

## On non-possessive functions of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular possessive suffix in Komi-Permyak

Possessive agreement (i.e., the usage of an overt person-number marker on the possessee) is not obligatory in Komi-Permyak (Permic, Uralic; cf. Batalova 1975, Rédei 1978: 61, Bartens 2000: 122, Ponomareva 2010: 56–61). I will argue that the lack of agreement is motivated by the polyfunctional nature of the 3<sup>rd</sup> (and to some extent the 2<sup>nd</sup>) person singular possessive suffix. Such non-possessive functions can be identifiability, definiteness, associativity, and anaphora as previous comprehensive studies on Uralic languages (Fraurud 2001, Nikolaeva 2003, Simonenko 2014, 2017, Egedi 2017) have shown.

The aim of the present talk is to introduce novel Komi-Permyak data on the different functions mentioned above following Egedi's (2017) and König's (2018) classification. The questions to be addressed here are: i) What is the distribution between the possessive and the non-possessive usage of the suffix? ii) What functions can the suffix have in particular? iii) How are these functions related to each other? The data I present here was elicited from two native language experts and was also collected from a corpus consisting of ca. 240,000 tokens (Korp).

Corpus data shows that from a set of 2654 tokens marked with the possessive suffix only 33.3% showed a marking of possession, i.e., the non-possessive functions seem to have a significant role in the language. Besides the possessive usage, shown in (1), the possessive suffix usually expresses direct anaphora (2) according to grammaticality judgements provided by the informants as well as judging by corpus results.

- (1) Nasta-lön      pon-ys?      šöd.  
Nastya-GEN    dog-3SG      black  
'Nastya's dog is black.'

- (2) Vör-yn      völ-ömaś      köin    da    ur.      Ur-ys      šu-öm      köin-lö:  
forest-INE    be-PST2.3PL    wolf    and    squirrel    squirrel-3SG    say-PST2.3SG    wolf-DAT  
'There lived a wolf and a squirrel in the forest. The squirrel said to the wolf.'

Additionally, Komi-Permyak seems to employ the possessive suffix in larger situational (or exophoric, following König 2018) contexts, i.e., in cases where the marker refers to an element that is either easily accessible to the addressee (3) or supposed to be semantically unique, as the sun is in example (4):

Context: A boy pointing to his heart. (This is a meme provided to speakers/learners of the language.)

- (3) Kytön      Kudymkar-ys?  
where      Kudymkar-3SG  
'Where is (that) Kudymkar?'
- (4) Šondi-ys      jugjal-ö.  
sun-3SG      shine-PRS.3SG  
'The sun is shining.'

The suffix is also used in so-called associative-situational contexts (cf. Egedi 2017), at least in cases when it refers to an entity that is different from the interlocutors and is available from direct sensory perception (5). However, results suggest that this is the least common usage of the marker.

- (5) Va-ys        tatön    öd'dön    köžyt.  
water-3SG   here        very        cold  
'The water is very cold here.'

Egedi (2017) offers the following possible grammaticalization path for the parallel suffixes of other Uralic languages:

- (6) associative-situational use > situational use / larger situational use

While examples (2)–(5) fit into this pattern, there are some counterexamples in the data I will introduce in more details. We have seen that in Komi-Permyak, the non-possessive functions seem to be common (even if not more common than the possessive one). And the results show that based on their semantics, there are at least three different non-possessive functions of the suffix in the language. Further research is needed in order to answer the question whether these are instances of an emerging new marker or stages of a grammaticalization path.

#### References

- Bartens, Raija 2000. *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Batalova, Raisa M. [Баталова, Раиса М.] (1975). *Ками-пермяцкая диалектология*. Издательство «Наука», Москва.
- Egedi, Barbara 2017. *Two paths running across the same field. The grammaticalization of referential marking in Uralic languages*. Talk given at Syntax of Uralic languages 2. 28.6.2017.
- Fraurud, Kari 2001. Possessive with extensive use: A source of definite articles? In Irène Baron – Michael Herslund – Finn Sørensen (eds.), *Dimensions of possession*, 243–267. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- König, Ekkehard. 2018. Definite articles and their uses. Diversity and patterns of variation. In Daniël Olmen – Tanja Mortelmans – Frank Brisard (eds.), *Aspects of Linguistic Variation*, 165–184. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Korp = Lars Borin, Markus Forsberg and Johan Roxendal. 2012. *Korp – the corpus infrastructure of Språkbanken*. ([http://gtweb.uit.no/u\\_korp/?mode=koi](http://gtweb.uit.no/u_korp/?mode=koi), 2020-11-3)
- Nikolaeva, Irina 2003. Possessive affixes in the pragmatic structuring of the utterance: Evidence from Uralic. In Pirkko Suihkonen – Bernard Comrie (eds.), *International Symposium on Deictic Systems and Quantification in Languages Spoken in Europe and North and Central Asia: Collection of papers*, 130–145. Izhevsk: Udmurt State University, and Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Ponomareva, Larisa 2010. *Komi-permják nyelvkönyv*. Budapest. Manuscript.
- Rédei, Károly 1978. *Chrestomathia Syrjaenica*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- Simonenko, Alexandra 2014. Microvariation in Finno-Ugric possessive markers. In Hsin-Lun Huang – Ethan Poole – Amanda Rysling (eds.), *Proceedings of the forty third annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 43)* 2. 127–140.
- Simonenko, Alexandra 2017. Towards a semantic typology of specific determiners. In Alexandre Cremers – Thom van Gessel – Floris Roelofsen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 21th Amsterdam Colloquium*, 425–434.