

## **Morpheme order variations and anomalies in Uralic languages**

László Fejes

[fejes.laszlo@gmail.com](mailto:fejes.laszlo@gmail.com)

Research Institute for Linguistics

Hungarian Academy of Sciences

Uralic languages are considered to be agglutinative, which means that a typical word form tends to contain several affixes, supposedly with definite borders. However, borders of affixes are obscure many times, often it is completely impossible to determine the order of grammatical category markers. This presentation deals with cases in which at least one segment in a portmanteau morpheme resembles the markers of one of the expressed categories in other word forms and can be identified as the marker of the same category in the portmanteau morpheme.

The presentation gives a survey of inflectional morpheme order variations both between the Uralic languages and inside particular languages (different morpheme order in different subparadigms). The discussed morpheme orders are the following.

Nominal morphology:

- The place of the plural (dual) marker;
- the order of case markers and possessive suffixes;
- the place of the definite marker;
- recursive case marking (more than one case marker in a word because of ellipsis);
- “overweight” / “overflowing” word forms: case marking “auxilliary adpositon”-s.

Verbal morphology:

- The order of the tense and the mood marker and the subject (object) agreement suffix;
- the order of the tense, the mood and the passive marker;
- the order of the tense, the mood and the subjectlessness marker;
- the order of the subject and the object agreement morpheme;
- categories marked on negative auxiliaries;
- “overweight” / “overflowing” word forms: categories marked on other auxiliaries.

I speak about “overweight” / “overflowing” word forms when there are “too many” grammatical category markers to be composed into one word and therefore a semantically empty auxiliary word emerges to bear some of the category markers.

In each presented case, I discuss explanations based on phonological or historical (etymological) reasons, on the reflection of syntax (the Mirror Principle) or on semantic grounds.

Examples come from the following Uralic languages: Erzya, Estonian, Finnish (standard and Inkeri dialect), Hungarian (standard and dialects), Khanty (Sherkaly and Cingaly dialects), Komi, Mansi (Northern and Tavda dialects), Mari (Eastern standard), Nenets, Nganasan, Udmurt.

## **Selected bibliography on the order of inflectional morphemes in Uralic languages**

Comrie, Bernard (1980b), The Order of Case and Possessive Suffixes in Uralic Languages: An Approach to the Comparative-Historical Problem. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 23: 81–86.

Honti, László (1975). *System der paradigmatischen Suffixmorpheme des Wogulischen Dialektes an der Tawda*. *Janua Linguarum. Series Practica* 246. Akadémiai Kiadó – Mouton, Budapest – Den Haag – Paris.

Honti László (1994–1995), A mondat szórendje és a morfémák sorrendje közti összefüggés az uráliban. *NyK* 94: 89–117.

3<sup>rd</sup> Vienna Workshop on Affix Order: Advances in Affix Order Research

- Honti, László (2001). Még egyszer a casus- és possessivsuffixumok sorrendjéről. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 98., 143–159.
- Luotonen, Jorma (1997). The variation of morpheme order in Mari declension. *Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura*, Helsinki