Uralic Case

Workshop of the 14th International Morphology Meeting

Budapest, Hungary, May 15th-16th, 2010

Convenors: Seppo Kittilä and Anne Tamm

Booklet of abstracts

This workshop is devoted to the study of case systems in Uralic languages. The Uralic languages are well known for their rich case inventories. However, most studies of Uralic cases deal with the rather extensively studied Hungarian, Finnish and perhaps Estonian cases and case systems. Cases of other Uralic languages have been studied to a much lesser extent. The goal of this workshop is to fill that void by giving a fuller picture of case systems of Uralic languages (including dialects). We thus especially encourage contributions dealing with lesser-studied Uralic languages (such as Samoyedic, Mari, Mordvinian, Sami languages and Khanty).

 The workshop clarifies the phenomena, the terminology and the comparability of the data in the individual languages, as specific to Uralic and in more general terms. It also accumulates knowledge about the case systems of each language, and about the specific cases in Uralic languages and dialects. We plan 'case studies of case', such as genitive, partitive, abessive, locatives, comitative etc. in Uralic languages, both in individual languages and across (Uralic) languages, and we invite papers on more general issues, such as the 'Uralicness' of the case systems and cases.

 For updates and more information about the workshop, please consult our workspace at <http://uraliccasesystems.pbworks.com/> SEE THIS PAGE FOR THE PDF VERSIONS OF THESE ABSTRACTS, OR ASK anne.tamm AT unifi for abstracts with the original layout as given by the authors.

The webpage of the main event (The 14th International Morphology Meeting) is found at <http://www.nytud.hu/imm14/>.

The program of the workshop "Uralic case"

Organization: Anne TAMM, Seppo KITTILÄ

Saturday, 15 May

14.00-14.30   Seppo KITTILÄ: *Introduction*

14.30-15.00   Jocelyne FERNANDEZ-VEST:

        Uralic localism in a discourse perspective: a comparison of local casesin Samic and Finnic languages

15.00-15.30   Kari HILTULA:

        On temporal factors motivating the use of Finnish directional locatives

15.30-16.00   Katja VÄSTI:

        Agent-like meaning of the element in allative in Finnish verbless constructions

coffee

16.30-17.00   Poster session

        Ilona RAUHALA:

        The adjective attributes in Saami – form and agreement

        Marje JOALAID, Iris METSMÄGI, Anne TAMM, Jaan ÕISPUU:

        Case semantics constraining TAM in Finnic non-finite verbs and nominalizations

        Fedor ROZHANSKIY:

        The fall and rise of partitive in Jõgõperä Votic

        Beatrix OSZKÓ, Larisa PONOMAREVA:

        The morphology of equative in Komi-Permyak

17.00-17.30   Jaakko LEINO:

        Case in the Finnish infinitive system

17.30-18.00   Susanna VIRTANEN:

        Remarks on use of accusative and lative cases in Eastern Mansi

18.00-18.30   Andrey SHLUINSKY:

Locative cases of the dual number of nouns in Forest Enets: a case study of 'postpositional cases'

Sunday, 16 May

9.00-9.30   Casper de GROOT:

Uralic Essive

9.30-10.00   Gabriella TÓTH:

The interpretation of case on secondary predicates in Hungarian and in Finnish

10.00-10.30   László FEJES:

Object marking and the concept of case

10.30-11.00   Sonya OSKOLSKAYA:

Locational demonstratives vs. locational adverbs: a case of Ingrian Finnish

coffee

11.30-12.00   Arja HAMARI:

The abessive case of the Permic languages

12.00-12.30   Anne TAMM:

The inventory of cases in the Uralic languages; summary of the workshop

Table of contents.

Casper de Groot. Uralic Essive

This paper wishes to contribute to the central topics of the workshop by discussing various formal and functional aspects of the *essive* in the Uralic languages. The *essive* can be considered a special feature of the Uralic case system; although only a part of present-day Uralic languages (mainly Fennic and Hungarian) have the *essive* in their case inventories. Some other languages may employ other case forms to serve as an essive, i.e. the *translative* (Khanty, Mordvin), the *locative* (Nothern Khanty), or *lative* (Mari). In Veps, the *essive* converged with the *genitive* and *accusative*.

The paper argues for the following points.

(1) The status of the *essive* in Uralic is not unproblematic. First of all, the *essive* is not a type of case such as the *accusative* or *locative* which mark referential nominals, but rather a predicative marker.

(2) The *essive* in Uralic is the marker of nominal or adjectival secondary predicates only. It does not apply to non-verbal main predications, and thus differs from predicative cases found in, for instance, Russian and Kolyma Yukaghir.

(3) How to accommodate the *essive* in the cases systems of the Uralic languages? The name suggests that the *essive* is a spatial case. Moreover, the *essive* in Fennic originates from Proto-Uralic locative *-na*. There is no straightforward explanation for the development of the *locative* into the *essive*.

(4) The constituents marked by the *essive* form a sub-class of or they partially overlap the class of depictives. They can be set apart from converbal depictives which do not allow the *essive* (interestingly, there are many examples of converbs taking other cases).

(5) The *translative*, also a marker of secondary predications which do not function as a depictive, may take up the *essive* interpretation.

(6) The *essive*-phrase often allows for a manner interpretation, that is why several languages allow the co-ordination of the *essive* with a converb. Languages may even have minimal pairs of genuine *essive* opposed to *essives* with a manner interpretation.

These points define the area in which the *essive* could be studied: referential vs. predicational; secondary vs. main predication; spatial vs. non-spatial; *essive* vs. *translative*; depictive vs. manner.

László Fejes. Object marking and the concept of case

The presentation deals with the nature of case. According to the widely accepted definitions, "Case is a system of marking dependent nouns for the type of relationship they bear to their heads" (Blake 2004, 1) or "Inflectional category, basically of nouns, which typically marks their role in relation to other parts of the sentence" (Matthews 1997, 46). According to these definitions, the role of case is to indicate the relationship of the noun (phrase) to its head. However, languages, including most of the Uralic languages, have structures which this generalization does not fit. In my study, I will focus on the object marking of some Uralic languages: the main question is how the number of the object marking cases can be specified. I do not investigate the reasons for using a particular case in a given construction. My answer is that we have to use a distributional analysis, however, in a wider context than just the relationship of the noun (phrase) and its head.

In certain Finnic constructions where there is contrast of accusative (nominative, genitive) and partitive form object, the formal opposition does not indicate the difference of the relationship to the head (which is the same in both cases), but shows whether the object is affected completely or partially. In some structures, e.g. in negation, only partitive is possible: it

should be suggested that the negative element (auxiliary) is the head and it gives the case -- however, the semantic role is only interpretable through the verb. In Permic languages and Mari, the contrast of nominative and accusative can indicate the difference in definiteness. In Permic, the form of the possessor differs according to whether the possessee is the object or not. In other words, the case of a possessor depends on an element different from its own head.

In the traditional description of Uralic languages, there is no consistent way to specify the number of cases.

On the one hand, for some researchers a minimal opposition is enough to postulate a case. Finnish is said to have a distinct accusative case since a couple of pronouns (personal pronouns and some of the interrogative pronouns) have a distinct form when they fulfill the role of the object. On the contrary, Estonian is said to have no accusative case, since we find no unique form for object in the paradigm of any word. However, a strict distributional analysis shows that the the situation is different:

Poliisi	*vangitsi*	*turistin.*
Politsei	*arreteeris*	*turisti.*
police	arrest.IMP3S	tourist-ACC1

The police arrested the tourist.

Poliisi	*vangitsi*	*minut.*
Politsei	*arreteeris*	*mu.*
police	arrest.IMP3S	1S-ACC1

The police arrested me.

Turisti	*vangittiin.*
Turist	*arreteeriti.*
tourist-ACC2	arrest.PASS.IMP

The tourist was arrested.

Minut	*vangittiin.*
Mind	*arreteeriti.*
1S-ACC2	arrest.PASS.IMP

I was arrested.

In both languages, it holds for most of the nominals that singular first accusative is homonymous with nominative while singular second accusative is homonymous with genitive, and plural first and second accusative is homonymous with nominative. However, some pronouns are exeptional: there is no distinction between first and second accusative in Finnish, although these forms are not homonymous with any other case form. On the contrary, Estonian ACC1 is homonymous with genitive even among these pronouns, which means ACC1 is not a proper case, it is genitive. However, ACC2 form of personal pronouns are homonymous with the partitive forms. This means that ACC2 (or simply ACC) is a proper case: the ACC2 form is homonymous with partitive for personal pronouns and with nominative for all other nominals.

On the other hand, some researchers take into account only distinct forms of a given word or

category. For example, Ob-Ugric languages, similarly to Finnish, have distinct accusative forms for (personal) pronouns. However, the accepted view is that only personal pronouns have accusative, all the nouns and other pronouns simply lack this case and the nominative case is used when they function as object. If the analysis here were the same as for Finnish, we should say that Ob-Ugric languages have an accusative case and for all the words but personal pronouns their form is homonymous with the nominative case form. (There is also a third, quite extremist approach, which can be illustrated by the Eastern Ostyak grammar of Gulya. According to that, all the functions can be described as independent cases. Gulya distinguishes unmarked cases for the 1. subject (~ nominative), 2. the object (~ accusative), 3. the temporal-modal adverbs, 4. the attribute (~ genitive, and the same for adjectival and numeral attributes), 5. the predicative. However, most of them is not distinguished formally in the paradigm of any word.)

The distributional analysis of transitive structures shows that the function of case is not to show the relationship of the noun (phrase) to the head but to a wider structure (construction). Construction types can differ in many senses including the syntactic category and grammatical number of the participating words, the presence of negation, the definiteness of the noun phrase etc. Following this way, we have to conclude that Estonian has no accusative at all and in Finnish only a couple of pronouns have accusative case.

References
Blake, Barry J., 1994. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
Gulya, J., 1966. *Eastern Ostyak Chrestomathy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Matthews, P. H., 1997. *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford---New York.

M.M.Jocelyne Fernandez-Vest. Uralic localism in a discourse perspective : a comparison of Local Cases in Samic and Finnic languages

Deixis, especially spatial deixis, is rich in the Uralic languages, morphologically richer in the Finnic than in the Samic languages thanks to their large number of case suffixes (among which 3 internal and 3 external local cases): Finnish and Estonian can thus be called "spatial languages by structure". But space is omnipresent in Sami culture, traditionally a culture of nomads, and the expression of spatio-temporal deixis is in oral Northern Sami (henceforth "Sami") quite complex: only two local suffixes (Locative-separative LS, and Directive D), but also prepositions, postpositions, lexemes (with varying degrees of grammaticalization), numerous adverbs. Anchored in the environment – localization can even be the sole criterion for individual identification in traditional society – , the semantic variations are mostly induced by the functional character of localizing: for reindeer breeders, the vertical dimension will be unmarked, for fishermen it will be a horizontal axis.
Morphologically, the two FU language branches illustrate thus 2 opposite evolutions of case systems : 1/ Languages generally get large case systems through the elaboration of the local cases – see the Finnish language. 2/ The cases, if numerous, have a tendency to syncretize – see modern (Northern) Sami, where there are 2 mergers, among grammatical (accusative-genitive AG) and local cases (LS < inessive and elative). A third usual tendency – the semantic cases, especially local cases, expand their territory through covering

syntactic relations and covering thereby grammatical cases (Lehmann 1982) – seems to concern directly the Partitive, a pivot-case of the Finnic system, which has disappeared in Sami :

« offcially » S and A are expressed exclusively by Nominative and AG. We shall question this official version of grammars, and try to validate a localist interpretation of the Samic and Finnic cases systems, hypothesizing that not only it is difficult to maintain a strict distinction between core grammatical cases and semantic cases, but taht a realistic vision implies to include the local cases in the grammatical system of both languages.

Starting from the concrete (local and temporal) meanings of the D (destination), and its exact counterpart LS, we shall study some of the meanings involved by the use of these cases with an animate being, e.g. LS in the "habitive" construction (*Máhte-s leat ođđa sabehat* "Matthew has new skis"), and as the source of reception / getting / asking (*Dan mun lean gullan Máhte-s* "I learned that from Matthew"). In complete agreement with Blake's conclusion that "Case is a system for marking dependent nouns for the type of relationship they bear to their heads (….) but it marks both relationships of propositional content and of discourse-pragmatic viewpoint (2001:183), we shall be interested of :

1/semantic-syntactically, the verbs the local rection of which is differently oriented in Sami and Finnish (Sa. *liikot* + D ≠ Fi. *pitää* + elative "to like"; Sa. *Diet ášši ii guoskka mu- nnje* (D) ≠ *Fi. Tuo asia ei koske minu-a* (Partitive*)* "That thing does not touch me [is none of my concern]"; Sa. *Várut beatnagi-s !* (LS) ≠ Fi. *Varo koira !* (Acc. Ø) "Beware of the dog!"

2/ pragmatically, the situations when LS encroaches further upon the expression of possession—usually rendered by the genitive (*Ádjá fanas lea ođas* "Grandfather's boat is new")—when one wishes to highlight through fronting the person or object possessed: *Oidnetgo don ádjá-sdan ođđa fatnasa?* "Have you seen grandfather's new boat?"; *Ádjá-sdat ođđa fanas lea juo ráigánan* "Grandfather's new boat already has a hole in it" (lit. "To Grandfather the new boat already has…"); *Duon nissoni-s dat nieida lea fárren Ruŧŧii* "That woman's daughter has gone to Sweden" (lit. "For that woman, the daughter has gone to Sweden"). This strategy of information structuring, equivalent to oral topicalizing devices in other languages (English "As for that woman, her daughter…"), suggests another type of case hierarchy than the usually referred to: concrete local cases are cognitively more salient than grammatical ones.

In order to problematize further these partly equivalent uses of local cases in related languages, and show the necessity to refer them to their discourse context, we have collected the occurrences of local cases in Sami and Finnish, with some incursions into other Samic and Finnic languages (where the mergers can be different) from a textual corpus of both narratives and dialogues. The diversity of factors which contribute towards the choice of the cases, in particular the interaction of syntactic and semantic features of the verbs, combined with enunciative and situational criteria, can be analyzed in terms of cognitive processes underlying the grammatical vs. «local» constructions. The role of the local cases for the information structuring of the sentence and discourse will be apprehended through the variations of parallel translations in the different languages : fictive dialogues (legends, novels, theater) and how the translator 1/ transfers a selection of the combined features of local cases into a language lacking the suffixed internal/external difference, or, on the conrary, 2/ makes explicit with the internal/external difference a specificity which was only latent in the other language,

3/ tries to reconstruct a difference of marked topicality when a further step of grammaticalization has neutralized it.

References : Alhoniemi Alho, 1983, « Suomen paikallissijojen käytöstä », in A. Hakulinen & P. Leino (toim.), *Nykysuomen rakenne ja kehitys*, 1 : *Näkökulmia kielen rakenteisiin*, Helsinki, SKS, TL 93, 209-228. • Anderson John M., 1997, *A notional theory of syntactic categories*, Cambridge University Press. • Blake Barry J., 2001 [2ⁿᵈ], *Case*, Cambridge University Press. • Comrie, Bernard, 1991, « Form and function in identifying cases », in F. Plank (ed.), *Paradigms : the economy of inflection*, Berlin, Mouton de Gryter, 41-56. 2005, • Fernandez-Vest M.M.Jocelyne, 1994, « Spatial cognition and the organization of discourse — evidence from the Sami language (Lapland) », SUNY Buffalo, Working Papers from the First International Summer Institute in Cognitive Science, *Multidisciplinary Foundations of Cognitive Science*, 40-51. • 2009, « Typological evolution of Northern Sami : spatial cognition and Information Structuring », *The Quasquicentennial of the Finno-Ugrian Society,* Jussi Ylikoski (ed.), Helsinki, SUST 258, 33-55. • Fillmore Charles, 1968, Case for case », in E. Bach & R.T. Harms (eds.), *Universals in linguistic theory*, London, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1-88. • Hakulinen Auli & Karlsson Fred, 1979, *Nykysuomen lauseoppia*, Helsinki, SKST 350. • Lehmannn, 1982, *Thoughts on grammaticalization : a programmatic sketch*, vol. 1, Köln, Institüt für Sprachwissenschaft • Luraghi Silvia, 1991, « Paradigm size, possible syncretisms, and the use of adpositions with case in inflective languages », in F. Plank (ed.), 57-74. • Serbat Guy, 1981, *Cas et fonctions*, Paris, PUF.

Arja Hamari. The abessive case of the Permic languages

In my presentation, I will focus on a rather marginal but still productive case of the Permic languages, namely the abessive (sometimes also known as the caritive or the privative case). The presentation is part of my research project in which I study the functions of this case category in the Finno-Ugric – or more precisely – in the Finno-Permic languages; the purpose of my work is to consider the functional development of the case in different sister languages. The abessive ending has etymological equivalents throughout the Uralic language family, which means that the suffix most likely goes back to the Uralic protolanguage. The original form of the suffix may have been *-ktå/-ktä*, but it is not clear whether it was originally a case ending or a derivational suffix (Janhunen 1982: 29, 31). Especially in the modern Finno-Permic languages the use of the descendants of this suffix have many similar features, but also differences do appear – these differences range from morphological to syntactic characteristics.

In the Permic languages, the forms of the abessive case suffix are -teg in Komi (K) and -tek in Udmurt (U). In both languages the suffix can be attached to both nouns and verbs. In nouns, the function of this case is to express the lack or shortage of something (K träktorteg 'without a tractor',

U träktortek 'id.'), while in verbs it is employed in the formation of negative gerunds (K tH·dlit· eg 'without noticing', U toditek 'without knowing'); both nouns and verbs carrying the abessive case suffix usually have an adverbial function (Bartens 2000: 102, 256–257). My paper deals with the similarities and differences that can be detected in the use of

these suffixes in the two Permic languages. I will concentrate on the literary language of both Komi and Udmurt, but descriptions and grammars of dialects and old text materials will, of course, be considered when available.

The study is based on a material mainly collected from two newspapers that appear in Komi and Udmurt. Both the Komi paper Komi mu and the Udmurt paper Udmurt duۑe appear three times a week and the articles are published both in a paper format and through the Internet. In the case of Komi, material has been collected from the issues of *Komi mu* that have appeared between October 1st, 2008 and September 30th, 2009, while the Udmurt material covers all the issues of Udmurt duۑۑe in the year 2007. Additional Komi material comes from five issues of the monthly journal VojViV koۑ๙uV (1–5/1997). Altogether, the size of the data base is approximately 2000 expressions in both languages.

References:

Bᴀʀᴛᴇɴs, Rᴀɪᴊᴀ 2000: *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys*. Mémoires de la Société Finno- Ougrienne 238. Helsinki.
Jᴀɴʜᴜɴᴇɴ, Jᴜʜᴀ 1982: On the structure of Proto-Uralic. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* XLIV. Helsinki.

Kari Hiltula. On temporal factors motivating the use of Finnish directional locatives

The present paper aims to clarify the semantics of the Finnish locatives, especially those that complement or modify the verb with a directional local case marking even though no apparent change of location is involved. In Finnish, verbs such as (a) *jäädä* 'remain', *jättää* 'leave', and *unohtaa*
'forget, leave behind', and (b) *hakea* 'search', *etsiä* 'look for' and *löytää* 'find', typically take a directional locative where some languages prefer a non-directional one. Recent explanations for the fact (e.g., Fong 1997; Huumo 2006, 2007) seem to talk at cross-purposes, the reason for which may lie in the inaccurate rendering of some of the earlier explanations.

Dahl (1987: 150–154) sees the class of verbs in (a) to exemplify borderline cases between what are prototypically seen as location (e.g., *be situated*) and direction (e.g., *move*). The complement of the Finnish verb *jäädä* is marked formally as direction (1) whereas in Russian the corresponding phrase is marked as location. As for the complements of the English *remain*, location and direction are not kept apart by any overt marking. (See the English and Russian counterparts of the example 1 below.)

Dahl (1987: 153) suggests that we may regard the complements of *remain*-type verbs as expressing either location or direction, depending on how we delineate direction. The directional locative in the illative in (1), *Lontooseen*, does not fit the usual definition for the semantic role GOAL, namely "the final point of a movement" as no apparent change of location is involved but rather "the point at which something is located as the result of what is said to take place in the sentence". Similarly for
the class of verbs in (b), the directional locative in the elative in (2), *taskusta*, will not take on the definition "the initial point of a movement" for the semantic role SOURCE, better conveyed by "the point at which the object is situated at the beginning of what is said to take place in the sentence"
(cf. Dahl 1987: 153, footnote 6; Rahkonen 1977: 43–44).

(1)	*Hän*	*jäi*	*Lontooseen.*	(Dahl 1987: 152.)
	He-NOM	remain-PST.3SG	London-ILL	

'He remained in London (Russ. On ostalsja v Londone)'

(2) *Hän*   *etsii*   *avainta*   *taskusta*.   (Dahl 1987: 153.)

     (S)he-NOM   look for-PRS.3SG   key-PART   pocket-ELA

     'He is looking for the key in (his) pocket'

Dahl's (1987) temporally-oriented conception of directional locatives has been criticized by Fong (1997) and by Huumo (2006, 2007). Interestingly enough, Fong (1997: 20) claims that "Dahl's theory overgeneralizes" whereas Huumo (2007: 79) sees the problem in that "[the explanation] cannot be generalized to explain all kinds of inchoative or terminated events where a participant either is in the location before the event or remains there after the event, since in general the static [i.e., non- directional] cases are used in such sentences".

The reason Fong (1997: 20) gives for her claim of the putative overgeneralization of Dahl's theory is that "sometimes, goals are expressed by direct objects, in accusative or partitive case". Her examples are of the Finnish verbs *saavuttaa* 'reach' and *tavoitella* 'strive for'. She adds that *remain-* or *stay-* type verbs such as the Finnish *jäädä* do not take goals in the accusative case. Fong's (1997) interpretation of Dahl (1987) suffers from the fact that the semantic role GOAL has also been used for PATIENT and THEME as well as for RECIPIENT. It is for this reason Blake (1994: 70) prefers the role DESTINATION to GOAL, or DIRECTION, the meaning of which is not transparent.[1]

Huumo (2006: 47–48; 2007: 79) gives credit to Rahkonen (1977) for first putting forward an idea that temporal factors are involved in the use of a directional locative in lieu of a non-directional one in Finnish, even though the explicit argument for such factors was formulated by Dahl (1987). What Huumo does not give credit to, however, are the original arguments. I will first comment on Huumo's (2006, 2007) rendering of Rahkonen (1977), then of Dahl (1987), in light of the examples (3–5) below.

(3) *Lapsi*   *rakensi*   *pöydälle*   *tornin*.   (Rahkonen 1977: 27.)

     child-NOM   build-PST.3SG   table-ALL   tower-ACC

     'The child built a tower on the table'

(4) *Kalle*   *löysi*   *taskustaan*   *markan*.   (Rahkonen 1977: 43.)

     Kalle-NOM   find-PST.3SG   pocket-ELA-3SG.PX   mark-ACC

     'Kalle found a mark (coin) in his pocket'

(5) *Liisa*   *lopetti*   *tanssin*   *pöydällä*.   (Huumo 2007: 79.)

     Liisa-NOM   stop-PST.3SG   dance-ACC   table-ADE

     'Liisa stopped/finished (her) dance on the table'

In (3) the directional locative in the allative, *pöydälle*, would indicate that the referent of the object <u>remains</u> on the table after being completed, i.e., it continues its presence in the location after the actual event has ended whereas in (4) the locative in the elative, *taskustaan*, would indicate that the money <u>was</u> in the pocket before it was found, i.e., the entity in question was already in the location. (Huumo 2006: 47–48; 2007: 78–79.) Contrary to what Huumo thinks seems to be the case, Rahkonen does not claim that the tower in (3) remains on the table after being completed but where it <u>is</u> after being completed, and the mark coin in (4) is in Rahkonen's words not presupposed but <u>implied</u> in the pocket. (Rahkonen 1977: 28–29, 43; see also Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979: 207–208.)

The above comments also apply to Huumo's (2006, 2007) critique on Dahl (1987). In choosing to speak of events instead of verbs and their possible complements, Huumo clearly extends the domain of Dahl's (as well as Rahkonen's) original argument. The terminative aspect Huumo (2007: 79) refers to in (5) is irrelevant as Liisa's presence on the table is not the result of what is said to take place in

---

[1] Dahl (1987: 150–151, footnote 4) notes that he is "using the terms *location* and *direction* in a pre-theoretical way and *location* and *goal* for the corresponding notions in case grammar".

the sentence, and we remain in the dark as to whether Liisa remained on the table after she finished her dance. It is clear that the semantic role of the adjunct *pöydällä* is not DESTINATION but LOCATION. Non-directional locatives in Finnish do not contain any implication on what happens to the referent in question after the actual event has ended (Rahkonen 1977: 28; Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979: 208).

I will discuss the expression of directionality of the Finnish locatives and will in this context argue for a semantic analysis which also elucidates dependency relations within the sentence.

References

Blake, Barry J.. 1994. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dahl, Östen. 1987. "Case grammar and prototypes". In René Dirven & Günther Radden, eds. *Concepts of case*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 147–161.
Fong, Vivienne. 1997. *The order of things: What directional locatives denote*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Stanford University.
Hakulinen, Auli & Fred Karlsson. 1979. *Nykysuomen lauseoppia* [Syntax of present-day Finnish]. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 350. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
Huumo, Tuomas. 2006. "'I woke up from the sofa': Subjective directionality in Finnish expressions of a spatio-cognitive transfer". In Marja-Liisa Helasvuo & Lyle Campbell, eds. *Grammar from the human perspective: Case, space and person in Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 51–75.
Huumo, Tuomas. 2007. "Force dynamics, fictive dynamicity, and the Finnish verbs of 'remaining'". *Folia Linguistica* 41: 73–98.
Rahkonen, Matti. 1977. "Suomen paikanilmauksista" [On the Finnish locative expressions]. *Virittäjä* 81: 21–52.

Seppo Kittilä. Uralic case: introduction to the workshop

Uralic cases are well known for their rich case inventories. Some Uralic languages, such as Hungarian and Veps, have been reported to have more than 20 cases, which is a very high number from a cross-linguistic perspective. Even languages with fewer cases (such as Saami languages) have nearly 10 cases (which is also a high number typologically). Languages with rich case inventories are especially interesting for studies of case, since they provide us with better insights into the functions of case. For example, what kinds of case are possible, which are common, which cases are rare and which are the functions that are rather expressed by adpositions. Many of the cases attested in languages with rich case inventories are so-called semantic cases, while languages with fewer cases 'focus' on grammatical cases. The former are more interesting as regards the possible functions of cases, functions expressed by grammatical cases display less variation (they are restricted to core semantic roles such as agent, patient and recipient).

Since case is something Uralic languages can be said to be famous for, it does not come as a surprise that case is a commonly studied feature of Uralic languages. There are numerous studies dealing with individual cases, either in a single language (e.g. genitive in Finnish) or in the whole language family (e.g. abessive in Uralic languages), in addition to which the case systems of the languages have also been studied (e.g. development of cases in Uralic languages). However, one of the problems of these studies is their idiosyncratic nature. Many of the studies of Uralic cases have been conducted within the framework of Uralic linguistics (and also written in languages not generally known by the scientific community), and the studies are thus not accessible to scholars working on case from a more general (e.g. typological-functional) perspective. One of the goals of this workshop is to change this by providing a discussion forum for all scholars interested in Uralic case irrespective of their background.

In my talk, I will give a very short introduction to case, especially case in Uralic languages. I start by briefly discussing case from a theoretical point of view. In other words, I will discuss some

definitions of case and some of the characteristic features of case in general. This will be followed by a short discussion of some of the recent studies of Uralic case. The nature of my talk is very introductory, since individual cases will be discussed in the talks that follow.

Marcus Kracht. Locatives in Mari

In a series of penetrating studies, Alho Alhoniemi has compiled and analysed the meaning and use of local cases of Mari (see among other (Alhoniemi 1967)). This material provides a sound basis for comparison with 'major' Uralic languages such as Finnish, Estonian and Hungarian. In this paper I will take a modern look at the Mari data. Using new insights concerning the morphology and syntax (Svenonius 2008) and the semantics (Kracht 2008) of local expressions, I shall look at the distribution and meaning of local cases of Mari.

Roughly, locative cases consist of two layers: the inner layer (Layer 1) describes the general location while the outer layer (Layer 2) describes the temporal dynamics. Thus in Finnish elative adds a Layer 1 suffix /s/ ("inside") and a Layer 2 suffix /ta/ ("from"). As is apparent from the following Mari paradigm for /olma/ "apple", the Layer 1 /s/ is found in Mari as well, without contrast (in Finnish /s/ contrasts with /l/).

Lative	olmaš	"to the apple"
Illative	olmaš(ke)	"into the apple"
Inessive	olmašte	"in the apple"
Ablative	olmaleč	"from the apple"
Approximative	olmaškᵊla	"in direction of the apple"

The current paradigm however differs from Finnish and Hungarian in that the /š/ by itself is the anding of the lative though there is reason to believe that the suffix of the lative must be analysed as an empty Layer 2 suffix.

The layering theory can explain certain idiosyncrasies like this one, noted in (Alhoniemi 1988). The inflection of /olᵊmbal/ takes only Layer 2 endings (contrasted here with /kuẟə/ 'house'). Surprisingly, it has an elative that is otherwise missing.

inessive	kuẟᵊšte	olᵊmbalne
illative	kuẟᵊške	olᵊmbake
lative	kuẟeš	olᵊmbalan
elative	—	olᵊmbač(ᵊn)

There are parallels with Finnish and Udmurt.

The simultaneous presence of both a lative and an illative presents interesting semantic questions, since the lative is the case of general goal directed movement. In fact, Mari seems to follow a general pattern of Uralic languages by which goal directionals are used in the absence of factual motion. The lative is synchronically no longer a general directional case. According to (3) these are the functions of the lative case in Mari.

1. Lative: rarely (!).
2. Prolative: /čerńila *pumaɣaeš* šärlä/ 'the ink is spreading *on the paper*'
3. Illative: /Sᵊlwa wüt koč pašazᵊwlak *pušeš* šinʒᵊn wońʒat/ 'the workers are getting *on board of the ship* [and] cross the Selwa'
4. Inessive: /alem *kajᵊš* šokšeš/ 'my strength is waning *in the heat*'
5. Transformative: /imńim *kuzᵊkeš* puaš/ 'to give a horse *as dowry*'.
6. Sometimes it is selected: /rwez *alaeš* koen/ 'the son remained *in the city*'.

Specifically, the lative is used to denote a location with verbs that denote change (Alhoniemi 1967, Bereczki 1990). This is quite common in Uralic. Using the layered theory of meaning some more general order can be brought into this list. In the talk I shall present a detailed account of local case meanings in Mari from the perspective of the layering theory.

References

Alho Alhoniemi. *Über die Funktion des Wohin–Kasus im Tscheremissischen*. Number 142 in Suomalais–Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia. Suomalais–Ugrilainen Seura, Helsinki, 1967.

Alho Alhoniemi. Postpositiorakenteiden synkroniaa ja diakroniaa. *Sananjalka*, 30:27–44, 1988.

Gábor Bereczki. *Chrestomathia Ceremissica*. Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest, 1990.

Marcus Kracht. The Fine Structure of Local Expressions. In Anna Asbury, Jakub Dotlačil, Berit Gehrke, and Rick Nouwen, editors, *Syntax and Semantics of Spatial P*, pages 35–62. John Benjamin's, Amsterdam, 2008.

Peter Svenonius. Projections of P. In Anna Asbury, Jakub Dotlačil, Berit Gehrke, and Rick Nouwen, editors, *Syntax and Semantics of Spatial P*, pages 63–84. John Benjamin's, Amsterdam, 2008.

Jaakko Leino. Case in the Finnish infinitive system

Finnish, as Uralic languages in general, is rich in morphology. This is manifest in both nominal and verbal inflection: verbs are inflected in two voices, four moods, four tenses, two numbers, and three persons, plus a number of non-finite forms, while nouns are inflected in two numbers and fifteen cases. An intriguing center of this morphological complexity is the Finnish non-finite verb inflection system which combines aspects of verb and noun inflection.

Given that Finnish has, morphologically speaking, three to five different infinitives (e.g. Hakulinen et al. 2004: 487 list three, while e.g. Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979: 87 speak of "four

or even five) and fifteen cases, there could theoretically be 5x15=75 different infinitive forms. The number would be further doubled if infinitives were inflected for number. However, each of the morphologically different infinitives has a defective case inflection paradigm: the 1ˢᵗ or *A* infinitive only has a basic (or "nominative") and a translative form, the 2ⁿᵈ or *E* infinitive only has an inessive and an instructive form, etc. In all, we only encounter 15 of the potential 75 combinations of the different infinitive markers and case endings.

As e.g. Siro (1964) has pointed out, together the defective paradigms of these different forms are in a complementary distribution: there are no more than three cases (two of which are questionable to begin with) covered by more than one of the five infinitives, and in each of these cases, the possible syntactic contexts of the "overlapping" case forms are complementary—to the extent, Siro suggests, that Finnish syntactically has only one infinitive. (For a more detailed discussion, see Leino 2003: 99–111).

The alleged complementary distribution, and the whole Finnish infinitive system, is held together by a number of conventional infinitive constructions, specialized expression types which serve as usage contexts for specific infinitive forms. For example, the 2ⁿᵈ or *E* infinitive inessive is predominantly used in the *temporal construction* which expresses simultaneous activity (1a), and the 3ʳᵈ or *MA* infinitive adessive in a construction which expresses means of carrying out the action expressed by the main predicate (1c):

(1) a. Kalle ajatteli Liisaa *syödessään*.
Kalle-NOM think-PST-3SG Liisa-PAR eat-INF2-INE-PX3SG
'Kalle thought about Liisa when he ate.'

c. Nälkä lähtee *syömällä*.
hunger-NOM leave-3SG eat-INF3-ADE
'Eating takes hunger away.'

Specific expression types or constructions like these are crucial in distinguishing seemingly overlapping case forms of infinitives from one another and pointing out their complementary distribution. In addition, they are also crucial in the sense that the whole notion of "infinitive" cannot be properly accounted for, and distinguished from the notion of "deverbal noun", without making reference to such constructions.

The overall system of Finnish infinitives has been approach surprisingly scarcely given how much research has been carried out on specific non-finite constructions. Especially the role of case inflection as an organizing factor in the five infinitive system calls for further study.

The present paper approaches the Finnish infinitive primarily through case inflection. The aim of the paper is to evaluate the hypothesis that case inflection is the ultimate organizing factor of the Finnish infinitive morphology complex. This hypothesis, which associates with Siro's hypothesis that Finnish has only one syntactic infinitive, will be compared to the competing, and more traditional, hypothesis according to which Finnish has

four or five different infinitives, each of which has a defective case inflection independent of each of the other infinitives.

As a more general contribution, the paper exemplifies a situation in which seemingly independent morphological categories turn out to be intertwined and interdependent. The fact that the Finnish infinitive marking morphology and case marking morphology support each other and organize each other may have implications which are significant not only for Finnish and related languages but also for morphological theory and typology.

References

Hakulinen, Auli – Karlsson, Fred 1979. *Nykysuomen lauseoppia.* SKS, Helsinki.

Hakulinen, Auli & Maria Vilkuna & Riitta Korhonen & Vesa Koivisto & Tarja Riitta Heinonen & Irja Alho 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi.* SKS, Helsinki.

Leino, Jaakko 2003. *Antaa sen muuttua. Suomen kielen permissiivirakenne ja sen kehitys.* SKS, Helsinki.

Siro, Paavo 1964. Infinitiivin asema suomen kieliopissa. *Sananjalka* 6: 20–26.

Iris Metsmägi, Jaan Õispuu, Marje Joalaid, Anne Tamm. Case semantics constraining TAM in Finnic non-finite verbs

Are cases TAM markers in Finnic and how does their semantics differ from the TAM markers that are not (originally) case markers? This contribution shows how the expression of TAM is subject to language-specific constraints in the less-known variants of Finnic, and these constraints are regularly motivated by case semantics. The presentation argues that there is a need for a heuristic concept for the form elements and phenomena that are related to the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic constraints in the synchronic structures. These phenomena and form elements are referred to as "cross-categorial case".

A previous account that has addressed a related issue is Aikhenvald (2008). According to Aikhenvald (2008:565), "versatile cases" can express temporal, causal and other relationships between clauses, and aspectual and modal meanings within a clause. For instance, Aikhenvald provides examples of case on nouns and verbs in Manambu, where the objective-locative case marks a core or an oblique argument. The locative case appears on the verb as well, as on *wukemar* 'forget', adding completivity to the event structure; locative case on a verb has an interpretation of 'completely orget'.

(1)   wun [de-ke-**m**]   wukemar-e-**m**
        I he-LK-OBJ/LOC forget-LK-OBJ/LOC
        'I completely forgot him.'   (Aikhenvald 2008:587)

Aikhenvald finds that core cases tend to express aspectual and modal meanings, while oblique cases tend to be used as clause-linkers. Versatile case comprises case on various verb forms and falls in three main types on the basis of its distributional characteristics: on verb roots, on fully or partially inflected verbs, and on non-finite verbs. Aikhenvald describes versatile case as 'chameleon morphemes' that can mark different categories and have related but also different meanings. This concept suits well for describing the case phenomena in Finnic, where, for instance, inessive case on non-finite verbs expresses aspect (progressive).

(2)   Õhus   on   *helju-ma-s*   piparkookide ja

air-INE be.3S float-M-INE gingerbread-GEN.PL and
röstitud mandlite magusvürtsikas lõhn,
roasted almond-GEN.PL sweet and spicy scent
kusagil küpsetatakse jõulusaia,
somewhere bake-IMPERS Christmas cake.PTV
jõululaatadel pakutakse auravat Glühweini.
Christmas fair-PL.ADE offer-IMPERS steaming.PTV gluhwein.PTV
'In the air is hanging the smell of gingerbread and roasted almonds, somewhere a Christmas cake is being baked, on Christmas fairs, Glühwein is offered to the customers.' (Estonian)

The Finnic data can help clarify some conceptual issues about these "chameleon morphemes" in Aikhenvald's account. Firstly, it is not always clear if the form in question can be referred to as case. It is not clear if this form is a morpheme. The TAM meaning constraints can be coupled with a diachronically motivated formant (-*s*), which is a part of a morpheme in modern language (-*mas*). Secondly, the Finnic data on spatial cases express primarily TAM semantics and pragmatics; they are not clause linkers despite their oblique nature. Thirdly, Aikhenvald's approach concentrates on typologically distant examples where variation cannot be observed. Some data on variation show that there are fewer differences in the semantics of the combinations of various types of non-finite or nominalized forms. Fourthly, in many languages it is not clear if the case-marked category in question is a verb or it has properties of an adjective (nominal) as well. It is not clear if versatile case can mark nouns if they are used as predicates. The languages involved are not properly tested for their category, and testing would be difficult given the choice of languages.

As a solution to these problems of the exact categories involved, a more semantics-centered and less morphology-centered take on the concept of "versatile case" can be considered. This presentation looks at the instances of spatial case and partitive in the Finnic languages (other than Finnish).

Case is a means of encoding TAM semantics in Finnic. Case penetrates into the predicate domain in all Uralic languages, most of which are characterized by rich case systems with approximately 10 members, and many have case systems of approximately 15 or 20 cases. An instance of TAM related cross-categorial case is partitive. Tveite (2002:151) analyzes the Livonian object case alternation as he telicity, closed-open situations, polarity, individuation of the object, realis-irrealis', as in (3) and (4).

(3) jo se um juvvõ tüödõ min jūs tiend
because it be.3sg good.par work.par I.gen by do.2part
'because she has done good work with me'

(4)   ta   um   ÿd   itt   jõva   tüö   min   jūrõ tiend
        she be.3sg   one.acc   emph good.acc work.acc I.gen to do.2part
           'she has done something good to me'   (Livonian, Tveite 2004:59)

Partitive object case is an instance of cross-categorial case, since it encodes TAM semantics, but the semantics has peculiarities that are specific to the Finnic categories only, e.g., selectional constraints on the verbs that partitive-marked objects occur with. The semantics of these TAM markers in Finnic differs from the TAM markers that are not (originally) case markers, such as prefixes, which are not selective in the same way and which modify the verb meaning differently. Also, the progressive in example (1) differs from the prototypical progressives in terms of its selection restrictions; to produce the progressive continuous reading, the verb should preferably be static and the subject typically inanimate in Estonian (Metslang 1994).

      This contribution targets the role of the *m*-formative forms (action nominals, non-finite verbs) in the TAM meaning. Are there any regularities in the TAM that can be read off the type of the form that the case attaches? The data are poorly tested still; note that the Karelian "partitive infinitives" are not infinitives, since they can be modified by an adjective that agrees with them in case (5).

(5)   Suurdu   keittämiä   pada   musteni.
        big.PTV   cook-M_PTV pot[NOM]   blacken-3S.PST
        'Intensive cooking made the pot turn black.' (Karelian)

Preliminary results show that the combinations with action nouns and infinitives are surprisingly similar, which may be attributed to the origin of the infinitives as action nominals.

      Tentatively we propose that cross-categorial case is a morpheme (or a part of a morpheme that has been a case diachronically), marking an argument or a predicate, either predicate nominal, a non-finite verb, a verb root or an inflected verb. It marks an argument noun as well as entities of a different syntactic category (adposition, verb, adjective), a clause, or a different semantic predicate (a noun, an adjective or a verb), but crucially its characteristic is that it encodes typical predicate or utterance level semantics or it links clauses.

Sofia Oskolskaya. Locational demonstratives vs. locational adverbs: a case of Ingrian Finnish[2]

In the Ingrian Finnish language that is spoken in the Gatchina district there are six case forms (among other) with the spatial meaning. These six case forms can be divided into two groups: internal and external. The internal case forms are inessive, elative, illative. They have the meaning of staying **in** the object, motion **from (within)** and **into** the object correspondingly. The external case forms are adessive, ablative, allative. They have the meaning of staying **on** the object, motion **from (the outside)** and **onto** the object correspondingly.

      Besides, Ingrian Finnish has a system of demonstrative pronouns that includes three different pronouns. Tämä (nämä — plural form) indicates the entity near the deictic centre. The pronouns tuo (nuo) and sᴇ (nee) indicate the entity farther from the deictic centre. Sᴇ is also used as an anaphoric pronoun. In the talk I am not going to look at the anaphoric use of sᴇ as well as the use of tuo because this pronoun is used quite rarely. If the

---

speaker wants to oppose two entities by distance, (s)he will most probably choose tämä and se. All the pronouns can be declined. The locational case forms of two pronouns are below:

internal	inessive		elative		illative	
	SG	PL	SG	PL	SG	PL
proximal	täss	näis	täst	näist	tähä	näis
distal	sien	nies	sint	niest	sinne	nies
external	adessive		ablative		allative	
	SG	PL	SG	PL	SG	PL
proximal	tiäl	näil	tiält	näilt	tähä	näil
distal	siel	niel	sielt	nielt	sinne	niel

First of all, it is important to mark that this is a declination of demonstrative pronouns that express **spatial** meaning in these case forms. The same case forms can be used in other functions. In Ingrian Finnish the allative form may be used to express the recipient role. If the proximal pronoun is used in this function, then it has a different form — tiäl.

Sometimes the forms of a pronoun and a cooccurring NP can be different — the internal form of the cooccurring NP can combine with the external form of the pronoun and vice versa:

(1) miä   läks-i-n   pois sie-lt   talo-st
    1SG go-PST-1SG   away that-**ABL**   house-**EL**
    'I went out of that house'.

The question arises whether it is a disagreement (if so, what are the reasons of the disagreement?) or just a use of locational adverb? We can find some arguments for and against the adverbial interpretation of the phenomenon. For: The "disagreement" happens only in spatial meaning of these case forms. Otherwise, it is impossible (2).

(2) höö   luati-vot   sint   / * sie-lt   kirja-st
    3PL   talk-3PL   that.EL / * that-ABL   book-EL
    'They speak about that book'.

Against: The "disagreement" is possible with plural forms, although it happens more occasionally (3).

(3) ota   kirja-t   näi-st   suur-i-lt   pööv-i-lt
    take.IMP   book-PL   that.PL-**EL**   big-PL-**ABL**   table-PL-**ABL**
    'Take the books from those big tables'.

According to these and some other properties we may suppose that the demonstrative pronouns with spatial meaning take a place between real pronouns, that are used as the determiners of NP, and adverbs.

———————————————

Beatrix Oszkó and Larisa Ponomareva. The morphology of equative in Komi-Permyak

The aim of our paper is to demonstrate the morphological implements of the equative constructions in Komi-Permyak. (The Komi-Permyak language belongs to the Uralic language family and is a member of the Permic branch. According to a census taken in 2002 the number of Komi-Permyaks is 125 235 and 75 % of them (94 328) speak the language.)

Komi-Permyak has the richest case system among the Permian languagues. According to the latest descriptions, Udmurt and the Yazva dialect of Komi have 15 cases, and Komi-Zyryen has 17. Komi-Permyak has 22 cases (Hausenberg 1998).

We would like to find out whether or not there is an equative case in Komi-Permyak.

There are various descriptions of Komi-Permyak ranging from a short review to a detailed grammar prepared according to the practice/routine of the Russian Academy in the '60s. (Abondolo 1998, Lytkin 1962, Krivosekova-Gantman 1956)

However, the abovementioned grammars only refer to the phenomenon but do not describe the equative in detail.

As a result, Komi-Permyak uses different morphological solutions:

a) postposition/suffix formed from attributive adjective

ыжд**a** 'sized'

Карта-ын	вöл-i	кукань ыжда	порсь.
stock-yard-INESS	be-PAST	calf-NOM POSTP	pig-NOM

'In the stockyard the pig was as big as a calf.'

гырис**я** 'enormous'

Картошка	мöйму	вöл-i	вöв	юр	гырис-я.
potato-NOM	last year	be-PAST	horse-NOM	head-NOM	enormous-SUFFIX

'Last year, the potato was as big as a horse-head.'

b) The components *кодь* and *моз* which could be

  i) postpositions following a verb, noun or pronoun

Талун	Епимей	вöл-i	туримоль	кодь	гöрд.
today	Efim	be-PAST	cranberry-NOM	POSTPOS	red

'Today Efim was red like a cranberry'.

Дак	мый	нö	мыр	моз	пукал-ан
Now then,	why	PARTICLE	snag-NOM	POSTPOS	sit-SG2

'Why are you sitting like a snag?'

ii) suffixes following adjectives and adverbs

Зонка	сулал-i-с	торйöн-моз	отир-сянь.
boy-NOM	stand-PRAET-SG3	far away-SUFFIX	people-DELAT

The boy was standing a little far away from the crowd.

Яблок	вöл-i	гöрд-кодь.
apple-NOM	be-PAST	red-SUFFIX

The apple was a bit red.

c) The synonym particles: *топ, жыв, дзик* 'like'.

The differences between these 3 forms are in their distribution. They are found near nouns, pronouns, verbs and adverbs formed from a noun.

И ру-а-с,	**топ**	тулыс	конец-ын,	кöвьяс-и-с	чöскыт
air-INESS-DET	PARTICLE	spring-NOM	end-INESS	spread-PAST-SG3	good-NOM
дук.					
odour-NOM					

In the air spreaded an odour like the one at the end of spring.

Жыв эд	Лаврей-ыс, — думайт-ö	том	хозяйка.
like	Lavrej-DET think-SG3	young-NOM	housewife-NOM

'He is just like Lavrej – thought the young housewife.'

Старик,	**дзик** профессор,	юöрт-i-с….
old-NOM	PARTICLE professor-NOM	say-PRAET-SG3

'An old man, who was like a professor, said'

References

Abondolo, Danie (1998), The Uralic Languages. Routledge Language Family Descriptions. London—New York, Routledge.

Hausenberg, Anu-Reet (19998), Komi. In: Abondolo, The Uralic Languages. Routledge Language Family Descriptions. London—New York, Routledge

Lytkin, V. I. [Лыткин, В. И.] (1962), Коми-пермяцкий язык: Введение, фонетика, лексика и морфология / Под ред. и при соавт. проф. В. И. Лыткина. Кудымкар: Коми-перм. кн. изд-во, 1962. с. 340

Krivosekova, A. S. [Кривощекова А.С.] (1948), К вопросу о сопоставительных послелогах и прилагательных на -*а* в коми языках // Ученые записки ЛГУ. № 105. Серия востоковедческих наук. Вып. 2. Л., 1948. с. 250–256.

Krivosekova-Gantman, A. S. [Кривощекова-Гантман А.С.] (1956), К вопросу о категории имён прилагательных в коми-пермяцком языке // В помощь учителю. Кудымкар, 1956. с. 28–47.

Ilona Rauhala. The adjective attributes in Saami – form and agreement

My presentation concerns the adjective system of the Saami languages. The focus of this presentation is in the rich and complex attribute form system that is unique compared to other Finno-Ugric languages. I will compare the Saami system with the features of adjective categories in other Finno-Ugric languages. Even if this issue has been under discussion for many times, it is still quite uncertain, why and how the Saami system has developed to its current form. I will also consider the features of the adjective *buorre* 'good' that in attribute position acts differently from other adjectives in Saami.

Typical for adjective categories in Finno-Ugric languages is, that formally they do not differ much from substantives. Some adjectives can also be used as substantives, e. g. in Udmurt *keïyt* 'cold; coldness, frost' (Bartens 2000: 130). In Saami the adjective category is quite clear compared to substantives, but like in other Finno-Ugric languages, also in Saami it is possible to use an adjective as substantive, for example *nuorra* 'young': *Nuorat leat skuvllas.* 'The young are at school'.

Syntactically adjectives in Finno-Ugric languages occur in attribute and predicative position. In attribute position there is usually no agreement between the adjective and its head word. In Finnic languages there is agreement, and also in Saami there is partial agreement if the attribute is a cardinal number or a demonstrative or interrogative pronoun. Of adjectives the word *buorre* 'good' has also partial agreement, and also *bahá* 'bad' if it is in connection with *buorre.* (Collinder 1960: 249.)

Usually in Finno-Ugric languages the attribute form of an adjective is the same as the basic form. In Saami, however, the attribute form is usually very different from the predicative form, and the system of attribute forms is rich and complex. For example: *ruoksat* 'red sg.nom.' *rukses* 'red attr.' The system of attribute forms is very rich and complex, and this is quite unique system in Finno-Ugric languages.

Many of the attribute forms are formed wit suffix -*s*, e. g. *éáhppat* 'black', attr. *éáhppes*. Konrad Nielsen has suggested that this suffix could have developed from genitive forms with possessive suffix of the 3rd person singular (Nielsen 1933: 304), but Mikko Korhonen has

seen this suggestion unlikely (1981: 246). Pekka Sammallahti assumes that this -*s* would originally be Finno-Volgaic lative suffix (1998: 71). This seems to be a regular assumption for many suffixes in Finno-Ugric languages, and it should be well explained why this attribute suffix would have developed from the lative suffix -*s*.

The examples of this presentation are mostly from Northern Saami but the main features of the system are common to all Saami languages. I will concentrate on the earlier studies of this rich and complex attribute forms system of Saami, and also make notions of adjectives that have an agreement with their head words in attribute position, such as *buorre* < **para-* (Fi. *parempi* 'better', *paras* 'the best', MdE *paro*, MdM *para* 'good'). This **para* is quite a special adjective because it agrees with its head word in attribute position also in other Finno-Ugric languages than Saami, for example in Mordvin, where it can agree in numerus: *paro tejteĚ* 'a good girl', *part tejteĚǥ* 'good girls' (Collinder 1960: 249, Bartens 1999: 108). Since the descendants of the old adjective **para* have exceptional agreement with their head words also in other Finno-Ugric languages, the original position should be reconsidered: Was this **para* adjective at all? Could it have more in common with some other category, e. g. numerals? These are the questions I'd like to open in my presentation.

LITERATURE

BARTENS, RAIJA 1999: *Mordvalaiskielten rakenne ja kehitys*. SUST 232. Helsinki.

----------------------- 2000: *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys*. SUST 238. Vammala.

COLLINDER, BJÖRN 1960: *Comparative Grammar of the Uralic Languages*. Almqvist & Wiksell: Stockholm.

KORHONEN, MIKKO 1981: *Johdatus lapin kielen historiaan*. Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seuran toimituksia 370. Jyväskylä.

NIELSEN, KONRAD 1933: A note of the origin of attributive forms in Lapp. – *Liber semisaecularis Societatis Fenno-Ugricae*. SUST 67. S. 296–307. Helsinki

Fedor Rozhanskiy. The Fall and Rise of Partitive in Jõgõperä Votic[3]

In Votic the Partitive marker has several allomorphs, one of them (-*a/-ä*) does not contain a consonant. In Kattila Votic, when this Partitive marker is attached to the stems ending in -*a/-ä*, the resulting forms have a long final vowel, e.g. *päivā* 'day:PART' [Ariste 1968: 20]. Thus, words that have stems ending in -*a/-ä* and do not have consonant gradation, can have the same forms for Partitive and Genitive (i.e. *einā* 'hay:PART/GEN', *sẹnā* 'word:PART/GEN'). In Jõgõperä Votic, which is notable for a strong apocope, the Partitive forms of this type have

---

lost the length of the final vowel. In the dictionary of Jõgõperä Votic [Tsvetkov 1995] (presenting the data from the beginning of the 20th century) the corresponding forms are spelled as *einä* 'hay:PART', *sẹna* 'word:PART'. These forms differ from Genitive forms, which have a prolonged vowel (*einằ* 'hay:GEN', *sẹnằ* 'word:GEN'), but are the same as Nominative forms (*einä* 'hay:NOM', *sẹna* 'word:NOM'). In contemporary Jõgõperä Votic the apocope developed even further, and the Genitive forms also lost the length of the final vowel. Thus, in contemporary Jõgõperä Votic we would expect a very specific situation: in many nouns three grammatical cases (Nominative, Genitive and Partitive) would have the same form, i.e. *kana* 'hen:NOM/GEN/PART', *iha* 'sleeve:NOM/GEN/PART', *тила* 'bed:NOM/GEN/PART', *кала* 'fish:NOM/GEN/PART', *griba* 'mushroom:NOM/GEN/PART', *raha* 'money:NOM/GEN/PART', *tara* 'garden:NOM/GEN/PART'. This situation looks really weird: some most important grammatical oppositions (for example, the opposition between a complete and incomplete action) are going to be lost due to the similarity of the case forms. However, the data collected from the contemporary Votic speakers show that the merging of case forms is not so widespread as it could be. Many nouns of the discussed type have an alternative variant of Partitive with a geminated consonant in the stem: *kana ~ kanna* 'hen:PART', *iha ~ ihha* 'sleeve:PART', *тила ~ тилла* 'bed:PART', *кала ~ калла* 'fish:PART', *griba ~ gribba* 'mushroom:PART', *raha ~ rahha* 'money:PART', *tara ~ tarra* 'garden:PART'.

In my presentation I would like to discuss the reasons why and what for these forms with a geminated consonant have appeared.

There is no doubt that this gemination is the so-called "secondary gemination" existing in many dialects of Finnic languages (of Ingrian, Estonian, Finnish, Livonian). This type of gemination was not observed in central Votic dialects, but it exists in Eastern Votic and Lower Luga Votic varieties. In Jõgõperä Votic secondary gemination is found both in nouns and verbs, but it is not so widespread as in the neighboring Luuditsa dialect. However, according to [Tsvetkov 1995] the discussed class of nouns (with *-a/-ä* stem and without consonant gradation) did not have secondary gemination in Partitive forms (there are forms like *kana, iha* but not *kanna, ihha* in the dictionary). Thus, one can claim that gemination in these forms is a recent phenomenon.

The main problem of this recent gemination is that it contradicts the phonetic rules that define its appearance. There are different types of secondary gemination but in all cases it appears only before a long vowel (in [Tauli 1956: 147] the gemination is explained as a result of a more intense articulation of the consonant due to the following long vowel). However, in forms *kanna, ihha*, etc. the vowel after the geminate is short. The hypothesis that the final vowel shortened later than the gemination developed does not look reliable, since already in [Tsvetkov 1995] the Partitive forms end in a short vowel. From my point of view, there is only one good explanation of this phenomenon: gemination in the Partitive forms was borrowed from Ingrian language. The following facts support this hypothesis: a) there is gemination in the corresponding nouns in Ingrian; b) there was a mixed Votic-Ingrian population in Jõgõperä; c) secondary gemination is widespread in the neighboring Luuditsa variety, where contacts with Ingrians were even more intensive than in Jõgõperä; d) the variation of forms with and without gemination looks rather natural for the borrowed forms, but it would not suit to the situation when gemination developed due to some phonetic causes; e) the similarity between Lower Luga Votic (including Jõgõperä) and Ingrian gemination was already observed in previous research (e.g. [Viitso 1964]).

The conducted analysis allows making two important conclusions:

a) The forms with secondary gemination can appear in a language not only as a result of phonetic processes but also as a result of borrowing. Consequently, secondary geminates can arise not only before a long vowel.

b) A tendency to merge two different cases can be often observed in a language. However, a language can develop some new mechanisms to avoid this merging. Sometimes these new mechanisms can arise after the merging of cases is complete (like in Veps, where Elative and Ablative were merged with Inessive and Adessive correspondingly, but later a new Elative and Ablative developed). Sometimes (like in Votic) a new mechanism is introduced only for those types of stems, for which the old system of differentiation does not work any longer.

References

Ariste P. 1968. A grammar of the Votic language. Bloomington - The Hague (Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series, vol. 68).

Tauli V. 1956. Phonological tendencies in Estonian. København (Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Maddelelser, bind 36, nr. 1).

Tsvetkov D. 1995. Vatjan kielen joenperän murteen sanasto. Helsinki.

Viitso T.-R. 1964. Hilisgeminatsioonist vadja keeles // Töid läänemeresoome ja volga keelte alalt. Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia. Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut; Toim. E. Pajusalu-Adler. Tallinn, 24-36.

Jack Rueter. Paradigm defectivity in Erzya declination types

The Erzya language is a Volga-Finnic language with a close similarity to its neighbor Moksha. Both languages have three declension types: the indefinite, definite and possessive, which entails four different paradigm patterns for each of the languages. The language of focus, Erzya, has at least 14 distinct morphemes that can be affixed onto the head of complex phrasal constituents, (NPs, non-finite phrases and adpositional phrases), in the indefinite declension. This makes 15 cases with the addition of the zero morpheme, associated with the nominative singular – casus componens. These cases, however, are not attested equally in all three declension types, nor are they compatible with all stems. The following table will illustrate forms that are "+" attested; "(+)" attested but with range restrictions or ambiguity, and "NA" those not attested or not applicable.

Attestation of morphemes in the declination types of Erzya						
Morpheme	Case name		Indefinite	Definite		
				Determinate		Possessive
				Plural	Singular	
Ø	Nominative	SG	+	NA	+	(+)
		PL	+	+	NA	(+)
-Oń	Genitive		+	+	+	(+)
-Neń	Dative		+	+	+	(+)
-DO	Ablative		+	+	+	+
-sO	Inessive		+	+	+	+
-stO	Elative		+	+	+	+
-S	Illative		+	+	NA	+
-Ov	Lative		+	+	NA	NA
-ks	Translative		+	+	+	+
-Ga	Prolative		+	+	+	+
-ška	Comparative		+	+	+	+
-VTOmO	Abessive		+	+	+	+
-Nek	Comitative		+	+	NA	(+)
-O	Locative		+	NA	NA	(+)
-Ne	Temporalis		+	NA	NA	NA

Hypothesized factors: (i) morphological ordering and phonology; (ii) range; (iii) semantic notions; (iv) WO disambiguation for syntactic homonymy, and (v) discourse roles.

(i) 4 morphological ordering strategies in 4 different ranges "{}":

(1) stem (+ PL) {INDEF.NOM};   stem + case {INDEF.OBL};   stem + PL + DEF.PL + case {DEF.PL};
(2) stem (+ case) + deictic marker {DEF.SG|POSS}.

(ii) Range restrictions see limitations on core cases in adpositions and non-finites while some non-core cases are limited in nouns.

(iii) Semantic notions contribute to incompatibility in morpheme combinations, i.e. affix + affix and stem + affix:

(1) Grammatical number (e.g. [DEF.PL] + [NOM.SG]; [DEF.SG] + [NOM.PL]);
(2) Entities[±CONCRETE] + abstract relations + definite/deictic marking (e.g. [LAT], [LOC], [TEMP], [COM])

(iv) Word order: Does SO ordering contribute to disambiguation of nominative/genitive homonymy?

(v) Discourse role and function incompatibility, e.g. coordinate versus subordinate access + primary arguments in ([POSS] + [DAT]).

Andrey Shluinsky. Locative cases of the dual number of nouns in Forest Enets: a case study of 'postpositional cases'[4]

The goal of the talk is to clarify the situation regarding the locative cases of the dual number in Forest Enets (FE). It has been reported many times (see, e.g. Tereščenko 1974, Mikola 2004:104) that Northern Samoyedic languages have no synthetic forms of dual locative cases (dative, ablative, locative, prolative), whereas there are corresponding singular and plural forms. These dual case forms are claimed to be built analytically using postpositions which serve functionally in the same way as synthetic case markers. However, based on the existing literature this claim seems to be true for Nenets, which has only the postpositional stem *nʲa-* for the dual locative cases (see Salminen 1997:118), but not for Nganasan, for which a variety of postpositions used in this context is reported (see Tereščenko 1979:73). No special research on this topic has been conducted previously for Enets, although Tereščenko (1966:442–443) reports the forms *neʔ* for dative, *nen* for locative, *nez* for ablative and *neɔn* for prolative, and Prokofʼev (1937:80–83) describes the same forms as case affixes.

During field research on this topic, three issues were checked.

First, given that Enets is a strongly endangered language, it was checked whether the constructions in question exist in contemporary FE: both the dual number itself and complex constructions tend to disappear early.

Eliciting grammatical data with speakers of FE showed that although sometimes they avoided building the constructions in question, generally the postpositional forms of the dual number of the

---

[4] [1] The following abbreviations are used: 1 – 1st person, ABL – ablative, AOR – 'indefinite tense', DAT – dative, DU – dual, NOM – nominative, OBL – oblique cases, PL – plural, PL.POSS – stem for plural possessive forms, PS – postposition, S – 'subjective' conjugation, SG – singular.

locative cases were readily produced, cf. in (1a-c) the dative forms for singular (1a), plural (1b) and dual (1c) number:

(1) a. kasa-xa-nʲ   ede-ma-zʔ

        sibling-DAT.SG-OBL.SG.1SG   be_glad-AOR-1SG.S[5]

        'I was glad to (see) my brother'.

b.   kaʃi-xi-nʲ   ede-ma-zʔ

        sibling.PL.POSS-DAT.PL-PL/DU.1SG   be_glad-AOR-1SG.S

        'I was glad to (see) my brothers'.

c.   kasa-xu-nʲ   ne-ʔ   ede-ma-zʔ

        sibling-DU-PL/DU.1SG   PS.DU-DAT   be_glad-AOR-1SG.S

        'I was glad to (see) my (two) brothers'.

Examples of the analytic dual locative cases in natural texts are not numerous, but still exist, and this strongly confirms the genuineness of these constructions.

Second, the morphological features of the postpositions that have the function of the markers of the dual locative cases were analyzed in order to see if there are any arguments to describe them as postpositions / analytical markers or as case affixes. There is strong evidence that the markers in question have significantly more phonological and morphological independence than affixes.

The phonological independence can be shown by the following facts. First, between the form of the dual number and the postpositional markers of the locative cases a short pause is possible. Second, the postpositional markers of the locative cases can have an independent stress. Both options are absolutely impossible for the standard case affixes that are used in the other parts of the case-number paradigm.

The morphological independence becomes apparent in coordinated constructions. When two nouns in a locative case of the dual number are coordinated, the postpositional case marker may be used only once for the whole coordinated construction, as in (2). This is not possible for the standard cases affixes in FE.

---

[5] The following abbreviations are used: 1 – 1st person, ABL – ablative, AOR – 'indefinite tense', DAT – dative, DU – dual, NOM – nominative, OBL – oblique cases, PL – plural, PL.POSS – stem for plural possessive forms, PS – postposition, S – 'subjective' conjugation, SG – singular.

(2)　　mod^j　bunki-xu-n^j　　　　te-xu-n^j　　　　　　　　ne-ʔ

　　　　I　　dog-DU-PL/DU.1SG　　reindeer-DU-PL/DU.1SG　　PS.DU-DAT

tɔxa-zʔ

get_used-1SG.S

'I got used to my (two) dogs and to my (two) reindeer'.

I am not aware of any facts that would, on the contrary, provide phonological or morphological evidence that the postpositions used to form the dual locative cases have any features that would distinguish them from other postpositions.

Third, potential variation between different postpositions used to fill the functional slot of the locative cases of the dual number was investigated. I checked if it is correct to make a statement about a functional correspondence in FE of the singular and plural locative cases on the one hand and of the dual combinations with *ne*-postpositions on the other hand. According to my field data, the distribution of the postpositional dual locative cases is exactly the same as the distribution of the synthetic singular and plural locative cases, and there is no variation between different postpositions used to build these forms for the dual number. For example, in (1c) and (2) the dual postpositional dative is used to mark the arguments of the verbs that determine lexically this case frame and combine also with singular and plural dative. In (3a) the lexically determined plural ablative is used, whereas in (3b) the postpositional dual ablative is used in the same context.

(3) a.　bunki-xit　　　sɛju-j　　　　　　kan^ji

　　　　dog-ABL.PL　　heart-NOM.SG.1SG　　leave.3SG.S

　　　　'I was frightened of the dogs (lit. My heart left from the dogs)'.

b.　　bunki-xiʔ　ne-z　　　　　sɛju-j　　　　　　　kan^ji

　　　　dog-DU　　PS.DU-ABL　　heart-NOM.SG.1SG　　leave.3SG.S

　　　　'I was frightened of the (two) dogs (lit. My heart left from the (two) dogs)'.

Summarizing, I show that the description of the postpositional dual locative cases in FE as analytical case forms built with postpositions is correct, however paradoxical this may seem. The forms in focus indeed consist of two independent phonological words and therefore are built analytically with a postposition that is an auxiliary element. At the same time, these analytical constructions fill the same functional slot as corresponding synthetic singular and plural forms and therefore are a part of the basic case-number paradigm of the FE nouns.

References

Prokof'ev, Georgij N. 1937. Èneckij (enisejsko-samoedskij dialekt) [Enets (Yenissey-Samoyed dialect)]. In: Prokof'ev, Georgij N. (ed.). *Jazyki i pis'mennost' narodov Severa.* Vol. 1. Moscow – Leningrad: Učpedgiz. Pp. 75-90.

Tereščenko, Natal'ja M. 1966. Èneckij jazyk [Enets]. In: Lytkin, Vasilij I., & Klara E. Majtinskaja (eds.). *Jazyki narodov SSSR.* Vol. 3. *Finno-ugorskie i samodijskie jazyki.* Moscow: Nauka. Pp. 438-457.

Tereščenko, Natal'ja M. 1974. Sklonenie v samodijskix jazykax [Declension in Samoyedic languages]. In: Skorik, Petr Ja., et al. (eds.). *Sklonenie v paleoaziatskix i samodijskix jazykax.* Leningrad: Nauka. Pp. 33-50.

Tereščenko, Natal'ja M. 1974. *Nganasanskij jazyk* [Nganasan]. Leningrad: Nauka.

Mikola, Tibor. 2004. *Studien zur Geschichte der samojedischen Sprachen.* Studia uralo-altaica 45. Szeged: SzTE Finnisch-Ugrisches Institut.

Salminen, Tapani. 1997. *Tundra Nenets Inflection.* Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Anne Tamm. The inventory of the Uralic cases

Uralic languages are typically characterized by rich case systems with approximately 10 members, and many have case systems of approximately 15 or 20 cases. According to Iggesen (2007), there are 24 languages with more than 10 cases; five of those listed are Uralic (Erzya Mordvin, Estonian, Finnish, Hungarian, and Udmurt).[6]

Across sources, one can find lists that state the number of cases. Erzya Mordvin has 12 and Moksha Mordvin 13 cases (Zaicz 1998: 192-194), Udmurt 16 cases (Riese 1998: 268), Komi has 18 cases (Riese 1998: 268), Komi Permyak has 17 cases (Lytkin et al. 1962: 184), Tundra Nenets 7 (Salminen 1998: 537), Kamas 7 (Szimoncsics 1998: 586), Nganasan 8-11 (Helimski 1998: 496), Selkup 13 (Helimski 1998: 560-561). However, the criteria applied for casehood differ across Uralic sources, and it is always worthwhile clarifying them before citing the number of cases for each language. Here is a list to consider concerning the possible reasons for reaching a different result in each particular language.

Productivity. One of the differences concerns productivity, most accounts do not include the nonproductive cases such as vocative. Other sources explicitly state the status of the cases in terms of their productivity. For instance, Võro is described as having 13 productive and 3 nonproductive cases (Iva 2007: 41), Eastern Mari with 8 productive and 3 nonproductive cases (Kangasmaa-Minn 1998: 226). However, others don't; moreover, the criteria for 'productive' may vary as well.

---

[6] The following languages have more than 10 cases in WALS: Awa Pit, Basque, Brahui, Chukchi, Epena Pedee, Estonian, Evenki, Finnish, Gooniyandi, Hamtai, Hungarian, Hunzib, Ingush, Kayardild, Ket, Lak, Lezgian, Martuthunira, Mordvin (Erzya), Nez Perce, Nunggubuyu, Pitjantjatjara, Toda, Udmurt (Iggesen 2008)

Grammatical analysis. Grammatical analysis matters as well, since the distinction between clitics, inflection, derivation, and postpositions is not uniformly treated. Veps with its various recently agglutinated postpositional cases is a challenging example (Grünthal 2005, Tikka 1992), and it has been argued that most of the Hungarian 18 cases are rather postpositions or adverbs (Kiefer 1987, Spencer 2008, Surányi 2009, de Groot 2009). In most instances, several factors combine, as in Votic or Veps. The Votic dialect reported by Tsvetkov (2008:27) has an inventory identical to that of Estonian, consisting of 14 cases; the additional unproductive exessive and instructive, and the accusative object case are recorded in the dialect studied by Ariste (Ariste 1968: 17).

Case syncretism. Variation in registering the number of cases occurs due to case syncretism. Many languages, especially the Finnic ones, have an object case that may be referred to as "accusative" in the system, but they have no clear morphological accusative formant in the present-day variants; therefore, the Finnic cases are typically treated differently. The variation of the number of cases int he Sámi languages is due to this factor. Sami languages are described having systems with 6-9 cases (Inari, Pite, Skolt Sámi 9 or 8, Southern Sámi 8 or 7, Lule Sámi 7, Northern Sami 7 or 6 (Wikipedia).

Dialect chosen. The number of cases varies considerably in the dialects of Khanty (3-11, including the fact that the alignment system has variants, e.g. the Khanty Vakh dialect has an ergative-accusative alignment) and Mansi (6-7) (Honti 1998: 343) and some sources do not state the exact dialect.

Official variant chosen. Political minority status may result in a different number of cases in one language; for instance, Meänkieli has two cases less than Standard Finnish, which has 15 cases (VISK § 81).

Diachronic perspectives. Since the Uralic languages are changing, their case systems are changing as well. Some cases disappear or become non-productive, postpositions may develop into cases.

This talk presents the inventory of the Uralic cases, combined with an overview of the results of the workshop.

Gabriella Tóth. The interpretation of Case on Secondary Predicates in Hungarian and in Finnish

Introduction: In a number of languages secondary predicates have case. In Russian the case on secondary predicates is idiosyncratic in the sense that it is very much influenced by the individual properties of the main verb in the sentence. In Hungarian and in Finnish case on secondary predicates are more regular, less dependent on the verb. In recent years it has been argued that there is a functional projection that dominates the lexical projection of Small Clauses (SCs). As in Romance languages the secondary predicate agrees in number and gender with its understood subject, several linguists (Chomsky (1995), Dalmi (2003)) have assumed that the functional projection that contains the number and gender features is Agreement Phrase (AgrP), while Hoekstra and Mulder (1990) and Torrego and Pesetsky (2003) argue that the functional projection contains temporal information, the reason while they labelled it Tense Phrase (TP). This talk makes an attempt show that the content of functional projection though it is temporal, it expresses aspectual information. Therefore we call it Aspectual Phrase (AspP). It will be argued that in languages like Hungarian and

Finnish the case on the secondary predicate is an overt morphological reflex of temporal aspectual reading.

The Data: In Hungarian and in Finnish SCs bear different cases depending on whether they are complement SCs or resultative SCs. In Hungarian and in Finnish complement SCPs bear dative and essive case as in (2) and (4), respectively, while resultative SCPs bear translative case as in (1) and (3).

(1) Hän$_j$ nauroi   [itsensä$_j$ kipeä ksi].   **Finnish**

     he-NOM laughed   himself-ACC   sick TRANS

     'He laughed himself sick.'

(2) Pidä-n [poikia   älykkäi-nä].

     hold-1SG boy-PL-PART intelligent-PL-ESS

     'I consider these boys intelligent.'   '

(3) János piros**ra**$_i$ festette [az ajtót t$_i$.]   **Hungarian**

     János read-TRANS painted the wall-acc

     'János painted the wall read.'

(4)   János boldog**nak**$_i$ tart-ott-am   [Mari-t t$_i$].

      János   happy-DAT hold-PAST-1SG   Mary-ACC

      'I did not consider Mary happy.'

The Proposal: The temporal ordering of the SC (complement small clause) and the main predicate is either contemporary or the state encoded in the SC temporally follows the event expressed in the main predicate (resultative clauses). It is argued that the functional projection of the SC is AsP whose head, that contains the case of the secondary predicate is responsible for the temporal ordering of the two (sub-)events represented by the main predicate and the SC. The case on the SCP in these languages reflects this temporal relation. The dative in Hungarian and the essive in Finnish express that the event of the main predicate and the state of the SCP is temporally contemporary, the sentence is imperfective. While the translative in both languages renders the event of the main predicate anterior to the state expressed by SC, and the sentence is perfective. Chomsky (1995) argues that AsP^0 has interpretable tense feature. AsP^0 also has uninterpretable φ-features and uninterpretable case feature valued and deleted by matching features on some phrase when the phase is transferred to the semantic interface (Chomsky (2000)). In the languages discussed here the SCP seems to be morphologically marked for aspect.

Maria Usacheva. Spatial Case Meanings in Samoyedic Languages

Uralic cases are famous for a very important role which spatial meanings play in them. The significance of these meanings is reflected, for example, in the fact that they are very often grammaticalized, i.e. that in many cases they are obligatory expressed either by adpositions or by cases. Uralic languages in general demonstrate two ways of such grammaticalization. First, a given spatial meaning can be expressed by a declined postposition which then becomes a case itself. Perhaps the most striking example of this kind are Komi languages. Some dialects of them have developed an additional system of spatial cases – approximative II and others (see [Nekrasova 2002]) - which 35 years ago were still considered to be postpositions (see [Batalova 1975]). Thus, the process of grammaticalization of declined postpositions into new spatial cases is very active in some Uralic languages. However, there is another possibility to express spatial meanings by means of grammar. For instance, some "old" cases can develop new spatial meanings. To this type of languages belong, for example, Nenets and Nganasan. In this languages the dative and the instrumental cases have locative functions:

(1) Nganasan [Tereshenko 1979, p. 297][7]:

депту-"турку-Ø	бы-тє	ђљмтў-"љ-"
goose-PL	lake-NOM.SG	water-DAT.SG sit-PRAES-3PL

'Geese sat <u>on the water</u> of the lake.'

(2) Nganasan [Tereshenko 1979, p. 87]:

биє-тєну	турку-тєну	комбу-"	ани"ка-"
wind-LOC.SG	lake-INSTR/LOC.SG	wave-NOM.PL	big-NOM.PL

'By wind there are big waves <u>on the lake</u>.'

(3) Forest Nenets, [Koshkareva 2005, pp. 135-136]:

касса	ню-Ø-й	нюча	текуша-н	тана-й-"
man	child-NOM.SG-POSS.1SG:SG	small	pine-DAT.SG	climb-REFL-REFL.3SG

 'My son climbed a small <u>pine</u>'.

(4) Forest Nenets [Jazyki 2003, p. 77]:

тяха-њ	гањк-хана	њымты-Ø	тайна	тягња-Ø
river-GEN.SG	bank-INSTR/LOC.SG	sit-3SG	there	cry-3SG

'(He) is sitting <u>on a bank</u> of the river and is crying there.'

On the other hand, Nenets and Nganasan have very "active" spatial cases demonstrating also non-spatial meanings, marking actants of some verbs and being involved in distributive and comparative constructions:

(5) Nganasan [Tereshenko 1979, p. 92]:

мыђ	тамтŭ-дŭо-му"	ємє-Ø	кубу-Ø	сєђхоляђкє-Ø
1PL.NOM	buy-PST-1PL	this-NOM.SG	fell-NOM.SG	five-NOM.SG

<u>баса-мєны</u>

<u>rouble-PROL.SG</u>

'We bought this fell <u>for five roubles</u>.'

(6) Forest Nenets [Koshkareva 2005, p. 190]:

чики	њашкай-м-т-ы	нешањ-а'ай-Ø	<u>дева'ко-мна</u>
this	child-ACC.SG-POSS.2SG:SG	human-AUG-NOM.SG	<u>orphan-PROLAT.SG</u>

пади-г-май-туњ

nickname-INCH-PP-SG.3.O:3PL.S

'People nicknamed this child <u>Devaku (orphan)</u>.'

(7) Forest Nenets [Koshkareva 2005, p. 190]:

њоп	нянь-куйи-Ø	я"гя	матан	њамогъ-щту-ту'
one	bread-DIM-NOM.SG	day	during	eat-HAB-SG.3.O:3PL.S

нянь	<u>пегя-куги-мана</u>
bread	<u>piece-CHAT-PROLAT.SG</u>

'(They) eat one piece of bread during the day, one person eats one piece.'

(8) Nganasan [Tereshenko 1979, p. 89]:

ђŭлясє-Ø	<u>тā%%-гєтє</u>	мерєгє-й"	чалиті-ті-Ø
wolf-NOM.SG	<u>domestic reindeer-ABL.SG</u>	fast-GEN.PL	run-PRAES-3SG

'A wolf runs faster than <u>a reindeer</u>.'

Futhermore, in Nenets and Nganasan cases with locative meanings are involved in some aspectual oppositions. Thus, for example, example (9) is telic, and (10) is atelic:

(9) Nganasan [Tereshenko 1979, p. 237]:

бєну-дўо-де Ø	нўо-Ø	<u>ма-тє</u>	кунда-"а-Ø
get.tired-PST-PP_{PERF}-NOM.SG	child-NOM.SG	<u>tent-DAT.SG</u>	sleep-praes-3sg

'A tired child fell asleep <u>in the tent</u>.'

(10) Nganasan [Tereshenko 1979, p. 237]:

бєну-дўо-де-Ø	нўо-Ø	<u>ма-тєну</u>	кундуа-ту
get.tired-PST-PP_{PERF}-NOM.SG	child-NOM.SG	<u>tent-INSTR/LOC.SG</u>	sleep-SG.3.S:3SG.O

'A tired child is sleeping <u>in the tent</u>.'

Finally, it is an interesting fact that the situation in a closely related Selkup language is quite different . This language has quite a rich system of spatial cases including locative, allative, illative etc. (see [Kuznetsova et al. 1980]), so the core cases "have no need" to express spatial meanings. Thus, from this point of view Selkup is more like Komi languages than Nenets and Nganasan. On the other hand, Selkup demonstrates the "internal vs external" case opposition (having illative case vs allative) which also arises in Nganasan (dative I vs dative II – see [Tereshenko 1979, pp. 83-84]).

So, we can see that Samoyedic languages demonstrate a heterogenious picture of spatial meanings expression. We are planning to present this picture from the synchronic point of view and to analyse its origin diachronically.

References:

Batalova R.M. Komi-permjatskaja dialektologija. Moskva, 1975.

Jazyki korennyh narodov Sibiri. Vypusk 7. Ekspedicionnyje materialy. Chast'. 2. Obraztsy tekstov na lesnom dialekte nenetskogo jazyka. Novosibirsk, 2003.

Koshkareva N.B. Ocherki po sintaksisu lesnogo dialekta nenetskogo jazyka. Novosibirsk, 2005.

Kuznetsova A.I, Helimskij E.A., Gruskina E.V..Ocherki po sel'kupskomu jazyku (tazovskij dialekt). Moskva, 1980.

Nekrasova G.A. Sistema L-ovyh padezhej v permskih jazykah: proishozhdenije i semantika. Syktyvkar, 2002.

Tereshenko N.M. Nganasanskij jazyk. Leningrad, 1979.

Susanna Virtanen. Remarks on use of accusative and lative cases in Eastern Mansi

My aim in this paper is to discuss the main functions of accusative and lative cases in the Middle Konda dialect of Mansi, which belongs to the Eastern dialects. I've chosen these two cases as target of my paper, because both accusative and lative appear in transitive constructions and are used for expressing similar semantic functions. So far, there haven't been comprehensive studies on the usage area of accusative or the distribution of ditransitive structures in Mansi. In contrast to the earlier grammars and other studies, I approach the theme from a functional point of view.

In comparison with other Finno-Ugric languages, Mansi case system is frequently scarce: there are only six cases: nominative, accusative, locative, lative, ablative and instrumental. In other words, there's for example only one local case paradigm. Accusative has disappeared from the Northern dialects.

Accusative
In the Eastern dialects accusative endings are Sg –*mø*; Du –*iimø, ägmø*; Pl –*tmø* (Kulonen 2007: 45). Accusative is used for marking direct object, but only in a restricted area. Accusative marked direct object can appear either in monotransitive or ditransitive clause. In a ditransitive clause it often represents R-argument, while dative shift is very frequent in Mansi.

Focal or indefinite objects are unmarked. Topical and definite objects are always verb marked, and appearance of zero anaphora (verb agreement alone) is among highly topical objects very frequent: an accusative nominal object constituent is used only when the object needs to be specified or emphasized. Accusative marked object is always accompanied by objective verb conjugation.

Direct object in monotransitive clause:
tøtø-kar-mø tø äln-iiløm
[that-guy-ACC PARTIC kill-PRS-SG<3SG]
"I'll just kill that guy."

kit pol-säm-mø juw-töäjøpø-s-öä, äk pol-säm-mø juw-tåt-iitø
[two berry-ACC PREF-eat- PRS-DU<3SG one berry-ACC   PREF bring-PRS-SG<3SG]
"He ate two of the berries and brought the third one home."

Direct object in ditransitive clause (secondary object):
om loåw-goåm neen jorpøng-øl
[I order-PRS-DU<1SG you-ACC victim-INSTR]
"I'll order you your victims."

Objects in possessed position can be marked either with possessive suffix alone or with possessive accusative, which is a combination of possessive suffix and accusative case ending.

Possessive suffix:
öäsy-øn tøg wot-ääløn!
 [grandfather-PxSg2Sg here call-IMP-Sg<2Sg]
"Call your grandfather to come here!"

Possessive accusative:
öäsy-tääm wot-äx° pümt-øs-tø:
[grandfather -AccPossSg3Sg call-INF start-Prs-Sg<3Sg]
"He started calling his grandfather."

Lative
Mansi lative has also been called *dative* or even *dative-lative*, because it covers both the functions of lative and dative. In my paper, I'll talk about *lative*.

Lative is a directional case and its case endings are Sg –*(ø)n, -ään, -nø*; Du -*öänø, -öän, -ägøn*; Pl-*tnø* (Kulonen 2007: 45). One of lative's functions is that of expression of direction, but it's also used in more dative-like functions: for marking indirect object or agent of a passive clause.

Expression of direction:
øtø mõõ-nø toont loåw-s-øløm, öätøm-ään tøxt-øx° pånst-äx°
[this land-LAT in.order.to tell-PRET-Sg<1Sg people-PxPl2Sg feed-INF raise.up-INF]
"I told you to come here to feed and maintain your people."

Indirect object:
om-nöän pøl eep-øng öänø, eep-øng töös öät wott-aat
[I-LAT steam-ADJ bowl steam-ADJ plate PARTICNEG put-PRS-3PL]
"They don't give (in sacrifice) any steaming bowl, any steaming plate for me either"

Agent of passive clause:
jäløp-woj-nø pøløtöäl-øwt
[bear-LAT frighten-PASS-prs-3PL]
"They were frightened by the bear."

Abbreviations: ACC – accusative, AccPoss – Possessive accusative. ADJ- adjective, Du – dual, IMP – imperative, INF – infinitive, LAT- lative, PARTIC – particle, PARTICNEG – negation particle, PASS – passive, PL- Plural, PREF – prefix, PRET- Preterity, PRS – Pesent time, Px – Possessive suffix, Sg – Singular,

References:
KULONEN, ULLA-MAIJA 1989: The Passive in Ob-Ugrian. SUST 203. Helsinki.
KULONEN, ULLA-MAIJA 2007: Itämansin kielioppi ja tekstejä. SUS. Helsinki.
KÁLMÁN, BÉLA 1989: Chrestomathia Vogulica. Harmadik kiadás. Tankönyvkiadó. Budapest.

SKRIBNIK, ELENA 2001: Pragmatic structuring in Northern Mansi. T. (Hg.): Congressus Nonus Internationalis Fenno-ugristarum. 2. Pars VI. Dissertationes sectionum: Linguistica III. Tartu. P. 222 - 239.

Katja Västi. Agentlike Meaning of the Element in Allative in Finnish Verbless Constructions

In Finnish, an argument in allative case denoting an animate referent usually functions as a RECIPIENT (1), BENEFICIARY (2), or EXPERIENCER (3).

(1) ***kuuluisuuks-i-lle***   *lähete-tä-än*   *ihailijakirje-i-tä*

   celebrity-PL-ALL   send-PASS-PERSON   fan.letter-PL-PRT

   'Fan letters are sent **to celebrities**.'

(2) *piirs-i-n*   ***häne-lle***   *karta-n*

   draw-PST-1SG   **(s)he-ALL**   map-ACC

   'I drew **her/him** a map.'

(3) ***papi-lle***   *tul-i*   *hiki*

   priest-ALL   come-PST.3SG sweat

   '**A/the priest** began to sweat.' (lit. 'To a/the priest came sweat.')

In verbless constructions, an element in allative denoting an animate referent can function in construction-initial position as an active participant as well. In my data, which consists of verbless constructions in newspaper headlines, I have found two different types of active participants in allative that I call PURCHASER (4) and ACTOR (5).

(4) ***Varka-i-lle***   *tietokone-i-ta*   *Vammala-ssa*

   thief-PL-ALL computer-PL-PRT   Vammala-INE

   '**Thieves stole** (etc.) computers in Vammala.' (lit. 'Computers **to thieves** in Vammala.')

(5) ***Maalivahti***   ***Martin Brodeuri-lle***   *maali*

   goalkeeper   **Martin Brodeur-ALL**   goal

   '**Goalkeeper Martin Brodeur scored** a goal.' (lit. '**To goalkeeper Martin Brodeur** a goal.')

Neither PURCHASER nor ACTOR cannot be seen representing a special participant role of the RECIPIENT, BENEFICIARY, or EXPERIENCER argument: these latter are relatively passive participants that do not initiate events, whereas these former can be seen as initiators of events they participate in. PURCHASER transfers or creates something into her/his own domain of possession; ACTOR achieves a result by acting in some special way (defined by lexical semantics of the arguments and world knowledge).

Goal-marking morphemes, like Finnish allative, are known to be very polysemous. Sally Rice and Kaori Kabata (2007) conducted a wide survey on functions that goal-marking morphemes, i.e. allative markers, have in 44 genetically and areally diverse languages. They found 33 different senses for allative markers, but only in the ERGATIVE usage (6) is there an agentive participant coded with allative – and it is found in a single ergative language (Ika). Thus there is no real equivalent for the source-oriented allatives of my data in Rice & Kabata's taxonomy, but PURCHASER and ACTOR seem unexpected: since there are no agentive participants coded with allative in other accusative languages (nor, virtually, in ergative languages), one would not expect to find them in Finnish either.

(6)   ***tigri-se?***   *an-ga-na*

       jaguar-ALL   REF-eat-DIST

       '**A jaguar** ate it.'   (Frank 1990: 37, quoted in Rice & Kabata 2007: 510, boldfacing mine.)

How can the meaning of the strongly goal-oriented allative extend to cover the active source-oriented participants as well? How are the active meanings motivated? Why can only some animate participants coded with allative be interpreted as active? Minimally, the verbless constructions in my data include only a construction-initial element in allative case and an element in nominative or partitive case (THEME argument); occasionally, the constructions include adjuncts as well. Thus the meaning of the construction is to a large extent based on the interplay between the element in allative and the THEME: there may be no other elements from which the meaning can be inferred. To solve these problems I look at THEME arguments and investigate their lexical meaning in relation to the lexical meaning of the argument in

allative they occur with, i.e., I try to find semantic frames that make it possible to construe an active participant role for allative. I expect the THEME arguments occuring with ACTORS to contain especially deverbal nouns, whereas the THEME arguments occurring with PURCHASERS probably cover mostly nouns that refer to relatively concrete items. Active components of the meaning of the Finnish allative, then, are tightly connected with pragmatics and world knowledge.

References

Frank, Paul (1990) *Ika Syntax*. Studies in the Languages of Colombia 1. Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington Publications in Linguistics 94. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.

Rice, Sally & Kabata, Kaori (2007) Crosslinguistic grammaticalization patterns of the allative. *Linguistic Typology* 11: 451–514.