

## CHAPTER 44

## Case

SEPPO KITTLÄ, JOHANNA LAAKSO, AND JUSSI YLIKOSKI

Uralic languages are generally well known for their rich case inventories. This is true for the best-studied languages of the family, namely Finnish, Estonian, and Hungarian, but there are also languages with considerably smaller case systems, such as North Khanty with only three cases. In this chapter, the notion of case in Uralic languages is examined from different perspectives. First, we will briefly discuss the definition of the notion of case, which directly affects the number of cases proposed for a given language. This will be followed by an illustration of different case systems of Uralic languages, ranging from rich to poorer systems. Uralic languages, especially those with richer systems, include a number of cross-linguistically intriguing cases, such as approximative and terminative cases. Finally, it will be shown that the use of cases is not merely formally conditioned, but various semantic and pragmatic aspects contribute to this as well. In other words, Uralic languages display many instances of Differential Argument Marking (DAM), more specifically, Differential Object Marking (DOM; see also 54.2.4.1).

## 44.1 Definition and demarcation of case

Case is a central category in the inflectional morphology of all Uralic languages. Case suffixes code both core grammatical functions or semantic roles (such as Agent or Patient) and more peripheral ones (adverbial constituents for Location, Instrument, etc.). In addition, pragmatic notions such as topicality and definiteness contribute to the use of cases. Nouns, pronouns, and many quantifiers, sometimes adjectives as well, are inflected for case. Non-finite verb forms (see chapter 48) can have complete or restricted case inflections, and adpositions, whether developed from relational nouns or not, often form series marked with different local or adverbial case suffixes (see chapter 50).

In many Uralic languages, the case system has a fuzzy periphery in which the demarcation between cases and adverb derivation may be up for debate. For instance, the number of cases in different Hungarian grammars ranges from seventeen to twenty-seven, depending on whether,

for example, the temporal in *-kor*, used only in expressions of time, as in *pünkösdkor* ‘at Pentecost’, or the distributive in *-nként*, as in *darabonként* ‘piece by piece’, are regarded as cases (Kiefer 1987). In these examples, the problems with the case status are due to productivity restrictions.

The case status of a suffix may also be questioned by morphophonological or syntactic criteria, as some putative case forms rather resemble multi-word constructions: compounds or postpositional phrases. The above-mentioned Hungarian temporal suffix *-kor* (transparently deriving from the noun *kor* ‘time’) does not comply with vowel harmony. The Estonian comitative in *-ga* does not normally display the general Finnic agreement of modifiers or coordinated nouns (*uue auto-ga* NEW.GEN CAR-COM ‘with a new car’, *minu ja sinu-ga* 1SG.GEN and 2SG-COM ‘with me and you’).<sup>1</sup>

The deviant morphosyntactic behaviour of the Estonian comitative in *-ga* can be explained by its relatively recent grammaticalization: the suffix still syntactically behaves like the postposition from which it is derived. However, the same agreement pattern occurs in Estonian with the abessive (*uue auto-ta* NEW.GEN CAR-ABE ‘without a new car’), terminative (*ärata-se ja hommikusöögi-ni* wake.up.call.GEN and breakfast-TERM ‘until wake-up call and breakfast’) and essive cases (*teadlase ja õpetaja-na* scholar.GEN and teacher-ESS ‘as a scholar and a teacher’), all of which are marked with ancient bound morphs. In Old Written Estonian or Estonian dialects, even other old cases may have displayed a postposition-like agreement pattern; the phenomenon seems to be at least partly conditioned by word structure or prosody (*targa-st mehe-st* ELA ‘of/about a wise man’ but *targa mehe-le* ALL ‘to a wise man; Erelt 1999).

Table 44.1 illustrates a somewhat different situation in Lule Saami: the inflection of *láhtto* ‘ski track’ in singular case forms including the case-like prolativ in *-rájge* (cf. Ylikoski 2015) shows uniform agreement patterns with the undisputed local cases illative, inessive, and elative, although *-rájge* is a relatively marginal and etymologically transparent morpheme (< *rájge* hole.GEN) that is not generally regarded as a case marker. However, the *-rájge* prolativ fits the

<sup>1</sup> Note that in Estonian, owing to the loss of genitive *\*-n*, the genitive form is identical to the stem to which most other case endings are attached.

**Table 44.1** Example paradigm of Lule Saami *láhtto* ‘ski track’, with the relevant local case suffixes and the prolativ marker in boldface

	<i>dat</i>	<i>áhtjes</i>	<i>áđá</i>	<i>láhtto</i>	<i>mav</i>	<i>gávnaj</i>
NOM	that	father.GEN.POSS.3SG	new	ski.track	REL.ACC	find.PST.3SG
	‘that/the new ski track of his/her father’s s/he found’					
GEN	<i>dan</i>	<i>áhtjes</i>	<i>áđá</i>	<i>láhtto</i>	<i>mav</i>	<i>gávnaj</i>
ACC	<i>dav</i>	<i>áhtjes</i>	<i>áđá</i>	<i>láhttov</i>	<i>mav</i>	<i>gávnaj</i>
ILL	<i>dan</i>	<i>áhtjes</i>	<i>áđá</i>	<i>láhttuj</i>	<i>mav</i>	<i>gávnaj</i>
INE	<i>dan</i>	<i>áhtjes</i>	<i>áđá</i>	<i>láhtton</i>	<i>mav</i>	<i>gávnaj</i>
ELA	<i>dat/dan</i>	<i>áhtjes</i>	<i>áđá</i>	<i>láhttos</i>	<i>mav</i>	<i>gávnaj</i>
PROL	<i>dan</i>	<i>áhtjes</i>	<i>áđá</i>	<i>láhttorájge</i>	<i>mav</i>	<i>gávnaj</i>
COM	<i>dajna</i>	<i>áhtjes</i>	<i>áđá</i>	<i>láhttujn</i>	<i>mav</i>	<i>gávnaj</i>
ESS	<i>dan</i>	<i>áhtjes</i>	<i>áđá</i>	<i>láhtton</i>	<i>mav</i>	<i>gávnaj</i>

morphosyntactic category of case also because it, unlike non-inflectional adverbs, can be preceded by genitival and adjectival modifiers and followed by finite relative clauses.

In accordance with the typological character of the Uralic languages, the case suffixes often occur in a constant and segmentable form: for instance, the Estonian inessive suffix is always *-s*, for all words and word types. This also makes them fairly similar to postpositions (out of which some of them have developed), both formally and syntactically, as adjective modifiers in most Uralic languages do not agree with their heads. For this reason, it is sometimes claimed that Uralic cases are “untypical”; Spencer (2008) even goes as far as to argue that Hungarian has no case at all and the Hungarian case suffixes are best thought of as “fused postpositions”.

Morphotactically, however, case suffixes behave similarly to other inflection elements. They are subject to morphophonological phenomena (for instance, consonant gradation; see e.g. 37.3.1.1 for Nnganasan). Co-occurrence or fusion with number or possessor person markers (see 44.3) may lead to considerable allomorphic variation in the form of case suffixes. In many Uralic languages regular sound changes have given rise to stem variation and increasingly fusional morphology.<sup>2</sup> A case in point is the genitive *\*-n*, which in some Finnic and most Saami varieties has been regularly deleted, so that the genitive case is expressed with stem alternations only or former stem-final vowels can be re-analysed as new case markers (e.g. North Saami *gahpir* hat : *gahpíra* hat.GENACC and *boadus* result : *bohtosa* result.GENACC). The range of stem variation can also be demonstrated by a comparison of the case inflections of Veps *kázi* ‘hand’ in Table 44.2 and *mužik* ‘man’ (a Russian loanword) in Table 17.3 (chapter 17).

<sup>2</sup> The agglutinative character of Uralic languages is often exaggerated. A nice comparison of agglutination indexes was published by Korhonen (1969 [1996]).

## 44.2 Case inventories in Uralic

As already mentioned, Uralic cases code both core grammatical functions (such as subject and object) and more peripheral ones (such as location and instrument). The case systems are, accordingly, often divided into grammatical and semantic or adverbial cases. However, it must be noted that semantic cases may also code grammatically conditioned functions (for instance, the agent in Ob-Ugric passive constructions is typically in the locative case).

The Uralic languages all belong to the nominative-accusative alignment type (for quasi-ergativity in Finnic, see 14.4.3; for alleged ergativity in East Khanty, see 32.4.2 and Havas 2006). They have an unmarked nominative which is the default case for subjects or Agent arguments (cf. 44.4.3). In addition to this, the group of grammatical cases may include, for instance, a genitive case (Proto-Uralic *\*-n*) and/or an accusative case (Proto-Uralic *\*-m*). However, neither the genitive nor the accusative are represented everywhere, nor are they necessarily marked with reflexes of the Proto-Uralic suffixes. Instead of the accusative, objects (depending on the definition of object) may occur in the nominative or in other cases (cf. 44.4.1).

The group of semantic or adverbial cases varies greatly from language to language; it may include numerous local cases (marking Location, Goal, Source, Path, etc.) but also possessive (Possessor, Recipient/Beneficiary, etc.), comitative-instrumental, etc. cases. The division into grammatical and semantic cases is seldom absolutely clear-cut. Earlier semantic cases may have developed various grammatical functions: for instance, the Finnic partitive has developed from a local ‘from’ case into a marker of imperfective aspect, unboundedness, and/or low transitivity.

The three major Uralic languages (Hungarian, Finnish, and Estonian, representing about ninety per cent of all Uralic speakers) are widely known for their rich case systems, the number of cases (depending on criteria) ranging between fourteen and fifteen in Estonian and Finnish and up to twenty-seven in some Hungarian grammars. Case inventories of similar size are also characteristic of Permic: Standard Udmurt grammars distinguish fifteen cases, Standard Komi has sixteen to twenty-three cases, depending on certain criteria. However, most Uralic languages have considerably smaller case inventories: Erzya Mordvin has about ten cases, Meadow Mari has nine, Forest Enets and North Saami have six, while North Khanty has only three. In fact, for Proto-Uralic only six to eight cases can be reconstructed (cf. chapter 1). Moreover, in many Uralic languages the case inventory shows demonstrably recent developments: enhancement (as in Hungarian, where many case suffixes still appear as postpositions in the oldest recorded texts, or in Veps with many case endings transparently corresponding to postpositions in other Finnic languages) as well as subsequent loss of cases (as in Livonian, where the series of the Finnic external local cases has fallen out of productive use). The range of variation even within a genetically closely related group such as the Finnic languages (here represented by Veps, Estonian, and Livonian) is illustrated in Table 44.2. For the semantics of the cases, see individual chapters on the languages as well as the discussion here.

The well-known high number of cases is thus not an ancient or stable feature nor typical of Uralic in general. In fact, there are only a few salient features shared by all or most Uralic case systems. Of the individual non-nominative cases, only the static locative, Proto-Uralic *\*-na*, is represented throughout the language family, but sometimes the original locative suffix occurs in a slightly altered meaning (in Hungarian, semantically specified as an “external” local case, the superessive; in Saami and Finnic in a more abstract sense, as the essive case) or as part of a historically complex suffix. All other cases reconstructed for Proto-Uralic appear only in some of today’s Uralic languages; for instance, the genitive *\*-n* is absent in Permic and Ugric (which either lack the genitive or display a genitive suffix of a different origin).

A further problem in mapping the case inventory of a given language may arise owing to the well-known fact that different types of noun phrases, especially pronouns in comparison with prototypical nouns, may display different case-marking patterns or completely different case markers. In particular, Finnic does not have a distinct accusative case for nouns (see 44.4.1), but some Finnic varieties have specific accusative forms for personal (and corresponding interrogative) pronouns, such as Finnish *kene-t* who-ACC,

**Table 44.2** Singular case forms for the words for ‘hand; arm’ in Veps, Estonian, and Livonian

	Veps	Estonian	Livonian
Nominative	<i>käzi</i>	<i>käsi</i>	<i>ke’ž</i>
Genitive	<i>käden</i>	<i>käe</i>	<i>kä’d</i>
Partitive	<i>kät</i>	<i>kätt</i>	<i>kätā</i>
Illative	<i>kādehe</i>	<i>kätte</i>	<i>kā’ddō</i>
Inessive	<i>kādes</i>	<i>kāes</i>	<i>kā’ds</i>
Elative	<i>kādespäi</i>	<i>kāest</i>	<i>kā’dst</i>
Allative	<i>kādele</i>	<i>kāele</i>	
Adessive	<i>kādel</i>	<i>kāel</i>	
Ablative	<i>kādelpäi</i>	<i>kāelt</i>	
Propinquative	<i>kādennoks</i>		
Approximative	<i>kādunno</i>		
Egressive	<i>kādennopäi</i>		
Prolative	<i>kätme</i>		
Terminative	<i>kādessaī</i>	<i>kāeni</i>	
Essive	<i>*?käden<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>kāena</i>	
Abessive	<i>kādeta</i>	<i>kāeta</i>	
Translative	<i>kādeks</i>	<i>kāeks</i>	<i>kā’dkōks<sup>b</sup></i>
Comitative	<i>kādenke</i>	<i>kāega</i>	
Dative			<i>kā’ddōn</i>

<sup>a</sup> In Veps, the essive mainly occurs in lexicalized adverbs and cannot be considered a productive case (Riho Grünthal, pers. comm.).

<sup>b</sup> The original translative and the comitative have merged in Livonian into what modern grammars call the instrumental case.

*meidä-t* 1PL-ACC. Also in North Mansi, the accusative (e.g. *ma:naw* [1PL.ACC] ‘us’) does not exist for nouns.<sup>3</sup> In contrast, for some Uralic languages restrictions are reported in the use of local or adverbial cases for personal pronouns or even for animate nouns. In North Mansi, the locative and translative cases are not used for personal pronouns (Riese 2001a: 24, 30–1), and Udmurt (cf. chapter 27) and Mari grammars claim that animate nouns are never inflected in local cases—which at least for Mari is false (Bradley 2016: 32).

<sup>3</sup> Note also that the accusative marker used with Mansi personal pronouns is identical to the possessive suffix of the corresponding person. The same strategy can also be seen in the accusatives of Hungarian first- and second-person pronouns which display the corresponding possessive suffix instead of or alongside the regular accusative marker *-t*, e.g. (*én* ‘I’): *enge-m* (~ *enge-me-t*) ‘me’.

### 44.3 Case inflection and other categories

Case marking often co-occurs with the marking of number (plural, in Samoyed and Ob-Ugric also dual) and possessor person, in Mordvin also with the suffixal marking of definiteness (“definite declension”, cf. chapter 23). Accordingly, in many Uralic grammar traditions it is customary to distinguish between “absolute” (i.e. only case- and number-marked) and “possessive” or “definite declension”. In languages with large case systems, the markers of different categories are often simply concatenated and remain distinct and segmentable, as in Finnish *talo-i-sta-mme* house-PL-ELA-POSS.1PL, Hungarian *háza-i-nk-ból* house-PL-POSS.1PL-ELA, or Komi *керкаяссьыным* *kerka-jas-ǰi-nim* house-PL-ELA-POSS.1PL ‘from our houses’. However, in plural or possessor-marked paradigms the markers of different categories can be fused or two or more forms can merge, which results in gaps and asymmetries. For example, in Finnish the GEN.SG (and NOM.PL) marking is deleted or fused before a possessive suffix (*talo-mme* house-POSS.1PL ‘our house’ or house-GEN.POSS.1PL ‘our house’s’ or house-PL.POSS.1PL ‘our houses’), and in Komi possessor-marked paradigms, the inessive and illative cases have merged and their suffixes fused with the possessive suffix, so that *керкаам* *kerka-am* house-INE/ILL.POSS.1SG means both ‘in my house’ and ‘into my house’ and neither the regular inessive (-in) nor the illative case suffix (-ə) is visible or segmentable. In Enets, in contrast, some grammatical cases coincide in the non-possessive declension but are distinguished from each other in connection with possessor marking (see chapter 36).

The lack of number opposition is sometimes (e.g. Kiefer 1987) considered a reason to question the case status of a given morpheme. In Hungarian, Finnic, and Permic, the case paradigms are usually quite symmetric in this respect. In Hungarian, plural forms normally carry both plural and case marking and only some marginal cases, such as the above-mentioned distributive in *-nként* and the sociative in *-stul/-stül* (as in *fiastul* ‘with (his/her/their) son’), do not have plural forms at all. In Finnish, in contrast, the comitative and (with a couple of lexicalized exceptions) the instructive forms seemingly contain the plural marker *i*, but there is no number opposition: *vaimo-i(-)ne-ni* wife-(PL-)COM-POSS.1SG is usually interpreted as ‘with my wife’, but the reading ‘with my wives’ would be possible as well.

In Skolt Saami, the essive and partitive cases are indifferent to the singular vs plural distinction altogether, and it seems partly a matter of taste and descriptive economy whether the essive and partitive forms are to be labelled as plain (singular-cum-plural) essives and partitives, or whether we should consider them as homonymous pairs of singular and plural case forms (Table 44.3).

**Table 44.3** The essive and partitive cases within the Skolt Saami case system (*kuē’l* ‘fish’)

	SG	PL		SG	PL
NOM	<i>kuē’ll</i>	<i>kuē’l</i>	or	<i>kuē’ll</i>	<i>kuē’l</i>
GEN	<i>kuē’l</i>	<i>kuō’li</i>		<i>kuē’l</i>	<i>kuō’li</i>
AKK	<i>kuē’l</i>	<i>kuō’lid</i>		<i>kuē’l</i>	<i>kuō’lid</i>
ILL	<i>kuālla</i>	<i>kuō’lid</i>		<i>kuālla</i>	<i>kuō’lid</i>
LOC	<i>kuē’lest</i>	<i>kuō’lin</i>		<i>kuē’lest</i>	<i>kuō’lin</i>
COM	<i>kuō’lin</i>	<i>kuō’livui’m</i>		<i>kuō’lin</i>	<i>kuō’livui’m</i>
ABE	<i>kuē’ltää</i>	<i>kuō’litää</i>		<i>kuē’ltää</i>	<i>kuō’litää</i>
ESS	<i>kuē’llen</i>			<i>kuē’llen</i>	<i>kuē’llen</i>
PART	<i>kuē’lled</i>			<i>kuē’lled</i>	<i>kuē’lled</i>

The Skolt Saami case paradigms in Table 44.3 also illustrate a case system in which various kinds of syncretism and homonymy are more prevalent than symmetry and analogy between singular and plural case forms: As described in chapter 12, the Skolt Saami accusative is identical with the genitive in singular (and usually also with the nominative plural, e.g. *kuē’l* for *kuē’ll* ‘fish’), whereas the accusative plural is identical with the illative plural (*kuō’lid*). Further, the comitative singular is identical with the locative plural throughout the noun inflection. It is possible to observe a kind of plural marker *-i-* for six of nine cases, but there is only one case (abessive) in which the singular and plural seem to have an identical case marker (*-tää*).

In languages with fewer cases (and more numbers), gaps in the plural and especially dual case paradigms are not unusual. In Nganasan, dual forms exist for only the three grammatical cases, while the adverbial case forms in the dual are replaced with postpositional phrases (cf. 37.3.1.1). A similar division of labour between adverbial cases and postpositions exists in the definite declension in Mordvin (see chapter 23): in Moksha Mordvin, instead of definite adverbial case forms only postpositional phrases can be used, while in Erzya, postpositional phrases (e.g. *веленть эйсе* *vel’e-nʲtʲ ejse* village-DEF.GEN in ‘in the village’) exist as options alongside the definite forms of adverbial cases (*велесенть* *vel’e-senʲtʲ* village-DEF.INE).

### 44.4 Syntactic and semantic functions of cases

The number of core grammatical functions or semantic roles (such as subject, object, Agent, or Patient) is, by definition,

limited, and so is the number of core grammatical cases, even in languages with extraordinarily rich case inventories. More peripheral semantic relations, on the contrary, sometimes look like a playground of adverbial cases that may form multifaceted subsystems of their own as well as include other highly specialized and typologically rare morphological manifestations of adverbial semantics.

#### 44.4.1 Core grammatical cases: subject and object marking, definiteness, and boundedness

As already mentioned, all Uralic languages belong to the nominative-accusative alignment type. They have an unmarked nominative which usually is the case of the grammatical subject. However, many Uralic languages lack an uncontroversial accusative case. In Finnic, most of Saami, and Mordvin, the original accusative in *\*-m* has regularly coincided with the genitive in *\*-n*, and from a synchronic point of view, the term “genitive-accusative” for the object case is debatable. The newest academic grammar of Finnish (Hakulinen et al. 2004) has given up the traditional term “accusative” (genitive-accusative or nominative-accusative) for the case of the total object in general and only uses the term for the accusative forms of personal pronouns marked with the distinct suffix *-t*.

Even where there is a distinct accusative case, it is not always used for all Patient arguments of transitive verbs. This means that the marking of the objects is not always purely grammatical (based on objecthood) but also semantically or pragmatically conditioned. For example, many experiencer verbs (such as ‘love’, ‘hate’, and ‘think’) take partitive-case objects in Finnish, and with many verbs, the aspect determines the use of the total object case (i.e. nominative, genitive, or *-t* accusative) or the partitive, the choice is thus never purely formal in nature.

Alongside some Samoyedic varieties, Hungarian shows the most consistent use of the accusative, but even in Hungarian, accusative marking can be left out if the object is marked with a possessive suffix, as in (1).

- (1) Hungarian  
*Szerete-m a felesége-m ~ felesége-me-t.*  
 love-1SG.OBC DEF wife-POSS.1SG wife-POSS.1SG-ACC  
 ‘I love my wife.’<sup>4</sup>

Unmarked (nominative) objects occur throughout Uralic, and their occurrence is usually explained with either or both of two parameters: (i) lack of canonical subject argument, and (ii) a bundle of features often labelled “indefiniteness”.

<sup>4</sup> Here and henceforth, all examples for which no origin is indicated have been created by the authors.

As concerns the first parameter, “Jahnsson’s Rule” in Finnic (see 14.4.3) is one of the best-known examples: the object is unmarked if there is no canonical nominative subject, that is, in the imperative (2) and impersonal (“passive”) clauses or with non-finites—in other words, if the object is the highest-ranking overt argument. Similarly, in Nganasan the direct objects of imperatives are in the nominative case instead of the accusative (3), and in Mari, objects of non-finites can be in the nominative instead of the accusative (cf. chapter 24).

- (2) Karelian  
*Salbua vai veräi teriä-mbä-h, kehoitta-u*  
 close.IMP.2SG only door quick-CPR-ILL urge-3SG  
*mies (...)*  
 man  
 ‘Just close the door quickly!—the man urges (me) ...’<sup>5</sup>
- (3) Nganasan (chapter 37.3.1.2)  
*miäðä-ði-t̃ji huturə-?*  
 string.of.sledges-DST-PL<3SG harness-IMP.2SG  
 ‘Harness for him the sledges.’

The second parameter, viz. indefiniteness of nominative objects, is invoked in Komi and Udmurt grammars. Both Permic languages have an accusative case, the use of which is explained in grammars with reference to either animacy (4) (cf. Bartens 2000: 332) or definiteness (6), while inanimate and indefinite objects are in the nominative case (5). Examples (4)–(6) are quoted from chapter 26.

- (4) Komi  
*Me аддза каньӧс.*  
 me addz-a kaŋ-əs  
 1SG see-PRS.1SG cat-ACC  
 ‘I see a cat.’
- (5) Komi  
*Me аддза керка.*  
 me addz-a kerka  
 1SG see-PRS.1SG house  
 ‘I see a house.’
- (6) Komi  
*Тайӧ – керка. Керкасӧ колӧ вильмӧдны.*  
 tajə kerka. kerka-sə koɫə viɫ-məd-ni.  
 this house house-ACC.POSS.3SG must new-DER<sub>CAUS</sub>-INF  
 ‘This is a house. The house needs to be renovated.’

The concept of definiteness, however, often remains poorly defined in Uralistic literature. Within Uralic, only Hungarian has fully grammaticalized definite and indefinite

<sup>5</sup> From a Karelian-language news article: <http://yle.fi/uutiset/3-9287284>.

articles, which has allowed for a very straightforward treatment of definiteness as a clear-cut category in Hungarian linguistics. Mordvin has suffixal definiteness marking, the so-called definite declension, which interacts with both the choice of subjective or objective conjugation and the assignment of object case (nominative, genitive-accusative, or a local case); these mechanisms are too complex to be dealt with in this chapter, but the reader is referred to Keresztes (1999), Rueter (2010), and Bernhardt (2020b). In the Permic languages, possessive suffixes are used not only for possessor marking but also (as in (6)) in a function which is often called “definiteness” or “determination” in Uralistic literature but in fact covers a bundle of semantic and pragmatic features such as identifiability (deixis, anaphora, uniqueness, etc.), emphasis or (conjectured) saliency, or common ground (cf. Nikolaeva 2004, Leinonen 2006a; see also chapters 45 and 54, and 51.2). Further interesting discussion on definiteness, showing its incremental nature, has arisen in connection with the question whether the demonstrative pronoun *se(e)* in spoken colloquial Finnish and Estonian can be considered a definite article (Juvonen 2000, Laury 1997, R. Pajusalu 1997; for Saami cf. also 8.4.2, 10.4.2).

In Finnic linguistics, definiteness as a factor of object case assignment has traditionally been connected with either boundedness (definite quantity/amount), aspect, or telicity (resultativeness) of action. Unboundedness or indefinite quantity as well as unaccomplished action (imperfective or progressive aspect, negation) or inherently irresultative actions with low affectedness of the object (such as that of “love” or “hate”) are coded with the partitive case (cf. 14.4.3). The Finnic partitive case has evolved from the original ablative meaning to an object case and further to the case of unbounded or indefinite-quantity (plural or uncountable) subjects and pivot NPs in an existential clause (cf. chapter 51), or nominal predicates. This development can be illustrated with what looks like a cline from Mordvin (certain local and certain partial-object meanings coded with the ablative or partitive case, the etymological cognate of the Finnic partitive) through Estonian (partitive objects and, possibly, pivot NPs in existential clauses) to Finnish (also partitive subjects and nominal predicates). Note, however, that the ablative in Mordvin only codes the Source in certain phrases and construction types (cf. Ylikoski 2016b: 61). It can be argued that in contemporary Mordvin, this case is rather grammatical than local and that the term “partitive” is more appropriate (see 23.3.1.1).

- (7) Erzya (Ylikoski 2016b: 61)  
 кудодо кудос  
 kudo-do kudo-s  
 house-ABL house-ILL  
 ‘from house to house’

- (8) Erzya (chapter 23)  
 Сон симсь винадо.  
 son s'im-s' vina-do.  
 3SG drink-PST.3SG liquor-PART  
 ‘S/he drank/was drinking liquor.’
- (9) a. Finnish  
 Kissa syö puuro-a.  
 cat eat.3SG porridge-PART
- b. Estonian  
 Kass söö-b putru.  
 cat eat-3SG porridge.PART  
 ‘The cat eats/is eating porridge.’
- (10) a. Finnish  
 Tä-ssä talo-ssa on kisso-ja (~ ?ovat  
 this-INE house-INE be.3SG cat-PL.PART be.3PL  
 kissa-t).<sup>6</sup>  
 cat-PL.(NOM)
- b. Estonian  
 Selle-s maja-s on kassi-d ~ kass-e.  
 this-INE house-INE be.3 cat-PL.(NOM) cat-PL.PART  
 ‘There are cats in this house.’
- (11) a. Finnish  
 Kissa-t o-vat julm-i-a peto-ja (~  
 cat-PL be-3PL cruel-PL-PART predator-PL.PART  
 \*julma-t pedo-t).  
 cruel-PL predator-PL
- b. Estonian  
 Kassi-d on julma-d röövloom-a-d (~ \*julm-i  
 cat-PL be.3 cruel-PL predator-PL cruel-PL.PART  
 röövloom-i).  
 predator-PL.PART  
 ‘Cats are cruel predators.’

Definiteness and boundedness are not necessarily correlated with each other. In Finnic linguistics, definiteness (referential status, “notive species”) has at least since Siro (1957) been distinguished from boundedness or definite quantification (“quantitative species”; cf. 51.2). Compare (12), with an unbounded but referentially definite object, with (13), in which the object is bounded but referentially indefinite.

- (12) Finnish  
 Si-tä uut-ta pien-pan-imo-olut-ta  
 that-PART new-PART small-brew-DER<sub>LOC</sub>-beer-PART

<sup>6</sup> *Tässä talossa ovat kissat* is not an existential but rather a locational sentence: ‘In this house, the cats are’, ‘This is the house where the cats are’.

*saa jo lähi-kaupa-sta-kin.*  
 get.3SG already close-shop-ELA-POL.P  
 ‘One can already buy that new craft beer even in the corner shop.’

- (13) Finnish  
*Käv-i-n juo-massa olue-n.*  
 go-PST-1SG drink-PROG beer-GEN(ACC)  
 ‘I went to have a/one beer.’

However, events in which the participants are definite and thus known to the hearer are more likely to be successfully completed (and thus non-partitive in Finnic), and with plural or uncountable objects, perfective marking (total object in Finnic) often implies definite (bounded) quantity as well as definiteness—cf. (9a,b) with (14a,b):

- (14) a. Finnish  
*Kissa syö puuro-n.*  
 cat eat.3SG porridge-GEN
- b. Estonian  
*Kass söö-b pudru (ära).*  
 cat eat-3SG porridge.GEN PERF  
 ‘The cat eats/will eat the porridge.’

In both (14a) and (14b), the object bears non-partitive coding, and the most readily available reading is thus that the cat will successfully complete the event in question. The denoted event is also bounded in that the cat will probably complete the event within a reasonably short, and thus definite, period of time.

#### 44.4.2 Peripheral grammatical cases

Core grammatical functions such as Agent or Patient are coded not only by core grammatical cases (nominative, genitive, accusative, partitive). In many if not all Uralic languages, core functions or obligatory arguments of the verbs can be coded by local or other adverbial cases. This is illustrated by languages such as North Khanty, in which there is neither genitive nor accusative but the locative (‘in’) and the lative (‘to’) case are retained; the locative or the lative case code not only adverbials of time, goal, purpose, or state but also (temporary or contingent) predicate nouns. In Ob-Ugric as a rule, agents in passive clauses are in the locative case (see also Kulonen 1989), while Saami languages also know agented passive clauses in which the agent is in the illative case (the prototypical recipient case). The North Saami construction in which the adversative passive verbs (–*halla-*, see 10.3.2.5) go materially back to frequentative-causative derivatives has been calqued to Kven; here, the agent is in the Finnic recipient case, the allative.

- (15) Kven  
*Mi-llä lailla tul-is tois-ten*  
 what-ADE in.way come-COND.3SG other-GEN.PL  
*toimi-it, jos het, alas-lähti-jä-t,*  
 act-INF if 3PL down-leave-DER<sub>AGT</sub>-PL  
*ota-t-el-ta-is fangi-ksi*  
 take-DER<sub>CAUS</sub>-DER<sub>FREQ</sub>-3PL-COND prisoner-TRSL  
*eli ammu-t-el-ta-is tyskälais-i-le?*  
 or shoot-DER<sub>CAUS</sub>-DER<sub>FREQ</sub>-3PL-COND German-PL-ALL  
 ‘What should the others do if they who are now going down (from the mountain) were taken prisoner or shot by the Germans?’<sup>7</sup>

Predicate nouns can occur in a non-nominative case not only in Finnic, where the translative or the essive case can express a contingent or temporary state (cf. 14.4.3 and Stassen 2001b). They can also be coded by the dative case as in Mari (cf. chapter 24) or by the lative case in North Khanty (see (16)).

- (16) North Khanty (chapter 31.4.3.3)  
*xuβ mer βuŋi ʔaβəʔ-ti xəj-a βəs.*  
 long time reindeer guard-PCTP.PRS man-LAT be.PST.3SG  
 ‘He has been a reindeer herder for a long time.’

Livonian and Hungarian, which have a non-local dative case (used primarily for coding the recipient in a “give” construction and also the possessor in predicative possession) also use this case for the coding of the highest-ranking argument or experiencer in modal constructions (which typically lack a canonical subject). The experiencer is also coded with the Recipient case in Permic (dative) and (Eastern) Finnic (allative), while other (Western) Finnic languages use the genitive (cf. Inaba 2015 and the Kven example (15)). For the Uralic languages of Russia, the model of the Russian dative case in modal constructions may also play a role (for Karelian, see Sarhimaa 1992a).

- (17) Karelian (Genetz 1880)  
*Oza-ttoma-lla pidä-is ol-la nai-matta.*  
 fortune-DER<sub>CAR</sub>-ADALL must-COND.3SG be-INF marry-CVB.NEG  
 ‘A poor man should refrain from marrying.’
- (18) Hungarian (Endre Ady)  
*A tanár-nak kell aztán lelkes lény-t*  
 DEF teacher-DAT must then soulful being-ACC  
*csinál-ni belőlük.*  
 make-INF 3PL.ELA

<sup>7</sup> From Alf Nilsen-Børsskog’s novel *Kuosuvaaran takana* (2004). The *ta* element is historically the marker of the Finnic passive or impersonal, which in the Far North Finnish varieties has assumed the role of a 3PL person marker.

(Children are spoilt and stupefied by their parents.)  
 ‘And then, the teacher must make soulful beings out  
 of them.’

- (19) Komi  
 ...председательлы колö унджыка уджавны.  
 predædaceɫ-li kol-ə un-dʒik-a udʒav-ni  
 chairman-DAT must-3SG.PRS much-CPR-DEF<sub>ADV</sub> work-INF  
 ‘The chairman must work more.’

Local cases may also be involved in Differential Object Marking, as in Komi dialects. The following example, presented and analysed by Klumpp (2012: 353), is from a folk tale in which “Death” sends his friend in a doctor’s guise to heal a rich man’s daughter. The use of the dative alongside the accusative is motivated by the information structure: it serves to de-focalize the patient pronoun (“her”) in order to place the contrastive focus on the addressee and the verb phrase (“and YOU, set about to CURE her!”).

- (20) Komi, Vym dialect  
 me pə sijə viɕəm-ə uɕkəd-a, a  
 1SG QUOT 3SG.ACC illness-ILL make.fall-PRS.1SG but  
 te pə sijə-li letɕit-ni kutɕiɕ  
 2SG QUOT 3SG-DAT cure-INF set.about.IMP.2SG  
 ‘I will make her fall ill, and you, he says, set about to cure her!’

Furthermore, local cases may code core arguments of verbs denoting emotions and experiences. In minority languages like North Saami, these constructions are typically susceptible to interference from majority languages; for example, the original illative complements of *liiko-* ‘like’ (21b) are losing ground to the Scandinavian-influenced genitive-accusative as well as the Finnish-influenced locative (Kittilä and Ylikoski 2018). At the same time, the existence of such variation illustrates the relative arbitrariness of case-marking in such contexts in that the same function can be expressed by multiple case forms.

- (21) a. Finnish  
*Pidä-n sinu-sta.*  
 like-1SG 2SG-ELA
- b. North Saami  
*Mun liiko-n dutnje ~ du ~ dus.*  
 1SG like-1SG 2SG.ILL 2SG.GENACC 2SG.LOC  
 ‘I like you.’
- (22) a. Aanaar Saami  
*Mun poolâ-m pennu-st.*  
 1SG be.afraid-1SG dog-LOC

- b. Komi  
 Ме пола понйысь.  
 me pol-a ponj-iɕ  
 1SG be.afraid-1SG dog-ELA
- c. Hungarian  
*Féle-k a kutyá-tól.*  
 be.afraid-1SG.SBC DEF dog-ABL  
 ‘I’m afraid of the dog.’

#### 44.4.3 Differential Argument Marking in Uralic

The Differential Object Marking (DOM) in Finnic (as described in 44.4.1 and in chapter 14.4.3, see also Lees 2015) is one of the best-known types of Differential Argument Marking (DAM) in Uralic and also somewhat less common cross-linguistically (cf. Iemmolo 2011). First of all, its function deviates from the cross-linguistically common pattern in that the Finnic DOM is primarily conditioned by definiteness or boundedness rather than animacy. Second, the formal manifestation is also a bit unorthodox, because DOM in Finnic involves the alternation of two marked forms (accusative and partitive) rather than marked and unmarked ones (type labelled as symmetrical DOM by Iemmolo 2011). Furthermore, the Finnic DOM covers an untypically wide range of functions, including boundedness and aspect, and the expression of decreased transitivity on a general level. However, DOM in Uralic may also be based on animacy (alongside definiteness) or even information structure as in Permic or Ob-Ugric (see especially Klumpp 2012 for Komi and Virtanen 2014 for East Mansi), or the choice between unmarked nominative and accusative can be syntactically conditioned (cf. examples (2) and (3)).

In addition to DOM, Uralic languages display numerous other types of DAM. First of all, there are numerous construction types in which the Agent/causer argument is coded with a non-nominative case. In nominative-accusative languages, proto-agents (in the spirit of Dowty 1991), and also some less typical agents usually appear in the nominative case (23), but inanimate causers or Forces, unlike typical agents, can also appear in a semantic case, as shown in (24):

- (23) a. Finnish  
*Häne-t surmas-i toivo-ton rakkaus.*  
 3SG-ACC kill-PST.3SG hope-DEF<sub>CAR</sub> love
- b. Hungarian  
*Meg-öl-te a remény-telen szerelem.*  
 PERF-kill-PST.3SG.OBC DEF hope-DEF<sub>CAR</sub> love  
 ‘Hopeless love killed him/her.’



- (24) a. Finnish  
*Hän kuol-i toivottomaan rakkaute-en.*  
 3SG die-PST.3SG hopeless-ILL love-ILL
- b. Hungarian  
*Bele-hal-t a reménytelen szerelem-be.*  
 3SG.ILL-die-PST.3SG.SBC DEF hopeless love-ILL  
 ‘S/he died of (lit.: “into”) hopeless love.’

Another example of Differential Subject Marking is illustrated by what Haspelmath (1993: 292) has labelled Involuntary Agent (see Kittilä 2005, Fauconnier 2012 for more detailed discussions of the phenomenon across languages). Involuntary Agents are causers of events that can be held directly responsible for the denoted event, but that do not instigate the event in question voluntarily or purposefully. Sometimes they can be coded with a local (adverbial) (as in 25b) or a possessor case (26b).

- (25) Finnish  
 a. *Minä pudot-i-n kupi-n.*  
 1SG fall.DER<sub>CAUS</sub>-PST-1SG cup-GEN(ACC)  
 ‘I let the cup fall [either voluntarily or inadvertently].’
- b. *Minu-lta puto-si kuppi.*  
 1SG-ABL fall-PST.3SG cup  
 ‘I (inadvertently) let the cup fall.’

- (26) Komi (Ievleva 1984: 182)  
 a. *Me дыр уз-и.*  
 me dir uz-i  
 1SG long.time sleep-PST.1SG  
 ‘I slept long.’
- b. *Менам дыр узьсис.*  
 menam dir uz-6-is.  
 1SG.GEN long.time sleep-REFL-PST.3SG  
 ‘I (inadvertently) slept (too) long’, ‘I overslept’.

Furthermore, subject-like (typically human or animate) arguments in constructions involving an emotion or an urge to perform the denoted action are often marked with non-nominative cases, for instance, with an object case as in the Finnish emotional causative constructions (27; cf. Siirainen 2005, Pörn 2008), or coded like possessors (cf. chapter 51.5.2) as in the Hungarian corresponding construction (28). The construction in question is interesting in the light of the fact that in cases such as (27), causativization decreases the degree of agency associated with the referent of the subject argument (see also Kittilä 2013):

- (27) Finnish  
*Mari-a laula-tta-a.*  
 M.-PART sing-DER<sub>CAUS</sub>-3SG  
 ‘Mari feels an urge to sing.’ (lit.: “Ø is making Mari sing”)

- (28) Hungarian  
*Mari-nak énekel-het-nék-je van.*  
 M.-DAT sing-POT-COND.1SG-POSS.3SG be.3SG  
 ‘Mari feels an urge to sing.’ (lit.: “for Mari, her I-might-sing exists” = “Mari has an I-might-sing”)

In Uralic languages with a larger number of local cases, Differential Goal Marking (DGM) or even Differential Location Marking (DLM, the term and the abbreviation are our own) is rather commonly attested. First of all, in Finnic and Hungarian, the choice of internal or external local case series with place names (cf. Creissels and Mounole 2011) is often lexically conditioned and impossible to explain by any transparent rule (see also 32).

- (29) Estonian  
*Ta ela-b Nõmme-l ~ Kilingi-Nõmme-s.*  
 3SG live-3SG N.-ADE ~ K.-N.-INE  
 ‘S/he lives in Nõmme ~ in Kilingi-Nõmme.’
- (30) Hungarian  
*Pécs-re ~ Bécs-be utaz-unk.*  
 P.-SUBL Vienna-ILL travel-1PL.SBC  
 ‘We are travelling to Pécs ~ to Vienna.’

Moreover, in Finnic (with the exception of Livonian) Recipients (31) are coded with the allative that otherwise functions as a local (directional) case, while Goals and Vicinal Goals (see Kittilä and Ylikoski 2011) may appear in many different forms.

- (31) Finnish  
*Mari lähett-i kirja-n opettaja-lle ~ Liisa-lle*  
 M. send-PST.3SG book-GEN teacher-ALL Liisa-ALL  
 ‘Mari sent a/the book to the teacher/Liisa’
- (32) Finnish  
*Mari lähett-i kirja-n Tamperee-lle ~ Helsinki-in*  
 M. send-PST.3SG book-GEN Tampere-ALL Helsinki-ILL  
 ‘Mari sent a book to Tampere ~ to Helsinki.’
- (33) Finnish  
*Mari heitt-i pallo-n Yrjö-n viere-en ~*  
 M. throw-PST.3SG ball-GEN Y.-GEN (be)side-ILL  
*pöydä-n alle*  
 table-GEN under  
 ‘Mari threw a ball to beside Yrjö ~ under the table.’

Finally, some Uralic languages also display instances of Differential Adjunct Marking (see also Aristar 1997 for a general discussion of the phenomenon, the term has been coined by us). Differential Adjunct Marking refers in this context to cases in which the coding of any other argument than S, A, O, and R is in some way affected by animacy.

SEPPÖ KITTELÄ, JOHANNA LAAKSO, AND JUSSI YLIKOSKI

Examples (34) and (35a,b) from Finnish show how animate adjuncts display more differentiation in the meanings of adverbial cases than inanimate ones. What is also relevant here is that an animate location can be coded only by an adposition, which may be claimed to stress its markedness as a landmark (see Klavan 2012 for a detailed discussion of similar variation in Estonian):

(34) Finnish

*Kirja on pöydä-llä ~ pöydä-n päällä.*  
 book be.3SG table-ADE table-GEN on  
 ‘The book is on the table.’

(35) Finnish

a. *Kirja on lapse-lla.*  
 book be.3SG child-ADE  
 ‘The book is in the child’s possession/keeping’, ‘The child has the book.’

b. *Kirja on lapse-n päällä.*  
 book be.3SG child-GEN on  
 ‘The book is on top of the child’ (for instance: somebody has put the book into a sleeping baby’s cot).

criticism, see Fejes 2016). However, as will be shown further, symmetric tripartite systems are typical of only a minority of Uralic languages, and the system often also includes cases for path (‘through’, ‘via’, ‘along’), end point (‘up to’), approximate goal or direction, etc.

Secondly, in more case-rich languages there can be two or even more such tripartite series. Finnish and Estonian (and most other Finnic varieties), as well as Hungarian, distinguish between internal (“inside”) and external (“on the surface”) local cases, a feature sometimes (see e.g. Kibrik 2003: 46) erroneously attributed to Uralic in general. Hungarian and the Finnic Veps also have a series of vicinal (“near”) local cases, and certain northern and eastern Hungarian dialects display a fourth set (albeit only used for names and certain human-referent nouns) traditionally called “familial local cases” (*családi helyragok*). Table 44.4 shows the Hungarian tripartite system in the inflection of *asztal* ‘table’ and *Kovács* (surname, ‘Smith’).

Analogous series exist for Finnic languages, but to various degrees. Understandably, the absence or existence of other series tends to affect the semantics of the rest of the cases, and the so-called internal cases that constitute the core of

**Table 44.4** The series of local cases for Goal, Location, and Source in Hungarian

	Goal	Location	Source
Internal cases	<i>asztal-ba</i> ‘into the table’	<i>asztal-ban</i> ‘in(side) the table’	<i>asztal-ból</i> ‘from inside the table’
Surface cases	<i>asztal-ra</i> ‘on to the table’	<i>asztal-on</i> ‘on the table’	<i>asztal-ról</i> ‘off the table’
Vicinal cases	<i>asztal-hoz</i> ‘to (the vicinity of) the table’	<i>asztal-nál</i> ‘at (the vicinity of) the table’	<i>asztal-tól</i> ‘from (the vicinity of) the table’
Familial cases (dialectal!)	<i>Kovács-ni</i> ‘to the Smiths’	<i>Kovács-nott</i> ‘at the Smiths’	<i>Kovács-nól</i> ‘from the Smiths’

#### 44.4.4 Adverbial/semantic cases

##### 44.4.4.1 Local cases (and local case systems)

The adverbial cases form the majority of Uralic case inventories. Especially as concerns the more case-rich Uralic languages, Hungarian and the Finnic and Permic branches, researchers within and beyond traditional Uralistics have paid considerable attention to two constructing dimensions of the local-case subsystem(s). First, the local cases often display a tripartite division into cases for source (‘from’), location (‘at’), and goal (‘to’, often called “lative” in Uralistic tradition). This feature is often claimed to be a central characteristic of the Uralic case systems (for a rare example of

Finnic local cases differ in meaning from language to language. Furthermore, the uses and meanings of the local cases also depend on the presence or absence of semantically related cases such as the dative or the comitative or instrumental case: Finnish uses the external ‘location’ case, the adessive in *-lla*, for instrumental meanings (e.g. *leikkaan veitse-llä* ‘I cut with a knife’), which in Estonian are expressed with the comitative in *-ga* (*lõikan noa-ga* ‘id.’).

As already mentioned, the popular and widespread idea of tripartite source-location-goal local case systems as typical of Uralic misrepresents the diversity of Uralic local cases. In fact, not even in all Uralic languages do the core local cases come in threes, owing to older or more recent mergers between two of the three dimensions.

Corresponding to the universal hierarchy proposed e.g. by Levinson (2003: 100–2), Goal and Location can be conflated in the internal local cases of many dialectal and colloquial Hungarian varieties (that is, instead of *-ba/-be* and *-ban/-ben*, only the former is used). Also in some Karelian varieties, the locative-cum-possessive Goal and Location cases adessive (‘on; at’) and allative (‘(on) to’) have merged into an adessive-allative. In contrast, Source and Location have merged into one case in North Saami and the Saami languages east of it; a similar merger in Veps and the Veps-based Karelian varieties (Livvi and Ludic) has prompted the emergence of new, recently grammaticalized ‘from’ cases (*mečä-s* ‘in the forest(; from the forest)’; *mečä-s-päi* ‘from the forest’).

There may also be gaps in the tripartite system. In most Mari varieties, there is no local case for Source and the meaning is expressed with a postposition. Also, the minimal case system of North Khanty has cases only for Location and Goal, and Source must be coded with a postposition. (For the division of labour between cases and postpositions, see chapter 50.)

Furthermore, as mentioned, many Uralic languages have further local cases outside the source-location-goal subsystem. Terminative cases denoting the end point of movement, action, or state in space or time (‘until, up to’) occur, for instance, in Veps and Estonian, in the Permic languages, and in Hungarian. For Komi-Permyak, a further case has recently been described by the name of “altiterminative” (Nekrasova 2015), denoting the vertical limit (‘up to the height of’).

- (36) Komi-Permyak (Nekrasova 2015: 204)  
 Пидзössэзви бродисö ваöт.  
 pidzəs-sez-vi broj-i-sə va-ət  
 knee-PL-ATERM wade-PST-3PL water-PROL  
 ‘They waded up to their knees in (through) water.’

Prolative cases denoting path (‘through’, ‘via’, ‘along’) belong to the case inventory of many Uralic languages: marginally in some Finnic and Saami (cf. Ylikoski 2015) varieties but more productively in Mordvin, Permic, and many Samoyedic languages. In addition to these, the Permic languages display further types of local cases: egressive cases coding the starting point (‘all the way from; since’), approximatives coding the approximate direction of motion (‘to the direction of’), and alongside the prolative a case occasionally dubbed “transitive” for other types of paths and routes (Bartens 2000: 107).

The Permic languages also serve as examples of languages with series of secondary local cases, partly analogous to Hungarian and Finnic “external” and “internal” local-case subsystems. In Komi, the approximative case suffix *-lqɲ* has, apparently relatively recently, given rise to a fully transparent series of local cases in which the approximative case marker is followed by virtually all other local case suffixes. The rather specific meaning of the approximative case has been largely inherited by the entire series of “proximal cases” (Table 44.5). Similarly in Mari, the modal case suffix *-la* can be attached to illative or inessive case forms, rendering a vicinal or proximal meaning (cf. 24.3.1.2).

Table 44.6 sums up the diversity of Uralic local cases from the perspective that does not take into account the internal vs external vs vicinal case series that are found in only three branches as described here.

For concrete examples of the previously mentioned local cases, readers are referred to individual language chapters in the present volume. Especially note that the prolative cases are found in most of the main branches of Uralic (37a–e). On the other hand, languages without a prolative case often resort to either postpositions or source (‘from’) cases (37f) to convey the same meaning, but static local cases may also serve the same purpose (38g).

**Table 44.5** The composition of the so-called proximal cases in Komi

			<b>Rough translation</b>
Approximative <i>-lqɲ</i> + Elative <i>-iε</i>	= Appr.-elative	<i>-lqɲiε</i>	‘from the direction of’
Approximative <i>-lqɲ</i> + Inessive <i>-in</i>	= Appr.-inessive	<i>-lqɲin</i>	‘in the direction of’
Approximative <i>-lqɲ</i> + Illative <i>-ə</i>	= Appr.-elative	<i>-lqɲə</i>	‘to the direction of’
Approximative <i>-lqɲ</i> + Egressive <i>-εqɲ</i>	= Appr.-egressive	<i>-lqɲεqɲ</i>	‘all the way from the direction of’
Approximative <i>-lqɲ</i> + Prolatives 1 and 2 <i>-əd, -ti</i>	= Appr.-prolative	<i>-lqɲəd, -lqɲti</i>	‘along the direction of’
Approximative <i>-lqɲ</i> + Terminative <i>-ədz</i>	= Appr.-terminative	<i>-lqɲədz</i>	‘up to the direction of’

(ÖKK; Kuznetsov 2012.)

SEPPO KITILÄ, JOHANNA LAAKSO, AND JUSSI YLIKOSKI

Table 44.6 Types of local cases in Uralic

	Source	Location	Goal	Path / Intermediate Point (Prolatives)	End Point (Terminatives)	Starting Point (Egressives)	(Approximate) Direction
Finnish, Livonian, Mansi	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	-
Western Saami	✓	✓	✓	(✓)	-	-	-
Estonian, Hungarian	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-
Veps	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-
Eastern Saami		✓	✓	-	-	-	-
Mordvin, Samoyed	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-
Mari	(in some dialects)	✓	✓	-	-	-	-
Permic	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
North Khanty	-	✓	✓	-	-	-	-
East Khanty	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓	-

(37) a. Erzya

Весе виенк пугынк теине ортава совамонтень.  
 ves'e vije-nk put-ink t'ein'e  
 all force-PL.GEN.2PL put-IMP.2PL>3PL narrow  
 orta-va sova-mo-nt'en'.  
 gate-PROL enter-AN-DAT.DEF

b. Komi

Став вынтö пуктöй, медым пырны векныд  
 öдзöсöд.  
 stav vin-tö puktəj, medim  
 all force-ACC.POSS.2PL put.IMP.2PL in.order.that  
 pir-ni vekn'id ədʒəs-əd.  
 enter-INF narrow door-PROL

c. Udmurt

Тыршелэ жоскыт капкати пырыны, ...  
 tirʃe-ʎe dʒoskit kapka-ti piri-ni, ...  
 strive-IMP.2PL narrow gate-PROL enter-INF

d. Tundra Nenets

Тыя нёвна варемда” мэць тюнгутаныда”.  
 tija n'owna war'emda?₁ mæ:ʔ₁s'°  
 narrow doorway.PROL effort.ACC.2PL use.CVB  
 tʃuŋkutan'da?₁  
 enter.IPF.IMP.2PL

e. Lule Saami

Oajbbut gártjes ukxa-rájge tjágga-t.  
 struggle.IMP.2PL narrow door-PROL enter-INF

f. Finnish

Men-kää sisään ahtaa-sta porti-sta.  
 go-IMP.2PL in narrow-ELA gate-ELA

g. Hungarian

Igyekez-ze-tek be-men-ni a szoros  
 strive-IMP-2PL in-go-INF DEF narrow  
 kapu-n, ...  
 gate-SUPESS  
 'Enter through the narrow gate.' (Luke 13:24)<sup>8</sup>

44.4.4.2 Non-local adverbial/semantic cases

Given the high number of cases in some Uralic languages, there are also numerous non-local adverbial cases, often straddling the border of case inflection and adverb derivation (as shown under 44.1). They display a broad range of

<sup>8</sup> Quoted from the following translations of the Gospel of Luke: (a) *Od veičsnyluv* (Helsinki 2006); (b) *Vyľ kösıys'šöm* (Helsinki 2008); (c) *Vyľ süžen* (Stockholm/Helsinki 1997); (d) *Лука' надвы Маймбабцо Юн* (Москва 2004); (e) *Ådå Testamentta* (Uppsala 2000); (f) *Raamattu* (1992); (g) *Biblia* (Budapest: Magyar Bibliatársulat 1996).

often quite specific functions. For instance, there is a type of cases named, for instance, “consecutive” (Komi), “final” (Hungarian), or “causative” (Mari, Moksha) and denoting various types and combinations of reason or purpose, as in the connection ‘go get/fetch X’:

(38) a. Komi folksong

НЫВ ВАЛА ЛЭЧЧӧ  
niv va-la lettɕ-ə  
girl water-CONSEC go.down-3SG.PRS

‘The girl goes down (i.e. to the river shore) to fetch water.’

b. Komi (Bartens 2000: 97)

Эз ЛОК РЫТЫН ШКОЛАӦ ДЫШЫСЛА.  
ez lok rit-in ʃkola-ə  
NEG.PST.3SG come.CNG evening-INE school-ILL

dif-is-la  
lazy-POSS.3SG-CONSEC

‘S/he didn’t come to school in the evening because s/he was lazy.’

(39) a. Moksha (Bartens 1999: 100)

mol’a-n kel’mæ ved’-əŋksa  
go-1SG cold water-CAUS

b. Hungarian

megye-k hideg víz-ért  
go-1SG cold water-FIN

‘I’m going to fetch cold water.’

(40) Hungarian

A szabad-ság-ért harcol-t-am.  
DEF free-DER<sub>N,ABSTR</sub>-FIN fight-PST-1SG

‘I fought for freedom.’

(41) Mari dial. (Tužarov 1984)

ærækæ-lænen tej tol-at  
liquor-CAUS here come-2SG

‘You come here for the booze.’

Some types of non-local adverbial cases occur throughout Uralic and lend themselves to some generalizations. To begin with, almost all Uralic languages use cases to code Instrument and Accompaniment. Mostly in line with the observations of Stolz et al. (2006), especially the westernmost languages of the family tend to use the same expressions for both functions, although the labels for the cases differ.

(42) a. Estonian

Mari söö-b jäätis-t lusika-ga ~  
M. eat-3SG.PRS ice.cream-PART spoon-COM  
oma sõbra-ga.  
own friend-COM

‘Mari eats ice cream with a spoon ~ with her friend.’

b. Hungarian

Mari kanál-lal eszi a fagyaltoa-t.  
M. spoon-COM eat.3SG.OBC DEF ice.cream-ACC

‘Mari eats the ice cream with a spoon.’

c. Hungarian

Mari fagyaltoa-t eszik a barát-já-val.  
M. ice.cream-ACC eat.3SG DEF friend-POSS.3SG-COM

‘Mari eats ice cream with her friend.’

On the other hand, especially Komi and Permyak of the Permic branch have separate instrumental and comitative cases (e.g. Коми машинаӧн мајинаӧн [car-INS] ‘by car’ vs машинакод мајина-көд [car-COM] ‘with a car’; cf. 26.3.1.2). In Mari, there is a comitative case for Accompaniment, but Instruments are rather coded with the postposition *dene*, also used for Accompaniment. Unquestionable instrumental and comitative cases are virtually absent in Mordvin and Finnish in the west as well as in Samoyed and North Khanty in the north-east, but all these languages use their static local cases (locatives, inessives, and adessives) in instrumental meaning. In the absence of full-fledged productive comitative cases, functions of local cases such as the Finnish adessive may stretch out to the vicinity of comitatives as seen in noun phrases of the type *makkara kaikilla mausteilla* [sausage all.PL.ADE spice.PL.ADE] ‘a sausage with all the works’.

While the instrumental and (often synonymous) comitative cases in Uralic do not fundamentally differ from instrumental cases in Slavic, for example, perhaps the most characteristic type of adverbial cases are the so-called abessive (or caritive) cases<sup>9</sup> with the meaning ‘without’. As such, an abessive is largely the opposite of an instrumental or a comitative: the opposite of going by car or having a car is to go and live without a car. With the exception of Samoyed and Ugric, all branches of Uralic have abessive cases with the meaning ‘without, lacking, not having’.<sup>10</sup> As summarized by Csepregi (2001), many of the suffixes that are used as abessive case markers are also attached to verb stems to yield negative converbs with the meaning ‘without V-ing’ (see also chapter 47). Moreover, it may sometimes be difficult to differentiate between case markers and adjectival and adverbial derivational suffixes (‘-less’),<sup>11</sup> but it

<sup>9</sup> In the Finnic research tradition, “abessive” is the term for the case while “caritive” denotes semantically related adjective derivatives (e.g. Finnish *kodi-ton* ‘homeless’). This terminological practice, however, is not consequently applied in all Uralic grammar traditions.

<sup>10</sup> In Hungarian, the essive case forms of caritive derivatives act as a functional equivalent for the abessive, cf. *szó-tlan-ul* word-DER<sub>CAR</sub>-ESS ‘without a word’, *kér-etlen-ül* request-DER<sub>CAR</sub>-ESS ‘without being asked’ and their Finnish equivalents *sana-tta* word-ABE, *pyytä-mä-ttä* request-INF-ABE (= request.CVB.NEG).

<sup>11</sup> For example, in Ob-Ugric languages the abessive suffix is used primarily in adjectival derivation, although in adverbial use such derivatives closely resemble case forms: North Mansi *ne:-ta:l* ‘unmarried’, *ne:-ta:l xos o:l-əs* (woman-ABE long be-PST.3SG) ‘He lived for a long time without a wife’.

appears that abessive cases are in many languages the primary means to express the meaning ‘without N’. In fact, most of them seem to have a common ancestor that may have been one of the cases of Proto-Uralic (cf. 1.4.3).

As is usual for expressions of negation, grammatical distinctions such as those of instrumentals and comitatives are neutralized in the abessives. Interestingly, the interplay between instrumentals/comitatives and their negative counterparts seems to be partly reflected in the apparently incidental similarity of the case suffixes—especially the instrumental/comitative case markers of individual languages are historically distinct from each other (see Table 44.7). (For concrete examples of the cases in question, see individual language chapters in the present volume, and for uniform descriptions of the abessives throughout the language family, see Miestamo et al. 2015.)

**Table 44.7** Formal similarity of some of the abessive and comitative/instrumental case markers in Uralic

	abessives	comitatives/ instrumentals
Estonian	-ta	-ga (COM)
Finnish	-tta	-lla (ADE)
West Mari	-de ~ -te	-ge ~ -ke (COM)
Komi	-təg	-kəd (COM)
East Khanty	-təɣ	-(j/ɣ)ət (INS)
East Mansi	-tal	-əl (INS)

Another distinctly Uralic type of cases consists of the cases labelled as essives and translatives. Usually, essives function as nominal or adjectival secondary predicates with the meaning of a temporary role or state, roughly equal to ‘as (a/the teacher, child, etc.)’. In many Finnic languages, such as Finnish, the essive has a static meaning while another case, translatable, is mostly used as its dynamic, directional counterpart. Further, certain south-eastern dialects of Finnish, as well as Ingrian and Votic, also have a third case of this type, the so-called excessive, which refers to the cessation of a given role or state. Example (43) from the Ingrian dialects of Finnish illustrates the use of the essive and the excessive:

- (43) Finnish (Tyrö, Ingria) (Särkkä 1969: 154)
- |               |                |   |            |           |             |
|---------------|----------------|---|------------|-----------|-------------|
| <i>ol-i-n</i> | <i>Narva-s</i> | <i>ke<tr> <tr> <td>be-PST-1SG</td> <td>Narva-INE</td> <td>spinner-ESS</td> </tr> </tr> </i> | be-PST-1SG | Narva-INE | spinner-ESS |
| be-PST-1SG    | Narva-INE      | spinner-ESS   |            |           |             |
| be-PST-1SG    | Narva-INE      | spinner-ESS   |            |           |             |
- pääsiäise-n tul-i-n ke|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
||  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Easter-ESS | come-PST-1SG | spinner-EXCESS | away |

‘I worked as a spinner in Narva, I came back home from spinning (from being a spinner) at Easter.’*

The translative form corresponding to the essive and excessive in (44) would be *ke|  |  |
| --- | --- |
||  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Standard Finnish | *kehräjäks* |

(partial) cognate of the Finnish translative is the translative-comitative (instrumental) in *-(kō)ks*, and (45) illustrates the two distinct main functions of this case:*

- (44) Livonian (Chapter 22)
- |           |                 |               |                 |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| <i>Ta</i> | <i>ba’rtō-b</i> | <i>si’ggō</i> | <i>lēba-ks,</i> |
| s/he      | feed-3SG        | pig.PART      | bread-TRSL/COM  |
- la’z ta iē-gō lī’ebizō-ks.*  
 let s/he become-IMP.3SG fat-TRSL/COM  
 ‘S/he feeds the pig with bread, so that it will become fat.’

Similar cases are found throughout the family, or in the absence of cases specialized for these particular functions, especially local cases such as the Mari and Udmurt inessives may be used. Especially in the Mordvin and Saami languages, one and the same case covers both the static “essive” and dynamic “translative” functions, and the two groups of cases in the two branches are largely identical in meaning, despite their different labels (“essive” in Saami, “translative” in Mordvin). So-called translative cases, partly also with “essive” functions, are found also in Khanty and Mansi languages. Samoyed languages such as Tundra Nenets and Forest Enets do have functionally analogous forms, but for morphological reasons they have not been regarded as cases proper (cf. 1.4.3 and Ylikoski 2017a). (For concrete examples of the essives and essive-like cases, see individual language chapters in the present volume, and for uniform descriptions throughout the language family, see de Groot (ed.) 2017; for the essive in Finnish, see especially Hynönen 2016.)

#### 44.5 Summary and conclusions

In this chapter, the notion of case in Uralic languages has been discussed from various perspectives. Uralic languages are famous for their rich case inventories, and the best studied and best known languages of the family, namely Finnish, Estonian, and Hungarian, do display high number of cases from a cross-linguistic perspective. However, this is not the whole picture, and the Uralic language family also has languages with considerably poorer case inventories, such as Forest Enets and North Saami with six, and North Khanty with only three cases. Moreover, it should be noted that there are different views on the exact number of

<sup>12</sup> The essive *ke|  |  |
| --- | --- |
||  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Standard Finnish | *kehräjä* |

the excessive *ke|  |  |
| --- | --- |
||  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Standard Finnish | *kehräjäntä* |**

cases in many Uralic languages, depending, e.g., on what criteria are seen as important for regarding a marker as a case marker.

Functionally, cases express different kinds of function in Uralic languages. Grammatical cases, nominative, accusative, genitive, and partitive, are, expectedly, related to the expression of core grammatical relations, such as subject, direct object, and indirect object. On the other hand, other cases (e.g. many local cases), are used for coding adverbial functions, such as instrument, comitative, and location. The languages with richer case systems, especially, also include cases that can be regarded as rather rare across languages. Examples of these include the terminative and approximative cases (the former is attested, e.g. in Veps and Estonian, and the latter in Veps and Komi). Also the essive case that is attested widely in Finnic and Saami languages is functionally quite rare across languages.

One thing that is also worth mentioning in this context is that the use of case, especially of grammatical cases, is only rarely purely formal in Uralic languages, but many semantic and also pragmatic features also make a contribution in this

respect. One of the best-known and most-studied manifestations of this is illustrated by the accusative/partitive variation of Finnic. In Finnish, the accusative codes definite objects and perfective aspect, while the partitive codes the opposite of these. Moreover, accusative typically occurs in clauses describing highly transitive events, while partitive is a general marker of decreased transitivity. This means that the speaker always needs to make a decision on the coding of the object based on definiteness and aspect, i.e. the coding is never merely formal in nature. In addition to the widely known variation between accusative and partitive, Uralic languages also display many other instances of Differential Argument Marking, including examples of DSM, DOM, DGM, and DAM. For example, the coding of (animate) Goals differs clearly from the coding of (inanimate and/or vicinal) Goals. The coding of place names is also interesting in that, for example in Finnish and Hungarian, the otherwise productive semantic differences between inner and outer local cases are neutralized, and the use of cases becomes lexically conditioned (i.e. the differences in marking do not manifest differences in the coded location).