE and DEFINITE, the last of which might, for concatenational reasons be split into SINGULAR and PLURAL, attest inflection in 15, 13, 10 and 13 cases, respectively (see table 4.40).

Adnominal conjugation, which otherwise is the focus of a doctoral dissertation (Turunen: 2010 “Nonverbal predication in Erzya: Studies on morpho-syntactic variation and part of speech distinctions”), has been outlined according to source grammars and attestation from corpus and field work. The compatibility of possessor index marking with case has been plotted in table (4.42). There are only five cases attesting possessive declension compatibility with nominal conjugation: the nominative, inessive, genitive, prolative and locative.

Clitic marking was observed as a dichotomy, either it is or it isn’t. It was observed that the dative adposition *te-*, with obligatory adnominal-person marking, does not co-occur with clitic marking, a matter which may be correlate with grammaticalization. (See more specifics in section 4.3 ADNOMINAL-TYPE PERSON IN PARTS OF SPEECH and table 4.49b.)

Possessive declension compatibility

The unique word forms of the majority corpus were filtered for possessive declension compatibility and 27 sublexica were discerned in a manual scan of the hits, which appeared on a highest-frequency-first-basis. Attestation was partially intuitional, but comparison of the sublexica was also applied. The results were rendered for the 351 hypothetical cells; there were 130 possible declensions attested (see table 4.59).

Inspection of possessive-declension attestation reveals variation in the association of sublexica, case and possessor index marking in Erzya. While there is a relatively high frequency of kin terms and body parts with possessive declension marking in the core cases, spatial entities and abstract referents are more typically the targets of local-case + possessor-index marking. The obligatory adnominal-marking requirement affects only certain sublexica, and these sublexica attest to limited case inventory in the majority corpus. Statistics on adnominal-person marking strategies morphological versus lexical provide evidence for word groups with distinctive patterns, which can be delimited by part-of-speech affiliation and/or semantic alignment (noun phrase, quantifiers, adpositional phrase and noun-like non-finite constructions in *-Om*). The adpositional phrase differs from other syntactic elements in that adnominal-person marking is subject to complementary distribution, namely, adpositions take either a preceding complement or they are marked with a possessive index. In noun phrases (also non-finites) person can be expressed with both lexical and morphological means (see tables 4.53–4.58).

Obligatory adnominal-person marking was attested in four parts of speech, nouns, quantifiers, pronouns, adpositions and noun-like non-finite constructions in *-Om*. In the grammars items with obligatory adnominal-person marking are usually shown to have smaller morphological case inventories, and their appearance in the tables is largely justified by their paradigmatic attestability.

In concatenation of the language two specific phenomena were subjected to inspection: Paradigm defectivity attested in the genitive and dative slots of the 1SG and 2SG possessive declension tables with regard to so-called KIN-TERM affiliation and secondary declension, a cover term for declension strategies in MODIFIERS-WITHOUT-NOUNS target NPS.

Paradigm defectivity

The investigation of paradigm defectivity attempted to ascertain the phenomena involved in the paradigm defectivity observable in the genitive slot of the possessive declension. (See specifics in (4.4.) PARADIGM DEFECTIVITY IN ERZYA POSSESSOR INDEXING.) It became apparent that the notion KIN-TERM is used inconsistently with regard to the two persons, 1SG and 2SG, involved in this defectivity. On the one hand, the indefinite-declension homonymic 1SG-genitive form in *-On* was observed in Shakhmatov's materials to appear with a smaller group of referents than that of the 2SG-genitive form *-Ot'*, namely, 1SG-genitive seemed to occur only with blood-kin term indicating distinct referent elder than the 1SG.

Comparison with dialect information from Alatyř' dialect (one with parameters for kin and number), provided insight into the importance of the feature "distinct", whereas subsequently evidence from the majority corpus provided examples of distinct kin terms used in contexts where a 3SG interpretation would be expected. Hence it was assumed that the alleged 1SG kin-term genitive was, in fact, an indefinite genitive marker, such as would be compatible with other high-inalienable possessa/targets of high-saliency/possessor marking, for example, proper nouns, the 1SG and 2SG person pronouns, as well as, in this case, distinct singular kin terms.

The weight of the 2SG adnominal marking was allowed to fall on less extensive dialect distribution. The 2SG-genitive form might be attested as an ambiguous marker affording both a 2SG genitive interpretation and one of a dialect genitive definite singular.

Modifiers without nouns (secondary declension)

The source grammars and corpora were inspected for secondary-declension attestation. (See specifics in (4.5.) ADNOMINAL SYNTAX AND DISTINGUISHING PERSONAL PRONOUN PARADIGMS.) It was found that Erzya attests to two strategies of MWN (modifiers-without-nouns marking): a zero marking strategy involving a simple symmetric shift of declension locus to the NP-final main item, and a speaker-oriented demonstrative pronoun strategy, generally involving the distal demonstrative pronoun *še* 'that', but probably also other speaker-oriented demonstrative pronouns, such as *šet'e* 'now this (a speaker-oriented demonstrative pronoun introducing a newly mentioned item in a dialogue context)'. It was then noted that certain modifier types, in written literature, attest to both strategies of MWN marking. An inspection was made of the sublexica with regard to what modifier types appeared with which MWN marking strategies.

The resulting hypothesis of two MWN marking strategies was then applied to the inspection of a disparity in the description of genitive-case pronouns, personal and reflexive/intensive, found in various treatises of the language. It was noted that three sets of genitive-case pronouns can be attested in the majority corpus for both strategies of MWN marking, and that the speaker-oriented demonstrative marking strategy has erroneously been presented as a definite-declension variant of the reflexive/intensive pronouns.

Morphological adnominal person in Erzya

Adnominal person in the morphological system of Erzya can be attested as one of the three declension types on a par with indefinite and definite declension. This declension type has a range in five different parts of speech nouns, quantifiers, pronouns, adpositions and the problematic non-finites in *-Om-*, whereas obligatory adnominal person marking is only attested in a minimal set of nouns, quantifiers, pronouns and adpositions. Adnominal-person in Erzya morphology is indicated by a suffix attesting to three separate ordering strategies. The non-core cases attest to a rigid CASE MARKER + POSSESSOR INDEX ordering; the core cases (nominative and genitive) make no distinction for case vs.

possessor index components, and the dative, which synchronically can be aligned with the strategy of the other core cases, but might diachronically speaking illustrate a POSSESSOR INDEX + CASE MARKER ORDERING strategy.

Possessor index marking is used to indicate the possessor in the grammatical categories of person and number. The possessor indices also offer a minimal distinction for the grammatical category of number for the possessa. The distinction can be seen in the absence of an *N* marker (traditionally viewed as a plural marker, but also an oblique marker). The 3SG marker in *-OzO* is only used with the nominative singular, syntactic subject/subject complement reading, in the literary language (dialect evidence exists for object marking of inanimates), whereas the 3SG marker in *-OnzO* appears in all other slots. The 1SG marker in *-Om* is limited to the nominative and genitive singular readings in normative grammars, while its counterpart in *-ON* appears in all other slots. In the majority corpus, however, the 1SG marker in *-Om* can appear in all slots, whereas it is the counterpart in *-ON*, which is never attested in the nominative singular slot (*-ON* can be attested in the genitive, object-function slot). The remaining four persons make no distinction for number of possessa.

Possessive declension can vary in compatibility with different sublexica from the five parts of speech where it is attested. Compounded parameters involving: (a) possessa and their correlation with the inalienability hierarchy, and (b) possessors with their salience in the hierarchies of accessibility might be used as argumentation for high-ranking on the accessibility marking scale, i.e. ZERO marking. Paradigmatic defectivity can and should be dealt with separately utilizing parameters, such as, case and person.

Possessor indexing is also attested in the secondary declension of NPS, such that it follows a ZERO-marker strategy, and can be found in texts of the majority corpus. Most person marking found in secondary-declension strategies involves genitive-case personal pronouns (neutral pronouns, reflexive/intensive stems, reflexive/intensive pronouns) and the parameter [\pm SPEAKER-ORIENTED DEMONSTRATIVE MARKING].

Text corpora research of adnominal-person marking in the morphological system of Erzya has helped to establish new points of departure in research of the language.

Erzya Source Literature (Corpora)

UPTMN 3.2 1967 = УПТМН 3.2 1967:

Эрзянские сказки

Published in: Устно-поэтическое творчество мордовского народа, в восьми томах

Саранск — Мордовское книжное издательство.

Word count: 53,753; Character count: 674,216

Abramov, Kuz'ma 1961 = Абрамов, Кузьма 1961:

Novel: Ломантне теевсть малацекс.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 105,272; Character count: 1,417,706

Abramov, Kuz'ma 1962 = Абрамов, Кузьма 1962:

Short story: Комолявка.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 27,527; Character count: 355,391

Abramov, Kuz'ma 1964 = Абрамов, Кузьма 1964:

Novel: Качамонь пачк.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 140,482; Character count: 1,904,375

Abramov, Kuz'ma 1967 = Абрамов, Кузьма 1967:

Novel: Эсеть кангость а маряви.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 86,654; Character count: 1,162,213

Abramov, Kuz'ma 1971 = Абрамов, Кузьма 1971:

Novel: Эрзянь цёра I.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 88,851; Character count: 1,193,094

Abramov, Kuz'ma 1973 = Абрамов, Кузьма 1973:

Novel: Эрзянь цёра II.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 110,126; Character count: 1,484,740

Abramov, Kuz'ma 1974 = Абрамов, Кузьма 1974:

Short story: Нурька морот.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 69,814; Character count: 926,847

Abramov, Kuz'ma 1980 = Абрамов, Кузьма 1980:

Novel: Велень тейтерь.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 114,914; Character count: 1,542,649

Abramov, Kuz'ma 1987 = Абрамов, Кузьма 1987:

Novel: Исяк якинъ Найманов.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 82,955; Character count: 1,143,607

Abramov, Kuz'ma 1988 = Абрамов, Кузьма 1988:

Novel: Пургаз.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: minorityCorpus

Word count: 131,155; Character count: 1,774,090

Abramov, Kuz'ma 1989 = Абрамов, Кузьма 1989:

Novel: Олячинть кисэ.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 110,103; Character count: 1,540,338

Abramov, Kuz'ma 1994 = Абрамов, Кузьма 1994:

Short story: Сараклыч.

In Kezèren' pingede. Èrzyan' ras'kede, 1994. Саранск

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 1,855; Character count: 10,452

Abramov, Kuz'ma 1996 = Абрамов, Кузьма 1996:

Drama: Эрванть эсензэ ормазо.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 10,819; Character count: 62,890

Ageikin, G. 1996 = Агейкин, Г. 1996:

Drama: Нумолнэть.

In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 1,894; Character count: 25,708

Altyskin, Viktor 1986 = Алтышкин, Виктор 1986:

Short story: Эрямонь пинкст.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 10,442; Character count: 143,373

Anoshkin, V. 1936/2 = Аношкин, В. 1936/2:

Short story: Валскень гудок.

In Syatko, 1936/2. Саранск

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 7,458; Character count: 106,947

Anoshkin, V. 1938/11–12 = Аношкин, В. 1938/11–12:

Short story: Геройства.

In Syatko, 1938/11–12. Саранск

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 7,132; Character count: 103,012

- Antonov, Ivan 1956 = Антонов, Иван 1956:
Novel: Вейсэнъ семиясо.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 63,063; Character count: 861,482
- Arapov, Vasili = Арапов, Василий :
Short story: Лутазъ теште.
Manuscript
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 21,304; Character count: 298,317
- Arapov, Aleksandr 1987 = Арапов, Александр 1987:
Poetry: Сырнесэ моданть пой кази.
In Maney vasolkst, 1987. Саранск
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 1,177; Character count: 17,513
- Arapov, Aleksandr 1990 = Арапов, Александр 1990:
Poetry: Вайгель.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 4,454; Character count: 59,450
- Arapov, Vasili 1995 = Арапов, Василий 1995:
Short story: Аштема ков.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 23,820; Character count: 336,942
- Bardin, Pyotr 1979 = Бардин, Пётр 1979:
Poetry: Тештень пиземе.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 3,302; Character count: 46,836
- Bargova, Tamara 1996 = Баргова, Тамара 1996:
Drama: Чаволкайтъ ды превейть.
In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 3,650; Character count: 46,785
- Bargova, Tamara 1997 = Баргова, Тамара 1997:
Short story: Вечкеманъ усият.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 32,945; Character count: 447,743
- Batyaikin, Il'ya 1986 = Батяйкин, Илья 1986:
Poetry: Валдаське.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 2,609; Character count: 39,306

- Biushkina, Mariya 1996 = Биушкина, Мария 1996:
 Drama: Сыргозема.
 In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск
 Format: majorityCorpus
 Word count: 8,089; Character count: 101,594
- Bryzhinski, Andrei 1994 = Брыжинский, Андрей 1994:
 Short story: Оймень валдо.
 Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
 Format: majorityCorpus
 Word count: 59,280; Character count: 833,631
- Bryzhinski, Mikhail 1983 = Брыжинский, Михаил 1983:
 Short story: Половт.
 Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
 Format: minorityCorpus
 Word count: 36,994; Character count: 498,156
- Bryzhinski, Mikhail 1991 = Брыжинский, Михаил 1991:
 Short story: Эряmodo надобия.
 Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
 Format: minorityCorpus
 Word count: 47,248; Character count: 638,165
- Bryzhinski, Mikhail manus = Брыжинский, Михаил manus:
 Ethnofantastic: Кирдажт.
 Manuscript
 Format: minorityCorpus
 Word count: 50,774; Character count: 676,782
- Chakin, Aleksandr 1995 = Чакин, Александр 1995:
 Poetry: Вечкемадо.
 Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
 Format: majorityCorpus
 Word count: 200; Character count: 2,850
- Chesnokov, Fyodor 1974 = Чесноков, Фёдор 1974:
 Short story: Од зрямонь увт.
 Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
 Format: majorityCorpus
 Word count: 30,700; Character count: 411,105
- Chesnokov, Fyodor 1996 = Чесноков, Фёдор 1996:
 Drama: Кавто кява.
 In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск
 Format: majorityCorpus
 Word count: 3,905; Character count: 49,504
- Chetvergov, Evgeni 1992 = Четвергов, Евгений 1992:
 Short story: Велень вайгельть.
 Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
 Format: majorityCorpus
 Word count: 33015; Character count: 455,453

- Chetvergov, Evgeni 2003 = Четвергов, Евгений 2003:
Short story: Иень тюст.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 40,235; Character count: 537,826
- Dergachyova, Lyubov' 1995 = Дергачева, Любовь 1995:
Poetry: Вечкемадо.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 2,208; Character count: 31,642
- Doronin, Aleksandr 1979 = Доронин, Александр 1979:
Poetry: Тештень пиземе.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 2,149; Character count: 31,960
- Doronin, Aleksandr 1993 = Доронин, Александр 1993:
Novel: Кочкодыкесь – паксянь нармунь.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 103,323; Character count: 1,387,372
- Doronin, Aleksandr 1994 = Доронин, Александр 1994:
Кинь ютасы молициясь.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 43,283; Character count: 618,643
- Doronin, Aleksandr 1996 = Доронин, Александр 1996:
Novel: Баягань сулейть.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 127,926; Character count: 1,859,037
- Doronin, Aleksandr 2001 = Доронин, Александр 2001:
Novel: Кузьма Алексеев.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: minorityCorpus
Word count: 102,821; Character count: 1,429,596
- Dyomin, Vasili 2008 = Дёмин, Василий 2008:
Fiction: Кузька эрзянь паз.
Manuscript
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 30,600; Character count: 422,782
- Èryushev, Boris 1997 = Эрюшев, Борис 1997:
Short story: Тиринь масторсто кучовкс.
In Otsyor, 1997. Саранск
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 2,384; Character count: 34,058

Evsev'ev, Makar 1931 = Евсевьев, Макар 1931:

Folklore: Мордовская свадьба.

Moskov — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 17,885; Character count: 251,263

Evsev'ev, Makar 1965 = Евсевьев, Макар 1965:

Folklore: Избранные труды 3. том.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Word count: 35,190; Character count: 461,626

Gorbunov, Genrikh 1993 = Горбунов, Генрих 1993:

Вастомат.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 46,414; Character count: 677,666

Grigoshin, Yakov 1996 = Григошин, Яков 1996:

Drama: Ёлкань перька.

In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 1106; Character count: 15475

Irkayev, Nikolai 1994 = Иркаев, Николай 1994:

Poetry: Моро Ратордо.

In Kezèren' pingede. Èrzyan' ras'kede, 1994. Саранск

Ishutkin, Nikolai 1987 = Ишуткин, Николай 1987:

Poetry: Маней васолкст.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 2,205; Character count: 33,697

Ishutkin, Nikolai 1994 = Ишуткин, Николай 1994:

Poetry: Тештень мастор.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 6,421; Character count: 98,194

Kalinkin, Ivan 1995 = Калинин, Иван 1995:

Ава ды лей.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Word count: 51,812; Character count: 764,547

Kalinkin, Ivan 2000 = Калинин, Иван 2000:

Short story: Кискань эрямо.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Kalinkin, Ivan 2000 = Калинин, Иван 2000:

Poetry: Сюконямо.

In Kiskan' èryamo, 2000. Саранск

Kemaikina, Raisa 1987 = Кемайкина, Раиса 1987:

Poetry: Маней васолкст.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 2,199; Character count: 32,749

Kemaikina, Raisa 1996 = Кемайкина, Раиса 1996:

Drama: Шумбрат, од ие.

In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 1,253; Character count: 17,534

Kirillov, Pyotr 1986 = Кириллов, Пётр 1986:

Short story: Кочказь сочиненият 3 томсо. 1-це томось.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: minorityCorpus

Word count: 38,686; Character count: 491,344

Kirillov, Pyotr 1987 = Кириллов, Пётр 1987:

Short story: Васенце урок.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 78,701; Character count: 1,033,975

Kirillov, Pyotr 1996 = Кириллов, Пётр 1996:

Drama: Литова.

In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 5,203; Character count: 69,710

Klyuchagin, Pyotr 1979 = Ключагин, Пётр 1979:

Short story: Пирявкс.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 6,050; Character count: 84,109

Klyuchagin, Pyotr 1990 = Ключагин, Пётр 1990:

Short story: Меельце кулят.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 3,407; Character count: 48,912

Klyuchagin, Pyotr 1997 = Ключагин, Пётр 1997:

Short story: Цёканка.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 26,666; Character count: 377,349

Kolomasov, Vasili 1996 = Коломасов, Василий 1996:

Novel: Лавгинов.

In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 60,737; Character count: 768,660

Kolomasov, Vasili 1996 = Коломасов, Василий 1996:

Short story: Тумо Петя.

In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск

Word count: 2,645; Character count: 34,228

Krivosheyev, Il'ya 1946 = Кривошеев, Илья 1946:

Poetry: Монь ким.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 4,604; Character count: 71,204

- Krivosheyev, Il'ya 1996 = Кривошеев, Илья 1996:
Drama: Мезе тят – секень неят.
In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 3,381; Character count: 44,523
- Krivosheyev, Il'ya 1999 = Кривошеев, Илья 1999:
Poetry: Кочказь произведеният.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
- Kuldurkayev, Yakov 1994 = Кулдуркаев, Яков 1994:
Poetry: Эрьмезь.
In Kezèren' pingede. Èrzyan' ras'kede, 1994. Саранск
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 10,466; Character count: 152,572
- Kutorkin, Andrei 1969 = Куторкин, Андрей 1969:
Novel: Лажниця Сура. Васенце книга. Валдаевть.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
- Kutorkin, Andrei 1976 = Куторкин, Андрей 1976:
Novel: Лажниця Сура. Омбоце книга. Кавто киява.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
- Kutorkin, Andrei 1987 = Куторкин, Андрей 1987:
Novel: Лажниця Сура. Колмоце книга. Ашолгадома ланга.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: minorityCorpus
Word count: 94,692; Character count: 1,319,982
- Kutorkin, Andrei 1997 = Куторкин, Андрей 1997:
Novel: Раужо Палмань.
In Rauzho Palman', 1997. Саранск
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 74,540; Character count: 1,028,488
- Kutorkin, Andrei 1997 = Куторкин, Андрей 1997:
Poetry: Ламзурь.
In Rauzho Palman', 1997. Саранск
Format: majorityCorpus
- Luk'yanov, Aleksei 1955 = Люкьянов, Алексей 1955:
Novel: Валдо ки.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 47,537; Character count: 633,678
- Lyubayev, Pavel 1958 = Любаев, Павел 1958:
Poetry: Ялгань вал.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 3,616; Character count: 51,370

- Lyulyakina, Serafima 1996 = Люлякина, Серафима 1996:
Drama: Авань седей.
In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 3,763; Character count: 47,616
- Martynov, Aleksandr 1984 = Мартынов, Александр 1984:
Novel: Толонь сёлмот.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 60,494; Character count: 823,353
- Motorkin, Mikhail 1996 = Моторкин, Михаил 1996:
Drama: Чачома чи.
In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 5,470; Character count: 73,927
- Motorkin, Mikhail 1997 = Моторкин, Михаил 1997:
Short story: Варма ковол.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 39,517; Character count: 554,726
- Petaikin, Aleksandr 1995 = Петайкин, Александр 1995:
Poetry: .
In Vechkemado, Саранск.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 138; Character count: 1,869
- Petaikin, Aleksandr 1996 = Петайкин, Александр 1996:
Drama: Тантей Штюрьба.
In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 5,414; Character count: 71,431
- Petrushkin, Nikolai 1997 = Петрушкин, Николай 1997:
Short story: Айгор Петя.
In Otsyor, 1997. Саранск
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 1,535; Character count: 21,148
- Platonov, Sergei 1970 = Платонов, Сергей 1970:
Poetry: Жойница зорят.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 4,851; Character count: 70,455
- Platonov, Sergei 1975 = Платонов, Сергей 1975:
Short story: Валдо васолкст.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 35,380; Character count: 486,334

Pronchatov, Ivan 1996 = Прончатов, Иван 1996:

Poetry: Сэняжа.

In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 2,964; Character count: 43,016

Radayev, Vasili & Anoshkin, V.1938/8 = Радаев, Василий & Аношкин, В.1938/8:

Short story: Депутат.

In Syatko, 1938/8. Саранск

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 5,914; Character count: 86,229

Radayev, Vasili 1964 = Радаев, Василий 1964:

Short story: Вечкевикс содавиксэнъ.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 11,239; Character count: 153,655

Radayev, Vasili 1967 = Радаев, Василий 1967:

Short story: Шошма леенть чиресэ.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 11,239; Character count: 153,655

Radayev, Vasili 1969 = Радаев, Василий 1969:

Short story: Истяк сакшны часиясь.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 11,239; Character count: 153,655

Radayev, Vasili 1973 = Радаев, Василий 1973:

Poetry: Сияжар.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 46,512; Character count: 676,843

Radayev, Vasili 1991 = Радаев, Василий 1991:

Short story: Тюштя.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 32,132; Character count: 471,653

Radayev, Mikhail 1996 = Радаев, Михаил 1996:

Drama: Тюштянь койть.

In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 1,285; Character count: 18,440

Raptanov, Timofei 1985 = Раптанов, Тимофей 1985:

Novel: Чихан пандо ало.

Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Format: majorityCorpus

Word count: 51,732; Character count: 710,941

- Razgulyayeva, Tat'yana 1997 = Разгуляева, Татьяна 1997:
Short story: Он, Вирень азор, Чуваронь кудынеть,....
In Otsyor, 1997. Саранск
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 6,195; Character count: 87,440
- Ruzavina, Valentina 1997 = Рузавина, Валентина 1997:
Short story: Седейстэ лисиця валт.
In Otsyor, 1997. Саранск
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 1,451; Character count: 20,230
- Ryabov, Anatoliy 1935 = Рябов, Анатолий 1935:
Linguistics: Эрзянь келень грамматика. Морфология.
Саранск — .
Word count: 15,655; Character count: 237,364
- Ryabov, Anatoliy 1935 = Рябов, Анатолий 1935:
Linguistics: Эрзянь келень грамматика. Средней школасо 6 классо тонавтнема книга.
Омбоце пелькс, синтаксис.
Саранск — .
Word count: 15,643; Character count: 228,820
- Sedoikin, Leonid 1991 = Седойкин, Леонид 1991:
Short story: Авань морозо.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 18,983; Character count: 256,050
- Sharonov, Aleksandr 1994 = Шаронов, Александр 1994:
Folklore: Масторава.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
- Shcheglov, Aleksandr 1968 = Щеглов, Александр 1968:
Short story: Уцяска.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 45633; Character count: 603740
- Shcheglov, Aleksandr 1974 = Щеглов, Александр 1974:
Short story: Свадьбадо икеле.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 20927; Character count: 277987
- Shcheglov, Aleksandr 1980 = Щеглов, Александр 1980:
Novel: Кавксть чачозь.
Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
Format: minorityCorpus
Word count: 94,460; Character count: 1,231,207
- Shcheglov, Aleksandr 1996 = Щеглов, Александр 1996:
Poetry: Гайкстак, бандура.
In Mon' vechkeviks knigam, 1996. Саранск
Format: majorityCorpus
Word count: 962; Character count: 13,609

- Sidorov, Viktor 1996 = Сидоров, Виктор 1996:
 Short story: Сулейть.
 Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
 Format: majorityCorpus
 Word count: 20,881; Character count: 287,287
- Sul'dina, Anna 1979 = Сульдина, Анна 1979:
 Poetry: Тештень пиземе.
 Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
 Format: majorityCorpus
 Word count: 3,077; Character count: 46,360
- Tarasova, Marina 1996 = Тарасова, Марина 1996:
 Short story: Псакань ёвкст.
 Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
 Format: majorityCorpus
- Vtulkin, Mikhail 1986 = Втулкин, Михаил 1986:
 Poetry: Валдаське.
 Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
 Format: majorityCorpus
 Word count: 3,004; Character count: 40,359
- Vtulkin, Mikhail 1996/10–11 = Втулкин, Михаил 1996/10–11:
 Short story: Равонь томбале.
 In Сятко, 1996/10–11. Саранск
 Format: majorityCorpus
 Word count: 13,890; Character count: 196,989
- Zhuravlyov, Vyachislav 1987 = Журавлёв, Вячислав 1987:
 Poetry: Эрьва морось монь чачи седейсэнь.
 In Maney vasolkst, 1987. Саранск
 Format: majorityCorpus
 Word count: 1,444; Character count: 21,265
- Zhuravlyov, Vyachislav 1993 = Журавлёв, Вячислав 1993:
 Short story: Овто латко ёвтнемат.
 Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
 Format: majorityCorpus
 Word count: 22,028; Character count: 298,382
- Zhuravlyov, Vyachislav 1996 = Журавлёв, Вячислав 1996:
 Poetry: Валдо ойме.
 Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
 Format: majorityCorpus
 Word count: 7,038; Character count: 101,534
- Zhuravlyov, Vyachislav 1999 = Журавлёв, Вячислав 1999:
 Poetry: Арсемат ды ёжот.
 Саранск — Мордовской книжной издательствась.
 Format: majorityCorpus
 Word count: 22,827; Character count: 315,603

Erzya corpora more extensively:

<<http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/~rueter/rsc/rueter-ErzyaSource.xml>>

IMDI-data files

<<http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/uhlcs/metadata/corpus-metadata/uralic-lgs/mordvin>>

Reference Bibliography

- Aasmäe, Niina 2007:
Rhythm Related Effects in Erzya.
In: *LINGUISTICA URALICA XLIII*: 4, 268–282.
- Abondolo, D. 1987:
Segments and prosodies in Erzya Mordvinian.
In: K. Rédei (ed.), *Studia Uralica*, 219–233.
Vienna: Verband d. Wiss. Ges. Österreichs.
- Adushkina 2000 = Адушкина, Н. С. 2000:
Азорксчинь категориясь, Азорксчинь невтиця суффикстнэнь тевс полдамоост,
Азорксчинь категориянтэ невтемань китне-янтнэ, Азорксчинь полавтнемасонтэ
падеженьтэ лувось.
EKM, 89—102.
- Agafonova 2000 = Агафонова, Н. А. 2000:
Местоимениясь.
EKM, 124—145.
- Ahlquist, August. 1861:
Versuch einer mokscha-mordwinischen Grammatik nebst Texten und Wörterverzeichnis.
St. Petersburg: Eggers et Comp.
- Ahlqvist, August Engelbrekt 1859:
Läran om Verbet i Mordvinskans Mokscha-dialekt.
Akademisk Afhandling, som med den vidtberömda Historisk-Filologiska Fakultetens vid
Kejsrerliga Alexanders-Universitetet i Finland samtycke till offentlig granskning framställes
af August Engelbrekt Ahlqvist, Hist.-Fil. Magister. Uti hist.-filol. lärosalen den 28 Maj 1859
p. v. t. f. m.
Helsingfors: J. C. Frenckell & Son.
- Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon 1998:
Dependencies between Grammatical Systems.
Language, 74, (1), 56–80.
- Alho Alhoniemi, Nina Agafonova & Mihail Mosin 1999:
Suomalais-ersäläinen sanakirja.
Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 64.
Turku: Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitos.
- Alyoshkina 2000 = Алёшкина 2000:
Деепричастиясь.
EKM, 222–227.
- Bakker, Dik WALS Online:
Person Marking on Adpositions.
WALS Online, chap 48.
<<http://wals.info/feature/48>> (2010)
- Bartens, Raija 1970:
On the Temporal Forms in Mordvin.
FUF XXXVIII, 247–256.
- Bartens, Raija 1979:
Mordvan, tšeremissin ja votjakin konjugaation infiniittisten muotojen syntaksi.
Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 170.
Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Bartens, Raija 1999:

Mordvalaiskielten rakenne ja kehitys.
Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 232.
Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Bickel, Balthasar & Johanna Nichols WALS Online:

Locus of Marking in Possessive Noun Phrases.
Obligatory Possessive Inflection.
In: *WALS Online*, chaps 24, 58.
<<http://wals.info/feature/24>> (2010)
<<http://wals.info/feature/58>> (2010)

Bubrikh 1930 = Бубрих, Д. В. 1930:

Звуки и формы эрзянской речи по говору с. Козловки.
Москва: Центральное издательство народов СССР.

Bubrikh 1947 = Бубрих, Д. В. 1947:

Эрзя-мордовская грамматика - минимум (Пособие для вузов).
Саранск.

Bubrikh 1953 = Бубрих, Д. В. 1953:

Историческая грамматика эрзянского языка.
Саранск.

Budenz, József 1869:

Moksa- és erza-mordvin nyelvtan.
Budapest: A M. T. Akadémia könyvkiadó-hivatalában.

Buzakova 2000 = Бузакова, Р. Н. 2000:

Падежтень смустест, Аволь падежень формась, Валмельгакось.
ЕКМ, 82–87, 87–89, 249–254.

Collinder, Björn 1969 [1957]:

Survey of the Uralic languages.
Compiled by Björn Collinder in collaboration with other scholars. 2nd rev. ed.
Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Comrie, Bernard 1981:

The languages of the Soviet Union.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Damaskin, Rudnev 1785 = Дамаскин, Руднев 1785:

Словарь IАзыковъ разныхъ народовъ, въ Нижегородской Епархіи обитающихъ,
имянно: Россіянь, Татарь, Чювашей, Мордвы, и Черемись: по высочайшему
соизволенію и повелѣнію Ея Императорскаго величества премудрой Государыни,
Екатерины Алексѣвны, императрицы и Самодержицы всероссійской, По алфавиту
Россійскихъ словъ Расположенной; и въ нижегородской Семінаріи отъ знающихъ онѣя
языки священниковъ и Семінаристовъ, подъ присмотрамъ Преізсвященнаго Дамаскина
Епископа нижегородскаго и Алаторскаго, сочиненной 1785 года.

Danilov, Viktor 1969 = Данилов, Виктор 1969:

К вопросу о комитативе в эрзянском языке.
Советское финно-угроведение (3), 171–174.

Danilov, Viktor 1973 = Данилов, Виктор 1973:

Общие функции инесива в мордовских и прибалтийско-финских языках.
Советское финно-угроведение (3), 185–194.

- Davydov, M. M. 1963 = Давыдов, М. М. 1963:
 Больше-Игнатовский диалект эрзя-мордовского языка.
ОМД II, 118–233.
- Dyomin, V. 2001 = Дёмин, В. 2001:
Комическое в мордовской литературе (этапы эволюции).
 Тип. «Рузаевский печатник». — 260 с.
- Egorova, A. S. 1976 = Егорова, А.С. 1976:
 О принципах выделения категории определения в эрзянском языке.
Советское финно-угроведение (2), 81–89.
- ЕКМ 2000 = Эрзянь кель, морфология 2000:
Эрзянь кель, морфемика, валонь теэвема ды морфология.
 Вузонь эрзянь ды финнэнь отделениянь тонавтицянтень туртов
 Редколлегиясь: Д.В. Цыганкин (отв. ред., Н. А. Агафонова, М. Д. Имайкина ды лият.
 — Саранск: Тип. «Крас. Окт.». — 280 с. — Мордов.-эрзя яз.
- ERV 1993 = ЭРВ 1993:
Эрзянь-рузонь валкс = рзянско-русский словарь. Ок. 27 000 слов/ НИИ языка,
 литературы, истории и экономики при Правительстве Мордовской АССР,
 под ред. Серебrenникова Б. А., Бузаковой Р. Н., Мосина М. В.
 — М.: Рус. яз., Дигора. 803 с.
- Erina, Ol'ga 1997 = Ерина, Ольга 1997:
Частичи в мордовских языках.
 Dissertationes philologiae uralicae universitatis Tartuensis, 1.
 Tartu: Tartu ülikooli kirjastus.
- Ermuškin, Grigorij I. 2004 = Ермушкин, Григорий И. 2004:
 IX. *Srednetěšskij dialekt èr'zja-mordovskogo jazyka*.
 Mitteilungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica. Heft 24.
 Moskva — Groningen.
- Estill, Denis 2004:
Diachronic change in Erzya word stress.
 Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 246.
 Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Ethnologue Online:
 <http://www.ethnologue.com/show_country.asp?name=RUE>
- Evsev'ev 1963 = Евсевьев, М. Е. [1928–29]/1963
Мордовская грамматика.
 (Избранные труды 4. Москва.)
- Feoktistov, A. P. 1960 = Феоктистов А.П. 1960:
 Мордовские языки и их диалекты.
 In: *Вопросы этнической истории мордовского народа*, 63–82.
 Москва.
- Feoktistov, A. P. 1963 = Феоктистов А.П. 1963:
Категория притяжательности в мордовских языках.
 Саранск: Мордов. кн. изд-во. — 184 с.
- Feoktistov, A. P. 1966 = Феоктистов А.П. 1966:
 Мордовские языки.
 In: *Языки народов СССР*, Том. III: Финно-угорские и самодийские языки, 172–220.
 Москва: Наука.

- Feoktistov, A. P. 1975 = Феоктистов А.П. 1975:
 Мордовские языки.
 In: Основы финно-угорского языкознания: Прибалтийско-финские, саамские и мордовские языки, 248—345.
 Москва: Наука.
- Feoktistow, A.P. 1990 = Феоктистов А.П. 1990:
 Die Dialekte der mordwinischen Sprachen.
 In: *MW* Band I, XXXI–LVII.
- Feoktistov, Aleksandr & Sirkka Saarinen 2005:
Mokšamordvan murteet.
 Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 249.
 Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Gabelentz, Herr Conon von der 1839:
 Versuch einer Mordwinischen Grammatik.
Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes. II. 2–3, 235–284, 383–419.
 Göttingen.
- Gheno, Danilo 1995:
 „‘Mordwinisch’ oder ‘Mokschanisch und Erzanisch’?“.
 In: Gábor Zaicz (red.), *Zur Frage der uralischen Schriftsprachen.* 57–61.
 Linguistica. Series A. Studia et dissertationes 17.
 Budapest: A MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet.
- Gil, David [2005]WALS Online:
 Adjectives without Nouns.
 In: *WALS Online*, chap 61.
 <<http://wals.info/feature/61>> (2010)
- ГМҮа 1962 I = ГМЯ 1962 I:
Грамматика мордовских (мокшанского и эрзянского) языков. I. Фонетика и морфология.
 Ред. М.Н. Колядёнков, Р.А. Заводова.
 Саранск.
- ГМҮа 1980 = ГМЯ 1980:
Грамматика мордовских языков.
 Под ред. проф. Д.В.Цыганкина.
 Саранск.
- Grebneva 2000 = Гребнева, А. М. 2000:
 Существительноеь, Падежень лувось, Аволь невтемачинь полавтнемась, Невтемачинь категориясь.
ЕКМ, 73–75, 76–77, 78–82, 102–105.
- Hamari, Arja 2007:
The negation of stative relation clauses in the Mordvin languages.
 Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 254.
 Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Heine, Bernd 1997:
Possession. Cognitive sources, forces, and grammaticalization.
 Cambridge University Press.
- HFST = Helsinki Finite-State Transducer Online:
 <<http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/kieliteknologia/tutkimus/hfst>>

- Imaikina, M. D. = Имайкина, М. Д. 1996:
Эрзянский язык. Учеб. пособие для русскоязычных студентов: В 2 ч. Ч. 2.
Саранск: Изд-во Мордов. ун-та. – 180 с.
- Imaikina, M. D. = Имайкина, М. Д. 2008:
Heeñь шкань эрзянь келесь. Фонетика. Учебник.
Саранск: Изд-во Мордов. ун-та. – 316 с. – На мордов.-эрзя яз.
- Kalima, Jalo 1910:
Die russischen Lehnwörter im Syrjänischen.
Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia XXIX.
Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Karlsson, Fred 2000:
Defectivity.
In: Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, Joachim Mugdan,
unter Mitarbeit von Wolfgang Kesselheim und Stavros
Skopeteas (eds.), *Morphology. An International
Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation. Vol. 17.1.* 647–654.
Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Keresztes, László 1990:
Chrestomathia Morduinica.
Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- Keresztes, László 1995:
On the Question of the Mordvinian Literary Language.
In: Gábor Zaicz (Red.), *Zur Frage der uralischen Schriftsprachen.* 47–55.
Linguistica. Series A: Studia et dissertationes 17.
Az MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézete.
Budapest: Kiefer Ferenc.
- Keresztes, László 1999:
Development of Mordvin definite conjugation.
Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 233.
Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Keresztes, László 2005:
Finno-Ugric cross-language analysis: Hungarian compared with Mordvin.
In: *Les langues ouraliennes aujourd'hui, Approche linguistique et cognitive. The Uralic
languages today, A linguistic and cognitive approach,* 369–379.
Sous la direction de M.M.Jocelyne Fernandez-Vest.
Paris.
- Kharitonova 2000 = Харитонова, А. М. 2000:
Числительноеь.
EKM, 115–123.
- Klement'eva, E.F. 2004 = Клементьева, Е.Ф. 2004:
Категория собирательности в эрзянском языке: Учеб. пособие.
Саранск: Тип. «Крас. Окт.». — 80 с.
- Klima, László 1995:
*The linguistic affinity of the Volgaic Finno-Ugrians and their ethnogenesis
(early 4th millennium BC – late 1st millennium AD).* Manuscript.
Budapest.

- Kolyadyonkov, M. N. 1940 = Колядёнков, М.Н. 1940:
Синтаксис и пунктуация, мордовских (эрзянского и мокшанского) языков.
 (Приняты научной сессией Мордовского Научно-Исследовательского Института Социалистической Культуры при СНК МАССР 25 июля 1940 г. и утверждены СНК МАССР 20 июля 1940 г.
 Саранск: Издательство МНИИСК.
- Kolyadyonkov, M. N. 1959 = Колядёнков, М.Н. 1959:
Структура простого предложения в мордовских языках.
Предложение и его главные члены.
 Саранск.
- Kortjevskaja-Tamm, Maria 2008:
 Adnominal possession
Uralic Typology Database Project.
 Wien.
 <http://uralictypology.pbworks.com/f/MKT_Wien_080924.doc>
- Krister Lindén, Miikka Silfverberg and Tommi Pirinen 2009:
 HFST Tools for Morphology - An Efficient Open-Source Package for Construction of Morphological Analyzers.
 In: Cerstin Mahlow and Michael Piotrowski (eds.), *State of the Art in Computational Morphology.*
 Workshop on Systems and Frameworks for Computational Morphology, SFCM 2009, Zurich, Switzerland, September 4, 2009, Proceedings.
- Kudashova 2002 = Кудашова, Любовь Александровна 2002:
Посессивность в эрзянском и венгерском языках.
 Специальность 10.02.02. – языки народов Российской Федерации (финно-угорские и самодийские).
 Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. Научный руководитель доктор филологических наук, профессор М.В. Мосин.
 Мордовский государственный университет имени Н.П. Огарёва.
 Саранск.
- Kuussaari, Eero 1935:
Suomen suvun tiet.
 Kuvaus Suomen sukukansojen kehityksestä sekä tuhatvuotisista vaelluksista ja valtataisteluista.
 Helsinki: Suomen heimosoturien liitto.
- Lallukka, Seppo 1992:
Venäjän uralilaisten kansojen tilastoa.
 Venäjän ja Itä-Euroopan instituutti, Julkaisusarja A 16.
 Helsinki.
- Luutonen, Jorma, Mikhail Mosin, Valentina Shchankina 2004:
Reverse dictionary of Mordvin = Обратный словарь мордовских языков.
 Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XXIX.
 Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Lyons, Christopher 1999:
Definiteness.
 Cambridge University Press.
- Markov, F. P. 1961 = Марков, Ф. П. 1961:
 Приалатырский диалект эрзя-мордовского языка.
OMD, 7–99.

- Mészáros, Edit 1999 = Месарош, Эдит 1999:
Словообразовательные суффиксы глагола в эрзянском языке.
Studia Uralo-Altaica 42.
- Mosin 2000 = Мосин, М. В. 2000:
Прилагательное.
ЕКМ, 108–115.
- Mosin, M. V. – N. S. Bajuškin 1983:
Ersämordvan oppikirja.
Apuneuvoja suomalais-ugrialaisten kielten opintoja varten VIII.
Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Moravcsik, Edith 2003:
Inflectional morphology in the Hungarian noun phrase:
A typological assessment.
In: Frans Plank (ed.), *Noun Phrase Structure in the Languages of Europe*, 113–252.
Mouton de Gruyter.
- MW 1990:
H. Paasonens Mordwinisches Wörterbuch. Band I (A–J).
Zusammengestellt von Kaino Heikkilä.
Unter Mitarbeit von Hans-Hermann Bartens, Aleksandr Feoktistow und Grigori Jermuschkin
bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Martti Kahla.
Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XXIII, 1.
Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisu 59.
Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura & Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus.
- MW 1992:
H. Paasonens Mordwinisches Wörterbuch. Band II (K–M).
Zusammengestellt von Kaino Heikkilä.
Unter Mitarbeit von Hans-Hermann Bartens, Aleksandr Feoktistow und Grigori Jermuschkin
bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Martti Kahla.
Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XXIII, 2.
Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisu 59.
Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura & Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus.
- MW 1994:
H. Paasonens Mordwinisches Wörterbuch. Band III (N–Ř).
Zusammengestellt von Kaino Heikkilä.
Unter Mitarbeit von Hans-Hermann Bartens, Aleksandr Feoktistow und Grigori Jermuschkin
bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Martti Kahla.
Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XXIII, 3.
Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisu 59.
Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura & Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus.
- MW 1996:
H. Paasonens Mordwinisches Wörterbuch. Band IV (S–Ž).
Zusammengestellt von Kaino Heikkilä.
Unter Mitarbeit von Hans-Hermann Bartens, Aleksandr Feoktistow und Grigori Jermuschkin
bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Martti Kahla.
Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XXIII, 4.
Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisu 59.
Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura & Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus.

Nad'kin, D. T. 1968 = Надькин, Д. Т. 1968:

Морфология нижнепьянского диалекта эрзя-мордовского языка.
OMD, 3–198.

Niemi, Jaana & Mihail Mosin 1995:

Ersäläis-suomalainen sanakirja
Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 48.
Turku: Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitos.

Nichols, Johanna 1988:

On alienable and inalienable possession.
In: W. Shipley (ed.), *In Honor of Mary Haas: From the Haas Festival Conference on Native American Linguistics*, 557–609.
Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nichols, Johanna 1992:

Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ob"edkin, V. D. 1961 = Объедкин, В. Д. 1961:

Старо-Турдаковский диалект эрзя-мордовского языка.
OMD, 100–196.

OMD 1961 = ОМД 1961:

Очерки мордовских диалектов. Том I.
Редакторы: доктор филологических наук, профессор М. Н. Колядёнков, кандидат филологических наук О. И. Чудаева.
Научно-Исследовательский Институт Языка, Литературы, Истории и Экономики при Совете Министров Мордовской АССР.
Саранск: Мордовское Книжное Издательство.

OMD 1963-II = ОМД 1963-II:

Очерки мордовских диалектов. Том II.
Ответственный редактор: проф. М. Н. Колядёнков.
Научно-Исследовательский Институт Языка, Литературы, Истории и Экономики при Совете Министров Мордовской АССР.
Саранск: Мордовское Книжное Издательство.

OMD 1968 = ОМД 1968:

Очерки мордовских диалектов. Том V.
Редакционная коллегия: И. С. Бузаков, Р. В. Бабушкина, Д. Т. Надькин.
Научно-Исследовательский Институт Языка, Литературы, Истории И Экономики При Совете Министров Мордовской АССР.
Саранск: Мордовское книжное издательство.

Ornatov, Pavel 1838 = Органовъ, Павель 1838:

Мордовская грамматика.
Составленная на наречий мордвы мокши Павломъ Орнатовымъ.
Москва: Въ Синодальной тип.

Paasonen, Heikki 1897:

Die türkischen Lehnwörter im Mordwinischen.
Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja XV, 2, 1–64

Paasonen, Heikki 1903:

Mordvinische Lautlehre.
Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia XX.
Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

- Paasonen, Heikki 1953 [1909]:
Mordwinische Chrestomathie mit Glossar und grammatikalischem Abriss.
 Hilfsmittel für das Studium der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen IV.
 Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Pall, Valdek 1996:
Ersa keel.
 Õpiku konspekt ja sõnaloend. — 119 lk.
 Tallinn.
- Pallas, P. S. = Паллас, П. С. 1789:
Сравнительные словари всех языковъ и нарѣчій.
 Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa.
 Въ Санктпетербургѣ.
- PLN 1995 = Prescriptive Literary Norms 1995:
Мокшень кяльс сёрмадомань, корхтамань, пунктуациянь норматне
Эрзянь кельсэ сёрмадомань, кортамонь, пунктуациянь лувтне. — 264 с.
 Саранск: «Красный Октябрь» типографиясь.
- Polyakov, O. E. & J. Rueter 2004 = Поляков, О. Е. & J. Rueter 2004:
Мокшень и эрзянь кяльхненъ фкякс- и аф фкяксшисна. Синь валлувксна.
Эрзянь ды мокишонь кельтненъ вейкекс- ды аволь вейкексчист. Сынст валлувост. /
 О. Е. Поляков, J. Rueter; Н.П. Огаревонь лемса Мордовский государственной
 университетсь.
 Саранск: «Красный Октябрь» типографиясь.
- Rijkhoff, J. 2004:
The Noun Phrase.
 Oxford University Press.
- Rueter, Jack 2003:
 Etymological Determinate Particles in Erzya Word Derivation.
 In: *International Symposium of Deictic Systems and Quantification in Languages Spoken*
in Europe and North and Central Asia.
 Udmurt State University, Iževsk, Udmurtia, Russia, May 22–25, 2001.
Collection of Papers, 164–172. Compiled and edited by Pirkko Suihkonen and Bernard
 Comrie with assistance of Sergej Anatol'evič Maksimov.
 Udmurt State University, Iževsk, Udmurtia, Russia & Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary
 Anthropology, Department of Linguistics, Leipzig, Germany.
- Rueter, Jack 2005:
 Conflicting Evidence for the Erzian Genitive.
 In: Hasselblatt, Cornelius, Eino Koponen und Anna Widmer (Hrsg.), *Lihkkun lehkos!*
 Beiträge zur Finnougristik aus Anlaß des sechzigsten Geburtstages von Hans-Herman
 Bartens.
 Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, Bd 65.
 Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Rueter, Jack 2007:
 Asymmetries in Word Class Divisions with Examples pertaining to Person in Erzya.
 In: *40th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea* 29 August – 1 September
 2007.
 University of Joensuu.

Rueter, Jack 2009a:

Case in Erzya: A synthesis of morphology, semantics, syntactic function, and compatibility with number person and definiteness (Disputed cases in Erzya.)

Section paper at SKY 2009: *Case in and across languages*.

Helsinki.

Rueter, Jack 2009b:

Is the “-msto/-mste” formant in Erzya anything more than a deverbal noun in the relative?

Abstract for “*Finiteness and Non-Finiteness*” Conference in Tallinn, November 25, 2009.

Rueter, Jack (Forthcoming):

On quantification in Erzya.

In: *Typology of Quantification: On quantification in Finnish and languages spoken in the Volga-Kama Region*.

Ryabov, A. = Рябов, А. 1931:

Русско-эрзянский словарь.

Москва: Центриздат.

Ryabov, Anatoli P. = Рябов, Анатолий П. 1935:

Эрзянь морфологиянь грамматика.

Саранск.

Salo, Merja (Forthcoming):

Mordvin *t* derivatives – semantic equivalent for impersonal.

In: Dybo, A. V. & Yu. V. Normanskaya (eds.), *Ural-Altai Studies, Scientific Journal*, 2: Moscow.

Sary, Heno 2002:

Indigenous Europeans East of Moscow.

Population and Migration Patterns of the Largest Finno-Ugrian Peoples in Russia from the 18th to the 19th Centuries.

Dissertation Geographicae Universitatis Tartuensis, 17.

Tartu.

Siewierska, Anna 2004:

Person.

Cambridge University Press.

Spencer, Andrew 1992:

Nominal inflection and the nature of functional categories.

Journal of Linguistics 28, 313–41.

Shakhmatov, A. A. 1910 = Шахматовъ, А. А. 1910:

Мордовскій этнографическій сборникъ.

С.-Петербургъ.

Philip Johan von Strahlenberg 1730:

Das Nord- und Östliche Theil von Europa und Asia, in so weit solches das gantze Russische Reich mit Sibirien und der grossen Tatarey in sich begriffet.

In Verlegung des Autoris.

Stockholm.

Tikhonova, T. M. 1966 = Tichonova, T. M. 1966:

Expression of definiteness and indefiniteness of the direct object in the Mordvin languages.

Советское финно-угроведение (4), 241–245.

- Tikhonova, T. M. 1974 = Тихонова Т.М. 1974:
Суффиксы притяжательности в непритяжательном значении в волжских языках финно-угорской группы.
In: *Вопросы советского финно-угроведения*, 119–121.
Петрозаводск.
- Tikhonova, T. M. 1980 = Тихонова Т.М. 1980:
Категория лично-принадлежности; Притяжательное склонение; Указательное склонение; Категория определенности неопределенности.
In: *ГМУа 1980*, 182–228.
- Trosterud, Trond 2006:
Homonymy in the Uralic Two-Argument Agreement Paradigms.
Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seuran Toimituksia 251.
Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Tsygankin, D. 1961 = Цыганкин, Д. 1961:
Шугуровский диалект эрзя-мордовского языка.
ОМД, 294–395.
- Tsygankin, D. V. 1978 = Цыганкин, Д. В. 1978:
Грамматические категории имени существительного в диалектах эрзя-мордовского языка (определенности-неопределенности и притяжательности). — 70 с.
Саранск: Мордов. кн. изд-во.
- Tsygankin 2000a = Цыганкин, Д. В. 2000a:
Валонь теевемась.
ЕКМ, 34–37.
- Tsygankin 2000b = Цыганкин, Д. В. 2000b:
Мордовские языки глазами ученого-лингвиста.
Саранск: Типография «Красный Октябрь».
- Tsyurkaikina 2000 = Цыпкайкина, В. П. 2000:
Глаголось.
ЕКМ, 146–216.
- Turunen, Rigina 2010:
Nonverbal Predication in Erzya: Studies on morphosyntactic variation and part of speech distinctions.
University of Helsinki, Faculty of Arts, Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies.
<<http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-10-6277-3>>
- WALS Online:
The World Atlas of Language Structures Online.
<<http://wals.info/>>
- Wiedemann, F. J. 1865:
*Grammatik der ersa-mordwinischen Sprache
nebst einem kleinen mordwinisch-deutschen und deutsch-mordwinischen Wörterbuch*.
Mémoires de l'académie impériale des sciences de St.-Pétersbourg, VII^E Série. Tome IX, № 5.

Witsen, Nicolaes 1705:

Noord en Oost Tartarye, Ofte Bondig Ontwerp Van eenig dier Landen en Volken Welke voormaels bekend zijn geweest. Beneffens verscheide tot noch toe onbekende, en meest nooit voorheen beschreve Tartersche en Nabuurige Gewesten, Landstreeken, Steden, Rivieren, en Plaetzen, in de Noorder en Oosterlykste Gedeelten Van Asia En Europa Verdeelt in twee Stukken, Met der zelviger Land-kaerten: mitsgaders, onderscheide Afbeeldingen van Steden, Drachten, enz. Zedert naeuwkeurig onderzoek van veele Jaren, door eigen ondervondinge ontworpen, beschreven, geteekent, en in 't licht gegeven, Door Nicolaes Witsen.

(First print: Amsterdam, 1692; Second print: Amsterdam, 1705. Reprint in 1785.)

't Amsterdam By François Halma, Boekverkooper op de Nieuwendyk.

Yakushkin, A. D. 1961 = Якушкин, А. В. 1961:

Дракинский диалект эрзя-мордовского языка.

OMD, 197–293.

Zaicz, Gábor 1998:

Mordva.

In: D. Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic Languages*, 184–218.

London: Routledge.

Zaicz, Gábor 2006:

Mordva.

In: D. Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic Languages*, 184–218.

London: Routledge.