

PAUL ALVRE (Viljandi)

ON THE BALTIC-FENNIC DATIVE
(with special reference to the Liv language)

The nominal inflectional system of the Liv language includes a dative case ending in *-n* (*izà-n* 'to the father' — *izàdā-n* 'to the fathers'). The usual equivalent of this dative in the other Baltic-Fennic (= BF¹) languages is the allative or adessive (e. g. Est. *isa-le*, *isa-l* — *isade-le*, *isade-l*, Finn. *isä-lle*, *isä-llä* — *isi-lle*, *isi-llä*), more seldom the ablative. In his grammatical survey of the Liv language, L. Kettunen has connected this case with the locative (dativ-locativ²), presuming for either the development **-na* > *-n*. If this explanation is entirely acceptable with regard to the locative (e. g. *tagā-n* < **taka-na* 'behind' — Est. *taga*, Finn. *taka-na*), it is rather dubious, however, for a number of reasons, whether one can proceed from a primary form ending in **-na* in the case of the dative. Some traces of the dative survive in the other BF languages as well, especially in early literary Finnish. In all such instances the origin and development of the dative is obviously different from that of the locative.

In studying the BF dative one should consider not only the morphological aspect but also the functions of this case in different languages.

1

In the Liv language the dative is one of the most frequently used cases. In the singular the case ending *-n* is added to the word stem and in the plural to the stem of the *dā*-plural. The following are some examples of the dative used in an allative function: *tōvaz min' āndiz aīnā, āina ma āndiz ni'emān, ni'em min' āndiz sēmā, sēmā ma āndiz kaššān, kaš min' āndiz laṣs, laṣs ma āndiz tam mān* (NLK 25) 'heaven gave me hay, the hay I gave to a cow, the cow gave me milk, I gave the milk to a cat, the cat gave me a child, I gave the child to an oak'; *sien um eittān iīm* (LT 15) 'fear has come over this one'; *sieda ma āndab sinnōn* (UT 236) 'this I (shall)

¹ The following abbreviations are used in this article: BF = Baltic-Fennic, Est. = Estonian, Finn. = Finnish, Latv. = Latvian.

² L. Kettunen, *Livisches wörterbuch mit grammatischer einleitung*, Helsinki 1938, p. XVI; L. Kettunen, *Hauptzüge der livischen laut- und formengeschichte*, Helsinki 1947, p. 59.

give to you'; *sāl um ikš vanà skùolmeistār oþpattān laþstān rōntīdi* (ULS 94) 'there an old schoolmaster taught the children letters (books)'; *un siz nānd gruždinttāt tūgād āndabād lūqmādān sīzzāl* (ULS 122) 'and then (they) feed these scorched ashes to the cattle'. Closely allied to these examples are instances of *dativus commodi* and *incommodi*, e. g. *se um minnān lālam* (LiG 75) 'this is difficult for me', etc., a type of dative that is likewise characteristic of the Indo-European languages.

The use of the dative is also common in such instances where the other BF languages employ the adessive, e. g. *muñittān leķstā lūomād ukkē, punāþþān ūdān ne voļttā t'errāp* (ULS 27) 'the cattle of the others fell ill, only those of P unāp remained healthy'; *se aņķkar nāñittān um jētsā* (ULS 88) 'this anchor is before them'.

The dative together with the verb *vōlda* (*uōlda*) 'to be' expresses possession, i. e. a person or object to whom or to which something belongs: *mīnnān um* (HLLF 59) 'I have' (= Est. *minul on*, Finn. *minulla on*); *mīn nūorimis tidārān um brūdganā* (LWb XLI) 'my younger daughter has a beau'; *amād jelūdān, āittadān, tōļādān mitt ittān iz uo ukši, amādān voļttā ukst jārānts* (ULS 58) 'none of the houses, sheds, stables had any doors, all of them lacked doors'.

The verb *vōlda* (*uōlda*) may also be omitted, e. g. *mīn izān k^uodā* (HT 13) 'my father (has) a house' (cf. *mīn izān um k^uodā* 'my father has a house'). Both possibilities occur also in Latvian where the dative alone or together with the verb *būt* 'to be' likewise expresses a person or object who or which possesses something, e. g. *tēvam ir divi zirgi — tēvam divi zirgi* (LeG 427) 'father has two horses'. There is no doubt that the construction without the verb in Liv has developed under the influence of Latvian in whose western dialect areas (in the neighbourhood of the Liv language) the possessive genitive is replaced by a *dativus possessivus* even in such cases as *dēls valķe tēvam cepur* (LeG 431) 'the son wears (his) father's hat'.

The Liv dative with a possessive meaning may also stand at the end of a sentence: *sie k^uodā um mīn izān* (HT 13) 'this house is my father's'. The fact that in such cases the dative is consistently used in Liv, whereas in Latvian the genitive is also possible (*māja ir tēva* (gen.) — *māja ir tēvam* (dat.) 'the house is father's'), suggests that this type of datival sentence in Liv may go back to the BF parent language and be actually the same as the Finnish *talo on isän* (= *talo on isällä*).³

The Estonian construction *mul tuleb* 'I must' is likewise rendered in Liv by means of the dative, e. g. *ku u'm amādān lēmāst pušmāš* (LT 14) 'when all must go (to the manor) to work'. The coincidence with the Latvian debital dative (see J. Endzelin, LeG 428—429) seems to be merely accidental because the same construction (gen.-dat. + *on*

³ Although the Mordvin languages seem to suggest an earlier genitive in the Finnish type *isän on talo* 'father has a house', the transition to the adessive (*isällä on talo*) in the BF parent language probably took place through the intermediary of an *n*-case that was felt to be a dative.

+ infinitive IV) occurs also in Finnish, e. g. *sinun on meneminen* 'you have to go'.

But in addition to its allative and adessive functions the Liv dative also has an ablative function, e. g. *kis m'nnân siedâ vejtâv?* (LWb 224) 'who will take that from me?'; *kârna kârnan silmâ âb ra'dlâ* (HT 12) 'a raven will not peck out the eye of a raven'; *ta um vînt sien (sie neitsân) sidâm* (HLLF 59) 'he has carried off the heart of this (girl)'. An ablative function is also characteristic of the Latvian dative (e. g. *kas šim pirks?* (LeG 423) 'who will buy from him?'), whose influence on Liv is here beyond doubt.

As we have seen, the dative is used in Liv not only in the meaning of the allative, but it frequently replaces the Estonian and Finnish adessive and ablative. The latter cases have a vestigial flavour in present-day Liv because their use is mainly limited to adverbs of place and time, e. g. *ta lâb mōlâ* 'he goes to the country'; *ta jelâb mōl* 'he lives in the country'; *ta tu'l mōlv* 'he came from the country' (cf. Est. *maale, maal, maalt*; Finn. *maalle, maalla, maalta*). The recession of the external local cases has occurred in close connection with an expansion in the sphere of usage of the dative. The functions of the allative, adessive and ablative have gradually been transferred to the dative, a process in which the influence of Latvian has made itself felt. This is a phenomenon that has no parallel in the other BF languages. On the other hand, in the extinct Salace dialect of Liv, where there is no *n*-dative⁴ and where a contrary process has taken place, the use of the external local cases is more like that in Estonian than in the Liv dialects of Kurzeme.

Of obviously recent origin is likewise an additional peculiarity of the use of the dative in Liv, viz. that attributes often (although there are exceptions) remain vestigially in the genitive before a datival head-word, e. g. singular *sis_se perimiez um kîttân sie perinaizân* (ULS 31) 'then this farmer said to this farmer's wife'; *un ta um ė'dâgîzi aņdân sie nûor p'nnân* (ULS 65) 'and he gave some supper to this young dog'; — plural *vqi ne kalâm'edân um ka ka'ldi* (ULS 82) 'whether those fishermen have any fish'. Of course this has nothing to do with the original Fenno-Ugric lack of concord between adjectives and their head-words, but is reminiscent rather of the close link existing between the dative and genitive cases in Liv, a fact which can be observed in connection with surviving datives in other BF languages as well.

A strictly Livish feature, however, is the use of some postpositions with the dative, e. g. *mies magûb naizân kuðral* (LiG 76) 'the husband sleeps beside his wife'; *pan ummâ kâd tãm mân pâl* (LiG 76) '(he) put his hand on him'; *tâmâm astân (?) nânt kânda jâdân jûrâ* (ULS 100) 'he has stepped up to these bearers'. There is vacillation here because the genitive can also be used instead of the dative, e. g. *ė'dân tu'l k'odâi naiz jûrâ* (ULS 103) 'in the evening (he) came home to the wife'. In the encroachment by the dative upon the genitive one can again discern a Latvian influence: the Latvian preposition + dative has been adapted to the

⁴ J. Sjögren, *Livische Grammatik nebst Sprachproben* (= J. A. Sjögren, *Gesammelte Schriften, Band II, Theil I*), St. Petersburg 1861.

Liv language where it has given the type dative + postposition (cf. Latv. *isim da kungam!* 'wollen wir zum Herrn gehen!', LeG 500). The equivalent of this in the Salace dialect is the allative + postposition, e. g. *mil imi om tädl vail?* (LiG 76) 'what kind of a person there is among you?'

If in the Liv language it is possible to distinguish the morphological dative from the genitive, then in the other BF languages these two cases are entirely similar. Only concrete semantic analysis enables one to decide in individual instances whether the sentence contains a genitive or a vestigial dative (in grammars of the Finnish language the latter is called a datival genitive). If the genitive-like form can be replaced by the allative, one may often opt for a surviving dative. In other instances, however, the dative is only probable.

In literary Estonian there are no traces of the dative. A few genitives with a datival function have, however, been observed in folk songs, e. g. in the sentence *anna vett mu kõrvile juua* 'give my bay horse some water to drink', in which the meaning of the word *kõrvile* is the same as of the allative *kõrvile* '(to the) bay horse'. This example shows that the allative has acquired the function of the dative in Estonian.

Various genitives in the Vot language can be translated into Estonian by the allative or adessive. Consequently, there should be no doubt as to their datival functions which are conspicuously the same as in Liv or Finnish. E. g. (VKG 23) *kumpa sinū näüttip parep keikkia?* (= Est. *kes sulle näib kõikidest paremana?*) 'who seems best of all to you?'; *minū beļe kuhē mennā* (= Est. *mul pole kuhugi minna*) 'I have nowhere to go'; *ohto sinū on savvea setkua* 'it is enough for you to pug the clay'; *keikkī piti eļla* (= Finn. *kaikkien piti olla*) 'all had to be'.

Judging by the Vepse language, datival sentence constructions are not particularly characteristic of the eastern BF languages. The following uncertain cases have been included among the group as datival genitives, e. g. (VMLT 237—238) *kehlan iškemai, kenen pravd* 'let us lay a wager (to see) who is right'; *ukon jo vuodet tulde* 'the old man grew older ("the years came")'; also the Vepse equivalent of the type *unknown to me* (Est. *minu teadmata*) in the sentence *mužikōden nähmätä i vō antta* 'one cannot give without the men seeing it'.

No datival instances have been found in distinguishing the functions of the genitive in the Valdai dialect of Karelian.⁵ In Karelian folklore, however, to judge by the "Kalevala", there are reliable traces of the datival genitive, e. g. *Juopa puoli tuoppiasi - - - Anna toisen toinen puoli, pahemman pahempi puoli* (26. 399—412) 'Drink your half-stoup - - - Give the other half to the other one, the worse half to the worse one'.

The widespread occurrence of the dative in Finnish calls for particular attention. In the old literary language its use was surprisingly frequent, in certain constructions the dative that resembled the genitive being preferred to the present-day allative in the singular as well as in the plural.

E. g. (SKR 100) *antoi ryövärin suuta* 'kissed the robber';

⁵ P. Palmeos, Karjala Valdai murrak, Tallinn 1962, pp. 24—26.

en ole heidän yhdenkään paha tehnyt 'I have done no evil to any one of them'; *niinköistä te Herran maksatte?* 'is this the way in which you repay God?'; *anna minun lapsia* 'give me children'; *ja antoi suuta hänen jalkainsa* 'and kissed his feet'; *se on valmistettu perkeleen ja hänen enkelittens* 'this is made for the devil and his angels'; *niinkuin etikka tekee pahaa hammas-ten ja savu silmään* 'as vinegar is bad for the teeth and smoke for the eyes'. Instances with an adessive meaning are, however, much rarer, e. g. *mikä sinun on, mikä kansan on* (SKR 100) 'what you have, what the people have'.

In contemporary Finnish clear cases of datival genitives can be found only in fossilized expressions — set phrases, proverbs and occasionally in folk-songs. From the point of view of contemporary linguistic feeling allative cases predominate here as well, although there are some possibilities where the adessive may be employed instead. E. g. (SK 343—346) *Jumalan ~ Luojan kiitos* 'thanks be to God ~ to the creator'; *mitäs minä sen (=sille) teen?* 'what can I do about it?'; *mitä hän sinun (=sinulle) teki?* 'what did he do to you?'; *anna kättä köyhän miehen, köyhällä on lämmin koura* 'give your hand to a poor man, a poor person has a warm palm'; *ei häijyn sian hyvä mikään* 'nothing is good for a bad pig'; *tulee vahinko viisahanakin* 'a misfortune can befall even a wise man'; *on käskijän väkeä, lainanottajan eloa* (SKR 100) 'the master has power, the borrower — corn'.

There are also a number of other instances of adverbial genitives in Finnish which greatly resemble the use of the Liv dative or the Voté datival genitive or in which the survival of an otherwise earlier dative is probable. Suffice it to mention only the following instances. In connection with the verbs *pitää, täytyy, tulee* expressing necessity, e. g. *sinun pitää olla ahkerampi* 'you must be more alert'; with the verb *käydä*, e. g. *minun (=minulle) kävi paremmin kuin hyvin* 'things went very well with me'; *meidän ei käy lähteminen* 'it is not fitting for us to go'; with the verb *tulla*, e. g. *minun (=minulle) tuli vedet silmiin* 'water (i. e. tears) came to my eyes'; in connection with verbs expressing permission and command, e. g. *anna lasten olla* 'let the children be'; *käskin hänen poistua* '(I) ordered him to leave'; in connection with the construction *olla*-verb + Infinitive IV (nominative or partitive), e. g. *minun on nyt lähteminen kotiin* 'I must go home now'; *sinne ei ole kenenkään menemistä* 'nobody can go there'; such instances linked with an Infinitive I as *äiti toi omenoita lasten syödä* 'mother brought the children some apples to eat'; *meillä on huoneita miesten maata* 'we have (enough) rooms for men to sleep in', etc. Special mention should be made of a sentence type with the verb *olla*, where the dative-genitive is the equivalent of the adessive, e. g. *pojan (=pojalla) on nälkä ja vilu* 'the boy is hungry and cold', etc.

The instances listed here are not included among the dative-genitives in descriptive grammars of the Finnish language,⁶ because contemporary linguistic feeling does not permit them to be replaced by the allative. It is, nevertheless, very probable that even instances of the adessive ending in *-n* are original datives and that as such they have been in use since the BF parent language (cf., e. g. Finn.

⁶ A. Penttilä, Suomen kielioppi, Porvoo—Helsinki 1957, pp. 344—346.

minun on nälkä and Liv *m'nnən um nālga* 'I am hungry'). The similarity with the corresponding types in Liv and even in Vot is so great as to discount the possibility of a later parallel development.

The presence of an *n*-case with analogous functions in Lappish, and some other facts which will be discussed below, suggest that the dative was part and parcel of the declensional system of the BF parent language already before the external local cases came into being. At the same time the dative also fulfilled the functions of the present-day adessive (approximately in the same manner as in the Mordvin languages today). The development of the external local cases meant the beginning of a recession of the dative. The extent of this recession has varied in different languages. Liv is an exception among the BF languages because in Liv it is the dative and not the allative, adessive and ablative which has emerged victorious and it performs the functions of all the external local cases.

2

The exceptional character of the relations between the Liv dative and the external local cases is not sufficient ground for attributing an origin to the dative in Liv different from that in the other BF languages. In connection with his examples of the Liv dative L. Kettunen rightly refers to the link with the Finnish dative-genitive.⁷ One cannot, however, support his view that the Liv dative is the same case as the locative (their functions are diametrically different). There is even less foundation for the attempt to generalize the erroneous conclusion drawn from Liv material to the other BF languages as is done by L. Kettunen in one of his later investigations.⁸ Here likewise a distinct boundary between the dative and the genitive seems to disappear. An attempt is made to prove that the genitive developed from the locative-essive in the BF parent language. This is done by means of a phonetic comparison of the Liv *m'nnən* 'to me' and the word *v'e'ddāl* < **vetelä* 'liquid'.

It must be emphasized that such a comparison does not prove that the form *m'nnən* originated in **minuna*. It is essential to remember that the dative always has the same stem as the genitive (the latter being often exceptional because of its similarity with the nominative plural). The dative in the singular is also derived from the genitive by means of the ending *-n* (genitive *kalā* 'fish' — dative *kalān* 'to the fish'). As stem generalizations are not lacking in different cases, the erroneous impression is created as if the dative *m'nnən* is a form of an earlier locative worn down by apocope. It should be added that in another place L. Kettunen has himself expressed doubt as to the validity of such a position. Here he regards the form *m'nnən* as analogous: "die lautliche entwicklung in einzelfällen kompliziert sein kann (z. B. *m'nnən* viell. anal. statt *m'n*)".⁹

As to the attempt to derive the genitive from the locative, then this idea is not new either. Already in his doctoral thesis M. Weske con-

⁷ L. Kettunen, Hauptzüge der livischen laut- und formengeschichte, p. 59.

⁸ L. Kettunen, Die Herkunft des Terminativs, Genitivs, Instruktivs und Komitativs. — Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia Toimituksia B 98, 2, Helsinki 1956, p. 12 ff.

⁹ L. Kettunen, Hauptzüge der livischen laut- und formengeschichte, p. 53.

sidered the locative to be the primary case from which the other *n*-element cases (including the genitive) have developed.¹⁰ A variant of the same idea occurs in the works of D. Bubrich, according to whom the locative case which answers the question *where?* (*talo on isän* < **isänä* 'дом у отца') has developed into a possessive genitive: *isän talo* 'дом отца (отцовский)'.¹¹ The problem has been dealt with more recently by B. Serebrennikov who proceeds from the *n*-locative and maintains that the genitive has been attained via the comitative-instructive.¹²

The present writer believes that all the explanations listed above (as well as the link between the genitive and *n*-adjectives) are possible in principle if we place the origin of the *n*-genitive in the Uralic parent language despite the fact that it is unknown in the present-day Ugric languages. It would be too artificial to presume a parallel change from **na* > *n* as having occurred at a different time and extending from the Samoyed areas to the BF languages. Moreover, in this case one would encounter even greater phonetic difficulties in the BF languages (e. g. the problem of strong and weak degrees in words with alternation of stem consonants) than in the case of the *m'ni.än* type of dative in the Liv language.

The *n*-genitive like the *n*- (or *n̂*-) lative is undoubtedly of Uralic origin. A connection with the *n*-instructive or instrumental is surely more easily comprehensible than a link with the locative. The same case developed as a noun modifier (adnominally) into the genitive and as a verb modifier (adverbally) into the instructive. It is likewise probable that the *n*-lative belongs etymologically to the same group.¹³ One should not neglect the *n*-lative in elucidating the origin of the dative in Liv and the other BF languages. Let us first briefly examine some additional explanations that have been advanced to account for dative forms in the BF languages.

F. J. Wiedemann regards the Liv dative as an original genitive on the grounds that in Hungarian likewise the same case combines the functions of the genitive and the dative.¹⁴ In the same place F. J. Wiedemann suggests that the adverb *kougän* (weit), which resembles the Liv dative, is perhaps only accidentally similar to the Finnish essive *kaukana* 'in the distance', and that the form *kougänd* (von weitem) is nothing but "ein Surrogat des Ablativs", the regular equivalents of which are the Estonian adessive *kaugel* and ablative *kaugelt*. The Liv and Finnish datives, the Finnish particles ending in *-nne* (*sinne* 'there', *tänne* 'here', etc.) and a number of cases translated by the allative from more distant cognate languages are included by A. Ahlqvist among the latives ending in *-ne*, *-nne* (*-nnek*) (Yleinen tulosija).¹⁵ V. Thomsen, who was familiar with the works of M. Weske and A. Ahlqvist, believes that the Liv *n*-dative is, generally speaking, the same case as the Finnish *na*-essive,

¹⁰ M. Weske, Zur vergleichenden Grammatik des finnischen Sprachstammes, Leipzig 1873, p. 75 ff.

¹¹ Д. В. Бубрих, Историческая морфология финского языка, Москва—Ленинград 1955, pp. 12—13.

¹² Б. А. Серебренников, Валлийская конструкция *y mae cath gan y ferch* и проблема происхождения суффикса родительного падежа в уральских языках. — СФУ I 1965, pp. 5—10.

¹³ E. Itkonen, Kieli ja sen tutkimus, Helsinki 1966, p. 267.

¹⁴ J. A. Sjögren, Livische Grammatik nebst Sprachproben, p. 77.

¹⁵ A. Ahlqvist, Suomen Kielen Rakennus. Vertaavia kieliopillisia tutkimuksia. I. Nominien Synty ja Taivutus. Suomalainen Runo-oppi, Helsinki 1877, pp. 99—100.

which may in some instances have acquired the additional lative ending *-nne*.¹⁶ E. N. Setälä doubts whether the Liv dative in *-n* is connected with the lative particles ending in *-nne* (*-nnek*) and the terminative particles in *-ni*, *-nni*, because the latter contain more elements than the datives.¹⁷ The correct conclusion is drawn in the same place that two distinct case forms have merged to produce the present Finnish genitive. On the basis of the views of V. Thomsen and L. Kettunen, L. Posti believes that the starting-point of the Liv dative was a case which ended in *-na*, *-nä* and whose counterpart is the Finnish essive; assuming this to be true the survival of a word-terminal *-n* would be "völlig natürlich".¹⁸ D. Bubrich does not consider the Finnish dative to be a distinct case, but regards the adessive type *minun on kiire* 'I am in a hurry', etc. as a variant of a genitive which originated in a locative and developed along the line *зде?* — *у кого?*¹⁹ He finds that the allative meaning (*кому?*) should be attributed to the influence of Russian and other neighbouring languages.

If we bear in mind the lative origin of the Finnish dative (< *-n* ~ *-ñ*), it should be clear that there is no room for assuming a foreign influence. As regards the Finnish language, most scholars continue to maintain together with E. N. Setälä that the dative and the genitive have a different origin. They also continue to share A. Ahlqvist's fundamental view that the Finnish dative was originally a lative case.²⁰ Its closer parallels are therefore the Finnish illatives, allatives and lative adverbs ending in *-n* (cf. *taan*, old literary form *taghan* 'behind'), its more distant parallels being the *n*-latives in the Samoyed languages (Enets-*tagaŋ* 'behind') and the compound suffixes with a datival *n*-element in more distant related languages, e. g. Erza-Mordvin *ava-ñeñ* '(to a) mother' (a double *n*-lative), Mari *imñ-lan* '(to a) horse', Hungarian *ember-nek* '(to a) human being', etc.

3

The question may very well be asked whether in the case of the Liv dative one should not proceed from the same standpoint and reject L. Kettunen's explanation of the locative origin of the dative. Such a solution seems to be the nearest to the truth in view of the great similarity of the functions and case endings of the dative in Liv and Finnish. The fact that in present-day Finnish the genitive and the dative have fused into one case, whereas in Liv the genitive lacks the *n*-ending that occurs in the dative, should be regarded as of secondary importance. The Liv language has undergone a special development which does not preclude our proceeding in individual languages from a common datival *n*-ending of the BF parent language. Although the word-final *-n* generally disappeared at an early date in Liv (in the genitive frequently together with a preceding vowel), then in the dative (where one should also note a reduplicated ending *-nen* similar to that in Erza-Mordvin) the survival by way of exception of *-n* is mainly due to the functional load of the

¹⁶ V. Thomsen, *Beröringer mellem de finske og de baltiske (litauisk-lettiske) Sprog. En sproghistorisk Undersøgelse*, København 1890, p. 50.

¹⁷ E. N. Setälä, *Yhteissuomalainen äännehistoria* I—II, Helsinki 1891, pp. 382—383.

¹⁸ L. Posti, *Grundzüge der livischen Lautgeschichte* (= MSFOu LXXXV), Helsinki 1942, p. 282.

¹⁹ Д. В. Бубрих, *Историческая морфология финского языка*, pp. 13—14.

²⁰ L. Hakulinen, *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys* I. Äänne- ja muoto-oppia, Helsinki 1941, p. 86; E. Itkonen, *Kieli ja sen tutkimus*, p. 268.

case ending (allative, adessive and ablative functions). The loss of the dative ending in *-n* would have meant a phonetic coincidence of these forms with the nominative and the genitive, something that threatened all nominal words in the plural and a majority of them in the singular. By way of comparison it could be pointed out that the survival of the word-final *-n* in order to preserve functional distinction is a fact which may be observed in other BF languages as well, e. g. in the first person singular of the verb the *-n* has not been lost in the North Estonian dialects (*annan* '(I) give', not *anna*); neither has it been subjected to vocalization, in the West Vot dialect (*annan* '(I) give', not *annā*). The genitival *-n* has also been preserved in the singular of the northern and central Veps areas, although it has disappeared in the plural: singular *pun*, but plural *puide* (: *pu* 'tree'). An interesting parallel where a semantic difference (distinct function) has led to phonetic divergence is provided by the second person singular forms of the imperative mood of the island dialects of Estonia: word-final **-k* has disappeared in affirmative, but survives as *o* in negative speech, e. g. **jōk* > *jō* 'drink', but *ā jōo* 'do not drink'. The background to the phonetic divergence of the *n*-genitive and the dative in Liv was even somewhat more favourable because to the semantic difference between these cases was added a difference in adnominal (gen.) and adverbial (dat.) positions within the sentence.

These Liv genitive forms in which the ending **-n* has survived even today (for reasons of sentence phonetics) completely resemble the dative. This is added proof that the ending of the dative was already earlier *-n* and not *-n* + vowel as presumed by E. N. Setälä and L. Kettunen²¹ (cf. *lōdan* *al* 'under the table' — dat. *lōdan*; *pānoùk* 'neck-hole (in a garment)' — dat. *pān*; *mielān* *mētkāo* 'thoughts of the heart (i. e. cherished thoughts)' — dat. *mielān*, etc.). Explanations of a vocalic dative ending in Liv are all the more artificial because the dative plural is not formed from an *i*-plural stem but from the genitive as in Finnish. L. Kettunen has theoretically constructed an initial *i*-plural form **jal-koina*²² which is suitable only for explaining the locative-essive and not the dative *jālgadān* 'feet' (cf. genitive *jālgad*). There is not sufficient ground for comparing (as is done by L. Kettunen²³) the Liv dative with the recent *dā*-stem comitative-translative or with the *de*-plural that has developed from the comitative in Estonian. If there had been an initial *i*-plural form **jalkoina*, some traces of it would probably have survived just as one finds instances in 19th-century written records of a regular translative and a comitative similar to the latter through analogy, e. g. *patīks* (: *pat* 'sin'), *lābīks* (: *lāb* 'window').²⁴

The great age and key position of the dative within the BF declensional system is proved, among other things, by the fact that it was used also in the plural already before the *i*-plural cases came into being at a time when alongside the nominative plural there existed only a singular stem genitive (**kalaten* ~ **kaladēn* 'of fishes') and a lative-dative closely connected with the latter from the phonetical point

²¹ E. N. Setälä, *Yhteissuomalainen äännehistoria*, p. 383; L. Kettunen, *Livisches wörterbuch*, p. XLI and LIII; L. Kettunen, *Hauptzüge der livischen laut- und formengeschichte*, p. 71 and 59.

²² L. Kettunen, *Livisches wörterbuch*, p. LIII; L. Kettunen, *Hauptzüge der livischen laut- und formengeschichte*, p. 71.

²³ L. Kettunen, *Hauptzüge der livischen laut- und formengeschichte*, pp. 59—60.

²⁴ J. A. Sjögren, *Livische Grammatik nebst Sprachproben*, p. 85.

of view. If there existed an *i*-plural, it would not be clear why both in Liv and in Finnish the dative lacks an *i*-declension such as exists in the case of the later allative and adessive.

Finally let us glance at the dative in the Mordvin languages where in addition to an allative and an adessive function a lative shade may appear occasionally, e. g. Erza *мон ютан киментень* 'I (shall) go to the birch-tree', *монень сась ломань* 'a person came to me', *те таркентень иля сакшно* 'do not come to this place' (P. A.). The Moksha dative often has an equivalent in the Erza illative (*s*-lative),²⁵ whereas datives with an allative and adessive function are basically the same as in Liv and Finnish, e. g. Erza *Тон авай, монень панть сюкорт* (ГМ II 213) 'you mother, bake me a cookie'; Erza *тән монень жалят* (ГМ II 213) 'I am sorry for you (= you me sorry)'; Moksha *Няевсь, што Авдювонь пях пара мялезонза* (ГМ I 111) 'it could be seen that A. was in a very good mood'; Erza *монень эрзви симемс* 'I am thirsty' (P. A.); Moksha *Лашос тядя ти савсь учендомс баняста цёранец* (ГМ I 111) '(the) mother had to wait long for her son to return from the bath-house'.

In conclusion we may state that the dative, one of the older cases in the BF languages, is in all these languages — Liv included — of a lative (<*-*n* ~ *-*n̄*), but not of a locative (<*-*na*) origin as erroneously claimed by L. Kettunen. The lative origin of the dative did not prevent the latter from fulfilling to some extent also an adessive function alongside the allative before the development of the external local cases. This is proved among other things by the great similarity of such constructions as the Liv *mī'nñān um...* and the Finnish *minun on...* 'I have...'. If one also considers the fact that in adverbial instances it was as a rule only the lative-dative which could be employed instead of the adnominal genitive, then the number of datival constructions surviving even in Finnish is probably appreciably greater than hitherto believed.

Abbreviations

HLLF — L. Kettunen, Hauptzüge der livischen laut- und formengeschichte, Helsinki 1947; **HT** — L. Kettunen, Die Herkunft des Terminativs, Genitivs, Instruktivs und Komitativs. — Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia Toimituksia B 98, 2, Helsinki 1956; **LeG** — J. Endzelin, Lettische Grammatik, Riga 1922; **LiG** — J. A. Sjögren, Livische Grammatik nebst Sprachproben (= J. A. Sjögren, Gesammelte Schriften, Band II, Theil I), St. Petersburg 1861; **LT** — J. Märgiste, Liiviläisiä tekstejä, Helsinki 1964; **LWb** — L. Kettunen, Livisches wörterbuch mit grammatischer einleitung, Helsinki 1938; **NLK** — Näyteitä liivin kielestä. Kerännyt E. N. Setälä. Suomen-tanut ja julkaissut Väinö Kyrölä (= MSFOu 106), Helsinki 1953; **P. A.** — Specimens obtained from Academician Paul Ariste; **SK** — A. Penttilä, Suomen kielioppi, Porvoo—Helsinki 1957; **SKR** — A. Ahlqvist, Suomen kielen rakennus. Vertaavia kieliopillisia tutkimuksia. I. Nominien Synty ja Taivutus. Suomalainen Runoppi, Helsinki 1877; **ULS** — L. Kettunen, Untersuchung über die livische sprache. I. Phonetische einföhrung. Sprachproben (= Acta et

²⁵ Грамматика мордовских (мокшанского и эрзянского) языков I. Фонетика и морфология, Саранск 1962, p. 114.

Commentationes Universitatis Dorpatensis B VIII 3), Tartu 1925; **UT** — *Už Testament, Evangeliumõd ja apostold tÿöd*, Helsinki 1937; **VKG** — P. Ariste, *Vadja keele grammatika*, Tartu 1948; **VMLT** — L. Kettunen, *Vepsän murteiden lauseopillinen tutkimus (= MSFOu LXXXVI)*, Helsinki 1943; **ГМ I** — *Грамматика мордовских (мокшанского и эрзянского) языков I. Фонетика и морфология*, Саранск 1962; **ГМ II** — М. Н. Коляденков, *Грамматика мордовских (эрзянского и мокшанского) языков II. Синтаксис*, Саранск 1954.

ПАУЛЬ АЛВРЭ (Вильянди)

О ПРИБАЛТИЙСКО-ФИНСКОМ ДАТИВЕ (особенно в ливском языке)

Во многих прибалтийско-финских языках сохранились следы древнего датива, в ливском же языке он и в настоящее время — один из наиболее употребительных падежей.

Л. Кеттунен и некоторые другие исследователи связывали происхождение ливского датива на *-n* с локативом на **-na* (*mi'nññn* 'мне' < **minu-na*). Автор статьи показывает, что в отношении ливского языка, как и в отношении других прибалтийско-финских языков, нужно исходить из древнего латива (на **-n ~ *-ñ*). Сравнение форм датива в ливском и других прибалтийско-финских языках свидетельствует о том, что датив, как и генитив, образованный от основы единственного числа (**kalatēn ~ *kaladēn* 'рыб'), очевидно, и во множественном числе начали употреблять еще до возникновения падежей множественного числа с признаком *i*. В прибалтийско-финском праязыке датив наряду с лативно-аллативной функцией выполнял функцию адессива, что между прочим доказывает и большое сходство конструкций лив. *mi'nññn im ...* и фин. *minin on ...* 'у меня есть...'.
: