

## Split nominals in Hill Mari<sup>1</sup>

Polina Pleshak

ELTE Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics

polinapleshak@gmail.com

This paper analyzes discontinuous noun phrases in Hill Mari (Uralic) focusing on simple (order-preserving) splits. Hill Mari data support a Copy and Partial Deletion (CPD) analysis of such split DPs and shed new light on the nature of CPD, revealing that it involves nominal ellipsis (NE), rather than a superficial deletion of repeated phonological material.

Many languages allow noun phrases to occur discontinuously (1). One of the most influential analyses of this phenomenon is CPD or scattered deletion (Fanselow and Čavar 2000, 2003).

(1) BCS (Fanselow & Čavar 2003: 3)

*Crveni je Ivan auto kupio.*

Red has Ivan car bought

‘Ivan has bought a red car.’

Split nomina are not typologically rare (Fanselow and Féry 2006), but their formal analysis has been mostly developed on Germanic and Slavic data (Fanselow & Čavar 2003). Hill Mari pattern discussed in this paper finds typological parallels (Kazenin 2009) but is less integrated into formal analysis. Below, I show how it can inform the discussion on the nature of CPD.

Hill Mari wh-elements take nominal morphology optionally, and I assume that non-concordant split-DPs result from canonical sub-extraction:

(2) *maxan' / maxan'-əm tən' cäškä-m pädâr-t-en-ät?*  
what what-ACC 2SG cup-ACC break-CAUS-PRET-2SG

‘What cup did you break?’

Otherwise, Hill Mari left-dislocated elements pattern with nominals in elliptic contexts. Although both ellipsis and CPD involve deletion, their relationship has not been truly discussed. I propose that CPD should be reanalyzed as involving NE.

Hill Mari adnominal dependents within the noun phrase do not show concord (3)-(4). However, they cannot appear bare under NE (5b-c).

(3) *kelgä / \*kelgä-vlä karem-vlä mäs-läm kelš-ät.*  
deep deep-PL gully-PL 1SG-DAT.AGR.1SG be\_liked-NPST.3PL

‘I like deep gullies.’

(4) *kelgä / \*kelgä-škä karem-äškä popaz-en-äm.*  
deep deep-ILL gully-ILL get\_in-PRET-1SG

‘I got into a deep gully.’

(5) a. *maxan' tâgâr-âm irgod-âm škol-äškâ či-et?*  
what shirt-ACC tomorrow-ACC school-ILL put\_on-NPST.2SG

‘What shirt will you put on tomorrow for school?’

b. *pet'a-n-âm / \*pet'a-n.*  
Petja-GEN-ACC Petja-GEN  
‘Petja’s.’

---

<sup>1</sup> This research was supported by the following grants: BCS-2116344, BCS-1619857, BCS-1941733, and NKFI – EXCELLENCE 152225.

- c. *pet'a-n ti jakšar-gâ-m.*  
 Petja-GEN this red-FULL-ACC  
 'This red one of Petja's.'

Dislocated non-wh adnominal elements also must bear the morphology of the head noun (6), like in NE (5).

- (6) *izi-m / \*izi mən' cäškä-m pädâr-t-en-äm.*  
 small-ACC small 1SG cup-ACC break-CAUS-PRET-1SG  
 'I broke a SMALL cup.'

In both elliptical expressions and dislocated nominals, agreement extends beyond case to include number as well:

- (7) *izi-vlä-m / \*izi mən' cäškä-vlä-m pädâr-t-en-äm.*  
 small-PL-ACC small-ACC 1SG cup-PL-ACC break-CAUS-PRET-1SG  
 'I broke SMALL cups.'

Following Fanselow & Ćavar (2003) extension of Chomsky's (1995) copy theory of movement, I analyze Hill Mari concordant dislocated elements as CPD structures, as they bear additional morphological marking, not present in the base-generated position, suggesting they do not result from movement. While a CPD analysis of split DPs is not new, I develop it further by addressing the nature of deletion.

I will focus on the derivation of the left part of a simple split-DP (7). First, the entire object DP gets copied to the left periphery (8a). Then, in the higher copy, the lowest NP gets deleted.

- (8) a. [[[[*izi*]<sub>AdjP</sub> [*cäškä*]<sub>NP</sub>]<sub>NP-vlä</sub>]<sub>NumP-m</sub>]<sub>DP</sub> mən' [[[[*izi*]<sub>AdjP</sub> [*cäškä*]<sub>NP</sub>]<sub>NP-vlä</sub>]<sub>NumP-m</sub>]<sub>DP</sub> ...  
 b. [[[[*izi*]<sub>AdjP</sub> [*cäškä*]<sub>NP</sub>]<sub>NP-vlä</sub>]<sub>NumP-m</sub>]<sub>DP</sub> ...

Partial deletion thus targets constituents within a hierarchical structure, as in ellipsis (Lobeck 1991, Merchant 2013, a.o.). The obligatory presence of morphological markers indicates that the NP constituent undergoes deletion, not the phonological material remaining in the lower copy; otherwise, we would delete the markers in one of the copies. Occurring in the split-DP twice, morphological markers also challenge accounts that refer to the restriction on pronouncing the same phonological material twice (Fanselow & Ćavar 2003), thereby motivating a reanalysis of the nature of the deletion involved.

Hill Mari split noun phrases exhibit the morphological reflexes of ellipsis, as evidenced by the presence of nominal markers that would be impossible on adnominal dependents with overt heads. The parallelism between CPD and NE suggests that the two have common nature. My analysis of the non-head part of CPD as NE predicts that CPD should obey restrictions on NE, thereby constraining the types of split nominals that can occur.

**References:** Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist program*. MIT Press; Fanselow, G., & Ćavar, D. (2003). Distributed deletion. *Theoretical approaches to universals*, 65-107. John Benjamins Publishing Company; Fanselow, G. & Féry, C. (2006). *Prosodic and morphosyntactic aspects of discontinuous noun phrases: A comparative perspective*. Ms, Universität Potsdam; Kazenin, K. (2009). Discontinuous nominals, linear order, and morphological complexity in languages of the North Caucasus. *Linguistic Typology*, 13(3); Lobeck, A. (1991). Phrase structure of ellipsis in English. *Perspectives on phrase structure: Heads and licensing*, 81-107; Merchant, J. (2013). Voice and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 44(1), 77-108.