# Degrammaticalization in North Saami: Development of adpositions, adverbs and a free lexical noun from inflectional and derivational suffixes

*Jussi Ylikoski (Tromsø)*

**Abstract**

This article discusses degrammaticalization in North Saami. Globally, one of the best known examples of degrammaticalization is the development of the North Saami adposition and adverb *haga* 'without' from an earlier abessive case suffix. This article builds on earlier studies by examining *haga* in greater detail and by relating the development of *haga* to its cognates *dagi* and *dagá* in Lule Saami. The history of the Saami abessive sheds light to the understanding of the North Saami morpheme *-naga*, a derivational suffix most likely originating from the Proto-Saami essive **-na*, which in turn goes back to the Proto-Uralic locative case suffix. It is shown that denominal "contaminative" adjectives such as *varranaga* 'stained with blood' and *gáfenaga* 'stained with coffee' have given rise both to the postposition *naga* 'stained with' and, most importantly, to the noun *naga* 'stain' which mainly occurs in compound nouns such as *varranaga(t)* 'blood stain(s)' and *gáfenaga(t)* 'coffee stain(s)' in the Guovdageaidnu dialect of North Saami. Emergence of a concrete content word such as this appears to be the very first attested example of a degrammaticalization chain going all the way from an affix to a lexical noun.

**Keywords**: case markers, degrammaticalization, derivational suffixes, essive case, North Saami

## 1.Introduction

While *tundra* (← Kildin Saami *tundar* 'highlands; tundra', cognate to North Saami *duottar* id.) is probably the most widespread international Saami loan word, by far the best known grammatical morpheme discussed in general linguistics seems to be the North Saami adposition *haga* 'without'. From a purely synchronic perspective, *haga* is a quite ordinary adposition. However, it has received considerable attention because of the peculiarity of its origin as a Proto-Saami abessive case suffix that only later became degrammaticalized into a free morpheme, a postposition that functions as an adverb and as a preposition as well.

There are relatively few reliable instances of degrammaticalization, "a composite change whereby a gram in a specific context gains in autonomy or substance on more than one linguistic level (semantics, morphology, syntax, or phonology)" (Norde 2009: 120). The present paper aims to add to our understanding of such processes in general, and of the potential of Saami languages to further contribute to degrammaticalization studies in particular. While the following sections do provide additional remarks on North Saami *haga* (extensively discussed by Nevis 1986 and Norde 2009: 207–209 *et passim*), the main focus is on its near-namesake *naga*, a morpheme whose synchrony and diachrony has remained unnoticed outside Saami linguistics. As the morphemes *haga* and *naga* seem to go back to Proto-Saami abessive and essive case suffixes and ultimately to the Proto-Uralic abessive and locative, respectively, the conclusions regarding their historical development are of equal interest to general Uralistics as well.

The structure of the paper is as follows: After brief preliminary remarks about degrammaticalization and its study (Section 2), Section 3 presents a commented overview of how North Saami through its *haga* 'without' has contributed to the study of degrammaticalization during recent decades. More detailed discussion in Section 4 focuses on a completely different morpheme, *(-)naga*, with a number of its functions both as a bound and as a free morpheme: After a presentation of the suffix *-naga* and its assumed origins in Section 4.1, Section 4.2 provides an overview of the functions of the element *naga* as two different adverbs (*naga* 'in a tipsy state', *nagage* '(not) at all'), as a marginal postposition with the meaning 'stained with' and as a noun for 'stain'. After the predominantly synchronic description in Section 4 (largely based on Ylikoski 2014b, 2014c, 2015), Section 5 scrutinizes the situation as a relatively exceptional instance of degrammaticalization of a derivational affix into free morphemes – a postposition and even a free lexical noun (Section 5.1). After a so-called parameter analysis of the development in question (Section 5.2), Section 5.3 seeks for possible language-internal explanations to the degrammaticalization of the morphemes *haga* and *naga* in North Saami. Finally, Section 6 summarizes the contribution of the North Saami morphemes to our understanding of degrammaticalization in general and to our understanding of the history of Uralic case suffixes in particular.

Majority of the data and information comes from authentic (in part translated) texts made available by the SIKOR corpus at UiT The Arctic University of Norway, various other texts, as well as observations from daily commu-

nication, discussions with my native speaker colleagues, students and other acquaintances, and my own non-native intuition of the language.[1]

## 2. Theoretical background

A central concept in the present study is *degrammaticalization*, a notion felicitously characterized as "the ugly duckling of grammaticalization studies" by Norde (2009: 1). It is needless to repeat the history of the concept here (see, e.g., Norde 2009: 1ff., 106ff.; Viti 2015; Willis 2015), but in a nutshell, it is possible to characterize degrammaticalization as processes that can, in one way or another, be characterized as linguistic changes that seem to be in opposition to the processes known as grammaticalization. Put concretely, instances of claimed degrammaticalization are commonly seen as apparent counterexamples to the so-called unidirectionality hypothesis which states that inflectional and derivational affixes arise – through an intermediate clitic phase – from grammatical words that ultimately tend to go back to lexical words (Hopper & Traugott 2003).

Coined by Lehmann (2002, 2015 [1982]) in 1982 to refer to something that was not supposed to exist, the notion of degrammaticalization has gained increasing interest and attention during the past decades, a major milestone being Norde's (2009) monograph *Degrammaticalization* that is the most comprehensive coverage of the history of degrammaticalization studies and their reception among linguists. In addition to this, she presents a complete framework for dissecting possible instances of degrammaticalization to its parts. In scrutinizing virtually all sides of earlier degrammaticalization studies, Norde presents twenty concise case studies along the framework depicted in Table 1.

[1] I wish to thank Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol Ánte, Biret Ánne Bals Baal, Joret Mihkkal Bals, Karen Anne Oskal Eira, Kjell Kemi, Laila Susanne Oskarsson and Mai Britt Utsi as well as members of the Saami language mailing list (giella@list.uit.no) for insightful and inspiring comments about my findings as well as intuitions of their language. Further, I express my thanks to Johanna Johansen Ijäs, Nobufumi Inaba, Esa Itkonen, Laura Janda, Eino Koponen, Julia Kuprina, Muriel Norde and Torbjörn Söder for their valuable help and comments on earlier versions of this paper.

Table 1. Parameters and processes of grammaticalization and degrammaticalization.

| | Parameter | Process of grammaticalization (Lehmann 2002, 2015) | Process of degrammaticalization (Norde 2009) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Paradigmatic | integrity | attrition | resemanticization/ phonological strengthening/ recategorialization |
| | paradigmaticity | paradigmaticization | deparadigmaticization |
| | paradigmatic variability | obligatorification | deobligatorification |
| Syntagmatic | structural scope | condensation | scope expansion |
| | bondedness | coalescence | severance |
| | syntagmatic variability | fixation | flexibilization |

The parameters and processes characteristic of grammaticalization in Table 1 derive from Lehmann (2002: 110; 2015: 132), whereas the right-hand column displays processes characteristic of degrammaticalization as defined by Norde (2009: 130–131).[2] While Norde emphasizes (pp. 111–112) that degrammaticalization is not to be understood as a complete mirror-image reversal of grammaticalization, it is remarkable that she is able to show that virtually all of the main processes of grammaticalization can, in a sense, be reversed. Her examples include the often-mentioned development of the Irish personal pronoun *muid* 'we' from the first person plural verb suffix, the rise of the Dutch/Frisian/German quantifier *tig*/*tich*/*zig* 'umpteen, dozens' from the numeral suffix as seen in, e.g., *zeventig*/*santich*/*siebzig* 'seventy', and the development of the North Saami adposition *haga* 'without' from a previous abessive case suffix. What is crucial in such cases is that the morphemes in question have gained autonomy "on more than one linguistic level (semantics, morphology, syntax, or phonology)" (Norde 2009: 120).

In addition to six parameters and as many as eight distinct processes of degrammaticalization (Table 1), Norde operates with three distinct types of degrammaticalization in general: *deinflectionalization*, *debonding* and *degrammation* (see also Norde 2011, 2012). Of the three types, *deinflectionalization* is "a composite change whereby an inflectional affix in a specific linguistic context gains a new function, while shifting to a less bound morpheme type" (Norde 2009: 152); the development of the *s*-genitive in English and Scandi-

[2] For exact definitions of the largely self-explanatory terms and extensive discussion of the processes in question, see original sources.

navian languages is an example of this type of change – that often deals with a bound morpheme that develops from an inflectional affix in the direction of a derivational affix or clitic rather than taking a more common, albeit reverse, grammaticalization path. In *debonding*, bound morphemes become free words yet are not radically reanalyzed as free lexical words, rather as grammatical words such as in the above-mentioned cases of Irish *muid* 'we', Dutch *tig* 'umpteen' and North Saami *haga* 'without'. Thirdly, Norde defines *degrammation* as a reanalysis of a grammatical word as a lexical word such as the Welsh noun *eiddo* for 'property', originally a masculine third person singular possessive pronoun 'his' (Norde 2009: 145–148).

While linguists of many persuasions are interested in the findings of Norde and other degrammaticalizationalists' studies, not all are willing to abandon the idea of the unidirectionality of grammatical change. To generativists such as Kiparsky (2012: 22), the unidirectionality hypothesis is not merely a hypothesis but an article of faith; processes governing grammaticalization are rooted in the principles of Universal Grammar, and "[s]ince those general principles are invariant across languages, grammaticalization *must* be unidirectional" (emphasis original). As a result, "apparent cases of degrammaticalization cited in the literature" are passed over as no more than "ordinary analogical changes" to him, not unlike grammaticalization *per se*.

While Norde's conceptual framework for understanding degrammaticalization has been received quite favorably and with only a few suggestions for improvement (e.g., Ramat 2010; Rosenkvist 2011; Joseph 2014), it is not uncommon to see phenomena labeled as degrammaticalization still ignored or belittled even in the most recent textbooks on language change (e.g., Bybee 2015: 137). One of the most dismissive reactions to the accumulating body of counterexamples to the unidirectionality hypothesis is presented by Lehmann (2015: 193) in the third, revised edition of his 1982 book in which the term *degrammaticalization* was first presented:

> Some examples have been adduced in the literature (in particular, in Norde 2009) that come rather close to being empirical evidence of degrammaticalization. Should a completely convincing case be found – something that no current theory is in a position to exclude –, then it would merit considerable interest.

> The theory of grammaticalization, however, would be only marginally affected. (Lehmann 2015: 193–194)[3]

Unfortunately, Lehmann does not specify what he means by Norde's examples not coming close enough to count as degrammaticalization as he defines it. As the purpose of the present paper is not to propose fundamental changes in the concepts and definitions of grammaticalization and degrammaticalization, it can be anticipated that the empirical subject matter and data presented in the following sections will not be enough to fully convince those who have already rejected the possibility of degrammaticalization. Compare historical Uralists' profound unanimity about the main features of the origin and development of the North Saami abessive (Section 3) with Lehmann's (2004: 173) disbelief in the general quality of this research tradition: "If no specific reasons are provided why we should regard Saami *taga* 'without' as degrammaticalized from a case suffix, it is much more plausible that it has just not proceeded as far in grammaticalization as the cognate element of the other Finno-Permic languages, in which it has become a case suffix."

It must be admitted that those who wish not to believe in the existence of degrammaticalization do not usually deny the factual language history but understand and define both grammaticalization and the proposed idea of degrammaticalization in their own ways that make degrammaticalization appear an impossible or at least unattested phenomenon. However, it is to be hoped that not only North Saami *haga* (Section 3) but especially the development of the North Saami morpheme *(-)naga* (Sections 4 and 5) – as an example of a free lexical item (noun) that has emerged from a bound derivational if not originally inflectional suffix – can serve as a significant addition to the growing body of evidence proving the reality of degrammaticalization. After a detailed analysis of the North Saami data, Section 5.3 seeks for wider language-internal explanations to the discussed phenomena, and in this way adds to our understanding of the counteracting forces that are able to make some morphemes resistant to the undeniable predominance of unidirectionality in grammatical change. To keep the general description of the degrammaticalization phenomena in North Saami easy to read, I largely refrain from using Norde's (2009) concise but unestablished conceptual framework up until Section 5. Her work nevertheless

[3] Although Lehmann (2015: 192–194) is not convinced of the reality of degrammaticalization, he strongly disapproves of scholars repeatedly concluding that he claims grammaticalization to be unidirectional and by extension, degrammaticalization not to exist. However, it is not easy to avoid getting the impression of a decided reluctance to acknowledge the significance of the wealth of examples "that come rather close to being empirical evidence of degrammaticalization". Even in Lehmann (2015: 21), the author firmly repeats his earlier statement (Lehmann 2002: 17) that "[g]iven two variants which are related by the parameters of grammaticalization (...), we can always tell which way the grammaticalization goes, or must have gone".

serves as the foundational basis for our understanding of degrammaticalization in North Saami and elsewhere.

## 3. History of research: From the Proto-Uralic abessive to North Saami *haga* and Lule Saami *dagi*/*dagá* 'without'

The development of the North Saami adposition and adverb *haga* 'without' from a previous abessive case suffix has been one of the most frequently suggested pieces of evidence for a phenomenon known as degrammaticalization. Compare the following examples with more or less identical meanings:[4]

(1) South Saami

| *Manne* | ***gaamegapth*** | *mïnnem*. |
|---|---|---|
| 1SG | without.shoes | go.1SG |

(2) North Saami

| *Mun* | *manan* | ***gápmagiid*** | ***haga***. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1SG | go.1SG | shoe.PL.GENACC | without |

(3) Skolt Saami

| *Mon* | *mõõnam* | ***kä'mmitää***. |
|---|---|---|
| 1SG | go.1SG | shoe.PL.ABE |

'I'll go without shoes.'

In addition to other Saami languages southwest (1) and east (3) of North Saami, the cognates of the North Saami postpositional phrase *gápmagiid haga* 'without shoes' (2) are also single-word forms in languages as distant as West Mari (Mari) and Komi (Permic) whose word forms like *kem-de* [boot-ABE] 'without boots' and *kẹm-tẹg* [shoe-ABE] 'without shoes' all go back to an ancient, possibly Proto-Uralic abessive case marker in **-pta*.[5] While languages such as Skolt Saami, West Mari and Komi have productive abessive cases (cf. Skolt Saami *kaammi* 'shoe' : *kä'mmitää* shoe.PL.ABE), South Saami word forms like *gaamegapth* (← *gaamege* 'shoe') (1) are better analyzed as lexicalized adverbs,

[4] Unless otherwise specified, examples are based on my personal knowledge of the languages in question. Further, examples come from North Saami unless otherwise specified. For the purposes of the present paper, the orthographic variation caused by earlier scholarly transcriptions and orthographic standards as well as occasional misspellings in North Saami texts has been reduced to a minimum by transforming and correcting all data to the present standard orthography.

[5] This study does not operate with allomorphy or abstract morphophonemes related to vowel harmony in the predecessors and sister branches of the Saami languages. The grapheme *a* is used instead of *a/ä* or <*A*> (e.g., **-pta* pro **-pta*/*-ptä* or **-ptA*). Unless otherwise specified, the Uralic Phonetic Alphabet (or the Finno-Ugric transcription system) is used for the phonological representation of the contemporary and reconstructed morphemes discussed.

the scattered remnants of the Proto-Saami abessive case forms in *-*ptākȩk* or *-*ptākȩn*. Also, North Saami has similar, somewhat unproductive adverbs that go back to earlier abessive case forms of odd-syllable nouns such as *gáma* 'shoe' → *gápmagahttá* 'without shoes', *gahpir* 'hat' → *gahperahttá* 'without a hat', and *váidda* 'complaint; charge' → *váidagahttá* 'without complaint(s); without charge(s)'. However, as such words are uncommon and not known in all varieties of the language (Nielsen 1926: 62–65), it is much more usual to encounter postpositional phrases like *gápmagiid haga* [shoe.PL.GENACC without] or *gahpira haga* [hat.GENACC without] instead.

North Saami *haga* has been regarded as vacillating between postpositions and case suffixes ever since the 18th and 19th centuries (see below), but for comparative Uralists, it has long been obvious that the postposition originally goes back to a case suffix and not vice versa. However, simple phrases alone may not always be sufficient to differentiate between postpositions and case suffixes. For example, *lobihaga* ~ *lobi haga* 'without permission' may still be interpreted as a single word form, *lobihaga* [permission.ABE] (where the "abessive" -*haga* may be better regarded an adverbial derivational suffix rather than a case marker), or, alternatively, as a postpositional phrase, *lobi haga* [permission.GENACC without]. This is obviously a context in which the abessive case forms may have been originally reanalyzed as postpositional phrases. However, additional evidence such as conjunction reduction in (4) and an adverbal, independent *haga* in (5) unmistakably confirm the morphological independence of *haga*:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (4) | *Mun* | *báhcen/lean/birgen* | | ***gápmagiid*** |
| | 1SG | remain.PST.1SG/be.1SG/manage.1SG | | shoe.PL.GENACC |
| | ***(haga)*** | ***ja*** | ***gahpira*** | ***haga***. |
| | (without) | and | hat.GENACC | without |
| | 'I remained / am / will manage without shoes and (without) hat.' | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| (5) | *Mun* | *báhcen/lean/birgen* | ***haga***. |
| | 1SG | remain.PST.1SG/be.1SG/manage.1SG | without |
| | 'I was left / am / will do without.' | | |

Examples reminiscent of (4–5) were first introduced to a wider audience – outside Uralic linguistics – by Nevis (1986) in his short paper "Decliticization and deaffixation in Saame: Abessive *taga*". In his paper, Nevis does not speak about degrammaticalization but of decliticization and deaffixation and characterizes *haga* (*taga*) as a postposition and an adverb, just like his predecessors in Saami linguistics had done long before him. Since Nevis, *haga* and examples similar to those above have been discussed by, inter alia, Campbell (2001: 127), Joseph

(2003: 485), Haspelmath (2004: 29) and Kiparsky (2012: 20, 37–41). The most comprehensive account of the morpheme has been presented by Norde (2009: 207–209 *et passim*; see also Norde 2010: 142–144) who adds that *haga* may also occur as a preposition instead of postposition. Indeed, one occasionally encounters prepositional phrases such as *haga støttejuvllaid* 'without training wheels' (6) and *haga gahpira* 'without a hat' (7):

(6) *[N.N.]* *ii* *leat* *eambbo*
N.N. NEG.3SG be.CNG more
*go* *njeallje* *jagi* *ja* *son* *máhttá*
than four year.GENACC and 3SG can.3SG
***haga*** ***støttejuvllaid*** *sykkelastit.*
without training.wheel.PL.GENACC ride.bicycle.INF
'N.N. is no more than four years old and s/he can ride a bicycle without training wheels.' (Johanna Johansen Ijäs, p.c., 2008)

(7) *Ale* *mana* ***haga*** ***gahpira****!*
NEG.IMP.2SG go.CNG without hat.GENACC
'Don't go without a hat!' (Jernsletten 1998: 29)

Example (6) is an authentic utterance from a six-year old child in Guovdageaidnu, Norway, while (7) is an example of unwanted Norwegian interference (cf. Norwegian prepositional phrase *uten lue* [without hat]) from a North Saami textbook for secondary schools (see also *Giellaságat* 1/2007; Ylikoski 2015: 128). The expected postpositional equivalents of the above phrases would simply be *støttejuvllaid haga* and *gahpira haga*.

In light of facts such as those mentioned above, Norde (2009: 209) presents a parameter analysis of the development of *haga*. This morpheme is one of her best examples of degrammaticalization on various levels of language – apart from the fact that the phonological makeup of *haga* may have remained unchanged ("unstrengthened" as opposed to attrition characteristic of grammaticalization) and that the morpheme has not been degrammaticalized all the way from an inflectional affix to an adposition to a noun or a member of another major word class. Norde's parameter analysis of *haga* (Table 2 below) will serve as the frame of reference for the analogous analysis of North Saami *naga* in Section 5.2.

While Norde's analysis of the situation is quite accurate, certain common claims about *haga* call for clarification. Minor shortcomings[6] aside, one surprisingly persistent misconception – though not repeated by Norde – is that the degrammaticalization of *haga* is more or less confined to "the Enontekiö dialect" of North Saami or "Lappish" (e.g., Viti 2015: 386). This is apparently due to the fact that one of Nevis' sources is Sammallahti's (1977) description of the phonology of the Eastern Eanodat (Eanodat/Enontekiö municipality, Finland) subdialect of the western inland dialect of North Saami, but *haga* is actually a postposition and an adverb throughout the language area that covers large sections of the northernmost Norway, Sweden and Finland.

What is more, and quite relevant to our understanding of the origins of North Saami *haga*, is that it is far from obvious that we ought to conclude that *haga* has been degrammaticalized only in North Saami proper. To begin with, the morpheme *haga* has been analyzed as an adposition as early as in Leem (1748: 349, 353) and Friis' (1856: 28, 191) grammars of North Saami, and already Stockfleth (1840: 10) remarked that *haga* was no longer a true case suffix although it seemed to originate in such. On the other hand, Wiklund (1891: 198) believed in the opposite development – i.e., grammaticalization – and thus regarded postpositional features of the abessive as remnants of an earlier stage. However, what is most remarkable is that Wiklund was not speaking about North Saami but its nearest sister language, Lule Saami. Indeed, Lule Saami is very much like North Saami in that occasional adverbs (or severely restricted abessive case forms) like *gábmagahtá* 'without shoes' (8) correspond to *gápmagahttá* in North Saami, whereas the default expression for 'without' is the postposition *dagi* (alternatively *dagá*). As seen in (9–10), *dagi* may optionally undergo conjunction reduction much like *haga* in North Saami (4):

(8) Lule Saami

| *Gå* | *dijáv* | ***biednikbursa*** | ***dagi,*** | ***vuossa*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| when | 2PL.ACC | purse.GEN | without | bag.GEN |
| ***dagi*** | ***ja*** | ***gábmagahtá*** | *rádjiv,* | |
| without | and | without.shoes | send.PST.1SG | |
| *åhtsålijda* | *gus* | *de* | *majdik?* | |
| lack.PST.2PL | Q | DPT | something.PL.ACC | |

'When I sent you without purse, bag or sandals, did you lack anything?' (ÅT: Luke 22:35)

[6] Following Nevis (1986), many scholars refer to the morpheme *haga* as <*taga*>, but this is – albeit possible – a very marginal representation of the morpheme in the contemporary North Saami orthography adopted in the late 1970s. Furthermore, Nevis' examples stem from various sources written in diverse scholarly notations, further confused by misspellings or idiosyncratic deviations from such notations.

(9) Lule Saami

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Dievnastiddje* | *galggá* | *gåtsedit,* | | *gájkka* |
| servant | must.3SG | supervise.INF | | everything |
| *dáhpáduvvá* | ***ságastallama*** | ***(Ø)*** | ***ja*** | ***stuojme*** |
| happen.3SG | discussion.GEN | | and | fuss.GEN |
| ***dagi*** | *báhtjaj* | *gaskan.* | | |
| without | boy.PL.GEN | between | | |

'The servant must take care that everything is done without discussion or fuss between the boys.' (SIKOR)

(10) Lule Saami

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Máhttet* | *luondov* | *friddja* | *adnet* | ***ilá*** | ***moadda*** |
| be.able.INF | nature.ACC | free | use.INF | too | many |
| ***rievddamij*** | ***(Ø)*** | ***ja*** | ***hieredusáj*** | | ***dagi*** |
| change.PL.GEN | | and | hindrance.PL.GEN | | without |
| *le* | *ájnas* | *oasse* | *sáme* | *iellemkvalitehtas.* | |
| be.3SG | important | part | Saami | quality.of.life.ELA | |

'The possibility to use nature without too many changes and hindrances is an important part of the Saami quality of life.' (SIKOR)

At this point it must be noted that Lule Saami *dagi* /tɑki/ and especially *dagá* /tɑkɑ̄/ (IPA /tɑkɑː/) are phonologically quite similar to North Saami *haga* (Western North Saami /hɑkɑ̄/, IPA /hɑkɑː/, Eastern North Saami / tʿɑ̨ɑ/, IPA /tʰɒ.ɒ/), their reconstructed proto-form being the Proto-Saami abessive suffix **-ptākẹn* or **-ptākẹk* (see below). The question whether Lule Saami *dagi* can ever function as an adverb (5) or a preposition (6–7) remains outside the scope of the present study, but it suffices to note that since *dagi* is able to undergo conjunction reduction and can be interpreted as a postposition governing the genitive, it has already acquired morphosyntactic features that clearly set it apart from the unambiguous case suffixes in the language.[7] Furthermore, conjunction reduction seems to be possible even in the more distant Skolt Saami, as seen in an elicited phrase *veelk da neei'btää* [fork.GEN and knife.ABE] 'without a fork and a knife' (Feist 2015: 252). According to Erkki Itkonen (1946: 41) the morphophonological properties of Skolt Saami abessives like *vuõddâmtää* [bridegroom.ABE] 'without bridegroom' also suggest that such formations are better analyzed as postpositional phrases (e.g., *vuõddâm tää* [bridegroom.GEN without]). This said, it can be concluded that the degrammaticalization of the Saami abessive seems to have begun long before the era of modern North

[7] On the other hand, it is not uncommon to encounter written Lule Saami word forms like *loabedagi* (pro expected *loabe dagi* [permission.GEN without]) 'without permission' especially in frequent collocations, just like *lobihaga* pro *lobi haga* id. in North Saami.

Saami. Although Leem (1748: 349, 353) interprets the North Saami element as a free morpheme (*Takka*, *Taga*), other early grammatical descriptions of North Saami regard it as a case suffix (Ganander 1743; Rask 1832). However, it is uncertain whether these studies are reliable enough to tell about the true status of the abessive in the 18th century.

At any rate, the first steps toward the postpositions *dagi* and *haga* have been taken long before our time, and the Saami abessive has largely been degrammaticalized into postpositions in two or even three different languages whose total area stretches about 600 kilometers. As regards the research history, the first one to correct Wiklund's (1891) premature claim about the direction of the change was Wiklund himself, as he later proved (Wiklund 1902: 57–59) – with reference to sound correspondences that are still valid today – that the Saami abessive case suffix must have preceded the postpositions in Lule and North Saami. As regards synchronic descriptions of Lule Saami, *dagi* and *dagá* have been described as postpositions ever since (Wiklund 1901: 32–33; 1915: 36–37; Spiik 1989: 100).[8]

Finally, a few comments on the proto-form of the Saami abessive are in order. According to the received view, North Saami *haga* and *-httá*, Lule Saami *dagi*, *dagá* and *-htá* (and a number of other variants), Skolt Saami abessive marker *-tää* (3) as well as the South Saami element *-pth* (1) all go back to the Proto-Saami abessive suffix **-ptākȩn* or **-ptākȩk*. However, the details of these reconstructions are not without problems. In any case, the suffix seems to be ultimately based on a Proto-Uralic abessive marker **-pta* or, alternatively, **-kta* (**-ktå*) proposed by Janhunen (1982: 31; 1998: 473), and its various descendants are widely used in most of the Uralic languages (see, e.g., T. Itkonen 1992; Csepregi 2001 and Hamari 2014). As for the descendants of the Proto-Uralic suffix in Saami, Finnic, Mari and Permic (e.g., Finnish *-tta*, West Mari *-de*, Komi *-tęg* and Udmurt *-tek*), it is customary to regard the abessive markers as composite suffixes consisting of the original abessive marker that has been followed by a directional ("lative") suffix **-k*. However, Häkkinen (1983: 77) rightfully remarks that the preservation of the suffix-final plosives in Komi (*-tęg*) and Udmurt (*-tek*) seems suspicious with respect to the hypothesis that the suffix **-pta-k* originates in Proto-Finno-Permic. Bartens (2000: 84) suggests that the Permic suffixes could be explained by postulating a more

[8] Although Lule Saami and North Saami are nowadays kept strictly apart and generally considered as two distinct languages, there is still no full consensus on the exact border between the two languages. For diverging dialectological approaches to the issue, see Wickman (1980), Sammallahti (1998b: 19), Larsson (2012: 286–289) and Rydving (2013), and Magga (1994) on the divergent development of the Lule Saami and North Saami orthographies in the 1970s and early 1980s.

complex predecessor parallel to the one in Proto-Saami (see below).[9] There is no consensus on whether the abessive was originally inflectional or derivational, but for example Janhunen (2014: 317) has just recently regarded it (under the label privative) as one of at least eight cases of Proto-Uralic.

The abessive in Proto-Saami has been explained as a complex bundle of ancient case suffixes, since the Pre-Saami (Proto-Finno-Saami) abessive suffix *-*pta*-*k* was allegedly followed by one more lative; either a pleonastic occurrence of *-*k* (Sammallahti 1998b: 203, 247) or, alternatively, a lative in *-*n* (Korhonen 1981: 226–227). However, such exploitation of the so-called lative markers is common yet methodologically unfounded in Uralic historical morphology (see, e.g., Aikio & Ylikoski 2007: 33, 57–60; Ylikoski 2011: 255–256, 262–264). There are neither concrete material evidence nor functionally plausible explanations to support the hypothesis that pleonastic directional case markers (*-*k* + *-*k* or *-*k* + *-*n*) could have been added to an abessive element *-*pta* without adding any directional meanings (Aikio & Ylikoski 2007: 58–59). On the contrary, it appears that the only reason for such a postulation is the fact that an earlier element *-*ptak* has been followed by something that has preserved the plosive *k and even resulted in a morpheme-final vowel in elements like North Saami *haga* or Lule Saami *dagi*/*dagá*.

It seems that the exact origins of North Saami *haga* and its cognates remain without a definite explanation. In fact, it can also be remarked that the most distant sister languages of North Saami such as South Saami and Skolt Saami have even less if any concrete signs of a common Proto-Saami abessive marker *-*ptākẹn* or *-*ptākẹ̄k*. The only Saami languages that clearly seem to have preserved a velar plosive element *k are North Saami (*haga*), Lule Saami (*dagi*/*dagá*) as well as Pite Saami (-*dak*), the third member of the northern group of western Saami as understood by Sammallahti (1998a: 45; 1998b: 6ff.). As these three languages share many common features in comparison to the entire

[9] For the record, Udmurt has not only the abessive case and the analogous negative converb ('without V-ing') in -*tek* (-*тэк*), but also the adverb *tek* (*тэк*) meaning 'idly; doing nothing':

(i) Udmurt

| *Тэк* | *улод* | — | *уждунтэк* | *кылёд* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***tek*** | *ulod* | — | ***užduntek*** | *kị̄l′od* |
| idly | live.FUT.2SG | | salary.ABE | remain.FUT.2SG |

'If you live doing nothing, you will remain without salary.' (*Udmurt Duńńe*, 11 October 2011)

Despite its enticingly abessive-like semantics, *tek* is most obviously a Turkic loan as proposed by Wichmann (1987 s.v.); cf. Bashkir *tik* (*мик*) 'idly, in vain' and Tatar *täk* (*мәк*) 'in vain, for nothing'. On the other hand, T. Itkonen (1992: 222) points out that the Mansi abessive (caritive) suffix (North Mansi -*tal* (-*мал*)) does not follow vowel harmony like other case suffixes, and this could possibly be explained as a remnant of an earlier, less affixal stage similar to the degrammaticalized *haga* in North Saami.

Saami branch (see also Aikio 2012: 77, 108; Rydving 2013), it might still be possible to re-evaluate the age and position of the abessive marker *-*ptākẹn*/ *-*ptākẹk*, not to mention finding possible alternative explanations instead of the ill-founded lative hypotheses. However, the ultimate etymological makeup of the North and Lule Saami postpositions is not of utmost importance to our understanding of the later degrammaticalization described above. Therefore, it is easy to agree with Norde's analysis of the North Saami *haga*. Table 2 is a slightly modified version of her parameter analysis of the degrammaticalization of the earlier case suffix.[10]

[10] In addition to the use of the abessive postposition *keahttá* (Ylikoski 2009: 101–102), *haga* may also be replaced by the preposition *almmá* (ii), and in Lule Saami, the postposition *dagi/dagá* may occasionally be replaced by *váni* (iii). On the other hand, both North Saami *almmá* and Lule Saami *váni* most often co-occur with the postpositions, resulting in kind of circumpositional phrases like *almmá oktasaš giela haga* 'without a common language' and *váni åhpadiddjeoahpo dagi* 'without teacher education'.

(ii) North Saami

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Giella* | *lea* | *maid* | *etnihkalaš* | | *joavkku* | |
| language | be.3SG | also | ethnic | | group.GENACC | |
| *garvemeahttun* | | *siskkáldas* | | | *eaktu,* | |
| unavoidable | | internal | | condition | | |
| ***almmá*** | ***oktasaš*** | ***giela*** | *lea* | *váttis* | *govahallat* | |
| without | common | language.GENACC | be.3SG | difficult | imagine.INF | |
| *makkárge* | *sosiála* | *organiserema.* | | | | |
| any.kind | social | organize.VN.GENACC | | | | |

'Language is also an unavoidable internal condition of an ethnic group; it is difficult to imagine any kind of social organization without a common language.' (Aikio 2006: 101)

(iii) Lule Saami

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Sån la* | *mánájgárden* | *barggam,* | *ja* | *åhpadiddjen* | |
| 3SG be.3SG | kindergarten.INE | work.PST.PTCP | and | teacher.ESS | |
| ***váni*** | ***åhpadiddjeoahpo***. | | | | |
| without | teacher.education.GEN | | | | |

'She has worked in a kindergarten, and as a teacher without a degree.' (SIKOR)

Table 2. Parameter analysis of North Saami *haga* based on Norde (2009: 209) (to be repeated in Section 5.2).

| Parameter | Primitive change(s) |
|---|---|
| **Integrity** | *resemanticization*: ☑; *haga* can function as an independent adverb meaning 'without' (Example 5), which means that it no longer only modifies a noun phrase (as an abessive case suffix).<br>*phonological "strengthening"*: ☑; there has been no change at the segmental level, but at the prosodic level *haga* as an adverb or a pragmatically marked postposition receives the primary stress instead of the secondary one (Examples 5 and 11).<br>*recategorialization*: ☐; *haga* does not join a major (inflected) word class. |
| **Paradigmaticity** | *deparadigmaticization*: (☑); *haga* no longer forms part of the paradigm of North Saami nominal case inflections. |
| **Paradigmatic variability** | *deobligatorification*: (☑); as a postposition, *haga* is still in opposition with the inflectional case markers, but in some varieties of North Saami, it may be substituted by other abessive elements (Ylikoski 2009: 101–102). |
| **Structural scope** | *scope expansion*: ☑; expanded scope of *haga* is reflected by conjunction reduction (Example 4) and the ability to follow the possessive (Norde 2009: 207). |
| **Bondedness** | *severance*: ☑; *haga* has become a free morpheme. |
| **Syntagmatic variability** | *flexibilization*: ☑; *haga* can occur independently (Example 5), and even as a preposition (Examples 6–7). |

My analysis of the situation differs from that of Norde in one respect: while she plainly states that *haga* has not experienced changes at the phonological level, I have also checked the box for phonological strengthening because of the fact that as an adverb, *haga* differs from the postposition *haga* in that the adverb virtually always has a full initial-syllable stress. As for *haga* as a postposition, it usually has a stress of its own only when the meaning of *haga* – a pronounced lack of something – is specifically emphasized. Of course, we do not have any direct evidence about the stress pattern of the undegrammaticalized abessive suffix in the early predecessors of contemporary North Saami,

but as inflectional or derivational suffixes in Saami languages apparently never get the primary stress, there are strong reasons to believe that this originally applied to *-haga* as well. As will be discussed further below, North Saami disyllabic suffixes may receive secondary stress regardless of the total number of syllables. This is apparently one of the characteristics that has encouraged the degrammaticalization of this former suffix that is still occasionally written as a single word with its head – especially in frequent and potentially lexicalized collocations such as *lobihaga* 'without permission; illicitly', *bargguhaga* 'without work; unemployed' and *mávssuhaga* 'without fee; for free'. The unmarked stress pattern in (11a) gives *haga* a secondary stress (ˌ), whereas *haga* in a pragmatically marked position – in contrast to the comitative *lobiin* 'with a permission' in (11b) – or as an adverb (Example 5 repeated here) receives the primary stress (ˈ):

(11)

a. *Don* *bohtet* *deike* *ˈlobi* *ˌhaga*.
2SG come.PST.2SG here permission.GENACC without
'You came here without permission.'

b. *Don* *it* *boahtán* *deike* *makkárge*
2SG NEG.2SG come.PST.PTCP here any.kind
*lobiin* *muhto* *baicce* *ˈlobi*
permission.COM but rather permission.GENACC
*ˈhaga*.
without
'You didn't come here with any kind of permission but *without* permission.'

(5) *Mun* *báhcen/lean/birgen* *ˈhaga.*
1SG remain.PST.1SG/be.1SG/manage.1SG without
'I was left / am / will do without.'

Prosodic changes such as this are generally regarded to be as valid as segmental changes when assessing either a grammaticalization or degrammaticalization of a given morpheme (see, e.g., Hopper & Traugott 2003; Norde 2009; Lehmann 2015). In other words, it is legitimate to say that *haga* has also gained in phonological strength as a part of the degrammaticalization process.

The problems and parameters presented here are also crucially relevant to our understanding of another morpheme, the suffix *-naga* and the word *naga* in North Saami, which will be the main topic of the following sections. Section 4 describes the synchrony and diachrony of *naga* in a theory-neutral manner,

whereas Section 5 is dedicated to the analysis of the findings in light of degrammaticalization studies and especially within Norde's (2009) parametric framework for *haga* and other instances of claimed degrammaticalization.

## 4. From the Proto-Uralic locative to *(-)naga* 'stain'

In contrast to *haga*, the morpheme *(-)naga* has been one of the least well known grammatical morphemes in North Saami. From a synchronic perspective, the functions of the element *naga* are so variegated that it would be more accurate to speak of various homophonous morphemes. On the other hand, many functions of *naga* can be seen as forming a continuum – or more than one continuum – even from a synchronic point of view. From a diachronic perspective, it is possible to see a continuum that leads from the Proto-Uralic locative case suffix *-*na* to the noun *(-)naga* 'stain' in the present-day Guovdageaidnu dialect located in the heart of the North Saami language area.

Although the suffix -*naga* has been occasionally mentioned by grammarians and lexicographers ever since the 18th century (Leem 1748: 362–363; 1768: 1354, 1414 *et passim*), there have not been systematic studies of its morphology, syntax and semantics prior to three recent papers (Ylikoski 2014b, 2014c, 2015) on which the following panchronic account is largely based. Section 4.1 gives a short presentation of the suffixal use of -*naga* (Section 4.1.1) as well as a discussion on the origins of the suffix (Section 4.1.2), whereas Section 4.2 describes the lesser known uses of *naga* as an independent, non-suffixal morpheme. The emergence of the latter phenomena will be discussed and analyzed at length in Section 5.

### 4.1. The suffix -*naga*

#### 4.1.1. The functions of -*naga*

The element *naga* has two main functions as a productive or at least a partly productive derivational suffix. However, our understanding of the history of this suffix is partly dependent on a limited number of unproductive adverbs and pronouns that will be discussed further below.

The most important and, in principle, fully productive function of the suffix -*naga* is to form denominal derivatives such as *varranaga* 'stained with blood', *oljonaga* 'stained with oil' and *muohtanaga* 'stained/covered with snow' as seen below:

(12)

a. *Albasa* *gorut* *lei* ***varranaga*** *ja*
lynx.GENACC carcass be.PST.3SG blood.*naga* and
*bastilis* *sávzzagaccat* *vuhttojedje* *das.*
sharp sheep.claw.PL be.visible.PST.3PL that.LOC
'The lynx carcass was stained with blood and one could see the sharp claw marks of sheep in it.' (SIKOR)

b. *Ja* *gahččamis* *lei* *bániid*
and fall.VN.LOC be.PST.3SG tooth.PL.GENACC
*nordadan,* ***varranaga*** *baksamiiddisguin*
knock.PST.PTCP blood.*naga* lip.PL.COM.3SG
*viggá* *cummástallat.*
attempt.3SG kiss.INF
'And he hit his teeth when he fell, and is now trying to kiss her with his blood-stained lips.' (SIKOR)

(13)

a. *Guovllus* *leat* *247* *loddešlája* *ja*
region.LOC be.3PL 247 bird.species.GENACC and
*31* *dain* *leat* ***oljonaga***.
31 that.PL.LOC be.3PL oil.*naga*
'There are 247 species of birds in the region, and 31 of those have been stained with oil.' (SIKOR)

b. *Áidna* *maid* *máhtát,* *lea* *biillaid*
only REL.PL.GENACC can.2SG be.3SG car.PL.GENACC
*čuoggut* *ja* ***oljonaga*** *biktasiid*
tap.INF and oil.*naga* garment.PL.GENACC
*bálkut* *miehtá* *viesu.*
throw.INF throughout house.GENACC
'The only things you are able to do is to tinker with cars and to throw oil-stained clothes all over the house.' (Vars 1992: 21)

(14)

a. *Son* *lei* ***muohtanaga*** *juohke* *sajis.*
3SG be.PST.3SG snow.*naga* every place.LOC
'He was covered with snow all over.' (Gustavsen 1982: 70)

b. *Son* *bođii* *sisa* ***muohtanaga*** *náhkkegahpiriin.*
3SG come.PST.3SG in snow.*naga* fur.hat.COM
'He came in with a fur hat covered with snow.' (Gustavsen 1982: 28)

Nearly all earlier descriptions of denominal *-naga* forms have hastily characterized them as adverbs, and at best, presented only examples like (12a), (13a) and (14a). However, only about half of the authentic occurrences of denominal *-naga* are used in a predicative function (12a, 13a and 14a), whereas the other half are adnominal modifiers as seen in (12b), (13b) and (14b) (Ylikoski 2014b: 57–58). As such, they look very much like adjectives, although comparative and superlative forms seem to be absent. Unlike nearly all regular adjectives, *-naga* lacks plural forms in contexts where a plural would be otherwise expected (13a and 15a). However, such morphological restrictions are not completely foreign to adjectives.[11] A further reason to consider *-naga* forms as adjectives is the fact that they can be coordinated with unambiguous adjectives such as *njuoskkas* 'wet':

(15)
a. *Mu* *biktasat* *leat* ***njuoskasat*** ***ja***
1SG.GENACC garment.PL be.3PL wet.PL and
***giehpanaga***.
soot.*naga*
'My clothes are wet and stained with soot.'

[11] For example, in the eastern dialects of North Saami, deverbal adjectives like *áddehahtti* 'understandable' and *luohtehahtti* 'trustworthy' and denominal adjectives like *varrái* 'rich in blood; ruddy' (← *varra* 'blood'), *veahkkái* 'helpful' (← *veahkki* 'help') and *hearvái* 'funny' (← *hearva* 'adornment; fun') lack plurals, and the former type does not usually have comparatives and superlatives either. As a matter of fact, the "adverbs" in *-naga* are also reminiscent of the so-called abessive forms in *-httá* (see Section 3 above) in that dictionaries label forms like *gahperahttá* as adverbs (e.g., Sammallahti & Nickel 2006), but at least their attributive counterparts such as *gahperahtes* in the noun phrase *gahperahtes mánná* 'a hatless child' must be considered as adjectives. Not unlike *-naga*, the abessives in *-httá* do not have plural forms:

(iv) a. *Mánná* *lea* ***gahperahttá***.
child be.3SG without.hat
'The child is without a hat.'

b. *Mánát* *leat* ***gahperahttá/*gahperahtát***.
child.PL be.3PL without.hat/*without.hat.PL
'The children are without hats.'

b. *Mus* *leat* ***njuoska*** ***ja*** ***giehpanaga***
1SG.LOC be.3PL wet.ATTR and soot.*naga*
*biktasat.*
garment.PL
'I have wet and soot-stained clothes.' (cf. Ylikoski 2014b: 58–59)

One more strong argument for regarding *-naga* forms as adjectives are uncommon but attested instances in which the derivational suffix is further followed by a case suffix such as the essive *-n* – historically a parent morpheme of *-naga* (see below) – in contexts that usually require a specific case form. The essive form *varranagan* in (16) functions as a depictive secondary predicate that conveys information about the subject of the subordinate clause:

(16) *Muittán* *healkkehin* *go* *nubbi*
remember.1SG wince.PST.1SG when another
*boltasii* *muorramáddagis* ***varranagan***.
get.up.PST.3SG foot.of.tree.LOC blood.*naga*.ESS
'I remember how I winced when the person got up at the foot of a tree, stained with blood.' (SIKOR)

A morphologically reminiscent but syntactically and semantically more ambiguous *-naga* form *málanagas* [paint.*naga*.LOC] will be discussed further below (Example 37 in Section 5.1).
As for their semantics, almost all instances of denominal *-naga* can be characterized as "contaminative" derivatives that denote mostly unwanted states in which the entities in question are stained or covered by the substance denoted by the stem noun such as *varra* 'blood', *olju* 'oil', *muohta* 'snow' and *giehpa* 'soot' in the above examples. Occasionally some metaphorical extensions occur, e.g., *varranaga tragediija* 'bloody tragedy' as well as *veaháš viidnanaga Freda* 'slightly tipsy Freda' seen in (17):

(17) *Veaháš* ***viidnanaga*** *Freda* *manai*
slightly spirits.*naga* Freda go.PST.3SG
*gobi* *bajágeahčái,* *šlivgii*
deep.place.in.river.GENACC upper.end.ILL fling.PST.3SG
*moddii* *ja* *nu* *dohppii* *stuorra*
a.couple.of.times and thus bite.PST.3SG big
*luossa.*
salmon
'A slightly tipsy Freda went to the upper end of the pool, cast the fishing rod a couple of times, and then a big salmon bit.' (SIKOR)

Given its rather precise and concrete meaning, denominal *-naga* is not very frequent in the available electronic corpora consisting mainly of newspapers and administrative texts, but when needed, *-naga* is a fully productive suffix that can yield forms like *banánanaga* 'stained with banana', *šukuládanaga* 'stained with chocolate' and *guacamolenaga* 'stained with guacamole'. As it happens, such expressions have been reported to be most frequent in families with little children. Morphologically, denominal *-naga* forms are created simply by adding the suffix to the noun in the nominative. It appears that the only possible morphological alteration is the so-called allegro shortening (see Sammallahti 1998b: 41–42) that may affect the stem vowel in a manner similar to compound nouns: *olju* 'oil' becomes *oljo-* in *oljonaga* 'stained with oil' just like in compounds such as *oljobohkan* 'oil drilling' and *oljofitnodat* 'oil company'.

The other main function of the suffix *-naga* is less relevant for the purposes of the present paper, but it can be mentioned that *-naga* occurs in at least eighteen known deadjectival forms that have highly specific syntactic and semantic functions quite different from those of the denominal *-naga* described above. Deadjectival *-naga* forms usually function as patient-controlled depictives. In other words, they serve as secondary predications on transitive clause objects (18) or, correspondingly, passive clause subjects. In this function they come quite close to the essive case (*-n*), but *-naga* adds a meaning of transience in comparison to the plain essive that refers to a temporary but nevertheless more stable states (e.g., '(when) still raw' as opposed to '(when) raw'):

(18) *Bahákasa* *goidoš* *go* *dan* *gáhku=ge*
devil.GENACC slug as that.GENACC cake.GENACC=too
***njuoskkasnaga*** *válddii* *uvnnas*.
raw.*naga* take.PST.3SG oven.LOC
'That damn fool, he even took the cake from the oven still raw.' (Guttorm 1986: 34)

As described in more detail in Ylikoski (2014c; forthcoming), the lexical semantics of deadjectival *-naga* forms are quite typical of adjectival depictives cross-linguistically. Similar to many secondary predicates across the globe, forms like *njuoskkasnaga* 'while still raw/wet' (18), *liekkasnaga* [warm.*naga*] 'while still warm', *ođasnaga* [new.*naga*] 'while still new', *varasnaga* [fresh.*naga*] 'while still fresh' and *eallinaga* [alive.*naga*] < [live.PRS.PTCP.*naga*] 'while still alive, while still living' encode universal physical states or conditions.

The syntax, semantics and morphological productivity of denominal and deadjectival *-naga* forms are so different that it is suitable, from a synchronic point of view, to regard the two types as separate categories. Although both denominal and deadjectival *-naga* forms have been labeled as adverbs by later

grammarians and lexicographers, it seems that one of the best analyses was presented by Friis (1887: LI *et passim*) who analyzed denominal forms like *varranaga* 'stained with blood' as adjectives, but deadjectival forms like *varas-naga* 'while still fresh' as adverbs. At best, it is possible to generalize that both types refer to more or less transient states or at least to states that are ideally ephemeral instead of permanent: forms like *varranaga* (12, 16) and *oljonaga* (13) refer to properties of being 'in a state of still having (stains of) blood/oil', whereas *njuoskkasnaga* (18) and *varasnaga* , for example, are depictives with the meaning 'in a state of still being raw/fresh'. As will be discussed below, both meanings seem to derive from the common essive origin of the element *-naga*.

### 4.1.2. On the origins of *-naga*

In spite of a couple of rather assertive statements on the issue, the origin of the suffix *-naga* is not entirely clear. It seems that the first explanation was given by Beronka (1940: 172) who stated that the essive forms of nouns like *varra* 'blood' and *muohta* 'snow' can be amended with "the adverbal suffix *-ga*", i.e. *varra-n* [blood-ESS] → *varra-naga* 'stained with blood' and *muohta-n* [snow-ESS] → *muohta-naga* 'stained with snow'. However, while the reference to the essive seems plausible indeed, the statement about "the adverbal suffix *-ga*" must be rejected, because such a hypothetical suffix, not to mention its origins, is not otherwise known in the language.

In his synchronic school grammar of North Saami, Bergsland (1961: 46) shortly refers to the use of the essive in contexts like *ealli-n fievrridit* [alive-ESS transport.INF] 'transport (animals) alive' as well as to the essive *muohtan* in the meaning 'with snow on it', and in this connection he refers to "augmented [Norwegian *utvidede*] essive forms in *-naga* or *-na*" such as *eallinaga*, *eallina* and *muohtanaga*, *muohtana* id. However, Bergsland does not try to describe or explain the "augments". It may be specified here that certain dialects possess a shorter variant *-na* besides *-naga* (e.g., Nielsen 1938 s.v.; Beronka 1940: 172; Bergsland 1961: 46), but as it is unanimously regarded as a shortened form of *-naga*, this variant has no special relevance here.

After Beronka and Bergsland, the next – and heretofore most specific – explanation is given by Sammallahti (1998b: 93). In his condensed description of some of the denominal adverbs and their origins, words like *muohtanaga* are described as follows:

> *muohta-naga* 'with snow on it' from *muohta* 'snow' (< P[roto-]S[aami] **-nɐ̯ɢɐ̯n* < Mid-P[roto-]S[aami] **-nāɢɐ̯n* < < F[inno-]S[aami], Uralic **-na/nä* + F[inno-]S[aami], Uralic **-k-* + *(-i-)* **-n*) (Sammallahti 1998b: 93; see also Sammallahti 1998a: 83)

Elsewhere, when presenting the analogous etymologies of the adverbs *oktanaga* ~ *aktanaga* ‘at the same time’ and *dalán(aga)* ‘at once’ (see below), Sammallahti (1998b: 236, 258) explains that the elements *-*k*- and *-*n* are Proto-Uralic latives. This combination of latives is identical with Korhonen’s (1981: 226–227) explanation of the Saami abessive suffix (*-*ptākẹn*) and functionally more or less identical with that of Sammallahti’s pleonastic, reduplicated lative suffixes in the Proto-Saami abessive marker *-*ptākẹk* (Section 3). However, Sammallahti does not mention deadjectival -*naga* forms, whereas Bergsland (1961: 46) considers both denominal and deadjectival forms as augmented essives. On the other hand, Bergsland (p. 61) mentions *dalánaga* (~ *dalán*) ‘at once’ (cf. *dalle* ‘then’) as an example of a “reinforcing” suffix -*naga*, -*na*, -*n* also occurring in certain pronominal expressions such as *dammanaga (beaivvi)* ‘(on) that very (day)’ (cf. *dan beaivvi* [that.GENACC day.GENACC] ‘on that day’) without reference to the essive.

No-one seems to have presented either competing or complementary etymologies to -*naga*. However, it should be pointed out that Sammallahti’s explanation does not include functional motivation for the presence of the so-called lative case markers in this context. Instead, when compared with the essive case in North Saami, -*naga* shows significant resemblance. Although the essive case *per se* does have many functions that could be characterized as “lative” or “directional” in some sense, it is remarkable that virtually all actual occurrences of all -*naga* forms lack such functions. A comprehensive description of the essive case in North Saami goes beyond the scope of the present paper (see Ylikoski, forthcoming), but it can be asserted that most of the functions of the element -*naga* can be seen as near-synonyms to some of the fairly marginal functions of the essive. In other words, it is not unreasonable to agree with Bergsland (1961: 46) who regarded -*naga* as an augmented form of the essive in -*n*; -*naga* forms could indeed be seen as a kind of subspecies of the essive, although the most proper synchronic characterization is more likely “(deadjectival) adverbs” and “(denominal adverb-like) adjectives”.

The actual occurrences of the depictive deadjectival -*naga* forms can almost always be replaced with the corresponding adjective in the essive case; *njuoskkasnaga* ‘while still raw’ of (18) could be exchanged for the essive *njuoskkasin* ‘while raw’, for example. As described at length in Ylikoski (2014c; forthcoming) and mentioned above, the main difference between deadjectival -*naga* forms and the essive in similar syntactic contexts is that the former have an additional meaning of transience in comparison to the plain essive that also refers to temporary but relatively long-standing states. As regards the denominal -*naga*, its semantic relation to the essive is to a certain extent obvious, but open to alternative descriptions that may originate in dialect differences (cf. Nielsen 1926: 353; 1938 s.v.; Ylikoski 2014b: 64). However, the main

difference is syntactic: The predicative *-naga* forms such as *varranaga* ‘stained with blood’, *oljonaga* ‘stained with oil’ and *muohtanaga* ‘covered/stained with snow’ in (12a–14a) can, at least in principle, virtually always be exchanged with essives such as *varran*, *oljun* and *muohtan*, but the adnominal forms such as those in (12b–14b) cannot – the essive is not used as an adnominal modifier of this type. However, the North Saami essive has a number of grammatical functions in which the *-naga* forms are entirely impossible (Ylikoski 2014b: 60; Ylikoski, forthcoming).

What is more, while it might be legitimate to characterize many of the functions of the essive as “lative” or “directional”, *-naga* does not have such functions in spite of the fact that it is precisely *-naga* and not the essive (< Proto-Uralic locative **-na*) that has been described as consisting of a bundle of ancient case affixes, two of which are characterized as latives. The North Saami essive can be described as a case that has – to use the terminology used in Uralic linguistics – both essive (stative) and translative (dynamic) functions and the frequency of the latter types seems to actually surpass the former types (Ylikoski, forthcoming). The translative functions of the essive include resultatives and, therefore, it is possible, for example, to make something warm (adjective *liekkas-in* [warm-ESS]) or even turn it into ash (noun *gutna-n* [ash-ESS]), but *-naga* is not possible here:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (19) | *Sii* | *liggejedje* | *viesu* | *menddo* | ***liekkasin*** |
| | 3PL | warm.PST.3PL | house.GENACC | too | warm.ESS |
| | *ja* | *loahpas* | *dat* | *bulii* | ***gutnan***. |
| | and | end.LOC | that | burn.PST.3SG | ash.ESS |

‘They warmed up the house too hot and in the end it burned to ashes.’

The forms *liekkasnaga* ‘while still warm’ and *gutnanaga* ‘stained with ash’ are not possible in (19), although they are fully possible word forms in the functions described above (Section 4.1). As *-naga* forms would be ungrammatical in virtually all contexts in which the essive can be characterized as dynamic (Ylikoski, forthcoming), it is difficult to find semantic justification for considering the suffix to be composed of the Proto-Saami essive followed by as many as two directional case suffixes. However, it is easy to agree with Beronka (1940) as well as with Bergsland (1961) and Sammallahti (1998a, 1998b) in that the first part of the suffix must go back to the Proto-Saami essive (**-na*) and ultimately to the Proto-Uralic locative.

In addition to the scholars referred to above, the origins of *-naga* has also recently been pondered in light of Ylikoski’s (2014c) observations of the remarkable similitude between the North Saami deadjectival depictives and their close functional equivalents in Mari deadjectival adverbs in *-ńek*:

(20) North Saami

a. *Goappašagat* *bálkestuvvuiga* ***eallinaga***
the.two.of.them(.PL) throw.PASS.PST.3DU alive.*naga*
*dollajávrái* *mii* *buollá* *riššain.*
fiery.lake.ILL REL burn.3SG sulfur.COM

East Mari

b. *Нуным когыньыштымат* *илышынек* *киш* *дене*
*Nunə̑m* *kogə̑ńə̑štə̑m=at* *ilə̑šə̑ńek* *kiš* *dene*
3PL.ACC the.two.of.them.ACC=and alive.*ńek* resin with
*йӱлышӧ* *тулан* *ерыш* *шуымо.*
*jülə̑šö* *tulan* *jerə̑š* *šuə̑mo.*
burn.PRS.PTCP fiery lake.ILL throw.PASS.PTCP
'The two of them were thrown alive into the fiery lake of burning sulfur.' (OT & US: Revelation 19:20)

In addition to a number of synonymous but non-etymological word pairs like North Saami *liekkas-naga* 'while still warm' and Mari *levə̑-ńek* id., the adverbs *eallinaga* 'while still alive' (20a) and *ilə̑šə̑ńek* id. (20b) are both based on present participles of the Uralic verb **elä-* 'live'. Also the North Saami *njuoskkas-naga* 'while still raw/wet' (18) and Mari *noćkə̑-ńek* 'while still wet' look very much like possible cognates. While the question of possible common origins of the North Saami and Mari forms is best left unanswered at the present stage of research – as there is no essive case in Mari (Ylikoski 2014c) – it can be remarked that the translational equivalents of *eallinaga* and *ilə̑šə̑ńek* (20) in Finnic and Permic are successors of the Proto-Uralic locative and therefore cognates of the Saami essive. For example, Finnish *elävä-nä* [alive-ESS] and Veps *eläba-n* [alive-ESS] as well as Komi *lovj-ẹn* [alive-INS] and Udmurt *ulep-en* [alive-INS] can all be used in the same context. Therefore, it seems fully possible that some of the essive functions of **-na* may go back to the Proto-Uralic (cf. Erkki Itkonen 1966: 264; Ylikoski 2014c: 428).

Finally, it can be noted that Nielsen (1926: 353; 1938 s.v.) already described the functions of *-naga* mostly by comparing it to the essive from a synchronic perspective. Further, the lone denumeral adverb *oktanaga* 'at the same time' (from *okta* 'one') is reminiscent of the adverb *oktan* 'together' (identical with the essive of *okta*). However, *oktanaga* is actually the only concrete reason for reconstructing the suffix *-naga* up to Proto-Saami; Skolt Saami *õhttna* id. (cf. *õhttân* [one.ESS]) is formally comparable with the Skolt Saami abessive (Pekka Sammallahti, p.c.). As for the closest sister language of North Saami, it appears that Lule Saami *dalánagi/dalánagá* 'at once' and *åbbånagi/åbbånagá* 'much, remarkably' (← *åbbå* 'entire; quite') are the only word forms directly

comparable with North Saami (*dal(l)ánaga* ‘at once’, *obbanaga* ’entirely, as a whole’).

All in all, it remains unclear at which proto-language stage the origins of North Saami *-naga* can be reliably reconstructed. Also, the problem of the origins of the element *-(a)ga* must be considered unsolved. The practice of explaining etymologically opaque elements as so-called lative suffixes or even multiple suffixes is a peculiar characteristic of traditional Uralistics, but in the absence of any apparent functional motivation whatsoever, it seems unsubstantiated to claim that *-naga* goes materially back to one Proto-Uralic locative case and two directional ones. However, better explanations have not been presented either. Given the semantics of *-naga*, perhaps the most logical explanation would be a focus particle of some kind, but in the present absence of concrete evidence, this speculation cannot be developed further (but cf. Bergsland 1945: 9, 30–31; 1946: 98, 105; Ylikoski 2014c: 428).

Nevertheless, there seems to be complete unanimity on the essive origins of the first part of the element *-naga*. Indeed, regardless of at least four different views on the latter part of the suffix (Beronka 1940; Bergsland 1961; Sammallahti 1998a; 1998b; Ylikoski 2014c, 2015), it appears obvious that the first part of the suffix goes back to the Proto-Saami essive and ultimately to the Proto-Uralic locative that may already have had similar functions. It is difficult to imagine an alternative explanation for the element. The predicative *-naga* such as *varranaga* ‘stained with blood’ in (12a) is almost synonymous with the essive (*varran*), and other Saami languages use only their essives (Lule Saami *varran*, Aanaar Saami *vorrân*, Skolt Saami *võrrân*) or, as in South Saami, either the essive (*maeline* [animal.blood.ESS]) or alternatively the genitive (*maelien* [animal.blood.GEN]) in this function. The following section will focus on the non-suffixal functions of the element *naga*, and all of them seem to go back to various functions of the denominal *-naga* forms such as *varranaga* ‘stained with blood’.

### 4.2. Independent *naga* and *nagage*: two adverbs, a postposition and a noun

In this section, I briefly describe the four types of non-affixal use of the element *naga*. The diachronic analysis of the variegated phenomena in question is left to the Section 5 below.

#### 4.2.1. *nagage* (adverb) ‘(not) at all, (not) a trace’

The first mention of the element *naga* as a free morpheme was presented by Nielsen (1938 s.v. *nâgâ*, *-nâgâ* ~ *-nâ*) beside the bound suffix *-naga* discussed above. In his translation, the word means ‘the least trace (of), ever so little, a tiny bit (usually with negative or doubt)’:

(21) *Ii* *leat* *(ii)* ***nagage***.
NEG.3SG be.CNG (NEG.3SG) *nagage*
'There is not a trace of it.', 'There is nothing at all.' (Nielsen 1938 s.v. *nâgâ*, *-nâgâ ~ -nâ*)

Except for one hapax legomenon occurring in Nielsen's (1938 s.v. *nâgâ*, *-nâgâ ~ -nâ*) dictionary only, all his examples similar to (21) are still commonplace in contemporary North Saami. However, the element *naga* cannot be considered a purely free morpheme here, since in virtually all such instances *naga* is obligatorily followed by the clitic *=ge* '(not) even', and *nagage* is thus a word of its own (Ylikoski 2015: 113, 117–118). Examples (22) and (23) show that the use of *nagage* seems to have remained the same from the 19th to the 21th century:

(22) *Das* *ijas* *mii* *eat*
that.LOC night.LOC 1PL NEG.1PL
*bállen* *sakka* *oađđit* *sakka*
get.peace.PST.PTCP much sleep.INF much
***nagage***, *muhto* *go* *iđit* *leai*
*nagage* but as morning be.PST.3SG
*šaddan* *de* *ráhkkaneimmet* *vuolgit*
become.PST.PTCP DPT be.prepared.PST.1PL leave.INF
*fasttain* *davásguvlui*.
again northward
'We barely were able to sleep at all that night, but as morning had come, we made ourselves ready to head towards north again.' (Balto 1980 [1889]: 43)

(23) *Min Áiggi* *bargi* *máisttii*
Min Áigi.GENACC employee taste.PST.3SG
*murjjiid,* *ja* *duođašta* *ahte* *dat*
berry.PL.GENACC and assure.3SG COMP that.PL
*eai* *lean* ***nagage*** *suvrát...*
NEG.3PL be.PST.CNG *nagage* sour.PL
'A *Min Áigi* (newspaper) employee tasted the berries and s/he can assure that they were not sour at all.' (SIKOR)

Although *nagage* in (21) can be translated into English as *(not) a trace*, it is notable that the North Saami word has not been and cannot be considered as a noun but an adverb with its function comparable to the English *(not) at all* seen in the translations of (22–23) above. Sammallahti and Nickel (2006 s.v.) do not provide examples like the ones above, but refer to this function with

the German expressions *(nur) dem Namen nach* ‘in name (only)’, *pro forma* and *(nur) eine Spur von* ‘(only) a trace of’. For more examples of *nagage*, see Nielsen (1938 s.v. *nâgâ*, *-nâgâ* ~ *-nâ*) and Ylikoski (2015: 117–118).

### 4.2.2. *naga* (adverb) ‘in a tipsy state’

The first occurrence of a truly independent *naga* in research literature can be found in Sammallahti’s (1989 s.v.) dictionary and later at Sammallahti and Nickel (2006 s.v.). In these descriptions (without any examples of sentence contexts), *naga* is labeled as an adverb with two meanings: that of *nagage* seen above, and that of *naga* ‘in a tipsy state’ (Finnish ‘maisteessa, lievässä humalassa’; German ‘angetrunken, beschwipst’) as seen below.[12] The following examples illustrate the adverb *naga* in actual use:

(24)
| *Sire* | *lea* | *oahppan* | *oaidnit* | *goas* | *Máhtte* | *lea* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sire | be.3SG | learn.PST.PTCP | see.INF | when | Máhtte | be.3SG |
| ***naga***, | *dat* | *láhtte* | *álo* | *seammaláhkai,* | | |
| *naga* | 3SG | act.3SG | always | in.the.same.way | | |
| *almmáštallá* | *ja* | *skeaikkiha* | *ain* | | *njálgát* | |
| brag.3SG | and | cackle.3SG | each.time | | sweet.ADV | |
| *iežas* | | *ságaide.* | | | | |
| REFL.GENACC.3SG | | story.PL.ILL | | | | |

‘Sire has learned to see when Máhtte is tipsy; he always acts the same way: brags and cackles at his own jokes.’ (Vest 1997: 216)

(25)
| *Ja* | *de* | *mii* | *šaddat* | *vázzit* | *dakko* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| and | DPT | 1PL | end.up.1PL | walk.INF | that.way |
| *čađa,* | | *ja* | *de* | *mun* | *oainnat* |
| through | | and | DPT | 1SG | you.see |
| *váccán* | | *ovddimusas,* | *vehá* | ***naga***. | |
| walk.1SG | | foremost.LOC | little | *naga* | |

‘And then we ended up walking through the place, and, you see, I was going first, slightly tipsy.’ (Johan Mathis Buljo, Árdna 2016)

Incidentally, it appears that this function of *naga* may be only accidentally missing in Nielsen (1938) who nevertheless mentions the verb *nagahuvvat* ‘become slightly tipsy’ formed with the translative verb derivational suffix *-(h)uvva-*, and even refers to *naga* as its stem (Nielsen 1938 s.v. *nâgâtuvvât*).

[12] The somewhat clumsy translation ‘in a tipsy state’ for *naga* is intended to highlight its adverbal functions, because unlike the words *tipsy* or *slightly intoxicated* in English, *naga* cannot be used as an adnominal modifier.

### 4.2.3. *naga* (postposition) 'stained with; with traces of'

The morpheme *naga* is also used as a kind of postposition in a function that seems to be in complementary distribution with the denominal suffix *-naga* 'stained with; with traces of' described in Section 4.1. Whereas the suffix *-naga* is attached to nouns that refer to substances with which something has been stained, the postposition *naga* is a highly exceptional postposition in that it does not usually take nouns as its complement. Instead, *naga* combines with demonstrative, indefinite and interrogative pronouns such as *dat* 'it; that', *mii nu* 'something' and *mii* 'what'. Unlike the suffix *-naga* that is attached to nouns in the nominative, *naga* behaves like nearly all adpositions in the language and takes its complements in the genitive-accusative case:

(26) *Maid* *lohket,* ***man*** ***naga*** *diet*
what.PL.GENACC say.PST.2SG what.GENACC *naga* that
*lei?*
be.PST.3SG
'What did you say, what was it stained with?'

(27) *Essiivvain* *sáhttá* *govvidit* *ahte* *juoga*
essive.COM can.3SG describe.INF COMP something
*lea* ***man nu*** ***naga****: ...*
be.3SG something.GENACC *naga*
'With the essive, it is possible to describe that something is stained with something: ...' (Pope & Sárá 2013: 112)

An illustrative example of the use of *naga* as a postposition can be seen in Helander's (1991: 35) description of the relations of the denominal verbs in *-huvvat* with their stem nouns. He characterizes verbs like *varahuvvat* 'get stained with blood' (← *varra* 'blood') and *guolggahuvvat* 'get stained, covered with (animal) hair' (← *guolga* 'hair') with the words *šaddat dan naga* [become.INF it.GENACC stained.with] 'become stained with it [= the referent of the stem noun]'. In other words, *varahuvvat* means 'become *varranaga* (= stained with blood)' and *guolggahuvvat* means 'become *guolganaga* (= stained, covered with hair)', but a pronominal equivalent of *varranaga* 'stained with blood' and *guolganaga* 'stained, covered with hair' is the postpositional phrase *dan naga* 'stained with it'.

The very limited distribution of the postposition *naga* 'stained with' is quite similar to the marginal "abessive" postposition *hahttá* 'without' attested in some dialects of North Saami (e.g. *dán hahttá* [this.GENACC without] 'without this'; cf. Nielsen 1938 s.v. *hât'ta*) as well as the postpositional use of the case-like "prolative" element *(-)ráigge* 'through; along' (e.g. *dán ráigge* [this.GENACC

through] ‘through this’; cf. Ylikoski 2014a: 56). On the other hand, it can be added that both *ráigge* (Ylikoski 2014a: 53–56, 63–64) and even *naga* (Ylikoski 2015: 119–121) may marginally take noun complements as well:

(28) *Geađgi* *lea* *ain* ***guolevuoja*** ***naga,*** *go*
stone be.3SG still fish.fat.GENACC *naga* as
*dan* *vuide* *buori*
it.GENACC smear.PST.3PL good.GENACC
*guollelihku* *oažžun dihte.*
fishing.luck.GENACC get.CVB.PURP
‘The stone is still stained with fish fat, as it was smeared on it to bring fishing luck.’ (Hætta 1994: 25)

Instead of the postpositional phrase *guolevuoja naga*, a more expected expression for ‘stained with fish fat’ here would be the nominative-based derivative *guolevuodjanaga*.

### 4.2.4. *(-)naga* (noun) ‘stain’

The fourth and apparently the newest function of the independent *(-)naga* is its use as a noun with the meaning ‘stain’. As will be discussed in the following section, it is no coincidence that all known authentic occurrences of this noun occur in compound nouns:

(29) ***Varranagat*** *oidnojit* *ja* *rumbbut* *nu*
blood.*naga*.PL be.visible.3PL and carcass.PL so
*duokkot dákko.*
here.and.there
‘Blood stains and carcasses can be seen here and there.’ (Sara 2003: 34)

(30) *Go* *deallu,* *de* *várrogasat*
when rub.skin.3SG DPT careful.ADV
*jiehkkuin* *neaská* ***vuoiddas-*** ***ja***
leather.scratcher.COM scrape.3SG grease and
***ostonagaid*** *eret.*
willow.bark.*naga*.PL.GENACC away
‘When preparing the skin, one carefully scrapes off the stains of grease and willow bark with a leather scratcher (*jiehkku*).’ (Gáhkkorčoru mánáidgárdi 2011)

(31) *Buohkat* *stellejedje* *borranláhkái.*
everyone(.PL) arrange.PST.3PL ready.to.eat
*Fulle* *sákkiid* *borranreaidun* *ja*
whittle.PST.3PL stick.PL.GENACC cutlery.ESS and
*doide* ***gáfenagaid*** *eret* *guvssiin.*
rinse.PST.3PL coffee.*naga*.PL.GENACC off wood.cup.PL.LOC
'Everyone got themselves ready to eat. They whittled sticks to eat with and rinsed the coffee stains off the wooden cups.' (Sara 2013: 60)

(32) *Vikkai* *sihkkut* *eret* ***gáffenaga,***
try.PST.3SG wipe.INF off coffee.*naga*(.GENACC),
*muhto* *vilges* *báidi* *lei* *beare* *ráinnas*
but white shirt be.PST.3SG too clean
*ja* *vielgat,* *ja* *dielku* *oidnui*
and white and spot be.visible.PST.3SG
*vaikko* *man* *ollu* *son* *sihkui*
though what.GENACC much 3SG wipe.PST.3SG
*ja* *basai.*
and wash.PST.3SG
'She tried to wipe off the coffee stain, but the white shirt was too clean and white, and the spot was visible no matter how hard she as hard as she wiped and washed.' (Sara 2014: 12)

The words *varranagat* 'stains of blood', *vuoiddas- ja ostonagaid* 'stains of grease and willow bark', *gáfenagaid* 'coffee stains' and *gáffenaga* 'coffee stain' are indisputably nouns. They occur in subject and object positions and are inflected accordingly in case and number just like any other noun (cf. *fága* 'subject, discipline' : pl. nom. *fágat*; sg. gen.-acc. *fága* : pl. gen.-acc. *fágaid*). The morpheme *(-)naga* functions as heads of endocentric compound nouns and its meaning is 'stain' as is most explicit in Example (32) in which the noun

*dielku* ‘the spot’ refers to the same referent as *gáffenaga* ‘the coffee stain’.[13] As for *varranagat* in (29) and *vuoiddas- ja ostonagaid* in (30), the former is a translation from the Lule Saami noun *mállegålgådisá* ‘stains of blood’ and Example (30) occurs originally with a parallel Norwegian sentence in which the equivalent of *vuoiddas- ja ostonagaid* is the noun phrase *rester av smøring og seljebark* ‘remains of grease and willow bark’ (Ylikoski 2015: 123–124). For more examples of the noun *(-)naga*, see Ylikoski (2015: 121–125) and the discussion in the following section.

## 5. Discussion and further remarks

After the synchronic description of the morpheme *(-)naga* as well as a glance at its origins, this section extends the diachronic analysis of the morpheme up to the present. More precisely, the present diversity of the functions of the morpheme is analyzed as a result of degrammaticalization and lexicalization. In Section 5.1, I will first describe the observable history of *(-)naga* as such. After this, in Section 5.2 the nature and development of *(-)naga* is analyzed in terms of the parameters of degrammaticalization presented by Norde (2009) and already seen in use for *haga* ‘without’ in Section 3. Finally, the ultimate factors that may lie behind such degrammaticalization are discussed in Section 5.3.

### 5.1. Degrammaticalization of *(-)naga*

In the absence of representative historical data from a language with relatively short literary history, it is not easy to tell for certain when a given phenomenon such as a solitary word – or only one of its meanings – came into existence. The following account is based on the available language data and descriptions of North Saami grammar and lexicon from the 18th to the 21th century.

The use of the suffix *-naga* seems not to have experienced significant changes since Leem’s (1748: 362–363; 1768: 1354, 1414 *et passim*) pioneering descriptions in which both denominal (e.g. *vuodjanaga* ‘stained with grease/butter’, *varranaga* ‘stained with blood’) and deadjectival (*obbanaga* ‘as a whole’)

[13] The noun *gáffenaga* ‘coffee stain’ in (32) is clearly different from the adjective *gáffenaga* ‘coffee-stained’ in (v) whereas the compound noun *duolvadielku* (= *duolva* ‘dirt’ + *dielku* ‘spot’) is here used to refer to the entity ‘stain, dirt spot’:

(v) *Máhtte* *hirpmástuvai* *čorgatvuođa,* *mii*
Máhtte be.astonished.PST.3SG cleanliness.GENACC REL
*goađis* *lei.* *Luotni* *ii* *oidnon,*
hut.LOC be.PST.3SG litter NEG.3SG be.visible.PST.PTCP
*ii* ***duolvadielku,*** *ii* ***gáffenaga*** *gohppa=ge*
NEG.3SG stain.of.dirt NEG.3SG coffee.*naga* cup=even
*lean* *beavddis.*
be.PST.CNG table.LOC
‘Máhtte was astonished at the cleanliness in the hut. No litter, not a stain of dirt could be seen, there was not even a coffee-stained cup on the table.’ (Guttorm 1981: 48)

forms as well as isolated adverbs (like *dallánaga* ‘at once’ and *oktanaga* ‘at the same time’) can be found. It can be remarked, though, that the depictive deadjectival forms with transitory meanings such as *varasnaga* ‘while still fresh’ were not recorded before the 19th century. Instead, Ganander (1743: 22) mentions words like *varaskon* <*Waraskon*> which have not been attested later (see Ylikoski 2015: 115–116). However, the denominal and deadjectival *-naga* forms can be found in the dictionaries published in the 19th century (e.g., Friis 1887: LI *et passim*), and their use in authentic texts from the same era (e.g., Qvigstad 1928: 80; 1954: 55) is identical to the modern use as seen in Examples (12–15), (18) and (20a) above.

Apparently the only seemingly recent innovation – at least absent in the available text material published before the 21st century – is the possibility of the conjunction reduction seen in (33) where the construction *varra- ja guomonaga* ‘stained with blood and chyme’ is used instead of the equally possible *varranaga ja guomonaga* (“stained with blood and stained with chyme”):

(33)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Mus* | *ii* | | *lean* | |
| 1SG.LOC | NEG.3SG | | be.PST.CNG | |
| *gáržžohallandovdu,* | | *eambo* | *ahte* | *lei* |
| feeling.of.obligation | | more | COMP | be.PST.3SG |
| *eannjehas* | *go* | *lei* | | *nu* |
| disgusting | as | be.PST.3SG | | so |
| ***varra-*** | ***ja*** | ***guomonaga***. | | |
| blood | and | chyme.*naga* | | |

‘I did not feel it as an obligation, but it was so disgusting as that it [= a dead magpie] was so badly stained with blood and chyme.’ (SIKOR)

Constructions like this may be considered as first symptoms of the debonding of a morpheme and have presumably been preceded by suffixes that have, most likely, not originally undergone conjunction reduction. In other words, this makes the morpheme *(-)naga* look a bit like the postpositions *haga* (4) and *dagi* (9–10) seen in Section 3.

The first recorded use of a non-suffixal element *naga* can be found in Nielsen’s (1938) dictionary with examples like (21–23) seen above. Almost all his examples include the clitic *=ge* ‘even’, making the word form *nagage* ‘(not) at all’ a word of its own. The exact relation of this expression to the suffix *-naga* ‘stained with (N); while still (A)’ is far from obvious, but will be discussed further below.

The second recorded use of *naga* as a free morpheme is Sammallahti’s (1989 s.v.) and Sammallahti and Nickel’s (2006 s.v.) mention of the adverb *naga* having the two meanings ‘in name only; only a trace of’ and ‘in a tipsy

state; slightly drunk'. The dictionaries do not contain example sentences, but the latter type of meaning is certainly that of *naga* seen in (24–25). As discussed in Ylikoski (2015: 118–119, 126), it is quite natural to assume that this function is a back-formation of the derivative *viidnanaga*, literally 'stained with alcohol; with traces of alcohol' (← *viidna* 'spirits') used most often as an euphemism for 'slightly intoxicated'. As such, *(viidna)naga* 'slightly intoxicated; in a tipsy state' is quite similar to back-formations like *(ham)burger* and *(omni)bus*, which have probably never been considered to be degrammaticalizations, as their morphological and semantic statuses have not changed even though their phonological forms have been renewed. However, it appears that while *viidnanaga* 'slightly intoxicated; stained with alcohol' is used as an adjective (both a predicative and an adnominal modifier), *naga* acts more like an adverb 'in a tipsy state' in that it cannot be used as an attribute. While noun phrases like *viidnanaga gohppu* 'a cup with traces of alcohol' and *veahháš viidnanaga Freda* 'a slightly tipsy Freda' ("Freda with traces of alcohol") seen in (17) are possible, **naga Freda* is not, although *Freda lei (viidna)naga* [F. be.PST.3SG (spirits.)*naga*] 'Freda was slightly tipsy' is. Regardless of how *naga* has acquired the meaning 'in a tipsy state', it cannot be regarded as an outcome of degrammaticalization. At least from a synchronic perspective, the adverb *naga* 'in a tipsy state' can at best be regarded as a clipped and morphosyntactically and semantically limited variant of *viidnanaga* 'slightly intoxicated; stained with alcohol'.[14]

The third and fourth functions of *naga* can be regarded as results of degrammaticalization in the sense adopted here (Norde 2009). Not much can be said about the rather marginal postpositional use of *naga*, though. In principle, phrases like *man naga* [what.GENACC stained.with] 'stained with what' (26), *dan naga* [it.GENACC stained.with] 'stained with it' and *guolevuoja naga* [fish.fat.GENACC stained.with] 'stained with fish fat' (28) are structurally identical to other postpositional phrases (e.g., *man haga*, *dan haga* and *guolevuoja haga* 'without what / it / fish fat'). Formally, the free morpheme *naga* is identical to the suffix *-naga* in denominal forms with the identical meaning 'stained with'. The only difference between the two is that instead of being suffixed to the pronouns in the nominative, the postposition *naga* is in a nearly complementary distribution with noun-based derivatives and takes its complements in the genitive-accusative. A possible explanation for the rise of the postposition *naga* might lie in the fact that certain nouns such as *mála* 'paint' do not differentiate between the nominative and genitive-accusative cases in the singular,

[14] A similar example from another Uralic language is the sentential interrogative *tä* 'huh?; what did you say?' in colloquial Finnish, originally a clipped variant of the partitive interrogative pronoun *mi-tä* [Q-PART]. Even though the morpheme *tä* does seem to go back to the Proto-Uralic ablative **-ta*, the development of *tä* cannot be characterized as degrammaticalization in the sense adopted here (cf. Havu 2004; Lingtyp 2007).

and therefore it may be possible to reanalyze derivatives like *málanaga* [paint (.NOM).*naga*] 'stained with paint' as genitive-accusative based formations such as postpositional phrases *mála naga* [paint.GENACC stained.with] 'stained with paint'.

Finally, the most fruitful object of degrammaticalization studies is the use of *(-)naga* as a noun with the meaning 'stain'. Indeed, it is possible to try to date and locate the phenomenon and reconstruct the degrammaticalization as a process and pathway from a derivational, almost case-like suffix to a noun that usually occurs in compounds, but is ultimately an independent noun as well. While it is somewhat unclear as to what extent the other functions of the free *naga* – i.e. the adverbs *nagage* '(not) at all' and *naga* 'in a tipsy state' and *naga* as a postposition 'stained with' – are in active use throughout various parts of the North Saami language area, they nevertheless seem to be known by most speakers and have belonged to the language for generations.

The noun *(-)naga* 'stain', in contrast, is seemingly quite new. This function has never been mentioned in dictionaries or any other accounts of the language. Moreover, the authentic occurrences of *(-)naga* 'stain' in literary use are quite few and fairly recent: Even with the help of approximately 50 million word forms available electronically, only five authentic instances of *(-)naga*, used unambiguously as a noun, have been identified (see Examples 29–32 above), and they all stem from the period between 2003–2014. What is more, these five occurrences come from the works of four writers and translators, all of whom appear to be natives of the municipality of Guovdageaidnu (Kautokeino), at the very heart of contemporary North Saami in the northern inland of Norway and almost the only place where the overwhelming majority of the population speaks the language.

According to preliminary experiments on the acceptability of the observed phenomenon, *(-)naga* as a compoundable noun is quite well known and accepted in Guovdageaidnu, whereas it is equally foreign to speakers of other dialects. Furthermore, some of my native speaker colleagues and students from Guovdageaidnu have also affirmed to me that even though all authentic instances of *(-)naga* 'stain' occur in compound nouns (including the conjunction reduction seen in *vuoiddas- ja ostonagaid* in 30), it is also possible to use *naga* as an independent, uncompounded noun in contexts like (34–36). On the other hand, such discussions as well as the responses to a query on a language workers' mailing list (giella@list.uit.no, 11–12 May 2016) have made it evident that Examples (34–36) are approved less enthusiastically than compounded *-naga* nouns discussed above.

(34) %*Mat* *diet* *leat* ***nagaid****?*
what.P L that.PL be.3PL *naga*.PL.GENACC
'What are those stains?' (elicited)

(35) %*Jus* *doppe* *leat* ***mat nu*** ***nagat****,* *de (...)*
if there be.3PL some.PL *naga*.PL DPT
'If there are some kind of stains, then...' (elicited)

It sometimes appears that *naga* 'stain' is even less accepted as the head of a noun phrase with determiners or adjectival modifiers such as those seen in (36). However, sentences like this are also accepted by many speakers:

(36) %*Dus* *lea* *ain* ***diet*** ***rukses***
2SG.LOC be.3SG still that red.ATTR
***naga*** *báiddis*.
*naga* shirt.LOC
'You still have that red stain on your shirt.' (constructed)

In light of the predominant unidirectionality of grammatical changes, it appears that a denominal, mostly adjectival derivational suffix cannot easily depart from its suffixal functions and become an independent noun, and neither do the examples seen above exhibit how this may have happened. However, an interesting cue is provided by yet another writer-translator from Guovdageaidnu. Consider Example (37):

(37) *Jo,* *jo!* *Go juo* ***málanagas***
yes yes since paint.*naga*.LOC
*ballájit,* *mannoset* *dalle!*
get.frightened.3PL go.IMP.3PL then
'Okay! Since they get scared of someone stained with paint, let them go then!'
or: 'Okay! Since they get scared of a paint stain, let them go then!' (*Vulle Vuojaš* 28/1988: 7)


Picture 1. Donald Duck stained with paint (*Vulle Vuojaš* 28/1988: 7).

Example (37) comes from a Donald Duck story in which the protagonist wants to get rid of his rival contestants on a television show. To reach his goal, he paints his face with spots and pretends to suffer from an infectious disease in order to frighten the other contestants away. As the plan works (Picture 1), he utters the comment (37) that has potentially two different syntactic interpretations: either an adjectival, but kind of elliptical reading 'they get scared of someone stained with paint' or alternatively a nominal reading 'they get scared of a paint stain'.

Interestingly, (37) dates from 1988, which is 15 years before the first attested occurrence of *(-)naga* as an unambiguous noun (29). The reason for not considering (37) as unambiguous is that it seems to be unambiguous to only those speakers who do not know or acknowledge the morpheme *(-)naga* as a noun. To such language users, generally outside Guovdageaidnu, the only intelligible interpretation is to consider *málanagas* as an adjective (*málanaga* 'stained with paint') that is somewhat exceptionally used like a noun with the meaning '(some)one stained with paint'. Regardless of the part of speech, *málanagas* is a locative case form governed by the verb *ballát* 'get frightened', morphologically similar to *varranagan*, the context-determined essive case form of an adjectival *varranaga* 'stained with blood' seen in (16) above.

In light of the denominal adjectival *-naga* known widely throughout the language area, *málanagas* of (37) can be interpreted as an adjective, a sort

of elliptical variant of a noun phrase like *málanaga gilvaleaddjis* [paint.*naga* contestant.LOC] ‘(get frightened) of a contestant stained with paint’. However, to those who know the noun *(-)naga* ‘stain’, the most natural interpretation of *málanagas* seems to be ‘(get frightened) of a paint stain’. Indeed, this latter interpretation is the one that best corresponds to the Norwegian sentence (38) that has apparently served as the source of translation:

(38) Norwegian

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Tja,* | *ja!* | *Når* | *de* | *lar* | *seg* | *skremme* | |
| well | yes | as | 3PL | let.PRS | REFL | frighten.INF | |
| *av* | ***noen*** | ***klatter*** | ***med*** | ***farget*** | ***salve*** | *i* | *fjeset,* |
| by | some | blob.PL | with | colored | salve | at | face.DEF |
| *så!* | | | | | | | |
| then | | | | | | | |

‘Okay! Since they let themselves be frightened by some blobs of colored salve on my face, okay then!’ (*Donald Duck & Co* 28/1988: 8)

When trying to track the degrammaticalization path from the suffix *-naga* ‘stained with’ to the noun *(-)naga* ‘stain’, the ambiguity seen in (37) can, of course, be seen as one of the potential crossroads in which primarily adjectival derivatives like *málanaga* ‘paint-stained’ have been open to new interpretations. After the reanalysis of *málanaga* as a compound noun meaning ‘paint stain’, the following step is the extension of the latter to contexts in which an adjectival interpretation is no longer possible (29–32). Example (37) and the entire grammatical context in which such sentences can be created and potentially reanalyzed is, luckily enough, a needle in the haystack phenomenon, as characterized by Norde (2009: 136) when describing a situation in which a grammatical morpheme “must have a form which happens to be identical (or at least similar) to an inflected noun or verb, and this form must be the appropriate one in the context in which the reanalysis takes place”.

Another, albeit more hypothetical, kind of context in which adjectival *-naga* forms may be open to reanalysis is adnominal modifiers and their relation to their heads. Incidentally, Nielsen (1926: 288; 1938 s.v. *nâgâ*, *-nâgâ* ~ *-nâ*) does not claim to present any examples of adnominal *-naga* forms as such, but in his transcription, phrases like *dáigenaga gaccat* [dough.*naga* nail.PL] ‘dough-stained nails’ are written with a hyphen (*dai ˈgĕnâgâ-gâʒʒâk*) indicative of Nielsen’s interpretation of the *-naga* forms as adverbal modifiers of heads of compounds similar to expressions like *dáppeolbmot* (*dabbĕ-ǫlˈbmuk*) [here-people.PL] ‘the local people’. Even though Nielsen’s analysis seems to contradict all contemporary manifestations of adnominal *-naga* that are always

written separate from their heads, it seems that true compound nouns such as the unattested **dáigenagagaccat* could be open to at least two interpretations: 1) either the traditional use of *-naga* as an adjective-like adverb or an adverb-like adjective (‘dough-stained nails’), or 2) *dáigenaga gaccat* or **dáigenagagaccat* could alternately be interpreted as a kind of compound – and may indeed have been reanalyzed – consisting of three nouns *dáigi* ‘dough’, *(-)naga* ‘stain’ and *gaccat* ‘nails’, i.e. as ‘dough-stain nails’.

As it seems obvious that the noun *(-)naga* ‘stain’ originated from denominal adjectives that were reanalyzed as compound nouns (29–32) in one way or another, it is understandable that the noun still seems to occur mostly in compounds. However, this ought not to decisively diminish the noun status of *(-)naga*, as the language has also other comparable nouns such as *(-)rohkki* ‘deceased, late’, *(-)riehpu* ‘poor thing’ and *(-)sássa* ‘prospective relative’ that almost exclusively occur in compounds like *vuonerohkki* ‘late mother-in-law’, *vuoneriehpu* ‘poor mother-in-law’ and *vuonesássa* ‘prospective mother-in-law’ (← *vuoni* ‘mother-in-law’).

In sum, the data and observations presented above make it rather evident that denominal adjectival derivatives in *-naga* have been reanalyzed as nouns, more precisely as compound nouns. Ultimately, the element *(-)naga* has become a free morpheme that needs not be compounded in order to function as a noun with the meaning ‘stain’. While the adjectival functions of *-naga* ‘stained with’ have been generally known ever since the mid-18th century, the semantically related noun *(-)naga* has been attested only in the municipality of Guovdageaidnu and dates to the 21th century or, at best, to a sole occurrence from 1988. Therefore, it would appear that the noun *(-)naga* should be regarded as a result of recent language change. However, my native speaker informants who have confirmed the grammaticality of sentences like (29–32) and (34–37) tend to regard the noun *(-)naga* as an ordinary part of language and do not feel that it would be foreign or novel to the elderly generation either. Needless to say, further research is needed.

At this point it must be emphasized that there are good reasons to reject interpreting the emergence of the noun *(-)naga* ‘stain’ as an instance of lexicalization instead of degrammaticalization. As described by Norde:

> The best-known example of the lexicalization of an affix is *-ism* which can be used as a count noun in many languages, as a hypernym for ‘ideology’ (English *isms*, Dutch *ismen*, Swedish *ismer*, French *ismes*, etc.). This kind of change is clearly different from degrammaticalization for two reasons: (i) the suffix is taken out of its context to serve as a noun, whereas degrammaticalization is a context-internal change, and (ii) it is not the reverse of a grammaticalization change, because there is no evidence of nouns becoming a suffix ‘in one bang’. (Norde 2009: 113)

As suggested by the potential ambiguity of *málanagas* in (37) and the fact that the use of *naga* ‘stain’ as an independent, uncompounded noun in sentences like (34–36) is accepted in varying degrees and less commonly than the compound nouns of (29–32) and (37), it seems that *naga* ‘stain’ has never been crudely taken out of its context, but has instead been reanalyzed within its previous contexts, multiple times. Moreover, as it seems that adjectival *-naga* ‘stained with’ is known and used more or less all over the language area while compounded *-naga* ‘stain’ nouns are confined to the Guovdageaidnu dialect – the uncompounded noun *naga* ‘stain’ being accepted and used by even fewer people – the development of *(-)naga* ‘stain’ has definitely been gradual and, as such, clearly the opposite of a lexicalization “in one bang”.

As already seen in Section 4.1.2, the details of the prehistory of the suffix *-naga* are less clear, but it seems obvious that the suffix is originally based on the predecessor of the contemporary North Saami essive case marker *-n*. Table 3 presents the timeline of the development of *(-)naga*.

Table 3. Development of *(-)naga* ‘stain’ in Guovdageaidnu North Saami.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Proto-Uralic | *N-*na* | locative (‘in; at’; perhaps also essive ‘as’) |
| Proto-Saami | *N-*na* | essive (‘as’) (> North Saami essive *-n*) |
| North Saami (pre-19th century) | N-*naga* | derived adjective/adverb (‘stained with’) |
| 1988 | N-*naga(-)* | inflected in case, potentially ambiguous word class (adjective ‘stained with’ or noun ‘stain’) |
| 2003– | N-*naga(-)* | compound noun inflected in case and number (‘stain’) |
| 2016 | *naga(-)* | marginally independent noun inflected in case and number (Guovdageaidnu dialect) |

It is worth noting that the development of the noun *(-)naga* ‘stain’ has not lead to the loss of *-naga* as an adjectival/adverbal suffix any more than the earlier emergence of the suffix *-naga* has lead to the loss of the essive case. The gradual divergence of two morphemes and their multiple functions is fully in line with more normal grammaticalization such as the divergence of the *gonna* future from English *going to*, where the latter has by no means disappeared or lost its original functions (see, e.g., van der Auwera 2002: 23–24; Norde 2009: 149–151).

For the sake of completeness it can be noted that the old and widespread use of the adverb *nagage* ‘(not) at all, (not) a trace’ seen above (Examples 21–23) is semantically quite close to the apparently new noun with the meaning ‘stain’. In fact, under normal conditions – without knowing that *(-)naga* ‘stain’ has not

been attested in the language earlier – it would be quite natural to surmise that the adverb '(not) at all, (not) a trace' is based on the noun 'stain'. However, in light of the existing evidence it is difficult to imagine that the former widely spread expression that dates at least as far back as the 19th century (Example 22) would be based on a noun that can only be attested in the language a century later. In principle, it is possible to imagine that *nagage* is a remnant of an earlier word similar to the present-day *(-)naga* 'stain' that could then be seen as a reborn noun, but it is not possible to entertain this idea further within the confines of the present study. The present-day *(-)naga* 'stain' seems to be a relatively recent innovation in the Guovdageaidnu dialect of North Saami.

### 5.2.Parameter analysis of *(-)naga* 'stain' – "all the way up the cline"

Of all four types of *naga(ge)* as independent words (Section 4.2), only the development of the postposition *naga* 'stained with' (Examples 26–28) and especially the emergence of the noun *(-)naga* 'stain' correspond to Norde's (2009) definition of degrammaticalization. In the following, the above observations and remarks about the degrammaticalization of *(-)naga* 'stain' are summarized in accord with Norde's (2009) parameter analyses of the twenty case studies of degrammaticalization in her monograph.

As shortly described in Section 2, Norde's theoretical framework is, as it were, a mirror-image of Lehmann's (2015 [1982]) seminal presentation of the six parameters of grammaticalization. Both Lehmann's parameters and processes of grammaticalization and those of Norde's on degrammaticalization were presented in Table 1 (Section 2). A central feature of Norde's approach to degrammaticalization is that she sees each of the six parameters of degrammaticalization as being associated with one or more types of primitive changes, i.e. elementary linguistic changes on either the phonological, morphological, syntactic or semantic level. As cited in the beginning of this paper, Norde (2009: 120) defines degrammaticalization as "a composite change whereby a gram in a specific context gains in autonomy or substance on more than one linguistic level (semantics, morphology, syntax, or phonology)". In other words, degrammaticalization is a composite change that by definition must consist of several primitive changes in the direction opposite to that known as grammaticalization.

Neither Norde (2009) or other scholars have presented an exact definition of an entirely perfect and undeniable process of degrammaticalization, but Norde (2009: 111) cites Lehmann's (2004: 170) challenging description of what would count as "a good case of degrammaticalization":

> Degrammaticalization is the reverse of grammaticalization. (...) [W]e can see that this is a process in which a linguistic sign gains in autonomy, i.e. it becomes relatively free from constraints of the linguistic system. A good case

> of degrammaticalization would consequently be one in which, for instance, an infix first becomes a peripheral affix, this then becomes a free form, gaining more concrete semantic features and a few more phonological segments. All the while, the paradigm of forms with a similar distribution fills up by other items taking the same course, expanding into a larger class of more heterogeneous elements. In the further course of events, the degrammaticalized item joins the lexical (rather than grammatical) subclass of its category, passing, for instance, from an adposition to a relational noun, typically sprouting a case suffix that had not been there. The reverse of such a process is an everyday grammaticalization phenomenon. (Lehmann 2004: 170)

As a matter of fact, an even more perfect case of degrammaticalization would be one in which the degrammaticalizing infix described above would acquire its first form and function *ex nihilo*. However, Norde (2009) and many others have adopted a more merciful attitude to potential cases of degrammaticalization. Even though degrammaticalization is a composite change consisting of several primitive changes, it is best understood as a cluster concept in the sense that none of the primitive changes (Table 1) is either necessary or sufficient for regarding the development of a given morpheme as degrammaticalization. Instead, it ought to be more fruitful to think that a composite change is often "better" – i.e. more revealing about the less known possibilities of language change – the more primitive changes in the direction of an ideal degrammaticalization it takes. Apparently due to the diversity of dozens of potential cases of degrammaticalization discussed by Norde (2009), she does not attempt to rank her examples, but in any case her parameter analysis of *haga* contains a significant number of primitive changes that seem to make it one of her best examples of degrammaticalization. As seen in Table 2 (repeated from Section 3), North Saami *haga* has ultimately failed to undergo only one primitive change, as the former abessive case suffix has not become a member of a major word class but only an adposition and an adverb.

Table 2. Parameter analysis of North Saami *haga* based on Norde (2009: 209) (repeated from Section 3).

| Parameter | Primitive change(s) |
|---|---|
| **Integrity** | *resemanticization*: ☑; *haga* can function as an independent adverb meaning 'without' (Example 5), which means that it no longer only modifies a noun phrase (as an abessive case suffix).<br>*phonological "strengthening"*: ☑; there has been no change at the segmental level, but at the prosodic level *haga* as an adverb or a pragmatically marked postposition receives the primary stress instead of the secondary one (Examples 5 and 11).<br>*recategorialization*: ☐; *haga* does not join a major (inflected) word class. |
| **Paradigmaticity** | *deparadigmaticization*: (☑); *haga* no longer forms part of the paradigm of North Saami nominal case inflections. |
| **Paradigmatic variability** | *deobligatorification*: (☑); as a postposition, *haga* is still in opposition with the inflectional case markers, but in some varieties of North Saami, it may be substituted by other abessive elements (Ylikoski 2009: 101–102). |
| **Structural scope** | *scope expansion*: ☑; expanded scope of *haga* is reflected by conjunction reduction (Example 4) and the ability to follow the possessive (Norde 2009: 207). |
| **Bondedness** | *severance*: ☑; *haga* has become a free morpheme. |
| **Syntagmatic variability** | *flexibilization*: ☑; *haga* can occur independently (Example 5), and even as a preposition (Examples 6–7). |

To pull the threads together, Table 4 presents an analogous parameter analysis of the North Saami noun *(-)naga* 'stain' based on the facts and reconstructions presented in previous sections. The table also contains some indisputable minor facts that have not been mentioned above.

Table 4. Parameter analysis of North Saami *(-)naga* à la Norde (2009).

| Parameter | Primitive change(s) |
|---|---|
| **Integrity** | *resemanticization*: ☑; *(-)naga* not only has an abstract (derivational) meaning ('stained with'), but it has gained a new function as a noun with the concrete lexical meaning 'stain' (Examples 29–32).<br>*phonological "strengthening"*: ☑; there has been no change at the segmental level lately, but at the prosodic level *(-)naga* as a noun or a pragmatically marked postposition receives the primary stress instead of the secondary one; earlier, the derivational suffix *-naga* has grown in comparison to its assumed original platform, the Proto-Saami essive in **-na*. The material origin of the latter part of the morpheme remains unclear, though.<br>*recategorialization*: ☑; *(-)naga* belongs to a major (inflected) word class of nouns. |
| **Paradigmaticity** | *deparadigmaticization*: (☑); not relevant for derivational affixes, as *-naga* is not a part of the paradigm of North Saami nominal case inflection and is still also used as a derivational suffix. However, the element seems to go ultimately back to the Proto-Saami essive case marker that has deparadigmaticized into a derivational suffix and later a noun. |
| **Paradigmatic variability** | *deobligatorification*: (☑); while still used as a derivational suffix *-naga*, *(-)naga* as a noun for 'stain' can be substituted by nouns such as *dielku* 'spot, stain' (also in compounds such as *varradielku* pro *varranaga* 'blood stain'). |
| **Structural scope** | *scope expansion*: ☑; expanded scope of *(-)naga* is reflected by conjunction reduction (cf. *varra- ja guomonaga* 'stained with blood and chyme' in (33) and *vuoiddas- ja ostonagaid* 'stains of grease and willow bark' in (30)). |
| **Bondedness** | *severance*: ☑; *(-)naga* has (albeit marginally) become a free morpheme. |
| **Syntagmatic variability** | *flexibilization*: ☑; *(-)naga* can occur as a noun for 'stain' (Examples 34–36) and also as a postposition 'stained with' (Examples 26–28). |

As can be seen by comparing Tables 2 and 4, it is possible to assign positive values to each and every type of change involved in the development of *(-)naga*. The questions about phonological strengthening and especially deparadigmaticization can be answered positively if the perspective is extended to the presumption that the derivational suffix -*naga* originates in the Proto-Saami essive case suffix *-*na*. If this is true, the original case marker has been augmented to become -*naga*, a deparadigmaticized derivational suffix. On the other hand, while it is a phonological fact that *naga* as an independent word has primary stress on its initial syllable (cf. discussion on *haga* in Section 3), it is also an unavoidable effect of the severance, because all autochthonous North Saami nouns have such a stress pattern.

Perhaps the most important feature in the development of *(-)naga* is – in Norde's terms – its recategorialization, the process in which a derivational suffix has been reanalyzed as a noun that is inflected and used almost like any noun – evidently first in compounds and afterwards as a free noun by some speakers. Norde does not consider this an impossibility, but emphasizes already in the beginning of her comprehensive monograph that "there are no examples of degrammaticalization 'all the way up the cline' – a degrammaticalization chain from suffix all the way to lexical item has not been attested" (Norde 2009: 8). As mentioned in Section 2, she presents examples of *debonding* in which suffixes have become pronouns (Irish *muid* 'we') and quantifiers (Dutch/Frisian/German *tig*/*tich*/*zig* meaning 'umpteen, dozens'), and examples of *degrammation* in which function words like the Welsh preposition for 'after' or the possessive pronoun 'his' have become the verb for 'fetch' and the noun for 'property', respectively, but the development of *(-)naga* is an unprecedented combination of both types of degrammaticalization. Finally, in light of the essival origin of *(-)naga*, its history also seems to include the last of Norde's three subtypes of degrammaticalization: her definition of *deinflectionalization* is largely identical to her idea of the primary change *deparadigmaticization* as seen in Tables 2 and 4 above.

The overall importance of the development of *(-)naga* is further underlined in the following statements by Norde:

> (...) some authors dismiss degrammaticalization as a valid type of change on the basis of a distorted definition of degrammaticalization as a mirror-image reversal of grammaticalization, even though no one, to the best of my knowledge, has ever claimed the existence of such a full reversal. Such developments verge on the impossible, as I have argued on several occasions in this book. What sets apart degrammaticalization from grammaticalization is that in most cases, degrammaticalization entails a single shift from right to left on the cline of grammaticality. There may be some subsequent change (as in the case of Saami

> haga, which developed from suffix to postposition to preposition (...)), but in general we may say that there is no 'domino effect'.
>
> This is mainly an observation, not something which is inherent in the definition of degrammaticalization. The reason why there are no degrammaticalization chains is that circumstances under which a degrammaticalization can take place are very rare, and it is quite unlikely that such circumstances would arise twice in the history of a given morpheme (...). (Norde 2009: 123)

It appears that Norde is quite right in noting that development of lexical words like *(-)naga* 'stain' from affixes like the derivational suffix *-naga* 'stained with' and possibly ultimately from the Proto-Saami essive case suffix **-na* (roughly: 'as') does indeed seem impossible and at best, such changes are highly unlikely. This is one of the main reasons for the relative length and depth of the description of *(-)naga* throughout the preceding sections. However, Namiki and Kageyama (2016: 230–231) have just recently pointed out that the development of two Japanese verbs *mekasu* (めかす) 'dress up' and *buru* (ぶる) 'put on airs, be self-important' – from older derivational suffixes *-mekasu* 'behave like, pretend to be, try to show' and *-buru* 'behave as if, pretend to be' (e.g., *sinsetu-mekasu* [kind-*mekasu*] (親切めかす) 'pretend to be a kind person', *gakusha-buru* [scholar-*buru*] (学者ぶる) 'act pedantically') – also seem to qualify as examples of bound affixes that have degrammaticalized to free lexical items such as verbs.[15] As there certainly are scholars who will find it tempting to assume that the development of *(-)naga* must have been the reverse of what is presented here, it must be emphasized and repeated that the first attested potentially noun-like instance of *(-)naga* dates from 1988 (Example 37), whereas *-naga* as a denominal derivational suffix has been described ever since the first 18th-century accounts of the language (Leem 1748: 362–363; 1768: 1354, 1414).

Finally, the most meticulous approach to the history and research history of *-naga* leads us to even more surprising if not bizarre conclusions about the development of the morpheme in question. It was mentioned in Section 4.1.2 that the heretofore most specific and the most principled etymological expla-

[15] Quite interestingly, Everett and Kern (1997: 382) have cursorily suggested that in Wari' (Chapacuran; Brazil), "[t]here are two kinship terms and one verb which might have been derived from verbal inflectional clitics, although this is still a bit speculative". The authors propose that the matriarchal structure of the language community may have given rise to the nouns *na'* 'my mother' and *nem* 'my brother-in-law' on the basis of third person singular inflectional clitics with meanings comparable to '(s)he' and "he-to-her", respectively. Further, the Wari' verb *nam'/nanam'* 'be pregnant' appears to be composed of third person markers for subjects and objects. It seems that these examples have not been discussed or even mentioned in connection with degrammaticalization studies, and due to the label *a bit speculative* it is impossible to regard the Wari' examples as verified instances of degrammaticalization (see also Esa Itkonen 2005: 186–187). If true, development of words meaning 'my mother', 'my brother-in-law' and 'be pregnant' from inflectional clitics come very close to being examples of bound affixes that have degrammaticalized to free lexical items.

nation given to *(-)naga* is Sammallahti's (1998a: 93; 1998b: 83, 236, 258) assertion that its Proto-Saami predecessor *-*nɐ̯ɢɐ̯n* goes ultimately back to not only Proto-Uralic locative *-*na* but also Proto-Uralic directional (lative) case suffixes *-*k* and *-*n*. However, it was pointed out that the hypothesis seems to lack functionally plausible arguments and is perhaps better understood as a representation of the long Uralistic tradition of nonchalantly explaining away opaque morphemes by referring to so-called lative cases as their material origin. On the other hand, it must be admitted that Sammallahti's etymology is virtually the only one available, and in this respect it is possible to state that according to his theory on the origin of the suffix *-naga*, also the noun *(-)naga* 'stain' must be considered as going back to as many as three Proto-Uralic local case suffixes and nothing else. (In the same vein, the adposition and adverb *haga* 'without' seems to go back to the Proto-Uralic abessive suffix and two Proto-Uralic lative suffixes; see Section 4.1.2 above.)

It goes without saying that the theoretical possibility of three local case suffixes stacking together and later degrammaticalizing to a noun for 'stain' verges on the impossible, as Norde would put it. Be that as it may, the mere possibility of such development is enough to remind us of the fact that even though the various processes of grammaticalization and degrammaticalization consist of primitive changes that may individually be regarded as mirror-images of each other, it would be absurd to presuppose that entire grammaticalization and degrammaticalization chains as composite changes be understood as exact mirror-images of each other. Just like the passage quoted from Lehmann (2004: 170) at the beginning of this section has been intended to make degrammaticalization as the reverse of grammaticalization appear impossible, it is quite impossible to imagine a "more natural" process of grammaticalization in which a noun for 'stain' in a given language – be it *(-)naga* in North Saami, *stain* in English or *macula* in Latin – would, over time, "grammaticalize" via a derivational affix into not only one locative case affix but also two different directional case affixes. Interestingly enough, if traditional Uralistic explanations are combined with the North Saami data and analyses presented above, the opposite does not seem entirely impossible.

To make Uralic historical morphology appear even more fanciful, it may be remembered that according to the received view, the genitive-accusative plural marker *-id* /-j(t)/ seen in noun forms like *ostonagaid* 'stains of willow bark' (30) and *gáfenagaid* 'stains of coffee' (31) goes back to the Proto-Uralic genitive plural *-*j* and ablative *-*ta* (Korhonen 1981: 209–216; Sammallahti 1998a: 67; 1998b: 68). This said, the present-day North Saami genitive-accusative plural *nagaid* 'stains' in (34) should in principle be reconstructed as going materially back to as many as five Proto-Uralic case suffixes: *-*na* (locative) + *-*k* (lative)

+ *-*n* (another lative) + *-*j* (genitive plural) + *-*ta* (ablative). However, the exact origin of the element *(-)naga* remains unknown and requires further research.

### 5.3. Grammaticalization theory or conspiracy theory: why *haga* and *naga*?

The most dedicated degrammaticalization denialists aside, phenomena regarded as degrammaticalization have been considered quite exceptional and difficult to generalize on. As late as in 1994, Bybee et al. (1994: 13) were explicitly open to the possibility of affixes becoming free words, but acknowledged that they were aware of only one example, the development of the Irish personal pronoun *muid* 'we' from the first person plural suffix *-mid*. A decade later, Haspelmath (2004: 29) listed eight "real exceptions" to unidirectionality of language change; his examples include Irish *muid*, English and Scandinavian *s*-genitive and North Saami *haga*. Five years later, Norde (2009) published a monograph that includes twenty concise case studies on similar phenomena, and new examples are continuing to be presented (e.g., Willis 2010; Rutten 2012; Doron & Meir 2015).

Despite the growing interest in degrammaticalization, there have been very few systematic attempts to *explain* degrammaticalization in terms of possible factors that may have influenced or promoted individual degrammaticalization processes, not to speak of more abstract factors that might explain what causes degrammaticalization in general. Even Norde (2009: 233–237) addresses the question of motivating forces of degrammaticalization only briefly on the few last pages of her erudite monograph and is not able to find significant regularities that could be considered as typical of degrammaticalization on the whole. However, since North Saami is apparently able to provide as many as two exceptionally good examples of a phenomenon that is not even acknowledged by all linguists, it is intriguing to ask whether the development of the words *haga* and *(-)naga* in North Saami could have partly similar explanations.

The question about the ultimate causes of degrammaticalization has received surprisingly vague and impressionistic answers from scholars. When describing the birth of Irish *muid* 'we', Bybee et al. (1994: 13–14) refer to "strong paradigmatic pressure" to reanalyze the former verb suffix as a pronoun, since the Irish verb conjugation has been in the process of losing the original inflectional forms and replacing them with more analytic constructions. Norde (2002: 61; 2009: 102) refers favorably to Plank (1995: 217–218) who characterizes the development of the English *s*-genitive as a consequence of "a system disruption" (*Systemstörung*). Further, she refers to Lass (1997: 297) who vaguely states that exceptions from the general direction of grammaticalization phenomena require "a rather special kick" such as "some kind of powerful innovation" or "some kind of external 'energy'". However, Newmeyer (2000: 268–269) points

out that the "strong paradigmatic pressure" taken up by Bybee et al. (1994: 13–14) is not a rare factor in linguistic change altogether. Indeed, it seems possible to use wordings like "paradigmatic pressure", "system disruption", "a rather special kick" and "some kind of powerful innovation" in explaining hundreds of attested examples of ordinary grammaticalization as well. For this reason, perhaps the most sobering answer to the puzzle is Haspelmath's (2004: 29) confession that his eight examples of degrammaticalization (in his terms *antigrammaticalization*) "do not fall under any other generalization, and I cannot say more about them", and "until we have a solid generalization, any attempt at explaining these cases away seems premature".

Apparently the most recent explicit contribution to the problem of explaining degrammaticalization is Viti's (2015) paper in which she aims to present two principles underlying degrammaticalization. The first of the claimed principles would be more accurately described as observations on the constructional types of grammatical elements that may undergo degrammaticalization. However, the second principle is a true attempt to prove that degrammaticalization is prone to take place especially in languages with characteristically agglutinative morphology – in opposition to more fusional and isolating languages. Viti's (2015: 406, 411) main explanatory point for this is that in such languages bound morphemes are identified more easily and they are supposedly therefore also more easily detached as independent words.

A detailed assessment of Viti's arguments falls outside the scope of the present paper, but her use of North Saami as an example of an agglutinative language that fosters degrammaticalization calls for some comments. Referring to the North Saami *haga*, Viti (2015: 405) states that most cases of degrammaticalization "are drawn from agglutinative languages or language families, such as Finno-Ugric or, more generally, from Uralic". However, in this connection she fails to pay attention to the fact that North Saami is definitely one of the weakest examples of agglutinative languages within the Uralic language family. Incidentally, however, it appears that the morphological type of the language may indeed partly explain the degrammaticalization of both *haga* and *(-)naga*. Consider Table 5 that illustrates the inventory of the six morphological cases in North Saami in their singular forms. The plural forms of uncountable nouns – most typical heads of *-naga*[16] – are virtually non-existent and less relevant here.

[16] It is also possible to create and use *-naga* forms like *guollenaga* 'stained with fish' from prototypically countable nouns (*guolli* 'fish'), though.

Table 5. The North Saami singular case forms of *varra* ‘blood’, *giehpa* ‘soot’ and *muohta* ‘snow’.

| | ‘blood’ | ‘soot’ | ‘snow’ |
|---|---|---|---|
| nominative | *varra* | *giehpa* | *muohta* |
| genitive-accusative | *vara* | *gieba* | *muohttaga* |
| locative | *varas* | *giebas* | *muohttagis* |
| illative | *varrii* | *gihpii* | *muohttagii* |
| comitative | *varain* | *giebain* | *muohttagiin* |
| essive | *varran* | *giehpan* | *muohtan* |

As seen in Table 5, North Saami nouns – not unlike verbs and adjectives – undergo various morphophonological changes such as consonant gradation (e.g., *varra* : *vara*; *giehpa* : *gieba*; *muohta* : *muohttaga*), diphthong simplification (*giehpa* : *gihpii*), unstressed vowel alteration (*varra* : *varrii*; *giehpa* : *gihpii*) and consonant alteration at the end of the stem (*muohta* : *muohttag-*). In certain stem types, it is not obvious whether the last vowel ought to be analyzed as belonging to the case suffix (locative *muohttagi-s* or *muohttag-is*) or constituting a suffix of its own (genitive-accusative *muohttaga-Ø* or *muohttag-a*). Otherwise, the genitive-accusative lacks a case marker altogether. This said, the essive case marker *-n* stands out as the only case suffix that is almost always attached to the stem identical with the singular nominative and can thus be regarded as a truly agglutinative affix.

Even in the realm of derivation, many derivational suffixes also affect the stem (e.g., *varra* ‘blood’ → *varrái* (pred.) : *varrás* (attr.) ‘rich in blood; ruddy’, *varra* → *va**r**aheapme* (pred.) : *va**r**ahis* (attr.) ‘bloodless; anemic’). In this context, it is evident that it cannot be the alleged agglutinative type of North Saami that explains the degrammaticalization of *haga* ‘without’ and *(-)naga* ‘stain’. Quite on the contrary, it seems more plausible to assume that these disyllabic morphemes have gained their independence precisely because of the fact that they barely fit into the predominantly fusional type of the language. The earlier abessive case suffix did originally trigger consonant gradation but not other morphophonological changes, and this has led to the ambiguity through which the oblique stem followed by *(-)haga* has allowed reanalysis of a former case form as a postposition governing the genitive-accusative. One important factor must have been the fact that the disyllabic *(-)haga* has been a very untypical morpheme among the case suffixes that do not usually augment the noun stem by more than a single syllable (Table 5). Instead, the disyllabic *haga* as well as Lule Saami *dagi*/*dagá* (see Section 3) fit in the group of postpositions like *birra* ‘about; around’, *bokte* ‘via’, *dihte* ‘because of’ and *(n)ala* ‘on(to)’ (~ Lule Saami *birra*, *baktu*, *diehti* and *nali* id.). Therefore, it has been natural

to reanalyze abessive case forms like *varahaga* [blood.ABE] as postpositional phrases like *vara haga* [blood.GENACC without] on a par with *vara nala* [blood.GENACC on(to)] 'on(to) the blood'), for example.

In the same vein, the development of *(-)naga* can be better understood in light of the fusionality seen in Table 5 and especially in light of the fact that the only purely agglutinative case suffix in North Saami is the essive marker *-n* that most likely serves as the basis for the derivational suffix *-naga*: *varra* : *varra-n* (essive, including the meaning 'stained with blood') → *varra-naga* 'stained with blood' (12a–b), *muohta* : *muohta-n* → *muohta-naga* 'stained with snow' (14a–b), *giehpa* : *giehpa-n* → *giehpa-naga* 'stained with soot' (15a–b) and so on. As a result, denominal *-naga* forms are based on the nominative stem, and as disyllabic suffixes like *-naga* receive a secondary stress in spite of the length and form of the base stem, this has made them prosodically analogous to compound nouns (e.g., *ˈvarraˌnaga* 'stained with blood' and *ˈbanánaˌnaga* 'stained with banana' on a par with *ˈvarraˌsmáhkka* 'taste of blood' and *ˈbanánaˌsmáhkka* 'taste of banana').

The unusual morphosyntactic and semantic preconditions for ambiguity and subsequent reanalysis of derivations as compounds – and the concomitant reanalysis of the derivational suffix as a noun – have already been described in Section 5.1 above. The morphophonemic explanation for the reanalysis is hardly based on "strong paradigmatic pressure", "system disruption", "rather special kicks" or "some kind of external energy", but, on the contrary, in the fact that North Saami morphology is so fusional and so full of morphophonological alterations that disyllabic agglutinative suffixes are quite atypical in the language, and as such they are more reminiscent of independent words. Moreover, it seems that instead of Viti's (2015: 406, 411) claim that morphemes like *(-)haga* and *(-)naga* are prone to be identified and separated from their bases because of the overall agglutinativity of the language, it may be precisely the relatively high degree of fusionality that makes such untypical affixes stick out as something more than mere affixes and thus open to reanalysis in potentially ambiguous sentence contexts. On the other hand, it is true that North Saami has also been agglutinative enough to develop the agglutinative morphemes that have been able to degrammaticalize. It is probably a mere coincidence that *haga* and *naga* are formally so close to each other, but it might not be a coincidence that it has not been any of the nonsyllabic, stem-changing suffixes like the illative case marker *-i* /-j/ or the derivational suffix *-i* /-j/ '-y' as in *varrii* [blood.ILL] 'to blood' or *varrái* [blood.ADJ] 'ruddy' that have undergone gradual debonding and finally degrammaticalized into independent words.

It should go without saying that the mere "agglutinative language family membership" of North Saami is even less eligible to account for recent changes in the language as it is one of the least agglutinative languages of the family.

It must also be noted that even though the North Saami grammar and lexicon are increasingly being affected by bilingualism and full-scale interference from the majority languages Norwegian, Swedish and Finnish, the development of the suffix *-naga* and the word(s) *(-)naga* does not show any signs of external influence whatsoever.

Doyle (2002: 77–78) characterizes the degrammaticalization of the Irish *muid* 'we' from the first person plural verb suffix *-mid* as an outcome of "a conspiracy of syntactic and phonological factors". In light of everything that has been said about the development of North Saami *haga* 'without' and *(-)naga* 'stain; stained with' in the preceding sections, it is easy to agree with Doyle's sentiments and conclude that in contrast to the more or less unidirectional grammaticalization theory that by no means is able to explain a large part of the ordinary morphological innovations in the language (see, e.g., Sammallah -ti 1998b: 69–71; Ylikoski 2009: 116–117, 197–199; 2014a), the histories of *haga* and *(-)naga* are better understood with the help of "conspiracy theories" consisting of extraordinary combinations of phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic circumstances that have provided for multiple unusual reanalyses of earlier suffixes.

It may be added that in North Saami there are a number of similar but considerably less degrammaticalized morphemes that may occasionally undergo debonding, namely conjunction reduction à la *vuoiddas- ja ostonagaid* 'stains of grease and willow bark' (30) and *varra- ja guomonaga* 'stained with blood and chyme' (33). Such morphemes have been discussed in Ylikoski (2009: 116–128, 200–201) where it is conjectured that such phenomena could in principle be regarded as tentative symptoms of a wholesale "degrammaticalization drift" in North Saami; a situation in which somewhat atypical disyllabic suffixes seem to represent an intermediate stage on the way to a more clitic-like status for many of the present-day suffixes. Examples mentioned in Ylikoski (2009) include, among others, the verb forms *hála- ja čále-dettiin* [speak and write-CVB.SIM] 'when speaking and writing' and *bora- ja juga-keahttá* [eat and drink-CVB.NEG] 'without eating and drinking' instead of ordinary converbs *háladettiin ja čáledettiin* and *borakeahttá ja jugakeahttá* id., nouns like *nuorra- ja olmmái-vuohta* [young and man-hood] 'youth and manhood' instead of *nuorravuohta ja olmmáivuohta* and adjectives like *áhče- ja eatne-heapme* [father- and mother-less] 'fatherless and motherless' instead of *áhčeheapme ja eatneheapme*. In a way, situations in which such morphemes stand out as quite atypical for affixes are reminiscent of Norde's (2001; 2009: 206–207) thoughts on deflexion as impetus to degrammaticalization of morphemes like English and Scandinavian *s*-genitive and Irish *muid* 'we'.

## 6. Conclusion

The previous sections have described and discussed the degrammaticalization of the North Saami *haga* 'without' and *(-)naga* 'stain; stained with' from earlier suffixes that seem to ultimately originate in the Proto-Uralic abessive (*-*pta*) and locative (*-*na*) case markers. While *haga* has already been well known even outside traditional Saami and Uralic linguistics, more information has been presented about the morpheme and its history, including its cognate in Lule Saami in which the former abessive case suffix is mostly used as the postposition *dagi*/*dagá*. On the other hand, the existence and recent degrammaticalization of the morpheme *(-)naga* has not been subject to detailed study earlier. While many of the grammatical and lexical functions of *(-)naga* have been documented by earlier grammarians and lexicographers ever since the 18th century, the most interesting change seems to have taken place quite recently, as the noun *(-)naga* 'stain' seems to be confined to the Guovdageaidnu dialect and has not been recorded by earlier scholars. Regardless of the somewhat unclear origin of the derivational suffix -*naga*, it can be shown that denominal adjectives such as *varranaga* 'stained with blood' and *gáfenaga* 'stained with coffee' have very exceptionally, but in itself quite naturally, given rise to the marginal postposition *naga* 'stained with' and even to the homonymous noun *(-)naga* 'stain', as adjectives in -*naga* have been – in favorable contexts – reanalyzed as compound nouns such as *varranaga(t)* 'blood stain(s)' and *gáfenaga(t)* 'coffee stain(s)'.

While many of the claimed examples and even the entire concept of degrammaticalization have been rejected by some linguists, even the most receptive scholars of language change have been unable to detect instances of degrammaticalization "all the way up the cline", from bound affixes all the way to lexical items (Norde 2009: 8). The synchrony, prehistory and the most recent changes of the morpheme *(-)naga* are hopefully able to prove that such a development is possible not only in theory but also in practice. As such, the degrammaticalization of the noun *(-)naga* 'stain' can be compared to the rise of the Japanese verbs *mekasu* 'dress up' and *buru* 'put on airs, be self-important' from earlier derivational suffixes -*mekasu* 'behave like, pretend to be, try to show' and -*buru* 'behave as if, pretend to be' (Namiki & Kageyama 2016: 230–231). The emergence of North Saami *(-)naga* 'stain' appears to be the very first attested example of a degrammaticalization chain from a derivational or even inflectional affix to a lexical noun. The fact that North Saami morphology has experienced as many as two grammatical affixes degrammaticalizing to independent words may be due to the extraordinary position of agglutinative disyllabic suffixes in the otherwise fusional language.

In addition to the typological importance of the observed degrammaticalization phenomena as well as the value of the general synchronic description of

less-known building blocks of North Saami grammar and lexicon, the preceding sections also provide novel insights into the history of Uralic inflectional and derivational morphology in general. If the most serious and nearly the only proposed etymology of the element *-naga* (Sammallahti 1998a, 1998b) is considered reliable, North Saami exhibits a highly unprecedented development in which as many as three Proto-Uralic case markers – the locative in **-na* and the latives in **-k* and **-n* – have first been stacked together, in this way becoming a derivational suffix, and afterwards degrammaticalized to an independent noun for 'stain'. Regardless of the historical accuracy of the entire story, the development of North Saami *(-)naga* is a living example of the fact that the diachronic research on Saami and other Uralic languages need not be confined to the ancient past, but instead, the Saami languages are in constant change – not only along well-trodden grammaticalization paths or through interference exerted by dominant majority languages on endangered minority languages, but endogenously and through unforeseen routes of degrammaticalization as well.

## Abbreviations

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | first person | IMP | imperative |
| 2 | second person | INE | inessive |
| 3 | third person | INF | infinitive |
| ABE | abessive | INS | instrumental |
| ABL | ablative | LAT | lative |
| ACC | accusative | LOC | locative |
| ADJ | adjective | NEG | negative |
| ADV | adverb | PART | partitive |
| ATTR | attributive | PASS | passive |
| CNG | connegative | PL | plural |
| COM | comitative | PRS | present |
| COMP | complement | PST | past |
| CVB | converb | PTCP | participle |
| DEF | definite | PURP | purposive (converb) |
| DPT | discourse particle | Q | question |
| ELA | elative | REFL | reflexive |
| ESS | essive | REL | relative |
| FUT | future | SG | singular |
| GEN | genitive | SIM | simultaneous (converb) |
| GENACC | genitive-accusative | VN | verbal noun |
| ILL | illative | | |

**References**

Aikio 2012 = Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol Ánte (Aikio, Ante): On Finnic long vowels, Samoyed vowel sequences and Proto-Uralic *x. In Hyytiäinen, Tiina – Lotta Jalava – Janne Saarikivi – Erika Sandman (eds): *Per Urales ad Orientem: Iter polyphonicum multilingue. Festskrift tillägnad Juha Janhunen på hans sextioårsdag den 12 februari 2012.* MSFOu 264. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne. 227–250.

Aikio, Ante & Ylikoski, Jussi 2007: Suopmelaš gielaid *l*-kásusiid álgovuođđu sáme- ja eará fuolkegielaid čuovggas. In Ylikoski, Jussi – Ante Aikio (eds): *Sámit, sánit, sátnehámit. Riepmočála Pekka Sammallahtii miessemánu 21. beaivve 2007.* MSFOu 253. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne. 11–71.

Aikio, Samuli 2006: Historjá dutkama čárvváin. [Review of Hansen, Lars Ivar & Olsen, Bjørnar 2004: *Samenes historie fram til 1750*.] *Sámi dieđalaš áigečála* 1/2006. 98–103.

Árdna = Árdna. Samisk kulturprogram. [11 April 2016]. <https://tv.nrk.no/serie/ardna-tv/SAPP67004216/11-04-2016> [12 May 2016].

ÅT = *Ådå Testamennta*. Uppsala: Svieriga Rámátsiebrre 2000.

Balto, Samuel J. 1980 [1889]: *Med Nansen over Grønlandsisen i 1888. Min reise fra Sameland til Grønland.* Tromsø & Oslo & Bergen: Universitetsforlaget.

Bartens, Raija 2000: *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys.* MSFOu 238. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Bergsland, Knut 1945: L'alternance consonantique date-t-elle du lapon commun? In *Festskrift til Konrad Nielsen på 70-årsdagen 28. august 1945*. Oslo: A.W. Brøgger. 1–53.

Bergsland, Knut 1946: *Røros-lappisk grammatikk. Et forsøk på strukturell språkbeskrivelse.* Oslo: Aschehoug.

Bergsland, Knut 1961: *Samisk grammatikk med øvelsesstykker.* Oslo: Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet.

Beronka, Johan 1940: *Lappische Kasusstudien. II. Zur geschichte des Nominativs, des Akkusativs, der allgemeinen und äusseren Lokalkasus.* Oslo: Brøggers.

Bybee, Joan 2015: *Language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bybee, Joan L. & Perkins, Revere & Pagliuca, William 1994: *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, Lyle 2001: What's wrong with grammaticalization? *Language Sciences* 2. 113–161.

Csepregi, Márta 2001: Abessiivi, karitiivi – suffiksi yli sanaluokkarajojen. In Seilenthal, Tõnu (ed.): *Congressus Nonus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum. 7.–13.8.2000 Tartu. Pars IV. Dissertationes sectionum: Linguistica I.* Tartu. 181–189.

*Donald Duck & Co* 28/1988. Oslo: Hjemmet.
Doron, Edit & Meir, Irit 2015: The impact of contact languages on the degrammaticalization of the Hebrew definite article. *Journal of Jewish Languages* 3. 283–299.
Doyle, Aidan 2002: Yesterday's affixes as today's clitics: A case-study in degrammaticalization. 2002. In Wischer, Ilse – Gabriela Diewald (eds): *New reflections on grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 67–81.
Everett, Daniel L. & Kern, Barbara 1997: *Wari'. The Pacaas Novos language of Western Brazil.* London & New York: Routledge.
Feist, Timothy 2015: *A Grammar of Skolt Saami*. MSFOu 273. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.
Friis, J. A. 1856: *Lappisk Grammatik. Udarbeidet efter den finmarkiske Hoveddialekt eller Sproget, saaledes som det almindeligst tales i norsk Finmarken.* Christiania: J. W. Cappelen.
Friis, J. A. 1887: *Ordbog over det lappiske Sprog*. Christiania: Jacob Dybwad.
Gáhkkorčoru mánáidgárdi 2011 = Duodje prošeakta mánáidgárddis/ Duodji prosjekt i barnehagen. [13 September 2011]. gáhkkorčoru studeantta mánáidgárdi. <http://gahkkorcorustudentbhg.blogspot.no/2011/09/duodje-proseakta-manaidgarddis-duodji.html> [6 May 2013].
Ganander, Henricus 1743: *Grammatica Lapponica*. Holmia: Salvius.
*Giellaságat* 1/2007 = Gielladikšun. *Giellaságat* 1/2007. <http://www.giella.no/Filnedlasting.aspx?MId1=3465&FilId=1499> [29 January 2016].
Gustavsen, John 1982: *Issat báhtara*. Sámegillii jorgalii Britt Rajala. Deatnu: Jår'galæd'dji.
Guttorm, Eino 1981: *Árbeeatnan luohti*. Deatnu: Jår'galæd'dji.
Guttorm, Johannes 1986: *Heillodeaddji čázit*. [Deatnu]: Jår'galæd'dji.
Hætta, Odd Mathis 1994: *Sámiid dološ osku ja álbmotgáttut*. Sámegillii jorgalan ImO/Karen Anne Oskal Eira. [Alta]: Alta museum.
Häkkinen, Kaisa 1983: *Suomen kielen vanhimmasta sanastosta ja sen tutkimisesta: suomalais-ugrilaisten kielten etymologisen tutkimuksen perusteita ja metodiikkaa.* Turku.
Hamari, Arja 2014: Inflection vs. derivation. The function and meaning of the Mordvin abessive. In Rainer, Franz – Francesco Gardani – Hans Christian Luschützky – Wolfgang U. Dressler (eds): *Morphology and meaning. Selected papers from the 15th International Morphology Meeting.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. 163–176.
Haspelmath, Martin 2004: On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization. In Fischer, Olga – Muriel Norde – Harry Perridon (eds): *Up and down the cline: The nature of grammaticalization.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. 17–44.

Havu, Jukka 2004: La particule interrogative *-ko* / *-kö* et le pronom interrogatif *tä* en finnois : deux cas de « dégrammaticalisation » ? In Fernandez-Vest, M.M. Jocelyne – Shirley Carter-Thomas (eds): *Structure informationnelle et particules énonciatives*. Paris: L'Harmattan. 279–294.

Helander, Nils Ø. 1991: Suorggideapmi. In Guttorm, Vesa – Nils Ø. Helander – Kjell Kemi (eds): *Muhtun giellagažaldagat*. Guovdageaidnu: Sámi oahpahusráđđi. 19–54.

Hopper, Paul & Traugott, Elizabeth Closs 2003: *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Itkonen, Erkki 1946: *Struktur und Entwicklung der ostlappischen Quantitätssysteme*. MSFOu 88. Helsinki: Société Finno Ougrienne.

Itkonen, Erkki 1966: *Kieli ja sen tutkimus.* Helsinki: WSOY.

Itkonen, Esa 2005: *Ten non-European languages: An aid to the typologist.* Turku: University of Turku.

Itkonen, Terho 1992: Ugrilaisten kielten karitiivista. In Deréky, Pál – Timothy Riese – Marianne Sz. Bakró-Nagy – Péter Hajdú (eds): *Festschrift für Károly Rédei zum 60. Geburtstag.* Wien & Budapest: Institut für Finno-Ugristik der Universität Wien. 221–237.

Janhunen, Juha 1982: On the structure of Proto-Uralic. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 44. 23–42.

Janhunen, Juha 1998: Samoyedic. In Abondolo, Daniel (ed.): *The Uralic languages*. London & New York: Routledge. 457–479.

Janhunen, Juha 2014: Ural-Altaic: The polygenetic origins of nominal morphology in the Transeurasian zone. In Robbeets, Martine – Walter Bisang (eds): *Paradigm change: In the Transeurasian languages and beyond*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 311–336.

Jernsletten, Per 1998: *Hála ja čále ná. Njálmmálaš ja čálalaš giellageavaheapmi*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.

Joseph, Brian D. 2003: Morphologization from syntax. In Joseph, Brian D. – Richard D. Janda (eds): *Handbook of historical linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. 472–492.

Joseph, Brian D. 2014: [Review of Norde, Muriel 2009: *Degrammaticalization*.] *Word Structure* 7. 94–103.

Kiparsky, Paul 2012: Grammaticalization as optimization. In Jonas, Dianne – John Whitman – Andrew Garrett (eds): *Grammatical change: origins, nature, outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 15–51.

Korhonen, Mikko 1981: *Johdatus lapin kielen historiaan.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Larsson, Lars-Gunnar 2012: *Grenzen und Gruppierungen im Umesamischen.* Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 83. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Lass, Roger 1997: *Historical linguistics and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leem, Knud 1748: *En lappisk Grammatica efter den Dialect, som bruges af Field-Lapperne udi Porsanger-Fiorden.* Kiøbenhavn: Gottman Friderich Kisel.

Leem, Knud (Canutus) 1768: *Lexicon Lapponicum bipartitum.* Nidrosiae: Seminarium Lapponicum Fridericianum.

Lehmann, Christian 2002 [1982]: *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. Second, revised edition. Erfurt: Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.

Lehmann, Christian 2004: Theory and method in grammaticalization. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 32. 152–187.

Lehmann, Christian 2015 [1982]: *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. 3rd edition 2015. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Lingtyp 2007 = Lexicalization of case markers. [Discussion thread on the Lingtyp mailing list, January 2007.] <http://listserv.linguistlist.org/pipermail/lingtyp/2007-January/thread.html2022> [29 January 2016].

Magga, Ole Henrik 1994: Hvordan den nyeste nordsamiske rettskrivingen ble til. In *Festskrift til Ørnulv Vorren*. [Tromsø]: Tromsø museum, Universitetet i Tromsø. 269–281.

Namiki, Takayasu & Kageyama, Taro 2016: Word structure and headedness. In Kageyama, Taro – Hideki Kishimoto (eds): *Handbook of Japanese lexicon and word formation*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 201–236.

Nevis, Joel A. 1986: Decliticization and deaffixation in Saame: Abessive *taga*. In Joseph, Brian D. (ed.): *Studies on language change.* Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics 34. Columbus: The Ohio State University Department of Linguistics. 1–9.

Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2000: *Language form and language function*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Nielsen, Konrad 1926: *Lærebok i lappisk. I. Grammatikk. Lydlære, formlære, orddannelseslære og syntaks samt tillegg.* Oslo: A. W. Brøgger.

Nielsen, Konrad 1938: *Lappisk ordbok. Grunnet på dialektene i Polmak, Karasjok og Kautokeino. III. N–Æ.* Oslo: H. Aschehoug & co. (W. Nygaard).

Norde, Muriel 2001: Deflexion as a counterdirectional factor in grammatical change. *Language Sciences* 23. 231–264.

Norde, Muriel 2002: The final stages of grammaticalization: Affixhood and beyond. In Wischer, Ilse – Gabriela Diewald (eds): *New reflections on grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 45–65.

Norde, Muriel 2009: *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Norde, Muriel 2010: Degrammaticalization: three common controversies. In Stathi, Katerina – Elke Gehweiler – Ekkehard König (eds): *Grammaticalization. Current views and issues*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 123–150.

Norde, Muriel 2011: Degrammaticalization. In Narrog, Heiko – Bernd Heine (eds): *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 475–487.

Norde, Muriel 2012: Lehmann's parameters revisited. In Davidse, Kristin – Tine Breban – Lot Brems – Tanja Mortelmans (eds): *Grammaticalization and language change: New reflections*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 73–110.

OT = *Ođđa Testamenta.* Oslo: Norgga Biibbalsearvi 1998.

Plank, Frans 1995: Entgrammatisierung: Spiegelbild der Grammatisierung? In Norbert Boretzky et al. (eds): *Natürlichkeitstheorie und Sprachwandel*. Bochum: Brockmeyer. 199–219.

Pope, Kirsten & Sárá, Máret 2013: *Eatnigiella. Giellaoahpu váldogirji*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.

Qvigstad, J. (ed.) 1928: *Lappiske eventyr og sagn. II. Lappiske eventyr og sagn fra Troms og Finnmark.* Oslo: H. Aschehoug & co. (W. Nygaard).

Qvigstad, J. 1954: *Opptegnelser fra samenes liv*. Tromsø: Tromsø museum.

Ramat, Paolo 2010: [Review of Norde, Muriel 2009: *Degrammaticalization*.] *Language* 86. 979–982.

Rask, Rasmus 1832: *Ræsonneret lappisk Sproglære efter den Sprogart, som bruges af Fjældlapperne i Porsangerfjorden i Finmarken. En Omarbejdelse af Prof. Knud Leems Lappiske grammatica.* København: J. H. Schubothes Boghandling.

Rosenkvist, Henrik 2011: [Review of Norde, Muriel 2009: *Degrammaticalization*.] *Lingua* 121. 320–322.

Rutten, Gijsbert 2012: From adverb to conjunction and back: The (de)grammaticalization of Dutch *dan*. *Diachronica* 29. 301–325.

Rydving, Håkan 2013: *Words and Varieties. Lexical Variation in Saami.* MSFOu 269. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Sammallahti, Pekka 1977: *Norjansaamen Itä-Enontekiön murteen äänneoppi.* MSFOu 160. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Sammallahti, Pekka 1989: *Sámi-suoma sátnegirji. Saamelais-suomalainen sanakirja.* Ohcejohka: Jorgaleaddji.

Sammallahti, Pekka 1998a: Saamic. In Daniel Abondolo (ed.): *The Uralic languages*. London & New York: Routledge. 43–95.

Sammallahti, Pekka 1998b: *The Saami languages. An introduction.* Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.

Sammallahti, Pekka & Nickel, Klaus Peter 2006: *Sámi-duiskka sátnegirji. Saamisch-deutsches Wörterbuch.* Karasjok: Davvi Girji.

Sara, Máret Ánne 2013: *Ilmmiid gaskkas.* Guovdageaidnu: DAT.

Sara, Máret Ánne 2014: *Doaresbealde doali.* Guovdageaidnu: DAT.

Sara, Mikkel Nils 2003: *Gumpe, sápmelaš ja boazu. Boazosámi čilgehusat ja muitalusat gumppe ja guođoheami birra.* Guovdageaidnu: Sámi allaskuvla.

SIKOR = SIKOR. UiT The Arctic University of Norway and the Norwegian Saami Parliament's Saami text collection. Version 01.03.2015. <http://gtweb.uit.no/korp/> [29 January 2016].

Spiik, Nils Eric 1989: *Lulesamisk grammatik.* Luleå: Th. Blaasvær.

Stockfleth, N. V. 1840: *Grammatik i det lappiske Sprog, saaledes som det tales i Norsk-Finmarken. Förste Del. Bogstav- og Formlæren.* Christiania: Chr. Gröndahl.

*Udmurt Duńńe = Удмурт Дунне.* Октябрь 11, 2011. Тэк улод — уждунтэк кылёд. <http://udmdunne.ru/2011/10/тэк-улод-уждунтэк-кылёд/> [29 January 2016].

US = *У Сугынь*. Хельсинки: Библийым кусарыше институт 2007.

van der Auwera, Johan 2002: More thoughts on degrammaticalization. In Wischer, Ilse – Gabriela Diewald (eds): *New reflections on grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 19–29.

Vars, Ellen Marie 1992: *Buot ovddemus jápmet niegut*. [Indre Billefjord]: Iđut.

Vest, Jovnna-Ánde 1997: *Árbbolaččat. Romána. Vuosttas oassi*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.

Viti, Carlotta 2015: On degrammaticalization: Controversial points and possible explanations. *Folia Linguistica* 49. 381–419.

*Vulle Vuojaš* 28/1988. Sámás: Ellen Marie Vars. Oslo: Hjemmet.

Wichmann, Yrjö 1987: *Wotjakischer Wortschatz*. Aufgezeichnet von Yrjö Wichmann. Bearbeitet von T. E. Uotila und Mikko Korhonen. Herausgegeben von Mikko Korhonen. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XXI. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Wickman, Bo 1980: Features of dialect mixture in the Lappish dialect of Northern Gällivare. In Ikola, Osmo (ed.): *Congressus Quintus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum. Turku 20.–27. VIII 1980. Pars III, Dissertationes symposiorum linguisticorum*. Turku. 267–272.

Wiklund, K. B. 1891: *Laut- und Formenlehre der Lule-Lappischen Dialekte*. Stockholm.

Wiklund, K. B. 1901: *Lärobok i lapska språket.* Uppsala: Lundequistska bokhandeln.

Wiklund, K. B. 1902: Zur geschichte des urlappischen *ā* und *ū* in unbetonter silbe. II. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 2. 41–71.

Wiklund, K. B. 1915: *Lärobok i lapska språket.* Andra, reviderade upplagan. Uppsala: Akademiska bokhandeln.

Willis, David 2010: Degrammaticalization and obsolescent morphology: Evidence from Slavonic. In Stathi, Katerina – Elke Gehweiler – Ekkehard König (eds): *Grammaticalization. Current views and issues*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 151–177.

Willis, David 2015: Degrammaticalisation. First draft, July 2015. [To appear in Ledgeway, Adam & Ian Roberts (eds): *Cambridge handbook of historical syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.] <https://www.academia.edu/14426934/Degrammaticalisation> [29 January 2016].

Ylikoski, Jussi 2009: *Non-finites in North Saami.* MSFOu 257. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Ylikoski, Jussi 2011: A survey of the origins of directional case suffixes in European Uralic. In Kittilä, Seppo – Katja Västi – Jussi Ylikoski (eds): *Case, animacy and semantic roles.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. 235–280.

Ylikoski, Jussi 2014a: Davvisámegiela *-ráigge* – substantiiva, advearba, postposišuvdna vai kásus? *Sámi dieđalaš áigečála* 2/2014. 47–70.

Ylikoski, Jussi 2014b: Davvisámegiela substantiivavuđot *-naga*-hámit giellaoahpa ja sátnevuorkká rájá alde. *Sámi dieđalaš áigečála* 1/2014. 51–71.

Ylikoski, Jussi 2014c: Kieliopin arvoituksia marissa ja pohjoissaamessa: depiktiiviset suffiksit *-ńek* ja *-naga*. In Inaba, Nobufumi – Jorma Luutonen – Arja Hamari – Elina Ahola (eds): *Juuret marin murteissa, latvus yltää Uraliin. Juhlakirja Sirkka Saarisen 60-vuotispäiväksi 21.12.2014*. MSFOu 270. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne. 415–432.

Ylikoski, Jussi 2015: Kásusgehčosat dielkodávddas? Fuomášumit sámegiela *(-)naga* álgovuođu ja degrammatikalisašuvnna birra. In Hirvonen, Vuokko – Johanna Johansen Ijäs – Marjatta Jomppanen – Kaarina Vuolab-Lohi (eds): *Symposia ávvučála. Nostalgiija, naga ja eará gielalaš ja kultuvrralaš fenomenat.* Guovdageaidnu: Sámi allaskuvla. 111–134.

Ylikoski, Jussi (forthcoming): The essive in North Saami. In de Groot, Casper (ed.): *Uralic essive and the expression of impermanent state*. <https://www.academia.edu/22921560/The_Essive_in_North_Saami> [29 January 2016].