

## Let's talk about the morphosyntax of cohortatives in Udmurt!

Vsevolod Masliukov

Lomonosov MSU

**Introduction:** (Co)hortatives, or 1PL imperatives, invite the addressee(s) to complete an action together with the speaker. In Udmurt, there are two principal ways to convey this meaning:

- (1) a. Vid-o-m-(e)                      no      iz-o-m-(e).  
       lie.down-FUT-1PL-?            and    sleep-FUT-1PL-?  
       ‘Let’s lie down and sleep.’
- b. Ojdo-(le)<sup>1</sup>    vid-o-m                      no      iz-o-m.  
       HORT-?    lie.down-FUT-1PL        and    sleep-FUT-1PL  
       ‘Let’s lie down and sleep.’    (Repina 2017)

So, either the FUT.1PL of the verb is used alone or together with a special cohortative particle *ojdo(le)*. Note the suffix *-(le)* which may appear on the particle or on the verb alongside the standard 1PL agreement marker if the exhortation is addressed to more than one person. Using the terminology from typological literature (e.g. Dobrushina, Goussev 2005), it derives an *augmented inclusive imperative* (AII) from the *minimal inclusive imperative*. The same suffix is also used for the 2PL imperative in Udmurt:

- (2) Vuza-le            val-d-es.  
       sell-IMP.2PL    horse-POSS.2PL-ACC  
       ‘(You.PL) Sell your horse!’    (Repina 2017)

Using the 2PL marker to form the AII is typologically common (Dobrushina & Goussev 2005), cf. Russian *pojď’-om-t’e*. However, I aim to show that *-(le)* neither encodes imperative mood nor carries the 2<sup>nd</sup> person feature.

**Data and claim:** I argue that *-(le)* is the realization of [PL] agreement feature on verbs and is unmarked for person features. The first argument comes from the set of 2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement suffixes:

	SG		PL	
	unmarked	IMP	unmarked	IMP
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> p.</b>	<i>-d</i>	0	<i>-di</i>	<i>-(le)</i>

Table 1. (from Winkler 2001)

---

<sup>1</sup> Another particle, *vaj* (lit. give.IMP), may be used instead of *ojdo* (Alatyrev 1970).

The surface forms of IMP suffixes do not resemble the 2SG/PL markers from the indicative paradigm. The second argument comes from negative clauses in the indicative:

	<i>mini-ni</i> (to go)		<i>u3a-ni</i> (to work)	
	SG	PL	SG	PL
<b>1<sup>st</sup>p.</b>	u-g mini NEG-1.SG go.CNG	u-m min-e NEG-1.PL go.CNG-PL	u-g u3a	u-m u3a-le
<b>2<sup>nd</sup>p.</b>	u-d mini	u-d min-e	u-d u3a	u-d u3a-le
<b>3<sup>rd</sup>p.</b>	u-z mini	u-z min-e	u-z u3a	u-z u3a-le

Table 2. the FUT subparadigm (*ibid.*)

In Udmurt, a special negative verb inflects for person and partly for number features, whereas the lexical verb appears in the connegative form. The same suffix  $-(l)e^2$  is used in all boxes of the PL subparadigm. To defend the view that  $-(l)e$  encodes (IMP).2PL at this point would mean postulating a random syncretism with the plain PL morpheme in connegatives.

**Analysis:** If my proposal that  $-(l)e = \text{PL}$  is on the right track, the fact that the suffix appears above the regular 1PL ending  $-m$  in cohortatives requires an explanation. After Zanuttini, Pak & Portner (2012) I will assume that a Jussive head in syntax (located just above T) is responsible for the imperative semantics. It also has its own set of person features, and they determine the particular *flavor* of the imperative: [SPKR][ADDR]<sup>3</sup> yields cohortatives and [ADDR] yields 2<sup>nd</sup> p. imperatives. The Jussive head has a number probe [#: \_] that agrees with the subject. T also agrees with the subject in a standard fashion. Lexical insertion in the morphological component then proceeds as follows:

- (3) [SPKR][ADDR] ↔ *ojdo/vaz/Ø* / \_\_ Jussive  
 [PL] ↔  $-(l)e$   
 [SPKR][ADDR]([PL]) ↔  $-m$  / \_\_ T

Since  $-(l)e$  is an affix and needs a host, in the absence of a cohortative particle it will be lowered onto the verb. The analysis predicts that  $-(l)e$  should not appear on the verb if a cohortative particle is present and that it may appear on some overt functional head that is higher than the lexical verb.

I will test those predictions in my talk and discuss how my analysis may handle any exceptions. I will also compare the Udmurt system to that of Komi and a few other languages with AIs.

**Abbreviations:** ACC — accusative; CNG — connegative; IMP — imperative; FUT — future tense, HORT — hortative; NEG — negative; PL — plural; POSS — possessive; SG — singular.

<sup>2</sup> Its allomorphs are phonologically conditioned (Winkler 2001).

<sup>3</sup> Where SPKR stands for *speaker* and ADDR for *addressee*.

**References:** Alatyrev 1970 — Alatyrev, V. I. (1970) Grammatika sovremennogo udmurtskogo jazyka. Sintaksis prostogo predlozhenija.; Dobrushina & Goussev 2005 — Dobrushina, N., & Goussev, V. (2005). Inclusive imperative. *TYPOLOGICAL STUDIES IN LANGUAGE*, 63, 179.; Repina 2017 — Repina, T. Ju. (2017). Morfosemanticheskij analiz udmurtskih imperativnyh konstrukcij. *Ja 415 Jazykovye kontakty narodov Povolzh'ja H: aktual'nye problemy normativnoj i istoricheskoy fonetiki, gram-matiki, leksikologii i stilistiki. Sbornik statej.*—Izhevsk: Izdatel'skij centr «Udmurtskij universi-tet», 268-287; Winkler 2001 — Winkler, E. (2001). *Udmurt*. Lincom Europa.; Zanuttini *et al.* 2012 — Zanuttini, R., Pak, M., & Portner, P. (2012). A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 30, 1231-1274.