Jussi Ylikoski (Oulu/Guovdageaidnu)

On the tracks of the Proto-Uralic suffix *-ksi – a new but old perspective on the origin of the Mari lative

This paper presents a comprehensive reappraisal of the origins of the Mari lative case marker -(e)š. According to the received view, the suffix -(e)š originates in a Proto-Finno-Volgaic *s-lative, ultimate origin of which has not been explained. As the traditional theory of the origins of the so-called s-cases in Saami, Finnic, Mordvin and Mari suffers from various methodological shortcomings, alternative proposals have been presented, but the Mari lative continues to lack a plausible explanation. At the same time, the Finnic and Mordvin translatives in *-ksi are nowadays related to the Northern Samoyed predestinative in *-tə̂. This paper aims to present a functionally and phonologically sound theory of the origin of the Mari lative case marker -(e)š by relating the suffix to translatives and derivations in *-ksi, acknowledging that the hypothesis is not new, but actually predates the prevailing theory of the 20th century. At the same time, the paper presents the first familywide overview of the possible descendants *-ksi, a suffix that may have functioned as a case marker already in Proto-Uralic.

1.   Introduction

This paper is a follow-up to my recent re-evaluation of the origins of the so-called s-cases in western Uralic. According to the tradition going back to Jännes (1890) and Setälä (1890), the *-s- element of the so-called inessive, illative and elative cases in Saami, Finnic, Mordvin and Mari goes back to the so-called lative case in *-s. In Ylikoski (2016), I have claimed that this received view suffers from various methodological shortcomings, and as the first functionally and typologically substantiated hypothesis on the issue, I have suggested that the s-cases originate in Proto-Uralic postpositional phrases instead. Furthermore, I have proposed that the s-cases can be related to at least the Samoyed local cases with the Proto-Samoyed element *-ntə-, and that all of these could go back to Proto-Uralic postpositional phrases based on a relational noun *sekä-, *seki- or *sex(i) which may have survived in Khanty relational nouns for 'inside, interior'.

However, while Ylikoski (2016) completely disavows the traditional yet methodologically groundless idea about the so-called Proto-Finno-Volgaic *s-lative as the material origin of the western Uralic inessive, illative and elative cases, it is acknowledged that there remains one alleged descendant of the *s-lative that cannot be readily explained as an obvious sister form of the rest of the s-cases. From a functional perspective, the so-called lative case in Mari is distinctly different from the inessive, illative and elative cases that can be safely characterized as the unmarked default local cases of the four westernmost branches of Uralic. Thus, the only remaining case marker that still in a sense originates from the hypothetical Proto-Finno-Volgaic lative is the Mari lative suffix -(e)š, which, however, can barely be characterized as a

true "lative" in the Uralistic sense of the word: As will be seen below, the Mari lative is not primarily a directional case. This paper attempts to shed light on the nature and origin of this most distinct outlier among the cases that are traditionally considered as descendants of the Proto-Finno-Volgaic *-s-lative.

As suggested by the title of the paper, the purpose of the present study is twofold: Firstly, I aim to present a seemingly new, functionally motivated and also phonologically credible theory of the origin of the Mari lative case marker -(e)š; secondly, a logical, consecutive aim of the study is to add to our understanding of the Proto-Uralic suffix *-ksi, the proposed origin of Mari -(e)š, and for this reason the paper seeks to present the first familywide overview of the possible descendants of Proto-Uralic *-ksi, the reconstruction of which naturally relies on such a general picture. In addition to these two main objectives, this paper also argues, albeit less directly, for the importance of two often undervalued themes in contemporary historical Uralistics: 1) the knowledge of and respect for the long and rich history of Uralistics as well as 2) the need for establishment of true semantic-functional correspondence between the grammatical elements compared. This study aims to show that the answer to the riddle of the Mari lative can be found only by comparing it to its functional equivalents in other branches, and the most plausible answer was originally found using a similar way of thinking already in the first half of the 19th century.

The structure of the paper is as follows: Section 2 provides a brief overview of the lative case in Mari as well as the research on its origins. Section 3 is the main body of the paper which presents a new hypothesis about the origin and cognates of the Mari lative. It is acknowledged that the "new hypothesis" was actually conjectured by early Uralicists of the 19th century, but their early thoughts about the common origin of the Mari lative -(e)š and the Finno-Mordvin translative *-ksi were never tested but instead got gradually ignored and forgotten by later scholars. In light of recent advances in the study of the Finnic and Mordvin translatives, as well as the Northern Samoyed predestinative (Section 3.1), the comparison of these three branches is now extended to Mari. After briefly commenting on earlier research (Section 3.2) and presenting and analyzing comparative data from all four branches (Sections 3.3–3.5), Section 4 presents additional phonological and lexical comments on the topic. Finally, Section 5 draws the threads together and provides a general discussion by relating the present observations to the early and more recent views of the origins of the categories in question. As a result, it is concluded that there are many good reasons to believe that the Mari lative shares most if not all of its origins with the Finnic and Mordvin translatives as well as with the Samoyed predestinative which may all go back to a Proto-Uralic case-like inflectional or derivational suffix *-ksi.[1]

As the scope of this paper comprises the origins and the long history of research of a number of case suffixes in a number of Uralic languages, some precautions and disclaimers are in order: This paper in no way attempts to address all relevant details of the use of the Mari lative and its proposed cognates in individual Uralic languages – neither those according to the received view nor those proposed here. This study is not primarily about directional or other local cases in Mari or other languages; more information about the synchrony and diachrony of local cases and local case systems in the languages in question is provided by Kittilä and Ylikoski (2011) as well as Ylikoski (2011, 2016). Neither is it possible to present a systematic comparison of the more abstract and grammatical functions and their realizations (see especially Section 3.5), but for a more uniform and typological approach to many related expressions, the reader is referred especially to de Groot (2017) and its individual chapters on the so-called essives and translatives in Uralic languages. On the whole, although the present study is one of the most systematic and functionally oriented approaches to the reconstruction of Uralic historical morphology and the argumentation is backed by dozens of full example sentences in which the proposed cognates are in actual use in analogous contexts, it is acknowledged that the selected examples are only a preliminary sample of the functional similarity of the Mari lative, the Finnic and Mordvin translatives and the Samoyed predestinative. More systematic, corpus-based studies must be left for future research. Moreover, the study is admittedly tendentious in advocating its own cause by giving most attention to the similarities, rather than differences, between the grammatical elements compared. This, however, is the very essence of the comparative method even when comparing and tracking grammatical morphemes as abstract as those discussed in the present study.

2.   The Mari lative and its origins: the state of research

2.1. The lative within the Mari case system

According to the classical view, the western Uralic or "Finno-Volgaic" *s*-cases were all said to go back to a hypothetical "lative" case in *-*s*. As discussed in length in Ylikoski (2016), one of the main problems of this hypothesis has been the fact that the alleged *-*s*-lative has been regarded as a product of the so-called Proto-Finno-Volgaic period, but the ultimate origin of the element has not usually been problematized. Further, it has remained unclear as to how the alleged Proto-Finno-Volgaic *-*s*-lative came to serve as a mere platform to which other local case suffixes were attached – already in the hypothetical Proto-Finno-Volgaic, which for the most part has lost its support among contemporary scholars.

However, among the so-called *s*-cases of the so-called Finno-Volgaic languages, the Mari *lative* in -*(e)š* is an exception in that it barely functions as a *local case* in the generally accepted sense of the term. While the Mari *illative* in -*š(ke)* – more precisely, Meadow (Eastern) Mari -*š/-ške/-ško/-škö* and Hill (Western) Mari -*š/-škə̂/-škə*

– is unquestionably the default directional case, the same cannot be said of the so-called lative case. The many functions of the Mari lative will be described in more detail in the following sections, but to give a brief overview of the main subject of this study, Table 1 illustrates the case system in Meadow Mari.

	'fish'	'needle'	'water'
Nominative	*kol*	*ime*	*βüd*
Genitive	*kolə̂n*	*imə̂n*	*βüdə̂n*
Accusative	*kolə̂m*	*imə̂m*	*βüdə̂m*
Dative	*kollan*	*imə̂lan*	*βütlan*
Lative	*koleš*	*imeš*	*βüdeš*
Illative	*kolə̂š(ko)*	*imə̂š(ke)*	*βüdə̂š(kö)*
Inessive	*kolə̂što*	*imə̂šte*	*βüdə̂štö*
Comparative	*kolla*	*imə̂la*	*βütla*
Comitative	*kolge*	*imə̂ge*	*βütke*

Table 1. Examples of Meadow Mari nominal inflection (cf. Alhoniemi 1985: 43ff.; 1993: 45ff.; Riese et al. 2017).

In Hill Mari, the case system is otherwise similar to that of Meadow Mari, but it also includes a caritive ('without') case. The labels for the cases are more or less self-explanatory, except for the lative (discussed later) and the comparative (or modal-comparative or modal) case which often means 'like'. As the present study focuses on only one case and its counterparts in more than dozen other Uralic languages, it is not possible to provide a comprehensive description of the entire case system. However, it is worth noting that except for some dialects, Mari has only two uncontroversial local cases, the inessive ('at; in') and illative ('to'); the meaning 'from' is expressed by postpositions (Meadow Mari *gə̂č́*, Hill Mari *gəc*).

2.2. On the functions of the lative

The Mari lative has an unusually wide range of functions: The case is used in various kinds of predicative and complement functions and also as adverbial modifiers which refer to locations, instruments, purpose, cause and time (duration or *terminus ad quem*). In spite of the label *lative*, the Mari lative suffix seldom functions as a truly directional case marker. To give a rough picture of the diversity of functions in question, the following sentences are a condensed list of translations for ten of Alhoniemi's (1985: 54–56; 1993: 55–56) twenty-six example sentences of the functions of the lative:

The cuckoo nestling grows up *in a foreign nest*.
I have brought wheat *in a small pouch*.
I advise you to take her *as your wife*.
They regard him *as a good friend*, *as a relative*.
Cheap things become *expensive*.
Drink *for your health*.
Everything will be fine *by the morning*.
I'm not staying here *for a long time*.
He got confused *because of the angry words*.
He sold his squirrel skin *at half price*.

Mari – as well as Finnic, Mordvin and Samoyed – equivalents of the above sentences will be scrutinized in Section 3. As regards the "lativeness" of the lative, I repeat my earlier stance on the nature of the Mari lative with respect to cases like the illative of the same branch (see also Ylikoski 2016: 17–18):

> The picture of *s*-cases is further complicated by another case suffix, as the present-day Mari also possesses a case labeled as "lative". Despite its name, the Mari lative suffix *-(e)š* hardly deserves to be characterized as a directional case marker, as none of its multifaceted functions includes concrete movement or transfer in place (or even in the sphere of possession). Rather, the idea of its "directionality" seems to be based on the use of the lative in a variety of syntactic contexts that belong to the secondary grammatical functions of some of the directional cases in other Uralic languages. Such functions include expressions such as *pel ak-eš užal-aš* [half price-LAT sell-INF] 'to sell at ("to") half price' and *sar-eš kol-aš* [war-LAT die-INF] 'to die in ("to") a war' (for more examples, see e.g. Alhoniemi 1993: 55–56). Even though many of these functions may be related to those typical of the primary functions of directional cases (as also suggested by the cross-linguistic data discussed by Rice & Kabata 2007), there are no tenable reasons for regarding the Mari lative as a directional case on this basis only. (Ylikoski 2011: 262, Note 23.)

2.3. On the origins of latives – and translatives

While Alhoniemi (1967) provides the first systematic and, to date, most extensive synchronic description of the Mari lative and its relation to the illative, he does not question the received view on the origins of the two cases. As a matter of fact, his study was conducted in the middle of the age of consensus on such issues among the Finnish Finno-Ugristics: The Finno-Volgaic *s*-lative had been conceived in 1890 (Jännes 1890, Setälä 1890) and later canonized by Szinnyei (1910) and the following generations of linguists. According to Szinnyei (1910: 80), the Mari illative in *-š(ke)* contains the Proto-Finno-Volgaic *s*-lative. Later scholars have explicated that the Mari lative in *-e(š)* is the direct

descendant of the Proto-Finno-Volgaic lative, while the illative in *-ške* is an amalgamation of the *-*s*-lative and a Proto-Uralic or Proto-Finno-Ugric lative in *-*k* (see Itkonen 1966; Alhoniemi 1967: 326ff. and references therein).

As described in more detail in Ylikoski (2016: 28–31 *et passim*), there were occasional nonconformists such as Collinder (1952, 1962) and Tauli (1956), but they were largely ignored by the mainstream scholars. It may be added that Alhoniemi himself has later distanced himself from the certainty of the mainstream lative paradigm (Alhoniemi 1988: 34; 2001: 111–113), but without giving any special attention to the Mari lative in these contexts. That said, it can be stated that the problem of the origins of the Mari lative in particular has not been addressed by others either. For example, the classical view is repeated in Galkin's (1964), Bereczki's (1988, 2002) and Anduganov's (1991) accounts of Mari historical morphology.

However, while many of the basic tenets of the predominant lative paradigm of the past century were crystallized by Szinnyei (1910), there are a number of virtually forgotten but significant exceptions as regards the origins of the Mari lative. As will be discussed in more detail below, it is remarkable that this tradition barely survived in the mainstream Uralistics of the 20th century. One of the forgotten examples includes the following lines in Beke's (1911) historical grammar of Mari:

> Van ezeken kívül a cseremiszben még egy -*š*, -*eš* rag, a mely mind lativusi, mind locativusi jelentéshez használatos. Kétségtelenül az előbbi volt az eredeti, s nem más mint a finn és md. translativusi -*ks (s)*. (Beke 1911: 191)

> 'In addition, in Mari there is also a case in -*š*, -*eš*, which is used in both lative and locative meanings. Undoubtedly, the former function is the original, nothing else than the Finnic and Mordvin translative in -*ks* (-*s*).'

Unfortunately, Beke does not present any examples or references to justify his claim. Neither does he explain the origins of the Finnic and Mordvin translatives. Correspondingly, it appears at first sight that there are no references to either Beke or the Mari lative in any of the many discussions on the origins of the Finnic and Mordvin translatives.

The puzzle of the Finnic and Mordvin translatives – e.g., Finnish -*ks(i)* and Estonian, Erzya and Moksha -*ks* – has received considerable attention ever since Jännes (1890) and Setälä (1890) up to our time (e.g., Ajanki 2014, Salminen 2014). In a nutshell, there are two competing explanations: According to Szinnyei (1910: 77–78), the translatives in -*ks(i)* go back to the latives *-*k* and *-*s*, i.e. the same elements that have been regarded as the building blocks of the Mari illative (*-*s* + *-*k* > -*ške*), but in the opposite order. This mirror-image hypothesis has not been accepted as readily as the hypotheses concerning the so-called *s*-cases: An alternative explanation has been to regard the translative suffix as going back to denominal and deverbal derivations in *-*ksi* (e.g., Hakulinen 1979: 101–102; Saarinen 2001). Related to the latter hypothesis, Janhunen (1989) has suggested that the element has a cognate in the so-called

predestinative declension in Samoyed. While the old lative theory has nevertheless been supported by scholars like Korhonen (1979: 10–11), Riese (1993) and Grünthal (2003: 186), the derivational hypothesis amended with the Samoyed connection has clearly gained support in the most recent studies (Aikio & Ylikoski 2007; 2016; Leisiö 2012, 2014; Lehtinen 2007: 67–68; Ajanki 2014, Salminen 2014).[2]

Despite the increasing number and increasing depth of studies on the Finnic and Mordvin translatives and the Samoyed predestinative, it is remarkable that virtually all studies have focused on only one or two main branches of Uralic. Most importantly, both Ajanki (2014) and Salminen (2014) do subscribe to the relatedness of the *-ksi morphemes (Ajanki: *-kse) in Finnic, Mordvin and Samoyed, but Ajanki concentrates on Finnic (Finnish and Estonian) and Mordvin (Erzya) only, whereas Salminen focuses on Finnic (Finnish) and Samoyed. In describing the predestinative in Nganasan and other Northern Samoyed languages, Leisiö (2012, 2014) makes only brief references to Janhunen's (1989) hypothesis on the common origins of the Samoyed and Finnic morphemes; neither of them mentions Mordvin. Mordvin and Samoyed have thus never been compared with each other directly, and, in spite of the allegedly Proto-Uralic origins of the morphemes in question, no potential cognates have been offered or even considered beyond the three branches and Saami whose directional adverbs in *-ksi have long been a mystery to Saami-Finnic historical morphology (see also Itkonen 1966: 273).

It is against this background that it is possible to turn to the main topic of the present study: the quest for possible cognates of the Finno-Mordvin-Samoyed *-ksi in yet another branch of Uralic or, from a seemingly unrelated point of view, the quest for the possible cognates of the Mari lative in *-(e)š which can no longer be regarded as a descendant of a Proto-Finno-Volgaic lative because of the lack of satisfactory evidence for either the *s-lative or a Finno-Volgaic protolanguage.

3. The origin of the Mari lative re-evaluated: syntactic and semantic observations

This section provides a comprehensive functional approach to the origin of the Mari lative. As a background for the ostensibly new theory of the origin of the Mari lative, Section 3.1 presents a short summary of the Finno-Mordvin-Samoyed suffix *-ksi and its research history. In Section 3.2, the discussion is turned to the Mari lative and,

---

2. Interestingly, the translatives in *-ksi have never been labeled as "s-cases" even by those who have supported the hypothesis that the translative marker contains the *s-lative just like the rest of the Finno-Volgaic s-cases.

In addition to the functional and typological critique of the Uralistic tradition of explaining case markers by amalgamating hypothetical lative and other case markers one after another (Ylikoski 2016: 31–41), it is worth noting that Salminen (2014: 294) dismisses the lative theory on the origin of *-ksi simply by referring to the fact that when a one-consonant suffix is attached to a stem ending in another consonant, epenthetical vowels occur between the two consonants, not after them. This observation certainly applies to the Mari illative in -ške as well.

most importantly, to the first but later forgotten tradition of explaining its origins. Drawing the two threads back together, Section 3.3 argues for the possibility and need to reassess the origin of the Mari lative by way of function-based comparison of the Mari lative and its syntactic and semantic counterparts in Finnic, Mordvin and Samoyed. This is done in Section 3.4, in which it is seen that many temporal, purposive, causative and other functions of the Mari lative are analogous to the use of the Finnic and Mordvin translatives in particular. Finally, Section 3.5 is an attempt to break into the core of the original functions shared by not only the Mari lative and the Finnic and Mordvin translatives, but also by the North Samoyed predestinative declensions, terminological and typological differences notwithstanding.

   The present study intentionally regards and treats the Mari lative and other possible descendants of the posited Proto-Uralic suffix *-ksi* as morphemes that have little to do with true local cases. For this reason, the spatial functions of the Mari lative have been left outside the main focus of this study. This study in no way underrates Alhoniemi's (1967) comprehensive description of the complex interrelations of the lative in *-(e)š* and the illative in *-š(ke)*, but at the same time the present discussion offers a deliberately revisionist perspective to the complex problem that has been misleadingly presented as solved – to the extent that contemporary scholars and students of historical Uralistics are barely aware of the existence of the forgotten but invaluable contributions by scholars of the 19th century. As for the translative cases in Finnic and Mordvin – not to mention the predestinative in Northern Samoyed – there are virtually no reasons to describe these categories in relation to local cases. The only translative that has quite often been labeled as a kind of local case is that of Finnish, but this is mostly due to outdated views on the origins of the case marker.[3] In line with Haspelmath (2009: 512–517) and Hynönen (2016: 35; 2017), in this study all translatives are regarded as belonging to so-called abstract (or grammatical) cases instead of concrete (or semantic) cases to which local (or spatial) cases belong.

3.1. Finno-Mordvin-Samoyed *-ksi*: two alternative theories

Before turning back to the Mari lative and the largely forgotten ideas about its relationship with the Finnic and Mordvin translatives, a few words are in order about the research history of the latter cases.

   A significant part of our current understanding of Finnish, Finnic and western Uralic (Saami-Finnic, Finno-Mordvin, Saami-Finnic-Mordvin, and Finno-Volgaic [= Saami-

---

3.   In the Finnish grammatical tradition, the translative in *-ksi* along with the essive in *-nA* has been given a peculiar label "general local case" as an attempt to make them look somewhat symmetrical to the so-called internal (*s-*)cases and external (*l-*)cases. However, neither of the two "general local cases" are prototypically used to express location, but the reasons to such labels lie in the commonly accepted idea of the Proto-Uralic locative origins of the essive as well as in certain supposedly translative adverbs such as *tännemmäksi* 'closer towards here' and *kauemmaksi* 'further away (to)' (cf. the stative essives *tännempänä* and *kauemmaksi*). On the early history of the description of Finnish local cases, see Stipa (1990: 271–275); for more contemporary approaches, see Grünthal (2003: 126) and Huumo & Ojutkangas (2006: 12ff.).

Finnic-Mordvin-Mari]) historical phonology and morphology is largely based on Eemil Nestor Setälä's (1890) groundbreaking treatise on Finnic historical phonology (see, e.g., Ylikoski 2016: 24ff.). As regards the translatives, Setälä (1890: 167ff.) directs his attention to the similarity of Finnic and Saami local (directional) adverbs such as Finnish *alas* 'downward' ~ North Saami *vuolás* id., Finnish *ylös* 'upward' ~ North Saami *alás* 'upward (in terrain)' as well as Finnish *ulos* 'to the outside' ~ North Saami *olggos*. However, given the phonological, morphological and semantic complexity of this issue (see, e.g., Itkonen 1966), it is actually quite surprising that Setälä does not relate the Finnic translative case to the similarly productive, formally and functionally very similar case in Mordvin. In our days it is customary to refer to Szinnyei (1910: 77–78), who was apparently the first to explain both the Finnic and the Mordvin translative suffixes as sharing the common origin in the latives in *-k* and *-s* (see, e.g., Riese 1993: 5; Ajanki 2014: 257), but the two translatives had actually been related to each other at least half a century earlier by Boller (1854: 41–44) as well as by Ahlquist (1861: 20) and Wiedemann (1865: 41) in their grammars of Moksha and Erzya, respectively. What is more, these observations were repeated and further developed by Donner (1879) in his pioneering attempt to reconstruct the Finno-Ugric protolanguage; I will return to this below.

While the Mordvin translative was not discussed by Setälä (1890), the Finnic and Mordvin translatives were at the same time equated by Arvi Jännes (Arvid Genetz) who published his monograph on the so-called particles in Finnish (Jännes 1890) as a professorial thesis in competition for the professorship of the Finnish language and literature at the University of Helsinki with Setälä (Setälä 1890). Ajanki's (2014: 257–259) reference to Jännes (1890: 311) seems to suggest that Jännes was the first scholar to confidently propose a derivational theory for the origin of the translative. In this view, translative forms such as Finnish *aida-ksi* [fence-TRA] for *aita* 'fence' can be related to denominal derivations such as *aidas* [material.for.fence] : *aidakse-n* [material.for.fence-GEN], and this example has been repeated ever since. However, this view – and this example – was presented and supported already by Ahlqvist (1877: 58–59, 109) who in turn ascribed this observation to his unnamed predecessors (see also Donner 1879: 491).

As described in more detail by Ajanki (2014: 257ff.), the two theories dubbed the *lative theory* and the *derivation theory* have been competing for popularity for more than a century. The lative theory traditionally also embraces Saami with its directional adverbs, no matter how many phonological and semantic problems they may pose. On the other hand, the derivation theory focuses only on the non-local translatives in Finnic and Mordvin. However, this has gradually given way to new horizons in mapping the prehistoric landscape of the Finnic and Mordvin translatives. Saarinen (2001) presents a concise account of not only Finnic and Mordvin but also Saami, Mari and Permic denominal and deverbal derivations, and against this background it is understandable that an increasing number of scholars nowadays accept Janhunen's (1989) hypothesis about the common origins of the Finnic translative and the so-called predestinative declension in Samoyed. For example, Leisiö (2012; 2014), Ajanki (2014) and Salminen (2014) all have pointed out the functional similarity of these two geographically and phonologically distant categories in the three branches

of Uralic. However, as Ajanki (2014) concentrates on Finnic and Mordvin, and Leisiö (2012; 2014) and Salminen (2014) compare the Samoyed predestinative to Finnic only, Mordvin and Samoyed have been compared with each other only indirectly.

When comparing the Finnic translative with that of Mordvin, Ajanki's (2014) starting point is syntactic. On the other hand, Salminen (2014) compares the Finnish translative with the Samoyed (mostly Nenets) predestinatives largely from morphological and semantic perspectives. It must be noted that the Samoyed predestinative quite evidently shares areal-typological features with the so-called designative case in Tungusic (Leisiö 2012: 210; Siegl 2013: 402–403; Salminen 2014: 290) and, regardless of which of the competing taxonomies of the Uralic language one favors, Finnic, Mordvin and other westernmost branches of Uralic are certainly closer to each other than to Samoyed almost without exception – on all levels of linguistic description. The distance between the translatives in the west and predestinatives in the east is also reflected in the history of comparative Uralistics. It would be anachronistic to expect that these categories ought to have been related to each other already by the first scholars of Finnic and Mordvin, to many of whom (even long after Donner 1881) Samoyed was a remote and unknown group of languages and only faintly relevant for Finno-Ugric studies (cf. Ylikoski 2016: 62–63).

What is more, regardless of the historical and areal relations between the Samoyed predestinative and similar phenomena in other languages of western and central Siberia, there is actually a complete lack of consensus on how the predestinative category – or the predestinative categories of the five so-called Northern Samoyed languages (Tundra and Forest Nenets, Tundra and Forest Enets as well as Nganasan) – ought to be understood. To begin with, the phenomenon has been labeled as a *predestinative*, *destinative*, *desiderative* and *benefactive (declension)*, often characterized a special subtype of declension in which only three cases – the nominative, genitive and accusative – are possible. On the other hand, Nikolaeva (2009) and Leisiö (2012, 2014) have approached the phenomenon as a *nominal (future) tense*, whereas others – ever since M. A. Castrén (Castrén n.d.; Siegl 2013: 388, 397–398) – have regarded predestinatives as one or more cases, and Siegl (2013: 401) has also suggested that it could be characterized as a kind of *applicative on noun phrases*; Siegl characterizes the Forest Enets predestinative (benefactive) as expressing the "benefit *X for Y* or *having X at Y's disposal*" (*op.cit.* 381). Accordingly, almost every aspect in the use of this category has been subjected to alternative analyses (see also, e.g., Khanina & Shluinsky 2014; Nikolaeva 2014).

For the purposes of the present paper, my aim is not to contribute to the synchronic analyses of the predestinatives or the debate that has been reviewed most extensively by Siegl (2013: 378–403). Without taking a stance on the superiority of any of the labels used for the Samoyed phenomenon, I have chosen to use the most common term *predestinative (declension)*. I will only focus on the functional equivalence of Samoyed predestinatives and their possible cognates in Finnic, Mordvin and Mari. For this reason, the theoretical description and discussion – consisting of data not only from Finnic, Mordvin and Samoyed but also from Mari – is deliberately kept somewhat shallow: While it may be possible to label certain functions of the Finnic

and Mordvin translatives as various kinds of secondary predicates or "functives" (Creissels 2014), for example, it is less obvious whether the same labels automatically apply to Samoyed predestinatives, no matter how identical the propositional meanings of the sentences in question may appear (for various kinds of conceptual approaches to the phenomena in question, see, e.g., Ajanki 2014, Creissels 2014, Leisiö 2014 and de Groot 2017). The main purpose of the following sections is to provide a general picture of the common functions of the grammatical means under discussion.

3.2. The Mari lative and its origins: prehistory of research

As regards the alternative explanation for the origins of the Mari lative, it was seen in Section 2 that in his historical grammar of Mari, Beke (1911: 191) somewhat bluntly states that the Mari lative in *-(e)š* is, without doubt, nothing else than a cognate of the Finnic and Mordvin translatives. Beke vaguely refers to directional ("lative") functions of these cases, but does not provide any phonological, morphological, syntactic or semantic arguments in support of his view.

It seems that Beke's comment has gone almost entirely unnoticed in all subsequent studies on Mari and its historical morphology. It appears that his remark has been mentioned only by Lewy (1922: 120) briefly in his historical grammar of Mari and more explicitly by Wiklund (1927: 322) in his paper on the origins of the translative markers in Finnic and Mordvin. After mentioning Lewy's (1922: 132–134) short-lived hypothesis of the Mari lative as a shortened variant of the illative in *-ške*, Wiklund regards this as unlikely and supports Beke instead, and also refers to Beke's (1911: 110) observations on the regular change *-kš* > *-š* in the language.

As discussed in more detail in Ylikoski (2016: 29ff.), Wiklund's (1927) paper was one of his reactionary responses to the Finnish historical linguistics steered by Eemil Nestor Setälä at the beginning of the 20th century. It appears that the fate of Wiklund's remarks on the Finnic and Mordvin translatives and their relation to the Mari lative was similar to much of his legacy: They were largely dismissed by Finnish linguists who remained the leading authorities on the historical morphology of the westernmost branches of Uralic.

To the best of my knowledge, there are no references whatsoever to Beke's (1911) and Wiklund's (1927) views on the common origins of the Finno-Mordvin translative and the Mari lative in any of the literature on these issues discussed after Wiklund (1927). To shortly anticipate the discussion on the phonological aspects of the "translative" origins of the Mari lative (Section 4), it may be remarked that the development *-ks(i)* >> *-š* is indeed quite unproblematic, as evidenced by the commonly accepted view that Mari derivatives such as *jolaš* 'pants' (← *jol* 'foot; leg') are etymologically akin to those like Finnish *jalas* : *jalakse-* 'skid, runner (of a sled)' (← *jalka* 'foot; leg').

While the dismissal of the above-mentioned dissidents may be surprising but understandable at the same time, it is even more surprising and far less understandable to observe that Beke's (1911) and Wiklund's (1927) views are not rare quirks on only two ignored pages in the long history of Uralic historical morphology. On the contrary, it is rather easy to delve into the "prehistory" of Uralic historical morphology and observe

that even though the mainstream historical Uralistics of the 20th and early 21st century has confidently relied on the received wisdom based on the so-called lative paradigm as founded mainly by Setälä (1890) and Szinnyei (1910) and further elaborated by their followers, this era was preceded by many open-minded scholars whose observations have been unduly forgotten. It goes without saying that the written records of the 19th century Uralistics do not belong to the prehistory in the proper sense of the word, but it appears that to most scholars of our time the pioneering work that predates Setälä (1890), for example, has ceased to exist as a part of research history that is considered worth knowing or understanding (cf. Itkonen 2004: 319; Häkkinen 2010).

It has already been mentioned above that the formal and functional similarity of the Finnic and Mordvin translatives was quite obvious to the first Finnic grammarians of Moksha (Ahlquist 1861: 20) and Erzya (Wiedemann 1865: 41). However, it is noteworthy that already in 1847, at the age of only little trustworthy comparative studies on the Uralic historical grammar, Wiedemann had published his grammar of Mari in which he describes the main functions of the lative as follows:

> -*sch* bildet 1) einen Prädicativ- oder Factivcasus, wie ihn auch andere finnische Sprachen haben, und steht als solcher a) bei den Verben „urtheilen, meinen, zeigen als, werden zu, machen zu, verändern in, halten für etwas" u. dgl. [...]; b) bei allerlei Sätzen, welche irgend ein Thun ausdrücken, zur Angabe des Zweckes oder der Absicht dabei, [...] (Wiedemann 1847: 31)

In addition to 1) the two "predicative" or "factive" case functions described above, as the Finnic (Finnish and Estonian) translatives were characterized at that time, Wiedemann (1847) describes the Mari lative as also used in 2) the "locative" functions (as shortly described in Section 2 above) as well as in occasional expressions of 3) time and, quite specifically, 4) price, as mentioned in Section 2 above.

At the end of the synchronic description of functions of the lative, Wiedemann adds the following comment on the origins of the case marker. Before him, the only scholar to discuss Mari cases from a diachronic perspective had been Castrén (1845: 11) who had barely managed to distinguish the lative in -*(e)š* from the illative in -*š(ke)* from each other:

> Castrén wirft dieses Suffix mit -*schka* zusammen, und meint daß dieses daraus entstanden sei als Verlängerung vermittelst des auch bei der Adverbbildung vorkommenden Afformativs -*ka*. Ich kann freilich nicht beweisen, daß -*schka* nicht auf diese Weise entstand, sehen wir aber auf den gegenwärtigen Bestand der Sache, so muß man, glaube ich, durchaus beide Suffixe trennen. In der unter (1) aufgeführten Bedeutung möchte schwerlich *sch* mit *schka* vertauscht werden können, vielmehr ist es, auch in der Form sich nähernd, das finnische Factivsuffix -*ksi*, esthnisch -*ks*, zum Theil auch -*s*; und daß in einigen Verbindungen -*sch* und -*schka* gleichbedeutend siehen können, beweist noch nicht ihre Identität, denn das Gleiche findet sich auch bei andern Casussuffixen; auf die Frage „wann" stehn z. B. -*n*, -*m*, -*schta*, -*esch* (vgl. die betreffenden Paragraphen. (Wiedemann 1847: 32–33)

Incidentally, the first – and possibly only – scholar to refer to Wiedemann's view on the origins of these cases was Anton Boller (1854: 41–42), an Austrian outsider as regards Uralic linguistics. Not only does Boller in his 80-page paper "Die Declination in den finnischen Sprachen" support Wiedemann's view and even call also the Mari case *translative* instead of *lative*, but he emphasizes that phonologically, *š* (Boller's ‹ś›) can be regarded as a reduced variant of -*ks*, and its functions are similar to the translative in the west. What is more, it appears the Boller may have been the very first scholar to acknowledge the similarity of the Finnic translative and that of Mordvin, to the extent that he takes it for granted – long before the latter was duly described by Ahlquist (1861: 20) and Wiedemann (1865: 41). After briefly arguing for the obvious affinity between the Finnic and Mordvin translatives and their namesake in Mari, he passes the Mordvin translative – on a par with the nominative and the genitive – as one of the self-explanatory cases of the branch (*op.cit.* 44).

Considering the somewhat shaky foundations of the first works in Uralic historical morphology, it might be to some degree understandable that the early conjectures by Wiedemann (1847) and Boller (1854) have not gained attention in later studies, but it is worth noticing that Wiedemann's view was also repeated in Budenz's (1864: 453) early treatise on Mari. However, the most remarkable fact is that these views were also repeated in one of the most comprehensive seminal works in historical Uralistics, Donner's "Die gegenseitige Verwandtschaft der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen" (Donner 1879: 491–492):

> Im čeremissischen bildet *š* den factiv. In bezug auf die bedeutung ist diese überhaupt wenig modificirt, indem die endung *ks, s* im finnischen, estnischen, mordvinischen und čeremissischen als faktiv, im livischen als faktiv und instrumentalis, im lappischen als allativ auftritt. [...]
>
> Wir können daher wenigstens die folgenden suffixe des translativs oder factivs mit einander verbinden.

Finnisch	*kse, ksi, s.*
Votisch	*ksi, hsi.*
Vepsisch	*ks.*
Estnisch	*ks.*
Livisch	*ks.*
N. Lapp.	*ssi, s.*
Schwed. Lapp.	*s.*
Enare Lapp.	*s.*
M. Mordv.	*ks.*
Ersa Mord.	*ks.*
Ceremissisch	*š.*

Again, it must be stated that Donner does not explicitly refer to his predecessors' (Wiedemann 1847; Boller 1854; Budenz 1864) views either, but neither has he himself been credited by scholars like Beke (1911) and Wiklund (1927) as generally the most

remarkable linguist who had no doubts in regarding the Mari lative (or factive, in his own terms) as a cognate of the Finnic and Mordvin translatives as well as the Saami adverbs often considered in this context. On the other hand, Donner does refer to Wiedemann (1847) and his data and acknowledges that the mutual relations between the Mari lative, illative and even inessive are not as straightforward as one could hope for (Donner 1879: 488–489). Further, Donner (*op.cit.* 491) cautiously entertains the possibility of adding the Permic terminatives (Komi -*ęś*, Udmurt -*oź*) to the same group; for later views on the origin of these cases, see Ylikoski (2011: 267) and references therein.

Finally, it may be noted that the above list of scholars – ranging from Wiedemann (1847) to Wiklund (1927) – who have considered the Mari lative a cognate of the Finnic and Mordvin translatives is not exhaustive: At least Müller (1882: 206) supports the same view. As both the supporters and detractors of this long-forgotten view have mostly acted on their own instead of referring to their predecessors or contemporaries with similar interests, it is unclear as to who else may have been of the same opinion. While it seems safe to say that the views of Wiedemann (1847), Budenz (1864) and Donner (1879) cannot possibly have gone unnoticed by their immediate followers like Setälä, Jännes, Szinnyei, Beke and Wiklund, one can never be sure whether later scholars such as Erkki Itkonen, Paavo Ravila, Lauri Hakulinen, Mikko Korhonen, Gábor Bereczki, Ivan Galkin and Alho Alhoniemi, to mention but some of the most eminent experts in western Uralic historical grammar, have consciously rejected or only unintentionally neglected the proposed connection, to the extent that I have not been able to detect any references to the above-mentioned hypotheses after Wiklund (1927) nearly a century ago.[4] Be that as it may, it appears that this hypothesis merits a more dedicated investigation, and even preliminary observations leave one wondering why the hypothesis has been fully abandoned in favor of an allegedly Proto-Finno-Volgaic *ex nihilo* "lative" case that has supposedly acquired a number of translative-like functions, the development of which has apparently never been explained.

3.3. The Mari lative in light of the Mordvin and Finnic translatives and the Northern Samoyed predestinative: preamble

The translative cases in the two Mordvin languages and in about a dozen Finnic languages are quite abstract in meaning, and, as a consequence, the translative cases in individual languages have many more or less specialized functions that still await detailed study. It seems that Voutilainen's (2011) master's thesis on the Finnish translative is the only truly comprehensive and empirical description of these cases, and in

---

4.   By careful reading it is possible to observe a rare exception in Häkkinen's (1985: 82 [2002: 79]) textbook of Finnish historical grammar in which the author briefly discusses the Finnic and Mordvin translatives and their proposed cognates in Saami, and then goes on to state that the translative has not been shown to have cognates in Permic, Ugric or Samoyed. Curiously, Mari is not mentioned either way.

the absence of comparable data from Mordvin, for example, all comparisons between Finnic and Mordvin translatives remain partly impressionistic. On the other hand, it is definitely possible to distinguish certain major features that are shared by all languages, and it is precisely these major functions that have traditionally formed the basis of the comparison of the translatives within and across the two branches. As mentioned above, there have been occasional attempts to relate Finnic and Mordvin translatives to other branches such as Saami and Permic, but the proposed cognates are both formally and functionally quite distinct from the translatives, and they therefore fall outside the main focus of the present study.

However, as it was mentioned in Section 3.1 above, it has been only quite recently that the so-called predestinative declension in the Northern Samoyed languages has been related to the Finnic translative. The morphological, syntactic and semantic nature of the predestinative (Proto-Samoyed *-*tâ*) is in many ways quite distinct from the translative (Finno-Mordvin *-*ksi*) and it is therefore no wonder that the first attempt to bridge the translatives in the west and the predestinatives in the east was presented less than thirty years ago (Janhunen 1989). Only some functions of the predestinatives have easily lent themselves to comparison with the translatives, and it must be acknowledged that while most of the examples presented come from Tundra Nenets (Salminen 2014) and Nganasan (Leisiö 2012, 2014) and reliable data is also available for Forest Enets (Siegl 2013), Forest Nenets and Tundra Enets are still little known also in this respect.

Understandably enough, comparisons between the Finnic and Mordvin translatives as well as those between the Finnic (Finnish) translative and the Samoyed predestinative have centered on similarities and disregarded obvious incongruities as less relevant and due to later developments in the individual languages. In a nutshell, the common core of all comparisons contains the notion of purpose or purposiveness and, related to this, a feature of transformation to a new role or function (to serve the given purpose). Further, these properties have long suggested that the inflectional categories of the translatives and the predestinative can also be related to certain derivational suffixes with comparable forms and functions (see Section 4 for further discussion).

As mentioned above, the Mordvin translative and the Samoyed predestinative have not been directly compared with each other. Although this will be done shortly below, the main objective of the present study is to extend the discussion to Mari by re-evaluating the long-forgotten hypothesis concerning the common origins of the Mari lative and the Finno-Mordvin translative. However, the hypothesis can be tested for Samoyed at the same time. Indeed, it will be seen that many of the Finno-Mordvin comparisons can be extended to both Mari and Samoyed, just like the Finno-Samoyed comparisons gain further support from not only Mordvin but Mari as well.

Alhoniemi's (1967) dissertation on the functions and mutual relations of the Mari lative and illative is the most extensive synchronic description of the Mari lative ever presented. It is remarkable that although his references include Wiedemann (1847), Budenz (1864) and Beke (1911), it appears that he does not say a word about

the early attempts to relate the lative to the Finnic and Mordvin translatives. However, Alhoniemi's synchronic description of the use of the Mari lative and illative in authentic texts representing traditional language use in the 19th and 20th centuries is able to serve as a solid basis for the following attempt to test a hypothesis that starkly differs from the received view, the so-called lative theory supported by Alhoniemi and almost all Finnish Finno-Ugricists of the 20th century (but see Häkkinen 1983: 74; 1984: 9; 2002: 80; Ylikoski 2016: 31–33).

On the other hand, Alhoniemi's (1967) 375-page monograph on the two cases is unnecessarily intricate for the present purpose *per se*. Instead, the concrete basis of the following comparison is Alhoniemi's (1985/1993) two-page condensation of his view of the Mari lative in his concise grammar of the language, generally considered the best of its kind. Since the publication of Alhoniemi (1985/1993), the most notable additions to this topic are Savatkova's (2002) grammar of Hill Mari and Kuznecova's (2008) brief account on the local case system in Mari, but they have little to add to Alhoniemi's (1967; 1985/1993) observations.

To turn to the functions of the Mari lative, Alhoniemi divides these into ten categories. For the purposes of the present paper, these can be classified into three groups: 1) functions that have given the case its label "lative" because of their similarity to some of the directional ("lative") cases in other Uralic languages, 2) functions that are most relevant and could even be labeled "translative" when compared to the translatives in Finnic and Mordvin, and 3) diverse other functions that do not lend themselves to generalizations as a whole and cannot be easily regarded as belonging to the "lative" or "translative" functions of the case. The latter group includes instances in which the lative-marked noun expresses an instrument that is somehow related to an action in motion (1), or is the price of a transaction (also possibly understood as an instrument) (2) or a temporal adverbial modifier referring to a period of time during which something happens (3):[5]

Meadow Mari

(1) *Пеленем   шыдаҥым   изи   **мешак-еш**   конденам.*
     *Pelenem   šə̂daŋə̂m   izi   **tešak-eš**   kondenam.*
     along.1SG   wheat.ACC   small   bag-LAT   bring.PST2.1SG

     'I have brought wheat in a small pouch with me.'
     (Alhoniemi 1985: 55; 1993: 55)

(2) *Ур   коваштыжым=ат   тудо   Павыллан   пел   **ак-еш**   ужален.*
     *Ur   koβaštə̂žə̂m=at   tudo   Paβə̂llan   pel   **ak-eš**   užalen.*
     squirrel   skin.3SG.ACC=DPT   3SG   Paβə̂l.DAT   half   price-LAT   sell.PST2.3SG

     'He sold even his squirrel skin to Paβə̂l at half price.'
     (Alhoniemi 1985: 56; 1993: 56)

---

5.   Almost all examples have been harmonized by transforming earlier scholarly transcriptions to the present-day standard orthographies as well as by transforming certain scholarly transcriptions to meet the current standards.

(3) **Кеч-еш** ик олмам коч!
     Keč-eš ik olmam koč!
     day-LAT one apple.ACC eat.IMP.2SG

'Eat an apple a day!' (Alhoniemi 1985: 56; 1993: 56)

As for the first and foremost function of the lative in Alhoniemi's view, the case is used as a "directional local adverbial" that accompanies a verb expressing "emerging" or "external or internal change of state". To understand what is meant by this, it is worth repeating all his four examples with the Finnish and German translations:

(4) Meadow Mari

(a) *Куку* *иге* *еҥ* **пыжаш-еш** *кушкеш.*
     Kuku *ige* *jeŋ* **pəžaš-eš** *kuškeš.*
     cuckoo young foreign nest-LAT grow.3SG

Finnish

(b) *Käenpoika* *kasvaa* *vieraassa* *pesässä.*
     cuckoo.young grow.3SG foreign.INE nest.INE

German

(c) *Das Kuckucksjunge wächst im fremden Nest (eig. ins fremde Nest).*

'The cuckoo nestling grows up in a foreign nest.'
(Alhoniemi 1985: 54–55; 1993: 55)

(5) Meadow Mari

(a) *Пычалым* *кучен,* **сар-еш** *колена.*
     Pəčaləm *kučen,* **sar-eš** *kolena.*
     gun.ACC hold.CVB war-LAT die.1PL

Finnish

(b) *Aseeseen tarttuen kuolemme sodassa.*
     gun.ILL grasp.CVB die.1PL war.INE

German

(c) *Zur Waffe greifend sterben wir im Krieg (eig. in den Krieg).*

'Grasping our guns, we die in war.' (Alhoniemi 1985: 55; 1993: 55)

(6) Hill Mari

(a) *Тӹдӹ* *картым* **стенä-эш** *пышкылеш.*
     Tədə *kartəm* **stenä-eš** *pəškəleš.*
     3SG map.ACC wall-LAT pin.3SG

Finnish

(b) *Hän   kiinnittää   kartan   seinään.*
     3SG   attach.3SG   map.GEN   wall.ILL

German

(c) *Er befestigt die Karte an der Wand.*

     'He attaches the map on the wall.' (Alhoniemi 1985: 55; 1993: 55)

(7) Hill Mari

(a) *Тӹдӹн   **кӹшäн-влä-эш**   кок   пистолетӹм   мот.*
     *Tədən   **kəšän-βlä-eš**   kok   pistoľetəm   mot.*
     3SG.GEN pocket-PL-LAT   two   handgun.ACC find.3PL

Finnish

(b) *He   löytävät   hänen   taskuistaan   kaksi   pistoolia.*
     3PL   find.3PL   3SG.GEN   pocket.PL.ELA.3SG two   handgun.PART

German

(c) *Sie finden in seinen Taschen zwei Pistolen.*

     'They find two pistols in his pockets.' (Alhoniemi 1985: 55; 1993: 55)

As argued by Ylikoski (2011: 262; 2016: 16–18), it appears that the idea of the "directionality" of the Mari lative case is mostly based on the fact that the "directional" use of the case corresponds to some of the secondary grammatical functions of truly, and primarily, directional cases in other Uralic languages. The lative nouns in (4a–7a) are governed by verbs denoting 'growing', 'dying', 'attaching' and 'finding', all of which are verbs expressing "emerging" or "external or internal change of state" in Alhoniemi's terms.

  As seen in the Finnish translations, it is possible to translate the Mari lative with static local cases like the inessive (4b and 5b), directional cases like the illative (6b) and separative cases like the elative (7b). It is true that the illative would also be to some extent possible in (4b) (*vieraaseen pesään*) and (5b) (*sotaan*). Perhaps for this reason, the German translations (4c) and (5c) include specifications according to which the examples "literally" refer to "growing (in)to the foreign nest" (*ins fremde Nest*) and "dying (in)to the war" (*in den Krieg*). However, such specifications are highly misleading as the author does not actually present any evidence according to which the lative ought to be interpreted as being truly a directional case. Instead, one of the main points in Alhoniemi's (1967) dissertation is the very fact that in Mari, the illative case is a true directional case while the lative case is used in functions that are "directional" mainly in the sense that many other Uralic languages employ their otherwise undisputed directional cases in the same functions – unlike the neighboring Indo-European languages, as partly seen in the German and English translations above.

  It must nevertheless be acknowledged that there are contexts such as complements of the verbs *šinćaš* 'sit down' and *pəštaš* 'put' in which both the lative and

illative are allowed: Expressions like *divaneš šinč́aš* [couch.LAT sit.down.INF] 'sit down on the couch' and *divanə̂š(ke) šinč́aš* [couch.ILL sit.down.INF] id. as well as *mešakeš pə̂štaš* [sack.LAT put.INF] 'put in a sack' and *mešakə̂š(ke) pə̂štaš* [sack.ILL put.INF] id. or *pə̂rdə̂žeš sakaš* [wall.LAT hang.up.INF] 'hang (something) on the wall' and *pə̂rdə̂žə̂š(ke) sakaš* [wall.ILL hang.up.INF] id. apparently do not differ in meaning (Ylikoski 2016: 18; Riese et al. 2017: 121). However, it is notable that such borderline examples have not acquired a significant role in the descriptions of Mari lative as an allegedly directional local case of any kind. In this connection it is also good to note that while western grammatical traditions of Mari have labeled this puzzling case as a "lative" which commonly refers to directional cases just like "illative", Russian grammatical traditions call only the illative a directional case (*направительный падеж*), whilst the lative case has gotten a much more ambiguous yet unbiased label as an "adverbial" case (*обстоятельственный падеж*).

3.4. On the functions and functional equivalents of the Mari lative

After a lengthy introduction to the very core of the present study, the following pages present a revised view of those functions of the Mari lative that can be related to not only the Finnic translative as suggested already by Wiedemann (1847) but also to the Mordvin translative (Boller 1854, Donner 1879) and, as an ultimate consequence of recent advances in Samoyedology (Janhunen 1989), to the Northern Samoyed predestinative as well.

In addition to the functions mentioned in the preceding section, Alhoniemi distinguishes the following five types of latives: 1) so-called predicative adverbials, 2) purposive adverbial modifiers, 3) temporal-purposive adverbial modifiers, 4) futuritive adverbial of duration and 5) causal adverbial modifiers. As described in detail by Hynönen (2016: 30–41 *et passim*), the label "predicative adverbial" is a Finnish (and Finno-Ugricist) wastebasket category that comprises various phenomena commonly known as secondary predicates (depictives, resultatives and circumstantials), (primary) nominal predicates and predicate complements (subject and object complements). The label can be understood as a combination of various predicative functions that are morphosyntactically "adverbial" in the sense of being marked with "adverbial" cases other than those used for canonical subjects and objects (nominatives, accusatives and partitives). As for the lative-marked "predicative adverbials" in Mari, Example (8a) with its Finnish translation (8b) is a case in point; both the Mari lative and the Finnish translative mark the nouns for 'wife' as predicative complements for 'take':

(8)   Hill Mari

(a)   *Мӹнь   тäländä   пишок   тӹдӹм   **вät-еш-дä**   кандаш   советаем.*
      *Məń   täländä   pišok   tədəm   **βät-eš-tä**   kandaš   soβetajem.*
      1SG   2PL.DAT   very   3SG.ACC   wife-LAT-2PL   lead.INF   advise.1SG

Finnish

(b) *Minä neuvon   Teitä   kovasti   ottamaan   hänet   **vaimo-kse-nne**.*
1SG   advise.1SG 2POL.PART strongly   take.INF   3SG.ACC wife-TRA-2PL

'I strongly advise you to take her as your wife.'
(Alhoniemi 1985: 55; 1993: 55)

While the Mari lative has apparently not been regarded as a cognate of the Finnish translative since Wiklund (1927), a growing body of Uralicists respond favorably to Janhunen's (1989) hypothesis on the common origin of the Finnic translative and the Northern Samoyed predestinative as seen in (9a) with a Finnish translation (9b):

(9)   Tundra Nenets

(a) *тюку   вэсако'   не   нюм'   **не-дӑ-н-да**   мэда*
*tyuku° wæsakoh   nye   nyúm   **nye-d°-n-ta**   me°da*
this   old.man.GEN woman   child   woman-PREDEST-GEN-3SG take.3SG>SG

Finnish

(b) *Hän   otti   tämän   ukon   tyttären   **vaimo-kse-nsa**.*
3SG   take.PST.3SG this.GEN   old.man.GEN daughter.GEN wife-TRA-3SG

'He took that old man's daughter as a wife for him.'
(Tereščenko 1965: 291; Aikio & Ylikoski 2016: 138)

Although the predestinative has not been compared directly with the translative in Mordvin, both Erzya and Moksha abound with analogous translatives such as Erzya *koźejkaks* in (10):

Erzya

(10) *Сон   саизе   **козейка-кс**   эстензэ.*
*Son   sajiźe   **koźejka-ks**   eśťenze.*
3SG   take.PST.3SG>3SG wife-TRA   REFL.DAT.3SG

'He took her as his wife.' (MW s.v. *sajems*)

I will shortly return to various "predicative adverbials" below, after the following examples of other translative-like functions of the Mari lative.

Another main function of the Mari lative that corresponds to the Finnic translatives even in Alhoniemi's (1985) translations is that of expressing purpose:

(11) Meadow Mari

(a) ***Тазалык-еш-ет**   йӱ(ы)н   колто!*
***Tazalǝk-eš-et**   jü(ǝ)n   kolto!*
health-LAT-2SG   drink.CVB   send.IMP.2SG

Finnish

(b) *Juo*   ***terveyde-kse-si****!*
    drink.IMP.2SG   health-TRA-2SG

    'Drink for your health (= cheers)!' (Alhoniemi 1985: 55; 1993: 55)

(12) Hill Mari

(a) *Äви,*   ***корн-еш***   *киндет*   *изиш*   *уке*   *вӓл?*
    Äβi,   ***korn-eš***   *kindet*   *iziš*   *uke*   *βäl?*
    mom   road-LAT   bread.2SG   little.bit   NEG-EX   Q

Finnish

(b) *Äitiseni,*   *ei=kö*   *sinulla*   *ole=kin*   *vähän* *leipää*
    mother.DIM.1SG   NEG.3SG=Q   2SG.ADE   be.CNG=DPT   little   bread.PART
    matkaa   *varten (~ **matka-ksi**)?*
    journey.PART for   journey-TRA

    'Mom, I guess you have some bread for the journey?'
    (Alhoniemi 1985: 55; 1993: 55)

It is true, as pointed out by Alhoniemi (1967: 303–307; 1985: 52, 55; 1993: 53, 55), that the purposive function of the lative is more prevalent in Hill (Western) Mari, whereas Meadow (Eastern) Mari tends to favor the dative in -*lan* instead, and many of the purposive latives of Meadow Mari (11a) may be perceived as somewhat lexicalized. As seen above, the Finnic translative is also commonly used as a purposive (see also Voutilainen 2011: 59–62), and, although purposives do not constitute an equally salient function in Mordvin, (13) is one of Ajanki's (2014: 274) examples that fits the above picture quite well:

Erzya

(13) *Часошкань*   *ютазь,*   ***теле-кс***   *лембестэ*   *оршнезь, [– –]*
    Časoškań   *jutaź,*   ***ťeľe-ks***   *ľembeste*   *oršńeź, [– –]*
    moment.COMP.GEN   pass.PST.PTCP   winter-TRA   warm.ELA   dress.PST.PTCP

    'After a while, warmly dressed for the winter, [– –]' (Ajanki 2014: 274)

Alhoniemi's (1967: 303–307) description of the so-called purposive latives also included another type of modifiers that he has later separated from purposives proper. According to Alhoniemi (1985: 55; 1993: 56), the lative as a so-called temporal-purposive adverbial modifier expresses the latest possible date of a state of affairs or the time for which the action or event takes place. Alhoniemi's own examples such as (14a) and (15a) have again been translated with the Finnish translative in its idiomatic use in the function that could be characterized as *terminus ad quem* (cf. Saarinen 2001: 243 and Voutilainen 2011: 53–58 for the Finnish translative):

(14) Hill Mari

    (a) ***Ирок-еш***   *лиэш*   *цилä.*
        Irok-eš   *lieš*   *cilä.*
        morning-LAT become.3SG everything

    Finnish

    (b) ***Aamu-ksi*** *kaikki*   *tulee*   *kuntoon.*
        morning-TRA everything   come.3SG shape.ILL
        'Everything will be fine by the morning.' (Alhoniemi 1985: 55; 1993: 56)

(15) Hill Mari

    (a) ***Когеч-еш*** *толам.*
        Kogeč-eš   *tolam.*
        Easter-LAT   come.1SG

    Finnish

    (b) *Tulen*   ***pääsiäise-ksi.***
        come.1SG Easter-TRA
        'I'll come for (or: by) Easter.' (Alhoniemi 1985: 55; 1993: 56)

An additional example pair is (16a–b). The Finnish *talveksi* 'for the winter' is unanimously regarded as the full cognate of the Erzya translative *t'el'eks* seen in (13) above, but again, the formal and functional resemblance with the Mari lative *teleš* is unmistakable:

(16) Hill Mari

    (a) *Охырецӹм,*   *кавштам*   ***тел-еш***   *äвам*
        Oχǝrecǝt,   *kaβštam*   ***tel-eš***   *äβat*
        cucumber.ACC cabbage.ACC winter-LAT mother.1SG

        пиш *яжон*   *пашарта.*
        piš *jažon*   *pašarta.*
        very   well   press.3SG

    Finnish

    (b) *Äitini*   *säilöö*   *taitavasti* *kurkkuja*   *ja*
        mother.1SG preserve.3SG skillful.ADV cucumber.PL.PART and

        kaalia   ***talve-ksi.***
        cabbage.PART winter-TRA
        'My mother is very good at preserving cucumber and cabbage for
        the winter.' (MarlaMuter s.v. *нашáрташ*; Finnish translation J. Y.)

Finally, a further function set apart from the above-mentioned temporal-purposive latives by Alhoniemi is that of the "futuritive adverbials of duration":

(17)   Meadow Mari

    (a)   ***Кужу-эш***   *ом*   *код*   *тышак.*
        Kužu-eš   *om*   *kod*   *t∂šak.*
        long-LAT   NEG.1SG   stay.CNG   here

Finnish

    (b)   ***Pitkä-ksi*** *aikaa*   *en*   *jää*   *tänne.*
        long-TRA   time.PART   NEG.1SG   stay.CNG here

        'I'm not staying here for a long time.' (Alhoniemi 1985: 56; 1993: 56)

(18)   Hill Mari

    (a)   *Ти*   *жепым*   *тӹдӹ*   ***минут-еш=äт*** *мондыде.*
        Ti   *žep∂m*   *t∂d∂*   ***minut-eš=ät*** *mond∂de.*
        this   time.ACC   3SG   minute-LAT=DPT   forget.PST2.NEG.3SG

Finnish

    (b)   *Tätä*   *aikaa*   *hän* *ei*   *unohtanut*   ***minuuti-ksi=kaan.***
        this.PART time.PART 3SG NEG.3SG forget.PST.PTCP minute-TRA=DPT

        'S/he never forgot this time, not even for a minute.'
        (Alhoniemi 1985: 56; 1993: 56)

Once again, Alhoniemi (1985: 56) unpretentiously translates the lative with the Finnish translative, although in his dissertation he does not even mention any of the early proponents of the "translative" origins of the Mari lative when painstakingly trying to corroborate the mainstream theory about a Finno-Volgaic *s-lative (Alhoniemi 1967).

    The last, only vaguely translative-like function discerned by Alhoniemi is the use of the Mari lative as a causal adverbial modifier:

(19)   Meadow Mari

    (a)   *Шыде* ***шомак-еш*** *тудо* *ялт*   *аптранен.*
        Š∂de ***šomak-eš*** *tudo* *jalt*   *aptranen.*
        angry   word-LAT   3SG   completely   get.confused.PST2.3SG

Finnish

    (b)   *Vihaisten* *sanojen* *vuoksi* *hän* *hämmentyi*   *kokonaan.*
        angry.PL.GEN word.PL.GEN because 3SG get.confused.PST2.3SG completely

        'He got completely confused because of the angry words.'
        (Alhoniemi 1985: 56; 1993: 56)

The Mordvin translative does not appear to have causal meaning, and Ajanki's (2014: 252–253) attempts to describe the Finnish translative as causal can be questioned, as her examples rather seem to be examples of purposives. However, the conceptual relatedness of purpose and cause is quite obvious and at least the question words

for 'why; for what purpose; for what reason' are transparently translative in both branches (Finnish *miksi*, Erzya *meks*) and they are used for inquiring purposes and reasons alike; the corresponding demonstratives are *siksi* 'therefore' and *śeks* id.[6] Also, the Finnish translation (19b) of the causal lative *šomakeš* in (19a) is headed by the postposition *vuoksi* 'because of; for' which quite transparently seems to go back to the translative of *vuo* 'stream' (SSA s.v.).

To unveil some of the lesser-known functions of the Finnic translatives as used in lesser-known languages of the branch, it is also possible to compare the Mari lative of cause seen in (19a) above and (20) below with the translatives presented by Kettunen (1943: 140, 265) in his description of the Veps syntax:

Hill Mari

(20) *Парня*   **ӱит-еш** *кыічыштä.*
     Parńa   **üšt-eš**   *kəčəštä.*
     finger   cold-LAT   ache(.from.cold).3SG

   'The fingers are aching because of cold.'
   (Alhoniemi 1967: 302 < Ramstedt 1902: 50)

(21) Veps

   (a) *Niškan   kibištab   **lume-ks**.*
       neck.GEN   ache.3SG   snow-TRA

   Finnish

   (b) *Niskaa   kivistää   **lumisatee-ksi** (=ennustaen   lumisadetta).*
       neck.PART ache.3SG   snowfall-TRA   anticipate.CVB snowfall.PART

       'My neck is aching because of snow (= anticipating snowfall)'
       (Kettunen 1943: 265)

According to Kettunen (1943: 140, 265), modifiers like *lumeks* (21a) resemble translatives of purpose, but translatives such as these refer to anticipated weather, disease or the like. He remarks that the phenomenon is not foreign to Finnish either, and translates the Veps example as (21b). Kettunen describes the phenomenon under expressions of cause, but on the other hand labels such translatives as "translatives of consequence" or rather "translatives of omen". According to Alhoniemi (1967: 301–303;

---

6. Although the causal meanings of *miksi* and *meks* 'why' and *siksi* and *śeks* 'therefore' could be seen as results of convergent development, their striking similarity suggests that the word pairs could be lexicalized remnants of earlier causal functions of the translative. Compare also the use of predestinative in Forest Enets (i) (See Section 3.5):

   Forest Enets
   (i) **obu-đu-ń**   *ńexuń*   *məbiđʔ*
       what-PREDEST-GEN.1SG child.LAT.1SG   say.PERF.1SG
       'Why did I tell my child?' (Siegl 2013: 358)

1985: 53; 1993: 54), latives of cause are not very frequent in Mari either, and, not unlike most of the translative-like functions discussed above, they are more common in Hill Mari than in Meadow Mari where the dative in -*lan* is rather favored. Also the question word for 'why, for what reason, for what purpose' is *molan* instead of the lative *moeš*. However, in search of the possibly common origins of the Mari lative and the translatives in Finnic and Mordvin, it suffices to observe that all of the functions in this section are quite widespread throughout Mari and Finnic, albeit mostly confined to purposives and "predicative adverbials" in Mordvin.

3.5. In the grammatical core of the lative: predicative and complement functions

3.5.1. Secondary predicates

Finally, it is worth returning to the so-called predicative adverbial functions of the Mari lative and its proposed cognates. It was already seen above (8–10) that while Mari uses its lative in expressions like 'take (someone) as a wife', Finnic and Mordvin employ their translatives, and in Northern Samoyed the so-called predestinative forms may be used. It was also remarked that the Finnicist and Uralicist label "predicative adverbial" comprises not only secondary predicates such as the kind of resultatives of the type 'take (someone) as a wife', but also primary nominal predicates and predicate complements that are regarded as combining certain properties of canonical predicates and those of adverbials. Largely the same was intended by Wiedemann (1847: 31) who characterized the Mari lative primarily as a "predicative" or "factive" case occurring with verbs such as 'judge', 'mean', 'appear', 'become', 'make', 'change' and 'consider', even though he also included various kinds of purposives under the same category.

Although the category of "predicative adverbials" may seem suspiciously vague, it must be admitted that it quite conveniently embraces a number of grammatical functions in which the Mari lative coincides with not only the Finnic and Mordvin translatives but the Samoyed predestinative as well. Example (22) is a Forest Enets analogue to Examples (8–10) seen above:

Forest Enets

(22) оласнэ   манā: пурзы дя   ни   комабут,
    olasne   *manaa*   *purđi* *ďa*   *ńiʔ*   *komabut*
    witch   say.3SG   back   earth   on.LAT want.CVB.GEN.2SG

    нэ-з-оδ   ибляйгу бунтику му''
    ńe-đu-d   *ibľeigu* *buntiku* *tuʔ*
    woman-PREDEST-GEN.2SG   little   dog.DIM   take.IMP.2SG

    'The witch said: "If you want to come back on earth, take a little dog as your wife."'(Lit. 'wife for you') (Siegl 2013: 385, 399 < Labanauskas 2002: 17)

To give another set of examples, the following sentences show that while '(give something) as a gift' is coded with the lative in Mari, the translatives and the predestinative are, once again, used in other branches of Uralic again:

Meadow Mari

(23) *Ик   руш   армийын   начальникше —   князь Курбский —*
     Ik   ruš   armijə̂n   načaĺnikše —   kńaź   Kurbskij —
     one   Russian   army.GEN   head.3SG   knyaz Kurbsky

     Литваш   куржын   да   польский   король   деч   кугу
     Litvaš   kuržə̂n   da   poĺskij   koroĺ   deč̆   kugu
     Lithuania.ILL run.PST2.3SG and   Polish   king   from   big

     *мландым   **пӧлек-еш**   налын.*
     *mlandə̂m   **pölek-eš**   nalə̂n.*
     land.ACC   gift-LAT   take.PST2.3SG

     'A Russian army leader – Prince Kurbsky – defected to Lithuania and got a large domain as a gift from the Polish king.' (Kosminskij 1961: 265)

(24) Erzya

   (a) *Нетъ   книгатьнень   **казне-кс**   саинь.*
        *Ńeť   kńigaťńeń   **kazńe-ks**   sajiń.*
        this.PL   book.PL.GEN.DEF   gift-TRA   get.PST.1SG(>3PL)

   Estonian

   (b) *Ma   sain   need   raamatud   **kingi-ks**.*
        1SG   get.PST.1SG   this.PL   book.PL   gift-TRA

   Finnish

   (c) *Sain   nämä   kirjat   **lahja-ksi**.*
        get.PST.1SG   this.PL book.PL   gift-TRA

        'I got these books as a gift.' (Ajanki 2014: 244)

(25) Nganasan

   (a) *kəntə-ðə-mtə   melïðəsïəm   **maðajśüə-ðə-tə***
        sled-PREDEST-ACC.2SG   make.PST.1SG   gift-PREDEST-GEN.2SG

   Finnish

   (b) *Tein   sinulle   reet   **lahja-kse-si**.*
        make.PST.1SG   2SG.ALL   sled.PL gift-TRA-2SG

        'I made the sleds as a gift for you.' (Leisiö 2012: 210)

As a third type of secondary, complement-like predicates it is possible to present everyday expressions for the dynamic process of studying and its aim to acquire a profession that is coded with the cases in question:

(26) Hill Mari

    (a)   ***Учител-еш***   *тымень*   *лӓктӹн.*
              Učiťəľ-eš   *tə̂meń*   *läktən.*
              teacher-LAT   study.CVB   go.PST2.3SG

    Finnish

    (b)   *Hän*   *opiskeli*   ***opettaja-ksi.***
              3SG   study.PST2.3SG   teacher-TRA

              'He studied to become a teacher.'
              (Savatkova 2002: 105; Finnish translation J. Y.)

    Moksha

(27) *Кармась*   *тонафнема*   ***учитель-кс.***
      Karmaś   *tonafńema*   ***učiťeľ-ks.***
      begin.PST.3SG   study.INF   teacher-TRA

      'He began to study to become a teacher.' (Aterev 2012)

3.5.2. (Primary) nominal predicates

One of the central remarks on the similarity of the translatives in Mordvin and Finnic, and Estonian in particular, has long been that the translatives in -*ks* are used as primary nominal predicates in stative predicative clauses (e.g., Wiedemann 1865: 41; Ajanki 2014). It appears that neither the Mari lative nor the Samoyed predestinative are commonly used in such functions, but, instead, Mari employs the inessive case and languages like Tundra Nenets and Forest Enets make use of case-like forms labeled as essive-translatives (Alhoniemi 1985: 58–59; 1993: 59; Siegl 2013: 166–167; 2017b; Jalava 2017; Saarinen 2017). However, copular or semi-copular verbs carrying the dynamic meaning 'become' may also occasionally take the lative in Mari (28a) and the predestinative in Forest Enets (29a). Again, analogous use of the Finnic translative is seen in the translations of both sentences:

(28) Hill Mari

    (a)   *Пӱртӱсыжат*   *тыланда*   *"Са-еш*   *лийже!"*   *манылда.*
              Pürtüsə̂žat   *tə̂landa*   ***"Saj-eš***   *lijže!"*   *manə̂lda.*
              nature.3SG=DPT   2PL.DAT   good-LAT   be.IMP.3SG   say.3SG

    Finnish

    (b)   *Luonto=kin sanoo teille:*   *"Tulkoon*   *kaikki*   ***hyvä-ksi!"***
              nature=DPT   say.3SG   2PL.ALL   be.IMP.3SG   everything   good-TRA

              'Also the nature says to you: "Let everything become good!"'
              (Alhoniemi 1967: 278; Finnish translation J. Y.)

(29) Forest Enets

    (a)   *Убайза*   **пуяҫь**   *каниби,*
            Ubajđa   **puja-aś**   *kańibi,*
            thimble.3SG   nose-ESSTR   become.PERF.3SG

            дёзлачихуза   **туаҫь**   *канибихи,*
            ďođlatʼixuuđa   **tua-aś**   *kańibixi’,*
            scraping.DU.3SG   wing-ESSTR   become.PERF.3DU

            пизооза   **маха-з[о]-д[а]**   *каниби,*
            piđo’ođa   **maxa-đo-da**   *kańibi,*
            leather.scraper.3SG   back-PREDEST-GEN.3SG   become.PERF.3SG

            чедида   **бату-зо-да**   *каниби.*
            ťieďida   **batu’o-đo-da**   *kańibi.*
            comb.3SG   tail-PREDEST-GEN.3SG   become.PERF.3SG

    Finnish

    (b)   *Hänen*   *sormustimensa*   *tuli*   **nenä-ksi,**
            3SG.GEN   thimble.3SG   become.PST.3SG   nose-TRA

            hänen   *kaavinjätekaistaleensa*   *tulivat*   **siiv-i-ksi,**
            3SG.GEN   scraping.PL.3SG   become.PST.3PL   wing-PL-TRA

            hänen   *kaavinrautansa*   *tuli*   *hänen*   **selä-kse-en**   *ja*
            3SG.GEN   leather.scraper.3SG   become.PST.3SG   3SG.GEN   back-TRA-3SG   and

            hänen   *harjansa*   *tuli*   *hänen*   **pyrstö-kse-en.**
            3SG.GEN   comb.3SG   become.PST.3SG   3SG.GEN   tail-TRA-3SG

    ‘Her thimble became a nose, her scrapings became wings, her leather scraper became her back, and her comb became her tail.’[7]
    (Salminen 2014: 292 < Sorokina & Bolina 2005, text 37, sentence 14)

In the following examples, the lative and the translatives are governed by slightly more lexical verbs, but the functional resemblance of the cases is all the more obvious:

(30) Meadow Mari

    (a)   *Шулдо*   *сату*   **шерг-еш**   *возеш.*
            Šuldo   *satu*   **šerge-š**   *βozeš.*
            cheap   goods   expensive-LAT   lie.down.3SG

    Finnish

    (b)   *Halpa* *tavara* *koituu*   **kallii-ksi.**
            cheap goods incur.3SG   expensive-TRA

    ‘Cheap things become expensive.’ (Alhoniemi 1985: 55; 1993: 55)

---

7.   I wish to thank Tapani Salminen for helping me to gloss and transliterate (29a) as well as for pointing out the misspelling *махазадо pro *махазода* in the original source.

Erzya

(31) *[– –],*   *биляронь*   *сока*   *кшнитне*   *стить*   *сырнеде*   ***питневе-кс.***
      bil'aroń   *soka*   *kšńitńe*   *st'it'*   *sirńeďe*   ***pitńeve-ks.***
      Bilyar.GEN   plow   iron.PL.DEF   become.3PL   gold.ABL   expensive-TRA

'[– –], and the Bilyar plowshares become more expensive than gold.'
(Abramov 1988: 274)

3.5.3. Object complements

In addition to primary and secondary predicates, a further type of "predicative adverbials" relevant in this context are instances in which the lative and its proposed cognates function as object complements in the sense of complementing a direct object so as to render an otherwise incomplete clause fully grammatical. Compare the following set of examples entailing the meaning 'consider; regard as' (32–34):

Meadow Mari

(32) *Марий-влак*   *тудым*   *поро*   ***тос-еш,***   ***род-еш***   *ужыт.*
      Marij-βlak   *tudə̂m*   *poro*   ***tos-eš,***   ***rod-eš***   *užə̂t.*
      Mari-PL   3SG.ACC   good   friend-LAT   relative-LAT   consider.3PL

'Maris regard him/her as a good friend, as a relative.'
(Alhoniemi 1985: 55; 1993: 55)

Erzya

(33) *Мон*   ***душман-кс,***   *полай,*   *путытинь,*
      Mon   ***dušman-ks,***   *polaj,*   *putit'iń,*
      1SG   sorcerer-TRA   spouse.VOC   put.PST.1SG>2SG

а   *паро*   ***ломань-кс*** *ловитинь.*
a   *paro*   ***lomań-ks*** *lovit'iń.*
not   good   person-TRA   consider.PST.1SG>2SG

'I regarded you, my husband, as a sorcerer, I considered you an evil man.' (MW s.v. *lovoms*)

Tundra Nenets

(34) *хари"*   ***ня-да-ндо'***   *толабидо'*
      xəryiq   ***nya-d°-ntoh***   *tolabyidoh*
      REFL   friend-PREDEST-GEN.3PL   regard.3PL>SG

'They regard him/her as their friend.'
(Tereščenko 1965: 750; Salminen 2014: 291)

As regards Finnic equivalents to the above sentences, (32) and (34) have been right-fully translated with the Finnish essive by Alhoniemi (32´a) and Salminen (34´a), but corresponding sentences in Estonian may employ the translative instead (32´b, 34´b):

(32´) Finnish

(a) *Marit   pitävät   häntä   hyvä-nä   **ystävä-nä,   sukulaise-na**.*
Mari.PL   regard.3PL 3SG.PART good-ESS   friend-ESS   relative-ESS

Estonian

(b) *Marid   peavad   teda   hea-ks   **sõbra-ks,   sugulase-ks**.*
Mari.PL   regard.3PL 3SG.PART good-TRA   friend-TRA   relative-TRA

'The Maris regard him/her as a good friend, as a relative.'
(Alhoniemi 1985: 55; Estonian translation J. Y.)

(34´) Finnish

(a) *He   pitävät   häntä   oma-na   **ystävä-nä-än**.*
3PL   regard.3PL 3SG.PART own-ESS   friend-ESS-3PL

Estonian

(b) *Nad   peavad   teda   oma   **sõbra-ks**.*
3PL   regard.3PL 3SG.PART own   friend-TRA

'They regard him/her as their friend.'
(Salminen 2014: 291; Estonian translation J. Y.)

Although the Finnish verb *pitää* 'hold; consider' (34´a) takes its object complements in the essive, the nearly synonymous verb *luulla* 'suppose' (35b) takes the translative:

(35) Tundra Nenets

(a) *тикы   нем'   **небя-да-н**   пэрңавась,*
*tyiki°   nyem   **nyebya-də-n°**   pæ°rŋawəsy°*
that   woman.ACC mother-PREDEST-GEN.1SG make.PST.1SG>SG

тэмбараравэв''
temp°rarawew°q
err.NARR.REFL.1SG

Finnish

(b) *Luulin   sitä   naista   **äidi-kse-ni**.*
suppose.PST.1SG that.PART woman.PART mother-TRA-1SG

'I mistook the woman for my mother.'
(Tereščenko 1965: 688; Salminen 2014: 289–290)

Finally, a semantically quite different but structurally analogous set of examples is seen in (36), with the lative and translatives complementing the objects of 'leave':

(36) Hill Mari (US: John 14:18)

(a)   *Мӹнь*   *тӓмдӓм*   **тылык-еш**   *ам*   *коды,*
      Mə́ń   *tämdäm*   **tə̂lə̂k-eš**   *am*   *kodə̂,*
      1SG   2PL.ACC   orphan-LAT   NEG.1SG   leave.CNG

      мӓ   *докыда*   *толам.*
      tä   *dokə̂da*   *tolam.*
      2PL   to.2PL   come.1SG

Estonian (Piibel: John 14:18)

(b)   *Ma* *ei* *jäta*   *teid*   **orbu-de-ks**,
      1SG NEG leave.CNG 2PL.PART orphan-PL-TRA

      ma *tulen*   *teie*   *juurde.*
      1SG come.1SG 2PL.GEN to

Erzya (OV: John 14:18)

(c)   *Мон* *а*   *кадтадызь*   **урозо-кс;**   *сан*   *мекев*   *тенк.*
      Mon *a*   *kadtadiź*   **urozo-ks;**   *san*   *mekev*   *t́enk.*
      1SG NEG leave.1SG>2PL orphan-TRA come.1SG back   2PL.DAT

      'I will not leave you as orphans; I will come to you.'

Although the full example sentences presented in this section are, after all, only a moderate and somewhat random sample of the overarching functional similarity of the Mari lative, the Finnic and Mordvin translatives and the Samoyed predestinative, they greatly exceed those presented in earlier studies in which the Mari lative has been claimed to originate from the hypothetical *s*-lative of the hypothetical Finno-Volgaic protolanguage. In lieu of a systematic, corpus-based exploration of the topic, it may be mentioned as a most rudimentary quantitative approach to the issue that of the total of 26 example sentences of the functions of the lative in Alhoniemi's (1985: 54–56) concise grammar of the language, eight latives have been translated into Finnish with the translative, six with the inessive, and the twelve others with various other cases and postpositions, including three occurrences of *vuoksi* 'because of; for' – discussed in connection with (19b) in Section 3.4 above – and only three illatives (6b) to which the lative has traditionally been related. For hundreds of further examples of the Mari lative, the reader is referred to Alhoniemi's (1967) comprehensive account of the case in question and the most interested skeptics are encouraged to translate these examples into Finnic, Mordvin and North Samoyed languages.

4.   The origin of the Mari lative re-evaluated: phonological and lexical observations

According to the received view of the origin of the Mari lative, the phonological part of the explanation is relatively unproblematic. As soon as one adheres to the idea of the **s*-lative that emerged in Proto-Finno-Volgaic – and thinks that its ultimate origin need not be considered an issue (cf. Korhonen 1979: 14; Häkkinen 1983: 74; Ylikoski 2016: 31–35) – it is easy to see the case marker *-(e)š* as the expected reflex of a word-final *-s* (see, e.g., Alhoniemi 1967: 322ff.; Bereczki 1994: 53–55 and references therein). The origin of the preconsonantal *-e-* has been considered unclear but of little importance, like vowel elements of Uralic suffixes virtually always are treated, being often explained away as a result of epenthesis or metanalysis. However, if one acknowledges the many fundamental problems in reconstructing a Proto-Finno-Volgaic lative in **-s*, combined with the fact that the Mari lative has an unusually wide range of functions but very few of them can be characterized as "lative" or directional, it must be acceptable to look for alternative, more careful explanations.[8]

The previous section provided functional evidence in favor of the "translative" origins of the Mari lative. As it turns out, the proposed development from **-ksi* to *-(e)š* is not very challenging from a formal perspective either. In fact, it is potentially quite easy to accompany Wiklund (1927: 322) who approvingly cited Beke's (1911: 191) statement that Mari *-(e)š* is undoubtedly nothing else than the Finnic and Mordvin translative in *-ks(i)* or *-s*. Although the word-internal **-ks-* has been preserved as *-kš-* in words like *mokš* 'liver' (< Proto-Uralic **mïksa* id. > Finnish *maksa*, Erzya *makso* etc.), suffixal and other word-final occurrences of **-ks(-)* have mostly diminished, as evidenced by derivatives such as *jolaš* 'pants' (← *jol* 'foot; leg'), an ostensible cognate of Finnish *jalas* : *jalakse-* 'skid, runner (of a sled)' (← *jalka* 'foot; leg') as well as opaque words like *omaš* 'brushwood shelter; hut'.[9]

However, the comparison with the lative is not as straightforward as it could be, as the latter-mentioned nouns can be reconstructed as originating from (*)*-kš* < **-ksi* on the basis of the Northwestern dialect and the Volga dialect of Meadow Mari in which the consonant cluster has been preserved in words such as *jalakš* 'pants' and *omakš* 'hut' (Wichmann 1913–1918: 1–4; Beke 1934: 109–110; Galkin 1966: 18–20; Bereczki 1994: 36; Saarinen 2001: 246; Moisio & Saarinen 2008). Indeed, it is the

---

8.   The problematics of the **s*-lative and its relation to certain Finnish and Saami "lative" adverbs has also embraced various inexplicable relations to the "translative" directional adverbs such as Finnish *luokse* 'to (the vicinity of)' and *taakse* 'to the behind', or *alas* 'downward' with cognates such as North Saami *vuolás* id. although the expected Finnish counterpart of *vuolás* would be ***alaksi*, or alternatively, the expected North Saami counterpart of Finnish *alas* would be ***vuolis* (see Itkonen 1966).

9.   Although Mari *jolaš* 'pants' and Finnish *jalas* 'skid, runner' can be said to be cognates in the sense of being composed of cognate morphemes (Wichmann 1913–1918: 2–3; Saarinen 2001: 241, 246), it appears that the Mari word is not a direct descendant of **jalkaksi* (← **jalka* 'foot; leg' + **-ksi*) but rather a later combination of Mari *jol* and a suffix that has been attached to it after the loss of **k(a)* in the noun. Furthermore, the meanings of the Mari and Finnic words are so distant from each other that it is likely that they have been formed independently.

conservative nature of these dialects that helps us to identify the derivational suffix -aš as -akš < *-(a)ks, but at the first sight none of the dialects in Mari seem to support the hypothesis of the *-ksi origins of the lative: The lative case marker appears to be the plain -(e)š throughout the language area. However, this obstacle need not be insurmountable, and even the previously meaningless vowel -e- appears to have an important role in understanding the origin of the case marker.

As mentioned already in Section 3.1, the Finnic and Mordvin translatives have been related to denominal nouns in *-ksi ever since Ahlqvist (1877: 58–59, 109), Donner (1879: 491) and even their predecessors. This view has been the only visible alternative to the so-called lative theory that has gradually lost ground to the derivation theory (see also Ajanki 2014: 257ff.). The oft-repeated examples include Finnish *aidas* [material.for.fence] : *aidakse-n* [material.for.fence-GEN] (← *aita* 'fence'; translative *aidaksi*), *sormus* [ring] : *sormukse-n* [ring-GEN] (← *sormi* 'finger'; translative *sormeksi*), *teräs* [steel] : *teräkse-n* [steel-GEN] (← *terä* 'blade'; translative *teräksi*), likewise Estonian *sõrmus* [ring] : *sõrmuse* [ring.GEN] (← *sõrm* 'finger'; translative *sõrmeks*) and *teras* [steel] : *terase* [steel.GEN] (← *tera* 'blade'; translative *teraks*) as well as Erzya *surks* 'ring' and *čevks* 'log for shingles' which are identical to the translative forms of *sur* 'finger' and *čev* 'shingle'. It is nowadays widely maintained that the derivational function is the most original, and derivatives may have easily been reanalyzed as cases in favorable syntactic contexts.

Not only do the above derivatives occur in Finnic and Mordvin along with their translatives, but the same suffix has also been identified in Saami (e.g., North Saami *áiddis* 'material for fence' ← *áidi* 'fence'), Mari (*jolaš* 'pants' ← *jol* 'foot; leg', *šüraš* 'groats' ← *šür* 'soup' etc.) as well as in Permic (Komi *šįdęs* 'groats; material for porridge' ← *šįd* 'porridge; soup'; Komi *purtęs* 'knife sheath' and Udmurt *purtes* id. ← *purt* 'knife') (see, e.g., Saarinen 2001 and references therein). Most recently, Salminen (2014: 292–293) has remarked that the Samoyed purposive derivational suffix *-tâ such as Tundra Nenets -d° in *pyiryebcod°* [boil.NMLZ.PURP] 'something intended for boiling' (← *pyiryebco* 'something boiled') can also be regarded as a reflex of Proto-Uralic *-ksi – not unlike the predestinative marker *-tâ(-) and the translatives in Finnic and Mordvin. The relation between Finno-Mordvin *-ksi and Samoyed *-tâ is entirely regular, as evidenced by the Samoyed cognates of words like Finnish *maksa*, Erzya *makso*, Mari *mokš* 'liver' mentioned above; cf. Proto-Uralic *mįksa* 'liver' > Proto-Samoyed *mįtə* > Tundra Nenets *mid°* id. (see also Salminen 2014: 289ff.).

How, then, can the Mari lative marker -(e)š be connected to the derivatives in -aš (~ -akš) < *-(a)ks when there are no signs of dialectal latives in **-(e)kš? Frankly, it appears that an alternative lative suffix **-(e)kš would have solved the mystery long before the Finno-Volgaic lative in *-s was ever conceived (Jännes 1890, Setälä 1890). As seen in the previous section, uses of the Mari lative resemble those of Finnic and Mordvin translatives and even the Samoyed predestinative to the extent that had the lative marker been more obviously similar to Finnic -ksi, Mordvin -ks and ultimately Proto-Finno-Volgaic or Proto-Uralic *-ksi, there would probably never have been a need to look for other explanations. Just like there have apparently never been

attempts to derive the Finnic translative and that of Mordvin from unrelated sources (despite some functional mismatches), a dialectal lative suffix **-*(e)kš* in Mari would have prevented any major disagreements ever since Wiedemann's (1847) pioneering observations.

When evaluating the new but old hypothesis presented here, it is also instructive to note that in spite of the wide popularity of the derivational theory that connects the Finnic and Mordvin translatives to the derivatives discussed above, they also differ from each other. True, Mordvin forms such as Erzya *surks* may be analyzed as both derivatives ('ring') and translatives (of *sur* 'finger'), but Finnish *sormus* 'ring' and *teräs* 'steel' are distinct from *sormeksi* [finger.TRA] and *teräksi* [blade.TRA], and it takes 21st-century linguists to continue to explain the common origins of the two phenomena. Further, Estonian derivatives have lost the consonant cluster *-ks- altogether: *teras* [steel] : *terase* [steel.GEN] differs from the translative *teraks*, although dialectal translative forms like *terast* and *teräs* also occur (cf. Saareste 1955: 34–35). The Saami, Permic and Mari derivatives mentioned above have been connected to *-ksi even in the absence of known translative-like inflectional categories.

Given the fact that at least Finnic and Mordvin translatives have been growing apart from each other, as well as from denominal derivation, for several millennia, the different vocalisms of the Mari lative in -*(e)š* and the derivational suffix -*aš* (~ -*akš*) can be regarded as more or less natural outcomes of diversification of the two categories. The decisive difference between the two is that there are no visible signs of a consonant cluster -*kš*(-) (*-*ks*-) in the lative marker in any dialects, but such leveling across the dialects would not be more problematic than many opposite and irregular phenomena in inflectional morphology, for example the eight variants – -*ks*, -*ss*, -*sse*, -*se*, -*gs*, -*s*, -*ssi* and -*st* – of the translative in Estonian dialects (Saareste 1955: 34–35) or more than a dozen kinds of illatives in Finnish (Kettunen 1940, Map 182). There is a considerable amount of irregularity in the survival of -*akš*, too (see Wichmann 1913–1918: 1–4; Beke 1934: 109–110; Galkin 1966: 18–20; Bereczki 1994: 36; Saarinen 2001: 246; Moisio & Saarinen 2008).

However, it must be admitted that the homogeneity of the lative in -*(e)š* throughout the dialects is quite remarkable in contrast to the variation among individual lexemes such as *mokš* ~ *moks* 'liver', *jolaš* ~ *jalakš* ~ *jolakχš* 'pants' and *omaš* ~ *omakš* ~ *omas* 'hut'. Perhaps the easiest way to explain this discrepancy is to keep in mind that the lative marker -*(e)š* has, after all, for ages been an independent inflectional morpheme in a paradigmatic relationship with other case markers such as the illative in -*š(ke)*, whereas individual words – derived and underived alike – lead independent lives in and across dialects.

Nevertheless, it is actually possible to observe at least some Mari word forms whose formal makeup is as ambiguous as that of Erzya *surks* ('ring' or [finger.TRA]): Although the lative forms most commonly end in -*eš*, at least most ancient nouns ending in -*a* manage with -*š*, and as a consequence it is possible to attest ambiguous forms such as *parńaš* that may be either the lative for *parńa* 'finger' or a derived noun for 'thimble'; the two are kept apart in the dialects that have preserved the derivational

suffix -*akš* (Alhoniemi 1985: 157; 1993: 147). In other words, that Mari *parńaš* displays the common origin of the lative in -*(e)š* and the derivational suffix -*aš* more transparently than any comparable words in Finnish do.

On the other hand, Mikhail Zhivlov (p.c.) has presented an unusually elegant explanation for the vowel *e* in the lative marker -*(e)š* and, with it, the entire suffix. He points out that while the Proto-Uralic second-syllable vowels **a*, **ä* and **i* realize mostly as *ə̂* (or have been altogether lost) in Mari (as seen, e.g., in the accusative forms *kolə̂m* [fish.ACC], *imə̂m* [needle.ACC] and *βüdə̂m* [water.ACC] in Table 1 in Section 2), a second-syllable -*e*- is nevertheless present in certain possessive forms as seen in Table 2.

	kol 'fish'	*ime* 'needle'	*βüd* 'water'
1SG	*kolem*	*imem*	*βüdem*
2SG	*kolet*	*imet*	*βüdet*
3SG	*kolžo*	*imə̂ž(e)*	*βütšö*
1PL	*kolna*	*imə̂na*	*βütna*
2PL	*kolda*	*imə̂da*	*βütta*
3PL	*kolə̂št*	*imə̂št*	*βüdə̂št*

Table 2. Examples of Meadow Mari possessive forms (cf. Alhoniemi 1985: 74ff.; 1993: 72ff.; Riese et al. 2017).

According to Zhivlov, the lative suffix -*eš* can be compared to the first and second person singular forms in -*em* and -*et*, which in turn differ from the rest of the possessive suffixes in having the second-syllable vowel -*e*-. Zhivlov suggests further that the difference between these and the rest of the possessive forms resembles the development of Saami possessive forms in word forms like North Saami *áibmán* [needle.1SG], *áibmát* [needle.2SG] and *áibmis* [needle.3SG][10] (← *áibmi* 'needle' < Proto-Uralic **äjmä* > Mari *ime* 'needle'): The quality of the second-syllable vowel depends on whether the original third-syllable vowel (in a suffix) is **i* or **a/ä*. In other words, word forms like the accusative **äjmä-m* as well as the third person possessive form **äjmä-s**ä*** have yielded forms like North Saami *áimm**i*** [needle.GENACC] and *áibm**i**s* [needle.3SG] as well as Mari *imə̂m* [needle.ACC] and *imə̂že* [needle.3SG], but forms with a third-syllable **i* have resulted in forms like *áibm**á**n* [needle.1SG] and *im**e**m* id. as well as *áibm**á**t* [needle.2SG] and *im**e**t* id. (< Proto-Uralic **äimä-mi* and **äimä-ti*). When all comes around, in light of this pattern it is possible to explain why the Mari lative

---

10.   Although nominative possessive forms like *áibmán* [needle.1SG], *áibmát* [needle.2SG] and *áibmis* [needle.3SG] belong to standard descriptions of North Saami, such word forms are actually highly marginal and next to non-existing except for nouns with human referents in vocative and logophoric functions (cf. Nielsen 1926: 117–118). However, instead of using more everyday forms like *áhčči* [father] : *áhččán* [father.1SG] : *áhččát* [father.2SG] : *áhččis* [father.3SG], the cognate pair *áibmi* and *ime* is used for illustrative purposes here.

has forms like *koleš* [fish.LAT], *imeš* [needle.LAT] and *βüdeš* [water.LAT], but the corresponding illatives are *kolâš(ko), imâš(ke)* and *βüdâš(kö)* just like the inessives are *kolâšto, imâšte* and *βüdâštö*: The two local cases seem to go back to *-s(kA)* and *-stA*, but the lative seems to originate in an *-i*-final suffix. In principle, such a suffix could have been a completely unparalleled *-si*, but in light of the present discussion it is much more plausible to derive it from *-ksi*.[11]

To return to the derivations, it is somewhat surprising to note that earlier research has not even addressed the problem of explaining the divergence of the Finnic derivatives in *-s* : *-(k)se-* as in Finnish *aidas* [material.for.fence] : *aidakse-n* [material.for.fence-GEN] : *aidakseni* [material.for.fence.NOM/GEN.1SG] 'my material for fence; (material) for my fence' and the translative as in *aita* 'fence' : *aida-ksi* [fence-TRA] : *aidakse-ni* [fence-TRA-1SG] 'for my fence'. The outward appearance of *-ksi* might have been conserved by the possessive suffixes as seen in (8b), (9b), (11b), (25b), (29b) and (35b) above, and most importantly in almost all occurrences of Northern Samoyed predestinatives ever cited in literature (e.g., Künnap 1987; Janhunen 1989; Leisiö 2012, 2014; Siegl 2013; Salminen 2014). On the other hand, it is remarkable that many accounts of the Mordvin translative emphasize that the translative differs from most other cases by not taking possessive suffixes any more than inflecting for number or definiteness (Bartens 1999: 99; Ajanki 2014: 248). However, according to Rueter (2010: 94–95) such forms are not non-existent but only extremely marginal in Erzya; see also (38) and (39) where *-ks* is followed by definite genitive suffixes.[12]

In any event, it may be equally possible to think that the preservation of the case suffix in Finnic does not need a specific explanation *per se*, but the shortened nominative forms like *aidas* 'material (stake) for fence' may be due to conforming to the predominantly disyllabic structure of Finnic nouns. From a purely phonological point of view, it is necessary to regard either the preservation of *-ksi* in the translative or the reduction of the morpheme *-ksi* in derivations as irregular – not to speak of the development of the Eastern Estonian translative in *-st* which could hardly be related to *-ksi* if there were not enough comparative evidence in the rest of Finnic (Rätsep 1979: 66–70). These unexplained states of affairs do not substantially differ from the divergence of the analogous morphemes in Mari.

---

11.   I owe this excellent explanation entirely to Mikhail Zhivlov, but all remaining errors are my own.
12.   One of Siegl's (2013: 401) main arguments for not regarding the Forest Enets predestinative as a case (or a case subsystem) is its inability to combine with number except for possessive suffixes. On the other hand, he admits that the predestinative and the uncontroversial morphological cases of the language are, in a way, in complementary distribution as they occur in identical positions but exclude each other (*op.cit.* 399).

5.   Discussion and conclusion: Proto-Uralic *-ksi and its descendants

In the preceding sections, the so-called lative case in Mari has been described and examined specifically in relation to the translative cases in Finnic and Mordvin as well as, to lesser extent, in relation to the so-called predestinatives in Northern Samoyed. In light of not only the functional similarities but also in light of historical phonology it is possible to derive the lative suffix -(e)š from Pre-Proto-Mari ("Proto-Finno-Volgaic" or the less controversial Proto-Uralic) *-ksi – although the details of Mari historical phonology are notoriously complex in general, and await further studies. While I wish to argue that the Mari lative most likely goes back to *-ksi instead of the much more dubious *s-lative as claimed by the traditional view, it must be admitted that the lative has also many functions that are not shared by the Finnic and Mordvin translatives or the Samoyed predestinative. Moreover, many of the translative-like functions of the lative are also found among the functions of the dative and illative cases; the use of dative is more characteristic to Meadow Mari, while Hill Mari employs the lative.

To be sure, focusing on the similarities instead of differences and mismatches belongs to the very fundamentals of historical-comparative linguistics. All research of the common origins of the Finnic and Mordvin translatives, for example, has concentrated on the similitude, not differences of the two phenomena separated by about one thousand kilometers in space and several millennia in time. These translatives have much later been compared with the Samoyed predestinative, but, naturally enough, predominantly only with the functions that lend to comparison. Indeed, it appears that a large part of the respective functions of the predestinatives and the translatives cannot be easily compared, but one can hardly expect much more from inflectional suffixes with as abstract grammatical functions as these morphemes have. For example, the use of the Samoyed predestinative is largely limited to contexts in which the benefactives or the prospective possessors (of a wife or a gift, for example) are explicitly expressed with possessive suffixes, to the extent that Siegl (2013) labels the category as a benefactive and characterizes it as a kind of applicative on noun phrases, expressing the "benefit X for Y or having X at Y's disposal". Otherwise, the case-like essive-translative forms are used (see Example 29 above). As the essive-translatives in North Samoyed are quite recent grammaticalizations from converb forms of copulas (Jalava 2017; Siegl 2017b), one can assume that they may have taken over some of the earlier functions of the predestinative.

Regardless of whether *-ksi is traced back to Proto-Uralic or only to some of the later common ancestors postulated for Finnic, Mordvin and perhaps Mari, we are dealing with cases that in many respects belong to the realm of the so-called grammatical (abstract, syntactic) cases more than to adverbial (concrete, semantic) cases. However, in spite of the millennia-long divergence of *-ksi in two, three or even four or more major branches of Uralic, scholars such as Janhunen (1989; 2014: 317), Ajanki (2014) and Salminen (2014) have been able to reason that the most original function of the suffix is to denote purpose – purposes of (intentional) actions and purposes of use (of concrete objects and other entities).

Ajanki (2014: 272–273) proposes that the original purposive functions of the Finno-Mordvin translative have resulted in the developmental path PURPOSE → FUTURE → CHANGE → SIMILATIVE, for example. The development of similative functions seems to be foreign to the Mari lative, but is shared by the translatives in Finnic and Mordvin.[13] As regards the Mari lative, however, it appears possible to attribute all its translative-like functions such as purposives, temporal-purposive adverbial modifiers, futuritive adverbials of duration and causal adverbial modifiers (Section 3.4) to a common "purposive" origin of *-ksi. Furthermore, most of the "predicative adverbial" functions of the lative – secondary and primary predicates as well as predicative complements (Section 3.5) – refer to changes of state, often as a result of dynamic processes to fulfill aims and purposes of intentional human agents (e.g., those taking someone as a wife or giving something as a gift).

In spite of the evident likeness of the Mari lative and the Finnic and Mordvin translatives, at the current stage of research I wish to refrain from presenting any schematic paths or semantic maps (cf. Ajanki 2014), in order to avoid the danger of applying internal reconstruction based on synchronic Mari data to mechanically explain the historical development of the lative in accord with plausible but unproven paths of grammaticalization (cf. Joseph 2004). In fact, it is remarkable that Ajanki's path PURPOSE → FUTURE → CHANGE → SIMILATIVE for the Finno-Mordvin translative does not quite fit in the picture of the Uralic *-ksi in general: If the Finnic and Mordvin translatives and the Mari lative are related to the Northern Samoyed predestinative, it seems indeed that the latter is represented by FUTURE and CHANGE in particular, but the proposed initial functions of PURPOSE are not seen to a comparable extent in Samoyed (see Section 3.4). In fact, as non-purposive yet future-oriented functions of *-ksi are also quite common in the western Uralic languages, a less specific alternative would be to think that a major semantic feature of *-ksi might have originally been a future (or related irrealis) meaning in general (cf. Nikolaeva 2009; Leisiö 2012, 2014).

Even though the above discussion has rehabilitated and advocated the Wiedemannian hypothesis of the "translative" origins of the Mari lative, the case in question is extraordinarily polysemous and multifunctional. Therefore one should not exclude the possibility that the suffix -(e)š may have multiple sources after all. Even though the idea of a Proto-Finno-Volgaic lative in *-s must be dismissed as an unfounded hypothesis (Ylikoski 2016), the Mari lative does coalesce with the illative in -š(ke) both in form and function in multiple ways (Alhoniemi 1967). A particularly difficult nut to crack is that of the

---

13.   In addition to examples presented by Ajanki (2014: 245–246, 260–265), it may be noted that as one of the subtypes of the similative translative consists of expression for 'speak in language X' (e.g., Erzya *eŕźa-ks kortan* [Erzya-TRA speak.1SG] 'I speak in (or: like an) Erzya', Finnish *puhun ersä-ksi* [speak.1SG Erzya-TRA] id.), one of the few so-called translative adverbs in Saami is North Saami *sámás* (as well as Aanaar Saami *sámás* and Skolt Saami *säämas*) 'in(to) Saami'. However, single adverbs like this as well as North Saami *vealggás* 'on credit' (← *vealgi* 'debt; credit') and the apparently recent *loanas* 'as a loan' (← *loatna* 'loan' < Scandinavian *lån* id.) seem to have little to say about the possible remnants of *-ksi, although they are reminiscent of the Finnic translatives such as Finnish *saameksi* 'in(to) Saami', *velaksi* 'on credit' and *lainaksi* 'as a loan' (as well as Meadow Mari *küsə̂n-eš* [loan-LAT]) used in largely the same functions (cf. Nielsen 1926: 181).

so-called "lative" functions of the lative (Sections 2 and 3.3) which barely fit either the concept of translatives or that of true directional cases. Therefore, even in the absence of obvious candidates for the secondary origins of *-(e)š* it may be worthwhile to compare the suffix with the Livonian translative-comitative in *-(kõ)ks*, going back to almost complete merger of the Finnic translative in *-ksi* and a later Southern Finnic comitative based on *kansa* 'companion, company' (see, e.g., Grünthal 2003: 177ff.).

Should a comparable merger of two fundamentally distinct morphemes have taken place in the distant past of Mari, it may remain entirely impossible to reconstruct such development on the basis of contemporary data. However, although the present discussion has focused on the lative marker *-(e)š* and its "translative" functions in particular, it is possible that additional light is shed by a completely different element, *-an/-än*, occurring outside the declension proper and having an unknown origin evidently distinct from *-(e)š*: As described in detail by Alhoniemi (1967; 1985: 61–69; 1993: 60–67), Mari has a closed set of complementary postpositions and adverbs known as "unproductive local cases" that are formally different from, but partly related to, the illative, inessive and lative case suffixes as well as the "ablative" postpositions (Meadow Mari *gȃč*, Hill Mari *gǝc* 'from'). However, although the so-called unproductive illatives like the postposition-cum-adverbs *ümbake* 'on(to)' and *βǝ(l)kǝ* id. (Meadow and Hill Mari, respectively) clearly resemble the illative case suffixes *-š(ke)* and *-š(kǝ)* both in form and function, the so-called unproductive latives such as *ümbalan* and *βǝlän* are evidently markedly different from the lative in *-(e)š*: They are used only in the so-called lative or allegedly directional and specific instrumental functions exemplified by Examples (1) and (4a–7a) discussed in Section 3.3, but not in the "translative" functions discussed in Sections 3.4 and 3.5.

Unsurprisingly, the origins of the "unproductive lative" marker *-an* have been unanimously ascribed to ancient latives, but it is most important to note here that the so-called directional functions of the lative in the semantically strict but morphologically wide sense – *-(e)š* for nouns, *-an* for adverbs and postpositions – may originate from something different than the "translative" functions that can be ascribed to the suffix *-ksi*. In other words, the existence of the "unproductive lative" in *-an* may suggest a possibility of multiple origins of the Mari lative as we know it.

At the end of the day, it appears that the only concrete etymology that can be reliably presented to the Mari lative in *-(e)š* is Proto-Uralic *-ksi* which has also given rise to the translative cases in Finnic and Mordvin as well as – yet less obviously – to the vaguely case-like category of predestinatives in Northern Samoyed. The proposed moderate development of Proto-Uralic *-ksi* to Mari lative in *-(e)š* is at any rate a significantly more plausible scenario than the traditional yet unsubstantiated view of the development of a strikingly translative-like lative case from a highly hypothetical Proto-Finno-Volgaic lative in *-s*, the origins and functions of which were never explained (see Ylikoski 2016: 31–35). Moreover, denominal derivations of apparently the same origin can also be found in not only Finnic, Mordvin, Mari and Samoyed, but also in Saami and Permic. The most concrete thing we can say about the original function of the morpheme is that it seems to have carried a vague meaning of

purpose or future (entailing a "translative" or "predestinative" change of role). At any rate, no better candidates for distinctly purposive morphemes – neither affixes nor words – have been reconstructed for Proto-Uralic or most ancient intermediate protolanguages.

As regards the ultimate origin and nature of Proto-Uralic *-ksi, there are good reasons to ask whether the morpheme has been a case suffix already in the most remote reconstructable protolanguage. In his pioneering proposal to connect the Samoyed predestinative with the Finnic translative, Janhunen (1989: 301) ends his paper by asking – but not answering – the question about the possibility of presuming that Proto-Uralic *-ksi might have been a derivational suffix that has acquired case-like functions from early on. This question has not been explicitly addressed by subsequent scholars Leisiö (2012: 212–213; 2014), Ajanki (2014) and Salminen (2014), either. Somewhat surprisingly, the idea of a Proto-Uralic case in *-ksi has been entertained most directly in Lehtinen's (2007: 67–68) textbook on the history of Finnish already before the primary research conducted in the following decade.

In the preceding sections, very little has been said about Permic and nothing about Ugric. However, it is enough to remember the well-known fact that even the generally accepted hypothesis about the Proto-Uralic genitive in *-n is actually based on Saami, Finnic, Mordvin, Mari and Samoyed only, and there are no more concrete traces of the equally established Proto-Uralic accusative either, as only Saami, Mari, Mansi and Samoyed quite unquestionably share the case marker *-m that has either disappeared or merged with the genitive elsewhere. Given the wholesale restructuring of inflectional morphology in both Permic and Ugric, it is only understandable that the possible cognates of a possibly Uralic *-ksi are not readily found – they may well be lost forever. However, as it appears that even the origin of the Permic illative (Komi and Permyak -ę and Udmurt -e) – having certain "translative" functions similar to the ones discussed in the present paper (Bartens 2000: 106) – is still quite obscure (Ylikoski 2011: 257–258; 2016: 61–62), it might not be entirely fruitless to keep *-ksi in mind also, whenever the origins of the Permic case markers are critically re-examined. In the case of a more thorough re-evaluation of received wisdoms, the same could even be said for the Khanty and Mansi translatives in *-γ (cf. Honti 1998: 343–345), realized as -ii in East Mansi:[14]

---

14.   Upon closer scrutiny, even the Saami languages could show signs of an earlier *-ksi with translative functions. The South Saami equivalents of the enigmatic North Saami "lative" adverbs such as *vuolás* 'downward' and *olggos* 'to the outside' (Section 3.1 and Note 8) end in *-se*, as in *våålese* 'downward' and *olkese* 'to the outside'. Likewise, the derivations in *-ksi are formed with *-se* for disyllabic but *-(a)sse* for trisyllabic nouns, as in *tjohpe* 'hat' → *tjohpese* 'material for hat' and *gaamege* 'shoe' → *gaamegasse* 'material for shoes'. However, *tjohpese*, *gaamegasse* and most other derivations of this type are homonymous with the illative (i.e., *tjohpese* [hat.ILL] and *gaamegasse* [shoe.ILL]), and further still, especially South Saami is known for employing its illative in the "translative" functions that are otherwise occupied by the essive cases in the Saami languages:

East Mansi

(37) *om   neegøm   **neeg-ii**   nän   wøsløn?*
     1SG   woman.1SG   woman-TRA   Q.LAT   take.PST.2SG>SG

'Why have you taken my woman as your wife?' (Kulonen 2007: 75)

Nevertheless, the typological incongruity of the Samoyed predestinative declension with western Uralic case systems undeniably makes it appear an outlier in relation to Finnic -*ks(i)*, Mordvin -*ks* and Mari -*(e)š*. Therefore, it could also be possible that only the three westernmost case suffixes share common origins in *-ksi*, and the nature and origin of the Samoyed predestinative in *-tə̂* may have to be re-evaluated in the areal context of western and central Siberia, as suggested by Siegl (2013: 401–403) who seems to be the only scholar to regard Janhunen's hypothesis unlikely – mainly due to the syntactic differences between the predestinative and the Finnic translative (though mentioned in only one sentence without examples or references). Indeed, it is noteworthy that vaguely similar phenomena have been attested in languages like Even, Evenki and Udihe (Tungusic), Ket (Yeniseian), Dolgan (Turkic) as well as Selkup (Southern Samoyed; apparently not cognate with the Northern Samoyed predestinative).[15]

According to Siegl (2013: 403), "the clustering of this category around the Yeniseian language family, whose speakers are known to have switched to numerous other languages of the area, might provide new insights for further research". As the related phenomena in Turkic have been ascribed to a Tungusic substrate, it is certainly possible to assume that the typological distance between the Northern Samoyed predestinative and its geographically and chronologically distant western cognates has grown further as a result of such language contacts. In this case it is also reasonable to assume that the origins of the present-day predestinatives lie in a less peculiar derivational or inflectional category typical of "Standard Average Uralic".[16]

South Saami

(ii) *Daate   kaarre   lea   sån   jijtje   dihte   nåajties-ålma,*
     DEF   man   be.3SG   DPT   REFL   DEF   sorcerer

     *mij   maahta   jijtje   **snöölkese**   jih   viht   **almetjisse**   sjidtedh.*
     what   can.3SG   REFL   wolf.ILL   and   again   person.ILL   become.INF

'This man is apparently the sorcerer who can turn himself into a wolf and again into a man.' (Siegl 2017a: 205 < Andersson 1992: 63; the expected standard spelling of the illative forms would be *snöölhkese* and *almetjasse*.)

In other words, it could be speculated that the South Saami illative case markers and their use might also contain traces of *-ksi*.

15.   See, for example, Malchukov (1995: 10) for an Even example for 'take this girl as a wife!', Khanina and Shluinsky (2014: 1421) for 'I am taking you as a wife for the hero' in Udihe, and Bekker (1978: 163) for a Selkup example for 'he took my youngest sister as his wife'. Confusingly enough, the Selkup translative – not unlike the Khanty and Mansi translatives – has been said to go back to a Proto-Uralic lative in *-k* – one of the building bricks of the the so-called lative theory for the origins of the Finno-Mordvin translative (see Bekker 1978: 160–162 and references therein).

16.   It is also indicative that of all alternative interpretations for the predestinative, Siegl (2013: 397–401) carefully considers the case interpretation as the only true alternative to the idea of "a distinct but defective nominal declension" presented by Prokof'ev (1937) and also favored by Siegl himself.

On the other hand, the Erzya translative is also a case that is able to come close to derivational – purposive or "predestinative" – suffixes. In (38–39), the translatives *peŋge-ks* [firewood-TRA] '(those) for firewood', *kudo-ks* [cottage-TRA] '(those) for a cottage' and *utomo-ks* [granary-TRA] '(those) for a granary' behave as if they had been demoted to derivations to which other case markers such as genitives can be attached, quite like the case markers following the predestinative markers in Northern Samoyed (for comparable types of the so-called secondary declension in Mordvin, see Hamari 2016):

Erzya

(38) *Весе   шочкнэнь   пултын²к   —   и   **пен²ге-кс-нэнь***
     *Veśe   šočkneń   pultiŋk   i   **peŋge-ks-neń***
     all   log.DEF.PL.GEN   burn.PST.2PL>3PL   and   firewood-TRA-DEF.PL.GEN

     *и   **кудо-кс-нэнь**.*
     *i   **kudo-ks-neń**.*
     and   cottage-TRA-DEF.PL.GEN

     'You burned all logs – both those for firewood and those for
     a cottage.' (Bartens 2003: 48 < Evsevʹev 1963: 101)

Erzya

(39) *Васьня   ускик   **кудо-кс**   шочконьть,   а   мейле*
     *Vaśńa   uskik   **kudo-ks**   šočkoń,   a   mejľe*
     at.first   haul.IMP.2SG>3PL   cottage-TRA   log.DEF.GEN   and   after

     ***утомо-ксо-ньть**.*
     ***utomo-kso-ńtʹ**.*
     granary-TRA-DEF.GEN

     'At first, fetch the logs that are intended for the cottage and after that
     those for the granary.' (Bartens 2003: 48 < Evsevʹev 1963: 101)

In any event, the most fundamental statement on the origins of *-ksi* and *-tə̂* has recently been made by Janhunen (2014) who nonchalantly adds to his classical synopsis of the structure of Proto-Uralic (Janhunen 1982) two cases – the privative (i.e., abessive or caritive) and the predestinative:

> For Proto-Uralic, for instance, it is possible to reconstruct two plural markers (nominative vs. oblique) and at least as many as seven case markers, two of which may functionally be classified as primarily "grammatical" (accusative, genitive), while three are "local" (locative, ablative, dative) and two others "modal" (privative, predestinative) (Janhunen 1982: 30–31, 1989). (Janhunen 2014: 317)

Janhunen's statement is quite bold, especially in light of his classical binary branching perspective to the taxonomy of the Uralic languages and in the absence of explicit data to support the hypothesis. However, it is intriguing to note that in addition to the

many similarities between the predestinative and the western Uralic cases in *-*ksi* discussed in the preceding sections, the Forest Enets predestinative *bii-đu-ń* [in.law-PREDEST-GEN.1SG] in (40) can be translated into Finnish with the translative *vävy-kse-ni* [son.in.law-TRA-1SG] which can be regarded as an exact cognate of *bii-đu-ń*, both going back to Proto-Uralic **wäŋiwi-ksi-ni*.

(40) Forest Enets

(a) *uu* **bii-đu-ń** *ebut* *soiđa*
2SG in.law-PREDEST-GEN.1SG be.CVB.2SG good.3SG

'If you were my son-in-law, this would be good.' (Siegl 2013: 386)

Finnish

(b) *Sinä* *olisit* *hyvä* **vävy-kse-ni**.
2SG be.COND.2SG good son.in.law-TRA-1SG

'You would make a good son-in-law to me.' (Finnish paraphrase J. Y.)

Moreover, the above sentences can be paraphrased in Hill Mari as follows:

Hill Mari

(c) *Тӹнь* **винг-еш-ем** *лач* *лиät* *ыльы.*
Tәń **βiŋ-eš-em** *lač* *liät* *ə̂l'ə̂.*
2SG son.in.law-LAT-1SG just.right be(come).2SG be.PST.3SG

'You would make a very good son-in-law to me.' (Julia Kuprina, p.c.)

A minor formal difference between the three forms is that the Hill Mari possessive form *βiŋešem* appears to go back to **wäŋiwi-ksi-mi* instead of **wäŋiwi-ksi-ni*. In any case, the idea of the "predestinative" or "translative" origins of the Mari lative can be understood as an additional support for the long history of the morpheme in question. It is impossible to present an exact reconstruction of the original functions of Proto-Uralic *-*ksi*, but in light of the examples presented in this paper it seems plausible to suggest that those may have included expressions for secondary predicates like 'take (someone) as a wife', 'give (something) as a gift' and 'suit (someone) for a son-in-law'. These kinds of expressions are quite universal, but it is notable that there have probably been no attempts to reconstruct Proto-Uralic morphosyntax to the extent that would cover such functions.

In other words, none of the reconstructed cases or other grammatical devices have been presented in "translative", "predestinative" or "purposive" expressions for 'as a wife', 'as a gift' or 'for a son-in-law', but it is now possible to propose that such functions have belonged to the domain of Proto-Uralic *-*ksi*. Symptomatically enough, these functions are so abstract that it is also difficult to reconstruct Proto-Uralic words for concepts like 'wife' and 'gift'. However, as nouns like **wäŋiwi* 'son-in-law' have probably been used in such functions through all ages, it is also possible to find *-*ksi* forms like Moksha *ovks* that seem to go back to the same source:

Moksha

(41) *Молян*   **ов-кс**   *ся*   *стирть*   *лангс.*
      moľan   **ov-ks**   *śä*   *śťeŕeť*   *laŋks.*
      go.1SG   son.in.law-TRA   that   girl.DEF.GEN   on

      'I will marry that girl and become a son-in-law with his family.' (MW s.v. *ov*)

In the end, it is worthwhile to once more compare the two alternative histories of the word forms seen above. Figure 1 summarizes the most recent views on the origins of the suffixes discussed throughout the preceding sections, but the Mari lative is still described as a descendant of a hypothetical Proto-Finno-Volgaic *s*-lative.

Proto-Uralic	*wäŋiwi-ksi(-ni)* (vaguely "translative" functions)	?
	↓	↓
Proto-Finno-Volgaic	*väŋivi-ksi(-ni)* (vaguely "translative" functions)	*väŋivi-s(V)-mi* (hypothetical *s*-lative with no known origin or "translative" functions)
	↓	↓
Finnic (Finnish)	*vävy-kse-ni* 'as/for my son-in-law'	
Mordvin (Moksha)	*ov-ks* 'as/for a son-in-law'	
Mari (Hill Mari)	–	*βiŋ-eš-em* 'as/for my son-in-law'
Samoyed (Forest Enets)	*bii-đu-ń* 'as/for my son-in-law'	

Figure 1. The marking of "translative" (or "predestinative" or "purposive") functions from Proto-Uralic to Finnish, Moksha, Hill Mari and Forest Enets according to the contemporary view (Janhunen 1989, 2014; Lehtinen 2007; Leisiö 2012, 2014; Salminen 2014) without revision of the origins of the Mari lative.

In contrast to Figure 1, Figure 2 subsumes the Mari lative under the direct descendants of the Proto-Uralic suffix *-ksi*. As William of Ockham put it, plurality must never be posited without necessity.

Proto-Uralic	*wäŋiwi-ksi(-ni/mi)
	son.in.law-ksi(-OBL.1SG/NOM.1SG)
	(vaguely "translative" functions;
	e.g., 'as/for my son-in-law')
	↓
Finnic (Finnish)	vävy-kse-ni
Mordvin (Moksha)	ov-ks
Mari (Hill Mari)	βiŋ-eš-em
Samoyed (Forest Enets)	bii-đu-ń

Figure 2. The marking of "translative" (or "predestinative" or "purposive") functions from Proto-Uralic to Finnish, Moksha, Hill Mari and Forest Enets according to the view presented in this paper.

It appears that the classical idea of a binary branching family tree of the Uralic languages has often led scholars to stop searching for distant cognates of a word or an affix if such are not readily observable in the closest branches of the tree. The first attempt to relate the Finnic translative to the Samoyed predestinative was cautiously presented less than thirty years ago (Janhunen 1989). However, an increasing number of competing views on the taxonomy of the family have been presented since Häkkinen (1983, 1984), and such alternative taxonomies are even more open to new ideas concerning the nature of Proto-Uralic (cf. Ylikoski 2016: 60–63). At any rate, if the classical view on the Proto-Uralic noun inflection is to be revised, a "predestinative" or "translative" case in *-ksi is definitely one of the strongest candidates for an amendment.[17] The foundation for this hypothesis was laid already by Wiedemann (1847) and was further developed by scholars such as Boller (1854) – who even labeled also the Mari case in -(e)š a *translative* – as well as Donner (1879), Beke (1911) and Wiklund (1927), but was unfortunately ignored and ultimately forgotten by subsequent generations of linguists.[18]

---

17.   Let it be added that Janhunen's (2014: 317) proposal of a Proto-Uralic privative (abessive, caritive) case appears an equally sensible amendment that would certainly merit more detailed analysis.
18.   For the record, the initial impetus for the present study was my serendipitous observation that the Finnish translative is the most common translation equivalent for Alhoniemi's (1985: 54–56) examples of the Mari lative. It was only afterwards that I realized that I had reinvented the wheel that had been in use for at least eighty years. Ninety years after Wiklund (1927) and one hundred and seventy years after Wiedemann (1847) I am content to agree with Janhunen (2015: 13) that "one should never think that an etymology is 'new' before one has checked the extant literature, which in the case of comparative Uralic studies is massive and covers at least 200 years of etymological work. [...] It may take another half a century for the correct explanation to win its place in the pool of generally accepted etymologies".

Abbreviations

1	first person	IMP	imperative
2	second person	INE	inessive
3	third person	INF	infinitive
ACC	accusative	LAT	lative
ADE	adessive	NARR	narrative
ADV	adverb	NEG	negation
ALL	allative	NMLZ	nominalization
CNG	connegative	NOM	nominative
COM	comitative	OBL	oblique
COMP	comparative (case/adverb)	PART	partitive
COND	conditional	PERF	perfect
CVB	converb	PL	plural
DAT	dative	POL	polite
DIM	diminutive	PREDEST	predestinative
DPT	discourse particle	PST	past tense
ELA	elative	PST2	second past tense
ESS	essive	PTCP	participle
ESSTR	essive-translative	PURP	purposive
EX	existential	Q	question
GEN	genitive	REFL	reflexive
GENACC	genitive-accusative	SG	singular
ILL	illative	VOC	vocative

References

Abramov = Абрамов, Кузьма 1988: *Пургаз*. Саранск: Мордовской книжной издательствась.

Ahlquist, August 1861: *Versuch einer mokscha-mordwinischen Grammatik nebst Texten und Wörterverzeichniss*. St. Petersburg: Eggers et Comp.

Ahlqvist, August 1877: *Suomen kielen rakennus. Vertaavia kieliopillisia tutkimuksia. I. Nominien Synty ja Taivutus. Suomalainen Runo-oppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

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

Aikio, Ante & Jussi Ylikoski 2016: The origin of the Finnic *l*-cases. – *Fenno-Ugrica Suecana Nova Series* 15: 59–158.

Ajanki, Rigina 2014: The grown-up siblings: history and functions of Western Uralic *kse. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 62: 241–282.

Alhoniemi, Alho 1967: *Über die Funktionen der Wohin-Kasus im Tscheremissischen.* Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 142. Helsinki: Finnisch-Ugrische Gesellschaft.

Alhoniemi, Alho 1985: *Marin kielioppi.* Hilfsmittel für das Studium der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen X. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Alhoniemi, Alho 1988: Postpositiorakenteiden synkroniaa ja diakroniaa. – *Sananjalka* 30: 27–43.

Alhoniemi, Alho 1993: *Grammatik des Tscheremissischen (Mari). Mit Texten und Glossar.* Hamburg: Buske.

Alhoniemi, Alho 2001: Über den alten und neuen Lokalkasussuffixe im Tscheremissischen. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 56: 95–115.

Anduganov = Андуганов, Юрий Владимирович 1991: *Историческая грамматика марийского языка. I. Синтаксис.* Йошкар-Ола: Марийское книжное издательство.

Andersson, Ando 1992: *Maam dah soptsestamme!* Jokkmokk: Sámi Girjjit.

Aterev = Атерев, И. 2012: Аф юкснесазь учительснон — виде кис путыснон. – *Мокшень правда* 36/2012 (13.09.2012). <http://www.mokshen-pr.ru/?id_refer=3371> 22 February 2017.

Bartens, Raija 1999: *Mordvalaiskielten rakenne ja kehitys.* Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 232. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Bartens, Raija 2000: *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys.* Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 238. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Bartens, Raija 2003: Kahden kaasuspäätteen jonoista suomalais-ugrilaisissa kielissä. – Marianne Bakró-Nagy & Károly Rédei (eds), *Ünnepi kötet Honti László tiszteletére.* Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet. 46–54.

Beke, Ödön 1911: *Cseremisz nyelvtan.* Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

Beke, Ödön 1934: Zur geschichte der finnisch-ugrischen s-laute. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 22: 90–122.

Bekker = Беккер, Эрика Генриховна 1978: *Категория падежа в селькупском языке.* Томск: Издательство Томского университета.

Bereczki, Gábor 1988: Geschichte der Wolgafinnischen Sprachen. – Denis Sinor (ed.), *The Uralic languages. Description, history and foreign influences.* Handbuch der Orientalistik 8: Handbook of Uralic studies 1. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 314–350.

Bereczki, Gábor 1994: *Grundzüge der tscheremissischen Sprachgeschichte I.* Studia Uralo-Altaica 35. Szeged: Universitas Szegediensis de Attila József Nominata.

Bereczki, Gábor 2002: *A cseremisz nyelv történeti alaktana.* Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó.

Boller, Anton 1854: *Die Declination in den finnischen Sprachen.* Aus dem XI. und XII. Bande der Sitzungsberichte der philos.-histor. Classe der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften besonders abgedruckt.

Budenz, József 1864: Cseremisz tanulmányok. – *Nyelvtudományi közlemények* 3: 397–470.

Castrén, M. A. (n.d.): Anteckningar öfver Chantaisko-karasinska dialecten. – Manuscripta Castreniana. Vol. XIV. Samoiedica. Jenisei-Samoiedica.

Castrén, M. A. 1845: *Elementa grammatices Tscheremissæ.* Kuopio: J. Karsten.

Collinder, Björn 1952: Uralaltaisch. – *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 24: 3–4: 1–26.

Collinder, Björn 1962: *Introduktion till de uraliska språken. Finskan och dess frändespråk.* Stockholm: Natur och Kultur.

Creissels, Denis 2014: Functive phrases in typological and diachronic perspective. – *Studies in Language* 38:3: 605–647.

de Groot, Casper (ed.) 2017: *Uralic essive and the expression of impermanent state*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Donner, Otto 1879: *Die gegenseitige Verwandtschaft der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen*. Abdruck aus den Acta Soc. Scient. Fennicæ. Tom. XI. Helsingfors: Druckerei der Finnischen Litteratur-Gesellschaft.

Donner, Otto 1881: Die samojedischen Sprachen und die finnisch-ugrischen. – *Atti del IV Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti tenuto in Firenze nel settembre 1878. II*. Firenze: Le Monnier. 231–251.

Evsev'ev = Евсевьев, Макар Евсевьевич 1963: *Избранные труды IV. Основы мордовской грамматики*. Саранск: Мордовское книжное издательство.

Galkin = Галкин, Иван Степанович 1964: *Историческая грамматика марийского языка. Морфология. I*. Йошкар-Ола: Марийское книжное издательство.

Galkin = Галкин, Иван Степанович 1966: *Историческая грамматика марийского языка. Морфология. II*. Йошкар-Ола: Марийское книжное издательство.

Grünthal, Riho 2003: *Finnic adpositions and cases in change*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 244. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Häkkinen, Kaisa 1983: *Suomen kielen vanhimmasta sanastosta ja sen tutkimisesta. Suomalais-ugrilaisten kielten etymologisen tutkimuksen perusteita ja metodiikkaa*. Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 17. Turku: Turun yliopisto.

Häkkinen, Kaisa 1984: Wäre es schon an der Zeit, den Stammbaum zu fällen? – *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher. Neue Folge* 4: 1–24.

Häkkinen, Kaisa 1985: *Suomen kielen äänne- ja muotorakenteen historiallista taustaa*. Fennistica 6. Turku: Åbo Akademi.

Häkkinen, Kaisa 2002: *Suomen kielen historia 1. Suomen kielen äänne- ja muotorakenteen historiallista taustaa*. Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 69. Turku: Turun yliopisto.

Häkkinen, Kaisa 2010: Nuorgrammatiikkaa vai ei? – *Virittäjä* 114: 577–588.

Hakulinen, Lauri 1979: *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys*. Neljäs, korjattu ja lisätty painos. Helsinki: Otava.

Hamari, Arja 2016: The genitive in the secondary declension in the Mordvin languages. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 40: 1–33.

Haspelmath, Martin 2009: Terminology of case. – Andrej Malchukov & Andrew Spencer (eds), *The Oxford handbook of case*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 505–517.

Honti, László 1998: ObUgrian. – Daniel Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic languages*. London: Routledge. 327–357.

Huumo, Tuomas & Krista Ojutkangas 2006: An introduction to Finnish spatial relations. Local cases and adpositions. – Marja-Liisa Helasvuo & Lyle Campbell (eds), *Grammar from the human perspective. Case, space and person in Finnish*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 11–20.

Hynönen, Emmi 2016: *Suomen essiivi*. Annales Universitatis Turkuensis C 425. [PhD thesis.] Turun yliopisto.

Hynönen, Emmi 2017: The essive in Finnish. – Casper de Groot (ed.), *Uralic essive and the expression of impermanent state*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 29–56.

Itkonen, Erkki 1966: Esiintyykö *s*-latiivi permiläisissä kielissä? – *Virittäjä* 70: 273–280.

Itkonen, Esa 2004: Paavo Ravila yleisen kielitieteen edustajana. – *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja* 90: 319–329.

Jalava, Lotta 2017: The essive-translative in Tundra Nenets. – Casper de Groot (ed.), *Uralic essive and the expression of impermanent state*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 397–426.

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

Janhunen, Juha 1989: Samojedin predestinatiivisen deklinaation alkuperästä. – *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja* 82: 298–301.

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

Janhunen, Juha 2015: Etymology and the role of intuition in historical linguistics. – *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 20: 9–15.

Jännes, Arvi 1890: *Suomen partikkelimuodot*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Joseph, Brian D. 2004: Rescuing traditional (historical) linguistics from grammaticalization theory. – Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde & Harry Perridon (eds), *Up and down the cline – the nature of grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 45–71.

Kettunen, Lauri 1940: *Suomen murteet. III: A. Murrekartasto*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Kettunen, Lauri 1943: *Vepsän murteiden lauseopillinen tutkimus*. Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 86. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Khanina, Olesya & Andrey Shluinsky 2014: A rare type of benefactive construction: Evidence from Enets. – *Linguistics* 52: 6: 1391–1431.

Kittilä, Seppo & Jussi Ylikoski 2011: Remarks on the coding of goal, recipient and vicinal goal in European Uralic. – Seppo Kittilä, Katja Västi & Jussi Ylikoski (eds), *Case, animacy and semantic roles*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 157–182.

Korhonen, Mikko 1979: Entwicklungstendenzen des finnisch-ugrischen Kasussystems. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 43: 1–21.

Kosminskij = Косминский, Е. А. 1961: *Кокла курымласе историй. Средний школын 6-7 класслаштыш тунемме книга*. Йошкар-Ола: Марийский государственный издательство.

Kulonen, Ulla-Maija 2007: *Itämansin kielioppi ja tekstejä*. Apunevoja suomalais-ugrilaisten kielten opintoja varten XV. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Künnap, Ago 1987: Põhjasamojeedi predestinatiivsest deklinatsioonist. – *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja* 81: 209–220.

Kuznecova = Кузнецова, Маргарита 2008: Система пространственных падежей в марийском языке. – *Linguistica Uralica* 44: 3: 198–207.

Labanauskas = Лабанаускас, К. И. (ed.) 2002: *Родное слово – Энецкие песни, сказки, исторические предания, традиционные рассказы, мифы*. Санкт-Петербург: Просвещение.

Lehtinen, Tapani 2007: *Kielen vuosituhannet: suomen kielen kehitys kantauralista varhaissuomeen*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Leisiö, Larisa 2012: Tempuksen ja moduksen merkintä nganasaanin nomineissa. – Tiina Hyytiäinen, Lotta Jalava, Janne Saarikivi & Erika Sandman (eds), *Per Urales ad Orientem: Iter polyphonicum multilingue. Festskrift tillägnad Juha Janhunen på hans sextioårsdag den 12 februari 2012*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 264. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne. 209–218.

Leisiö = Леисиё, Л. 2014: Именные категории времени в нганасанском и других северносамодийских языках. – *Вопросы языкознания* 2014: 1: 39–59.

Lewy, Ernst 1922: *Tscheremissische Grammatik. Darstellung einer wiesentscheremissischen Mundart*. Leipzig: H. Haessel.

Malchukov, Andrei L. 1995: *Even*. München: Lincom.

MarlaMuter = *МарлаМутер. 10 томан марий йылме мутер. Мутерыште чылаже 40991 мут*. <http://marlamuter.com/muter/10_томан/1011> 22 February 2017.

Moisio, Arto & Sirkka Saarinen 2008: *Tscheremissisches Wörterbuch*. Aufgezeichnet von Volmari Porkka, Arvid Genetz, Yrjö Wichmann, Martti Räsänen, T. E. Uotila und Erkki Itkonen. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae 32, Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 151. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura – Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus.

Müller, Friedrich 1882: *Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft. II. Band. Die Sprachen der schlichthaarigen Rassen. II. Abtheilung. Die Sprachen der malayischen und der hochasiatischen (mongolischen) Rasse*. Wien: Alfred Hölder.

MW = *H. Paasonens Mordwinisches Wörterbuch*. Zusammengestellt von Kaino Heikkilä. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Martti Kahla. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XXIII. Helsinki: Finnisch-Ugrische Gesellschaft 1990–1999.

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

Nikolaeva, Irina 2009: Nominal tense in Tundra Nenets and Northern Samoyedic. – Peter K. Austin (et al., eds), *Proceedings of Conference on Language Documentation and Linguistic Theory 2*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies. 241–250.

Nikolaeva, Irina 2014: *A grammar of Tundra Nenets*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

OV = *Од Вейсэньлув*. Хельсинки: Библиянь ютавтомань институтось 2006.

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

Prokof'ev = Прокофьев, Г. Н. 1937: Энецкий (Енисейско-самоедский) диалект. – Г. Н. Прокофьев (ed.), *Языки и письменность народов Севера часть 1 – Языки и письменность самоедских и финно-угорских народов*. Москва & Ленинград: Государственное учебно-педагогическое издательство. 75–90.

Ramstedt, G. J. 1902: *Bergtscheremissische Sprachstudien*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne XVII. Helsinki: Finnisch-Ugrische Gesellschaft.

Rätsep, Huno 1979: *Eesti keele ajalooline morfoloogia. II*. Tartu: Tartu Riiklik Ülikool.

Rice, Sally & Kaori Kabata 2007: Crosslinguistic grammaticalization patterns of the ALLATIVE. – *Linguistic Typology* 11: 451–514.

Riese, Timothy, Jeremy Bradley, Emma Yakimova & Galina Krylova 2017: *Оҥай марий йылме: A comprehensive introduction to the Mari language*. Vienna: University of Vienna.

Riese, Timothy 1993: Der Translativ in den uralischen Sprachen II. – *Linguistica Uralica* 29: 1–20.

Rueter, Jack 2010: *Adnominal person in the morphological system of Erzya*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 261. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Saareste, Andrus 1955: *Väike eesti murdeatlas. Petit atlas des parlers estoniens*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Saarinen, Sirkka 2001: Das finnisch-wolgaische Ableitungssuffix *kse*. – *Néprajz és nyelvtudomány* XLI: 2: 241–247.

Saarinen, Sirkka 2017: The Mari essive and its functional counterparts. – Casper de Groot (ed.), *Uralic essive and the expression of impermanent state*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 261–281.

Salminen, Tapani 2014: Suomalais-samojedilaisia muotovertailuja. – Nobufumi Inaba, Jorma Luutonen, Arja Hamari & Elina Ahola (eds), *Juuret marin murteissa, lehvät yltää Uraliin. Juhlakirja Sirkka Saarisen 60-vuotispäiväksi 21.12.2014.* Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 270. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 289–300.

Savatkova = Саваткова, А. А. 2002: *Горное наречие марийского языка.* Bibliotheca Ceremissica Tomus V. Savariae: Berzsényi Dániel főiskola.

Setälä, E. N. 1890: *Yhteissuomalaisten klusiilien historia. Luku yhteissuomalaisesta äänne-historiasta.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Siegl, Florian 2013: *Materials on Forest Enets, an Indigenous Language of Northern Siberia.* Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 267. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Siegl, Florian 2017a: The essive in South Saami. – Casper de Groot (ed.), *Uralic essive and the expression of impermanent state.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. 185–215.

Siegl, Florian 2017b: The essive-translative in the Enets languages. – Casper de Groot (ed.), *Uralic essive and the expression of impermanent state.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. 427–459.

Sorokina & Bolina = Сорокина, И. П. & Д. С. Болина 2005: *Энецкие тексты.* Санкт-Петербург: Наука.

SSA = Erkki Itkonen & Ulla-Maija Kulonen (eds) 1992–2000: *Suomen sanojen alkuperä. Etymologinen sanakirja I–III.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura & Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus.

Stipa, Günter Johannes 1990: *Finnisch-ugrische Sprachforschung von der Renaissance bis zum Neopositivismus.* Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 206. Helsinki: Finnisch-Ugrische Gesellschaft.

Szinnyei, Josef 1910: *Finnisch-ugrische Sprachwissenschaft.* Leipzig: Göschen'sche Verlagshandlung.

Tauli, Valter 1956: The origin of affixes. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 32: 170–225.

Tereščenko = Терещенко, Н. М. 1965: *Ненецко-русский словарь.* Москва: Советская Энциклопедия.

US = *У Согонь.* Хельсинки: Библим сӓрӹшӹ институт 2014.

Voutilainen, Eero 2011: Nykysuomen translatiivin polysemiaa. [Master's thesis.] Suomen kielen, suomalais-ugrilaisten ja pohjoismaisten kielten ja kirjallisuuksien laitos. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.

Wichmann, Yrjö 1913–1918: Beiträge zur tscheremissischen Nominalbildungslehre. – *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja* 30₆: 1–42.

Wiedemann, Ferdinand Johann 1847: *Versuch einer Grammatik der tscheremissischen Sprache nach dem in der Evangelienübersetzung von 1821 gebrauchten Dialekte.* Reval: Franz Kluge.

Wiedemann, Ferdinand Johann 1865: *Grammatik der ersa-mordwinischen Sprache nebst einem kleinen mordwinisch-deutschen und deutsch-mordwinischen Wörterbuch.* Mémoires de l'académie impériale des sciences de St.-Pétersbourg, VIIᵉ Série. Tome IX, № 5. St. Petersburg: Eggers.

Wiklund, Károly Bernát 1927: A translativus. – *Magyar Nyelv* 23: 321–328.

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

Ylikoski, Jussi 2016: The origins of the western Uralic *s*-cases revisited: historiographical, functional-typological and Samoyedic perspectives. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 63: 6–78.