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Introduction

Aims

♦ To discuss possessive suffixes in non-possessive uses
  ▪ extended use (Fraurud 2001)
  ▪ non-personal definite function (Künnap 2004)
  ▪ non-ptototypical use (Janda 2015)
  ▪ definiteness-marking function (Gerland 2014)

♦ Similar to definite articles in L_{+\text{ART}}\? (formerly claimed, recently challenged)

Claims

♦ Arguments pro grammaticalization
♦ The grammaticalization of Uralic Px-determination shows a reversed order wrt the grammaticalization of definite articles
♦ A unified account for both grammaticalization paths
♦ Marking pragmatic definiteness > marking semantic uniqueness
Introduction

Disclaimer

♦ Relying on data as found in literature
♦ Testing with native speakers in progress

Background

Languages under the Influence. Uralic syntax changing in an asymmetrical contact situation
2016-2017 (OTKA/NKFI 118079; PI: Katalin É. Kiss)

Nominal Structures in Uralic Languages
Proposed research period: 2017-2021; under review
General observations

Empirical basis:

♦ Numerical data from quantitative studies
  ➢ Fraurud (2001: 250-250) for Udmurt and Turkish, as compared with Swedish and English
  ➢ Nikolaeva (1999: 82) for Northern Khanty, as compared with English
    → arguing that non-ownership possessive constructions are also used to express relation types that are rendered by other kinds of modification in Indo-European languages (e.g. adpositional phrases, relational adjectives, etc.)

♦ Comparative observations

♦ Significant differences between the individual languages
Previous analyses

The non-possessive use of possessive suffixes


♦ a feature already present in Proto-Uralic (Janhunen 1981: 32; Décsy 1990: 81)

Comprehensive studies

- Kari Fraurud (2001)
- Nikolaeva (2003)
- Schroeder (2006)
- Gerland (2014)
- Simonenko (2014)
Previous analyses

Fraurud (2001)
- Extensive use of possessive suffixes in Permic (+Turkish, Yucatec Maya)
- POSS > DEF.ART? Arguments *pro* and *contra*
- Type I and Type II possessives

Nikolaeva (2003)
- Against the definiteness-account (Px in non-referential contexts)
- Classification of meanings:
  - Identifiability based on deixis and situational uniqueness
  - Identifiability based on anaphora (optional: "conditioned pragmatically rather than by rules of grammar")
  - Associative (non-prototypical possessive) relationship: i.) linking the reference to the speech act (Px:1SG or 2SG); ii.) linking to discourse-internal elements (Px:any)
  - Emphasis and contrast
Previous analyses

Schroeder (2006)
- Sum of descriptive claims, but concentrating on Komi and Udmurt
- Px:2SG → anaphoric; Px:3SG → non-anaphoric, unique reference
- "emergent category" as marker of definiteness (i.e. not fully grammaticalized)
  ⇒ expected to vary

Gerland (2014)
- Definiteness marking function of Px: inherent to some Uralic languages
- Two main functions of Px: i.) establishing a relation between entities; ii.) establishing a relation between an entity and the discourse
  ⇒ relational suffix; interpretation depends on either on the conceptual lexical type of the head noun or on the context

Simonenko (2014)
- Khanty (Shuryshkarski), Komi (Izhem), Mari (Meadow)
- Px in their non-possessive uses as varieties of reference-related markers
- The same semantic mechanisms can handle both non-possessive and possessive uses (salience-based global choice function)
Previous analyses - Summary

Does the extended use of Px correspond to the process of grammaticalization of definite articles?
- no characteristics of a well-shaped grammaticalization path
- lack of obligatoriness


Problems
- the distribution of Px-determination is not identical in the individual languages (cf. Simonenko 2014, Gerland 2014: 271)
- contradictions in the literature, wrt
  - concrete uses in a given context
  - inconsistency in selecting the relevant contexts
  - examples often cited without contexts (⇒ ambiguity)

Recent results based on fieldwork or corpus-studies:
- Zayzon (2015) for Nganasan
- Janda (2015) for Northern Mansi (only considers anaphoric contexts)
- Budzisch (2016) for Southern and Central Selkup
New questions

definiteness = referential identification
(Lyons 1999)

- How is referential identification encoded in Uralic languages and what part, if any, do possessive suffixes have in it?

- What does the extended use of Px mean?
- Can Px-determination be analyzed as a real grammaticalized element at all?
- If so, do the differences between languages correspond to different stages of grammaticalization?
- If so, what is its relation to the process that characterizes the grammaticalization of definite articles?
The Old Hungarian grammar of referential identification

Absence of article in definite contexts:

- with inherently unique nouns
- noun phrases with generic reading

referents identified independently of the direct context

⇒ *semantic* uniqueness

- with demonstratives
- with an overt possessor expression

referents identified by *other morphosyntactic devices*

Proposal

- the article first appeared to encode *pragmatic* definiteness
- the article must only appear, if definiteness has not been encoded otherwise

Spreading (Egedi & Simon 2012)
The definite article-cycle
The grammaticalization path of definite articles (Greenberg 1978)
### Strategies for referential identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Use</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anaphoric use</td>
<td>&quot;There's a new café in our street. We have nothing in the fridge. Let's go and see what we can get in the café.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative-anaphoric use</td>
<td>&quot;There's a new café in our street. The owner has just come back from Japan.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situational use</td>
<td>&quot;What does the cheesecake cost?&quot; (here, in the café where we are)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>larger situational use</td>
<td>&quot;The sun is shining brightly.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inherent uniqueness</td>
<td>&quot;I am never bored with the Italian cuisine&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Cf. also Givón’s (2001: 459-465) types of mental structures for grounding referents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies for referential identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anaphoric use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative-anaphoric use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situational use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| larger situational use = inherent uniqueness | "*The sun* is shining brightly."  
*I am never bored with *the Italian cuisine"* |


Cf. also Givón’s (2001: 459-465) types of mental structures for grounding referents

Referents not explicitly present in previous discourse / speech situation ⇒
**No DEMONSTRATIVES are used!**
Strategies for referential identification and definiteness marking in Hungarian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 0</th>
<th>Stage I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anaphoric use</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>DEM / ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative-anaphoric use</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>POSS / ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situational use</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>DEM / ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>larger situational use = inherent uniqueness</td>
<td>(\emptyset)</td>
<td>(\emptyset)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Strategies for referential identification and definiteness marking in Old Hungarian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Stage 0</th>
<th>Stage I/A</th>
<th>Stage I/B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anaphoric use</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>DEM / ART</td>
<td>DEM / ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative-anaphoric use</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>POSS / ART</td>
<td>POSS / ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situational use</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>DEM / ART</td>
<td>DEM / ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>larger situational use</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>ART</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= inherent uniqueness
Strategies for referential identification and definiteness marking in Old and Middle Hungarian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 0</th>
<th>Stage I/A</th>
<th>Stage I/B</th>
<th>Stage I/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anaphoric use</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>DEM / ART</td>
<td>DEM / ART</td>
<td>DEM+ART / ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative-anaphoric use</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>POSS / ART</td>
<td>POSS / ART</td>
<td>POSS+ART / ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situational use</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>DEM / ART</td>
<td>DEM / ART</td>
<td>DEM+ART / ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>larger situational use</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= inherent uniqueness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategies for referential identification and definiteness marking in Old Hungarian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 0</th>
<th>Stage I/A</th>
<th>Stage I/B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anaphoric use</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>DEM / ART</td>
<td>DEM / ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative-anaphoric use</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>POSS / ART</td>
<td>POSS / ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situational use</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>DEM / ART</td>
<td>DEM / ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>larger situational use</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>ART</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= inherent uniqueness

Grammaticalization path of the definite article: **deixis** > **identifiability**

anaphoric use > associative-anaphoric use
situational use > larger situational use
Strategies for referential identification (4 \(\geq\) 5)

Proposal for an extended version of the model
The fifth context: associative-anaphoric use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Use</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anaphoric use</td>
<td>&quot;There's a new café in our street. We have nothing in the fridge. Let's go and see what we can get in the café.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative-anaphoric use</td>
<td>&quot;There's a new café in our street. The owner has just come back from Japan.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situational use</td>
<td>&quot;What does the cheesecake cost?&quot; (here, in the café where we are)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>larger situational use</td>
<td>&quot;The sun is shining brightly.&quot; &quot;I am never bored with the Italian cuisine&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= inherent uniqueness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative-situational use</td>
<td>&quot;How is the dog?&quot; (addressee’s dog is meant) &quot;Where is the remote control?&quot; (TV in room)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Associative-situational contexts are not uniform

associative-situational context (1st/2nd person)

- association made with one of the interlocutors

(1) ‘How is the / your / (*that) dog?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$L_{+\text{ART}}$</th>
<th>$L_{-\text{ART}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Associative-situational contexts are not uniform

**associative-situational** context (3rd person)

- association made with an entity different from the interlocutors

(2) ‘Where did you put the / its / (*that) remote control?’

(3) ‘Will you give me please the number of the / (*its) / (*that) painter?’

[looking around in the renewed flat]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$L_{+\text{ART}}$</th>
<th>$L_{-\text{ART}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>✓/✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Associative uses

Px-determination is *not* extended or non-prototypical in associative-anaphoric and associative-situational contexts

*associative-situational* context (1st/2nd person)

- association made with one of the interlocutors

(4) Otyn koške n’i avtobus-ed
there go.**PRES.3SG** already autobus-**2SG**
‘Your bus is already going there.’

(Northern Khanty Nikolaeva 1999: 83, ex. 213d)

(5) tam xu:j-e:m xal’ša joxt-ə-s?
this man-**1SG** where come-**EP-PAST.3SG**
‘Where did this man (lit. my man) come from (to me)?’

(Udmurt, É. Kiss - Tánczos ms. ex. 23)
I. Associative uses

associative-situational context (3rd person)

➢ association made with an entity different from the interlocutors

(6) Guždor vylin turyn-ez čeber
field on grass-3SG beautiful

'In the field, the grass is beautiful.'

(if the referent is available for direct sensory perception)

(Udmurt, Nikolaeva 2003, ex. 6b)

Special case: time expressions

Nikolaeva (2003) discussing them under "identifiability based on deixis and situational uniqueness"

(7) čukna-jez tunne kežyt val
morning-3SG today cold was

‘The morning today was cold.’

(Udmurt, É. Kiss - Tánczos ms. ex.22a)
II. Beyond associativity

*Extended use:* Px for referential identification *in non-associative contexts*

- Direct anaphoric contexts
- Larger situational contexts
- Immediate situational contexts

**Direct anaphoric use**

(Komi, Southern Permyak dialect, Fraurud 2001: 252 (8) after Rédei 1978: 474)

(8) et-piriś sečće woktis ruć. rućis čig.

once then came fox fox-*3SG* hungry

‘Once a/the fox came that way. *The fox* was hungry.’

(Selkup, Nikolaeva 2003, ex.10, after Kuznecova et al. 1980: 187)

(9) Qoltyt qanyqqyn anty totta, anty-ty lapykɔ:l ɛ:ŋa.

river bank.on boat stands boat-*3SG* oar.without is

‘A boat stands on the riverbank, *the boat* doesn't have an oar.’
II. Beyond associativity

Larger situational use


(10) мəу-ðu șürü ңil'ənu չiiməə
earth-3SG snow-GEN under hidden.PTPASS.3SG
‘The earth is covered with snow.’

(Southern Selkup, Vasjugan, Budzisch 2015: 47, ex.10)

(11) tjele-dî kwed-i-mba
sun-3SG shine-EP-HAB.3SG
‘The sun is shining.’
II. Beyond associativity

Immediate situational use

(12) ‘Look at the / that / (*its, *your) blackbird!’

(Selkup, Upper Ket dialect, Budzisch 2016, ex. 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L+ART</th>
<th>L−ART</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>*✓</td>
<td>✓ *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(13) It’e, mata-l nü-di!
Itja door-2SG open-IMP.2SG
‘Itja, open the door!’
II. Beyond associativity

Immediate situational use


(14) wa:nt-a tam masina:j-e:n je:wra man-ǝ-s?
look-IMP.2SG this car-2SG aside go-EP-PAST.3SG
‘Look, that car (lit. your car) went aside’
[NB. If the addressee had no relation to the car previously.]

(Nenets, Nikolaeva 2014: 69, ex.25b)

(15) t’ukona sira-da wǝr-cawey°
here snow-3SG dirt-PROP
‘Here the snow is dirty.’
### Px in non-associative contexts
- based on literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mari</th>
<th>Udmurt</th>
<th>Komi</th>
<th>Khanty</th>
<th>Mansi</th>
<th>Nenets</th>
<th>Nganasan</th>
<th>Selkup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaphoric</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger situational</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+/- opinions vary in literature!

+? no example provided but generally alluded to, or not claimed explicitly, but presumable based on some examples.
## Strategies for referential identification and definiteness marking in Uralic languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 0</th>
<th>Stage I/A</th>
<th>Stage I/B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anaphoric use</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>DEM / POSS</td>
<td>DEM / POSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative-anaphoric use</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>POSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situational use</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>DEM / POSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>larger situational use = inherent uniqueness</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>POSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative-situational use</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>POSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grammaticalization path of the Px-determination: **associativity** > **identifiability**

- associative-anaphoric use > anaphoric use
- *associative-situational use* > situational use
- > larger situational use
Grammaticalization or not?

The characteristic mechanisms of grammaticalization:

• semantic bleaching
• context generalization
• morphological reduction
• phonetic erosion

Cf. the grammaticalization path of Px -ez/-jez in Udmurt

(É. Kiss & Tánczos ms.)

possessive agreement > partitivity marking > specific object marking

– loss of phi-features (semantic simplification),
– loss of some allomorphs (morphological simplification)
– obligatory in some of its new roles
The problem of obligatoriness...

Obligatoriness must hold in grammatically well defined contexts...

Referential identification can be encoded by more strategies

- Inherently unique nouns and generic noun phrases are only optionally marked if semantic definiteness does not need to be overtly marked
- Demonstratives
- Topicalization
- Verbal conjugation: objective agreement on the verb marking that the object is referentially identifiable (so called secondary topic) (e.g. Ob-Ugric and Samoyedic languages)
- DOM (e.g. Udmurt -ez/jez claimed to encode specific objects, É.Kiss & Tánczos ms.)
- Other...?
Scene III

[Visual stimulus: Living-room with a TV and other typical objects; two women]

W1: - Look, the TV is working again! It was repaired yesterday.
W2: - Will you give me please the number of the repairman? My TV's been out of order for two weeks.
W1: - Sure! I'll go to the kitchen, the mobile is on the table.
W2: - Let me try the TV in the meantime. Where's the power button?
W1: - The remote control is in the drawer.
W2: - Why on earth did you put the remote control in the drawer??
W1: - 'Cause the dog always steals it.
W2: - You shouldn't let him in the room anyway! Where's the dog now?
W1: - He's playing with the neighbor kid in the garden. I'll call them in, if you want to have a look at the dog. We can also give some cookies to the boy.
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