AGO KÜNNAP (Tartu)

ON THE URALIC (*)*m*-ACCUSATIVE*

Abstract. A language universal supposed by L. Palmaitis is worded as follows: "In those systems where the special form of accusative is attested, the category of gender does exist." A. P. Volodin groups Uralic languages with those that are known as being of an accusativeless structure: Uralic languages are accusativeless because in those languages there is no individual case form for a direct object (thus in the case of an object the (*)*m*-suffixe expresses its unmarkedness/markedness, indefiniteness/definiteness). If Uralic languages lack the category of grammatical gender (and there is no doubt about its lacking), then it does not make sense to look for an actual grammatical accusative case in them. We would consider the incidence of the Samoyedic common object suffix (*)-*m* as very old in Samoyedic languages, as a primary phenomenon, so to say.
Keywords: Uralic, morphology, accusative.

Traditionally, it is supposedly possible to find an **m*-accusative (or its traces at least) in numeous U r a l i c languages and to claim that the **m*-accusative occurred already in the supposed Proto-Uralic (see e.g. Wickman 1955 : 145—149; Майтинская 1974 : 241—246; Хайду 1985 : 294—295). On the other hand, concerning Uralic languages, the original **m*-accusative was supposed to have occurred only in S a m o y e d i c languages (see first of all Künnap 2002 : 30—32). From the viewpoint of the evidence and origin of the **m*-accusative in Uralic languages a particular interest is attracted both by a language universal as supposed by L. Palmaitis and a result of A. P. Volodin's language-theoretical analysis. Likewise, as before, one should focus on the origin of the **m*-accusative.

A l a n g u a g e u n i v e r s a l, supposed by L. Palmaitis, is defined as follows: "In those systems where the special form of accusative is attested, the category of gender does exist." (Palmaitis 1978 : 37; for a reference to the source I am indebted to Urmas Sutrop). If, indeed, there is the language universal as supposed by L. Palmaitis, a question may arise about Uralic languages in which the category of grammatical gender is lacking. (In Northern-Eurasian languages an equivalent to the Uralic (*)*m*-accusative can possibly be found in Tungusic languages, in which also the category

161

of grammatical gender is lacking; see Иллич-Свитыч 1971 : 10; 1976 : 49—50; Greenberg 2000 : 129—131; Marcantonio 2002 : 284; Klesment, Künnap, Soosaar, Taagepera 2003 : 375.)

V. Illič-Svityč proposed the following traces of the supposed nostratic object with the *m/b/w*-suffix: the I n d o - E u r o p e a n -*m*(Λ) (accusative; primarily denoting animated beings in the singular), T u n g u s i c *-ba, *-bä (-ba, -bä, -pa, -pä, -wa, -wä, -ma, -mä, -w, -m*; definite object, in southern-most languages also an indefinite object; primarily denoting a marked object), D r a v i d i a n -*m* (accusative; primarily denoting animated beings as marked objects) as nostratic equivalents to the U r a l i c suffix -*m*(Λ) (primarily denoting a singular definite object) (Иллич-Свитыч 1971 : 10; 1976 : 48—51). L. Dybo specifies (the information was received also from E. Helimski) the point made by V. Illič-Svityč, supposing rather the denotation of a marked object in Proto-Uralic (for a proof observe the use of the S a m o y e d i c suffix in the meaning of an indefinite object in Nenets and Enets and in the meaning of a marked object in Selkup Taz). Apparently only in Proto-Finno-Ugric a shift markedness → definiteness could have taken place as L. Dybo sees it (a peculiar development could have happened also in Samoyedic Nganasan). (See Иллич-Свитыч 1976 : 48—50.)

According to L. Dybo's explanation, in the case of m a r k e d n e s s this nostratic suffix (based on the examples from Turkic, Mongolic and Central Dravidian languages) indicates not only the definiteness of an object but also its complete engagement by activity, bringing it forth from the group. The distinction of such a definiteness and markedness of an object in Uralic linguistics is not usually noted but as a rule a sign of equation is applied between them. (see e.g. Rédei 1975 : 134). However, as far as Uralic languages are concerned, J. Gulya has written that a morphologi-cally marked form cannot be definite, without having earlier been "defined", quasi-determined in speech (1995 : 96—97).

In the course of the observation of a parallel incidence of the accusative suffix *M* in his "Eurasiatic language family" J. H. Greenberg (2000 : 129) noted it in the following languages: U r a l i c *-*m* (in all three main groups — in Finno-Permic, Ugric and Samoyedic), I n d o - E u r o p e a n *-*m* (AccSg of masculine and feminine nouns, Acc/NomSg of neuter nouns), M o n g o l i c (only in a few pronominal forms), T u n g u s i c -*wa, -wä, -ba, -bä, -ma, -mä* etc., J a p a n e s e *wo* (see also Klesment, Künnap, Soosaar, Taagepera 2003 : 375). By the way, there is the suffix -*b*V in Samoyedic K a m a s s that is often used in the function of a particle of emphasis, whereby in case of an object it adheres to the object form with-out a case ending, e.g., *dī ī n a - b ə dəpi* 'she needed j u s t t h e a r r o w'. Sometimes it may probably be used as an interrogative particle, e.g., *amōrzət t'ērul i g ɛ - b o* 'h a v e y o u eaten anything?', cf. Siberian (Altai) Tatar *üidö-bö* 'is he at home?' (Joki 1944 : 133, 189—190.) B. Wick-man writes in brief that in Kamass "A definite object is either in the nominative with addition of the enclitic -*bə* etc., or in the accusative." (1955 : 144). Its use with a definite object may indicate an origin of the Kamass suffix -*b*V (at least in parts) from a Tungusic object suffix -*ba, -bä* etc., because, e.g., Tungusic Evenkish has long been spoken in the immediate neighbourhood (and at least one particle — the negative *ašša, aša, aha* etc.

'no, not', has been borrowed into Selkup from that language, see Katz 1970 : 149—150).

Consequently, a few Northern-Eurasian languages — S a m o y e d i c and T u n g u s i c — where there is no category of grammatical gender use the (*)*m*-accusative. Proceeding from language universal supposed by Palmaitis nothing much can be done but asked whether the Samoyedic and Tungusic (*)*m*-accusative is a s. c. rightful accusative as a normal case form. And conditionally one could say that the concept "(*)*m*-accusative" is at least in the case of Uralic languages a result of a terminological confusion. A. P. Volodin, based on a respective analysis, groups Uralic languages with those that are known as being of an a c c u s a t i v e - l e s s structure. As he points out, the core of the grammatical structure of Uralic languages consists in the contrasting of indefiniteness and definiteness (indeterminativeness and determinativeness). On the other hand, the core in the s. c. nominative languages (in fact, in actual accusative languages) consists in the contrasting of subjective/objective (e.g. Indo-European languages). (Володин 2000 : 31—36; see also Volodin 1997 : 39—43.)

Leaving aside a number of theoretical details, we can understand A. P. Volodin's message in brief as follows: Uralic languages are accusative-less because in those languages there is no individual case form for a direct object (thus in the case of an object the (*)*m*-suffix expresses its unmarkedness/markedness, indefiniteness/definiteness). Besides, in Uralic a direct object can be expressed by more than one different case (e.g., in Finnish by three cases: nominative, genitive and partitive). (Neither V. Illič-Svityč nor L. Dybo addressed Uralic and Tungusic respective suffixes as accusative suffixes but in the case of those suffixes spoke only about the function of designating a definite object. Writing about Uralic and Altaic languages, A. Marcantonio (2002 : 242—243) mentioned a "so called accusative" for a marked object.) But if there is no actual accusative in Uralic languages, then the condition set to a universal by L. Palmaitis is fulfilled and those languages need not have any grammatical gender category. Or in other words: if Uralic languages lack the category of grammatical gender (and there is no doubt about its lacking), then it does not make sense to look for an actual grammatical accusative case in them. (Taken directly from L. Palmaitis' and A. P. Volodin's views, one cannot conclude anything about the use of the suffix (*)-*m* as an object suffix only in Samoyedic in the case of Uralic languages. Understandably, it does not designate an object as such but only some of its definite characteristics.)

It should also be said (continuing to use the common name *accusative* of the incidence below) that a number of researchers have supposed that the Uralic accusative (*)*m*-suffix descends from t h e l o c a l (*)*m* - s u f f i x. J. Pusztay gives examples about local use of the accusative *m*-suffix in Samoyedic T u n d r a N e n e t s, e.g., *j a x a k o - m - d a xa'awra* 'goes d o w n s t r e a m a l o n g t h e r i v e r' (-*da* is the 3PSg possessive suffix in the determinative function) (2000 : 15). J. Pusztay writes also that "Im Sinne der engen onthologischen Beziehung zwischen Ort und Zeit kann man auch den — nicht nur in den uralischen, sondern auch in den indo-germanischen Sprachen bekannt — accusativus temporalis heranziehen (vgl. tscher. [Mari] *šɔ̌žɔm* 'im Herbst', *tel-ɔm* 'im Winter'). Das -*m* als Sx der

Tempusbezeichnungen kommt im Tscheremissischen [M a r i] auch an Postpositionen und Interrogativa vor (*γoδƷm* 'während', *ku-na-m* 'wann' usw.)." (Pusztay 1995 : 94).

T h e   p r i m a r y   e x i s t e n c e   of the local (*)*m*-suffix in Uralic languages was supposed by A. Judakin, in particular, while most of his examples about the incidence of the local (temporal, to be more precise) (*)*m*-suffix come from the Mari language, e.g., *иргоды-м* 'in the morning', *кечевы-м* 'in the daytime' (Юдакин 1997 : 141, see also 91—92, 100, 140—142, 257—259). As the locative suffix the *m*-suffix in Mari is not generally used, its sphere of use is mainly limited to such temporal adverbs as 'in spring', 'in summer', 'in autumn', 'in winter', 'in the morning', 'in the daytime', 'in the evening', 'at night', 'at the time', 'at that time' etc. Possibly in Mari the accusative suffix *-m* comes from a temporal suffix *-m* (see also Künnap 2005 : 103—106).

J. H. Greenberg, too, considers the *M*-locative as a possible source for the *M*-accusative. He finds a number of equivalents among suffixes and probable underlying words of suffixes for the locative suffix *M* in the following languages: ? U r a l i c, e.g., Finno-Ugric Finnish *maa* 'earth' ~ Samoyedic Nganasan *mou* id. (he says that in this case a word-internal consonant interferes with a traditional Uralistic reconstruction **maγe*), I n d o - E u r o p e a n (claiming that equivalents are presumably there), T u n g u s i c, e.g., Tungus *gitu-mi* 'on/by foot', Y u k a g h i r *-m*(V), *-meŋ*, e.g. *pojerxo-mo* 'in the daytime', ? C h u k o t k a - K a m c h a t k a n, e.g., Chukchi *-m* 'place', Gilyak *mi-f* 'earth' ~ *-mi* 'inside', E s k i m o - A l e u t i c, e.g., Aleut *ka-ma* 'where?', ? A i n u, e.g., *ma* 'earth, peninsula, island, dry' (? < **ma-k* 'inside'), J a p a n e s e, e.g., *ma* 'place, room, time' (Old Japanese *-mi*, *-pi* etc. 'neighbourhood') (Greenberg 2000 : 139—143). In the case of the Uralic (*)*m*-accusative suffix other types of origin have been supposed, mainly as a descent from either a primary accusative suffix, 1P possessive suffix or any other (*)*m*-material (determinative) element of a pronominal origin (see first of all Wickman 1955 : 145—149; Farkas 1956 : 13—17; Майтинская 1974 : 241—246; Хайду 1985 : 231—232).

We could consider the incidence of the Samoyedic common direct object suffix (*)-*m* as very old in those languages, as a primary phenomenon, so to say, at the same time, naturally, not denying a possibility that its source could have been some other, even an older kind of suffix or a word. A. P. Volodin's analysis convinces us in the fact that the suffix in Samoyedic is not an actual suffix of the accusative case. Besides, L. Palmaitis' language universal wholly excludes a possiblity that in Uralic languages as those lacking any grammatical gender could have an accusative case.

R E F E R E N C E S

F a r k a s, J. von 1956, Der Genitiv und der Akkusativ in der uralischen Grundsprache. — UAJb. XXVIII, 5—17.
G r e e n b e r g, J. H. 2000, Indo-European and Its Closest Relatives. The Eurasiatic Language Family I. Grammar, Stanford.
G u l y a, J. 1995, Transitivität, Determiniertheit und objektive Konjugation. — CIFU VIII. Pars III, 96—99.

J o k i, A. J. 1944, Kai Donners Kamassisches Wörterbuch nebst Sprachproben und Hauptzügen der Grammatik, Helsinki (LSFU 8).

K a t z, H. 1970, Zwei Etymologien. — NyK 72, 147—150.

K l e s m e n t, P., K ü n n a p, A., S o o s a a r, S.-E., T a a g e p e r a, R. 2003, Common Phonetic and Grammatical Features of Uralic Languages and Other Languages in Northern Eurasia. — Journal of Indo-European Studies 31 3 & 4, 363—390.

K ü n n a p, A. 2002, Main Language Shifts in the Uralic Language Group, [München—Newcastle] (LINCOM Studies in Asian Linguistics 45).

—— 2005, About the Form of the Uralic Direct Object. — Phonetics, Grammar and Lexis, Tartu (FU 27), 100—109.

M a r c a n t o n i o, A. 2002, The Uralic Language Family: Facts, Myths and Statistics, Oxford—Boston (Publications of the Philological Society 35).

P a l m a i t i s, L. 1978, Tipologinès pastabos dèl giminès kategorijos formavimosi. — Baltistica 14 1, 27—37.

P u s z t a y, J. 1995, Diskussionsbeiträge zur Grundsprachenforschung (Beispiel: das Protouralische), Wiesbaden (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 43).

—— 2000, Szakszógyüjtemény az uráli nyelvek tanulmányozásához, Szombathely.

R é d e i, K. 1975, Der Akkusativ in den uralischen Sprachen (Zum Kasussystem der uralischen Grundsprache). — CIFU III. Pars I, 133—138.

V o l o d i n, A. P. 1997, Finnisch-ugrische (uralische) Sprachen in Kontakt. Zur allgemeinen Fragestellung. — Finnisch-ugrische Sprachen in Kontakt. Vorträge des Symposiums aus Anlaß des 30-jährigen Bestehens der Finnougristik an der Rijksuniversiteit Groningen 21.—23. November 1996, Maastricht, 35—43.

W i c k m a n, B. 1955, The Form of the Object in the Uralic Languages, Uppsala—Wiesbaden (UUÅ 6).

В о л о д и н А. П. 2000, Безаккузативность как типологическая доминанта уральских языков (На материале финского). — Материалы Международной научно-методической конференции преподавателей и аспирантов, посвященной 75-летию кафедры финно-угорской филологии СПбГУ. Санкт-Петербург, 16—17 марта 2000 г., [Санкт-Петербург], 35—43.

И л л и ч- С в и т ы ч В. М. 1971, Опыт сравнения ностратических языков (семитохамитский, картвельский, индоевропейский, уральский, дравидийский, алтайский). Введение. Сравнительный словарь (b—K̩), Москва.

—— 1976, Опыт сравнения ностратических языков (семитохамитский, картвельский, индоевропейский, уральский, дравидийский, алтайский). Сравнительный словарь (l—ʒ́), Москва.

М а й т и н с к а я К. Е. 1974, Сравнительная морфология финно-угорских языков. — Основы финно-угорского языкознания (вопросы происхождения и развития финно-угорских языков), Москва, 214—382.

Х а й д у П. 1985, Уральские языки и народы, Москва.

Ю д а к и н А. П. 1997, Сравнительно-историческая грамматика финно-угорских языков (Становление системы падежей), Москва.

Ago Künnap

АГО КЮННАП (Тарту)

ОБ УРАЛЬСКОМ АККУЗАТИВЕ НА (*)-*m*

Лингвистическая универсалия, выведенная Л. Палмайтисом, гласит: «В системах, в которых установлена специальная форма аккузатива, имеется категория рода». А. П. Володин определяет уральские языки как языки безаккузативного строя, поскольку в них отсутствует специальный падеж для обозначения прямого дополнения (суффикс (*)-*m* указывает лишь на его неопределенность/определенность). Если в уральских языках отсутствует категория грамматического рода (в чем нельзя усомниться), то нет смысла искать в них настоящий аккузативный падеж. Можно предположить, что общесамодийский суффикс (*)-*m* прямого дополнения в самодийских языках очень древний, т.е. исконный.