

On the verbs of ingestion and partitive function in Erzya

Jack RUETER

University of Helsinki
rueter.jack@gmail.com

Introduction

Language research scenarios are often developed and hinged upon a default language with a research history and tradition of its own. Thus, research in the Uralic languages is multifaceted, as there are often shared but also independent traditions in German, Russian, Finnish, Hungarian, English, etc. Here, each research language, naturally, brings its own “luggage” with it. And priorities are often indicative of well studied features found in the individual research languages themselves. Hence, we have a tendency to delimit phenomena studied in the target language according to familiar phenomena found in a ready research tradition.

Each research tradition brings its own highlights and elements of expertise. Hungarians, on the one hand, have experience in nearly a thousand years of written language documentation, and they also have work in discourse and aspect. All three provide insight in the study of other languages. Typical of the Finnish tradition, on the other hand, might be the study of the partitive, as this is a case of abundant use in Finnish, or the passive, as the Finnish passive differs greatly from that found in the Germanic and Romance languages. Research conducted by speakers of related languages, however, introduces yet another dimension, i.e., cognate phenomena. By seeking out and discovering mutual features, they not only underline the importance of their research tradition but provide evidence of a common ancestry and history.

Potentially, native scholars of smaller Uralic languages could access a wealth of scholarship on their own languages if they had the linguistic capabilities and established a research tradition of their own. In fact, research in Uralic etymology from a Northern Saami perspective can be seen as the opening of a new research tradition (cf. Aikio 2009). Likewise, work in Per-



mic and Uralic language description from a Komi-Zyrian perspective would also point to the strengthening of an established school there (cf. Cypanov 2009; 2016). Analogy of this development is seen elsewhere, but much more is needed. We need a strengthening of descriptive research that reflects phenomena in the individual target languages. In order to complement well established morphological research, we need more syntactic description, which together with the relatively established morphology of individual word tokens will bring each language together as a whole and contribute to their use as working media.

This paper deals with a phenomenon that only becomes salient when morphology and syntax are brought together. While cases in Finnic languages might be treated as cognates of cases in other Uralic branches, etymology alone does not provide for semantic or even syntactic correlation. Thus, the etymological cohesion between the Finnish partitive case and the ablative of the Mordvin languages cannot provide more than a hopeful assumption with regards to syntactic use.

The combined research of morphosyntax brings us closer to language in real-life context. It forces us to answer questions we have been able to ignore when dealing with isolated phenomena. Such questions include: *Can languages have two objects?* Yes, in fact, many do, but these are usually a combination of direct and indirect objects, such as in the English *give the boy the ball*, where “the boy” is the recipient, indirect object, and “the ball” is the theme/patient, direct object. *Does Erzya have a dual-object system consisting of two direct objects?* From a syntactic perspective, this should be settled based on the individual language. As semantic and translation evidence are not part of syntactic criteria (cf. Wickman 1955), we need to observe how parallel phenomena within the target language can be described. We need to look at partitive alternation, verbs of ingestion where this is manifest, and we need to compare usages in causative and passive constructions alike.

Background

The Erzya language is a close relative of Moksha, and both Mordvin literary languages are known for their complex morphologies, with both mutual and divergent features, see Rueter 2016; 2020. Morphological complexity in Erzya can be outlined as a division of word classes into three macro categories: (a) particles and interjections, which generally take no inflectional morphology; (b) finite verbs, which conjugate with both subject and object marking (see Keresztes 1999; Trosterud 2006), and (c) non-finites and nominals, which in context may take noun-phrase head marking, i.e., case but also may be involved

in subsequent copula complement marking (cf. Turunen 2010; Rueter 2013; Rueter et al. 2022). Morphological complexity in the Mordvin languages also makes syntactic complexity a feasible target of continued research, which can be exhibited openly. One venue for open presentation of syntax which has gained renown over the past decade among corpus linguists and typologists alike is the Universal Dependencies project.

Universal Dependencies (UD) hosts over 130 different languages with multiple subprojects, addressing varied genres and collections of individual languages (Zeman et al. 2022). This international treebank project provides an opportunity to align annotation practices within languages and simultaneously with other languages. For this reason, typology is becoming more and more interested in the language data available there. Now, one can find a growing representation of Uralic languages there, and in addition to the state languages of Estonian, Finnish and Hungarian, one also finds two Saami, two Karelian, two Permic and two Mordvin languages, but there is still much to be done.

In order to make the construction of UD treebanks feasible, work must be done with automation. For the larger treebanks, this has meant the building of morphological analyzers and syntactic parsers with dependency notation. Some of the smaller projects are even manually constructed – at least partially. For most languages, however, there are existing analyzers and parsers that have been tweaked or enhanced to cope with the building of treebanks according to Universal Dependencies prescriptions. It is the development of such parsers and their enhancement that helps to reveal phenomena in a language which previously had gone unnoticed, such as the “dual object” in the Mordvin languages.

The ablative and inessive objects

To best introduce the dual object, we need to look back to the middle of last century. In ‘Syntax and Punctuation’, Kolâdënkov states that Erzya has four separate cases for indicating the direct object: nominative, genitive, ablative and inessive (1940: 18–19; 1954: 47). As the nominative-genitive alternation of the direct-object case can be traced back to Gabelentz in 1838/39 and Wiedeman in 1865,¹ we will only examine the ablative and inessive here,

¹ https://rueter.github.io/emerald/historical-mordvin-grammars/docs/gabelentz_hcvonder-versuch-einer-mordwinischen-grammatik-1838-39.html
https://multilingualfacilitation.com/emerald/historical-mordvin-grammars/docs/wiedemann_fj-grammatik-der-ersa-mordwinischen-sprache-1865.html

accessing examples in original grammars and the ERME corpus. Koláděnkov describes the ablative object (a.k.a. partitive object, see Grünthal 2022; Hamari – Ajanki 2022) as indicating a delimited quantity or part of an entity, providing examples (1a)–(1c) (cf. Koláděnkov 1940: 19) with English translations by this author.

- (1a) *lišmeš* *jarsI* *tikše-d'e*
horse.def eat.3Sg grass-Abl
‘The horse is eating some grass. / the horse is feeding on grass.’
‘Лошадь ест сено.’
- (1b) *inžet'ne* *čaj-d'e* *šimil't*
guest.Pl.Def tea-Abl drink.Prt2.3Pl
‘The guests would drink tea.’
‘Гости пили чай.’
- (1c) *sajt'* *pešt'-t'-ne-d'e*
take.Imp.2Sg nut-Pl-Def-Abl
‘Take some of the nuts.’
‘Бери орехи(-то).’
- (1d) (Pronin – Popov 1968: 15)
kad'k *gloxt'i* *ved'teňt'*
allow.Imp.2Sg>3Sg gulp.3Sg water.Abl.Def
‘Let him gulp some of that water.’

The ablative-case object can be demonstrated to operate as both a true-partitive (1c-1d) and the pseudo-partitive relations (1a-1b) (for terminology see Seržant 2021). The true-partitive requires that a defined whole be present from which part is taken, this is observed in (1c-1d), whereas (1a-1b) lack a defined whole. In all four instances, however, there is no mensural classifier present (cf. Rueter 2013: 108). The presence of a mensural classifier such as ‘glass’, ‘cup’, ‘bucket’ would render use of the ablative ungrammatical, see examples (2a–2b), where (2b) is ungrammatical due to the simultaneous presence of both a measurement *stopka* ‘glass’ and an expression of undetermined quantity expressed by the ablative form of ‘tea’, which has a preceding asterisk to indicate the ungrammaticality.

- (2a) (Author unknown, Sâtko 1969/1: 89)
šimeđe *stopka* *keme* *tan'ej* *pši* *čaj.*
drink.Imp.2Pl glass strong tasty hot tea.
‘Drink a glass of strong, tasty, hot tea.’

(2b) (ungrammatical)

šimed'e *stopka* *keme* *tan'ej* *pši* **čaj-d'e*.
 drink.Imp.2Pl glass strong tasty hot tea-Abl.
 'Drink some a glass of strong, tasty, hot tea.'

Kolâdënkov provides, examples (3a)–(3b) for the inessive-case direct object or inessive postposition, which he characterizes as bearing the same meaning as the genitive object. Examples (1 and 3) are from Kolâdënkov (1940: 19; 1954: 202–205) with English translation by this author.

(3a) (Kolâdënkov 1940: 19)

pižemeš *moda-so-ńt'* *načtI*.
 rain.Def earth-Ine-Def.Sg moisten.3Sg
 'The rain was moistening the earth.'
 'Дождь мочит землю(-то).'

(3b) (Kolâdënkov 1940: 19)

čop *tečI* *učIń* *šomań* *ejse*.
 all.day today wait.Prt1.1Sg Sěma-Gen Ine
 'I was waiting for Sěma all day today.'
 'Сегодня целый день ждала (я) Семена.'

There is, however, a distinction between the genitive and inessive direct objects. In his description of the Northwestern dialect, Markov provides a more comprehensive description of the four direct-object cases and their distinctions (1961: 43–46). In the Northwestern group of subdialects, the inessive is only used as a definite object, and, in contrast to the genitive and nominative objects, it expresses an incomplete or ongoing action, whereas, slightly oversimplifying it, the nominative and genitive objects are associated with completed actions, which nowadays would be seen as associated with aspect.

Raija Bartens shares many of the same observations on the use of a definite inessive object, but she further indicates that both proper nouns and objects of generalizations might appear in the indefinite form (1999: 96), see example (4).

(4) (Bartens 1999: 96) (no source given)

vejke *lomańse* *śiśem* *lomaťt'* *a* *učIť*
 one person-Ine seven person.Pl Neg wait.3Pl
 'Seven people don't wait for one.'

In Rueter’s treatment of Quantification in Erzya (2013: 112), he finds that the distinction between genitive versus inessive object has been greatly neglected in the research literature. He provides a segment of text with an alternate to demonstrate a distinction between inessive and genitive, which are presented here again in examples (5a–5b). In example (5a) the definite inessive object seems to mark distributive points of a larger object, while the alternative marking found in the definite genitive (5b) would not have this distributive interpretation.

- (5a) (Bryžinskij 2008: 30)
- | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| ... <i>vannoś</i> | <i>korodovks-t-ne-ń</i> | <i>ejse</i> |
| to.examine.PrtI.3Sg | embattlement-Pl-Det-Gen | Po.Ine |
- ‘... he examined the embattlements (one point at a time)’
- (5b) ... *vannoś* *korodovks-t-ne-ń*
- | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|
| to.examine.PrtI.3Sg | embattlement-Pl-Det-Gen |
|---------------------|-------------------------|
- ‘... he examined the embattlements (as a whole)’

In *The Form of the Object in the Uralic Languages* (1955: 12), Wickman states that the ablative in Mordvin indicates motion away from something and therefore cannot be considered an object case on par with the partitive case of Finnish. Subsequent research of the direct object, however, has not found fault in treating the four different cases as direct object markers, cf. Itkonen 1972; Bartens 1999: 88–96; Buzakova 2000: 82–87. Modern studies also emphasize that the original locative usage of the Mordvin ablative only survives in some highly idiomatic constructions (Bartens 1999: 94; see also Hamari – Ajanki 2022).

Verbs of ingestion

The category *verbs of ingestion* (a.k.a. consumption, intake) has been alluded to by many working with the Mordvin languages (cf. Koláděnkov 1940: 18–19; 1954: 202; 1962: 115–116; Wickman 1955: 12; Itkonen 1972: 170; Larsson 1981: 190–191; Keresztes 1990: 73–74; 2011: 100; Bartens 1999: 93–94; Kiparsky 2004; Rueter 2010: 84). In Erzya these verbs include: *jarsams* ‘to eat’, *sevems* ‘to eat’, *śimems* ‘to drink’ and their equivalents, but the category is also extend to *targams* ‘to smoke’ and *lekśtams* ‘to take a breath’. Most important, all of these verbs can be found with the partitive-function ablative, that is, of course, with the exception of the verb *sevems* ‘to eat’, which indicates a completed action, and is in complementary distribution with the verb *jarsams* ‘to eat’, which utilizes the partitive function. Until

now, however, this category had not been assessed from a causative or passive structure perspective.

Verbs of ingestion in causative structure

Keresztes mentions the ablative-case direct object in passing (1990: 73–74; 2011: 100), but his example repeated here in example (6) is very meaningful, as it involves a prototypical causative verb *šimd'ems* ‘water, give sm smth to drink’. Both the Erzya and the Moksha sentence indicate a third person plural direct object, and yet there is also an ablative partitive function present in <lovso> and <lofctə> ‘of milk’. Is this some kind of dual-object structure?

- (6) (Keresztes 1990: 73–74)
- | | | | |
|------------|--------------------|------------------|----------|
| <i>son</i> | <i>šimd'ińže</i> | <i>lovso-do.</i> | (Erzya) |
| <i>son</i> | <i>šimd'əžəń</i> | <i>lofc-tə.</i> | (Moksha) |
| 3Sg | drink.Prt1.3Sg>3Pl | milk-Abl | |
- ‘He/she gave them water to drink’

The verb *šimd'ems* ‘to allow someone to drink something’ or ‘to provide something for someone to drink’ is a causative verb. Example (6) illustrates a third person singular subject and a third person plural direct object with an additional ablative “direct object”. From a causative perspective, the third person plural direct object represents the causee, whereas the ablative-case direct object is the object of the base verb *šimems* ‘to drink’, see example (7).

- (7) (Ůrčėnkova, 2002: 125–126)
- | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| <i>Son</i> | <i>[pižemeš]</i> | <i>šimd'-ińže</i> | <i>veše</i> | <i>kasovks-tne-ń</i> |
| 3Sg | [rain.Def] | water-Prt1.3Sg>3Pl | all | plant-Pl.Def-Gen |
| <i>umok</i> | <i>učovt</i> | <i>ved'-t'e.</i> | | |
| a.long.time | wait.Ptc.Telic | water-Abl | | |
- ‘The rain provided all the plants with water that had been expected for a long time.’

In example (7), above, we can see the definite genitive plural form of the word for ‘plant’ – the causee, but we also see the ablative-case word for ‘water’. According to Polinsky (1994: 131–132), the verb ‘to feed’ is, cross-linguistically, one of the most common causative verbs where the causee is a semantically immediate participant, i.e., ‘to feed’ is a prototypical causative verb. We can assume that the verb *šimd'ems* ‘give sm smth to drink’ in (7) is also a prototypical causative verb.

Verbs of ingestion in passive structure

The Erzya language has two separate structures referred to as passives (see Salo 2015). Both types, however, can participate in the regular derivation of both transitive and intransitive verbs. The more common Erzya passive derivation, in *-Ov-*, is telic by nature, and it might actually match the English “get” passive – something down the line of *meat gets eaten* (patient becomes subject with transitive verbs) and *the man gets drunk* (the subject remains subject with intransitive verbs) versus *the milk gets drunk* (patient becomes subject with transitive verbs). Unlike the English “get” passive, however, this passive does not have a counter-volitional connotation. In example (8a), we see what would be the retention subject from the intransitive base verb ‘to drink’. In example (8b), in contrast, the patient of the transitive base verb has become subject.

- (8a) (Abramov 1966a: 24)
- | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|----------|----------------|
| <i>t'ese</i> | <i>pramozonzo</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>šimevi.</i> |
| here | to.fall.Conv.Ill.Px3Sg | not | get.drunk |
- ‘Here he cannot drink until he falls over.’

- (8b) (Abramov 1966b: 8)
- | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------------|
| <i>žardo</i> | <i>pivaš</i> | <i>šimevš,...</i> |
| when | beer.Def.Sg | get.drunk.Prt1.3Sg |
- ‘when the beer got drunk (i.e., finished off)’

Against a background of the ambitransitive verb *šimems* ‘to drink’, we can examine the complementary verb pair *jarsams* and *sevems* ‘to eat’. Both base verbs take the telic derivation in *-Ov-*. Hence, (9a) *lomañeš jarsavš* person.Def.Sg get.enough.to.eat.3Sg ‘the person managed to get enough to eat’ with the derivation of *jarsavoms* ‘to.get.enough.to.eat’ from *jarsams* ‘to eat’ exhibits only the features of an intransitive verb. On the contrary, the verb *sevems* ‘to eat’ can only be treated as a transitive verb, which means it can only undergo the patient-to-subject promotion.

Salo (2015: 178–113) notes that the *-Ov-* formative in the verbs *šimd'e-vems* ‘to get watered’ and *andovoms* ‘to get fed’ can co-occur with the “ablative object”, but here the focus of what she is discussing addresses an idea of interchangeability between and instrumental inessive *-so/-se* and the ablative *-do/-de/-d'e/-to/-te/-t'e*. This author provides his own glossing for the example found by Salo (see 9).

- (9) (Abramov 1961: 309; ERS 1993: 49)
- | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|-------------------|------------------|
| <i>skal-tne</i> | <i>kurok</i> | <i>karm-it'</i> | <i>vazija-mo</i> |
| cow-Pl.Def | soon | begin-Prs.3Pl | calve-Loc.Inf. |
| <i>olgo-do</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>and-ov-it'</i> | |
| straw-Abl | Neg | feed-Pass-Prs.3Pl | |
- ‘The cows will soon begin calving,
 (9a) you don’t feed them on straw /
 (9b) feeding them on straw is not enough.’

The interpretations found in translations (9a) and (9b) are both possible and indicative of translation problems encountered. The point at issue here, however, is that the *-Ov-* passive allows for a co-occurring ablative-case adjunct.

Upon more extensive examination of corpora, it has become apparent that the partitive function is, in fact, compatible with mensural classifiers but only if the classifier has an approximative interpretation such as that rendered by the comparative case in *ška*. Thus, in example (10a), ‘about a bucket’ is compatible with the partitive function in the ablative-case form of ‘beer’. Reversing the ordering to the mensural classifier and ensemble noun does not affect the validity, see (10b), nor would the replacement of the true-partitive constructions in (10a–10b) with pseudo-partitive, i.e., indefinite ablative forms of the ensemble noun ‘beer’. The presence of a nominative-case mensural classifier *vedra* ‘bucket’ would require the word order (1) mensural classifier, (2) ensemble noun and an indefinite nominative singular form of the ensemble noun, see example (10c).

- (10a) (Slugina 2003: 57)
- | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>še</i> | <i>čokšněsteńt'</i> | <i>pija-do-ńt'</i> | <i>vedra-ška</i> | <i>šimekšnIńek...</i> |
| that | evening.Ela.Sg.Def | beer-Abl-
Sg.Def | bucket-Cmp | drink.Distr.
Pst1.1Pl |
- ‘That evening we had drunk about a bucket of the beer...’
- (10b) (variant with mensural classifier followed by ensemble noun)
- | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>še</i> | <i>čokšněsteńt'</i> | <i>vedra-ška</i> | <i>pija-do-ńt'</i> | <i>šimekšnIńek...</i> |
| that | evening.Ela.Sg.Def | bucket-Cmp | beer-Abl-
Sg.Def | drink.Distr.
Pst1.1Pl |
- ‘That evening we had drunk about a bucket of the beer...’

- (10c) (variant with non-approximated mensural classifier and ensemble noun)
še čokšheteňt vedra pija šimekšn. Inek...
 that evening.Ela.Sg.Def bucket.Nom beer.Sg.Indef drink.Distr.Pst1.1Pl
 ‘That evening we had drunk a bucket of the beer...’

Identifying the direct objects

In summary, we have observed a three-way pattern for nominative, genitive and ablative “objects”. The base verb *šimems* ‘to drink’ can take: (a) an indefinite nominative singular object (11a); (b) a definite genitive singular object (11b), and (c) what would appear to be an indefinite ablative object (11c).

- (11a) *mon šimiň ved’.*
 1Sg drink.Pst.1Sg water.Sg
 ‘I drank a (glass of) water.’
- (11b) *mon šimija ved’-ent’.*
 1Sg drink.Pst.1Sg>3Sg water-Def.Gen.Sg
 ‘I drank the (glass of) water.’
- (11c) *mon šimiň ved’-te.*
 1Sg drink.Pst.1Sg water-Abl
 ‘I drank (some) water.’

The distinction between (11a) and (11c) lies in the implicit quantifying unit ‘a glass of water’, understood in the former, and the absence of quantification in the latter. Were a definite ablative singular to be used, the definiteness would refer to a specified instance of water and not a quantity thereof.

The causative of ‘to give sm smth to drink’ *šimd’ems* takes a causee in either the indefinite nominative (12a), the definite genitive (12b) or the definite inessive (12c) with the base-verb object in the ablative, see (12a–12c). The ablative form indicates an indefinite amount and need not be construed as an object, otherwise, we must deal with a dual-object system.

- (12a) *tonavt. Icaš šimd’š ejkakš ved’-te.*
 teacher.Def.Nom.Sg give.to.drink.Pst.3Sg child.Sg water-Abl
 ‘The teacher gave a child (some) water to drink.’
- (12b) *tonavt. Icaš šimd’iňže ejkakš-tneň ved’-te.*
 teacher.Def.Nom.Sg give.to.drink.Pst.3Sg>3Pl child-Def.Gen.Pl water-Abl
 ‘The teacher gave the children (some) water to drink.’

- (12c) *tonavtIćaś* *śimd'ś* *ejkakš-tnese* *ved'-t'e.*
 teacher.Def.Nom.Sg give.to.drink.Pst.3Sg child-Def.Ine.Pl water-Abl
 'The teacher was giving the children water to drink.'

When the mensural classifier 'pitcher' is rendered as an approximate quantity, the ensemble noun 'water' is rendered in the ablative, see (13), and we can see that the causee continues to function as a direct object with correlating object marking on the matrix verb.

- (13) *tonavtIćaś* *śimd'-ińže* *ejkakš-tneń* *kukšin-śka* *ved'-t'e.*
 teacher.Def. give.to.drink- child- pitcher-Cmp water-
 Nom.Sg Pst.3Sg>3Pl Def.Gen.Pl Abl
 'The teacher gave the children about a pitcher of water to drink.'

When no approximation is associated with the mensural classifier 'pitcher', however, the ensemble noun 'water' must appear in the indefinite nominative singular. This formulation, as rendered in example (14.1), is ungrammatical, as it can only be construed as a dual-object construction. If we want to indicate the 'pitcher of water' as a direct object, we have to render the causee/recipient 'children' in the dative, see 14.2.

- (14.1) **tonavtIćaś* *śimd'ś* *ejkakš-tneń* *kukšin* *ved'.*
 teacher.Def. give.to.drink. child- pitcher water.Sg
 Nom.Sg Pst.3Sg Def.Gen.Pl
 'The teacher gave the children a pitcher of water to drink.'

- (14.2) *tonavtIćaś* *śimd'ś* *ejkakš-tneńeń* *kukšin* *ved'.*
 teacher.Def. give.to.drink. child-Def.Dat.Pl pitcher water.Sg
 Nom.Sg Pst.3Sg
 'The teacher gave the children a pitcher of water to drink.'

- (14.3) *tonavtIćaś* *śimd'iže* *kukšin* *ved'-eńt'* *ejkakš-tneńeń.*
 teacher.Def. give.to.drink. pitcher water- child-
 Nom.Sg Pst.3Sg>3Sg Def.Gen.Sg Def.Dat.Pl
 'The teacher gave the children the pitcher of water to drink.'

The disparity between the dative-case causee/recipient with nominative-genitive patient alternation structure found in examples (14.2–14.3) and the genitive-case causee with ablative-case structure would appear to indicate a lack of a promotion correlation associated with the ablative case. This, in combination with the meager evidence from the verbs 'to eat' *jarsams* and

sevems, will, at its least, detract from arguments for a dual-object for verbs of ingestion in the Erzya and Moksha languages.

Discussion and future research

The grammar tradition of Erzya indicates four separate cases for use as direct-object markers. The nominative, genitive and inessive direct-object markers are used in complementary distribution, and all can co-occur with an ablative-case argument. Whereas nominative-genitive alternation correlates with definiteness of the direct object, genitive-inessive alternation correlates with the aspectual notion of complete-incomplete. In this sense, the ablative-case argument is seen in alternation with the nominative and genitive direct objects, such that the ablative indicates an indefinite quantity from which part is taken, i.e., true-partitive versus pseudo-partitive functions. The ablative, however, is also collocated with the approximate function indicated by the comparative case but is not compatible with a recipient construction. This might corrode claims of a partitive-function direct object in Erzya.

The use of the ablative in Erzya is extensive, and its actual character has yet to be revealed. There are claims, without statistics, of whether the main use of this case is that of a locative or a core-grammar argument. Work with the ablative must be done beyond the investigation of verbs of ingestion. Ablative argument vs adjunct research may be approached with the help of depictives (den Dikken, Marcel, p.c.). Additional research of the ablative should include more work with further instances of nominative-genitive alternation, which might include other verb types. Finally, there may be reason to investigate the subjecthood of the definite ablative plural.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the University of Turku for employing me as a project researcher, where I worked on a constraint-grammar description compatible with the Mordvin languages 2021–2022, and the Uralic Causative project for funding my travels for presentations of this topic at two venues, where I have been able to develop my understanding of the subject.

Sources

- АВРАМОВ, К. Г. [Абрамов, К. Г.] 1961: Ломантне теевсть малацекс (роман). Мордовское книжное издательство, Саранск.
- АВРАМОВ, К. Г. [Абрамов, К. Г.] 1966a: Эсеть сталмось а маряви (роман). In: Сятко 1966/2: 3–39.
- АВРАМОВ, К. Г. [Абрамов, К. Г.] 1966b: Эсеть сталмось а маряви (роман). In: Сятко 1966/5: 3–33.
- BRYŽINSKIĪ, M. I. [Брыжинский, М. И.] 2008: Кирдажт. Саранск.
- ERME = Electronic Resources for Moksha and Erzya (includes a large portion of publications in Sätko and Mokša along with works from individual authors).
Meta-Share <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:lb-2023021601>
- PRONIN, V. – POPOV, V. [Пронин, В. – Попов, В.] 1968: Джон Ридэнь геройтнень киява. Документэнь коряс повесть. In: Сятко 1968/4: 4–27.
- ŠEGLOV, A. [Шеглов, А.] 1963: Тесэ весе мазыйть. In: Сурань толт 1963/4: 12–45.
- SLUGINA, M. [Слугина, М.] 2003: Участканть мизолксозо, эли иля эцне прят ков а эряви. In: Сятко 2003/10: 56–60.
- Unknown 1969: Тыненк, тейтерь-ават. In: Сятко 1969/1: 89.
- ŪRČENKOVA, N. [Юрчѐнкова, Н.] 2002: Pizemečifke. In: Сятко 2002/5: 125–126.

Bibliography

- AIKIO, ANTE 2009: The Saami Loanwords in Finnish and Karelian. PhD-dissertation, University of Oulu. <https://hcommons.org/deposits/item/hc:39061/>
- BARTENS, RAIIA 1999: Mordvalaiskielten rakenne ja kehitys. Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 232. Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, Helsinki.
- BUZAKOVA, R. N. [Бузакова, Р. Н.] 2000: Падежтнень смустест, Аволь падежень формась, Валмельгакось. Эрзянь кель, морфемика, валонь теевема ды морфология: Вузонь эрзянь ды финнэнь ождеделениянь тонавтницятнень туртов. Редколлегиясь: Д. В. Цыганкин (отв. ред., Н. А. Агафонова, М. Д. Имайкина ды лият). Красный Октябрь, Саранск. 82–87, 87–89, 249–254.
- СУРАНОВ, Е. А. 2009: Финно-угорские языки: сравнительный обзор. Издательство Кола, Сыктывкар.
- СУРАНОВ, JÖLGIN 2016: Вынийõра да мича – миян коми кивным. Анбур, Сыктывкар.
- ERS = Б. А. СЕРЕБРЕННИКОВ – Р. Н. БУЗАКОВА – М. В. МОСИН: Эрзянь–рузонь валкс. Эрзянско–русский словарь. Русский язык, Дигора, Москва, 1993.
- GABELENTZ, HERR CONON VON DER 1839: Versuch einer Mordwinischen Grammatik. Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes. II. 2–3. Druck und Verlag der Dieterichschen Buchhandlung, Göttingen. 235–284, 383–419.
http://multilingualfacilitation.com/emerald/historical-mordvin-grammars/docs/gabelentz_hcvonder-versuch-einer-mordwinischen-grammatik-1838-39.html

- GRÜNTAL, RIHO 2022: Diachronic bottlenecks of the Uralic (ablative-)partitive. *Linguistic variation*, 22. <https://benjamins.com/catalog/lv.21003.gru>
- HAMARI, ARJA – AJANKI, RIGINA 2022: Mordvin (Erzya and Moksha). In: Bakró-Nagy, Marianne – Laakso, Johanna – Skribnik Elena (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages (Oxford Guides to the World's Languages)*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- KERESZTES, LÁSZLÓ 1990: *Chrestomathia Morduinica*. Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest.
- KERESZTES, LÁSZLÓ 1999: Development of Mordvin definite conjugation. *Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seuran toimituksia*, 233. Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, Helsinki.
- KERESZTES, LÁSZLÓ 2011: *Bevezetés a mordvin nyelvészetbe*. Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó, Debrecen.
- KIPARSKY, PAUL 2004: Partitive Case and Aspect. <https://web.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/Papers/wuppertal.pdf>
- KOLÂDĚNKOV, M. N. [Колядѣнков, 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. Издательство Мнииск. Саранск.
- KOLÂDĚNKOV, M. N. [Колядѣнков, М. Н.] 1954: Грамматика мордовских (эрзянского и мокшанского) языков. Часть 2. Синтаксис. Мордовское книжное издательство, Саранск.
- KOLÂDĚNKOV, M. N. [Колядѣнков, М. Н.] 1962: Грамматика мордовских (мокшанского и эрзянского) языков. II. книга. Саранск.
- LARSSON, LARS-GUNNAR 1981: *Studier i de östersjöfinska språkens partitiv bruk*. Uppsala University, Uppsala.
- MARKOV, F. P. [Марков, Ф. П.] 1961: Приалатырский диалект эрзя-мордовского языка. In: М. Н. Колядѣнков (ред), *Очерки мордовских диалектов*. Том 1. Мордовское Книжное Издательство, Саранск. 7–99.
- POLINSKY, MARIA 1994: Double objects in causatives: towards a study of coding conflict. *Studies in Language* 19/1: 129–221.
- RUETER, JACK 2010: Adnominal person in the morphological system of Erzya. *Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seuran Toimituksia* 261. Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, Helsinki.
- RUETER, JACK, 2013: Quantification in Erzya. *Typology of quantification: on quantification in Finnish and languages spoken in the Volga–Kama Region*. In: Suihkonen, P. – Solovyev, V. (eds), *LINCOM Studies in Language Typology*. Vol. 28. 99–122.
- RUETER, JACK 2016: Towards a systematic characterization of dialect variation in the Erzya-speaking world: Isoglosses and their reflexes attested in and around the Dubyonki Raion. In: Shagal, Ksenia – Arjava, Heini (eds), *Mordvin languages in the field*. *Uralica Helsingiensia* 10. 109–148.

- RUETER, JACK 2020: Linguistic Distance between Erzya and Moksha. Dependent morphology. In: Клементьева, Е. Ф. – Мочалова, Т. И. – Рябов, И. Н. (ред.), Финно-угорские языки в современном мире: функционирование и перспективы развития: материалы Всероссийской научно-практической конференции, посвященной 95-летию заслуженного деятеля науки РФ, доктора филологических наук, профессора Цыганкина Дмитрия Васильевича. МГУ им. Н. П. Огарёва, Саранск. 90–110.
- RUETER, JACK – PARTANEN, NIKO – ALNAJJAR, KHALID. – HÄMÄLÄINEN, MIKA 2022: Establishing a Role for Minority Source Language in Multilingual Facilitation. *Nordlyd* 46/1: 231–240. <https://doi.org/10.7557/12.6370>
- SALO, MERJA 2015: Passive and reflexive categories in languages of the Volga Region, An areal typology study. PhD-dissertation, University of Helsinki.
- SERŽANT, ILJA 2021: Typology of partitives. *Linguistics* 59/4: 881–947. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2020-0251>
- TROSTERUD, TROND 2006: Homonymy in the Uralic two-argument agreement paradigms. *Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seuran Toimituksia* 251. Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, Helsinki.
- TURUNEN, RIGINA 2010: Nonverbal Predication in Erzya: Studies on morphosyntactic variation and part of speech distinctions. PhD-dissertation, University of Helsinki.
- WICKMAN, BO 1955: The form of the object in the Uralic languages. Almqvist & Wiksells, Uppsala.
- WIEDEMANN, F. J. 1865: Mémoires de l'académie impériale des sciences de St.-Petersbourg, VII^e Série. Tome IX, № 5. Grammatik der ersa-mordwinischen Sprache nebst einem kleinen mordwinisch-deutschen und deutsch-mordwinischen Wörterbuch. http://multilingualfacilitation.com/emerald/historical-mordvin-grammars/docs/wiedemann_fj-grammatik-der-ersa-mordwinischen-sprache-1865.html
- ZEMAN, DANIEL et al. 2022: Universal Dependencies 2.10, LINDAT/CLARIAH-CZ digital library at the Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University. <http://hdl.handle.net/11234/1-4758>.

*

О глаголах есть и пить и их партитивной функции в эрзянском языке

В данной статье рассматривается партитивная функция эрзянских глаголов приема внутрь. Глаголы приема пищи, «есть», «пить», «курить», «дышать» и т. д. печально известны в эрзянском и мокшанском языках своим словосочетанием с прямым дополнением в аблативном падеже, с разделительной функцией. Так как у эрзян нет одного конкретного падежа для обозначения прямого дополнения, Коладенков (1940:

19; 1954: 47) указывает четыре отдельных падежа, используемых для обозначения прямого дополнения: именительный, родительный, а также аблатив и инессив.

Мы обнаруживаем, что глаголы приема пищи с их аргументами партитивной функции не изучались в каузативных структурах. Поэтому мы обращаем внимание аудитории на использование аблатива партитивной функции в сочетании с другими прямыми объектами, указанными выше.

Мы показываем, что аблатив партитивной функции встречается вместе с прямыми объектами как в родительном, так и в неложном падеже. В то время как прямые объекты в родительном и невесивном падежах отмечают причину и находятся в дополнительном распределении, тогда как партитивная функция в аблативном падеже может свободно сочетаться с ними обоими, но не является обязательным аргументом глаголов приема пищи.

Мы также рассматриваем партитивную функцию в свете пассивных стратегий эрзян и обнаруживаем, что она не участвует в продвижении, а может встречаться в пассивных предложениях без каких-либо изменений.

Наконец, осознавая, что разделительная функция не является обязательным аргументом, мы сравниваем стратегии базового глагола и каузативного глагола. Мы находим, что, хотя есть свидетельства продвижения именительного-родительного чередования в каузативной структуре, когда причина чередуется между инессивным/родительным и реципиентом в дательном падеже, составляющая аблативного падежа не участвует. На самом деле показано, что аблатив сочетается со стратегиями аппроксимации сравнительного падежа, которые еще раз отвлекают внимание от подтверждения позиции объекта в синтаксисе аблатива.

Ключевые слова: эрзянский язык, глагол приема внутрь, прямое дополнение, партитивная функция, каузативная структура, пассив

ДЖАК РЮТЕР