

Remarks on the coding of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal in European Uralic

Seppo Kittilä & Jussi Ylikoski, University of Helsinki

Draft of January 10, 2011

1. Introduction

The Uralic language family is quite famous for its rich case inventories. In a survey of 261 languages, Iggesen (2008) lists 24 languages with ten or more cases, and five of them are Uralic (Erzya, Estonian, Finnish, Hungarian and Udmurt). According to Blake (2001), such systems typically comprise a large number of local cases, which certainly also holds for Uralic languages. For example, about a half of more than twenty cases of Hungarian and Veps are local cases. Therefore, it may not come as a surprise that cases constitute a recurrent topic in Uralic linguistics, even though most of the major studies with a special focus on cases are concerned with the diachrony of case markers (e.g. Castrén 1839, Alhoniemi 1967, 1977; Bartens 1972, 1978; Baker 1985, Grünthal 2003), whereas the description of their present-day usage is mostly left for general descriptions of individual languages. Not unlike the rest of the synchronic descriptions on Uralic, more detailed studies of Uralic cases are mostly limited to those of the three major Uralic languages Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian.

In contrast to the more typical studies of Uralic cases, the present paper is a synchronic comparative approach to cases and adpositions coding the semantic roles of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal. Examples of the roles are given below (see Section 2 for a more detailed description of these roles):

*John went **to London**.* (Goal)

*John gave a book **to Mary**.* (Recipient)

*John went **to Mary / to (the vicinity of) the house**.* (Vicinal Goal)

The goal of the paper is to shed more light on the semantic roles that carry the feature [+direction] – most notably those commonly known as Goal and Recipient, but also a slightly different role, here labeled as Vicinal Goal. From an areal and genetic perspective, the paper focuses on the European part of the Uralic language family, but the findings of the paper are also relevant to the studies of direction coding in other languages. From a morphological point of view, the paper is mainly concerned with directional morphological cases.

To our knowledge, previous studies (such as Blansitt 1988, Rice & Kabata 2007 and Kittilä 2008) scrutinizing Goal coding have not considered expressions of Vicinal Goal (‘to the vicinity of’) as manifestations of a semantic role of its own (cf., however, the concepts *Animate goal* and *Goal proximity* introduced by Wälchli 2010). However, as will be shown below, the coding of this

role differs in many languages from the coding of direction – in the common implicit sense of the term – which makes the role relevant to our understanding of direction coding from a broader perspective. It is noteworthy in this context that even though many Uralic languages spoken in Europe do have rich case inventories, few of them resort to morphological cases for coding Vicinal Goal but use adpositions (in practice, postpositions) instead (allative and approximative cases are, however, used also for Vicinal Goal coding). Consequently, the paper also touches upon the semantic differences between cases and adpositions, even though the focus of the paper lies on case. As will be seen below, a pervasive feature of the majority of Uralic local case and adposition systems is their tripartite nature, which means that spatial expressions such as those denoting endpoints of transfer are generally accompanied by two other morphologically, and often also etymologically, related expressions that indicate the static location or the source identical to that of the direction. What is most interesting in the present context, this built-in feature also has a variety of manifestations within the sphere of less local expressions such as those that code Recipients, Possessors and Donors. — It should, however, be noted that certain Uralic languages also have specific terminative (‘up to’) and some also approximative (‘towards’) cases, which make the tripartite nature of the system somewhat less clear. These cases will, however, not be discussed in this paper (but see Ylikoski, in preparation). In focusing on the semantically most typical expressions used for coding Recipient, Goal and Vicinal Goal, we will consider adpositions, i.e. postpositions in Uralic languages, only if the intended meaning cannot be expressed by cases; in practice, this applies to Vicinal Goal (and especially to animate instances of Vicinal Goal in most cases).

The subject matter of this study is limited to twelve literary varieties of a total of nearly thirty Uralic languages spoken in the northernmost and easternmost parts of Europe. As regards the topic of the present study, the twelve established literary languages of our sample can be considered fairly representative of the whole linguistic area (see Sections 3.1 and 4 below). The structure of the paper is as follows: In Section 2, we define the topic of the study in more detail. The three semantic roles are defined primarily based on the notions of coincidence and possession. The data is presented and discussed in Section 3 in which the examined languages are divided into six types according to which of the roles are coded by identical means and which bear different kind of coding. Also the morphological nature of the studied element (i.e. are they cases or postpositions) is considered. Finally, Section 4 discusses the central findings of the paper. (For diachronic discussion as well as some additional synchronic data on the topic of the present paper, the reader is referred to Ylikoski, in preparation.)

2. The roles

As noted above, the paper is concerned with the coding of three semantic roles; Recipient, Goal and Vicinal Goal. In this section, we define the roles in more detail before proceeding to examining their formal coding in the following section. The roles are defined and distinguished from each

other based on the features [direction], [possession] and [coincidence] as well as a less determinative property [animacy] that provides an important key to a deeper understanding of the typical (yet not all) concrete manifestations of the roles in question.

Examples of the roles discussed in the paper are found below (in boldface):

Goal (G)

*John went **to London**.* (intransitive motion)

*Mary sent John **to London**.* (transitive/caused motion)

Recipient (R)

*John gave **Mary** a book / a book **to Mary**.* (change of possessor, typically but not necessarily motion)

*John sent **Mary** a book / a book **to Mary**.* (change of possessor, motion)

Vicinal Goal (VG)

*John went **to Mary** / **to (the vicinity of) the house**.* (intransitive motion)

*John sent Bill **to Mary** / **to (the vicinity of) the house**.* (transitive/caused motion)

As can be seen, all of the three roles of the study share the value [+direction]. This means that all of the roles can be regarded as Goal *sensu lato* of motion or transfer. The exact meaning of [goal] may be claimed to vary somewhat depending on the role in question, but the differences in the nature of direction *per se* are not relevant to distinguishing between the roles. However, it is important to note that the instances of ‘sending’ seen above differ from the most typical example of events with Recipients, as ‘giving’ does not always necessarily presuppose concrete motion, i.e. carry the feature [+direction]. Put concretely, if *John gave the book to Mary* he may have already lent the book to her, and the act of giving was a mere declaration that John let Mary have and keep the book as her own possession. This is even more evident in situations such as that described by the sentence *John gave his house to Mary*. In this paper, however, we will be concerned only with those instances of the Recipient role that indeed can be seen as endpoints of caused possession and that thus involve the feature [+direction]. In other words, it is important to note that although the concept of Recipient adopted in this paper may slightly deviate from that of others (see e.g. Newman 1996: 211ff and Margetts & Austin 2007: 398), this is intended to serve the present purpose of highlighting the semantic properties that relate Recipients to other roles that are physically comparable if not identical to the prototypical Recipients in actual language use. Also the role of Goal is defined somewhat differently from previous studies, since the notion is confined to cases with the explicit feature [+coincidence] and it contrasts with Vicinal Goal, where coincidence is lacking. For example, in the examples above, John will not be within the confines of Mary, when

the denoted event has occurred, while this is the case in *John went to London*. When the coincidence is lacking in the latter case, this is usually linguistically highlighted, as in *John travelled near/to the vicinity of London*. These differences have not been explicitly accounted for in previous studies dealing with Goal. Irrespective of the nature of motion or transfer, the referents of the three types of arguments can be conceptualized as endpoints. On the other hand, the roles display evident differences in other respects, as will become clear below.

The examined roles are primarily distinguished based on two features that we have labeled as [possession] and [coincidence]. The first label is rather self-explanatory and it, expectedly, refers to whether a given event involves changes in possessive relations or not (see Rappaport Hovav & Levin 2008 for a more detailed discussion of caused motion and caused possession). This feature distinguishes Recipient from the two other roles of study; Goal and Vicinal Goal are mere endpoints of transfer, while the change or emergence of possession (which may be temporal or permanent) is an integral feature of Recipients. The feature [coincidence], in turn, refers to whether the location of referents of Theme and (Vicinal) Goal or Recipient will be (at least partly) identical after the event has occurred. Of the three roles discussed in this paper, [coincidence] has a positive value only for Goal; if John is sent to London, the location of John and London will eventually coincide (John will be located within the confines of London). With Recipient and Vicinal Goal, the transferred Theme will only be in the vicinity of the bearers of the relevant roles, but the locative relation is not that of coincidence. In the case of Recipient, the transferred Theme will be conceptually within the sphere of control of the Recipient, but concrete physical coincidence is lacking. With Vicinal Goal, the Theme only reaches the vicinity of the Goal without entering it.

The three roles can further be characterized with reference to animacy, although animacy cannot here be considered a defining semantic feature comparable to [direction], [possession] and [coincidence]. Typically, however, Goal is an inanimate role, while Recipient and Vicinal Goal are roles more typically borne by animate entities (see also Aristar 1997 for animacy effects on the coding of peripheral arguments). The distribution of animacy with Goal and Recipient is easily accounted for. First, inanimate entities (such as buildings, trees and rocks) are ideal landmarks due to their stable nature. On the other hand, genuine Recipients need to accept the denoted event of transfer, or, more properly, the change of possession. This is possible only if the participant in question is animate, prototypically human. As such, the role of Vicinal Goal can be borne by both animate ('go to Mary') and inanimate ('go to the house') entities, but it seems that the bearers of the role are more often than not animate. One of the reasons for this may be found in the fact that the value [+coincidence] is not typical of animate participants, and since the negative value [-coincidence] is decisive for Vicinal Goal, animate endpoints of motion most naturally bear this role. In a similar vein, patients have been seen as typically inanimate participants; they are less typical agents due to their incapability of instigating events with volition (see, e.g., Dowty 1991 and Næss 2003 for more detailed accounts of this). It is important to bear in mind that we do not claim that animate entities would be more prototypical bearers of the role than inanimate entities, but typicality means here that as endpoints of mere motion (i.e., without the feature [possession]), animate participants almost exclusively bear the role of Vicinal Goal. — A further point to be

emphasized is that throughout the present paper, the term *vicinal* refers somewhat vaguely to the vicinity or “neighborhood” of the landmark, which must be understood in a sense different from the expressions of scalar distance such as those denoting ‘near’ or ‘close’ as opposites to ‘far’ or ‘distant’. In all of the Uralic languages described below, the linguistic expressions of Vicinal Goal are mostly kept apart from those of ‘near’ or ‘close’ and the latter will not be discussed any further.

To summarize, the three roles of this study can be schematically represented as in Table 1; hypothetical role of Coincidental Recipient will be addressed separately below.

Table 1. Definitive features and typical properties of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal

<i>Goal (G)</i>	[+direction]	[-possession]	[+coincidence]	(typically inanimate)
<i>Recipient (R)</i>	[+direction]	[+possession]	[-coincidence]	(typically animate)
<i>Vicinal Goal (VG)</i>	[+direction]	[-possession]	[-coincidence]	(typically animate)
*“ <i>Coincidental Recipient</i> ”	[+direction]	[+possession]	[+coincidence]	

As was noted above, for the present purposes we have restricted our observations of Recipients to the prototypical situations where the value [+direction] is always present. Direction is therefore not a distinguishing feature between the scrutinized roles, but it aids us in making a distinction between these and other locational roles, such as static Locations and Sources (which in their turn can be further divided according to the features [possession] and [coincidence]). As was noted above, prototypical bearers of the Goal role are inanimate, since in the extra-linguistic world, inanimates are normally static objects that most naturally serve as landmarks for motion. Animate entities, in turn, are mobile and it is therefore less practical to describe our motion and location with reference to them. Rather, as mobile entities it is quite common for them to be active participants. It is, however, in order to note that it is most natural to enter the vicinity of various inanimate entities, but at least in the Uralic languages of Europe, many of the grammatical markers of vicinity are mostly used with reference to animates. For example, quick glances at the collocations of the Veps “second approximative” case *-nnoks* ‘id.’ or the Udmurt and Finnish vicinal postpositions *dory* and *luo* ‘to the vicinity of’ (~ Olonetsian *luo*, Section 3.2.3) in corpora of newspaper texts show that the great majority of the referents of Vicinal Goals are indeed animate (human). Prototypically, the semantic nature of Recipients requires that the referent be animate (or at least a body consisting of animate participants, such as school or parliament), as inanimate entities are not capable of genuine reception (i.e. becoming Possessors). Coincidence is thus an integral part of Goal only and it can be seen as the main difference between the two non-possessive directional roles of the study. With Goal, the transfer is “complete” in the sense that the Theme reaches the landmark and their locations eventually coincide. With Vicinal Goal, in turn, the transfer is only to the vicinity of the landmark. With Recipient, the “possessional” outcome of transfer is different and physical coincidence is not a fundamental part of the Recipient role. Similarly to Goal, the transfer can be seen as complete, as the Theme reaches the sphere of control of the Recipient. The feature [possession] has a positive value only for Recipients, as mere transfer to a prototypically inanimate entity does not in itself affect the possessive relations in any way.

There are many studies dealing with the linguistic coding of Recipient and Goal (see e.g. Blansitt 1988 and Kittilä 2008 among many others), but the third role of this study, *Vicinal Goal*, has not received comparable attention in earlier research. However, it seems important to study the coding of this role as well for a better understanding of the two other roles. The defining properties of Vicinal Goal underline what Recipient and Goal are not; the role lacks both of the features used for defining Recipients and Goals, which possibly contributes to its linguistic coding. The absence of this role in previous studies implies that the expressions of Goal usually also include those less prototypical expressions that lack the semantic value [+coincidence], which is here considered a prerequisite of Goal in the strict sense, whereas a directional (non-possessive) argument without this feature is regarded as carrying the semantic role of Vicinal Goal, i.e. motion to the vicinity of something – and, importantly, to the vicinity of *someone* – rather than into the confines of a (new) location. On the other hand, the feature [+possession] is also important, since it determines the coding of Recipients in many languages. As Recipient can be seen as the expected role of an animate participant in an event of transfer, the negative value [-possession] with typically human participants also needs to be highlighted; compare the sentence *John sent a book to Mary* with the both pragmatically and grammatically marked *John sent a book to the vicinity of Mary*. — For the sake of completeness, we may also note that the logically possible fourth role, “Coincidental Recipient” ([+coincidence] [+possession]), such as in *The stockkeeper of the clinic sent a dental implant to the patient* does not receive an explicitly different coding from other roles in any of the Uralic languages we have data for – nor in other languages we are acquainted with. An obvious reason for this is that such a feature combination is highly exceptional if not totally needless in normal human life, as seen also in the artificiality of the above example.

3. The data

3.1. Preliminaries

In this section, we will present and discuss our data. For our purposes, we have analyzed the argument marking of ‘send’ verbs in the translations of the New Testament into twelve Uralic languages spoken in Europe. We opted for focusing on verbs of sending, since ‘send’ is an event that is equally felicitous with both animate and inanimate Goal arguments (defined in a broad sense covering all the roles discussed in this paper). Moreover, we have used the New Testament as our source of data, because translations into all languages under examination have been readily available to us and they have provided a rich and easily searchable source of various kinds of linguistic expressions for sending events as well other, conceptually related events with which our primary data can be compared. All the six branches of European Uralic are represented as follows: As regards the topic of the present study, by far the most heterogeneous branch is Finnic (about ten languages in total) which is usually best known for Finnish and Estonian, but here mostly illustrated by Livonian, Olonetsian and Veps. The nine Saami languages are presented by North Saami and

Lule Saami, the two Mordvin languages by Erzya, the Mari branch (having two very close literary standards) by East Mari, and the three Permic languages by Udmurt and Komi. Finally, Hungarian has been traditionally considered as the only European language of the so-called Ugric branch, but there are also well-founded suggestions for regarding it as an independent branch within Uralic (see Salminen 2002 and Ylikoski, in preparation).

Although the choice of this sample has been largely determined by the availability of uniform corpora (modern and reliable New Testament translations), our understanding is that the languages studied here provide a representative picture of the whole European Uralic (about 30 languages). In fact, we will present concrete examples of only nine of the twelve languages, since the Olonetsian directionals are functionally close to those of Estonian and Finnish, and the Udmurt case and adposition system is virtually identical to that of Komi. — It may be explicated that several reasons for delimiting the focus of the present study to the European part of the Uralic family include not only areal and genetic aspects or the lack of uniform research material, but also the fact that the Ob-Ugric (Khanty and Mansi) and Samoyed languages of Siberia are as a whole still very poorly known in comparison to the Uralic languages west of the Ural mountains (for Tundra Nenets as a transcontinental but predominantly Asian language of the Samoyed branch falling outside the scope of the present paper, see Note 2 of Ylikoski, in preparation). For example, the traditional concepts of the Khanty language or the Mansi language are actually (sub)branches of their own, comprised of three and four distinct, poorly documented and partly extinct languages, which would make their analysis rather incompatible with the data provided by the European Uralic. It may also be of interest to the readers not familiar with Uralic languages that the Uralic languages spoken outside Europe are typologically quite different from those spoken in Europe. This also underscores the fact that we should not rush into making generalization regarding Uralic languages as a homogeneous language family.

The material of our study consists of translational equivalents of the sentences including the two ‘send’ verbs *apostellō* (135 instances) and *pempō* in (79 instances) of the original Greek New Testament, although not all of them include information about the directional participants of sending, i.e. the main topic of this study. Furthermore, as the translation approaches to the Bible text vary from case to case and most of the translations at our disposal are quite dynamic or functional as opposed to formal, word-for-word translations (see Nida 2004 [1964]), the following description of the European Uralic offers only qualitative generalizations instead of presenting quantitative details that nevertheless would not, it seems, affect our arguments or conclusions in any significant way. Of the dozens of sentences analyzed, we have chosen two representative passages to illustrate the coding of the roles discussed. The examples, written by the evangelist Luke in his Gospel and the Acts of Apostles, describe events (1) in which an animate, human-like messenger (the angel Gabriel) is sent to an inanimate Goal (the city of Nazareth in Galilee) that also includes an animate Vicinal Goal (a virgin named Mary) and (2) in which inanimate Theme (monetary donation) is sent to an animate Recipient (the brethren, i.e. the early Christians of Judea, represented by the elders of the congregation). The sentences we have analyzed are given in (1) and (2):

(Luke 2:16–17)

- (1) *Now in the sixth month of her pregnancy, the angel Gabriel was **sent** by God **to a city** (G) in Galilee called Nazareth, **to a virgin** (VG) engaged to a man named Joseph, a descendant of David. The virgin's name was Mary.*

(Acts 11:29–30)

- (2) *So all of the disciples decided they would **send** a contribution **to the brothers** (R) living in Judea, as they were able, by **sending** it through Barnabas and Saul **to the elders** (R).*

We have chosen these very examples due to their illustrative nature; they render it possible to focus explicitly on the coding of the three roles under study. As a matter of fact, the concrete data from our corpus does not significantly differ from but rather confirms our prior knowledge of the languages in question as well as the ways how these grammatical elements have been presented in earlier grammatical and lexical descriptions of these languages. However, the mutual relations of the morphological elements and semantic roles studied here have been mostly left without explicit discussion on the level of individual languages, not to speak of cross-linguistic surveys and functional-typological perspectives adopted in this paper.

As regards the presentation of the data below, we only give the examples with glosses, but will not repeat the free translations, since they do not vary from case to case. The material relevant to the discussion in this paper appears in boldface. In addition to the data itself, we also provide other relevant information about the local case system of a given language along with the number of cases in the language in question. The reader should, however, bear in mind that the tables describing the local case system of each language should be taken as rough simplifications only. For example, as the focus is on [\pm possessive] directional cases and their static and separative counterparts, other cases such as terminatives ('up to') and prolatives ('through') are not taken into account here. As we focus on the most basic functions of the relevant elements, it goes without saying that their actual use in the respective languages is certainly much more complex than what can be depicted within the confines of the general picture presented here. Even though other cases of the studied languages are not examined any further in the paper, unified presentations of the most important local cases of each language aid us in explaining the nature and functions of their directional cases in relation to other similar elements in the languages.

Based on the coding of the three roles in this study, we have divided the studied languages into six types. The typology is based on the morphological nature of the element used for coding direction, i.e. whether the languages use cases (and which ones) or adpositions for coding the discussed roles Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal. As discussed shortly below, the best-known Uralic languages also make a distinction between the so-called internal and external local cases, largely reminiscent of the semantic distinction between the English prepositions *in* and *on*. As these tripartite series include two directional cases, it could be said that the role of Goal is in a way divided into two, based, for example, on whether the motion is into the referent to the theme (as in 'into the house') or rather to its vicinity ('to the house'). However, the main focus of the present

study is in the division of labor between markers of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal, and the distinction between the so-called internal and external directionals is taken into account only with relation to the question whether one of the two is used for coding Recipient.

3.2. *The typology*

In this section, we will present the data itself. The presented typology is based on the coding of the three roles defined in Section 2. We have, however, listed most of the other local cases in the studied languages in order to provide the reader with a better overview of the case systems of the Uralic languages. As will be seen, the core of the local case systems of most Uralic languages can be presented in a tabular format where the directional cases (and postpositions, for that matter) are accompanied by static and separative parallels. Moreover, the number of cases is relevant to the typology, which also makes it important to mention other local cases as well. The typology is based on similarities and differences in the coding of the scrutinized roles.

The following list gives an overview of the six main types to be discussed. In those languages with two Goal-marking cases, the subscript numbers separate the most unmarked or “default” cases (G_1) from those with more or less marked positions in the language (G_2). The notation also includes information on whether the primary markers of Vicinal Goal are case suffixes or postpositions. The three languages in italics were included in the sample but do not provide additional information to be systematically presented in the present paper.

Type 1: $G_1 \neq G_2 \neq R \neq VG_{\text{case}}$ (Hungarian)

Type 2: $G_1 \neq G_2 = R \neq VG_{\text{case}}$ (Veps)

Type 3: $G_1 \neq G_2 = R \neq VG_{\text{postposition}}$ (Olonetsian, *Estonian*, *Finnish*)

Type 4: $G \neq R \neq VG_{\text{postposition}}$ (Livonian; Mari; Udmurt, *Komi*)

Type 5: $G = R \neq VG_{\text{postposition}}$ (Lule Saami; North Saami)

Type 6: $G_1 \neq G_2 \neq R = VG_{\text{case}}$ (Erzya)

Below, we will illustrate these six language types in light of actual linguistic data from the languages under examination. First, the data relevant to the discussion is illustrated, which is followed by a schematic representation of the elements (cases and postpositions) used for coding the roles examined. As noted above, the tables also include additional information about the case systems of the languages under examination.

3.2.1. Type 1: $G_1 \neq G_2 \neq R \neq VG$ (case)

The first type to begin with is manifested by Hungarian in which all the three roles are coded by different cases, in addition to which the role of Goal is divided into two:

Hungarian (about 22 cases in total)

- (3) *A hatodik hónapban pedig elküldte Isten Gábrriel angyalt Galilea egyik városába, Názáretbe, egy szűzhöz, aki a Dávid házából származó férfinak, Józsefnek volt a jegyese.*
 DEF six.ORD month.INE and send.3SG.DEFOBJ God Gabriel angel.ACC Galilee one town.3SG.ILL Nazareth.ILL INDF virgin.ALL who DEF David house.3SG.ELA descend.PTCP.PRS man.DAT Joseph.DAT be.PST.3SG DEF betrothed.3SG
A szűznek pedig Mária volt a neve.
 DEF virgin.DAT and Mary be.PST.3SG DEF name.3SG
- (4) *A tanítványok pedig valamennyien elhatározták, hogy aszerint, amint kinek-kinek módjában áll, valami segítséget küldenek a Júdeában lakó testvéreknek. Ezt meg is tették, és elküldték Barnabással és Saullal a gyülekezet elöljáróihoz.*
 DEF disciple.PL and all decide.PST.3PL.DEFOBJ COMP REL.according REL.how who.DAT-who.DAT means.3SG.INE suit.3SG some aid.ACC send.3PL DEF Judea.INE live.PTCP.PRS sibling.PL.DAT this.ACC PRT also do.PST.3PL.DEFOBJ and send.PST.3PL.DEFOBJ Barnabas.INS and Saul.INS DEF congregation leader.PL.3SG.ALL

Table 2. The markers of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal within the Hungarian local case system

	Direction	Location	Source
coincidence ₁	illative <i>-ba (G)</i>	inessive <i>-ban</i>	elative <i>-ból</i>
coincidence ₂	sublative <i>-ra (G)</i>	superessive <i>-n</i>	delative <i>-ról</i>
vicinity	allative <i>-hoz (VG)</i>	adessive <i>-nál</i>	ablative <i>-tól</i>
possession	dative <i>-nak (R)</i>	dative <i>-nak</i>	ablative <i>-tól</i>

With its 22 cases, Hungarian has a very rich case inventory both in the Uralic and especially in a more global perspective.¹ As expected, this is manifested also in the number of local cases, which is 11 in total (including the terminative ‘up to’). Hungarian uses four cases for coding the three roles under study. Firstly, there are two cases, labeled as the illative and sublative, to encode the role of Goal. As stated above, the main focus of the present study is not in scrutinizing the interrelations of the so-called internal and external local cases such as the Hungarian illative and sublative along

¹ In Table 2 and throughout the article, suffix allomorphy conditioned by vowel harmony, a typical feature of many Uralic languages, is omitted for the sake of clarity.

with their static and separative counterparts, but since this distinction continuously attracts the attention of many linguists, a few comments are in order.

Although a different kind of approach to local cases could as well favor a solution in which only the internal local cases (“coincidence₁” in the table above) were viewed as the basic markers of most prototypical spatial semantic roles such as Goal (in the strict sense), the external cases (“coincidence₂”) such as the Hungarian sublative can also be considered as quite basic expressions of location. What is most relevant in the present context is that they can be described as mostly carrying the semantic feature [+coincidence] quite like the English prepositions *on* and *onto* for which OED gives the following primary definitions: *on* ‘above and in contact with; at rest on the upper surface of; above and supported by’ and *onto* ‘to a position or state on or upon (a floor, chair, stage, etc.); so as to be supported by (a part of the body); so as to be transported by (an animal or vehicle).’ In contrast to this, however, the vicinal local cases such as the allative (Vicinal Goal) have the negative value [-coincidence]. The prototypical semantic differences of the three cases can be exemplified by comparing the coincidental illative *az asztalba* ‘(in)to the table’ and sublative *az asztalra* ‘onto the table’ with the non-coincidental allative *az asztalhoz* ‘to the vicinity of the table’. The close similarity of the illative and sublative is also exposed in the fact that even though most place names such as *Názáret* in (3) take illatives and other internal local cases, some others such as Budapest take the external cases instead (i.e. *Názáret-be*_{ILL} ‘to N.’ but *Budapest-re*_{SUBL} ‘to B.’). Finally, the fourth directional case seen above is the dative that is the exclusive marker of Recipients but does not have any non-possessive local functions.

The richness of the Hungarian case system has clear consequences for the coding of the roles relevant to this paper. First of all, the large number of cases makes it possible for the language to distinguish between as many as four different kinds of direction in the broad sense (or even five, if we include the terminative). As the language also has a case (allative) for coding Vicinal Goal only, there are no risks of ambiguity between the markers of Goal, Vicinal Goal and Recipient. (Of course, this is not to say that such an ambiguity should be necessarily evaded at all, as e.g. English is among the languages in which all the roles are usually coded by a single preposition *to*.) In fact, the inherent semantics of these cases uncover the semantic roles of the participants in spite of occasional overlap in more or less identical contexts. For example, the dative *testvéreknek* ‘to the brethren’ of (4) marks the Recipient of sending, whereas the allative *elöljáróihoz* ‘to (the vicinity of) the leaders’ depicts the leaders of the congregation as more of a Vicinal Goal than the true Recipients of the aid sent to the brethren, i.e. the whole congregation. This distinction is taken literally from the original Greek with the dative NP *tois ... adelphois* and the PP *pros tous presbuteros*. However, it will be seen in many other translations that follow that the leaders could have been represented as the Recipients proper as well, in which case the unambiguous dative *elöljáróinak* would have been used.

3.2.2. Type 2: $G_1 \neq G_2 = R \neq VG$ (case)

Type 2 differs from Type 1 in the formal identity of the Recipient marker with one of the markers of Goal. Also in this type, Vicinal Goal is coded with a special morphological case. This type is manifested by Veps of the Finnic branch, cf.

Veps (Finnic; 20–22 cases)

- (5) *Konz Elizaveta oli kudendel kul, Jumal oigenzi angelan*
 when Elizabeth be.PST.3SG six.ORD.ADE month.ADE God send.PST.3SG angel.GEN
Gavriilan lidnaha, Nazaretha, neičennoks, kudamban nimi oli Maria.
 Gabriel.GEN city.ILL Nazareth.ILL girl.APPR2 who.GEN name be.PST.3SG Mary
Maria oli toivotatud Josifale, kudamb oli
 Mary be.PST.3SG promise.PTCP.PASS.PST Joseph.ALL who be.PST.3SG
Davidan heimokundaspäi.
 David.GEN family.ELA
- (6) *Openikad pätiba abutada Judejas eläjile uskondvellile, ken*
 disciple.PL decide.PST.3PL help.INF Judea.INE live.PTCP.PRS.PL.ALL faith.brother.PL.ALL who
mil voib. Hö muga tegiba=ki i oigenziba Varnavanke i
 what.ADE can.3SG 3PL thus do.PST.3PL=too and send.PST.3PL Barnabas.COM and
Saulanke dengoid Jerusaliman uskondkundan vanhembile.
 Saul.COM money.PL.PART Jerusalem.GEN congregation.GEN elder.PL.ALL

Table 3. The markers of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal within the Veps local case system

	Direction		Location		Source	
coincidence ₁	illative	-hal-he (G)	inessive	-s	elative	-späi
coincidence ₂	allative	-le (G)	adessive	-l	ablative	-lpäi
possession	allative	-le (R)	adessive	-l	ablative	-lpäi
vicinity	approximative II	-nnoks (VG)	appr. I	-nno	egressive	-nnopäi

Similarly to Hungarian with the cases labeled as illative and sublative, Veps distinguishes between cases of Goal that are called illative and allative in the Veps (and the whole Finnic) grammatical tradition. Not unlike in Hungarian, the Veps illative can be considered the default Goal-marking case, whereas the spatial functions of the Veps allative are very much like those of the Hungarian sublative, e.g. *stol-ha_{ILL}* ‘(in)to the table’ vs. *stola-le_{ALL}* ‘onto the table’. — It is important to be aware that the Veps allative must not be confused with its Hungarian namesake, as the Hungarian allative is a case of Vicinal Goal and also etymologically completely unrelated to the Veps allative. However, even though the most prototypical concrete meaning of the Veps allative is similar to the

Hungarian sublative, it is at the same time the sole marker of Recipient and thus the equivalent of the Hungarian Recipient-marking dative as well.²

In spite of coding Recipients and many of the Goal arguments with the single allative case, Veps also uses a highly specialized case in *-nnoks*, labeled as the “second approximative”, for coding Vicinal Goal. The semantic functions of this case are very similar to those of the Hungarian allative. However, using a distinct case form for coding this role (and this role only) constitutes something of an exception, since nearly every other Uralic language uses postpositions for this purpose (see Types 3–6 below).³ What makes the Veps approximative 2 very interesting in the present context is the fact that in Veps, Recipient is coded by a polysemous allative case, but there is a specific case form available for coding Vicinal Goal. What is also noteworthy here is that both Hungarian and Veps with more than twenty cases rank highest among the Uralic case inventories. This suggests that coding of Vicinal Goal (especially with human landmarks) by case may become possible only if a given language has a rich case inventory including a rich system of local cases (cf., however, the nature and position of the Erzya dative discussed in Section 3.2.6). From a more diachronic point of view, it looks like the cases used for coding only Vicinal Goal seem to be among the last cases to grammaticalize (cf. Ylikoski, in preparation).

3.2.3. Type 3: $G_1 \neq G_2 = R \neq VG$ (postposition)

As regards the semantic similarities and differences in coding, Type 2 and Type 3 are basically identical to each other. However, the formal nature of the elements encoding Vicinal Goal is different, because of which an explicit distinction between the types is favored here. In the languages of Type 3, Goal and Recipient are coded by cases, while a postposition marks Vicinal Goal. Except for Veps (Type 2) and Livonian (Type 4), the rest of Finnic languages, including Finnish and Estonian, belong to this type exemplified here by Olonetsian (a.k.a. Olonets Karelian or Livvi):

Olonetsian (Finnic; ~15 cases)

- (7) *Konzu Jelizavetan kohtule oli kuvves kuu, Jumal tüöndi*
 when Elizabeth.GEN womb.ALL be.PST.3SG six.ORD month God send.PST.3SG
Gavriil-anhelin Galileih, Nazarietan linnah n'eičoin luo, kudaman nimi
 Gabriel-angel.GEN Galilee.ILL Nazareth.GEN city.ILL girl.GEN to who.GEN name

² It may be noted that most Recipient-markers of the Uralic languages, including the Hungarian dative and Veps allative, also have a multitude of other grammatical functions familiar from e.g. the usage of many Indo-European languages of Europe. For example, it can be seen in Examples (3) and (5) that Mary was engaged (betrothed, promised) **to** Joseph (Hungarian *Józsefnek*, Veps *Josifale*), and the disciples decided to help “to” their brothers. Similar examples can be seen in the data from other languages discussed in this paper.

³ Note, however, that certain northern dialects of Udmurt and the southernmost dialects of Permyak show signs of vicinal postpositions losing their independence and becoming case suffixes similar to those of Hungarian and Veps (see Ylikoski, in preparation).

oli Marija. Marijua oli uskaldettu andua mučoikse
 be.PST.3SG Mary Mary.PART be.PST.3SG promise.PTCP.PASS.PST give.INF wife.TRA
Davidan roduh kuulujale Josifale.
 David.GEN family.ILL belong.PTCP.PRS.ALL Joseph.ALL

- (8) *Sit opastujat otettih mieleh tüöndiä abuu Juudies eläjile*
 then disciple.PL take.PST.3PL mind.ILL send.INF help.PART Judea.INE live.PTCP.PRS.PL.ALL
uskovellile, jogahine omii taguzii müöte. Mugai hüö
 faith.brother.PL.ALL each own.PL.PART means.PL.PART according thus 3PL
luajittih da Varnavan da Saulanke tüöttih uskojien
 do.PST.3PL and Barnabas.GEN and Saul.COM send.PST.3PL believe.PTCP.PRS.PL.GEN
kanzukunnan vahnimile d'engua.
 group.GEN elder.PL.ALL money.PART

Table 4. The markers of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal within the Olonetsian local case system

	Direction		Location	Source	
coincidence ₁	illative	-h (G)	inessive	-s	elative - <i>späi</i>
coincidence ₂	allative	-le (G)	adessive(-ablative)	-l	ablative -l(<i>päi</i>)
possession	allative	-le (R)	adessive(-ablative)	-l	ablative -l(<i>päi</i>)
vicinity	postposition	luo (VG)	postposition	luo	postposition <i>luopäi</i>

As can be seen from Examples (5–8), Veps and Olonetsian are very close relatives within the Finnic branch of the Uralic (both are spoken in the Russian Republic of Karelia and the adjacent areas). Identically to Veps, Olonetsian distinguishes between two cases of Goal proper – the illative and allative – depending on the resulting location of the trajector, and the allative is split between Goal and Recipient coding in Olonetsian as well. The main difference to Veps is found in the form of the Vicinal Goal marker, which is a postposition in Olonetsian. However, this difference is not a trivial one. As was noted above, the role of Vicinal Goal can be viewed as an unexpected role of an animate participant. This (at least to some extent) explains the coding of the role by a semantically specified postposition instead of a case, as cases in general tend to belong to the core of the grammar in contrast to adpositions whose morphological and semantic properties make them a bit more marked or peripheral in this respect. This view is supported by the fact that the number of cases in the languages of Type 3 (and the other types to be discussed below) is lower than in Hungarian and Veps, and when seen from a historical perspective, at least the vicinal cases of Veps have emerged only after the establishment of the common Finnic local case system of internal and external cases. It thus seems that only languages with a very rich case inventory use a special case form for coding the role of Vicinal Goal.

In this connection it may also be noted that the local functions of the Finnic external cases are somewhat more vague than in Hungarian, and perhaps more so in the major Finnic languages Finnish and Estonian than in Veps and Olonetsian of the above examples. For example in Finnish

where the most prototypical local function of the allative corresponds to that of Veps and Olonetsian (e.g. Veps and Olonetsian *stola-le* ‘onto the table’ and Finnish *pöydä-lle* id.), it can be observed that especially with reference to inanimates that do not have prominent or functionally significant upper surfaces, the functions of external cases may resemble those of vicinal postpositions. For instance, *auto-lle* [car-ALL] ‘to the car’ may correspond to the unambiguously vicinal postposition phrase *auto-n luo* [car-GEN to] ‘to the vicinity of the car’ in many contexts. The most obvious explanation for this seems to be that while the most unmarked role for allative-marked animates is that of Recipient and the ‘onto’-type of Goal is most expected with referents for which this makes most sense (e.g. tables), the allative is in a way rather free to code other roles elsewhere. However, the most typical local functions of the external local cases do include the semantic feature [+coincidence].⁴

When speaking of the distinction between the so-called internal and external local cases of Finnic and Hungarian, and before turning to the rest of the European Uralic, it seems also worth emphasizing that the sociological position of the languages with internal and external local cases has quite often led to the misconception that the case systems of the major Uralic languages Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian were more or less typical representatives of the whole family. For example, Kibrik (2003: 46) introduces his presentation of the Hungarian and Finnish local case systems stating that “Uralic languages usually distinguish between the two inflectional localizations of internal [...] and external [...]”, and Kracht’s (2005: 145) starting point for discussing the semantics of Uralic locatives is a presumptuous assertion that “[t]he data comes mainly from Finnish and Hungarian, but we believe that the facts carry over *mutatis mutandis* to other Uralic languages.” Quite to the contrary, however, the following presentation of languages of Types 4 (with three subtypes), 5 and 6 will show that the remaining Uralic branches – and this can be said of Asian Uralic as well – *de facto* lack the corresponding distinction between internal and external local cases almost without an exception, and other aspects of spatial expressions within the family also show variation to such an extent that there are hardly any reasons to start drawing conclusions about the whole Uralic family (or even the European part of it) at this point, on the basis of only a couple of languages in the outskirts of the family of about forty languages in total.⁵ The next language to be discussed is Livonian that also lacks the external local cases in spite of belonging to the Finnic branch otherwise so famous for its local cases.

⁴ A further example of the predominance of the feature [+coincidence] in the Finnic “external” local cases is provided by the use of place names. It was mentioned in Section 3.2.1 that in Hungarian, most place names take the internal local cases but certain others take the external ones (the illative *Názáretbe* but sublative *Budapestre*). In Finnish, the selection of the right (i.e. locally established) alternative is grammatically so idiosyncratic that special lists have been compiled in order that language users are able to use correct forms. According to Korhonen (2004: 10), about two thirds of the Finnish place names take the internal, and one third the external local cases.

⁵ The only comparable situation can be found in the southern dialects of Permyak (Permic) for which see Ylikoski, in preparation. In any case, analogous statements about the Indo-European family could firmly claim that Indo-European languages usually have the dual number or SOV word order.

3.2.4. Type 4: $G \neq R \neq VG$ (postposition)

The main difference between Type 4 and the previous types is found in the lack of multiple cases for marking Goal (such as the illative and sublative in Hungarian or the illative and allative in Veps and Olonetsian). Languages of Type 4 only have one case marker for Goal and they are for Goal only. In the absence of directional cases expressing motion onto or towards a surface (cf. the Hungarian sublative as well as Veps and Olonetsian allative with functions comparable to the English *onto*), more specific postpositions can be used instead. Examples of the type are found in Examples (9–14) from Livonian, East Mari and Udmurt; similar systems are also found throughout the Mari and Permic branches (i.e. Western Mari as well as Komi and Permyak). As Type 4 is the dominant type in the two main branches of the family and also attested in a third branch, it could be seen as a kind of paradigm case (especially, since the local cases of the three branches are only remotely related to each other) – at least more so than the internal vs. external distinction discussed above – among Uralic languages of Europe, because of which the type is illustrated in light of more examples. In fact, however, the three languages discussed can be regarded as instances of three different subtypes that each provide interesting perspectives to our understanding of the nature of the Recipient role, which will become clear in the discussion below.

Livonian (Finnic; 8–9 cases)

- (9) *Ja kūdōnts kūs sai engōl Gabriel Jumalōst kaimdōt*
 and six.ORD.INE month.INE get.PST.3SG angel Gabriel God.ELA send.PTCP.PASS.PST
Galileamā jālgabō, nimtōt Natsaret, Neitst jūr, kis voļ
 Galilee.land.GEN city.ILL call.PTCP.PASS.PST Nazareth girl.GEN to who be.PST.3SG
kāldōt mien, nimtōt Jōzef, Dāvid kuodast,
 betroth.PTCP.PASS.PST man.DAT call.PTCP.PASS.PST Joseph David.GEN house.ELA
ja neitst nim voļ Maria.
 and girl.GEN name be.PST.3SG Mary

- (10) *Aga oppijist tāž jējaykš, kuijen ta vōib, āndōkši abbōks*
 but disciple.PL.ELA want.PST.3SG each how 3SG can.3SG gift.PL.PART help.TRA
kaimō veļidōn, kis Jūdeamāl jelist. Ja teit sieda,
 send.INF brother.PL.DAT who Judea.land.“ADE” live.PST.3PL and do.PST.3PL that.PART
kaimōs vaņimōdōn leb Barnabas ja Zaulus kādud.
 send.CVB elder.PL.DAT through Barnabas.GEN and Saul.GEN hand.PL.GEN

Table 5. The markers of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal within the Livonian local case system

	Direction		Location	Source	
coincidence	illative	-ō (G)	inessive	-s	elative -st
possession	dative	-n (R)	dative	-n	postposition <i>kādst</i>
vicinity	postposition	jūr(ō) (VG)	postposition	<i>jūr</i>	postposition <i>jūst</i>

East Mari (Mari; 9 cases)

- (11)⁶ *Kudymšo tylzyn Ūmo Gavriil Suksym Galilejyse Nazaret manme olaške*
 six.ORD month.GEN God Gabriel angel.ACC Galilee.ADJ Nazareth call.PTCP.PST city.ILL
kolten. Tudo David tukym gyč Iosif lüman pör"eřlan sörymö
 send.PST2.3SG 3SG David family from Joseph name.ADJ man.DAT promise.PTCP.PST
üdyr deke koltymo ulmaš. Üdyryn lümžö Mariâ lijyn.
 girl to send.PTCP.PSTAUX.PST2.3SG girl.GEN name.3SG Mary be.PST2.3SG
- (12) *Tunam tunemše-vlak, kažnyže kertmyž semyn, Iudejyse*
 then disciple-PL each.3SG can.NMLZ.3SG according Judea.ADJ
iza-šol'o-vlaklan polyšym koltaš punčalynyt.
 big.brother-little.brother-PL.DAT support.ACC send.INF decide.PST2.3PL
Nuno tygak yštenyt, pogymyšty Varnava den Savl dene pyrlâ
 3PL thus do.PST2.3PL gather.PTCP.PST.3PL.ACC Barnabas and Saul with together
presviter-vlaklan koltenyt.
 elder-PL.DAT send.PST2.3PL

Table 6. The markers of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal within the East Mari local case system

	Direction		Location		Source	
coincidence	illative	-ške (G)	inessive	-šte	postposition	<i>gyč</i>
possession	dative	-lan (R)	genitive	-n	postposition	<i>deč</i>
vicinity	postposition	deke (VG)	postposition	<i>dene</i>	postposition	<i>deč</i>

Udmurt (Permic; 15–17 cases)

- (13) *Kuatetî tolëzez mynyku, Inmar Gavriil kylčinëz Galileâys' Nazaret kare,*
 six.ORD month.3SG during God Gabriel angel.ACC Galilee.ELA Nazareth city.ILL
David ûrtys' Iosif nimo piosmurtly kuram Nyl dory ystëm.
 David house.ELA Joseph name.ADJ man.DAT propose.PTCP.PST girl to send.PST2.3SG
So Nyllèn nymyz: Mariâ.
 this girl.GEN name.3SG Mary

⁶ The Cyrillic orthographies of East Mari, Erzya and Udmurt have been transliterated according to ISO 9.

- (14) *Soku dyšetskis'ës, kot'kudîz aslaz luonlykez"â, Iudeâyn ulîs'*
 then disciple.PL each.3SG REFL.GEN.3SG possibility.3SG.ADV Judea.INE live.PTCP.PRS
agaj-vyn''ëssyly ûrttèt ystyny mylkyd karillâm.
 big.brother-little.brother-PL.DAT help send.INF mind do.PST2.3PL
Ûrttëtsès ystîllâm. Soe Iudeâys' vösâs'kis'ëslèn kivaltîs'ëssyly
 help.ACC.3PL send.PST2.3PL this.ACC Judea.ELA believer.PL.GEN leader.PL.DAT
Varnaven Savl börs'y kelâllâm.
 Barnabas.INS Saul with send.PST2.3PL

Table 7. The markers of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal within the Udmurt local case system

	Direction		Location		Source	
coincidence	illative	<i>-e (-y) (G)</i>	inessive	<i>-yn</i>	elative	<i>-ys'</i>
possession	dative	<i>-ly (R)</i>	genitive	<i>-len</i>	ablative	<i>-lys'</i>
vicinity	postposition	<i>dory (VG)</i>	postposition	<i>doryn</i>	postposition	<i>dorys'</i>

Basically, the coding of the three roles above is the same: the cases labeled as illatives code Goal and the datives Recipient, while postpositions are employed for Vicinal Goal. The distinction is formally very clear and there are no overlaps in coding, such as those attested in Types 2 and 3. However, we may, if so desired, divide the languages above in three subtypes based on the general position of the Recipient markers, i.e. the dative cases in the case systems of the languages in question.

As for Livonian (9–10), it is noteworthy that the morphosyntax of the language was (until its extinction in 2009) one of the most Indo-Europeanized among the Uralic languages which can also be seen in the fact that it has only eight productive cases in contrast to its close relatives Estonian, Finnish and Olonetsian with at least 14 and Veps as many as 20–22 cases. However, it can be observed that Example (10) also includes the word form *Jūdeamāl* ‘in Judea’ that has been glossed as an “adessive” in accord with the traditional terminology of Finnic linguistics, although this is not a true adessive or any other productively formed case either, but rather a remnant from an earlier pan-Finnic adessive case or maybe only its incipient stage in pre-Livonian. Although the diachronic accounts concerning the history of these forms may vary, there are hardly any reasons to regard forms such as *Jūdeamāl* as external local cases. In addition to certain fully lexicalized adverbs and adpositions (e.g. *jōdmōl* ‘before’, *sizāl* ‘in(side)’), apparently the only semi-productive use of this element can be seen in compounded place names in *-mā* ‘land’: the directional and separative equivalents of the “adessive” *Jūdeamāl* ‘in Judea’ are the “allative” *Jūdeamālō* ‘to Judea’ and “ablative” *Jūdeamāld* ‘to Judea’. As they almost never denote surfaces of their referents, they could perhaps be regarded as some kinds of allomorphs of the three local cases proper. In any case and irrespective of the theoretical possibility of the case status of these forms, they do not have any possessive functions whatsoever, which means that Livonian must definitely be regarded as belonging to a type different from the rest of the Finnic languages discussed above. In fact, if the “allative” formations such as *Jūdeamālō* ‘to Judea’ were regarded as a true allative case, Livonian

would thus constitute the seventh main type of European Uralic, namely “ $G_1 \neq G_2 \neq R \neq VG$ (postposition)”.

It may also be good to note that the functions of the Livonian dative (like that of Hungarian, Section 3.2.1) are strongly reminiscent of those Indo-European languages – including Latvian that submerged the Livonian language in the end – in which the datives can also code Possessor (*dativus possessivus*).⁷ In Mari, on the other hand, the dative is merely a Recipient marker, and is thus closer to the datives of, for example, Russian and German.

In Udmurt and other Permic languages (in Komi and its closest relative Permyak), the dative constitutes a part of an interesting tripartite system of possessive cases with genitive and ablative as the other members (see the table above). On a par with the dative that codes the transfer of possession to Recipient, the genitive codes static Possessor, while the ablative codes transfer of possession from the participant most often labeled as Donor. Thus, Udmurt provides us with the best pieces of evidence for the directional nature of the Recipient-marking datives, as despite its inherently non-local [+possession] nature, the Udmurt dative contrasts not only with the default Goal-marking case, illative, but also with two other possessive cases that are primarily used for coding possessive [-directional] relations and none of the truly local ones. The dative is thus one member of a system of three possessive cases, where the transfer or stability of *possession* is always explicit although the cases lack the capability of coding genuine local relations, such as Goal and source, they only code ‘direction of (transfer of) possession’ (see also, e.g. Jackendoff 1983 possession as an abstract location and Rappaport Hovav & Levin 2008 for a more detailed discussion of caused motion and caused possession). From this perspective, the Udmurt dative can unequivocally be seen and characterized as a directional possessive case even when used in contexts that do not presuppose concrete motion of the Theme. More importantly, the inherently directional nature of the dative cannot be claimed to derive from the existence of the tripartite subsystem of possessive cases, but rather, the Udmurt genitive and ablative only help us to put the dative case and, ultimately, the notion of the Recipient role – in its rightful place within the symmetric network of local and possessive relations. While the interrelations seen here are fully in line with the well-known diachronic developments of many languages, Udmurt shows how the principal differences between the roles discussed can be maintained on synchronic level as well. Furthermore, the collateral existence and partial similarities of local and possessive cases in the language may provide useful insights in contemplating whether – or to what extent – the concepts relating to possession may be viewed as mere subtypes of the concepts of location (cf. Payne 2009).

⁷ There is also a material similarity between the datives of Livonian (-*n*) and Latvian (-*m*). On the other hand, the more remote history of Latvian and Lithuanian points to the opposite kind of influence between the Baltic and Finnic languages; for a possible substrate influence in the emergence of secondary local cases in Baltic, see Ylikoski, in preparation.

3.2.5. Type 5: $G = R \neq VG$ (postposition)

Unlike any of the types discussed this far, Type 5 comprises the languages in which Goal and Recipient receive fully identical formal treatment (coding by a case), while Vicinal Goal is coded differently (by an adposition). The Saami languages are manifestations of this type, as shown below:

Lule Saami (Saami; 9 cases)

- (15) *Gudát máno Jubmel rájjaj ieŋŋgil Gabrielav nuorra niejda lusi*
 six.ORD month.GEN God send.PST.3SG angel Gabriel.ACC young girl.GEN to
Galileaj, Nasareta stádaj. Sån lij giláduvvam álmmaßn Davida
 Galilee.ILL Nazareth.GEN city.ILL 3SG be.PST.3SG betroth.PTCP.PST man.COM David.GEN
máttoš gen namma lij Josef, ja niejda namma lij Maria.
 tribe.ELA who.GEN name be.PST.3SG Joseph and girl.GEN name be.PST.3SG Mary
- (16) *Áhpadisálmmaß de ájgás báhtalin Judea vieljajda doarjjagav rádjat,*
 disciple.PL then decide.PST.3PL Judea.GEN brother.PL.ILL support.ACC send.INF
iesjguhtik ráde milta. Dáv dahkin ja rádjín Barnabasav ja
 everyone means.GEN according it.ACC do.PST.3PL and send.PST.3PL Barnabas.ACC and
Saulav vattáldagájt boarrásijda gálggitjit.
 Saul.ACC gift.PL.ACC elder.PL.ILL pass.SUP

Table 8. The markers of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal within the Lule Saami local case system

	Direction		Location		Source	
coincidence	illative	-j / pl. -(i)da (G)	inessive	-n	elative	-s
possession	illative	-j / pl. -(i)da (R)	inessive	-n	elative	-s
vicinity	postposition <i>lusi</i> (VG)		postposition	<i>lussta</i>	postposition	<i>lumna</i>

North Saami (Saami; 6 cases)

- (17) *Go Elisabet lei guđat mánuš, de Ipmil vuolggahii engel*
 when Elizabeth be.PST.3SG six.ORD month.LOC then God send.PST.3SG angel
Gabriela muhtun Galilea gávpogii man namma lei
 Gabriel.GENACC certain Galilee.GENACC city.ILL REL.GENACC name be.PST.3SG
Nasaret, nieidda lusa gii lei lohpadallan Jovssehiin, Dávveda
 Nazareth girl.GENACC to who be.PST.3SG betroth.PTCP.PST Joseph.COM David.GENACC
sogalaččain; nieidda namma lei Márjá.
 kindred.COM girl.GENACC name be.PST.3SG Mary

- (18) *Máhttájeaddjit mearridedje vuolggahit veahki oskuguimmiide geat*
 disciple.PL decide.PST.3PL send.INF help.GENACC faith.companion.PL.ILL who.PL
ásse Judeas, iešguhtege nu ollu go suittii. Sii dahke dán
 live.PST.3PL Judea.LOC everyone as much as afford.PST.3PL 3PL do.PST.3PL it.ACC
ja vuolggahedje attáldagaid searvegotti vuorrasiidda Barnabasa
 and send.PST.3PL gift.PL.GENACC congregation.GENACC elder.PL.ILL Barnabas.GENACC
ja Sávlosa mielde.
 and Saul.GENACC with

Table 9. The markers of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal within the North Saami local case system

	Direction		Location & Source	
coincidence	illative	<i>-i / pl. -(i)de, -(i)dda (G)</i>	locative	<i>-s / pl. -(i)n</i>
possession	illative	<i>-i / pl. -(i)de, -(i)dda (R)</i>	locative	<i>-s / pl. -(i)n</i>
vicinity	postposition	<i>lusa (VG)</i>	postposition	<i>luhtte</i>

The number of cases in Saami languages is among the lowest within the Uralic language family, especially the languages spoken in Europe. As regards local cases, all of the nine Saami languages have only one directional case, the illative. Otherwise, the local case systems of the Saami branch fall into two types: the four westernmost languages such as Lule Saami possess three local cases that are comparable to the tripartite local case series typical of Uralic languages seen already in all the languages discussed above. However, the small size of the Saami case inventories is further underlined in the five easternmost languages, including North Saami with only six cases in total, in which the earlier static and separative cases have merged into a single case labeled locative; the local (e.g. vicinal) postpositions have undergone analogous changes.

All of the local cases code both local [+coincidence -possession] and possessive [-coincidence +possession] arguments in Lule Saami and North Saami. The fact that the illative is the default marker for both Goal and Recipient has the consequence that the distinction between the studied roles is less explicit than in any of the languages discussed above. Saami languages do partly resemble Veps, Olonetsian and most other Finnic languages (Types 2 and 3) in which the coding of Goal is split between the illative and allative cases of the internal and external local case series, respectively. The semantic directional functions of the Finnic allative are somewhat vague and its use coincides with Recipient coding and partly also with Vicinal Goal, but unlike in Saami, the most unmarked case for expressing Goal is the illative that lacks all kinds of possessive functions.

As such, the division of marking is very economical and yet functional in Type 5. Goal and Recipient share common features (they are both endpoints of motion), but they are normally different enough (Recipients are animate participants, Goals inanimate), which yields identical coding possible. The risk of ambiguity is very small, and it is nearly always resolved by animacy. On the other hand, Recipient and Vicinal Goal are also both endpoints of motion, but differently from Goal, Vicinal Goal is often borne by an animate entity. This means that the risk of ambiguity is real, which makes it understandable to distinguish between the roles formally. And since Saami

languages do not have an extraordinarily rich case inventory, it is more natural to code the role by a readily available postposition than by a case form.

3.2.6. Type 6: $G_1 \neq G_2 \neq R = VG$ (case)

The last type to be found in the European Uralic comprises languages in which the coding of Recipient and Vicinal Goal coincides while the coding of Goal proper is partly divided by two different case markers, neither of which is employed for coding Recipient or Vicinal Goal. In our sample of languages, this type is manifested Erzya, but the other Mordvin language Moksha seems to have a virtually identical local case system in this respect. Examples (19) and (20) are thus from Erzya:

Erzya (Mordvin; ~12 cases)

- (19) *Elizavetan' pekiâmodont' mejle kotoce kovont' ûtamsto Pazos'*
 Elizabeth.GEN conceive.NMLZ.DEF.ABL after six.ORD month.DEF.GEN during God
kučize Gavriil angelènt' Galileân' Nazaret ošov,
 send.PST.3SG>3SG Gabriel angel.DEF.GEN Galilee.GEN Nazareth city.LAT
Mariâ tejterenten'⁸. Mariâ ul'nes' čiâvtoz' Davidèn' buen' Iosifnen'.
 Mary girl.DEF.DAT Mary be.PST.3SG betroth.PTCP.PST David.GEN family.GEN Joseph.DAT

- (20) *Seks Iisuson' mel'ga molicâtne sajst' mel' kučoms Iudeâv*
 therefore Jesus.GEN behind go.PTCP.PRS.DEF.PL come.PST.3PL mind send.INF Judea.LAT
kemicâ âlgatnenen' ârmakt, èr'vas' ès' uličinzè korâs. Istâ
 believer companion.PL.DAT money.PL everyone.DEF own wealth.PL.3SG according thus
tejst'=kak dy mejle Varnavan' dy Savlan' vel'de kučiz' net'
 do.PST.3PL=too and after Barnabas.GEN and Saul.GEN with send.PST.3PL>3SG these
ârmaktnen' Erusalimen' kemicân' kuron' prâvtnenèn'.
 money.DEF.PL.GEN Jerusalem.GEN believer.GEN group.GEN elder.DEF.PL.DAT

⁸ It is important and interesting to note that the dative form *tejterenten'* 'to (the vicinity of) the girl' could in theory be an illative as well. The Mordvin languages are the only Uralic languages with distinct indefinite and definite declensions, but the paradigms are partly asymmetric (see e.g. Zaicz 1998: 191ff.). As for the directional cases, this means that the formal distinction between the illative and dative (and even the semi-productive lative) is made in the indefinite declension but it is neutralized in the definite declension. Consequently, the word form *tejterenten'* is not only a dative but morphologically it could be regarded as the definite illative as well. In the present context, however, indefinite counterparts of *Mariâ tejterenten'* 'to (the vicinity of) the Virgin Mary' would be unambiguous datives such as *tejternen'* 'to (the vicinity of) a girl' or *Mariânen'* 'to (the vicinity of) Mary'.

Table 10. The markers of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal within the Erzya local case system

	Direction		Location		Source	
coincidence _(1&2)	illative	-s (G)	inessive	<i>-so</i>	elative	<i>-sto</i>
possession	dative	-nen' (R)	genitive	<i>-n'</i>	postposition	<i>pel'de</i> (<i>ked'ste</i>)
vicinity	dative (postpositions)	-nen' (VG) (<i>vakss, ked's</i>)	postpositions	<i>vakssso,</i> <i>ked'se</i>	postpositions	<i>vaksssto,</i> <i>ked'ste</i>

Erzya uses both illative and lative cases for coding Goal, but their division of labor is partly obscured by the fact that the lative case is not fully productive as its formation and use is mostly limited to denoting concrete locations; moreover, it does not have static or separative counterparts analogous to the inessive and elative seen in the above table (see Ylikoski (in preparation) for a more detailed description of the differences). However, what really makes Erzya exceptional among the Uralic languages is the identical coding of Recipient and Vicinal Goal. As has been repeatedly remarked, it is usually important for a language to make an explicit distinction between these two roles, since they are both often borne by animate entities and both share the value [-coincidence]. This may yield true ambiguity, since the role of the participants cannot be inferred from animacy alone, which suffices for an explicit distinction between (prototypically inanimate) Goal and (animate) Recipient, for example. Based on our data represented by (19) and (20), we may say that Erzya distinguishes between the studied roles partly according to animacy. This may appear as rather dysfunctional, since animacy is a property retrievable from the nature of participants. It is, however, in order to note that Erzya can, if necessary, distinguish formally between Recipient and Vicinal Goal by coding the latter role by the semantically more specific postpositions *vakss* and *ked's*, which in fact consist of the relational noun stems *vaks-* and *ked'-* followed by the illative marker *-s*. Unlike the dative, these postpositions have analogous static and separative equivalents in the inessive and elative.

Viewed from a diachronic point of view, Vicinal Goal functions of the Erzya dative could quite easily be regarded as a remnant of the primarily local origins of the present-day Recipient-marker (Ylikoski, in preparation). In light of the rather grammatical (case-)marking of Recipients and much more marked expressions of Vicinal Goal in the other languages discussed above, it is only expected that Recipients are always coded by the dative in Erzya as well, i.e. the dative is not replaced by other cases, not to speak of postpositions, in its most prototypical function. Considering the present availability of the unambiguous postpositional alternatives for coding Vicinal Goal (and their being formally analogous to the static and separative postpositions), it is not difficult to imagine a future stage in which the dative would be used to mark Recipients only. Erzya would then belong to Type 4 with Livonian, Mari and Udmurt, and *mutatis mutandis*, especially Livonian and Mari may well have originated from Erzya-like languages of Type 6.

4. Discussion

The previous sections have described the coding of three roles, Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal in Uralic languages spoken in Europe. Based on the similarities and differences in coding, we have distinguished among six main types (and within Type 4, three subtypes). In this section, we will discuss some of the central contributions of the data.

As was noted in Section 2, the three roles studied in this paper are both similar to and different from each other. All of them involve motion (they can all be seen as endpoints of transfer, be this concrete or more abstract in nature), while they are separated by other features, most notably possession and coincidence. The positive value of the feature possession is characteristic of Recipients, but lacking for the two other roles. This is understandable for Goal, as the role is typically borne by inanimate entities that are not capable of possession. On the other hand, [+possession] could also be claimed to be an expected feature of Vicinal Goal as a result of the typical (yet not entailed) animacy associated with the role. As defined in Section 2, the role thus lacks a feature that could in principle be expected based on its inherent nature, but the data presented in Section 3 supports our practice of identifying a specific [+directional] role that clearly deviates from the prototypical concepts of Recipient and Goal proper. The bearers of the role Vicinal Goal are mere endpoints of transfer, but they constitute less typical instances of Goal due to their often animate (and thus less stable) nature. The value [+coincidence], for its part, is characteristic of Goal only. This is also expected, since reception always refers to a transfer to the sphere of control of the Recipient, whereas Vicinal Goal differs from Goal in the “completeness” of motion (only with Goal the trajector successfully reaches the landmark). Vicinal Goal is the only one of the roles that cannot be defined by possession or coincidence; it lacks both.

As can be expected, the semantic differences and similarities between the studied roles are also manifested formally. Languages vary according to which of the roles are coded in a similar fashion and which of them is accorded a distinct formal treatment. The general picture that emerges is that languages in our sample code Recipient and Goal both uniformly and separately, while the role of Vicinal Goal is nearly always given a different formal treatment. The occurrence of languages in which Recipient and Goal are coded uniformly is best accounted for by the evident differences between the roles in question. First, both Recipient and Goal can be seen as endpoints of transfer, which is relevant to their coding by a directional case (or, as in many Indo-European languages, an adposition with a similar function). Second, the roles may often be sufficiently separated from each other by animacy; Recipients are typically animate, while Goals are more often than not inanimate entities. This has the consequence that the semantic role assignment of the identically coded arguments is clear irrespective of their coding in the majority of cases. Identical coding thus does not yield significant ambiguity. Languages of this type can be further subdivided according to the case used for Recipient coding. First, there are languages (Saami) that only have one directional case. In these languages, the only option is to employ this case for Recipient coding as well. Second, there are languages, such as Olonetsian and Veps, which have two cases of Goal, and the

one used for Recipient coding is not the default Goal-marker, illative, but the so-called external directional case, allative, instead.

Even though the languages that fully or partly combine the coding of Goal and Recipient constitute three of the six main types in our typology (Types 2, 3 and 5), they include only Saami and most of the Finnic branch of Uralic. In contrast to this, two other types (Types 1 and 4) of languages in which all of the three roles receive a distinct coding include three branches (Hungarian, Permic and Mari) accompanied by Livonian of the Finnic branch, and thus represent the most common way to code these roles. The semantic differences between the roles are perhaps less evident than between Agents and Patients, for example, but the differences are nevertheless real and thus formally manifested.

Finally, there are languages (Type 6) in which Vicinal Goal and Recipient receive identical formal treatment, while Goal bears different coding. In these languages, the triggering factor can be said to be animacy (or at least an explanation may be proposed based primarily on animacy). Recipient and Vicinal Goal are typically animate, while Goal is prototypically an inanimate role. As is received wisdom in linguistics, animacy determines the coding of arguments in many languages (e.g. DOM is triggered by animacy in many languages, see Aissen 2003 and Næss 2004 for DOM, Kittilä 2008 for Differential marking of Goals and Aristar 1997 for animacy effects on the coding of peripheral roles in general). As a consequence, we could expect animacy to make a contribution here as well. However, the effects and motivation of animacy-based marking are different for the roles of this study. In the case of DOM, one of the functions of animacy-based marking is to resolve potential ambiguity (the role of Patient may be coded in two different ways). On the other hand, identical coding of Recipient and Vicinal Goal, as opposed to Goal, can be said to add to the potential ambiguity; the roles that often should be distinguished, may receive identical coding. This makes the occurrence of this language type less expected. It is therefore understandable that despite the potential identical coding of the roles in Erzya, explicit distinction is also possible as was noted above (see postpositions *vakss* and *ked's* in Table 10). In other words, also Erzya has an explicit disambiguating mechanism available.

Above we have briefly discussed the rationale behind the attested language types. As in many cases, it is also interesting to take a look at other possible types that are not attested in the languages in question, as these types may naturally be found in other languages. First, we have not come across a Uralic language in which all the roles would bear identical coding. This can probably be explained by referring to the rather ambiguous nature of the type where Recipient and Vicinal Goal bear identical coding. Since these two roles are usually coded by different means, languages where all the roles are accorded the same formal treatment do not exist. It is, however, important to note that this type is by no means unattested in other languages. For example, English can code all the three roles by the preposition *to*. In many Turkic languages, on the other hand, all these roles can be coded by the dative case. Equally interesting is the lack of the type that accords Goal and Vicinal Goal identical coding, but codes Recipient differently. Goal and Vicinal Goal share one important feature in common that distinguishes them from the Recipient, namely the lack of possession. In addition, they both code motion towards a landmark, which would render them similar enough to

receive identical coding. Nevertheless, this language type is unattested in the languages of our sample.

However, in e.g. many Germanic and Romance languages, prepositions such as English *to*, Spanish *a* or Continental Scandinavian *til(l)* are used to code all of the three roles, thus including both Goal and Vicinal Goal. Therefore, it is not that surprising that the only known Uralic exception in this direction is South Saami, one of the most Scandinavianized varieties of Uralic. Due to the lack of research material comparable to other languages discussed here, it is not possible to present a full account of the directional role marking in South Saami, but the main difference to Lule Saami (Type 5, Section 3.2.5) seems to be that the default marker of Vicinal Goal, the postposition *gåajkoe*, may also code Goal proper especially in connection to place names. In other words, while the expected translation of '(sent) to the vicinity of Mary' is *Maarja-n gåajkoe* [Mary-GEN to] and the most common equivalent of '(sent) to Nazareth' is *Nasarete-se* [Nazareth-ILL], it is not uncommon to come across postpositional phrases of the type *Nasarete-n gåajkoe* [Nazareth-GEN to] 'id.' either. The details of this phenomenon must be left for further study, but it is remarkable that such adpositional marking of Goal proper is extremely untypical of Uralic languages.

Speaking of language contacts, it is possible to mention a couple of areal observations concerning the similarities and differences between the Uralic, Indo-European and Turkic languages of Europe. It was already noticed that languages such as English and Norwegian use single prepositions for all of the three roles discussed here. However, most of the Indo-European languages behave somewhat differently, and in this regard it is interesting to note that the Uralic languages of Types 2, 3 and 5 in which the markers of Recipient and Goal are more or less identical, i.e. those of the Saami and Finnic branches, are located in the immediate neighborhood of Norwegian and Swedish where *til(l)* is used for coding not only Recipient (*til de eldste / till de äldsta* 'to the elders') and Goal (*til(l) Nasaret*) but also Vicinal Goal (*til(l) Maria*). On the other hand, as the rest of the European Uralic languages distinguish between Recipient and Goal, so do also most of their Indo-European neighbors. Although Hungarian, Mari, Udmurt (Permic), Erzya (Mordvin) and Livonian (Finnic) code Goal with many different cases (instead of Indo-European prepositions), they are kept separate from exclusively Recipient-marking datives that, incidentally, are also prevalent in the neighboring Russian and other Slavic languages as well as German and Rumanian (adjacent to Hungarian), and Latvian (adjacent to Livonian). While we are not attempting to make further diachronic claims in any direction, it is rather interesting to note that in spite of the wide array of convergent features in the Uralic and Turkic languages of the Volga-Kama area (Wintschalek 1993, Hesselbäck 2005), Uralic languages such as Mari and Udmurt clearly align here with Russian rather than the long-standing neighbors of the Turkic family.⁹

⁹ Put concretely, the division of labor among Uralic directionals (Types 4 and 6) is more like those seen in the Russian equivalents of our examples (*poslat'* 'send' + *v gorod* [(in)to city.ACC] vs. *k deve* [to girl.DAT] vs. *brat'jam* [brother.PL.DAT]) and different from e.g. Tatar in which the only directional case is able to code all these roles (*cibärii* 'send' + *şähär-gä* [city-DAT] '(in)to the city' ~ *kız-ga* [girl-DAT] 'to (the vicinity of) the girl' ~ *ölkän-när-gä* [elder-PL-DAT] 'to (the possession of) the elders'). In fact, the same goes for Hungarian (Type 1) that also carries many features typical of both Slavic and Turkic languages but is more like Slavic in this respect.

While this study has focussed on one of the central semantic roles with the feature [+possession], the established label for this is, of course, Recipient. Similarly, its static counterpart is generally known as Possessor that is coded according to various subtypes of the so-called Oblique Possessive in the languages of our sample (Locative, Dative and Genitive Possessives in Stassen's (2008) terminology; see Tables 2–10 above). Logically, the third major role having the feature [+possession] is the separative one that expresses from whom something is gotten, taken etc. However, this role seems not to have received comparable attention in linguistics, and this is even reflected in the fact that it does not have an established label on a par with Recipient and Possessor, but different scholars call it by various names such as Donor, Possessive Source, Source of Possession or Initial Possessor. It has also been remarked (Korhonen 1975) that at least within the Uralic family, directional cases clearly outnumber both static and separative cases, and the data presented in this paper makes it more evident that it is especially the Donor role that often lacks a specific marker comparable to Recipient and Possessor on the one hand, and to Source proper on the other. Of the languages of our study, the Permic languages Udmurt and Komi are the only languages with a specific case (ablative) for Donor, whereas in the other languages with unambiguous Recipient-marking dative cases, Donors are coded asymmetrically by postpositions (Livonian *kädst*, Mari *deč*) or cases (and postpositions) that also code Vicinal Sources (Hungarian allative, Mari *deč*). The asymmetry between directional and separative cases becomes even more obvious if we also take into account the terminative cases: the Hungarian allative is in opposition not only to the dative (*Jánostól Máriának* 'from (the possession of) John to Mary') and allative (*Jánostól Máriához* 'from (the vicinity of) John to Mary') but even to the terminative (*Jánostól Máriáig* 'from John up to Mary'). However, the fact that Donor as the less-studied counterpart of Recipient is almost always coded with elements that also have concrete spatial (separative) functions once again corroborates our view about the fundamentally directional nature of the Recipient role.

As noted above, the feature [+coincidence] is an integral part of Goal, but the decisive property of Vicinal Goal is exactly the negative value of this feature. This feature is important, since it seems to disfavor identical coding of these two roles. From a pragmatic point of view, this apparent mismatch can be explained by regarding animacy as a sufficient disambiguating mechanism here, since based on world knowledge, we know that Themes do not physically enter animate entities in situations such as 'the angel/letter was sent to Mary', while in cases such as 'the angel/letter was sent to Nazareth', coincidence is expected. Furthermore, as a combination of the values [-coincidence] and [-possession], Vicinal Goal is definitely in a marked position. However, even though a transfer to Vicinal Goal can be characterized as "incomplete" from a purely spatial perspective, the feature [+possession] puts Recipients in a much more normal, i.e. unmarked, position. What is especially intriguing here is that while the semantic features of Goal [+coincidence, -possession] and Recipient [-coincidence, +possession] have less in common with each other than with Vicinal Goal [-coincidence, -possession], it seems most natural to keep the latter formally separate from both Goal and Recipient that most often are, moreover, formally less marked than Vicinal Goal. However, if the endpoint of transfer is animate and especially human, it

is rather expected that she or he is conceived as a Recipient (or new Possessor) and not merely a new Location (or better, “Vicinity”) of the Theme. All in all, Vicinal Goal is a highly marked role in that (1) if the landmark is inanimate, the motion towards it is incomplete in terms of location, or (2) if animate, the motion is likewise incomplete in terms of the possibility of possession – and with the value [+possession], the transfer is certainly regarded as complete even in the absence of physical coincidence.

5. Conclusion

The data in this paper and the brief discussion above have consequences for our understanding of the functions of argument marking. Typically, argument marking has been claimed to have either discriminatory or indexing functions. The discriminatory view of argument marking means that arguments are marked primarily for coding ‘who is doing what to whom’. The indexing view, in turn, comprises cases where argument marking serves to distinguish between, for example, typical and less typical instances of a role (for example, between typical (human) and less typical (inanimate) agents). The findings of this paper lend more support to the indexing functions of argument marking. For example, an animate participant can bear both the role of Recipient and Vicinal Goal in a given situation, and explicit marking is needed for assuring the intended reading of a construction. Referring to discrimination produces a less satisfactory explanation for the marking; the distinction between Recipient / Vicinal Goal and Agent (also Patient) is clear regardless of whether the given argument bears case marking or is adpositionally coded.

What the cases examined in this paper also show is that the marking is not only needed for distinguishing between clearly different semantic roles, but differences in marking often rather have the function of separating between similar, yet different roles. For example in the Saami and Finnic languages, Goal and Recipient may bear identical coding (in Finnic, this is restricted to certain instances of Goal), while both of these roles are formally distinct from Vicinal Goal. One possible explanation for this is that Recipient and Goal are sufficiently different roles, even though they also have features in common (they are both endpoints of motion). In practice, the most important distinguishing property is the animacy of the participant. Consequently, identical coding does not produce insurmountable ambiguity. In a similar vein, Goal and Vicinal Goal as well as Vicinal Goal and Recipient have features in common, but differently from Goal and Recipient, distinction between the roles cannot be inferred from inherent properties (such as animacy) of the relevant participants. Therefore, a formal distinction is more important for resolving potential ambiguity. In other words, identical marking does not necessarily manifest identity, but in certain contexts, it can rather follow from dissimilarity. Finally, the data also show that the semantic role of an argument does not depend only on its own features, but the features of other participants in events are also relevant. This is especially evident with animate Vicinal Goals.

Similarities and differences in coding of the three roles can also be approached from the viewpoint of the morphological element employed. As was noted above, the studied languages

typically code the roles of Recipient and Goal by cases, but they usually resort to postpositional coding for Vicinal Goal. Cases and adpositions have common properties (e.g. they are used for coding similar functions), but they also differ from each other functionally. The use of cases is usually more dependent of verbs, which means that their exact reading depends on verbal semantics. Also morphologically, they are more bound and less free morphemes and thus belong to the grammatical core of the language. Adpositions, in turn, are morphologically independent and semantically less prone to variation influenced by the semantics of verbs. This is relevant to the present discussion, since the expected roles of Goal and Recipient are invariably coded by case forms, while the role of Vicinal Goal is more typically coded by adpositions. Moreover, the more flexible nature of cases explains the identical coding of Recipient and Goal rather well. Languages may, of course, resort to semantically more specific adpositions or other lexical expressions such as *to the confines/possession/vicinity of* whenever it is necessary to underline the unexpected role associated with the argument in question.

It is also in order to note here that coding of Vicinal Goal by adpositions can be regarded as more elaborate coding, which is typical of markedness in general. Especially in situations where Vicinal Goals are human, the role borne by a directional participant is unexpected, whence languages resort to more elaborate coding than when coding Recipients. This also lends support to the theory of Differential Argument Marking, since the conceptually marked roles bear more distinct marking. In a similar vein, in DOM, animate Patients bear more explicit coding than inanimate ones. And what is also noteworthy in this context is that Vicinal Goal is coded by cases only in the languages with the highest number of cases. We should bear in mind, though, that there are languages in which a single case morpheme (such as datives in Turkic) can be employed for coding all the roles under study, which means that the language types described above do not exhaust the possible types found in languages. However, what is relevant here is that we have not come across a single language (within or outside the Uralic language family), in which Recipient and Goal would be coded by adpositions (only), while Vicinal Goal bore case-marking. This lends (at least some) support to the kind of markedness-based explanation proposed here.

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative	INS	instrumental
ACC	accusative	LAT	lative
ADE	adessive	LOC	locative
ADJ	adjective	NMLZ	nominalizer
ADV	“adverbial” (case)	ORD	ordinal
ALL	allative	PART	partitive
APPR2	“2nd approximative” (case)	PASS	passive
AUX	auxiliary	PL	plural
COM	comitative	PRS	present
COMP	comparative	PRT	particle
CVB	converb	PST	past
DAT	dative	PST2	“2nd past” (evidential)
DEF	definite	PTCP	participle
DEFOBJ	definite object	R	Recipient
ELA	elative	REFL	reflexive
G	Goal	REL	relative
GEN	genitive	SG	singular
ILL	illative	SUP	supine
INDF	indefinite	TRA	translative
INE	inessive	VG	Vicinal Goal
INF	infinitive		

Research material

East Mari: *U sugyn'*. [Hel'sinki]: Biblijym kusaryše institut, 2007.

Erzya: *Od vejsën'luv*. Hel'sinki: Bibliân' ûtavtoman' institutos', 2006.

Estonian: *Piibel. Vana ja Uus Testament*. Tallinn: Eesti Piibliselts, 1997.

Finnish: *Raamattu*. Helsinki: Suomen Pipliaseura, 1992.

Hungarian: *Új fordítás*. Budapest: Magyar Bibliatársulat, 1990.

Komi: *Vyl' kösjys'öm*. [Hel'sinki]: Bibliâ vudžödan institut, 2008.

Livonian: *Ûž Testament*. Helsinki, 1942.

Lule Saami: *Ádå Testamennta*. Uppsala: Svieriga ráamátsiebrre, 2000.

North Saami: *Ođđa Testamenta*. Oslo: Norgga Biibbalsearvi, 1998.

Olonetsian: *Uuzi Sana*. Helsinki: Biblienkiännändüinstituuttu, 2003.

Udmurt: *Vyl' sizën*. Stokgol'm and Hel'sinki: Biblez berykton"â institut, 1997.

Tatar: *Izge inžil âki Rabbybyz Gajsa Hristos turyndagy Âhşy häbär*. Stokgol'm: Bibliâne täržemä itü instituty näşriâty, 1995.

Veps: *Uz' zavet*. [Helsinki]: Biblijan kändmižen institut, 2006.

References

- Aissen, J. 2003. “Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. economy”. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21: 435–483.
- Aristar, A. R. 1997. “Marking and hierarchy types and the grammaticalization of case-markers”. *Studies in Language* 21: 313–368.
- Alhoniemi, A. 1967. *Über die Funktion des Wohin-Kasus im Tscheremissischen* [Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 142]. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Alhoniemi, A. 1977. “Zur Verwendung der Trennungskasus im Tscheremissischen”. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 42: 5–131.
- Baker, R. 1985. *The Development of the Komi Case System: A Dialectological Investigation* [Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 189]. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Bartens, R. 1972. *Inarinlapin, merilapin ja luulajanlapin kaasussyntaksi* [Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 148]. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Bartens, R. 1978. *Synteettiset ja analyttiset rakenteet lapin paikanilmauksissa* [Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 166]. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Blake, B. J. 2001. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blansitt, E. L. Jr. 1988. “Datives and allatives”. In *Studies in Syntactic Typology*, M. Hammond, E. Moravcsik and J. Wirth (eds), 173–191. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castr[é]n, M. A. 1839. *De affinitate declinationum in lingua Fennica, Esthonica et Lapponica*. Helsingforsiae: Frenckell.
- Dowty, D. 1991. “Thematic proto-roles and argument selection”. *Language* 67: 547–619.
- Grünthal, R. 2003. *Finnic Adpositions and Cases in Change* [Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 244]. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Hesselbäck, A. 2005. *Tatar and Chuvash Code-copies in Mari* [Studia Uralica Upsaliensia 35]. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- Iggesen, O. A. 2008. “Number of cases”. In *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, M. Haspelmath, M. S. Dryer, D. Gil and B. Comrie (eds), Munich: Max Planck Digital Library, chapter 49. Available online at <http://wals.info/feature/49>. Accessed on June 30, 2010.
- Jackendoff, R. S. 1983. *Semantics and Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kibrik, A. 2003. “Nominal inflection galore: Daghestanian, with side glances at Europe and the world”. In *Noun Phrase Structure in the Languages of Europe*, F. Plank (ed.), 37–112. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kittilä, S. 2008. “Animacy effects on differential Goal marking”. *Linguistic Typology* 12: 245–268.
- Korhonen, M. 1975. “Merkmalhaftigkeit und Merkmallosigkeit in den Finnisch-ugrischen Lokalkasussystemen”. In *Congressus Tertius Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum Tallinnae habitus 17.–23. VIII 1970: I. Acta linguistica*, V. Hallap (ed.), 111–117.
- Korhonen, R. 2004. “Asutusnimihakemisto sanakirjassa”. *Kielikello* 2004: 4: 10–13.

- Kracht, M. 2005. "The semantics of locatives in the Uralic languages". In *Les langues ouraliennes aujourd'hui. Approche linguistique et cognitive. / The Uralic Languages Today. A Linguistic and Cognitive Approach* [Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Etudes 340], M.M.J. Fernandez-Vest (ed.), 145–158. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Margetts, A. and Austin, P. K. 2007. "Three participant events in the languages of the world: towards a crosslinguistic typology". *Linguistics* 45: 393–451.
- Næss, Å. 2004. "What markedness marks: The markedness problem with direct objects". *Lingua* 114: 1186–1212.
- Newman, J. 1996. *Give: A cognitive linguistic study* [Cognitive Linguistics Research 7]. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nida, E. 2004. "Principles of Correspondence". In *The Translation Studies Reader*, L. Venuti (ed.), 153–167. London and New York: Routledge.
- OED = *Oxford English Dictionary Online. The definitive record of the English language*. Available online at <http://dictionary.oed.com/entrance.dtl>. Accessed on June 30, 2010.
- Payne, D. L. 2009. "Is possession mere location? Contrary evidence from Maa". In *The Expression of Possession*, W. B. McGregor (ed.), 107–142. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Rappaport Hovav, M. and Levin B. 2008. "The English dative alternation: The case for verb sensitivity". *Journal of Linguistics* 44: 129–167.
- Rice, S. and Kabata, K. 2007. "Crosslinguistic grammaticalization patterns of the allative". *Linguistic Typology* 11: 451–514.
- Salminen, T. 2002. "Problems in the taxonomy of the Uralic languages in the light of modern comparative studies". In *Лингвистический беспредел: сборник статей к 70-летию А. И. Кузнецовой*, 45–55. Москва: Издательство Московского университета.
- Stassen, L. 2008. "Predicative Possession". In *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, M. Haspelmath, M. S. Dryer, D. Gil and B. Comrie (eds), Munich: Max Planck Digital Library, chapter 117. Available online at <http://wals.info/feature/117>. Accessed on June 30, 2010.
- Wälchli, B. 2010. "Similarity semantics and building probabilistic semantic maps from parallel texts". *Linguistic Discovery* 8: 331–371.
- Wintschalek, W. 1993. *Die Areallinguistik am Beispiel syntaktischer Übereinstimmungen im Wolga-Kama-Areal* [Studia Uralica 7]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Ylikoski, J. (in preparation). "A survey of the origins of directional case suffixes in European Uralic". Available online at http://www.mv.helsinki.fi/home/jylikosk/origins_of_dir_cxs.pdf
- Zaicz, G. 1998. "Mordva". In *The Uralic Languages*, D. Abondolo (ed.), 184–218. London and New York: Routledge.