THE STATUS OF THE NON-FINITE -OmstO MORPHEME IN ERZYA

Abstract. This article approaches the +OmstO formative used in deverbal inflection from a concatenational perspective. It describes the morphological distinction between the elative-case non-finite in +Om+stO (sams → samsto 'to arrive'; oznomst → oznomsto 'to pray'; mol'ems → mol'emste 'to go') and its counterpart the elative-case deverbal noun in +OmA+stO (sams → samsto 'to arrive'; oznomst → oznomsto 'to pray'; mol'ems → mol'emasto 'to go'). These parallel forms are then subjected to further morphological and semantic inspection: (1) compatibility with the three declination types, indefinite (zero), possessive (cross-referential adnominal person morphology) and definite (determiner) marking, and (2) compatibility with functions attributed to the elative case of other common nouns. Finally, a tendency is discerned according to which both inflection types can be regarded as elative-case nouns distinguished by a [+progressive] parameter, whereby the so-called gerund is indicates a process, and the so-called deverbal noun a result.
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Preliminaries

Grammars of Erzya lack consistency in the description of the morphology of gerunds, deverbal nouns and infinitives. Let us therefore introduce ourselves to a concatenational morphological perspective of: verb stem types; the deverbal noun in OmA, and the locative case infinitive in OmO (elsewhere known as the nominative or even lative infinitive).

The tradition of verb-stem analysis varies, whereas vowel loss and retention in different cells of verbal inflection has been the target of research in most traditions of Erzya grammar (cf. Евсеевъ 1963 : 193—198). More recent presentations of the language have discerned a subset of stems relevant to the morphological correlation observed between finite conjugation forms and non-finite forms. In the modern Erzya literary language the illative infinitive in ms is attested in three vowel contexts, e.g. a+ms, e+ms and o+ms (Cyrillic а+мс, е+мс, о+мс [no instances of е+мс attested]). The general consensus advocates a system of two verb types, which, in an almost over-simplified way, can be established by the parameter...
When we apply the two-way split directly to the three stem vowels (a, e and o), it will be noted that all verbs ending in -ams retain the stem-final -a before the indicative preterit 3SG formative š. The infinitives ending in the mid vowels (o and e), however, cannot be associated with such a straightforward system. Verbs ending in ems and oms must be learned separately; some retain their mid vowel before the š formative and others lose it; a general rule of thumb is that deverbal verbs in the so-called frequentative formatives še, źe and kšno retain their stem vowels, (cf. Евсеєв 1963 : 198; Pall 1996 : 20; Trosterud 2006 : 250—251).

On method of indicating stem-vowel retention of loss in dictionaries is to insert a pipe ”|” at the appropriate break point. This is precisely what the most recent Erzya-Russian dictionary (Эрзянско-русский словарь, henceforth ЭРС 1993) does. Providing no specifics, the ЭРС 1993 gives forms, such as maks|oms, š ‘to give’ and sod|oms, š ‘to know; to recognize’, whereby the reader is readily aware of the appropriate IND.PRET|PRED-3SG forms maks and soda, respectively. Hence ЭРС 1993 provides readers and language learners with ready access to the workings of the Erzya verb stems. The verb sato|ms, -tš ‘to suffice’, however, takes us be surprise, i.e. in addition to the two types demonstrated above, there is a small subset of verbs ending in ẽms and oms that insert a Ŧ before the IND.PRET|PRED-3SG š formative, something reminiscent of the inessive-case forms attested in the Kozlovka variety of Erzya kaštomo ‘oven’ → kaštoł+so ‘in the oven’ (cf. Бу́бріх 1930 : 22). For a three-way split in the Erzya verb-stem types, see Table 1, analogous information on noun-stem types is available in Rueter 2010.

---

**Table 1**

Erzya verb-stem system attests to a three-way split

| Verb stem type | Gloss | +INF+ILL | +IND.PRET|PRED-3SG |
|----------------|-------|----------|-----------|
| **Consonant-final** |       |          |           |
| ‘to give’ | maks+Oms+s | maksoms | maks+šš | maksiš |
| ‘to bind’ | sod+Oms+s | sodoms | sod+šš | sodšš |
| ‘to go’ | mol+Oms+s | molems | mol+šš | molšš |
| **Vowel-final** |       |          |           |
| ‘to scold; to curse’ | źudo+Oms+s | šudoms | šudo+šš | šudošš |
| ‘to carve’ | lakše+Oms+s | lakšems | lakše+šš | lakšešš |
| ‘to know; to recognize’ | soda|Oms+s | sodams | soda+šš | sodašš |
| ‘to repeat’ | polaksa+Oms+s | polaksams | polakša+šš | polakšašš |
| **T-stem** |       |          |           |
| ‘to become tongue-tied’ | kundšete|T+Oms+s | kundšete|oms | kundšetešš |

In observing the three verb types illustrated in Table 1, we will note that the archiphone Š has reflexes in ZERO (Ø) with vowel-final and T-stem types, and mid vowels (o or e) depending on the front-back harmony trig-
gered by the adjacent vowels or palatalized/non-palatalized consonants of the preceding stem, e.g. \textit{sod+Om+s} \rightarrow \textit{sodoms} 'to bind', and \textit{mol+Om+s} \rightarrow \textit{mol\'ems} 'to go'.

The deverbal noun in \textit{Om.A} and infinitive in \textit{OmO} present us with a second variety of vowel harmony: mid-low dissimilatory vowel harmony. Thus, while the archiphone \textit{O}, as indicated above, has three reflexes at the surface level according to assimilatory vowel harmony, (Ø, o, e), the archiphone \textit{A} has a reflex in a when the preceding surface vowel is a mid vowel, and an o when the preceding surface vowel is a low vowel, see

\begin{table}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Verb stem type} & \textbf{Gloss} & \textbf{+DV+N} & \textbf{+INF+LOC} \\
\hline
\textbf{Consonant-final} & & & \\
\hline
'to give' & \textit{maks+OmA} & \textit{maksoma} & \textit{maks+Om+O} \\
'to bind' & \textit{sod+OmA} & \textit{sodoma} & \textit{sod+Om+O} \\
'to go' & \textit{mol+OmA} & \textit{mol\'ema} & \textit{mol+Om+O} \\
\hline
\textbf{Vowel-final} & & & \\
\hline
'to scold; to curse' & \textit{ôudo+OmA} & \textit{lôudoma} & \textit{ôudo+Om+O} \\
'to carve' & \textit{lakôsa+OmA} & \textit{lakôsoma} & \textit{lakôsa+Om+O} \\
'to know; to recognize' & \textit{soda+OmA} & \textit{sodamo} & \textit{soda+Om+O} \\
'repeat' & \textit{polakôsa+OmA} & \textit{polakôsama} & \textit{polakôsa+Om+O} \\
\hline
\textbf{T-stem} & & & \\
\hline
'to suffice' & \textit{satoT+OmA} & \textit{satoma} & \textit{satoT+Om+O} \\
'to become tongue-tied' & \textit{kundõseteT+OmA} & \textit{kundõsetema} & \textit{kundõseteT+Om+O} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Deverbal nouns and locative-case infinitives in the verb-stem system of Erzya}
\end{table}

It should be noted that although the modern standard attests a distinction between deverbal nouns and locative-case infinitives in all but \textit{a}-stem verbs, this has not always been the situation. One need only consult a publication of Pjotr Kirillov: \textit{ež cidàrkt kunsoloman\'zo} (КИРИЛЬЛОВ 1987: 40) 'he didn’t have the patience to listen to him' to observe deverbal-type forms in \textit{-oma-} where \textit{-omo-} would be expected. Here the word form \textit{kun}\textit{solo+ma+no} 'to listen to him' appears to have a \textit{ma} segment before the \textit{3SG} formative \textit{Onzo}, something which occurs in some forms of Erzya spoken in the Atjaševo raion. Therefore it cannot be taken for granted that even speakers of Erzya would be in full agreement upon the distinction between deverbal nouns and infinitive forms.

In this treatise of Erzya, I annotate the \textit{Om+O} infinitive as locative-case, a matter which by no means is unproblematic. Other annotations call it a nominative or a lative, they have their morphological short-comings. It is most likely the notion of zero marking that has been deemed sufficient when designating this infinitive as a nominative. Raija Bartens (1970: 247ff.; 1979: 25—26), however, indicates the problems of a nominative-case interpretation and points out the semantic and pattern-based criteria for a lative or locative interpretation. An additional morphological criterion can be cited in opposition to the nominative designation, namely, the formative \textit{OzO} used in marking a nominative singular subject-function possessum of a \textit{3SG}
possessor never occurs with the deverbal \( Om+O \) formative sequence; instead it is the formative \( OnzO \) the one that co-occurs with all other cases and the nominative plural that is attested. Hence the transitive verb forms, e.g. \( saj+eme+nze \) 'to take it/him/her', the only ones that are compatible with possessor indexing, cannot be glossed as nominative singular. A nominative singular gloss would require an ungrammatical form \( *saj+eme+zr \).

Morphologically, we are presented with two choices: we can interpret the \( OmO \) infinitive form as one with syntactic functions used in appositive expressions such as what is found in associative-collective numerals \( (kolmo+ \ ne+nze \ 'him/her/it and two others' (literally: 'the three of him/her/it')) \), with no case designation, or we can appropriate a case name, such as locative, which would set the non-finite verbal case patterns in parallel with those of some adverb/adposition case patterns, see Tables 3a—b.

In Table 3a the literary illative infinitive is presented adjacent to its translativ counterpart, familiar from some of the Erzya dialects. Functions attributed to the literary illative form include those, which in the case of common nouns would be readily associated with the translative, e.g. predicate complement. The ablative case presents a morphological conflict where the consonant-final stem type associated with non-finite inflection tends to occur in the literary language with an intermediate vowel. This intermediate vowel, however, should not be passed off as a direct indication of deverbal noun morphology, namely, the verb \( mol'em \) 'to go' attests to three variants in published Erzya literature: \( mol'emado, \ mol'eme\de \) and \( mol'emd'e \). The consonant-final stem of the ablative and the inessive forms is quite infrequent in the written language of the Erzya majority corpus (http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/~rueter/rsc/rueter-ErzyaSource.xml, described in Rueter 2010). The non-finite elative form has functions attributed to the elative form of other common nouns, i.e. source and temporal setting, and therefore provides no arguments for an explicit illative \( s+\) ablative \( DO \) concatenation in a synchronic treatise of the language, although a theoretical diachronic treatise of the language would.

In Table 3b the translative-case form or its homonym with the formative \( ks \) is used in noun derivation of spatial adverbs/adpositions with four-case declination patterns (lative, locative, ablative and prolate).

Thus we can observe an affinity between the two tables (3a—b): the non-finite patterns although preferring an illative formative in the literary

---

**Table 3a**

Non-finite case patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>ILL</th>
<th>(TRANSL)</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>ABL</th>
<th>INE</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>PROL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'to sing'</td>
<td>moram+ks</td>
<td>moram+o</td>
<td>moram(o)+do</td>
<td>moram+so</td>
<td>moram+sto</td>
<td>moram+ga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 3b**

Spatial adverb/adposition case patterns for the Erzya word \( \text{alo} \) 'under; below'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverb/Postposition 1</th>
<th>TRANSL</th>
<th>LAT</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>ABL</th>
<th>PROL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( al+ks )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( al+ov )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( al+o )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( al+do )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( al+ga )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
language, demonstrate a dialect translative counterpart to parallel the noun-derivation practice attested for adpositions, and the local cases locative, ablative and prolative are attested in both the non-finite morphology and the four-case pattern of this adverb/adposition type. Differences can be observed in the two case patterns. The spatial adverb/adposition, it would seem, is incompatible with the temporal-function cases of the illative and elative as well as the instructive-function case, the inessive, whereas the spatial notion attributed to the inessive would provide no additional information to the locative, already present. The absence of the lative formative *Ov* in the non-finites, however, appears problematic. In fact, the *OmO* infinitive is generally used where a target function would be expected, that is, in combinations with verbs of motion, e.g. the construction *tujems* (*tikšće*) *ledëme* to-go_*V._INF._ILL* hay_*N._ABS* to-mow_*V._INF._LOC* 'to go make hay' is much more common than the deverbal-noun construction with the explicit lative case *tujems leđma+O* to-go_*V._INF._ILL* to-mow_*V._N.+LAT* 'to go make hay' (Kurkin 1976 : 82).

In a description of the case pattern encountered in consonant-stem non-finite morphology, we can assume a 7-slot paradigm, lacking the three core cases (nominative, genitive and dative), see enumeration.

\[ +O_{m+s} +O_{m+O} +O_{m+dO} +O_{m+sO} +O_{m+stO} +O_{m+ga} +O_{m+ks} +\text{INF+ILL} +\text{INF+LOC} +\text{INF+ABL} +\text{INF+INE} +\text{INF+ELA} +\text{INF+PROL} +\text{INF+TRANSL} \]

The 7-slot non-finite pattern can be contrasted with the 12-slot pattern of the deverbal noun in *OmA*, which attests to core-case functions not available to the non-finite derivations.

\[ +O_{mA+Ø} +O_{mA+n} +O_{mA+ńeńi} +O_{mA+dO} +\text{DV-N+GEN} +\text{DV-N+DAT} +\text{DV-N+ABL} +\text{DV-N+PROL} +\text{DV-N+COMP} +\text{DV-N+ILL} +\text{DV-N+LAT} +\text{DV-N+TRANSL} +\text{DV-N+POL} +\text{INF+ABE} \]

Earlier (Bartens 1979 : 45) it has been assumed that Mordvin possessor indices affixed onto infinitives indicate the patient as opposed to the agent. This would mean that the notion of a distinction [±INFINITIVE] would appear manifest in transitive but not intransitive verbs. The Erzya language, however, appears to follow a possessor-index strategy where the primary argument of the verb is the possessor, and this strategy holds for non-finite in *Om* and deverbal nouns in *OmA*, alike, see (1), where the possessor indexed in (1a) is the S and that in (1b) the P. Thus the nominative-case deverbal noun can be demonstrated to operate according to the non-finite argument structure.

(1a) *érařja ška+ní juta+ź, okojñiki,*

*some* _pro-q.*ABS* time_*N*+GEN to-pass_ _V*+PTC-Z, finally_ _ADV,*

*mařav+ś* _bus+oit*

to-be-heard_ _V*+IND.PRET.L.PRED-3SG* _bus_* _N*+GEN.DEF.SG

*aš+mo+zo*

to-arrive_ _V*+DV-N+POSS-3SG.NOM.SG* (Моторкин 1997 : 147)

'After some time passed, finally, the arrival of the bus was heard'
'Doing something good isn’t easy, [and] for that reason its value is very high’

Studies of the Erzya language often speak of an (elative-case) gerund derived regularly from verb stems in much the same way as the -ms illative infinitive is. Most recently the OmstO formative (moramsto ’to sing’, oznomsto ’to pray’, vel’memstO ’to come back to life’) has been recognized as one of the three gerund-forming morphemes: -Ož, -OmstO and -do, (cf. Алекскина 2000: 222—227), contrast Bartens 1979. The OmstO formative, according to Алекскина 2000, is used in the deverbal derivation of clausal adjuncts, indicating the temporal frame of a non-matrix event/action/state entity, see (2).

(2) či+níť’ valg+omsto čokšné+ů
sun_N+GEN.DEF.SG to-set_V+INF.ELA evening_N+GEN
zorá+a+s vešč
redness-in-the-sky_N+NOM.DEF.SG the-whole_PRO-Q
olakad+a+s
to-turn-pale_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG (Алекскина 2000: 223)
‘As the sun set the redness in the evening sky became entirely pale’

As discussed above, Erzya also has a deverbal-noun formative OmA which, when declined in the indefinite elative formative stO, has varied reflexes in deverbal-noun formative, whereas the actual elative form is constantly represented by a back-vowel form in sto. Contrast the deverbal noun (DV-N) forms and their non-finite counterparts in table (4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>DV-N+ELA</th>
<th>DV-N.ELA</th>
<th>INF+ELA</th>
<th>INF.ELA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘to give’</td>
<td>maks+OmA+stO</td>
<td>maksomasto</td>
<td>maks+Om+stO</td>
<td>maksomsto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to go’</td>
<td>mol’+OmA+stO</td>
<td>mol’emasto</td>
<td>mol’+Om+stO</td>
<td>mol’emste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to scold’</td>
<td>šudo+OmA+stO</td>
<td>šudomasto</td>
<td>šudo+Om+stO</td>
<td>šudomstO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to suffice’</td>
<td>satoT+OmA+stO</td>
<td>satomasto</td>
<td>satoT+Om+stO</td>
<td>satomstO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to touch’</td>
<td>toka+OmA+stO</td>
<td>tokamosto</td>
<td>toka+Om+stO</td>
<td>tokamstO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the phonological difference between these two forms hinges upon three notions: (1) the presence of a mid/low vowel-harmony oriented vowel; (2) the semantic functions held by the elative for expressing temporal space, and (3) deverbal nouns attest to the same argument-marking strategies as the non-finite derivation, the question arises as to what extent the two elative-case derivations actually differ from one another. Are there
any semantic or syntactic criteria for claiming that the so-called gerund in \textit{Om+stO} is anything other than an elative-case word form that is regularly derived from verb stems, and functions as a temporal clausal adjunct as would other elative-case nouns with temporal-reference. The distinction between non-finite and deverbal-noun forms might, in fact, be arbitrary.

**Method**

The elative gerund morpheme \textit{OmstO} will be segmented into a hypothetical non-finite formative \textit{-Om} and a subsequent elative marker \textit{stO}. This segmentation will set it in contrast with that of the deverbal-noun elative affix sequence \textit{OmA+stO}, and thus render the elative form for inspection morphological, semantic and syntactic:

A) On the basis of the majority Erzya text corpus (http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/~rueter/rsc/rueter-ErzyaSource.xml), as defined in Rueter 2010, a brief list of morphological hits will be given to illustrate the relative frequency of the most widely attested elative forms of non-finite and deverbal-noun derivations.

B) The elative forms will be inspected for compatibility with the three Erzya declination types, indefinite, possessive and determiner, whereas determiner declination is not attested for adverbs and adpositions.

C) The functions of the elative case most prominently the temporal function of the \textit{OmstO} adjunct will be illustrated by means of representative examples.

D) Cross-referential adnominal-person marking on the two sets of word forms will be inspected for argument reference, whereas possessor indexing indicating anything other than P-argument reference has previously been cited as a criterion by which to distinguish \textit{Om} non-finites from infinitives, (cf. Bartens 1979 : 45).

**Analysis**

In a UNIX environment we can extract all words of pertinent form by means of the tool "egrep" and the regular expression "m(lalo)ct(olэ)". This will render three types of word forms: Hits: (1) non-finite forms in \textit{OmstO} (\textit{éramsto} 'while living', \textit{t̚u̞emste} 'while fighting'); (2) deverbal nouns in \textit{OmA+stO} (\textit{éramosto} 'from [the] life', \textit{t̚u̞emasto} 'from [the] fight'), and misses (\textit{śel̚inste} 'from (the) eye(s)', \textit{ka̞štomsto} 'out of (the) oven'). In Tables 5—6 we will observe the sheer frequency with which non-finite elative forms surpass the deverbalnoun elative forms, on the one hand, and the fact that both word types attest to three declination types, i.e. unlike adverbs and adpositions, word forms with the \textit{Om+stO} formative can take definite singular declination, which indicates a notion of reference, something associated with nouns. The hits column group in Table 5 has been divided into indefinite declination, possessive declination and definite declination to provide the reader an idea of co-occurrence frequency for each of the declination types, e.g. 'to go' \textit{mölémste}; \textit{mölémsten}, \textit{mölémsteť}, \textit{mölémstenze}; \textit{mölémsteňek}, \textit{mölémsteņk}, \textit{mölémtest}; \textit{mölémsteńť}. 
Table 5
21 most frequent non-finite elative $Om+stO$ in Erzya majority corpus
(http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/~rueter/rsc/rueter-ErzyaSource.xml)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Word form</th>
<th>Hits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to go'</td>
<td>mol'+emste</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to pass'</td>
<td>juta+msto</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to depart; to bring'</td>
<td>tuj'+emste</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to arrive'</td>
<td>sa+msto</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to come out; to go out'</td>
<td>liš'+emste</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to watch'</td>
<td>van+omsto</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to sleep'</td>
<td>udo+msto</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to live'</td>
<td>eра+msto</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to enter'</td>
<td>sova+msto</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to talk'</td>
<td>korta+msto</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to ride'</td>
<td>arд+omsto</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to stay'</td>
<td>ašё'+mste</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to study'</td>
<td>tonavtie+mste</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to make'</td>
<td>tёj+emste</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to walk; to visit'</td>
<td>jaka+msto</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to fight'</td>
<td>ту́r'+emste</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to meet'</td>
<td>vast+omsto</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to fall'</td>
<td>pra+msto</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to think'</td>
<td>ásê'+mste</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to finish'</td>
<td>přad+omsto</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to tell' (in detail)</td>
<td>jovtie+mste</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimal attestation of co-occurrence with definite-declension forms in Table 5 is only slightly smaller than that of co-occurrence with second-person possessor indexing, such that 2sg shares the same level of attestation as the definite-declension forms. First person possessor indexing comprises over twice the attestations found for that of second person, and the attestation for third person possessor indexing is again approximately five times of that attributed to first person possessor indexing. All in all, however, attestation of deictic declination (possessive and definite combined)
comprises only about one tenth of all non-finite elative word forms. While both OmstO and OmA+stO word types prefer indefinite elative declination forms, it will be observed that definite marking exceeds that of possessor indexing in the OmA+stO deverbal noun forms, where indefinite and definite forms contribute to the bulk of all attestations, see Table 6.

Table 6

21 most frequent deverbal nouns in elative OmA+stO from Erzya majority corpus (http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/~rueter/rsc/rueter-ErzyaSource.xml)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Word form</th>
<th>Hits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to live'</td>
<td>c'éramost</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to arrive'</td>
<td>samost</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to tell (in detail)'</td>
<td>joutńiemasto</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to begin'</td>
<td>ušomastō</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to talk'</td>
<td>kortamost</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to think'</td>
<td>ařśemastō</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to standup'</td>
<td>šľamostō</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to meet'</td>
<td>vastomastō</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to meet (recip)'</td>
<td>vastovomastō</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to sleep'</td>
<td>udomastō</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to strive'</td>
<td>bažamostō</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to fall'</td>
<td>pramostō</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to fight'</td>
<td>ūrémastō</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to finish'</td>
<td>přadomastō</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to write'</td>
<td>sormadomastō</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to love'</td>
<td>večkemastō</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to sit down'</td>
<td>ozamostō</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to lace'</td>
<td>šalgomastō</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to walk; to visit'</td>
<td>jakamostō</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to pray'</td>
<td>oznomastō</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to turn'</td>
<td>purdamosostō</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>237</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 42 verb forms shown in tables 5—6 only 11 are consistently representative of frequent non-finites and deverbal nouns. These eleven do not include the three most frequent verbs of the non-finite forms, which also means that the verbs Jutams 'to pass' and tujems 'to leave' with complete possessive paradigms are not represented. The verbs represented in Table 7
have deverbal nouns that can be characterized as [+COUNT], but they are by no means consistent in their other semantic characteristics, i.e. some indicate events (samo 'arrival', t'úrma 'fight') while others might be seen as the product of the action (kortamo 'talk, [what was said]', ařšema 'thought') indicated by the verb.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs with high frequency non-finite versus deverbal noun dichotomies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gloss</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to live'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to arrive'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to sleep'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to talk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to walk; to visit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to fight'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to meet'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to think'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to fall'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to tell (in detail)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to finish'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typical misses include elative-case nouns, such as, those found in Table 8.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common misses generated by &quot;m(lalo)cτ(oθ)&quot; expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word form</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šeř'm+ste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čama+sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ežem+ste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t'úrma+sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ferma+sto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The elative case represented by the formative -stO has two basic meanings — source and location. While source is primarily associated with notions of space (3), material (4), spatio-temporal starting point (5) and separation (6), capacity (7) and temporal setting(8) appear to convey the meaning of location.

(3) kudo+sto+únt

house_Ν+ELA+DEF.SG

'out of the house'

(4) šija+sto

silver_Ν+ELA

'out of silver'
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(5a) *vel'e+ste* \quad *vel'e+s*
\begin{align*}
& \text{village}_N+\text{ELA} & \text{village}_N+\text{ILL} \\
& \text{`from village to village'}
\end{align*}

(5b) *šoksše+ste* \quad *tundo+s*
\begin{align*}
& \text{autumn}_N+\text{ELA} & \text{spring}_N+\text{ILL} \\
& \text{`from autumn to spring'}
\end{align*}

(6) *ava+sto+nzo*
\begin{align*}
& \text{mother}_N+\text{ELA}+\text{poss-3sg} \\
& \text{`from its/its/his/her mother'}
\end{align*}

(7) *přavt+sto*
\begin{align*}
& \text{boss}_N+\text{ELA} \\
& \text{`from the position of boss/'} & \text{`in the position of boss'}
\end{align*}

(8) *eřva* \quad *či+ste*
\begin{align*}
& \text{every}_Q,\text{ABS day}_N+\text{ELA} \\
& \text{`every day'}
\end{align*}

The notion of temporal setting conveyed in (8) is, in fact, parallel to that observed in (2), above. Temporality, it would seem, is determined by the referent itself, i.e. the word či ‘day’ is a quantity of time, a duration. Since the adjunct in (2) či+šit řeš+om+sto ‘as the sun set’ indicates an activity simultaneous to that of the main predicate verb, one might readily draw a parallel between these two temporal entities. Speaking of temporal entities, naturally, brings us back to deverbal nouns, which should also bear temporal meaning. The verb přadom ‘to finish, to complete’ provides us with a near minimal pair in přadomsto (the non-finite) and přadomsto (the deverbal noun). In two examples from the same collection of short stories, we can observe both word forms in the same function. In (9) a notion of durative temporal space might be entertained as a setting for a meeting (vast ems ‘[to happen] to meet; to meet repeatedly’), indicating that the non-finite form conveys a notion of continuous or ongoing action.

(9) *mejelše+de* \quad *šiň*
\begin{align*}
& \text{last}_\text{pro-det}+\text{ABL they}_\text{pro-pers-3pl.nom} & \text{to-meet}_\text{v+Ind,pretI,predt-3pl} \\
& \text{kiže+s} & \text{žardo} \\
& \text{summer}_N+\text{gen to-end}_\text{v+inf}+\text{ELA+def.sg} & \text{when}_\text{pro-rel,abl} \\
& \text{son} & \text{uskše+s} & \text{gruzovoj} \\
& \text{he}_\text{pro-pers-3sg.nom} & \text{to-haul}_\text{v+Ind,pretI,predt-3sg} & \text{freight}_A,\text{ABS} \\
& \text{tovšajina+so stančija+v šuro} & \text{automobile}_N+\text{INE station}_N+\text{lat grain}_N,\text{Nom.sg} (Абрамов 1974 : 85) \\
& \text{`the last time they had met at the end of summer when he was hauling grain to the station in a dump-truck’}
\end{align*}

The deverbal noun in (10), on the other hand, could be construed to indicate a point in time, which would lead to a dichotomy, duration versus reference point. This dichotomy, however, could also be attributed to the time frames implicated by the predicate verbs; the verb vast ems ‘to meet’ in (9) entails a durative time frame, whereas the verb sams ‘to arrive’ in (10) indicates a point in time.

(10) *juta+ž* \quad *téře+ní* \quad *přad+oma+sto+nít*
\begin{align*}
& \text{to-pass}_V+\text{Ptc-Z winter}_N+\text{gen} & \text{to-end}_\text{v+DV-N+ELA+DEF.sg} \\
& \text{veře+ňteš} & \text{su+s} & \text{geolog+oň} \\
& \text{village}_N+\text{dat,def,sg to-arrive}_\text{v+Ind,pretI,predt-3sg} & \text{geologist}_N+\text{gen} \\
& \text{apokške gruppa} & \text{kolmo} & \text{ćora+t} \\
& \text{small}_A,\text{ABS group}_N,\text{Nom.sg} & \text{three}_\text{num-card,ABS man}_N+\text{pl.nom} \\
& \text{dí} & \text{vejke} & \text{ava} \\
& \text{and} & \text{conj one}_\text{num-card,ABS woman}_N,\text{Nom.sg} (Абрамов 1974 : 26)
\end{align*}
At the end of last winter, a group of geologists came to the village — three men and one woman.

Another verb kortams 'to talk' also provides us with examples of non-finite versus deverbal noun variation in kortamsto and kortamosto respectively. Here the non-finite or short form is consistently associated with the speech act, whereas the longer or deverbal noun indicates the product, see (11—12).

(11) korta+m+sto+ńt'  
   pšč+ste  van+ś,  
   to-talk_V+INF+ELA+DEF.SG sharp_A+ELA to-look_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG  
   tonavtńie-ś,  meže-ńt'  
   to-study_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG, what_PRO-N-INTER+GEN.DEF.SG  
   kona  ked-se  dī  koda  
   which_PRO-DEM-INTER.ABS hand_N+HNE and_CONJ how_PRO-ADV-INTER  
   kund-ī  sonze  
   to-hold_V+IND.PRES.PRED-3SG he_PRO-PERS-3SG.GEN.POSS-3SG  
   večkeviks+e's  jarsa+m+sto+nzo  
   beloved_N+NOM.DEF.SG to-eat_V+INF+ELA+POSS-3SG (Куторкин 1987 : 253)  
   'While talking he [Miko] watched attentively, studied, what, how and with which hand his beloved held onto things when she ate'

(12) no kirillov+ńeń  korta+mo+sto+ńt'  
   but_CONJ Kirillov_PRP+DAT to-talk_V+N+ELA+DEF.SG  
   vejke+jak  val  
   one_NUM-CARD.ABS+CLT word_N+NOM.SG  
   a  čařkoďev+i  
   not_PRT-NEG to-understand_V+IND.PRES-PRED-3SG (Шегилов 1968 : 29)  
   'But Kirillov cannot comprehend a single word from what is said'

Although activity versus product might be attested in some instances, there appears to be free variation in some publications between short and long forms. It seems that the short forms cannot be used for expression of product entities. If, however, the short form indicates a duration and not a point in time, then it can be attested as with verbs, such as, sīrgožems 'to wake up', see (13). Hence it is conceivable that the short Om+sto form can be associated with source functions, as well.

(13) kaštom+ost  udal+o  ćirk  
   oven_N+POSS-3PL behind_POP+LOC chirp_IDEOPHONE  
   měręv+ś  těle+n  
   to-suddenly-say_V+IND.PRET.I.PRED-3SG winter_N+GEN  
   udo+m+sto+nzo  sīrgož+ića  ćirkun  
   to-sleep_V+INF+ELA+POSS-3SG to-awaken_V+PTC-CA cricket_N+NOM.SG  
   (Куторкин 1976 : 236)  
   'Behind the stove a cricket awakening from its winter sleep gave a chirp'

Cross-referential adnominal-person marking, possessor indexing, is, as illustrated in tables (5—6), compatible with both non-finite and deverbal-noun forms. Possessor indexing, in Erzya, is primary-argument oriented, i.e. with the non-finite elative forms of intransitive verbs the personal affix indicates the S argument possessor, but with transitive verbs there are further stipulations to be dealt with, see (14—16).
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(14) Baška-baška těv+t+ňě+ste,
separate_adv-separate_adv thing_n+pl+def.pl+ela,
vejke-vejke mel’ga
one_num-card.abs-one_num-card.abs after_pop
mof'e+ma+sto+st mařav+i
to-go_v+n+ela+poss-3pl to-be-heard_v+ind.pres.pred-3sg
son+s+enze ška+ňí’t  ikel’ě+v
it_pro- pers-3sg+refl+poss-3sg.obl time_n+gen.def.sg forward_adv+t+lat
šašto+ma+s koso,
to-move_v+n+nom.def.sg, where_pro-spat-inter+ine,
mez’e dižardo
what_pro-n-inter.nom.sg and_conj when_pro-adv-temp.abl
mol’ti, tě+ňů lang+s
to-go_v+ind.pres.pred-3sg, this_pro-det+gen on_pop+ill
jav+i baška
to-share_v+ind.pres-pred-3sg separate_adv
mel’ autor+oš thought_n.nom.sg author_n.nom.def.sg (Горбунов 1993: 14)
‘From separate things, from their succession you can feel the progress-
ion of time itself, where, what and when it happens, this is something
the author addresses explicitly’

Irina pavlovnà čar’kód+š:
Irina_pro-nom.sg Pavlovnà_pro-nom.sg to-understand_v+ind.pret_i.pred-3sg:
těťuv+20 di ava+zo,
father_n+poss-3sg.nom.sg and_conj mother_n+poss-3sg.nom.sg,
naţ, lambo+kšt meńi+še
apparently_adv, many_q+iter to-say_v+ind.pret_i.pred-3pl
vejke+ńeń-vejke+ńeń maks+om+sto+nzo
to-give_v+inf+ela+poss-3sg
one_num-card+dat-one_num-card+dat
(Куторкин 1987: 105)
‘Irinà Pavlovnà understood: Apparently, his [Dina] father and mother had
said [that] several times when they gave/passed him [Dina] to each other’

While (14—15) illustrate the indication of primary-argument relations
of s and p, (16) would appear to indicate an agent relation for the possessor-
index, in as far as the verb ec’ems ‘to stuff’ is understood as a transitive
verb with the patient/theme indicated by the genitive-form attribute pengo
‘firewood’. In (17) we can observe yet another instance of an agent rela-
tion for possessor-indexing.

(16) toń bed’nińak+t+ne+ńi
you_pro-pers-2sg.gen pauper_n+pl+def.pl+gen
meţejak a mu+sńiňe,
anything_pro-n-indef.nom.sg not_prt-neg to-find_v+ind.pres.pred-3sg+3pl,
— karma+s muzgońd+em+e kástom+s
— to-begin_v+ind.pret_i.pred-3sg to-mutter_v+inf+loc oven_n+ill
penge+ńi ec’e+m+ste+nże matră
firewood_n+gen to-stuff-full_v+inf+ela+poss-3sg Matră_pro-nom.sg
(Куторкин 1976: 343)
‘There is nothing that will get to those paupers of yours [is there?] —
Matră began to mutter as she stoked the oven with firewood’
(17) t'ē mežeš?— mežene+
that_PRO-DET NOM.SG. A NOM.SG. — what_PRO-N-INTER+ NOM.DEM.SG? kévkšt+iže, šelme+nze
to-asv_v+IND.PRET1.PRED-3SG>3SG, eye_n+POSS-3SG.OBL
konia+m+sto+nzo, Merkelovna
to-close:eyes_v+INF+ELA+POSS-3SG, Merkulovna_PRP NOM.SG
(Kyôtpkkîh 1976: 22)

'That [is] good.— What is? Merkulovna asked him as she closed her eyes.'

No instances of deverbal nouns (OmA+sto) were detected in the Erzya majority corpus (http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/~rueter/rsc/rueter-ErzyaSource.xml) that were both (1) derived from transitive stems, and (2) had possessor-indexing indicating a P-argument relation.

**Results**

Non-finite and deverbal forms in the elative are attested with 3 declination types (indefinite, possessive and definite), an indication that both forms refer to entities, and are not mere relation-words such as adverbs and adpositions might be conceived to be, see tables 5—6 for specific data.

The Elative functions of temporal location and source can be discerned for the short form Om+stO, which indicates that these relation words are durative in nature, and might be distinguished from point-in-time referent deverbal nouns OmA+stO, see (9—11, 13).

Possessor indexing on non-finite targets is associated with the primary-argument relations s with verbs[-TRANS] (13—14), p with verbs[+TRANS] (15) when no competing indication of possessor is present, e.g. a genitive attribute may render an agent reading of possessor indices when a genitive-form attribute/p is present, (16—17).
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ДЖЕК РЮТЕР (Хельсинки)

Статус морфемы -OmstO В эрзянском языке

В статье анализируются закономерно образующиеся от эрзянских глаголов формы на -OmstO (названы герундий) и формы на -OmA+stO (элатив отглагольного существительного). Автор рассмотрел образование обеих форм и пришел к выводу, что использование элатива для выражения Temporal отношений находится в соответствии с основными функциями падежных форм существительного. Обе рассматриваемые формы выполняют функцию наречия в роли второстепенного члена предложения. Разница между ними состоит в том, что герундий на -OmstO обозначает процесс, тогда как отглагольное существительное на -OmA+stO используется для передачи ограниченного действия или результата.