

SVETLANA EDYGAROVA (Tartu)

ATTRIBUTIVE POSSESSION IN UDMURT LANGUAGE

Abstract. Until now only two types of patterns have been regarded in the framework of attributive possession in Udmurt languages: NN+N, N-GEN+NPX. The pattern NAbl+NPX was considered as the variant of the latter. In the present paper I deal with possession in a wider sense which can be presented by wider range of patterns. Attributive constructions with elative, inessive also express possession. Furthermore, I observe attributive phrases with adverbial, instrumental, and dative which are not yet grammaticalized as possessive, but which have the tendency to express possessive relationships. The usage of these constructions depends on semantic and syntactic specificities as inalienable/alienable, inanimate/animated, whole/partial, indefinite/definite possession, and indirect/direct object function of the possessee.

Keywords: Udmurt language, possession, attributive possession, possessive phrase, possessor, possessee.

1. Introduction

1.1. Traditional view of the problem

Attributive possession in Udmurt language is traditionally presented by two primary patterns of adnominal phrases.

(1) The combination with the former in the form of nominative (possessor) and the latter is without compulsory suffixes (possessee) (Перевошиков 1957 : 75–76, 81; ГСУЯ 1962 : 78; ГСУЯ 1970 : 11, 13, 17, 159–160; Вахрушев 1970 : 81–86; 1980 : 132–143):

korka *gs* (house-NOM door-NOM) 'a door of a house'

(2) The former (possessor) is in the form of genitive or ablative (in cases when the possessee is direct object) and the latter (possessee) has obligatory possessive suffix which applies to the person of the possessor (plus marker of accusative in the case of ablative) (ГСУЯ 1962 : 77–79; ГСУЯ 1970 : 9–13; Перевошиков 1957 : 71–92; Вахрушев 1970 : 78–106; 1980 : 130–168; Kel'makov, Hännikäinen 1999 : 73, 81–83 etc):

so-len *eš-ez* (he-GEN friend-3SG) 'his friend'

so-leś *eš-s-e* *ažžiško* (he-ABL friend-3SG-ACC see-PRS/1SG) 'I see his friend'

In certain circumstances one grammatical marker can disappear as
(1) genitive ending:

aśme gurt-mj (our(REF) village-1PL) 'our own village'
mon ki-ja-m (I-NOM hand-ILL-1SG) 'in my hand'

(2) possessive suffix:

pijaš-len mjlkjd (boy-GEN mood-NOM) 'boy's mood'
soos-len gurt (they-GEN village-NOM) 'their village'

According to components relation the first type is considered as parataxis. The second type has different terminology such as 'agreement' (Конюхова 1953 : 7; Тепляшина 1966 : 275); 'possessive forms of words relation' (Перевощиков 1957 : 71, 75); *izaphet* (Поздеева 1949 : 3; ГСУЯ 1970 : 9, 12; Вахрушев 1970 : 78, 81, 86). *Izaphet* is known as an adnominal phrase in the Turkic languages which expresses possessive relationships and has specific morphosyntactic appearance. However, the usage of the term *izaphet* is not the same in Udmurt grammar, while in the Turkic languages nominative phrase is called *izaphet* III or I (Майзель 1957 : 13, 15—17; Языки 32), in Udmurt linguistics only genitival phrase and its variants are meant as *izaphet* (ГСУЯ 1970 : 9; Вахрушев 1970 : 78—79).

The content and usage distinction of nominative and genitival phrases is usually explained by indefinite character of the former (ГСУЯ 1962 : 78; ГСУЯ 1970 : 11; Перевощиков 1957 : 76—77). Furthermore, V. Vachrušev finds other points of difference as accented possessor and emotional character of the second type (Вахрушев 1970 : 82—86).

1.2. Aims and objects of the study

Materials of Udmurt language demonstrate that the traditional classification is not enough in studying the present problem. First, the attributive possession in Udmurt language is expressed by a more extensive range of the possessive patterns. Second, the observation of phrases we have now actually does not describe all their specificities and essence. Third, the study of 'possession' concept has been advanced and acquired wider notion in recent researches which extent the framework of attributive possession. The main aim of the present study is to find attributive phrases in Udmurt language which are involved in the category of possession, and to describe their general meanings and usage specificities.

For that, materials of comprehensive literal Udmurt language were researched. The study is based on mass-media sources like newspapers "Удмурт дунне" and "Эчбур!", magazine "Инвожо", and television "Мынам Удмуртие". In these materials (No. 1—21), following attributive phrases were found:

Basic possessive phrases:

(1) Noun-Genitive+Noun-PX (NGen+NPx):

pisat'el'-jos-len sojuz-zj (writer-PL-GEN union-3PL) 'writers' union' (No. 10 : 33)

(2) Noun-Ablative+Noun-PX-Accusative (NAbl+NPxAcc):

šur-leś nim-z-e šot-em (river-ABL name-3SG-ACC give-PRET2/3SG) 'he/she gave the name of the river' (No. 16 : 167)

(3) Noun-Nominative+Noun (NN+N):

škola azbar-ın (school-NOM garden-IN) 'in the school garden' (No. 19 : 10)

Furthermore, materials demonstrate that there are attributive phrases which have locative modifier and have similar possessive meaning. These combinations can be synonymous in usage with phrases above. They will be called *alternative phrases*:

(4) Noun-Elative+Noun (NEl+N):

unıversıtet-ıń institut (university-EL institute-NOM) 'institute of the university' (No. 2 : 4)

(5) Noun-Inessive+Nominal Participle (NIn+NP):

centr-ın uzaś-jos (centre-IN worker-PL) 'workers of the centre' (No. 3)

In addition, we will briefly observe attributive phrases which are not yet grammaticalized as possessive patterns in Udmurt language, but which, first, have potential or tendency to express possessive relationship and; second, correspond to possessive phrases in other languages. They will be named *potential phrases*:

(a) Noun-Adverbial+Noun (NAdv+N):

kreźgur-ja urok (music-ADV lesson-NOM) 'the lesson of music' (No. 3)

(b) Noun-Dative+Noun (NDat+N):

udmurt kil-lı dıšetıś (udmurt-NOM language-DAT teacher-NOM) 'teacher of Udmurt language' (No. 17 : 25)

(c) Noun-Instrumental+Noun (NIns+N):

galstuk-en pıosmurt (tie-INS man-NOM) 'man with tie' (No. 9 : 28)

These attributive patterns are the main object of the present study. They will be (1) described; (2) grammatical means by which they are expressed will be analyzed, and concrete cases when they express/tend to express possessive/alternative relationships will be found; (3) their functional differentiation and usage specificities will be observed.

1.3. Theoretical background

The present article is the first stage in the study of attribute possession in Udmurt language. At the beginning descriptive method will be used to find out all kinds of constructions of attributive possession and their usage specificities. For that we will deal with findings in this paragraph.

Possession is a semantic category which expresses possessive relationships between two objects: possessor and possessee. In particular as possessive relationships are distinguished concepts like 'possession' and 'belonging'. Sometimes partitive relationship is also thought as a kind of possession (Chinchley 1996 : 100). Languages make a difference between these two concepts, and each one applies to the specific morphosyntactic combinations which are symbolized as 'have'- and 'belong'-constructions. It is argued that in the former constructions there is 'emphasis' on the possessor and therefore the possessee is indefinite; in the latter it is the possessee that receives 'emphasis' and therefore has definite character.

Another classification distinguishes two main types of linguistic constructions: predicative and attributive (Категория 133, 164; Chinchley 1996 : 101; Heine 1997 : 25). These two types have (a) morphosyntactic and (b) semantic specificities.

The former has specific restricted meanings, while the latter expresses more common and wide possessive relationships, e.g. predicative type is not used to express inalienable and partial relationships, but which can be widely expressed by attributive possession. While predicative construction has clausal syntax, the latter has phrasal syntax and the focus on how two nouns are linked, in particular on the word order of constituents and morphologic means.

On the semantic level possession has following notion: (a) animated possession (the possessor is human being or animated entity); (b) inanimate physical possession (the possessor and possessee are concrete inanimate and separable entities); (c) inalienable possession (the possessee is inalienable entity of the possessor, e.g. body-part, whole-part, kinship terms etc.); (d) abstract possession (the possessee is abstract concept, sometimes negative possession is also treated in this group) etc. Inalienability is considered as a special type of possessive relationships, which has the most ancient ways of expression; it involves a tighter structural bond between possessor and possessee, and tends to be not marked; it consists of a closed set nouns, which is presented mostly by attributive possession. In every language the range of inalienable entities can consist of different word classes, mostly they are kinship, body/part, whole/part, physical and mental state entities (Категория; Heine etc).

Possessive constructions can also be classified by basic and secondary possessive meaning or by major and minor usage (Категория 13; Heine 1997 : 157). Several possessive constructions can coexist in one language: basic ones have possession as a main meaning and express more common possessive relationships; minor constructions express specific meanings as an inalienability or inanimate possession and have restricted usage.

In the present article we will not deal with the diachronic aspect of the problem, the ways of grammaticalization. We will observe these questions only briefly. Historical development, cognitive aspects of the attributive possession in Udmurt are seen as a perspective of the present study.

2. Basic possessive phrases

Phrases which are used in general to express possession, and which have possession as a major function are considered here as basic.

2.1. Combination NGen+NPx

The most basic combination to express attributive possession is NGen+NPx which has two grammatical means: the possessor has genitive ending *-len* and precedes the possessee; the possessee follows the possessor and has personal suffix which applies to the person of the possessor. Here the presence of two markers is necessary; there are variants with one marker, but they have no general character and they will be not observed in the present article. The phrase has typical 'possessor specification' order. But the speci-

ficity of Udmurt construction is that thanks to double marking the word order of the phrase can be free: components can be separated by other words, the order can be reversal vs. *anaj-ez so-len siče ug dišaškj* (mother-3SG he-GEN such dress NEG/PRES/3SG) 'her/his mother does not dress such a way'. The phrase expresses 'belonging' or more exactly it has complete belonging nuance. The combination in priority expresses animate possession, but also marks all other kinds of possession as well. The pattern participates in predicative possession with copula *van*. It is interesting to know that in Komi language in the same pattern with genitive ending *-len* (a) the personal suffix is optional, and (b) the pattern is used only with animate possessor (Sazhina 2005 : 73–74).

The possessor has suffix *-len* which has the function of genitive. As genitive attribute it occurs in nominal phrases as *student-len kniga-jez* (student-GEN book-3SG) 'student's book', *korka-len l'ipet-ez* 'the roof of the house'; in phrases with latter *-(e)m*-participle and following personal suffix as *pijaš-len verašk-em-ez* (boy-GEN speak-PART-3SG) 'boy's speaking', *tjn-ad kjrža-m-ed* (you-GEN sing-PART-2SG) 'your singing'; and in other phrases with noun-like components as *kion vuz-em-len matekt-em-ez* (wolf-NOM howl-PART-GEN approach-PART-3SG) 'approaching of wolf's howling'.

It appears as complement in verbal constructions as a 'have'-construction *student-len kniga-jez van* (student-GEN book-3SG EX/PRS) 'The student has a book'.

til-ad semja-dj evgl (you-GEN family-2PL NEX) 'You do not have family' (No. 10 : 46)

And in other verbal constructions such as:

Agnessa-len vanm-iz perme (PN-GEN everything-3SG turn out-PRES/3SG) 'Agnessa arrives to do everything' (No. 10 : 32)

pijaš-len piñ-iz više (boy-GEN tooth-3SG be sick-PRES/3SG) 'Boy has toothache' (No. 9 : 41)

There are phrases based on *-(e)m*-participle which combine modal expressions of wish and capability. The subject of the action is presented by *-len* genitive.

pijaš-len l'eččik lu-em-ez pote (boy-GEN pilot-ACC(zero) be-PART-3SG leave-PRS/3SG) 'Boy want to be pilot' (No. 12 : 39)

vu-len ug luj bjž-em-ez (water-GEN can-NEG/PRES/3SG flow-PART-3SG) 'Water can not flow' (No. 12 : 24)

Genitive modifier with *-len* appears also as nominal copula in 'belong'-constructions *ta kniga student-len* 'The book is student's or belongs to student'.

The possessee has possessive suffix: if the possessor is presented by pronouns of 1st and 2nd person it is has endings *-(j)e/-j* (1SG), *-(j)ed/-jd* (2SG), *-mj* (1PL), *-dj/tj* (2PL); if the possessor is 3rd person or noun suffixes *-(j)ez/-jz* (3SG), *-sj* (3PL) appear. Some researchers propose to observe the possessive suffix in this case as a definitive marker. Actually the possessive suffix does not play here the role of definite marker, but determinative and simply indicates the possessor vs. *student-len kniga-jez van* 'The student has a book'.

We can consider the phrase as attributive possessive when the genitive modifier has the role of an attribute in the sentence.

In Udmurt language the same possessive template NGen+NP_x in attributive level expresses 'belonging' and in predicative level when the genitive modifier is complement — 'possession', and when it is nominal copula — 'belonging'.

Examples from below demonstrate that in the function of complement the suffix has a similar meaning with adessive. Historically genitive function of suffix *-len* derived from adessive. In the past the suffix had only locative function and signified location at somebody's place or something's place (Szinnyei 1910 : 73—74; ОСНОВЫ 1976 : 149). В. А. Серебренников states that at the same time the suffix had 'not only location meaning, but it also meant being under somebody's possession', the latter meaning gave rise to the genitive function (Серебренников 1963 : 53). It seems that the suffix in some conditions keeps its primary function in comprehensive language as well. I suppose that meaning transition 'adessive' → 'genitive' happened from predicative 'have'-construction to attributive construction: adessive modifier (perhaps at the beginning only animate entity) in 'have'-construction with development of sentence parts in the position before subject or not direct object drifted apart from the intransitive predicate and became genitive attribute. This historical circumstance explains why (a) the possessor has emphasised character; (b) the usage of Udmurt genitive is more restricted than Finnish *-n* genitive; (c) attributive genitive pattern tends to express animated possession (in Komi even only animated possession); (d) the phrase has meaning nuance as complete belonging. Thus, in Udmurt language predicative possession schema became a source schema for attributive.

Concerning usage specificity, first of all, the pattern NGen+NP_x as a basis of verbal and modal construction never has synonym patterns. Second, the phrase tends to express animated possession where the possessor is a person, group of persons, 'animated' entity or pronoun.

V. Sadovnikov-len no M. Tronin-len pjesa-įstj-zj počtal'jon (PN-GEN and PN-GEN play-EL-3PL postman-NOM) 'the postman from V. Sadovnikov's and M. Tronin's play' (No. 4)

pisat'el'-jos-len sojuz-zj-len jožči-jez (writer-PL-GEN union-3PL-GEN member-3SG) 'member of the writers' union' (No. 10 : 33)

Udmurt'i-len Rošši-je pjr-em-ez (PN-GEN PN-IL enter-PART-3SG) 'Udmurtia's entering to Russia' (No. 6)

Italmas-len už-ez (PN-GEN work-3SG) 'Italmas' (famous Udmurt ensemble) work' (No. 12 : 44)

Examples with pronouns:

ašme-len gurt-a-mj (REF-GEN village-IN-1PL) 'in our own village' (No. 15 : 66)

so-len busj-os-a-z (he/she-GEN field-PL-IN-3SG) 'on his fields' (No. 12 : 26)

tjñ-ad šulm-įd (you-GEN heart-2SG) 'your heart' (No. 16 : 166)

The phrase is widely used to express inanimate possession as well and has the following usage peculiarities.

(1) As many researchers state the phrase expresses possession of definite entities. Indeed, it is influenced by the structure of the phrase. In one hand, as in 'belong'-construction the possessee is definite.

(2) In the other hand, the possessor is emphasised and definite by specific meaning of the suffix *-len*, in particular by combination of genitive and historically adessive meanings.

XVI daur-len šor-a-z (NUM century-GEN middle-IL-3SG) 'in the middle of 16th century' vs. *korka šor-jn* 'in the middle of house' (No. 15 : 56)

Emphatic character of the possessor on the one hand, and definite meaning of both constituents on the other, raise complete belonging; the phrase has content like the possessee is completely under the power or control of the possessor. Let us see examples:

(a) *fakul'tet-len d'ekan-ez L'ubov Petrovna Fjodorova* (faculty-GEN dean-3SG PN-NOM) 'the dean of the faculty L'ubov Petrovna Fjodorova' (No. 17 : 24)

(b) *univeršit'et-iš' d'jšetis', docent Zagul'ajeva B. Š.* (university-EL teacher-NOM associate professor-NOM PN-NOM) 'teacher, associate professor of the university Zagulajeva B. Š.' (No. 17 : 25)

In (a) case the possessee (*dean*) is the only unique object and factual controller of the possessor (*faculty*). In (b) example the pattern with elative tells us that the possessee (*teacher*) is one of several objects of the possessor (*university*). If we use genitival pattern for both examples, the latter will have meaning 'university has the only teacher' or 'university is taught/controlled by teacher'. Thus, complete and partial possession is distinguished and marked by different patterns: complete possession is marked by genitive phrase and partial is expressed by elative phrase. The pattern usage depends on semantic significations of possessee and possessor. In such a way, complete belonging has a place in the following cases.

(1) The possessee is a unique alienable object of the possessor.

Rošsi-len kikbokšing-ja čempion-ez (PN-GEN kickboxing-ADV champion-3SG) 'the champion of Russia in kickboxing' (No. 21 : 1)

(2) The possessee is an inherent object of the possessor. Here the usage of term 'inalienable' is not acceptable, because the concept of inalienability has restricted character in Udmurt language and it is used with other patterns (see below p. 2.1.3). Inherent entities include words like *content*, *specify*, *beginning* etc.

krežgur-len puštros-ez-lj (music-GEN content-3SG-DAT) 'for the content of music' (No. 3)

kultura-len ramka-os-išt-jz (culture-GEN frame-PL-EL-3SG) 'from the frames of culture' (No. 13 : 30)

(3) The possessee is factual controller, owner, and creator of the possessor. As factual controllers, animate words like *director*, *dean*, *president*, *proprietor*, *creator*, *author* etc can be used.

pjesa-len avtor-ez (play-GEN author-3SG) 'the author of the play' (No. 4)

kultura jurt-len kivalentis-ez (culture-NOM house-GEN director-3SG) 'the director of cultural establishment' (No. 3)

gurt administraci-len jir-iz (village-NOM administration-GEN head-3SG)
'the head of village administration' (No 2 : 6)

(4) The possessee is whole object or expresses all amount of the possessor. This meaning mostly occurs when the object of the possessor is plural: *nules-len pgjšur-jos-iz* (forest-GEN animal-PL-3SG) '(all) animals of the forest' and *nulesk-iz pgjšur-jos* (forest-EL animal-PL) '(indefinite number of) animals of the forest'.

2.2. Combination NAbI+NPxAcc

The former has ablative ending *-leś* and the latter has possessive suffix with a following accusative ending. This phrase is considered as a kind of NGen+NPx phrase because it has the same semantic significations as previous, but appears only when the possessee has syntactic function of direct object. The specificity of the phrase is that the pattern has verbal subordination. The same pattern is known in Komi language with *-ljś* ending and expresses only animated possession (СКЯ 141; Энциклопедия 1998 : 391). In other Finno-Ugric languages this phenomenon is not found.

The possessor has suffix *-leś* which has the following functions: (1) ablative, (2) genitive, and (3) other specific functions.

(1) Ablative function appears in verbal constructions where the ablative modifier subordinates directly to the verb and obtains the syntactic function of compliment in the sentence.

žug-žag-leś so-je tazatono (weed-ABL it-ACC treat-PART) 'it should be treated from weeds' (No. 10 : 38)

jurt-ed-leś palen-e kuštono (house-2SG-ABL side-IL throw-PART) 'it should be thrown far away from your house' (No. 11 : 14)

(2) Genitive function occurs when only the possessee subordinates to the verb; in this case ablative modifier became an attribute.

udmurt kalik-leś pi-z-e silj karinj (udmurt-NOM people-ABL son-3SG-ACC glorify-INF) 'to glorify the Udmurts' son' (No. 10 : 38)

eš-ez-leś vetl-em-z-e kijl-sa (friend-3SG-ABL go-PART-3SG-ACC hear-GER) 'when he heard that his friend went' (No. 11 : 62)

Sometimes ablative and genitive functions of the ending coincide, in particular in sentences with transitive copula, where the possessee is direct object and the possessor is complement.

kolhoz-leś muzjem-z-e arenda-je bašt-i-mj (kolhoz-ABL land-3SG-ACC rend-IL take-PRET-1PL) 'We leased the land from/of kolhoz' (No. 15 : 37)

In such sentences possessive suffix appears when the possessee is thought to be under the control of the possessor or as inalienable entity of the possessor, in other cases it does not occur vs. *eš-e-leś gožtet bašt-i* (friend-1SG-ABL letter-ACC(zero) get-PRET/1SG) 'I got a letter from my friend'.

(3) The suffix is used to express comparison, cause, from what material something is done, or as a verb government etc.

vitton-leś uno (fifty-ABL more) 'more than fifty' (No. 10 : 33)

basma-leś lešt-em arberi-os (cloth-ABL make-PART thing-PL) 'things which are made from cloth' (No. 15 : 68)

so-leś žad'-em (he/she-ABL be tired-PRET2/3SG) '(he) got tired with him' (No. 11 : 40)

To explain the phenomenon of genitive form alternation the history of patterns should be observed. As was already said above, in Udmurt language predicative possession preceded to attributive possessive constructions. It seems that at the same time with predicative 'have'-construction 'expropriate'-construction existed as well (vs. *baštj so-leś purt* 'take the knife from him' or 'take his knife'). The latter was also thought as a kind of possession and had specific structure: ablative modifier occurred with verbs which had semantic restriction and transitive character. With the development of sentence parts the ablative modifier in the position before direct object drifted apart from the predicate and obtained genitive function. Thus, 'expropriate'-constructions became source schemas for attributive possession with direct object possessee.

The pattern NAbI+NPxAcc first of all is used only when the possessee is a direct object in the sentence. All other usage specificities are the same as *-len* genitive pattern has.

Animate possession:

art'ist-leś už-z-e tod-em-ez ej val (artist-GEN work-3SG-ACC know-PART-3SG NEX/PRET) 'he didn't know the artist's job' (No. 12 : 9)

avtor-leś malpan-z-e vala-mon-ges kar-e (author-ABL idea-3SG-ACC understand-PART-COMP do-PRES/3SG) 'it makes the author's idea more understandable' (No. 13 : 29)

Complete belonging:

- (a) *Vorčča gurt-leś počtal'jon-z-e* (PN-NOM village-ABL postman-3SG-ACC) 'the postman of Vortča village' (No. 5)
- (b) *učkiś-jos voźma-zj žyt-leś kutsk-em-z-e* (spectator-PL wait-PRET/3PL evening-ABL begin-PART-3SG-ACC) 'spectators waited the beginning of the evening' (No. 12 : 4)
- (c) *korka-leś kužo-z-e šett-i-zj* (house-ABL owner find-PRET-3PL) '(they) found the owner of the house' (No. 7)
- (d) *ńules-leś pejšur-jos-s-e* (forest-GEN animal-PL-3SG) '(all) animals of the forest'

2.3. Combination NN+N

The former noun is in nominative form and the latter noun does not have obligatory markers. In this phrase possession is expressed by syntactic means: the word order determines that the first element possesses the second. The word order is rigid; components cannot be separated. The phrase tends to express inalienable possession, but it can have other possessive meanings as well. The combination is considered as the most ancient possessive phrase and known in most of Uralic languages (Ravila 1941 : 90; Sebestyén 1957 : 339; Kokla 1963 : 279; Андуганов 1992 : 26 etc).

The former element of the phrase is expressed by the form which is here called *nominative*. Actually this form has specific characteristics as it

does not obtain grammatical markers of plurality, cases etc., and it has no reference meaning. A. Feoktistov states that the form is to express attributive function of nominative case (ФЕОКТИСТОВ 1963 : 48). Today we know a different term variation to call this form: *nominative, absolute form, primary form, nominativus absolutus, indefinite form* etc.

In nominal phrases where the former is expressed by nominative (or absolute) form the first component can be: (1) adnominal adjective: *šor ul'ča* 'middle street'; (2) the first element of composite word: *šorkar* ('middle' + 'city') 'capital', *bakča šijon* ('kitchen garden' + 'food') 'vegetable'; (3) noun with the following postposition: *ton šor-j učkiško* (you-NOM POSTP-IL look-PRES/1SG) 'I am looking at you', *žek vij-in* (table-NOM POSTP-IN) 'on the table'; (4) noun in the function of possessor: *korka šor* 'the middle of house'; (5) noun in the function of agent of the process which is expressed by *-(e)m*-participle in the latter part: *učj čird-em* (nightingale-NOM sing-PART) 'the singing of nightingale', *šundj pukš-em* (sun-NOM set-PART) 'sunset'.

This group of possessive phrase is semantically confined. Among all cases above only samples (4) and (5) can be considered as possessive phrases. Several composite words and postposition phrases have the same principle, but in this article they will be not treated as possessive phrases: first, they are not the same syntactic item as possessive phrase; second, they have different syntactic and grammatical functions, and constituents have other salient relationship than possession.

Another problem in the phrase distinction is the coincidence of adnominal adjective and nominative form of noun. In Udmurt language one word can signify different parts of speech, e.g. *zar'ni* can be translated as 'gold' and 'golden', *kultura* as 'culture' and 'cultural'. Hence, it is questionable if phrase like *teatr ulon* 'theatre life' should be treated as possessive or ordinary adjectival.

To answer the question, researchers usually give us semantic classification of phrases when they can be considered as possessive (Вахрушев 1980 : 134—138; Андуганов 1991 : 27—28); they also classify similar situations when there is no possessive relationship in concerned phrases (ФЕОКТИСТОВ 1963 : 53—54; Андуганов 1991 : 54—62; Вахрушев 1980 : 138—140). Researchers give us around 10 semantic groups to each meaning. I suppose that it is possible to give more universal classification for possessive cases:

(1) The latter component is the inalienable entity or part of the former whereas in opposite order the former has adjective function:

korka puš-sj (house-NOM inside-3PL) 'the inside of a house' (No. 15 : 83),

but

puš šulmaškon-jos-j-leś (inside-NOM concern-PL-1SG-ABL) 'from my inward concerns' (No. 10 : 38)

(2) The first part is the agent of the process which is expressed by the second part:

kion vuz-em (wolf-NOM howl-PART) 'a wolf's howling' (No. 13 : 67),

zar'ni kulesm-em (gold-NOM diminish-PART) 'gold lessening',

but

zar'ni zundes 'gold ring'

(3) The former component keeps noun properties and semantically the constituents can have possessive compatibility.

čugun śures stanči-įśen (cast iron-NOM road-NOM station-EGR) 'at the railway station' (No. 2 : 4)

In the last example concepts like *railway* and *station* have semantically possessive compatibility, but in the phrase *čugun śures* 'cast iron' + 'road' *cast iron* and *road* do not have it.

In concerned cases it is possible to change possessive phrases by genitival combinations, constructions with adjective are usually not possible. If we change them, the phrase loses its permanent meaning.

As it was said already above the present pattern has a tendency to express inalienable possession. In Udmurt language the following concepts belong to this category:

- (1) Body-part expressions: *val jįr* 'horse's head', *žęk kuk* 'leg of a table'.
- (2) Whole-part expressions when the part has spatial properties: *gurež jįl-įn* 'on the top of the mountain', *gurt pum-įn* 'in the end of the village', *vįškį pušk-į* 'inside (ILL) of the barrel'.
- (3) Parts of clothes: *derem sajes* 'sleeve of a dress', *pal'to sęzul* 'skirt of a coat', *šťan birdį* 'button of trousers'.
- (4) Physical and mental states: *ad'ami śam* 'character of a person', *pispu vužer* 'shade of a tree'.
- (5) Words which can be meant as an inalienable property of the other entity: *kńiga dun* 'the price of a book'.
- (6) Kinship terms. Not all kinship terms belong to the group of inalienability. Only terms with salient relative meaning can be regarded as inalienable: 'son', 'daughter', 'wife', 'child', 'younger brother', and 'younger sister': *Mikta kįśno* 'Mikta's wife', *Petįr pi* 'Peter's son', *Maša ken* 'Masha's daughter-in-law' (No. 10 : 42).

Other terms as 'aunt', 'uncle', 'elder brother', 'elder sister', 'mother', and 'father' in the same case with personal name express address and name: *Rabig apai* 'aunt Rabig', *Kol'a agai* 'uncle Kolya' (No. 2 : 8). To express possessive relationships of these terms the pattern with genitive is used: *Petįr-len agaj-ez* 'Peter's uncle/elder brother', *Maša-len anaj-ez* 'Masha's mother'.

Two personal names without markers mean that the first person is the mother or father of the second person: *Mikolai Vaśok* 'Nikolai's son Vassili' or lit. 'Nikolai's Vassili' (No. 14 : 66). In the past it was the way of personal name creation; today this method is changed by the Russian way. Today, kinship relations have a tendency to be presented by genitive pattern: *Mikta-len kįśno-jez*, *Petįr-len pi-ez*, *Maša-len ken-ez*.

Inalienability in Udmurt language is expressed not only by syntactic means, but also morphologically by using marker *-į*, while alienable content is marked by *-e*: *ki-į* 'hand-my', *pum-įz* 'end-his', *śam-įd* 'character-yours', *nįl-į* 'daughter-my' and *kńiga-je* 'book-my', *žęk-ed* 'table-yours', *pispu-ez* 'tree-his'. Actually in Udmurt language semantic groups of inalienability do not have exact distinction, hence, most researchers regard alternation *-e ~ -į* only as phonetic phenomenon, and deny the occurrence of independent category of inalienability in Udmurt language (Fokos-Fuchs 1963 : 217; Vászoly 1967 : 37; Кельмаков 1969 : 267; Лыткин 1970 : 233—234).

The pattern NN+N can also express all other possessive relations. In those cases the pattern has the following usage and functional specifications:

(1) According to most researchers, the phrase has indefinite meaning. Actually the absolute form by which the possessor is expressed, is used as a means to express indefiniteness or no reference denotation. On the other hand, as typical 'belonging'-meaning phrase it has definite possessee.

gurt kaliĵk-ez eĉĉa-z (village-NOM people-ACC invite-PRET/3SG) '(he) invited village people' (No. 2 : 6)

(2) For the same reason the phrase obtains adjectival character.

nĵl jĵr ponon 'girlish head-dress' (No. 14 : 18)

škola bakĉa 'school garden' (No. 19 : 10)

gurt administracija 'city administration' (No. 2 : 6)

nĵlkĵšno ogažejaskon-jos (women-NOM union-PL) 'women unions' (No. 2 : 1)

(3) The phrase has a generalized character and can be grammaticalized as composite word or pattern with postposition. There are examples where the phrase tends to express one concept, but components still keep concrete denotation.

nĵlpi sad-e vuĵ-lo (children-NOM garden-ILL arrive-PRES/3PL) '(they) come to kindergarten' (No. 18 : 5)

Keremet gurež jĵl-e korka pukt-i-z (PN-NOM mountain-NOM top-IL house-ACC(zero) build-PRET-3SG) 'He built house to the top of Keremet mountain or on the Keremet mountain' (no. 19 : 10)

The pattern NN+N has a tendency to be changed by NGen+NPx and it is used less and less.

3. Alternative phrases

Above the basic patterns of attributive possession were regarded. They are major patterns and known in Udmurt linguistics. Furthermore, other patterns of attributive possession exist. In Udmurt language, several locative cases can be involved in the category of possession. Materials demonstrate that relative and in particular situations inessive can be used as possessive markers of the possessor. These phrases do not have a direct possessive purpose, but in certain situations they obtain similar possessive meaning and can be synonyms of basic possessive constructions. In this group the relative pattern has a major usage and is a serious concurrent of preceding constructions.

3.1. Combination NElat+N

The former has an relative ending *-ĵś* and the latter does not have obligatory suffixes. This combination is known as adnominal (ГСУЯ 1970 : 21, 160; ГСУЯ 1962 : 109; Kel'makov, Hännikäinen 1999 : 46; Bartens 2000 : 106; Winkler 2000 : 26), but had never been regarded in the framework of possession. The pattern expresses inanimate alienable partial belonging. The phrase is also known in Komi, Estonian language: Est. *naissoo-st õpe-*

taja linna-st, Kom. kar-iš njobabjas-iš veleđiš 'woman teacher of the city' (Sazhina 2005 : 89). Usage of elative as a general marker of possession is known in many other European languages (*of, van, de*).

Today we know the following functions of the suffix *-iš*: (1) elative, (2) other, (3) genitive.

(1) Elative adjunct is used as adverbial modifier in verbal constructions.

Deri joros-iš konkurs-e 4 koll'ektiv vu-em (district-EL competition-ILL NUM ensemble-NOM arrive-PRET2/3SG) 'Four ensembles arrived to the competition from Deri district' (No. 2 : 4)

(2) It is used with several verbs in example like

uža-m-iš ě-z dugđi (work-PART-EL stop-NEG/PRET/3SG) '(he) didn't stop working' (No. 2 : 3)

(3) It has a genitive function in adnominal phrases. This function is not distinguished in Udmurt linguistics but it is found in several researches (Серебрянников 1958 : 195; 1963 : 51—52; Основы 166—167).

ačiz tabere kolhoz-iš vukoči (REFL now kolkhoz-EL miller-NOM) 'he is now miller of the kolkhoz' (No. 14 : 67)

pjesa-iš luket-s-e šud-i-mi (play-EL part-3SG-ACC play-PRET-1PL) 'we played part of the play' (No. 14 : 30)

One of the main criteria of the combination usage is that the pattern expresses inanimate belonging. As a possessor can be (1) any inanimate thing which can obtain spatial function (book, novella, thought etc); (2) concrete place like a geographic place or an establishment and a building. Rarely the possessor can indicate time and origin. The possessee is always an alienable entity which has ability to be inside of the possessor.

Bygi-iš kultura jurt (PN-EL culture-NOM house-NOM) 'cultural house of Bygi village' (No. 3)

univeršitet-iš institut-len muzej-a-z (university-EL institute-GEN museum-IN-3SG) 'in the museum of institute of university' (No. 2 : 4)

tjmet-iš čorig (lake-EL fish-NOM) 'fish of the lake' (No. 14 : 66)

šek-iš žaži (table-EL shelf-NOM) 'shelf of the table' (No. 8 : 15)

piči dñr-iš nunal-jos (small time-EL day-PL) 'days of childhood' (14:36)

Omga viži-iš ken (PN-NOM root-EL bride-NOM) 'the bride of Omga clan'.

As a typical 'belong'-construction the phrase has definite possessee, and marks partial belonging which appears in following situations.

(1) The possessee is one inalienable object among several; the phrase distinguishes one entity from the group of entities etc.

kun duma-iš d'eputat (state-NOM duma-EL deputy-NOM) 'the deputy of State Duma' (No. 3)

škola-iš pionervožatoj (school-EL pioneer leader-NOM) 'pioneer leader of the school' (No. 14 : 68)

fakul'tet-iš naučnoj metodist (faculty-EL scholar-NOM) 'the scholar of the faculty' (No. 14 : 26)

(2) The possessee is partial object or partial/indefinite amount of the possessor.

ta ogažejaškon-iš jožči-os (DEM union-EL member-PL) 'members of this union' = indefinite number of members (No. 20 : 2)

Iremel' gurež-iš bamal-jos (PN-NOM mountain-EL side-PL) 'sides of Iremel' Mountain' = several sides of the mountain (No. 14 : 64)

3.2. Combination NIn+NP

The former component has marker of inessive *-jn*. The latter is presented by participle with ending *-iš/-ś* formed from the verb which needs inessive government. In a concerned phrase only those participles can appear as possessee which are meant as a noun: *djšetiś* 'teacher', *vuz kariś* 'seller', *djšetskiś* 'pupil' etc.

The usage specificity of the pattern is similar with relative combination: (1) it expresses inanimate belonging to the place and (2) partial belonging. The usage difference is that the possessee is always in verbal accordance with the possessor. The present pattern can be used as a synonym with relative pattern, and in extended possessive phrases help to avoid the repeating of combinations.

centr-jn užaś-jos (centre-IN worker-PL) 'workers of the centre' (No. 3)

licej-jn udmurt kıl-lj džetiś (lyceum-IN udmurt-NOM language-DAT teacher-NOM) 'teacher of Udmurt language of lyceum' (No. 17 : 25)

Tartu univērsit'et-jn džetskiś (PN-NOM university-IN student) 'the student of Tartu University' (No. 17 : 26)

seminar-jn užaś-jos šertifikat bašt-i-zj (seminar-IN worker-PL certificate-ACC(zero) get-PRET-3PL) 'workers of the seminar got certificates' (No. 17 : 26)

4. Potential phrases

This group unites adnominal phrases which do not have possession as a major function, but have contiguous meaning with possession. These phrases express specific relationships between two objects. Very often they correspond to genitival phrases in other languages and in some languages they can be used as a major pattern of attributive possession.

4.1. Combination NAdv+N

The attribute is presented by noun with the adverbial ending *-ja*. The phrase is widely used in comprehensive language to express the property of entity by its specialization or purpose. This meaning in certain sense concerns the concept of possession as well. The phrase is known only in Udmurt language.

teatr-jos-ja festival' (theatre-PL-ADV festival-NOM) 'theatre festival' (No. 3)

fol'klor-ja kružok (folklore-ADV work-shop-NOM) 'folklore work-shop' (No. 3)

naci-os-ŷn uŷan pol'it'ika-ja miŷist'erstvo (nation-PL-INST work policy-ADV ministry-NOM) 'ministry of national policy' (No. 3)

udmurt drama-ja t'eatr (udmurt-NOM drama-ADV theatre-NOM) 'Udmurt dramatic theatre' (No. 4)

Roŷsi-ŷŷ ulos-jos-tŷ aŷinton-ja institut (PN-EL region-PL-ACC development-ADV institute-NOM) 'the institute for development of Russia's regions' (No. 3)

4.2. Combination NDat+N

The attribute is marked by dative ending *-lŷ*. In the function of dative attribute it expresses the target of purpose and the head noun expresses the object of purpose. The object which supposes to achieve the target has potential to belong in the future. Dative is also marked as 'possessive case' in Komi language (CKЯ 1955 : 141). In Hungarian this kind of pattern is used as the basic combination to express possession: *A ház-nak tete-je van* 'The house has roof' and *a ház-nak tete-je* 'roof of the house', where genitive *-nak* historically comes from dative.

udmurt kŷl-lŷ dŷŷetiŷ (udmurt-NOM language-DAT teacher-NOM) 'teacher of Udmurt language' (No. 17 : 25)

muvej pottiŷ-jos-lŷ ŷutetskon intŷ-os (oil-NOM breadwinner-PL-DAT rest-PART place-PL) 'places for rest for oil breadwinners' (No. 2 : 3)

nŷl-ŷz-lŷ kuŷŷim (daughter-3SG-DAT present) 'present for his/her daughter' (No. 1)

4.3. Combination NIns+N

The head noun is expressed by instrumental ending *-(j)en/-ŷn*. The ending has the function of instrumental and comitative, the latter has the meaning of accompaniment. Comitative function appears in phrases with animate head noun like *oŷki-jen piosmurt* 'man with glasses'. Meaning overlap with possession is evident: the example *oŷki-jen piosmurt* can be rephrased as *piosmurt, kudiz-len oŷki-ez van* 'the man who has glasses'. This pattern became the main source scheme to express possession in several African languages (Heine 1997 : 53—58, 75).

saŷ jŷr-ŷn reŷiŷŷer-leŷ (cheerful head-INS producer-ABL) 'from producer with bright intellect' (No. 17 : 77)

ŷgd iŷŷi-jen piosmurt (black hat-INS man-NOM) 'man with black hat' (No. 8 : 43)

Conclusions

As the main conclusions of the study it is possible to mark the following states:

1. Possessive phrases regarded above express 'belonging' concept, whereas 'possession' occurs in predicative possession. Nevertheless, attributive 'belonging'-construction NGen+NPx with *-len* marker historically arose from predicative possession; hence, the comprehensive phrase has empha-

sised possessor and complete belonging meaning. Furthermore, the pattern NAbI+NPxAcc indicates that 'expropriate' concept is considered by the Udmurts as possession domain as well, or at least it was considered in the past.

2. Udmurt language is typical possessor-possessee language, where the possessee follows the possessor. In phrases with genitive marker and possessive suffix, the reversal position of constituents is possible. In these phrases endings of subjective cases as genitive *-len* and ablative *-leś*, and locative cases as elative *-iś* and rarely inessive *-jn* can be used as morphologic markers of the possessee; in genitive case the possessor is marked twice by possessive suffixes. In the phrase NN+N the possessor is expressed by nominative form, reversal position of nouns is not possible.

3. The attributive possession in Udmurt language is expressed by a big amount of phrases as NGen+NPx, NAbI+NPxAcc, NN+N, NEI+N, NIn+N where the three first combinations are considered as basic, because they have possession as a major function, other alternative phrases have possession as a secondary function. Further, potential phrases exist too which do not express possessive relationship, but which have an overlap meaning with possession: NAdv+N, NDat+N, NIns+N.

4. Usage and functional distinction of concerned phrases depends on their semantic content. Thus, genitival phrases tend to express animated, definite, and complete belonging; the combination NN+N has as a major meaning of inalienable and indefinite belonging; locative patterns mark inanimate and partial belonging. Phrases can create semantic opposition pairs such as definiteness (NGen+NPx) — indefiniteness (NN+N), inalienability (NN+N) — alienability (NEI+N), animation (NGen+NPx) — inanimation (NEI+N), complete (NGen+NPx) — partial belonging (NEI+N). Ablative construction is also distinguished according the syntactic role of the possessee.

5. Diachronic processes of the formation of attributive possession contributed a big variation of patterns as well. Thus, 'have'- and 'expropriate'-constructions of predicative possession were grammaticalized as attributive patterns to express definite animate belonging and expropriate relations which caused variation NGen+NPx ~ NAbI+NPxAcc, on the one hand, and variation NGen+NPx/NAbI+NPxAcc ~ NN+N to distinguish definite and indefinite relations, on the other. It seems that for the reason of emphasised and animate possessor in genitival phrase, an elative pattern was grammaticalized to express definite partial and inanimate belonging: NGen+NPx ~ NEI+N. Nouns which arose from participles similarly with elative cases keep verbal govern of inessive: NIn+N ~ NEI+N.

Address:
Svetlana Edygarova
University of Tartu

Сокращения

ГСУЯ 1962 — Грамматика современного удмуртского языка. Фонетика и морфология, Ижевск 1962; ГСУЯ 1970 — Грамматика современного удмуртского языка. Синтаксис простого предложения, Ижевск 1970; Категория — Категория при-

тяжательности в славянских и балканских языках, Москва 1989; **Основы** — Основы финно-угорского языкознания: марийский, пермские и угорские языки, Москва 1976; **СКЯ** — Современный коми язык. Учебное пособие для высших учебных заведений. Часть I. Фонетика, лексика, морфология, Сыктывкар 1955; **Языки** — Языки мира. Тюркские языки, Москва 1997; **Энциклопедия** — Энциклопедия. Коми язык, Москва 1998.

Example sources: **No. 1** — Удмурт дунне 29.09.2006; **No. 2** — Удмурт дунне 05.12.2006; **No. 3** — Удмурт дунне 29.08.2007; **No. 4** — Удмурт дунне 17.10.2007; **No. 5** — Мынам Удмуртие 11.10.2007; **No. 6** — Мынам Удмуртие 17.10.2007; **No. 7** — Мынам Удмуртие 19.10.2007; **No. 8** — Инвожо № 10 2004; **No. 9** — Инвожо № 9 2005; **No. 10** — Инвожо 02.03.2006; **No. 11** — Инвожо 04.05.2006; **No. 12** — Инвожо 06.07.2006; **No. 13** — Инвожо 11.12.2006; **No. 14** — Инвожо № 1, 2 2007; **No. 15** — Инвожо № 3, 4 2007; **No. 16** — Инвожо № 5, 6 2007; **No. 17** — Инвожо № 3, 4 2007; **No. 18** — *Ӝечбур!* 10.04.2003; **No. 19** — *Ӝечбур!* 06.10.2005; **No. 20** — *Ӝечбур!* 25.09.2006; **No. 21** — *Ӝечбур!* 01.01.2007.

REFERENCES

- Bartens, R. 2000, *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys*, Helsinki.
- Fokos-Fuchs D. 1963, [Rev.] Грамматика современного удмуртского языка. Фонетика и морфология, Ижевск 1962. — *NyK LXV*, 217.
- Heine, B. 1997, *Possession. Cognitive Sources, Forces and Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kel'makov, V, Hännikäinen, S. 1999, *Udmurtin kielioppia ja harjoituksia*, Helsinki.
- Kokla, P. 1963, *Possessiivsuffixid mari keeles. Väitekiri filoloogiakandidaadi teadusliku kraadi taotlemiseks*, Tallinn.
- Ravila, P. 1941, *Über die Verwendung der Numeruszeichen in den uralischen Sprachen*. — *FUF XXVII*, 1—136.
- Sazhina, N. 2005, *Possessiivuse väljandamise viisid tänapäevase eesti ja sürjakomi keeles. Magistritöö*, Tartu.
- Sebestyén, I. 1957, *Die possessiven Fügungen im Samojedischen und das Problem des uralischen Genitivs*. — *ALHung*, 7, 1—4.
- Szinyei J. 1910, *Finnisch-ugrische Sprachwissenschaft*, Leipzig.
- Uotila, T. 1933, *Zur Geschichte des Konsonantismus in den permischen Sprachen*, Helsinki (MSFOu LXV).
- Vászolyi, E. 1967, *A finnugor személyjelek kérdéséhez (A permi nyelvek névszói személyjelek leíró vizsgálata és belső rekonstrukciója)*. — *NyK LXIX*, 3—56.
- Winkler, E. 2000, *Udmurt*, München.
- Андуганов Ю. В. 1991, *Историческая грамматика марийского языка. Синтаксис. Часть I. Введение, Йошкар-Ола*.
- 1992, *Причины сохранения прауральского облика в синтаксисе удмуртского и марийского языков*. — *Вопросы диалектологии и истории удмуртского языка*, Ижевск, 26.
- Вахрушев В. М. 1970, *Изафетные конструкции в удмуртском языке*. — *ЗУдмНИИ*. Вып. 21, 78—106.
- 1980, *Субстантивированные словосочетания в удмуртском языке*. — *Словосочетания в удмуртском языке*, Ижевск, 130—168.
- Кельмаков В. К. 1969, *Кукморский диалект удмуртского языка. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук*, Москва.
- Конюхова А. В. 1957, *Удмурт кыл грамматика. Синтаксис*, Ижевск.
- Лыткин В. И. 1970, *О вокализме непервого слога финно-угорских языков*. — *СФУ*, 221—238.
- Майзель С. С. 1957, *Изафет в турецком языке*, Москва—Ленинград.
- Перевощиков П. Н. 1957, *Притяжательные формы связи имен в определенных словосочетаниях удмуртского языка*. — *ЗУдмНИИ*. Вып. 18, 71—92.

- П о з д е е в а А. А. 1949, Синтаксические функции именной формы на *-эз* и *-ыс* в пермских языках. Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук, Ижевск.
- С е р е б р е н н и к о в Б. А. 1958, К истории возникновения конструкции типа коми-зырянского *аддза батълысь керка* 'вижу дом отца' в пермских языках. — Историко-филологический сборник. Вып. 2. Сыктывкар, 195—196.
- 1963, Историческая морфология пермских языков, Москва.
- Т е п л я ш и н а Т. И. 1966, Удмуртский язык. — Языки народов СССР, т. 3. Финно-угорские и самодийские языки, Москва, 261—280.
- Ф е о к т и с т о в А. П. 1963, Категория притяжательности в мордовских языках, Саранск.

СВЕТЛАНА ЕДЫГАРОВА (Тарту)

АТРИБУТИВНАЯ ПОСЕССИЯ В УДМУРТСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

До сих пор традиционный подход в рамках атрибутивной посессии рассматривал только два типа конструкций: NN+N, NGEN+NPX, причем конструкция с аблативом NABL+NPX обозначалась всего лишь как вариант генитивного словосочетания. В данной статье термин 'посессия' применяется в широком значении, что дает возможность в рамках атрибутивной посессии рассматривать множество других конструкций. Так, серьезную конкуренцию основным посессивным словосочетаниям могут составить конструкции с формами элатива, инессива. Кроме того, в данной статье описываются такие словосочетания (в форме адвербиала, инструментала и датива), которые на современном этапе еще не грамматикализировались как посессивные, но имеют такую тенденцию и в некоторых ситуациях создают конкуренцию другим конструкциям. Употребление и функционирование рассматриваемых конструкций зависит от их семантических и синтаксических особенностей, а именно: выражают ли они отношения неотчуждаемой/отчуждаемой, неодушевленной/одушевленной, часть-целое, неопределенной/определенной посессии, а также имеет ли объект посессора функцию прямого или косвенного объекта.