Nominalizations in Hill Mari*
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This paper deals with the two kinds of deverbal nouns that exist in Hill Mari: nominalizations derived using the suffix -mə̑- and those derived using -maš-. The aim of the study is to establish the functional structure in Hill Mari nominalizations. The data shows that the first kind of deverbal nouns found in Hill Mari, the -mə̑- nominals, retain a lot of clausal properties due to the many clausal projections embedded in the DP, the structure of these nominals thereby being [dp [p-osP [pP [vP [-maš- [nP [-[vP [-[vP [vP]]]]]]]]]]. The ambiguous results on the -maš- nominals suggest to analyse these as two different kinds of nominalizations, one of them functioning as a Referential Nominal and therefore including no functional verbal projections: [dp [p-osP [pP [vP [-maš- [nP [-[vP [-[vP [vP]]]]]]]]]], the other having the same structure as -mə̑- nominalizations (and only being grammatical for a group of speakers).
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1 Introduction

Hill Mari is a language of the Uralic language family spoken by about 20,000 people in the Mari El Republic, Russia. This paper deals with two types of deverbal nouns found in Hill Mari, namely the nominals headed by the suffix -mə̑- (1a) and those headed by -maš- (1b).1

(1) a. Məłän-em kelš-ä televizor-ə̑m anų̑-mə̑.
   I.DAT-POSS.1SG please-NPST.3SG [SG] TV-ACC watch-NMZ
   ‘I like watching TV.’

b. Vərsə̑ kogə̑ pə̑və̑-maš-ə̑m kod-en.
   war a.lot destroy-NMN.ACT-ACC leave-PRF.3SG
   ‘The war has left a lot of destruction.’

In the grammars of Alhoniemi (1993), Savatkova (2002) -mə̑- is described as a passive participle suffix. However, even in those grammars sentences can be found in which -mə̑- is attached to an intransitive verb stem and acts as a means to encode an argument clause (e.g. (2)).

(2) Tən-ə̑m ke-mə̑t-ə̑m nų̑-ə̑m.
   you.SG-ACC go-NMZ-POSS.2SG-ACC watch-AOR.1SG
   ‘I saw you go.’ (Alhoniemi 1993: 130)

---

* The work is supported by the RFBR grant № 16-06-00536.
1 The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: 1,2,3 = 1,2,3 person, ACC = accusative, AOR = aorist, ATT = attenuative, CAUS = causative, CMPR = comparative, CN = converb, CVB = converb, DAT = dative, GEN = genitive, IN = inessive, NEG = negation, NMN.ACT = deverbal noun, NMZ = nominalization, NPST = non-past tense, PL = plural, POSS = possessive, PRF = perfect tense, SG = singular.
As for \(-maš\), both grammars consider it a lexicalized substantivizing morpheme. Research conducted on argument clauses in Meadow Mari (Serdobol’skaya 2005, Serdobol’skaya et al. 2012) has shown that the corresponding suffixes \(-m\) and \(-maš\) in Meadow Mari form nominalizations encoding argument clauses. It is stated in Serdobolskaja (2005) that \(-maš\)-nominals have more nominal properties than \(-m\)-nominals. Given these facts, it seems plausible that the Hill Mari \(-m\) and \(-maš\) forms could appear to be nominalizations of some sort. The aim of this paper is to examine the properties of the two nominals and suggest an analysis of their syntactic structure.

The paper is structured as follows: in Section 2 I present the theoretical background of the study, in Section 3 I discuss the clausal and nominal properties of the nouns under investigation and posit the presence of certain functional projections in their structure. Section 4 concludes the results of the study.

The data presented were gathered between June 2016 and January 2017 during fieldwork with informants from Mikryakovo village of Gornomariysky District, Republic Mari El.

2 Theoretical background

One of the most intriguing properties of nominalizations is the presence of an argument structure. Grimshaw (1990) introduces diagnostics to distinguish between the nominals that license argument structure, AS-Nominals, and the ones that lack it, R(eferential)-Nominals. Firstly, AS-Nominals assign theta-roles to their arguments and the arguments are obligatory, while R-Nominals do not have any obligatory arguments and do not assign theta-roles. ASNs, unlike RNs, have an event reading. ASNs allow for agent-oriented modification as opposed to RNs. The subject of an ASN and/or a by phrase attached to it is an argument of the nominalization, while the subject and/or the by phrase of an RN is a possessive NP. The implicit argument of an ASN can control the PRO subject of an attached infinitive, while this is impossible with RNs. Aspeotual modifiers can attach to ASNs and cannot attach to RNs. Modifiers like frequent, constant are only possible with plural RNs, while they are grammatical for ASNs without the plural. ASNs are count nouns as opposed to RNs, which are mass nouns. The diagnostics are summarized in (3–4).

(3) AS-Nominals: 
- a. \(0\)-assignors, Obligatory arguments
- b. Event reading
- c. Agent-oriented modifiers
- d. Subjects are arguments
- e. by phrases are arguments
- f. Implicit argument control
- g. Aspectual modifiers
- h. frequent, constant etc. possible without plural
- i. Mass nouns

(4) R-Nominals: 
- a. Non-\(0\)-assignors, No obligatory arguments
- b. No event reading
- c. No agent-oriented modifiers
- d. Subjects are possessives
- e. by phrases are non-arguments
- f. No implicit argument control
- g. No aspectual modifiers
- h. frequent, constant etc. possible only with plural nouns
- i. Count nouns
According to Alexiadou (2001), these differences between ASNs and RNs result from the differences in their syntactic structure. Argument structure, adverbial modification and other verbal properties are a consequence of different clausal projections being present in the structure of an ASN. Alexiadou suggests the following structures (Alexiadou 2001: 19):

\[(5)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. ASNs</th>
<th>b. RNs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structure \[\text{Aspect}^\circ [\text{vP}]\] is spelled out as either a verb or a noun depending on whether it is embedded in a DP or a TP. In Borer (2003) a nominalizer is assumed to be present in the structure of ASNs. Alexiadou (2010) argues that the presence of a nominalizer head is subject to parametric variation in ASNs, thus also postulating that certain ASNs include a nominalizer.

Regarding v in (5a), Alexiadou proposes that it can either project an external argument or not, hence being [+transitive] or [–transitive]. Thus, the logical subject of the nominalized clause is either base generated within the vP and then moved to Spec,DP or is generated right in Spec,DP.

3 Hill Mari nominalizations

In this section I will introduce the basic characteristics of the Hill Mari language and the nominalizations in Section 3.1. In Section 3.2 I present arguments for the presence of certain functional projections in the structure of \(-m\)-nominals. In Section 2.3 I present the ambiguous data on \(-maš-\) nominals and also argue for the presence or absence of certain projections in their structure. I will assume the presence of the nP in both nominals since the suffixes under investigation seem to be acting as nominalizers.

3.1 Non-finite embedding in Hill Mari

Hill Mari is a language of the Uralic language family spoken by about 20,000 people in the Mari El Republic, Russia. It is an agglutinative SOV language.
There are three types of non-finites which often function as sentential complements: the infinitive (-aš), the converb (-en) and nominalizations. The two nominalizers are -mə̇ and -maš:

(6) a. ə̄dər-ʒə̇-n jažo(¬n) kušt-ʒmaš-ʒə̇-m
daughter-POSS.3SG-GEN good-ADV2 dance-NMN.ACT-POSS.3SG-ACC
āvā pāl-ā.
mother know-NPST.3[SG]
b. ə̄dər-ʒə̇-n jažo*(¬n) kušt-ʒmə̇-ʒə̇-m
daughter-POSS.3SG-GEN good-ADV dance-NMZ-POSS.3SG-ACC
āvā pāl-ā.
mother know-NPST.3[SG]
‘Mother knows that her daughter dances well.’

In these sentences the subject of the embedded clause is marked as a possessor and the clause itself as a possessum. Similar double-marking can be found in noun phrases in Hill Mari: the possessor is genitive-marked and the possessum is marked by possessive suffixes.

(7) Vai’a-n täng-ʒə̇
Vasya-GEN friend-POSS.3SG
‘Vasya’s friend’

At first glance, since with the -maš- nominal only adjectival modification is possible and with the -mə̇- nominal – only adverbial, it appears that one of these nominalization types corresponds to an ASN, and the other to an RN. However, further data show that the division is not that clear. Judging by the properties discussed below in Section 3.2, I conclude that the structure of -mə̇-nominalization includes most of the clausal projections, hence being highly verb-like. Yet its -maš- counterpart, as I show in Section 3.3, divides the speakers into two groups: for one group, it only functions as an RN, for the other – as another ASN.

3.2 -mə̇- nominals

3.2.1 v
Nominals of this kind assign accusative case to the object of the nominalized verb (8). Since accusative is assigned by little v, this provides evidence for the presence of a vP in the nominal’s structure.

(8) Noski-ᵐ pid-mə̇-ʒə̇ papa-n ʒə̇nzə̇-ʒə̇-m
socks-ACC knit-NMZ-POSS.3SG grandmother-GEN eyes-POSS.3SG-ACC
port’-ʒə̇n.
damage-PREF.3[SG]
‘Knitting of socks has damaged the grandmother’s eyesight.’

2 In Hill Mari most adverbs are derived from adjectives using the suffix -n.
Another piece of evidence is the possibility of adverbial modification: according to Alexiadou (2001), adverbs, especially manner adverbs, are licensed by $v$-nominals do not allow adjectival modification; they are modified by adverbs, which shows that they have a $v$ layer.

(9) Məläm tāng-em-ðn kuž-n / *kuž
L.DAT.Poss.1SG friend-Poss.1SG-GEN long-ADV/ *long
xororaj-mò-ʒ a-k kellō.
be.ill-NMZ-Poss.3SG NEG.NPST.3SG please.CN
‘I don’t like my friend being ill for a long time.’

To determine where the subject of the nominalized clause is generated, let us consider the scope of an adverb modifying the nominal:

(10) Təmdəš-m šdeštär-ä [DP xor’ ik təmen’ədä
teacher-ACC annoy-NPST.3[SG] at.least one pupil
,[DP sook koktan-əm näl-mò-ʒə] always two-ACC take-NMZ-Poss.3SG
a. ‘The teacher is annoyed that at least one pupil (per class) always gets bad
  marks.’ (SUBJ > always)
b. ‘The teacher is annoyed that there is always (at each test) a pupil who gets a
  bad mark.’ (always > SUBJ)

The adverb can have either narrow or wide scope with respect to the subject, which means that the subject is generated lower than the adverb and is then moved to its surface position. This shows that the little $v$ under consideration has the feature [+transitive]. Another argument for this can be drawn from Burzio’s generalization (Burzio 1986): since this little $v$ assigns accusative case, it projects an external argument.

3.2.2 Negation
Hill Mari has a special negative marker that is used to negate nominalizations (11) and differs from the negation of other non-finite forms (12–13).

(11) Təmdəš päl-ä təden’ə-ʒə-n
teacher know-NPST.3[SG] student-Poss.3SG-GEN
xororaj-dò-mò-ʒə gisän.
be.ill-NEG-NMZ-Poss.3SG about
‘The teacher knows that the student is not ill.’

(12) Vəs’a kəm keč-ə *kač-d-ən kerd-eš.
Vasya three day eat-CAR/ eat-NEG-CVB be.able-NPST.3SG
‘Vasya cannot eat for three days.’

Masha promise-PRF[3SG] a.two-ACC get-INF NEG.3SG get-NEG-INF
‘Masha promised not to get a two (a bad mark).’

The negation of nominalizations is not similar to negation in finite clauses:
Based on The Mirror Principle (Baker 1985: 375), I propose that since the position of the negative marker is closer to the root than the nominalizer, the structural position of negation is also below the \( nP \).

### 3.2.3 Tense

In Hill Mari, the subject of the nominalized clause can be either genitive marked or nominative marked. The properties discussed in this paper hold for both nominative and genitive constructions. In case of nominative marking, the possessive markers do not usually occur (16b). The acceptability of (16c), where a possessive marker is present although \( Pasha \) is nominative, is degraded.

(16) a. \( Pet'a \ Pasha-n \ joškarola-št̩ \ ₃l'-₃m̩-₃m \) 
   Petya   Pasha-GEN YoshkarOla-IN be-NMZ-POSS.3SG-ACC 
   päl-ₐ. 
   know-NPST.3[SG]  

b. \( Pet'a \ Pasha \ joškarola-št̩ \ ₃l'-₃m̩-m \ päl-ₐ. \) 
   Petya   Pasha YoshkarOla-IN be-NMZ-ACC know-NPST.3[SG]  

c. \( 'Pet'a \ Pasha \ joškarola-št̩ \ ₃l'-₃m̩-ž-ₐ \) 
   Petya   Pasha YoshkarOla-IN be-NMZ-POSS.3SG-ACC 
   päl-ₐ. 
   know-NPST.3[SG]  
   ‘Petya knows that Pasha lives in Yoshkar-Ola.’

If we compare the data for nominalizations with Hill Mari NPs it is important to mention that there can also be found NPs with unmarked complements (17). However, as discussed in Pleshak (2017: 65–66), these NPs are more likely to be compounds.

(17) \( pārsa \ lem \)  
   pea soup  
   ‘pea soup’

The data presented so far shows similarity between genitive subjects of nominalized clauses in Hill Mari and possessors.

The genitive-nominative alternation of the subject case in nominalized clauses of different Uralic languages has been widely discussed. For Beserman Udmurt, Serdobol’skaya et al. (2012) argue that the case of the subject depends on the syntactic position of the non-finite clause. For Meadow Mari, Serdobol’skaya (2008) suggests that the choice of the case is influenced by transitivity, animacy, thematic role, and more so by the referential status and discourse features of the subject. Georgieva (2016) analyses Udmurt and some Meadow Mari nominative subjects of nominalized clauses as non-heads
of deverbal compounds. This paper leaves the problem of the nature of nominative case of subjects in Hill Mari nominalizations for further research.

3.2.3.1 Modification

-mə- nominals allow modification by adverbs which, according to Cinque’s (1999) adverb hierarchy, are T-level adverbs.

(18) Pi-n sola-štə uže vəč-šəmə-žə-m Zina
    dog-GEN village-IN already wait-NMZ-POSS.3SG-ACC Zina
    mond-en.
    forget-PRF[3SG]
    ‘Zina forgot that the dog is already waiting outside.’

(19) Pervi puergə-rla-n plat' do' kašt-mə ūčitel'
    once man-PL-GEN dress with walk-NMZ-ACC teacher
    šajšt-šə.
    tell-AOR[3SG]
    ‘The teacher told (the class) that once men wore dresses.’

3.2.3.2 Raising-to-Subject

Further evidence of the presence of a TP comes from the fact that there is a raising-to-subject predicate that shows raising even when nominalized. Since the nominalization shows evidence of a movement associated with the T domain, a TP must be present in the structure of such nominalizations.

That the final position of the NP is Spec,TP of the matrix clause can be seen from the following data. First, the NP mən’ ‘I’ is nominative and controls agreement on the verb čučam ‘seem’.

(20) Mən’(*)-än [mən'- xavoraj-en kolt-šəmə-la] čuč-a-m.
    I(*-GEN) be.ill-CVB send-NMZ-CMPR seem-NPST-1SG
    ‘I seem to have fallen ill.’

    Second, in (21) the reflexive pronoun is co-indexed with the NP Vanya, which, according to Principle A, means that the NP is situated in the matrix clause. The same conclusion follows from the ungrammaticality of a pronominal co-indexed with the NP. According to Morgunova (2017), ške is a subject-oriented anaphor, which confirms its antecedent’s status as the subject of the matrix clause.

(21) Van'ə škə-lən-žə; / tədəs-lən- / [cerlən-šəmə-la]
    Vanya REFL-DAT-POSS.3SG/ he-DAT become.ill-NMZ-CMPR
    čuč-eš.
    seem-NPST,3[SG]
    ‘Vanya seems to himself, to have fallen ill.’

Thus the final position of the NP is Spec,TP of the matrix clause.

That the base position of the NP is in the embedded clause can be seen from the fact that the quantified subject of the matrix clause in (22) can have narrow scope with respect to an adverb in the embedded clause. Hence, the base position of the subject is below the adverb – in the embedded clause.
The same properties hold for a nominalized čučeš-clause, meaning that the raising happens in the nominalization as well.

Firstly, mə̈n’(-ə̈n) controls possessive agreement on čučem, hence it is in the same clause as the nominalization.

Secondly, an anaphor coindexed with Van’an is grammatical, which according to Principle A, means that they are in the same clause. Hence, Van’an is in the čučeš-clause.

Thirdly, the fact that apart from narrow scope the adverbial kənamžə can have wide scope with respect to the subject kədə tidə tetävlən supports the claim that the base position of the subject is in the dependent clause (namely, [kənamžə siren nəlməlä]).

3.2.4 Number

According to Alexiadou et al. (2010), nominalizations can be pluralized if they have an nP layer and if the pluralization is not blocked by a [–count] feature on ClassP which is caused by atelic inner aspect. In Hill Mari, -mə- nominals derived from telic stems, unlike those derived from atelic stems, can pluralize. Since I have assumed an nP layer present in these nominalizations, (26–27) are expected.
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(26) Val’a-n tokā-žə pozdan tol-mā-vlā-žə āvā-žə-m
Valya-GEN home late come-NMZ-PL-POSS.3SG mom-POSS.3SG-ACC shōdeštār-ā-t.
anno-NPST.3-PL
‘Valya’s comings home late annoy her mother.’

(27) Paškudā pi-n so mān’ām optō-mā-(*vlā)-žə
neighbour dog-GEN always I-ACC bark-NMZ-PL-POSS.3SG mān’ām shōdeštār-ā.
I-ACC annoy-NPST.3[SG]
‘The neighbourhood dog’s always barking at me annoys me.’

Thus, NumberP is also present in the structure of -mā- nominalizations. In this paper, I will follow Pleshak (2017) in naming the number projection PIP.

3.2.5 Possessive phrase and DP

Pleshak (2017) posits the following structure for a (singular) noun phrase in Hill Mari.

As can be seen from the examples above, a nominalization is marked with the same possessive suffix as a possessed noun. So, we can conclude that PossP is present in the structure of the nominalization.

As for the DP layer, Pleshak (2017) argues for its presence in Hill Mari nominals based on, firstly, the fact that demonstrative pronouns are restricted to a position above numerals and, secondly, that possessors need to have an assignor of the genitive case. Since, as also noted in Pleshak (2017), PossP does not appear to be this assignor because of the optional possessive marking on the head of a noun phrase, the only assignor left is the head D. Given the similarities in the properties of possessors and nominalization subjects and the fact that in nominalizations the possessive marking is also sometimes optional, although the genitive stays (29), I will assume in this paper that D is also the source of genitive in nominalizations. Hence, the subject’s final position would be spec,DP. That would mean that inside the nominalization case cannot be assigned in spec,TP. That could possibly be because the T is non-finite.

(29) ōrewāš-ān ądāráš gišān tumaj-mā-(žī) urok gišān
boy-GEN girl about think-NMZ-POSS.3SG lesson about
mond-ākt-a.
forget-CAUS-NPST.3[SG]
‘The boy’s thinking about a girl made him forget about the lesson.’

3.2.6 Summary

We have established that the -mā- nominalization is an ASN with the possible structure containing a vP, a NegP and a TP causing all the verbal properties of the nominal and an
nP, a PIP, a PossP and a DP responsible for the nominal properties. I will repeat (26) here in (30) to give an example of the structure of the -mə- nominalizations in (31).

(30) Val’a-n tokəˌẕə pozdan tol-mə-vlə-ŋə āvə-ŋə-m
Valya-GEN home late come-NMZ-PL-POSS.3SG mom-POSS.3SG-ACC Šdəltər-ə-t.
annoy-NPST.3-PL
‘Valya’s comings home late annoy her mother.’

In (31) the verb takes a nominalizer, a plural marker and a possessive marker while its underlying subject originates in spec,vP, moves to spec, TP and to spec, DP. Since there is no aspectual morphology or modification in Hill Mari, there is not yet enough data to speak about AspP within the nominalization structure.

---

3 As already discussed in Section 3, I assume here that the nominalizer represents the n head.
3.3 -maš- nominals

Let us now turn to the other nominalization pattern – the -maš- nominals. These nominals appear to be more restricted in a few ways. -maš- nominals cannot be derived from an atelic stem:

(32) Mən’ Alina-n mägər-əmkə-əm / *mägər-əmalar-əm

I Alina-GEN cry-NMZ-POSS.3SG-ACC / cry-NMN.ACT-POSS.3SG-ACC

kol-əm.

hear-PRF-1SG

‘I heard Alina cry.’

With respect to the clausal properties discussed in the following sections, the speakers fall into two groups: one considers all the sentences in 2.3.1–2.3.2 grammatical (Group ASN), the other does not (Group RN). For Group RN the suffix has very limited productivity, while for Group ASN any telic verb stem can take -maš.

3.3.1 v

For speakers of the Group ASN, these nominals also assign accusative case to the object of the nominalized clause. Group RN speakers do not allow -maš- nominals to surface with an object.

(33) Plof-əm ədər-məš mələm kelš-ə.

pilaw-ACC make-NMN.ACT I.DAT.POSS.1SG please-NPST.3[SG]

‘I like cooking pilaw.’

Just like for -mə- nominals, adverbial modification is also possible for Group ASN:

(34) Strouitel-vla-n toma-m jori pədərtə-maš-əsta

builder-PL-GEN house-ACC intentionally break-NMN.ACT-POSS.3PL

päl-ə.

know-NPST.3[SG]

‘The intentional destruction of the house by the constructors annoys the neighbors.’

3.3.2 Negation

The negation of the -maš- form looks exactly like the negation of -mə- nominals with the ASN Group. Hence, by the same logic we can posit a NegP under the nP.

(35) Təmdədə Pasha-n wrok-əm ədər-də-məš-əzəm

teacher Pasha-GEN homework-ACC do-NEG-NMN.ACT-POSS.3SG-ACC

päl-ə.

know-NPST.3[SG]

‘The teacher knows that Pasha didn’t do the homework.’
3.3.3 Tense
Unlike -mə- nominalizations, -maš- nominals do not allow for a nominative subject either with or without possessive markers on the nominalization for both groups of speakers.

\[ \text{Masha-n irok k̑ȓg̑št̑al-maš-ə̑ Pet'-a-m} \]
Masha-GEN morning run-NMN.ACT-POSS.3SG Petya-ACC
surprise-PRF.3[SG]

\[ *\text{Masha irok k̑ȓg̑št̑al-maš(-ə̑)} Pet'-a-m öȓk̑t̑-ən. \]
Masha morning run-NMN.ACT(-POSS.3SG) Petya-ACC surprise-PRF.3[SG]

‘It surprised Petya that Masha runs in the mornings.’

They also, unlike -mə- nominals (38a), do not license T-level adverbial modification (38b).

\[ \text{Vara vrač dokə ke-məš-ə̑štə Al'ona-m šədeštar-ə.} \]
then doctor to go-NMZ-POSS.3PL Alena-ACC annoy-NPST.3[SG]

‘Alena is angry about the fact that they will go to the doctor after.’

\[ ?\text{Vara vrač dokə ke-maš-ə̑štə Al'ona-m} \]
then doctor to go-NMN.ACT-POSS.3PL Alena-ACC
ə̑šëdeštar-ə.

annoy-NPST.3[SG]
Int.: ‘Alena is angry about the fact that they will go to the doctor after.’

Although there is no data for čučeš-raising for -maš- nominals, the other discrepancies between the T-associated properties of the two nominals give reason to assume the absence of T in the structure of -maš- nominalizations.

3.3.4 Nominal projections
With respect to number and possessive markers, -maš- shows the same properties as -mə- nominalizations for both groups of speakers. Since these nominals can only be derived from telic stems, they can all pluralize.

\[ \text{Val'a-n tokə pozda-n tol-maš-vlə-ə̑} \]
Valya-GEN home late-GEN come-NMN.ACT-PL-POSS.3SG
ə̑və-ə̑štə-m šədeštar-ə-t.
mother-POSS.3SG-ACC annoy-NPST-3PL

‘Mother is annoyed by Valya coming home late.’

As we can also see in (39), -maš- nominals can take possessive markers, too. So, the nominal part of the structure is the same for both nominalizations.

3.3.5 Summary
The data on these nominals allow us to posit two structures for two groups of speakers. For ASN the maximal structure is as follows:
For the RN group the structure of the nominal is simply:

\[(\text{DP} \ [\text{v}_\text{NP} \ [\text{vP} \ [\text{v} \ [\text{LP} \ ] \ ] \ ] \ ] \ ] \ ]\]

The speakers of both groups speak the same dialect and live in the same village. The division might correlate with the age of the speaker. However, it is difficult to posit or refute the presence of this correlation because the number of speakers is rather small and most of the informants are of about the same age.

4 Conclusion

We have examined the properties of two types of Hill Mari nominals and proposed structures for both. -mə- nominals have a lot of clausal properties and their structure includes high-level verbal projections, namely TP.

As for -maš- nominals, speakers fall into two groups. Some speakers seem to use them as RNs and some – as ASNs which are less verbal than the other nominalization.
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