

Arja HAMARI (Helsinki)

The abessive in the Permic languages

In the Permic languages, the forms of the abessive suffix are *-teg* in Komi and *-tek* in Udmurt. In this study the formal and functional characteristics of the abessive suffixes are treated both in the nominal categories (nouns, pronouns, adjectives, numerals and adverbs) and in verbs. The focus of this investigation is on the similarities and differences that can be detected, firstly, between the two closely related languages and, secondly, between the nominal and verbal categories. The study is mainly based on the Komi and Udmurt standard languages; the study material has been collected from two newspapers, *Komi mu* and *Udmurt duńie*.

1. Introduction

1.1. The object of the study

This study investigates the forms and functions of the abessive suffix in the Permic languages Komi and Udmurt. In modern standard Komi, the suffix is *-teg* and in Udmurt *-tek*. These suffixes are usually employed to express the absence of a referent (Komi *kerka-teg* ~ Udmurt *korka-tek* ‘without a house’) or an action (Komi *vetlj-teg* ~ Udmurt *vetlj-tek* ‘without going’) in a given situation. In the first instance, where the ending is attached to a word representing one of the nominal categories (nouns, pronouns, adjectives, numerals or adverbs), it is regarded as one of the case suffixes, that is, the abessive¹ case. In the latter instance, the suffix is attached to a verb stem and is considered the marker of negative converbs.² In this study, the term *abessive* will be used when referring to the suffix, regardless of the word-class of the stem.

Although it is generally acknowledged that the abessive endings used in the nominal and verbal paradigms are identical both diachronically and synchronically (see Chapter 2), they are usually treated separately in the grammars of Komi and Udmurt. Such treatments examine the functions of the abessive case in relation to the rest of the case paradigm, while the functions of the negative converbs are examined in the context of other converbs (see e.g. SKJa 1955: 143, 245–246 and ÖKK 2000: 79, 387–392 on Komi and GSUJa 1962: 100, 278–283 on Udmurt). The use of words belonging to the nominal categories on one hand and to the verbal categories on the other undeniably differ from each other in many respects, but the abessive forms of the Permic languages also have certain features in common regardless of the part of

1 In some sources, this case is called *caritive* (*Karitiv* in German, *karitiivi* in Finnish; see e.g. Bartens 2000: 84, 102–103; Csúcs 2005: 181–182). In this study, the term *caritive* will be reserved for the derivational ending in *-tem* (Komi) ~ *-tem* (Udmurt) that is used to form denominal adjectives as well as participial verb forms.

2 In this study, the term *converb* will be used instead of the more traditional term *gerund* when referring to the Permic non-finite verb forms that are mainly employed as adverbials (see Section 4.1).

speech of the word in question. One of the goals of this study is to clarify the similarities and the differences of the abessive forms of the nominal and verbal categories in these two sister languages. For example, it will be shown that the conditions of the use of the forms as adverbials, attributes and complements are the same for the nominal and verbal abessives. Differences, on the other hand, appear in for example the person marking in the nominal and verbal forms, especially in Udmurt.

As will be argued in Chapter 2, the abessive of both nominal and verbal forms can be regarded as a rather conservative category in that the forms and functions are similar in several Uralic languages to a large extent. However, there are certain features typical of the Permic languages that point to the fact that this category has not remained totally unchanged throughout history. Moreover, even in such closely related languages as Komi and Udmurt, there are several language-specific characteristics that have developed in the abessive since the break-up of the Permic proto-language approximately 1500 years ago. For example, in Udmurt the use of the abessive suffix is more extensive both formally and functionally than in Komi. Differences even occur within the dialects of Komi and Udmurt, but these dialectal differences will not be treated in detail in this study except for some brief remarks.

The study consists of three major parts. First, in Chapter 2, I will consider the assumptions of the origin of the abessive suffix and its further development in the Permic languages in light of the existing literature. Chapters 3 and 4, on the other hand, are devoted to the functions of the suffixes in both languages; the former deals with the characteristics of the abessive case in the nominal categories of nouns, pronouns, adjectives, numerals and adverbs, while in the latter chapter, the verbal abessive (i.e. the negative converb) will be treated. The features of person marking will also be studied in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 from both a formal and functional viewpoint. The conclusions of the study will be presented in Chapter 5.

1.2. The study material

The study material was collected from two leading newspapers that appear in Komi and Udmurt. Both the Komi newspaper *Komi mu* and the Udmurt newspaper *Udmurt duńńe* appear three times a week and include several types of texts ranging from news, interviews and columns to reviews, short stories and poems. Most of the articles are written by the newspapers' journalists, but in practically every issue there are also texts from other writers such as authors, poets and the general public.

Both *Komi mu* and *Udmurt duńńe* are published both in a paper format and on the internet. The study corpus was assembled by using the electronic versions, which is why the references in the examples presented in this article refer to the internet. The issues of an entire yearly cycle were utilized in both languages; in the case of Komi, the material was collected from the issues of *Komi mu* that appeared between October 1, 2008 and September 30, 2009, while the Udmurt material covers the issues of *Udmurt duńńe* between January 1 and December 31, 2007.

The distribution of the abessive case suffix in different word classes in the study material is given in Table 1. All in all, the Komi data consists of 1148 expressions that include a word form in the abessive case, while the size of the Udmurt data is 2078 expressions. The difference in the sizes of the data can be considered rather surprising, since the sizes of the corpora are by and large the same (approximately 700,000 words in both languages) and there is no other grammatical item or lexeme meaning ‘without’ in either of the languages. Therefore, the difference indicates that some other constructions may be used to express the lack of a referent or an action in Komi, whereas an abessive construction is preferred in similar contexts in Udmurt. No exhaustive explanation will be given for the difference in this study, although I will consider this theme when dealing with the functions of the case in Chapter 3 and 4.

	Komi	Udmurt
Nouns ³	371	691
Pronouns	42	163
Adjectives	1	2
Numerals	1	2
Adverbs	–	15
Verbs	733	1205
Total	1148	2078

Table 1. The distribution of the abessive suffix in the corpus.

As can be seen in Table 1, more than half of the data comes from verb forms in the abessive case in both languages, while nouns and pronouns form the second and third largest groups respectively. Occurrences of the abessive case in other parts of speech are relatively scarce. This distribution will be discussed in greater detail in the course of the study.

In addition to the newspaper material, earlier descriptions and grammars of the Permic languages will, of course, also be considered. As for the tripartite division of Komi into three main varieties – Komi (earlier Zyryan), Permyak and Yazva Komi – only the first of these will be dealt with in this study. The main focus will be on the standardized languages of Komi and Udmurt, but descriptions of the grammatical categories in dialects will also be taken into account when available. However, the dialects will be considered only as additional material – that is, no data was systematically gathered from dialectal sources. The study of the Permic abessive forms would certainly benefit from an examination of the modern spoken languages and their varieties as well as from older dialectal text collections, as these would most likely shed light on the changes of the grammatical category, and this will have to be taken into account in further study.

3 Including proper nouns and deverbal nouns.

2. The development of the abessive ending

2.1. The origin

Within the Uralic language family, the abessive case endings are both formally and functionally relatively uniform, especially in the Finnic, Saami, Mari and Permic languages. The Komi ending *-teg* and the Udmurt *-tek* are cognates with, for example, the Finnish *-tta/-ttä*, the Northern Saami *-haga* (< *-taga*)⁴ and Mari *-de* ~ *-te*⁵ that also serve as case endings (e.g. Itkonen 1992: 221; Csepregi 2000: 183–184, 187). Moreover, there is also a caritive derivational ending that is etymologically related to the abessive case suffix and that is likewise relatively well-preserved especially in the language groups mentioned above; for example, Komi *-tem*, Udmurt *-tem*, Finnish *-ton/-tön* (: *-ttoma/-ttömä-*) and Eastern Mari *-dâme* ~ *-tâme* are all cognates. The Erzya Mordvin *-vtomo* and Moksha Mordvin *-ftâma* (and their variants) are also related to the latter, but function both as case endings and as derivational suffixes (see e.g. Itkonen 1992: 221; Bartens 1999: 79–80).

It is assumed that both the case endings and the derivational suffixes are based on two parts, the first of which is common to both suffixes. This is an element that has been reconstructed as either **-ptV* (Korhonen 1981: 226–227) or **-ktV* (Janhunen 1982: 29, 31) and that can be traced back to the Uralic proto-language, as it has equivalents throughout the language family. However, it is not clear whether it was originally a case ending or a derivational suffix (Janhunen, id.). In the light of the Finnic, Saami, Mari, Mordvin and Permic languages, this suffix **-CtV* was supplemented by a nominal ending in **-mV* to produce an adnominal suffix or by a directional case ending in **-k*⁶ to produce an adverbial suffix; the successors of the former are usually derivational caritive endings (e.g. K[omi] *-tem* and U[dmurt] *-tem*), while the successors of the latter are most often inflectional abessive case endings (e.g. K *-teg* and U *-tek*) (Nevis 1986: 5–6; Itkonen 1992: 223; Csepregi 2000: 182).

When it comes to the verbal abessive and caritive forms, the picture is not as uniform. Janhunen (1982: 37) states that the Proto-Uralic derivational caritive ending was used to form the negation of the verbal noun in **-mâ* / **-mä* (resulting in a form in **-mâktâmâ* / **-mäktämä* in his reconstruction). However, no mention is made of the possible functions of this form. As pointed out by, for example, Csepregi (2000: 186) the derivational caritive ending requires a nominalizing suffix in *-mA* when attached to verbs in the Finnic and Saami languages, but in Komi as well as in Mari the caritive ending is attached directly to the verb stem. In Udmurt, on the other hand, the derivational ending in *-tem* is attached to one of the affirmative participial endings *-is*

4 The Northern Saami abessive ending is nowadays used as a postposition (Nevis 1986, Norde 2009: 207–208) and even as a preposition (Jussi Ylikoski, p.c.; see also Norde 2009: 208).

5 The abessive is a productive case only in the North-Western and Western dialects of Mari (Alhoniemi 1985: 221).

6 A. Kövesi (1965: 379) reconstructed this suffix either as **k* or **ŋ* and regarded it as an original derivational suffix.

or *-on*; in the past participle, a separate ending in *-mte* is used that probably consists of a nominalizing suffix in *-m* and an irregular caritive element in *-te* (Bartens 2000: 246–247).

The actual abessive ending can be attached to a verb stem in Saami, Mari and the Permic languages (e.g. K *vetli-teg* ~ U *vetli-tek* ‘without going’; K, U *vetli-* ‘go’), while in the Finnic languages, the verb must first be nominalized (e.g. Estonian *hari-ma-ta* ‘without farming / unfarmed’). Ylikoski (2009: 196 [footnote 78]) speculates that the former pattern might even represent the original way of forming negative converbs in the Uralic languages. Whatever the original form of the negative converb, it should be noted that at least within the Permic languages, it is not usual to form converbs by simply adding a case suffix into a verb stem; in addition to the negative converb, only the suffixes of the temporal converb K *-ig* ~ U *-ku* / *-ki* have hesitantly been reconstructed as representatives of an original case suffix in **-k* that was attached to a verb stem (Bartens 2000: 251). However, the temporal converb has other reconstructions as well (see Bartens 2000: 250–251 and Csúcs 2005: 284 for details).

2.2. The abessive in the Permic languages

The form of the abessive case suffix in the present-day Permic languages is exceptional in that both the Komi ending *-teg* and Udmurt *-tek* have a suffix-final stop which, according to the cognates of related languages, seems to represent the original directional case ending in **-k*. As pointed out by, for example, Uotila (1933: 132), Bartens (2000: 84) and most recently Csúcs (2005: 182), stops in final positions have usually been lost in the Permic languages. Such a loss has happened for instance in the illative case suffix: it now consists of a single vowel in both languages (K *-e*, U *-e*), but was probably originally formed by the same **-k* that has been reconstructed as a part of the abessive case suffix. The single vowels of the present-day illative most likely represent the original stem-final sounds of nouns that were left to carry the function of the case, when the original **-k* was lost in Proto-Permic (Bartens, id.). Another exceptional feature mentioned by Bartens (2000: 38) is the fact that the suffix-final stop has become voiced in Permyak (*-teg*) and in Yazva Komi (*-tøg*), although in these two Komi variants word-final stops have usually remained voiceless.

Several explanations for the survival of the suffix-final consonant have been offered. According to Uotila (1933: 132), the stop may have been preserved because it might not have occurred in absolute word-final position (see also Baker 1985: 137). In modern Komi, the possessive ending, if present, often follows the case marker and in Uotila’s opinion this could have been the original order of the two suffixes. The presence of the possessive suffix would have protected the last consonant of the abessive case suffix from erosion. (In modern Udmurt, on the other hand, the abessive ending is preceded by the possessive suffix; see Section 3.1.3.2 for the discussion of the suffix order in the two languages.)

Another explanation for the preservation of the suffix-final consonant is given by Cypanov (1997: 161–162), who considers the Komi forms of the abessive *-teg* and the caritive *-tem*. According to him, the similarity of these two suffixes could have led to the final consonants in both being retained; the loss of both *-g* and *-m* would have caused the two suffixes, which are functionally close, to merge. As stated in Hamari (2001: 135), this explanation might not suffice on its own, since in some related languages (especially in Mordvin) the abessive and the caritive have in fact merged both formally and functionally. Moreover, in the Udora dialect of Komi the endings of the abessive and the caritive can be used in free variation in exactly the same contexts, although the dialect still has two formally different suffixes (Sorvačeva & Beznosikova 1990: 33, 47; see also Section 3.1.2 below). However, the abessive and the caritive are not the only suffixes that were based on the consonant *t* and a subsequent vowel in Proto-Permic and, according to Csúcs (2005: 182), this suffixal similarity could have played a role in the preservation of the suffix-final consonant in the abessive case. Csúcs claims that there were only three vowels (**i*, **e*, **a*) that could appear in a suffix in early Proto-Permic and, as these three vowels were in free variation with each other, the last consonant of the abessive case was preserved to prevent confusion with other suffixes with an element in **tV*.

Finally, Bartens (2000: 84) has tentatively suggested that the abessive ending of the Permic languages might originally have been longer than today, which would mean that the present-day final consonants were not final in Proto-Permic. According to Bartens, the Permic abessive could in this case be paralleled with that of the Saami languages: in Korhonen's (1981: 226–227) reconstruction of the Proto-Saami abessive suffix (**-ptā-g-e-k* or **-ptā-g-e-n*) the lative **-g* (< **-k*) is followed by another directional case suffix, either **-k* or **-n*. Considering the sound changes of the Permic languages, a similar reconstruction of the Permic abessive would make the present-day forms totally regular. This suggestion is, however, difficult to verify in the light of the modern languages.

3. The abessive of the nominal categories

The Permic languages have a relatively rich case system: the number of cases ranges from 12 in certain southern dialects of Udmurt (Kel'makov & Saarinen 1994: 98) to over 20 in Permyak (e.g. Baker 1985: 66). If we exclude the most recent language-specific changes, where new cases have developed from earlier postpositions, the case inventory of the Permic languages shows obvious affinity. However, comparisons to the case systems of other Uralic languages indicate that this affinity does not go back beyond Proto-Permic, and therefore extensive changes must have taken place during the Proto-Permic period (see e.g. Tepljašina & Lytkin 1976: 145; Lytkin 1977: 20; Baker 1985: 137–153; Bartens 2000: 77–90). As summarized by Baker (1985: 137–153), these changes include, for example, phonological processes such as the deletion of word-final consonants that led to the loss of earlier suffixes consisting of a single

consonant, secretion when certain stem-final vowels were reanalysed as case endings, semantic shifts through which some old case suffixes gained new meanings and functions, adaptation of formerly nonfleotional elements into the system as case endings and compounding of older case suffixes into new endings. The changes led to a wide-ranging reorganization of the earlier case system and this development has, to some extent, continued independently in different parts of the Permic branch (Baker, id.).

If we look from the opposite perspective – what has changed the least of all in reconstructed case suffixes – we encounter the abessive. As mentioned above, the abessive endings have clear etymological equivalents in Finnic, Saami and Mari and probable cognates in the Ugric and the Samoyed branches and, consequently, the suffix most likely goes back to the Uralic proto-language. Furthermore, the functions of the abessive cases are very similar in Finnic, Saami, Mari and Permic, pointing to a relative stability of the case category (Csepregi 2000). Finally, the abessive case suffix has been maintained in all Permic languages and their dialects – a fact that further emphasizes the constancy of this case. In this chapter, this constancy will be evaluated in the light of the modern Komi and Udmurt standard languages.

Within the nominal categories, the abessive case suffix is most typically attached to nouns in the Permic languages, but attachment to pronouns, adjectives and numerals is likewise possible. Furthermore, in Udmurt some adverbs can carry the abessive suffix. I will treat the nominal categories in this order.

3.1. Nouns

3.1.1. The semantics of the abessive case forms

One of the prototypical uses of the abessive case are expressions in which the abessive is employed to denote the absence of an instrument or a companion in a certain situation or action (see e.g. SKJa 1955: 143 and ÖKK 2000: 79). In the affirmative, instrumentality is usually expressed by using the instrumental case in both Permic languages, but in the expressions of companion, the affirmative counterparts differ in the two languages so that, while the instrumental case is used in Udmurt, there is a separate comitative case in Komi for this function. The abessive can be used in both languages as the negative counterpart for these expressions:

(1) Komi (SKJa 1955: 143)

a. instrument:

the instrumental case	×	the abessive case
<i>ger-am</i> <i>traktor-en</i>		<i>ger-am</i> <i>traktor-teg</i>
plough-PRS.1PL tractor-INS		plough-PRS.1PL tractor-ABE
‘we plough / are ploughing with a tractor’		‘we plough / are ploughing without a tractor’

b. companion:

the comitative case

><

the abessive case

*užal-a Vanja-kečd**užal-a Vanja-teg*

work-PRS.1SG Vanja-COM

work-PRS.1SG Vanja-ABE

‘I work / am working with Vanja’

‘I work / am working without Vanja’

(2) Udmurt (Kondrat’eva & Fedorova 2004: 56–57)

a. instrument:

the instrumental case

><

the abessive case

*ručka-en gožjaškj-nj**ručka-tek gožjaškj-nj*

pencil-INS write-INF

pencil-ABE write-INF

‘to write with a pen’

‘to write without a pen’

b. companion:

the instrumental case

><

the abessive case

*njl-en ~ njl-in**njl-tek*

girl-INS girl-INS

girl-ABE

‘with a girl / a daughter’

‘without a girl / a daughter’

However, instruments and companions are by far not the only functions for either the instrumental/comitative cases or the abessive case in the Permic languages (for the different functions see e.g. ÖKK 2000: 74–79 on Komi and GSUJa 1962: 100–105 on Udmurt). This is not unique to the Permic languages only. Stolz, Stroh and Urdze (2006) have studied comitativity and instrumentality from a typological viewpoint and present a categorization of 14 different core functions of the expressions of ‘with’ across languages. They claim that these functions can be used as a basis to study the manifestation of comitativity and instrumentality as well as their negation across languages (although the list of functions is not exhaustive). In German for example, all of these functions are expressed by using the preposition *mit* ‘with’, but not all languages are this straightforward. As can be seen in the comparison of the German examples given in Example (3) and their English translations, these two languages differ from each other in their expressions of the functions in question:

(3) German (Stolz & Stroh & Urdze 2006: 41–42)

a. Co-operative

Agnes trinkt mit Werner Kaffee.‘Agnes is drinking coffee **together with** Werner.’

b. Reciprocal

Agnes unterhält sich mit Werner.‘Agnes is chatting **with** Werner.’

c. Active comitative / human companion

Agnes geht mit ihrer Tochter spazieren.‘Agnes is going for a walk **with** her daughter.’

- d. Passive comitative / animate companion
*Agnes geht **mit** ihrem Hund spazieren.*
 ‘Agnes is walking her dog.’
- e. Confective / inanimate companion
*Agnes geht **mit** dem Regenschirm nach draußen.*
 ‘Agnes goes out **with** her umbrella.’
- f. Ornative / temporary property
*Agnes kommt **mit** roten Augen vom Friedhof zurück.*
 ‘Agnes returns from the cemetery, red-eyed.’
- g. Combination
*Agnes trinkt immer Kaffee **mit** Milch.*
 ‘Agnes always drinks coffee **with** milk.’
- h. Part-whole / permanent property
*Die Agnes **mit** den braunen Augen wohnt woanders.*
 ‘The brown-eyed Agnes is living somewhere else.’
- i. Possession
*Die Agnes **mit** dem Porsche hat keinen Führerschein.*
 ‘The Agnes **with** the Porsche has no driving licence.’
- j. Human instrument
*Agnes terrorisiert **mit** ihren Kindern die Nachbarschaft.*
 ‘Agnes terrorises the neighbourhood **with** her children.’
- k. Body part instrument
*Agnes schreibt den Brief **mit** der linken Hand.*
 ‘Agnes is writing the letter **with** her left hand.’
- l. Means of transportation
*Agnes kommt **mit** dem Bus vom Friedhof zurück.*
 ‘Agnes returns from the cemetery **by** bus.’
- m. Material
*Agnes baut ein Haus **mit** Legosteinen.*
 ‘Agnes is building a house **using** Lego bricks.’
- n. Tool
*Agnes schlägt das Fenster **mit** dem Hammer ein.*
 ‘Agnes smashes the window **with** the hammer.’

When it comes to the negative counterparts of comitative and instrumental expressions, Stolz, Stroh and Urdze (2006: 167–170) claim that, cross-linguistically, the inventory of grammatical markers is usually smaller than in the affirmative expressions. This trait is not surprising in the light of what is known about negation in general; as argued by Miestamo (1998: 189, 198; 2005: 7–8), negation is a marked category as opposed to affirmation and, as a consequence, it is not unusual in languages that some grammatical categories that are marked in affirmation either lose that marking or the distinctions between categories are neutralized under negation. Within the comitative/instrumental expressions of the Permic languages, this is most clearly visible in Komi in which the abessive case can be regarded as a negative counterpart of two affirmative cases.

As for the typological classification by Stolz, Stroh and Urdze (2006) presented in Example (3) above, a detailed study would be required to determine what exactly the possible means are to express the core functions of comitativity and instrumentality in the Permic languages, but it can be said that many of them would involve the use of the instrumental or, in Komi, the comitative case. In the negative counterparts, the abessive forms would be used instead. For example, the following pairs of instrumental and abessive cases illustrate the expressions of combination (Example 4) and confective/inanimate companion (Example 5) in Komi:

(4) Komi (Cypanov 2007: 199)

- a. *Šid šoj-ənj sol-ən.*
 soup eat-PRS.3PL salt-INS
 ‘Soup is eaten with salt.’
- b. *Šid o-z šoj-nj sov-teg.*
 soup NEG.PRS-3 eat-CNG.3PL salt-ABE
 ‘Soup is not eaten without salt.’

(5) Komi (Cypanov 2007: 199)

- a. *Ənje gəstí mun-e źoriź-jas-ən.*
 Ənje visit go-PRS.3SG flower-PL-INS
 ‘Ənje goes for a visit with flowers.’
- b. *Ənje gəstí mun-e źoriź-jas-teg.*
 Ənje visit go-PRS.3SG flower-PL-ABE
 ‘Ənje goes for a visit without flowers.’

Other expressions, however, would be formed by using other grammatical means. For example, adjectivization would most likely be used to form expressions such as part-whole/permanent property:

- (6) Komi (ÖKK 2000: 110)
Sešša sikt-in ne-kod nin e-z ažživ
 then village-INE NEG-who any.more NEG.1PST-3 see.CNG.SG
paškir tošk-a starik-es.
 curly beard-ADJ old.man-ACC
 ‘Then no one in the village saw the old man with the curly beard any more.’

- (7) Udmurt (Kel'makov & Hännikäinen 1999: 116)
tuš-o piosmurt
 beard-ADJ man
 ‘a man with a beard’

The negation of the part-whole/permanent property would require a negative derivational suffix, the caritive ending of adjectives in the Permic languages (K *toš-tem* ~ U *tuš-tem* ‘beardless’).

In the study material, there were only a few examples of the abessive case that could be described in terms of prototypical instrumentality or companion. The following examples illustrate these – although it could be argued that the referents mentioned in Example (8) (‘microphone’ and ‘glasses’) are not typical instruments but, rather, devices of aid or the like:

- (8) Instrument:
 a. Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=351543>>
Važ strejba-as zev bur veĭ-i, vešig
 old building-INE.POSS.3SG very good be-1PST.3SG even
mikrofon-teg šorhit-i-m.
 microphone-ABE talk-1PST-1PL
 ‘It was very good in the old building, we even talked without a microphone.’
- b. Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art29.html>>
Očki-tek ližžiskj-nj bigat-iško na.
 glasses-ABE read-INF be.able-PRS.1SG still
 ‘I can still read without glasses.’
- (9) Companion:
 a. Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=301762>>
 [--] *kodi mam-teg-ĭs voškov o-z vermĭ več-nĭ, [--]*
 who mother-ABE-POSS.3SG step NEG.PRS-3 be.able.CNG.SG make-INF
 ‘[--] who cannot take a step without his/her mother, [--]’
- b. Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art961.html>>
Mon niĭ-ĭ-tek no-kitčj ej mĭnj-sal.
 1SG daughter-POSS.1SG-ABE NEG-where.ILL NEG.COND go-COND
 ‘I wouldn’t go anywhere without my daughter.’

In the study corpus, most occurrences of the abessive cannot be defined through the classification of Stolz, Stroh and Urdze (2006). The following sentences are examples of instances that do not fit into any of the categories they present:

(10) Komi

- a. <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=286376>>
No sport-teg-id mort-id edje labm-e.
 but sport-ABE-DET person-DET quickly get.weak-PRS.3SG
 ‘But without (doing) sports a person quickly becomes weak.’
- b. <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=262588>>
Bat-mam-teg bïdm-ig-ad Mašë e-z
 father-mother-ABE grow.up-CONV-2SG Mašë NEG.1PST-3
teđlij šań oļem-se.
 know.CNG.SG gentle life-ACC
 ‘Growing up without parents Mašë didn’t experience an easy life.’

(11) Udmurt

- a. <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art132.html>>
Sport-tek ul-em-e u-g lui
 sport-ABE live-NMLZ-POSS.1SG NEG.PRS-3 be.CNG.3SG
ńi, šu-e so.
 any.more say-PRS.3SG 3SG
 ‘I cannot live life without sports any more, he says.’
- b. <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art755.html>>
Ođig gažet bam no pot-em-ïñ
 one newspaper page even come.out-PTC.PST-PRED
evel Vladimir Belomorskix-len tuspuktem-jos-ïž-tek.
 NEG Vladimir Belomorskix-GEN photograph-PL-POSS.3SG-ABE
 ‘Not a single page of the newspaper has been published without pictures by Vladimir Belomorskix.’

In examples (10a) and (11a), an inanimate (and in fact, abstract) referent is involved, but it does not represent a companion or a property but, rather, an activity. In Example (10b), the noun in the abessive case refers to a human referent, but there is no cooperative, reciprocal or active feature involved in its role, nor does it represent a case of a human instrument, but rather possession or the like. In Example (11b), on the other hand, the abessive form refers to the absence of an inanimate referent, but since the subject of the clause (*gažet bam* ‘newspaper page’) is also inanimate, the function of the noun in the abessive cannot be defined according to the list provided by Stolz, Stroh & Urdze either.

As can be concluded from the Permic examples in this section (as well as from the following sections of this chapter) the functional domain of the abessive case is vast. Consequently, it is understandable that the domain is usually simply described as that of expressing the absence of a referent in a given situation or action, without an exhaustive categorization of the functions (see e.g. ÖKK 2000: 79 for Komi and GSUJa 1962: 100 for Udmurt).

3.1.2. The syntactic characteristics of the abessive case forms

Syntactically, the abessive forms of the Permic languages most often function as adverbials in the sentences; all examples given so far are instances of abessive forms as adverbials. However, there are examples of the abessive case in attributive position as well in both languages although, according to ÖKK (2000: 79), these are not frequent in Komi. The following examples illustrate these expressions as found in the study corpus:

(12) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=331746>>

Taje festival'-jas-se jez-is jon-a
 this festival-PL-ACC people-DET strong-ADV
viććis-eni, ed fonogramma-teg šil-əm-te
 wait-PRS.3PL as phonogram-ABE sing-NMLZ-ACC
talun gežeda nin kavl-an.
 today rarely any.more hear-PRS.2SG
 'People really look forward to these festivals, as today you rarely hear live music any more.'

(13) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art482.html>>

Soku duńne vjl-jn lu-o-z odig
 then world on-INE be-FUT-3SG one
kun, odig kultura, odig kvl odig
 country one culture one language one
kivaltiš, Inmar-tek ul-on.
 leader God-ABE live-NMLZ
 'Then, there will be one country, one culture, one language, one leader, life without God on earth.'

When treating the negative gerunds of the Permic languages, Bartens (2000: 257) points out that these can be used as attributes at least in Udmurt (but see Chapter 4 for Komi examples as well). She further notes that in her example of the Udmurt attributive verb form, the head of the construction is a deverbal noun. In the case of abessive noun forms, this seems to be the tendency as well, as in most cases of this type found in the study material, the head is, in fact, a deverbal noun as in examples (12) and (13) above. Also, when dealing with the attributive abessive case forms in Komi, ÖKK only provides this kind of examples:

(14) Komi (ÖKK 2000: 79)

- a. *bat-mam-teg ol-əm*
 father-mother-ABE live-NMLZ
 ‘life without parents’
- b. *nan-teg šoj-əm*
 bread-ABE eat-NMLZ
 ‘meal without bread’

We could therefore argue that the use of the abessive forms in such contexts is in fact a feature characteristic of the deverbal noun, rather than that of the noun in the abessive form. After all, deverbal nouns are originally verb forms that may have maintained some of the features of verbs – in this case the ability to take an originally adverbial modifier in the abessive case. This ability is connected to a grammatical process that Haspelmath (1996) calls transpositional or word-class-changing inflection. I will come back to this type of inflection in Section 4.2.2, when dealing with negative converbs in the Permic languages.

It should be noted, however, that according to GSUJa (1962: 100), the Udmurt abessive also appears in attributive positions with lexical nouns:

(15) Udmurt (GSUJa 1962: 100)

- žek vjl-ın vu-tek grafin sıl-e.*
 table on-INE water-ABE carafe stand-PRS.3SG
 ‘A carafe without water stands on the table.’

In these instances, the abessive forms must be regarded as true attributes. However, no data for this type of construction was found in the Udmurt corpus of the present study, which means that they are not very frequent in the standard language at least. Example (16), on the other hand, is a rare occurrence of this type in Komi. Here the abessive case form appears to modify a lexical noun. However, this expression is most likely a literal translation of the Russian expression *beskonečno žal* ‘(it is) an endless pity’ (*bes-koneč-no* ‘without-end-ADV’, *žal* ‘pity’) that is used as a predicate.⁷

(16) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=251853>>

- Pom-teg žal, mij ni veledjś-ıs, ni*
 end-ABE pity that NEG teacher-DET NEG
veledjś-ıs mijan pevst-ın abu-ėś nin.
 student-DET 1PL.GEN among-INE NEG-PL any.more
 ‘It is an endless pity that there is neither the teacher nor the student among us any more.’

7 I would like to thank my anonymous referee as well as Jussi Ylikoski for this observation.

Although the attributive use of the abessive case is not a frequent feature of the standard languages, it is more common in the Udora dialect of Komi. According to Sorvačeva & Beznosikova (1990: 47), nouns in the abessive case can be used interchangeably with adjectives derived from nouns by adding the caritive ending *-tem*. Consequently, the phrases in examples (17a) and (17b) carry exactly the same meaning. Sorvačeva and Beznosikova do not make any reference to the characteristics of the head of the constructions, but as seen in the examples they give, the head can be a lexical noun.

(17) Komi: Udora dialect (Sorvačeva & Beznosikova 1990: 47)

- a. *jur-tem* *uleš*
backrest-ADJ.CAR chair
'a chair without a backrest'
- b. *jur-teg* *uleš*
backrest-ABE chair
'a chair without a backrest'

Finally, it should be noted that within the Uralic language family, the use of abessives as attributes is not limited to the Permic languages. For example in Estonian, both nouns carrying the abessive suffix in *-ta* (Example 18a) and the verbal abessives in *-mata* (Example 18b) can be employed in an attributive position:

(18) Estonian (Itkonen 1992: 226)

- a. *kõrva-ta* *kohvi-tass*
handle-ABE coffee-cup
'a coffee cup without a handle'
- b. *hari-ma-ta* *põld*
farm-NMLZ-ABE field
'an unfarmed field'

According to Itkonen (1992: 226), the Estonian nominal abessive *-ta* and verbal abessive *-mata* are evolving into derivational endings that are used partly interchangeably with the original derivational caritive suffixes *-tu* and *-matu*; a similar phenomenon has been detected in North Saami and it has been reconstructed in Hungarian as well.

In addition to the uses of the abessive case as adverbials and attributes, this case also appears as an obligatory constituent in constructions that are formed with verbs meaning 'stay, be left' and 'leave' in both languages:

(19) Komi

a. <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=316128>>*Čelad' kol'-i-snj bat'-mam-teg.*

children be.left-1PST-3PL father-mother-ABE

'The children were left without parents.'

b. <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=346180>>*No Aleksandra Alekseeva uŝ-teg e-z kol'.*

but Aleksandra Alekseeva work-ABE NEG.1PST-3 stay.CNG.SG

'But Aleksandra Alekseeva was not left without work.'

(20) Udmurt

a. <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art1224.html>>*Šižim ares dırja-z ataj-tek kil'-i-z.*

seven years.old during-POSS.3SG father-ABE stay-1PST-3SG

'She was left without a father, when she was seven years old.'

b. <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art923.html>>*Voštišk-on-jos-in seren no-kin no uŝ-tek*

change-NMLZ-PL-INS because.of NEG-who NEG work-ABE

u-z kil', ŝu-i-z R. Kasimov.

NEG.FUT-3 stay.CNG.FUT.SG say-1PST-3SG R. Kasimov

'No one is going to be left without work because of the changes, said R. Kasimov.'

As will be seen in Chapter 4, the negative converbs are also found in these types of constructions, especially in Udmurt. The use of the nominal and verbal abessives as complements of verbs meaning 'stay, be left' or 'leave' is typical of some other Uralic languages as well (see e.g. Huumo 2005: 506 on Finnish and Alhoniemi 1985: 146 on Mari). According to Korhonen (1981: 226), this may even have been the original environment in which the abessive forms were used in the proto-language. Korhonen justifies this idea by referring to the original form of the abessive as a directional case form (i.e. a lative case in Korhonen's work) of a caritive derivation and claims that as the verbs in question usually require the adverbial noun in a case with a directional (or lative) meaning in the modern languages, this may have been their original feature.

However, when considering the uses of the Permic abessive verb forms, Bartens (2000: 257–258) shows that there are also other verbs that can take a verbal abessive as a complement; these are verbs meaning 'be, live' and (in Komi) 'be able to' (see Section 4.2.3). As can be seen in the examples below, these constructions are also possible with nominal abessives. This means that the use of the Permic abessive forms is not restricted to contexts in which the verb requires a directional complement.

- (21) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=246448>>
Už-teg e-z ov-l-j i Jakov
 work-ABE NEG.1PST-3 be-FREQ-CNG.SG too Jakov
Mitrofanovič Ročev, a šur-i-s taj sji
 Mitrofanovič Ročev but occur-1PST-3SG after.all 3SG.DAT
kad giž-nj “Kjk drug”, “Ižva giž-e”
 time write-INF two friend Ižva be.restless-PRS.3SG
da “Mu vež-an-djr” trilogija-se.
 and land change-NMLZ-time trilogy-ACC.POSS.3SG
 ‘Jakov Mitrofanovič Ročev wasn’t without work either, as after all he got time to write his trilogy of “Two friends”, “Ižva is restless” and “The end of the world”.’
- (22) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=356797>>
A taje už-teg-is enij-a kad-e ne-kjži
 but this work-ABE-DET now-ADJ time-ILL NEG-how
o-z pož.
 NEG.PRS-3 be.able.CNG.SG
 ‘But nowadays it is impossible to do without this kind of work.’
- (23) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art126.html>>
Respublika-ištijm odig-ez mejj-ez no bažim-ez
 republic-ELA.POSS.1PL one-DET old-DET and big-DET
vjli dišet-on učreždenije – Udmurt kun univěrsitet –
 high study-NMLZ institution Udmurt state university
tolež mįndaze ul-i-z rektor-tek.
 month about be-1PST-3SG rector-ABE
 ‘One of the oldest and biggest institutions of higher education of our republic – Udmurt State University – was without a rector for about a month.’

3.1.3. The abessive case and other grammatical markers

The abessive case forms can be accompanied by certain other grammatical markers in both Komi and Udmurt. These markers are the plural marker, possessive suffixes and the comparative marker. In comparison with other case suffixes, there is nothing particular about the plural marking of nouns in the abessive case: the plural ending precedes the abessive case suffix (e.g. K *kerka-jas-teg* ~ U *korka-os-tek* ‘without houses’), as it does in other cases as well. The person marking (i.e. the possessive suffixes) and the use of the comparative, however, deserve a somewhat more profound treatment, as there are certain features in their development and modern functions that are of interest for the present study.

3.1.3.1. Person marking

In the possessive declension of nouns, the case suffixes are accompanied by possessive suffixes. In the Permic languages, the order of the suffixes is not consistent throughout the case paradigms, but different cases show different patterns. In the abessive, the morpheme order is different in the two languages. In Udmurt, the abessive case suffix (Cx) always follows the possessive suffix (Px):

1SG <i>gurt-e-tek</i>	1PL <i>gurt-mj-tek</i>
2SG <i>gurt-ed-tek</i>	2PL <i>gurt-tj-tek</i>
3SG <i>gurt-ez-tek</i>	3PL <i>gurt-sj-tek</i>

Table 2. The possessive declension of U *gurt* ‘village’ in the abessive case (Bartens 2000: 110).

The plural suffix appears next to the word stem also in the possessive declension (e.g. *gurt-jos-mj-tek* ‘without our villages’).

In Komi, the morpheme order of the abessive case and the possessive suffix shows more variation. What is nowadays most commonly given as the possessive paradigm of the abessive in the standard language is that where the morpheme order is CxPx in all persons except the 1st person singular, which has the order PxCx (e.g. ÖKK 2000: 61; Bartens 2000: 111):

1SG <i>gort-ej-teg</i>	1PL <i>gort-teg-nijm</i>
2SG <i>gort-teg-id</i>	2PL <i>gort-teg-nijd</i>
3SG <i>gort-teg-is</i>	3PL <i>gort-teg-njs</i>

Table 3. The possessive declension of K *gort* ‘home’ in the abessive case (Bartens 2000: 111).

However, the picture that arises from earlier descriptions of Komi and especially grammars that deal with dialects is much more varied. According to, for example, Rédei (1978: 78–79), the morpheme order is PxCx in the singular persons (1sg *-ej-teg*, 2sg *-id-teg*, 3sg *-is-teg*) but CxPx in the plural (1pl *-teg-nijm*, 2pl *-teg-nijd*, 3pl *-teg-njs*). Bubrix (1949: 34), on the other hand, gives an exceptional presentation of the paradigm in that the possessive suffix of the 1st person singular is different from the forms given in other sources (*-ijm* instead of *-ej*) and it follows the case suffix. Within the Komi dialects, this variant of the possessive suffix is only found in the Letka dialect (Žilina 1985: 40–41). The morpheme order in Bubrix’s presentation is consistently CxPx:

1SG <i>mort-teg-ijm</i>	1PL <i>mort-teg-nijm</i>
2SG <i>mort-teg-id</i>	2PL <i>mort-teg-nijd</i>
3SG <i>mort-teg-is</i>	3PL <i>mort-teg-njs</i>

Table 4. The possessive declension of K *mort* ‘a person’ in the abessive case (Bubrix 1949: 34).

In the Komi dialects, there is extensive areal variation with regard to the morpheme order and, even within one dialect, the order can vary especially in the plural persons (see e.g. Sorvačeva & Saxarova & Guljaev 1966: 78 for the Upper Vyčegda dialect and Saxarova & Sel'kov 1976: 50–52 for the Ižma dialect). The diversity of these different paradigm patterns in Komi suggests that the morpheme order in the abessive case has been in a state of change for quite a while. The only feature common to all these morpheme order variants in Komi is that the plural suffix always appears next to the stem (e.g. *kerka-jas-ej-teg* ‘without my houses’, *kerka-jas-teg-nim* ‘without our houses’).

The morpheme order of the possessive declension and its development in the Permic languages has been dealt with by several scholars, most recently by Bartens (2000: 109–123) and Csúcs (2005: 201–206). What is striking in the possessive declension is that the morpheme order is different in different cases in both languages. As suggested by Bartens (1993: 29–30) and Honti (1995: 76–77), in Proto-Uralic the order of the case suffix and the possessive suffix most likely depended on the grammatical function of the case; in the grammatical cases (i.e. the accusative and genitive), the order was PxCx, while in the non-grammatical cases it was CxPx. In the Permic languages as well as in Mari, this duality was more or less preserved, although further developments in the case systems have produced some variation in both branches.⁸ In modern Komi and Udmurt, the morpheme order is usually CxPx in local cases,⁹ while in the rest of the case system it is PxCx (Bartens 2000: 117). However, in certain local cases, the order does not follow the general pattern: the exceptional cases are the terminative, the approximative and the egressive – all of which developed during the Proto-Permic period – and the instrumental case that developed from an earlier local case in Proto-Permic (see Bartens 1993: 29–30; Honti 1995: 70–78; Bartens 2000: 84, 87–89 and Csúcs 2005: 183–184 for details).

The abessive, however, is exceptional in the case paradigm system in that only in this case, the whole personal paradigm is different in the two sister languages. In Udmurt, the order is PxCx, whereas in Komi, CxPx prevails (although with extensive variation). This may be considered unusual since the two languages are generally in line with each other. The reason for this duality may be found in the two different kinds of bases of the morpheme order that were typical of the Uralic proto-language on one hand and of the Permic proto-language on the other. Since the abessive is not a grammatical case, the Komi order CxPx would be expected when following the Proto-Uralic principle. On the other hand, since the abessive is not a local case either, one would expect to encounter the Udmurt order PxCx on the grounds of the Proto-Permic

⁸ See Luutonen (1997) for a detailed study of the Mari variation.

⁹ In the inessive-illative, the case is represented by a peculiar *a* and the relative case ending is also irregular (Bartens 2000: 85, 115; see also discussion on the vowel *a* in Section 4.3.1).

principles. The variation attested in the Komi dialects can be seen as a reflection of these two concurring tendencies that were present during the Proto-Permic period.¹⁰

In the study material, possessive suffixes were used more often in Komi than in Udmurt, but the distribution of the suffixes between different persons was more extensive in Udmurt. Table 5 presents the occurrences of the suffixes in the material:

	Komi	Udmurt
1SG	–	6
2SG	36	2
3SG	29	13
1PL	–	1
2PL	–	1
3PL	1	3
Total	66	26

Table 5. The distribution of the possessive suffixes in the study material.

However, this distribution illustrates the use of possessive suffixes in general more than their relationship with the abessive case; the possessive suffixes are often employed to refer to the possessor of the referent in question as in Examples (9a), (9b) and (11b) seen above, but especially the 2nd and 3rd person singular possessive endings are usually used in a pragmatic function in both languages. They mark topicalization, emphasis, or focus or they mark the referent as determined (Bartens 2000: 122). This function can be seen in many of the abessive case forms as well, especially in Komi. For example, the Komi examples (10a) and (22) can be seen as instances of nouns in the abessive form marked as topical or focus with the possessive ending (marked “DET” in the glossings).

Finally, one more observation should be made regarding the Komi abessive suffix. In some dialects, the suffix has extended forms such as *-tegja*, *-teġji* and *-teġi* especially before a possessive suffix. The coaffix in *-ja / -ji / -i* is dialectally also found in the prosecutive, terminative and comitative case forms, usually preceding the possessive suffix (see Baker 1985: 232–237 and the references therein; see also

10 However, one person-specific feature can be detected in the morpheme order of both Komi and Udmurt. In the 1st person singular, two variants are used: in most of the case forms, this person is represented by Udmurt *-e* and Komi *-ej* (or their dialectal variants), whereas a suffix containing an *m* is found especially in local cases but also in the accusative in both languages. The former always precedes the case suffix in both languages, while the latter appears in suffix-final position (except in the accusative that has a subsequent vowel). Considering that Udmurt *-e* and Komi *-e-* (in *-ej*) most likely go back to a former stem vowel of nouns (Csúcs 2005: 199) and that the *-j* in the Komi suffix was probably originally a derivational diminutive suffix used in a vocative function (Bartens 2000: 113), it is to be expected that these would appear before case endings. The original 1st person element in *-m*, on the other hand, that has been preserved in the local cases seems to have been prone to appear in a position following the case suffix, and this tendency can also be seen in the abessive forms of the Letka dialect of Komi and in the abessive paradigm given by Bubrix seen above.

Section 4.3.3 for the extended abessive forms of verbs). According to Baker (id.), in the modern dialects, “the presence of *-ja* / *-ji* / *-i* is entirely superfluous to the functions of the case forms in every dialect where the compounds are found.” This suffix is etymologically related to the Udmurt adverbial case suffix in *-ja* and can still be found in certain Komi adverbs and postpositions, but it is not a productive case in Komi (Baker 1985: 154–155). Given that within the case system the coaffix is characteristically a component of the possessive declension, it bears a certain functional resemblance to the vowel *a* that is found in the personal forms of the Udmurt negative converb. I will come back to these forms in Section 4.3.1, when discussing the verbal abessive of the Permic languages.

3.1.3.2. The comparative forms of the abessive case

One peculiar feature of the Permic languages is the use of the comparative endings in words belonging to categories other than adjectives. Particularly often they can be attached to adverbs and verbs (see e.g. ÖKK 2000: 95–96, 198, 310–316 on Komi and Tepljašina 1964: 139 on Udmurt). Such extensive use is most likely connected to the presumed development of the comparative suffixes from clitics or derivational endings with meanings such as ‘more’ or ‘quite’ (see Bartens 2000: 133–138 and the references therein). In Udmurt, the comparative suffix is either *-ges* or *-gem*, while in Komi it is *-žik*.

The comparative suffix can also be attached to abessive forms in both Permic languages, although this was not common in the study corpus. Example (24) is the only occasion in which the comparative was encountered in Udmurt, while three such expressions were found in Komi (e.g. Example 25).

(24) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art444.html>>

No džšetskij-nj milkid-tek-ges vetljl-i-z.
 but study-INF will-ABE-COMP go-1PST-3SG
 ‘But he went to study rather unwillingly.’

(25) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=349462>>

Ėd taje gaž dirj-is stav-se
 as this rejoicing during-DET all-ACC
pož-i-s ňeb-nj don-teg-žik.
 be.able-1PST-3SG buy-INF price-ABE-COMP
 ‘As during this celebration everything could be bought at nearly no price at all.’

According to ÖKK (2000: 95), the comparative suffix in Komi marks a comparison of some sort even in expressions in which the suffix is attached to a case form of a noun. The standard of comparison is usually not expressed in the same sentence, but can be determined from the context. Tepljašina (1964: 139), on the other hand, states

that in Udmurt, the comparative suffix does not necessarily mark comparison, but can also be understood as a marker of the quality of an action or a change in the modality of an action. However, when considering the use of the verbal abessive, Perevoščikov (1959: 48) interprets the meaning of the combination of the abessive and comparative as ‘not quite’ (see also Section 4.3.2). Perevoščikov’s interpretation is, in fact, the closest to the meanings found in the comparative forms of the abessives in the examples above (i.e. ‘not quite willingly’, ‘rather unwillingly’ in Example 24 and ‘not quite with a price’, ‘at nearly no price’ in Example 25).

3.2. Pronouns

The abessive case suffix can also be attached to certain pronouns in both Komi and Udmurt. These include, for example, the personal pronouns (Tables 6 and 7) and the reflexive-intensive pronouns meaning ‘self’ in both languages (Tables 8 and 9); all of these pronouns can be inflected in most other cases as well (see e.g. Bartens 2000: 149, 151, 154, 157).

1SG <i>me-teg</i>	1PL <i>mijan-teg</i>
2SG <i>te-teg</i>	2PL <i>tijan-teg</i>
3SG <i>sj-teg</i>	3PL <i>na-teg</i>

Table 6. The Komi personal pronouns in the abessive case (Bartens 2000: 149, 151, 154).

1SG <i>mon-tek</i>	1PL <i>mi-tek</i>
2SG <i>ton-tek</i>	2PL <i>ti-tek</i>
3SG <i>so-tek</i>	3PL <i>soos-tek</i>

Table 7. The Udmurt personal pronouns in the abessive case (Bartens 2000: 149, 151, 154).

1SG <i>as-teg</i>	1PL <i>as-teg-nim</i>
2SG <i>as-teg-ïd</i>	2PL <i>as-teg-nïd</i>
3SG <i>as-teg-ïs</i>	3PL <i>as-teg-nïs</i>

Table 8. The Komi reflexive-intensive pronoun *as-* ‘self’ in the abessive case (Bartens 2000: 157).

1SG <i>ać-im-tek</i>	1PL <i>aś-me-os-tek / aś-me-tek</i>
2SG <i>ać-id-tek</i>	2PL <i>aś-te-os-tek / aś-te-tek</i>
3SG <i>ać-iz-tek</i>	3PL <i>aś-se-os-tek / aś-se-tek</i>

Table 9. The Udmurt reflexive-intensive pronoun *aś-* / *ać-* ‘self’ in the abessive case (Bartens 2000: 157).

As can be seen in the paradigms of the pronoun ‘self’, the possessive suffixes are also involved in all expressions except the Komi 1st person singular form. The function of the possessive suffixes is, however, not to mark possession; they simply refer to the same person as the pronoun itself.

The use of the abessive case forms of personal pronouns that were encountered in the study material do not differ from the prototypical uses of the abessive forms of nouns. Most of them were employed in an adverbial position in both languages, as in the following examples. Example (28) is one of only two occurrences of the pronoun ‘self’ in the abessive case in Udmurt, while no such examples were found in the Komi material.

(26) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=325401>>

Da i k̄ži siję b̄jdm-as me-teg.
and PRT how 3SG grow.up-FUT.3SG 1SG-ABE
‘And how is she going to grow up without me?’

(27) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art1015.html>>

En koškj, ton-tek m̄njm šekjt lu-o-z.
NEG.IMP leave.CNG.IMP.SG 2SG-ABE 1SG.DAT hard be-FUT-3SG
‘Don’t leave, it is going to be hard for me without you.’

(28) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art638.html>>

O, tati aš-me-tek no vetl-iš-jos-jz t̄jrmjt gine, [--]
oh here self-POSS.1PL-ABE too go-PTC-PL-DET enough quite
‘Oh, there are enough walkers here without us [--]’ (Lit. ‘without ourselves’)

Demonstrative and reciprocal pronouns can likewise be inflected in most cases in both languages, including the abessive case, as can interrogative, indefinite and relative pronouns based on pronouns meaning ‘who’ and ‘what’ (see e.g. ÖKK 2000: 187, 189, 192, 195 on Komi and GSUJa 1962: 170–172, 176, 177, 179–180, 182 on Udmurt). A couple of instances of demonstrative (Example 29) and reciprocal (Example 30) pronouns in the abessive case were encountered in the Komi material, as well as examples of interrogative pronouns in relative function (Example 31):

(29) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=257822>>

Ljdda ta-teg o-z pož
read.IMP.2SG this-ABE NEG.PRS-3 be.able.CNG.SG
lešed-nj demokratičeskej gosudarstvo.
establish-INF democratic state
‘Read, without this a democratic state cannot be established.’

- (30) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=356022>>
Zduk etameđ-teg ov-nj e-g verm-ej.
 moment each.other-ABE live-INF NEG.1PST-1 be.able-CNG.PL
 ‘We couldn’t live one moment without each other.’

- (31) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=331739>>
Ti viž-annjd medša dona-tor-se, mij-teg
 2PL guard-PRS.2PL SUPERL valuable-thing-ACC what-ABE
o-z vermj sevmj-nj obščestvo – žoñvižalun.
 NEG.PRS-3 be.able.CNG.SG develop-INF society health.
 ‘You are guarding the most valuable thing without which society cannot develop – health.’

In Udmurt, on the other hand, the negative indefinite pronoun can be inflected in the abessive case. In Example (32a), this form is used as an adverbial, in Example (32b) as an attribute to a deverbal noun and in Example (32c) as a complement to the verb *kijl’ini* ‘stay, be left’:

(32) Udmurt

- a. <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art1270.html>>
No ta ar-ijn ik avgust tolež-e kjšnomurt
 but this year-INE same august month-ILL woman
nomjr-tek bert-e, vjl-az vekci derem gine.
 nothing-ABE return-PRS.3SG on-INE.POSS.3SG thin dress only
 ‘But also this year in August, the woman returns without anything, with only a thin dress on her.’
- b. <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art422.html>>
Nomjr-tek kijl’em užbergatiš-narkoman kjk
 nothing-ABE stay-PTC.PST entrepreneur-drug.addict two
kvarтира-ijn luškašk-em ni.
 apartment-INE steal-2PST.3SG already
 ‘The self-employed drug addict, who has been left without anything has already robbed two apartments.’
- c. <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art728.html>>
Ožj soos nomjr-tek no kijl’-i-zj.
 like.this 3PL nothing-ABE NEG stay-1PST-3PL
 ‘This way, they were left without anything.’

No equivalent Komi examples were found in the corpus of the present study. However, ÖKK (2000: 189) does mention the form *ninemeteg* ‘without anything’ in a table presenting the inflectional paradigm of *ninem* ‘nothing’, although cautiously in parentheses and without any examples.

Another special type of an abessive case on pronouns in Udmurt is the idiomatic expression *sointek-a*. It consists of an instrumental case form of the 3rd person singular pronoun *so*, which is followed by the abessive case ending and an enclitic question particle *-a*. The position of the phrase is usually in the beginning of the clause and, despite the question particle, it is not understood as a question but rather as a rhetorical expression that can be translated ‘isn’t this the reason why’ or ‘this must be the reason why’. Examples of this are presented below in a larger context to better illustrate their usage:

(33) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art832.html>>

<i>Gord</i>	<i>so</i>	<i>inmar-len</i>	<i>bujol-ez.</i>	<i>So-in-tek-a</i>	<i>uno</i>
red	3SG	God-GEN	colour-POSS.3SG	3SG-INS-ABE-Q	many
<i>kun-jos-len</i>		<i>flag-jos-azj</i>	<i>gord</i>	<i>bujol</i>	<i>vań.</i>
country-PL-GEN		flag-PL-INE.POSS.3PL	red	colour	EX

‘Red is the colour of God. This must be the reason why so many countries have the colour red in their flags.’

(34) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art1046.html>>

<i>So</i>	<i>u-g</i>	<i>śotj</i>	<i>no-kin-lj</i>	<i>čemtj-nj-mogžj-nj.</i>
3SG	NEG.PRS-3	let.CNG.PRS.3SG	NEG-who-DAT	stop-INF-halt-INF
<i>So-in-tek-a</i>		<i>ogažejaškon-jš</i>	<i>ńań</i>	<i>budetiš-jos kotkud</i>
3SG-INS-ABE-Q		union-ELA	grain	farmer-PL every
<i>gektar-jšťiz</i>	<i>tue</i>	<i>šor-ljđ-jn</i>	<i>27,4</i>	<i>centńer</i>
hectare-ELA.POSS.3SG	this.year	middle-figure-INE	27.4	hundredweight
<i>ju</i>	<i>tjš</i>	<i>kutsa-zj.</i>		
grain	seed	thresh-1PST.3PL		

‘He doesn’t let anyone stop or halt. This must be the reason why the farmers of the union threshed an average of 27.4 hundred kilograms of seed grain from every hectare this year.’

Generally, the abessive case cannot be attached to any other case suffix in either Komi or Udmurt. This form has most likely developed on the basis of the rather lexicalized instrumental form of the 3rd person singular *soin* ‘therefore, on that account’. Consequently, the construction is not exactly a combination of the instrumental case and the abessive case but, rather, a further lexicalization of the adverb *soin*. (See other abessive case forms of adverbs in Udmurt in Section 3.4.)

3.3. Adjectives and numerals

In both Permic languages, the abessive case ending can be attached to adjectives and numerals as well. However, the number of occurrences of abessive forms of adjectives and numerals was very low in the study corpus, only one of each in Komi and two of each in Udmurt. In all of these cases the forms in question functioned as nouns. In examples (35) and (36) the abessive forms of adjectives are presented.

(35) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=282308>>
Ižid kar kol'-i-s šonid-teg, va-teg, transport-teg.
 big city stay-1PST-3SG warm-ABE water-ABE transportation-ABE
 'A big city was left without heat, water and transportation.'

(36) Udmurt

a. <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art740.html>>
*Čerod-jos-tek no kuañer-jos-tek socializm-e!*¹¹
 queue-PL-ABE and poor-PL-ABE socialism-ILL
 'Without queues and without the poor to socialism!'

b. <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art1157.html>>
 [--] *muket-jos-se žinji ar čože uvolñitelnoj-tek vož-illam* [--]
 other-PL-ACC.PL half year during vacation.ADJ-ABE hold-2PST.3PL
 '[--] the others were prevented from taking a vacation for half a year [--]'

The use of adjectives as nouns is typical for other Uralic languages as well. In the Permic languages, in addition to the abessive, other case suffixes can also be attached to the adjectives on these occasions (SKJa 1955: 158; GSUJa 1962: 136).

As can be seen, the use of these forms does not deviate from what has been said above about the abessives of nouns. The Udmurt examples are representatives of adverbial use of the abessive case, whereas in the Komi example, the adjectival noun is employed as a complement to the verb *kolñi* 'stay, be left'.

The numerals in the abessive case were all instances of school grades used as nouns. These, too, functioned as adverbials:

(37) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=303105>>
No medjm veškav-nj šuda-jas ljd-as,
 but OPT end.up-INF fortunate-PL amount-ILL.POSS.3SG
student-lj kovm-as pom-ša kjk vo veledčj-nj "3"-teg.
 student-DAT must-FUT.3SG end-ADJ two year study-INF 3-ABE
 'But to make it to the group of the fortunate ones, a student must study the last two years without a (grade) "3".'

(38) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art742.html>>
Nirišeti šešši-jez ik "kuin-jos-tek" pot-i.
 first examination.period-ACC same three-PL-ABE go.out-1PST.1SG
 'I left the first examination period likewise without "threes".'

11 The expression in (36a) is elliptical, as it is a headline of a newspaper article.

3.4. Adverbs

Probably the most prominent difference between Komi and Udmurt in the use of the abessive case in the nominal categories is that in Udmurt, the case suffix can be attached to certain adverbs, whereas in Komi, this is not possible. In the material of the present study, two adverbs were encountered that appeared in the abessive form on several occasions: *oži* ‘like this, in this way’ and *kema* ‘for a long time’.

The abessive in the form *ožitek* is clearly used to produce a negation or a contrast of the adverb *oži* ‘like this, in this way’; the meaning of *ožitek* could be described as ‘not like this, not in this way, otherwise’. The following extended examples illustrate the use of this form:

(39) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art283.html>>

<i>Mon</i>	<i>malpa-ško:</i>	<i>tazaljik-ed</i>	<i>gine</i>	<i>med</i>	<i>lu-o-z</i>	–
1SG	think-PRS.1SG	health-POSS.2SG	only	OPT	be-FUT-3SG	
<i>malpan-ed</i>	<i>bjdesm-o-z.</i>	<i>Oži-tek</i>		<i>tatćjož</i>	<i>ul-on</i>	
dream-POSS.2SG	come.true-FUT-3SG	like.this-ABE		so.far	live-NMLZ	
<i>intj</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>baštj-nj</i>	<i>ej</i>		<i>permiťj-sal.</i>	
place	too	buy-INF	NEG.COND		be.able-COND	

‘I think that if only you will stay healthy, your dream will come true. Otherwise (i.e. if I didn’t believe in this) I wouldn’t have been able to buy an apartment so far.’

(40) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art522.html>>

<i>Televideñi-iš</i>	<i>košk-em-e</i>		<i>pumiš</i>	<i>u-g</i>
television-ELA	leave-NMLZ-POSS.1SG		about	NEG.PRS-1SG
<i>žala-ški,</i>	<i>ugo</i>	<i>oži-tek</i>	<i>mon</i>	<i>ej</i>
be.sorry-CNG.PRS.1SG	because	like.this-ABE	1sg	NEG.COND
<i>vui-sal</i>	<i>“Čagjir-čagjir</i>	<i>djdjik-e”</i>		<i>peredaća-je.</i>
come-COND	bright.blue-bright.blue	dove-POSS.1SG		program-ILL

‘I’m not sorry about my leaving the television, because otherwise I wouldn’t have come to the (radio) program “My Bright Blue Dove”.’

However, the abessive form of *kema* ‘for a long time’ is of a different type; *kematek* bears the same meaning as *kema*, but the difference between the “nominative” and abessive cases is that the abessive only appears in negative expressions:

(41) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art146.html>>

<i>Valentina</i>	<i>Petrovna</i>	<i>umme</i>	<i>ušj-nj</i>	<i>kema-tek</i>
Valentina	Petrovna	into.sleep	fall-INF	for.long-ABE
<i>ej-z</i>	<i>bigatj.</i>			
NEG.1PST-3	be.able.CNG.1PST.SG			

‘Valentina Petrovna couldn’t fall asleep for a long time.’

(42) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art778.html>>

Kjšnomurt *pe,* *piosmurt* *šariš,* *višon-ze*
 woman they.say man compared.with illness-ACC
kema-tek *u-g* *šedj.*
 for.long-ABE NEG.PRS-3 feel.CNG.PRS.3SG

‘They say that compared to men, women don’t feel the illness for a long time.’

(43) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art841.html>>

Ta *prazdnik-ez* *gurt-o-os* *kema-tek* *u-z*
 this feast-ACC village-ADJ-PL for.long-ABE NEG.FUT-3
vunet-e.
 forget-CNG.FUT.PL

‘The villagers are not going to forget this feast for a long time.’

However, *kema* and *kematek* are not in complementary distribution, since *kema* ‘for a long time’ can likewise be employed in negative contexts, as in the following example:

(44) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art29.html>>

Jekaterina *Alekseevna* *sobere* *kema* *e-z*
 Jekaterina Alekseevna there.after for.long NEG.1PST-3
ćida *ni –* *kul-i-z.*
 endure.CNG.SG any.more die-1PST-3SG

‘After that Jekaterina Alekseevna couldn’t endure for a long time any more – she died.’

In the adverbs *ožitek* ‘not like this, not in this way, otherwise’ and *kematek* ‘for a long time’ as well as in the form *sointek-a* ‘isn’t this the reason why’ or ‘this must be the reason why’ seen in Section 3.2, the meaning of the abessive has been reanalysed. It no longer carries the meaning ‘without’ but has become a marker of contrast (in *ožitek* and *sointek-a*) or of a kind of negative agreement (in *kematek*).

4. The abessive of verbs: the negative converbs

The term *converb* has been introduced in the typological study of non-finite verb forms to replace such earlier terms as, for example, *adverbial participle*, *conjunctive participle*, *gerund*, *gerundive* or *verbal adverb*. According to the typological definition, a converb is a non-finite verb form that typically functions as an adverbial, i.e. it is syntactically dependent on another verb form, but is not its obligatory complement (Haspelmath 1995: 3–8; Nedjalkov 1995: 97; Ylikoski 2001: 215–217; Ylikoski 2003: 189). Consequently, the Permic verbal abessives (e.g. K *vetlj-teg* ~ U *vetlj-tek* ‘without going’; K, U *vetlj-* ‘go’) can be regarded as converbs; the abessive verb

forms are often employed as adverbial modifiers of verbs (see e.g. Bartens 2000: 257). However, as will become apparent in the course of this study, the syntactic functions of the abessive verb forms of the Permic languages are not restricted to adverbials, as they are also employed as attributes and even obligatory complements of certain verbs. In this section, I will first treat the semantics of the negative converbs (4.1) and then consider their syntactic features (4.2). Finally, the interaction of the verbal abessives and other grammatical markers will be discussed (4.3).

4.1. The semantics of the negative converbs

Both Komi and Udmurt have a rather rich variety of converbs. In Komi, there are five productive converbs: (1) the temporal converb in *-ig* (and its extensions¹²), (2) the converb in *-emen* that expresses accompanying circumstances, (3) the terminative converb in *-tež*, (4) the converb in *-men* that expresses the degree of the action in question and (5) the negative converb in *-teg* (Fokos-Fuchs 1958; Stipa 1960; Bartens 2000: 248–265; Ylikoski: 2001). In Udmurt there are likewise five converbs, some of which share a common origin with the Komi converbs: (1) the converb in *-ku* (northern dialects) ~ *-kj* (southern and middle dialects) is temporal, as is (2) the terminative converb in *-tož* that can also be used to express contrast (‘instead of’), (3) the converb *-mon* expresses the degree of action, (4) the converb in *-sa* is extensively used in temporal, conditional and modal contexts and (5) the converb *-tek* has a negative meaning (Fokos-Fuchs 1958; Perevoščikov 1959; Stipa 1960; GSUJa 1962: 269–293; Bartens 2000: 248–265). Moreover, some descriptions of Udmurt converbs include certain case forms of verbal nouns in the inventory. These are the affirmative *-(e)men* and *-(e)miš* that are used synonymously to express a reason for an action and their respective negative counterparts *-mtejen* and *-mtejš* (Kel’makov & Hännikäinen 1999: 232–233).

The meaning and use of the negative converbs in both languages is extensive. Therefore, especially in the case of Komi, it has been no easy task to define the affirmative counterparts of the negative converb. In fact, several categorizations have been offered by different scholars (for a summary, see Ylikoski 2001: 208–209 and the references therein). The following list of sentences with opposite polarity will illustrate the wide array of possible contexts for the Komi negative converb.¹³

12 As specified by Ylikoski (2001: 201–205) among others, there are also converbs in Komi that have developed through the attachment of a plural ending, certain case suffixes or postpositions to the converb in *-ig*. The extended forms such as *-igjas* (< *-ig* + *-jas* ‘PL’), *-igen* (< *-ig* + *-en* ‘INSTR’), *-igkosti* (< *-ig* + *-kosti* ‘between’), *-igkežle* (*-ig* + *kežle* ‘for/by [a period of time], for the purpose of’), etc. usually express temporal simultaneity of the actions of the main verb and the converb. Simultaneity is also expressed by the plain *-ig*, but the extended forms often add some other semantic feature to the verb form.

13 The negative converb is glossed “ABE” in the examples of this section, while other converbs are glossed “CONV”.

(45) Komi (ÖKK 2000: 388)

- a. *Vanja mun-e šil-ig.*
 Vanja go-PRS.3SG sing-CONV
 ‘Vanja goes singing.’
 ><
Vanja mun-e šiv-teg.
 Vanja go-PRS.3SG sing-ABE
 ‘Vanja goes without singing.’
- b. *Jur-se peljnt-ig-moz eš ju-e va.*
 head-ACC.POSS.3SG bend-CONV-like ox drink-PRS.3SG water
 ‘Bending its head, the ox drinks the water.’
 ><
Jur-se peljnt-teg eš ju-e va.
 head-ACC.POSS.3SG bend-ABE ox drink-PRS.3SG water
 ‘Without bending its head, the ox drinks the water.’
- c. *Gorz-ig-tjr-ji mun-am vož-e.*
 shout-CONV-full-ADV go-PRS.1PL front-ILL
 ‘Shouting we go forward.’
 ><
Gorzi-teg mun-am vož-e.
 shout-ABE go-PRS.1PL front-ILL
 ‘Without shouting we go forward.’
- d. *Taži dumajt-ig-ən, Miron pet-i-s kil’če vijl-e.*
 like.this think-CONV-INS Miron go.out-1PST-3SG porch on-ILL
 ‘Thinking like this, Miron went out on the porch.’
 ><
Taži dumajt-teg, Miron pet-i-s kil’če vijl-e.
 like.this think-ABE Miron go.out-1PST-3SG porch on-ILL
 ‘Without thinking like this, Miron went out on the porch.’
- e. *Čećal-əmən kotert-ənĵ čel’ad.*
 jump-CONV run-PRS.3PL children
 ‘The children run and jump.’ (Lit. ‘The children run jumping.’)
 ><
Čećav-teg kotert-ənĵ čel’ad.
 jump-ABE run-PRS.3PL children
 ‘The children run without jumping.’

The affirmative converb in *-em̄en* shows in fact an original instrumental form of a verbal noun in *-em*, and its status as a converb has been questioned (see Ylikoski 2001: 207–208 for discussion). Another suffix that is sometimes considered a converb is *-ana(a)* (e.g. ÖKK 1000: 381–383), which is based on a derivational ending in *-ana* and an optional suffix *-a* of adverbs. These verb forms can also be regarded as affirmative counterparts of negative converbs:

(46) Komi (ÖKK 2000: 388)

– <i>Siži?</i>	– <i>donjal-ana-a</i>	<i>jual-i-s</i>	<i>Anna</i>	<i>tét.</i>
like.that	contemplate-NMLZ-ADV	ask-1PST-3SG	Anna	aunt
“‘Like that?’ asked aunt Anna contemplating.”				
><				
– <i>Siži?</i>	– <i>donjav-teg</i>	<i>jual-i-s</i>	<i>Anna</i>	<i>tét.</i>
like.that	contemplate-ABE	ask-1PST-3SG	Anna	aunt
“‘Like that?’ asked aunt Anna without contemplating.”				

As can be seen in the examples above, the affirmative equivalents of the abessive verb forms usually express simultaneity, but different forms carry further semantic features that most often specify the manner of the action. These further specifications are absent in the negative converbs. This wider diversity of the affirmative forms is another manifestation of the asymmetry between affirmation and negation and the larger number of distinctions made in the affirmative category as opposed to the negative (Ylikoski 2001: 208–209). In the case of the Komi converbs, more semantic and functional distinctions are made in the affirmative converbs, while only one converb has a negative meaning and must cover a wider range of meanings.

In Udmurt, on the other hand, the converb in *-tek* is most often presented as the negative counterpart of only one verb form: the affirmative converb in *-sa* (e.g. Perevoščikov 1959: 48, 263–264; Serebrennikov 1963: 309; Kel’makov & Hännikäinen 1999: 224–225). The meaning of the affirmative converb is extensive; as for the temporal relation between the converb and the main verb, the converb can express an action that precedes the action denoted by the main verb or is simultaneous with it, but is sometimes even used in a context in which the main verb expresses the preceding action (GSUJa 1962: 274–278). Moreover, the converb in *-sa* can be used to denote, for example, the condition, reason, circumstances, purpose or manner of the action of the main verb (GSUJa, id.). The same extensive meaning is given to the Udmurt negative verb form in *-tek* (GSUJa 1962: 278–283; Kel’makov & Hännikäinen 1999: 224–225). The following examples illustrate some of the uses of the two converbs:

(47) Manner

- a. Udmurt <
- <http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art334.html>
- >

Dirtj-sa pirt-i-zj kabinet-e.

hurry-CONV bring-1PST-3PL room-ILL

‘They brought (her) quickly to the (reception) room.’ (Lit. ‘brought hurrying’.)

- b. Udmurt (Kel’makov & Hännikäinen 1999: 224)

Adami dirtj-tek mjn-e.

person hurry-ABE go-PRS.3SG

‘The person goes without hurry.’ (Lit. ‘goes without hurrying’.)

(48) Simultaneity

- a. Udmurt (Kel’makov & Hännikäinen 1999: 225)

Djšetskiš malpaški-sa puk-e.

student think-CONV sit-PRS.3SG

‘The student sits and thinks.’ (Lit. ‘sits thinking’.)

- b. Udmurt (Kel’makov & Hännikäinen 1999: 225)

Djšetskiš nomjr no kari-tek puk-e.

student nothing NEG do-ABE sit-PRS.3SG

‘The student is sitting without doing anything.’

(49) Preceding action

- a. Udmurt (Kel’makov & Hännikäinen 1999: 225)

Ata-je, korka piri-sa, žek šer-j puk-i-z.

father-POSS.1SG house-ILL enter-CONV table behind-ILL sit-PST1-3SG

‘After entering the house, my father sat down at the table.’ (Lit. ‘entering [--] sits down’.)

- b. Udmurt (Perevoščikov 1959: 255)

Nene-je gurt-e bertj-tek, mon šudj-nj

mother-POSS.1SG home-ILL return-ABE 1SG play-INF

ε-j potj, [--]

NEG.1PST-1SG go.out.CNG.1PST.SG

‘I didn’t go out to play before my mother returned home, [--]’ (Lit. ‘without my mother returning home’.)

(50) Reason or condition

- a. Udmurt (Kel’makov & Hännikäinen 1999: 225)

Uram-jn šud-iš pinal-jos-iz adžj-sa, pereš-jos

street-INE play-PTC.PRS child-PL-ACC.PL see-CONV old-PL

tod-azj va-i-zj piči djr-zes.

mind-ILL.POSS.3PL bring-1PST-3PL small time-ACC.POSS.3PL

‘As they saw the children playing in the street, the old remembered their own childhood.’ (Lit. ‘remember [when] seeing’.)

b. Udmurt (GSUJa 1962: 281)

<i>Kiž-jos-len</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>ñil-pu-os-len</i>	<i>vaj-jos-si</i>
spruce-PL-GEN	and	fir-tree-PL-GEN	branch-PL-ACC.PL
<i>lijm-jen</i>	<i>šekit-ez-li</i>	<i>čida-tek</i>	<i>ñakjrsk-il'lam.</i>
snow-GEN	heavy-POSS.3SG-DAT	endure-ABE	bend-PST2.3PL

‘The branches of the spruces and the fir trees have bended, as they didn’t endure the heaviness of the snow.’ (Lit. ‘have bended without enduring’.)

According to Perevoščikov (1959: 263–264), certain other verb forms can also be interpreted as affirmative equivalents of the converb in *-tek*. He states that, in addition to the verb form in *-sa* in Example (51b), the constructions in examples (51c) and (51d) can also correspond to the negative converb.

(51) Udmurt (Perevoščikov 1959: 263–264)

a. (Perevoščikov 1959: 263)

<i>Noš</i>	<i>M. I. Lopatkina,</i>	<i>T. V. Naumova,</i>	<i>A. N. Karkina,</i>	<i>Z. A. Sematkina</i>	
but	M. I. Lopatkina	T. V. Naumova	A. N. Karkina	Z. A. Sematkina	
<i>no</i>	<i>muket-jos-iz</i>	<i>araš-jos</i>	<i>ara-n</i>	<i>norma-zes</i>	<i>multes-en</i>
and	other-PL-DET	harvester-PL	harvest-NMLZ	norm-ACC.POSS.3PL	surplus-INS
<i>bidešti-tek</i>	<i>lud-iš</i>	<i>e-z</i>	<i>koški-le.</i>		
fulfil-ABE	field-ELA	NEG.1PST-3	leave-CNG.PL		

‘But M. I. Lopatkina, T. V. Naumova, A. N. Karkina, Z. A. Sematkina and the other harvesters didn’t leave the field without exceeding the harvesting norms.’

b. (Perevoščikov 1959: 264)

[--]	<i>ara-n</i>	<i>norma-zes</i>	<i>multes-en</i>	<i>bidešti-sa</i>	<i>gine</i>	[--]
	harvest-NMLZ	norm-ACC.POSS.3PL	surplus-INS	fulfil-CONV	only	

‘[--] only after exceeding the harvesting norms [--]’

c. (Perevoščikov 1959: 264)

[--]	<i>ara-n</i>	<i>norma-zes</i>	<i>multes-en</i>	<i>bidešt-em</i>	<i>bere</i>	<i>gine</i>	[--]
	harvest-NMLZ	norm-ACC.POSS.3PL	surplus-INS	fulfil-NMLZ	after	only	

‘[--] only after exceeding the harvesting norms [--]’

d. (Perevoščikov 1959: 264)

[--]	<i>ara-n</i>	<i>norma-zes</i>	<i>multes-en</i>	
	harvest-NMLZ	norm-ACC.POSS.3PL	surplus-INS	
<i>bidešt-o</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>sobere</i>	<i>gine</i>	[--]
fulfil-PRS.3PL	and	thereafter	only	

‘[--] they exceed the harvesting norms and only after that [--]’

Considering these different uses of the Permic negative converbs, they can be regarded as contextual converbs, that is, their function can be determined according to the context of their use (see Nedjalkov 1998: 424 on the definition of the term).

4.2. The syntactic characteristics of the negative converbs

4.2.1. The abessive verb forms as adverbials

As mentioned above, the negative converbs of the Permic languages usually serve as adverbials. The examples of the negative converbs presented in the previous section were all cases of adverbial use of the verb forms. Two further examples are given below, and in both the negative converbs appear in coordination with other adverbials:

- (52) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=270404>>
*Taje perje šeššija-*is* mun-i-s venžj-teg da edje.*
 this time.ILL session-DET go-1PST-3SG quarrel-ABE and fast
 ‘This time the session passed quickly and without quarrelling.’

- (53) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art1155.html>>
Venjamin Semjonovič vañ-ze rad-iz-ja, džrtj-tek lešt-e.
 Venjamin Semjonovič all-ACC order-POSS.3SG-ADVL hurry-ABE do-PRS.3SG
 ‘Venjamin Semjonovič does everything in an orderly fashion and without hurrying.’

Using Haspelmath’s (1996) terminology, the Permic negative converbs are typical occurrences of transpositional or word-class-changing inflection. The formation of the abessive verb forms is completely regular, general and productive, which makes their morphology inflectional rather than derivational, but in the formation of the converbs the word-class of the word seems to change¹⁴, and this is traditionally seen as a feature of derivation rather than inflection. According to Haspelmath (1996: 52), in cases of transpositional inflection, two levels of word-class are actually present. On one hand, the formation is used in syntactic contexts that are not typical for the word-class of the basis, but on the other hand, certain features of the original word-class are retained. Consequently, Haspelmath distinguishes between two types of syntax in the use of the words derived by word-class-changing inflection: external and internal syntax. In the case of the Permic negative converbs (and, in fact, other Permic converbs as well), their use in the adverbial function can be defined in terms of external syntax. However, the converbs are still clearly verb forms in that they can acquire modifiers typical of verbs, which is a feature of their internal syntax; an adverb can be seen in Example (45d) for Komi and in examples (49b), (50b) and (51a) for Udmurt, while an object is present in Example (45b) for Komi and in examples (48b) and (51a) for Udmurt.

The subject of the negative converb is usually the same as the subject of the main verb, but this is not absolutely necessary. According to the grammatical descriptions of both Komi and Udmurt, a different subject of the converb can be expressed

14 That is, from a verb to a “verbal adverb”; however, see Ylikoski (2003: 195–196, 220–222) for criticism of the interpretation of converbs as adverbs.

by a noun in either nominative or genitive case or by using a possessive suffix in the abessive verb form (e.g. Bartens 2000: 257; ÖKK 2000: 390). However, in the corpus of the present study, different kinds of trends can be seen in Komi and in Udmurt. In Komi a subject in the genitive case (as in Example 54) was encountered nine times, but not once in the nominative (but see Hamari 2001: 141 for an example). In Udmurt, on the other hand, thirteen cases of nominative subjects (as in Example 55) were found, but no genitive.

- (54) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=287204>>
Gaške, silen išed-teg e-g i lo artist-en, [--]
 maybe 3SG.GEN encourage-ABE NEG.1PST-1SG PRT become.CNG.SG artist-INS
 ‘Maybe without her encouraging (me) I wouldn’t even have become an artist [--]’

- (55) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art672.html>>
Keña nil-pi-os bud-i-zj, anaj-jos erkija-tek, kužmo
 how.many girl-boy-PL grow.up-1PST-3PL mother-PL cuddle-ABE strong
ataj ki-os-tj adžj-tek, ulon-leš šuldjir-ze vala-tek.
 father hand-PL-ACC.PL see-ABE life-ABL joy-ACC.SG understand-ABE
 ‘How many children grew up without mothers cuddling (them), without seeing strong father’s hands, without understanding the joy of life.’

Moreover, as pointed out in Hamari (2001: 141), the subject can also appear in the instrumental case in Komi. The occurrence of subjects in the instrumental case in Komi has been regarded as a Russian influence by Bubrix (1949: 42).¹⁵ However, at least with negative converbs the use of the instrumental case in subjects may have originated in constructions in which an instrument was reanalysed as an agent (Hamari 2001: 141). For example, in the following sentence extracted from a source outside the study corpus, the body part nouns in the instrumental case are ambiguous in this sense; they can be understood either as body part instruments or as agents.

- (56) Komi (Hamari 2001: 141 < Fokos-Fuchs 1958: 303)>
med lu-e zeletej dom, ki-en
 OPT be-PRS.3SG golden house hand-INS
maljšti-teg, kok-en čužji-teg
 touch-ABE foot-INS push-ABE
 ‘let there be a golden house, without a hand touching, without a foot pushing’

The use of the possessive suffixes will be dealt with in greater detail below, but it can be stated already at this point that their use in a disambiguating function was practically non-existent in the corpus. Among the 35 Komi cases in which a possessive ending appeared in the abessive verb forms, only one expression can be interpreted as an instance of the ending in this function. In Example (57), the subject of the main

15 Bubrix deals with subjects of finite verbs and does not mention non-finite verb forms in this context.

verb ('the judges') is different from the subject of the negative converb ('[the team] Stroitel') and the 3rd person singular possessive suffix refers to the latter.

(57) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=300754>>

Gegervo-an-a, sudja-jas vors-teg-is
 understand-NMLZ-ADJ judge-PL play-ABE-POSS.3SG
šet-i-sni verm-em-se "Stroitel'-lj".
 give-1PST-3PL win-NMLZ-ACC Stroitel'-DAT

'It is understood that the judges gave the victory to (the team) "Stroitel"' without its playing.'

In Udmurt, on the other hand, the use of possessive suffixes in abessive verb forms is extremely rare. Although data has been presented by some scholars, no examples of their use were found in the corpus of the present study (see Section 4.3.1).

4.2.2. The abessive verb forms as attributes

In addition to the adverbial uses, there are cases in which the abessive verb forms are used in an attributive position. As mentioned before, Bartens (2000: 257) points out that the attributive use of the abessive verb form is possible in Udmurt (as in Example 58), but as can be seen in Example (59), also the Komi negative converb can be employed this way:

(58) Udmurt

a. Bartens (2000: 257 < GSUJa 1970: 14)

dugdij-tek už-an
 cease-ABE work-NMLZ
 'ceaseless work'

b. <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art301.html>>

Televizor, kompjuter až-ijn dij-ez vala-tek
 television computer front-INE time-ACC understand-ABE
puk-on tazaljk-lj izjan vaj-e.
 sit-NMLZ health-DAT damage bring-PRS.3SG

'Sitting in front of the television or the computer without being aware of (the passing of) time causes damage to health.'

(59) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=340141>>

[--] *da korš-enj aslanis Jen-ljš žonvižalun, ozjrlun, bur*
 and ask-PRS.3PL own.GEN.POSS.3PL God-ABL health wealth good
urožaj da jort-a-jort-jš-keđ žikšj-teg ol-em.
 crop and friend-ADJ-friend-POSS.3SG-COM quarrel-ABE live-NMLZ

'[--] from their God they ask health, wealth, good crop and life without friends quarrelling with each other.'

When dealing with the attributive use of nouns in the abessive case, it was pointed out that they mostly appear in constructions in which the head is a deverbal noun (see also Bartens 2000: 257), although a lexical noun can sometimes also appear as the head. However, it seems to be a general restriction of the use of the converb as an attribute that only a deverbal noun can appear as a head; in the corpus of this study, data was only found of this particular use. On the other hand, as shown in Hamari (2001: 140) the abessive verb form of Komi can also appear as an attribute, when the head is the noun *už* ‘work’ that is not exactly deverbal, though its relation to the verb *užavni* ‘to work’ is clear:

(60) Komi (Hamari 2001: 140 < *Vojvju kožuv* 1997: 60)

<i>Da</i>	<i>nešta</i>	<i>čjg</i>	<i>vo-jas,</i>	<i>omeľik</i>	<i>paš-keṃ,</i>	<i>sešša</i>
and	still	hunger	year-PL	poor	dress-shoes	then
<i>žik</i>	<i>ńin</i>	<i>šojćjv-teg</i>	<i>už –</i>	<i>stav-js</i>	<i>taje</i>	<i>i</i>
just	still	rest-ABE	work	all-DET	this	PRT
<i>vajed-ema</i>	<i>tuberkuloz-ež-js,</i>			<i>tjdal-e.</i>		
bring-2PST.3SG	tuberculosis-TERM-POSS.3SG			seem-PRS.3SG		

‘And also the years of famine, poor clothes and then work without any rest – it seems that all this brought him to (catch) tuberculosis.’

When dealing with such constructions as found in examples (58) and (59), we can state that they actually contain two layers of the kind of inflection that Haspelmath (1996) calls transpositional: the formation of the deverbal noun on one hand and the formation of the abessive verb form on the other. Firstly, the head of the constructions is a deverbal noun, which means that in many cases, a process is involved in which the word-class of the word has changed from a verb to a noun. The external syntax of the deverbal nouns is that of typical nouns. In Example (58b) Udmurt *pukon* ‘sitting’ is a subject, while in Example (59) Komi *oleṃ* ‘living, life’ is an object. On the other hand, the internal syntax of these nouns involves verbal features in that they have adverbial modifiers: the abessive verb forms. Secondly, in these cases the abessive verb forms are used as attributes, which is a function of typical adjectives. On the other hand, the abessive verb forms still have features that are typical for verbs, as they can also take modifiers of their own. In Example (59) the attributive converb of Komi has its own adverbial phrase, whereas in Example (58b) the converb of Udmurt is accompanied by an object.

4.2.3. The abessive verb forms as complements

As shown earlier, abessive forms of nouns often appear as obligatory constituents in constructions formed with verbs such as ‘stay, be left’ and ‘leave’. The same is true of the verbal abessive forms:

- (61) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=310859>>
Vojtir-kost-sa téhnika-sa da nauka-sa térmiń-jas, geografija
 nation-between-ADJ technology-ADJ and science-ADJ term-PL geography
ńim-jas koľ-enj vežšj-teg, tažj bjd kįvj-jn.
 name-PL stay-PRS.3PL change-ABE like.this every language-INE
 ‘International, technological and scientific terms, geographical names stay un-
 changed, (it is) like this in every language.’

- (62) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art59.html>>
Malj-ze ali vera-ńj u-g ńi bigat-iškj,
 why-ACC now say-INF NEG.PRS-1SG any.more be.able-CNG.PRS.1SG
no so ožj ik gožtj-tek kįl-i-z.
 but 3SG like.this same write-ABE stay-1PST-3SG
 ‘I cannot say the reason any more but, anyway, it wasn’t written.’ (Lit. ‘it was
 left without writing’)

- (63) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art265.html>>
Tuljs vu-i-z, busj-os-tj kižj-tek u-d kelj.
 spring come-1PST-3SG field-PL-ACC.PL sow-ABE NEG.FUT-2SG leave.CNG.FUT.SG
 ‘Spring has come, you will not leave the fields without sowing.’

Even in these contexts, the subject of the converb can be different from that of the main verb. This is the case in the following Udmurt example where the subject of the abessive verb form is *juos* ‘corn (pl.)’, while the subject of the main verb is *busjosj* ‘my fields’:

- (64) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art874.html>>
Ožj ju-os kišma-tek ik busj-os-j kįlj-l-i-zj.
 like.this corn-PL ripen-ABE same field-PL-POSS.1SG stay-FREQ-1PST-3PL
 ‘Thus, the corn of my fields did not ripen.’ (Lit. ‘my fields stayed without the
 corn ripening’)

In addition to verbs meaning ‘stay, be left’ and ‘leave’, the verbal abessives can be used with verbs meaning ‘be; live’ and (in Udmurt) ‘become’. According to Bartens (2000: 258), sentences such as Example (65) in Udmurt are converb constructions in which the abessive form together with the main verb *uljnj* ‘be; live’ expresses continuative aspect; Bartens considers these constructions to have developed under the influence of the Turkic languages spoken in the vicinity of the Udmurts.

- (65) Udmurt (Bartens 2000: 258 < GSUJa 1962: 281)
umoj šem-ze todj-tek u-m ul-iške
 good heart-ACC.POSS.3SG know-ABE NEG.PRS-1PL be-CNG.PL
 ‘We know his/her good heart.’ (lit. ‘we are not without knowing his/her good
 heart’)

The Komi verb *ovni* ‘be; live’ cognate with Udmurt *ulini* is also used in constructions with the abessive verb forms, but it does not carry the same type of continuative meaning. According to Cypanov (1995: 138) *ovni* can be replaced by *kolni* ‘stay, be left’ in at least the following expression:

- (66) Komi (Bartens 2000: 258 < Cypanov 1995: 138)
- | | | | | | |
|------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------|
| <i>sek</i> | <i>že</i> | <i>sije</i> | <i>as-keč-is</i> | <i>venzi-teg</i> | |
| then | PRT | 3SG | self-COM-POSS.3SG | argue-ABE | |
| <i>e-z</i> | | <i>kol'</i> | ~ | <i>e-z</i> | <i>ov</i> |
| NEG.1PST-3 | | stay.CNG.SG | | NEG.1PST-3 | be.CNG.SG |
- ‘even then he couldn’t be without arguing with himself’

According to Cypanov (1995: 138), this type of constructions have largely been replaced by negative constructions that are formed by using the negative particle *ne* borrowed from Russian and the infinitive of the verb:

- (67) Komi (Cypanov 1995: 138)
- | | | | | | | |
|------------|-----------|-------------|------------|--------------|-----------|----------------------|
| <i>sek</i> | <i>že</i> | <i>sije</i> | <i>e-z</i> | <i>vermi</i> | <i>ne</i> | <i>venzi-ni</i> [--] |
| then | PRT | 3SG | NEG.1PST-3 | argue.CNG.SG | NEG | argue-INF |
- ‘even then he couldn’t be without arguing [--]’

All in all, in the study corpus, the abessive verb forms appeared as complements to different verbs much more regularly in Udmurt than in Komi. This could be due to, on one hand, the Turkic influence on Udmurt that has led to the extension of the converb forms to aspectual constructions and, on the other hand, the rise of alternative expression type in Komi under the influence of Russian.

4.3. The negative converbs and other grammatical markers

The grammatical markers that can be attached to the abessive in the forms of the negative converbs are the same that were seen in the treatment of nominal abessives: the possessive suffixes and the comparative ending. The plural suffix, however, is not possible in these forms, although – as was seen in footnote 12 – they are not completely unheard of in the Permic converbs. In addition to possessive and comparative suffixes, a postposition can be agglutinated in the Komi abessive suffix.

4.3.1. Person marking

In the Komi negative converbs, the possessive suffixes always follow the abessive ending. This morpheme order is hardly surprising, since the possessive suffixes in general are not attached to the verb stems in non-finite verb forms in the Permic languages – if acceptable at all (see e.g. Bartens 2000: 228ff. for the marking of subject

person in different non-finite forms). The 1st person singular suffix is not used in the Komi negative converbs:

1SG –	1PL <i>už-teg-njm</i>
2SG <i>už-teg-id</i>	2PL <i>už-teg-njd</i>
3SG <i>už-teg-is</i>	3PL <i>už-teg-njs</i>

Table 10. The Komi negative converb of *už-* ‘sleep’ with person marking (ÖKK 2000: 390)

However, according to ÖKK (2000: 390), although the original function of the possessive suffixes in Komi negative converbs was only to refer to the subject, this is no longer their primary function. In modern Komi, mostly the possessive endings of the 2nd and 3rd person singular persons are in use, and they are mainly employed to denote that the action is already known from previous discussion or to mark focus, topicalization etc. This was clearly visible in the study corpus in which mostly the 2nd and 3rd person singular forms were encountered – except for one occurrence of the 3rd person plural – and in many of them, the possessive suffix could be interpreted as appearing in a pragmatic function. Of course, if the subject is the 2nd or 3rd person singular and a possessive suffix is present that refers to the same person, the function of the suffix is difficult to determine. In the following sentence, however, the subject is the 1st person plural, so the possessive suffix cannot refer to it:

(68) Komi <<http://www.komipress.ru/smi/issue.php?id=304156>>

<i>A</i>	<i>mi</i>	<i>Ljušžen-keđ</i>	<i>kizke-mijke</i>	<i>kjv</i>
but	1PL	Ljušžen-COM	somehow-something	word
<i>šu-teg-is</i>		<i>eta-međ-es</i>	<i>gegervo-am...</i>	
say-ABE-POSS.3SG		one-another-ACC	understand-PRS.1PL	

‘But somehow we and Ljušžen understand each other without saying a word...’

In Udmurt, no verbal abessives with a possessive ending were found in the corpus of the present study, but there are some references to their use in this language as well (Fokos-Fuchs 1958: 305, Perevoščikov 1959: 51; Bartens 2000: 257). However, the forms are radically different from the possessive declension of nouns. Unlike within nouns, the possessive suffixes follow the abessive ending in negative converbs, but are preceded by an *a* vowel, the origin of which is uncertain (Bartens 2000: 257):

(69) Udmurt (Bartens 2000: 257 < Fokos-Fuchs 1958: 305)

pottj-tek-a-dj
take.out-ABE-a-POSS.2PL

‘without your taking (the gold) out’

(70) Udmurt (Perevoščikov 1959: 51)

<i>Tunne</i>	<i>keṭ-te</i>	<i>tir̄im-on</i>	
today	stomach-ACC.POSS.2SG	be.filled-NMLZ	
šed̄t̄i-tek-a-d	<i>keṭi-ni</i>	<i>en</i>	<i>vetli.</i>
find-ABE-a-POSS.2SG	sleep-INF	NEG.IMP	GO.CNG.IMP.SG

‘Don’t go to sleep today without finding food.’

Perevoščikov (1959: 51) assumes that these forms have developed from a combination of the abessive case suffix and the inessive form of the possessive nominal declension; after all, the possessive endings of the verbal abessives are identical to the inessive (and illative) of the possessive declension (cf. *gurt-ad* ‘in/into your (sg.) village’, *gurt-adj* ‘in/into your (pl.) village’), in which the vowel *a* appears as an irregular designation of the locational case. However, the assumption of the combination of the two case forms is rather unconvincing, because the semantics of the compound cannot be rationalized. On the other hand, the origin of the vowel *a* in the inessive-illative forms is not completely understood either, and it is likely that they are etymologically of same origin – although the common denominator cannot be the local meaning of the inessive-illative. As pointed out by Bartens (2000: 116–117), the vowel *a* before the possessive ending is typical not only of the inessive-illative, but also of the possessive forms of the terminative case of nouns. As mentioned before, the morpheme order can be either PxCx or CxPx in the terminative, and the vowel *a* only appears in the latter case:

(71) Udmurt

a. (Bartens 2000: 111)

<i>gurt-ed-ož</i>	~	<i>gurt-ož-a-d</i>
village-POSS.2SG-TERM		village-TERM-a-POSS.2SG
‘up to your (sg.) village’		‘up to your (sg.) village’

b. (Bartens 2000: 112)

<i>gurt-tj-ož</i>	~	<i>gurt-ož-a-di</i>
village-POSS.2PL-TERM		village-TERM-a-POSS.2SG
‘up to your (pl.) village’		‘up to your (pl.) village’

The same vowel can be seen in the possessive forms of the terminative converb in *-tož* that includes the terminative case suffix (Bartens 2000: 254); in this verb form, only the order CxPx is possible:

(72) Udmurt (Perevoščikov 1959: 72)

a. *lid̄ži-tož-a-d*
 read-CONV-a-POSS.2SG
 ‘until you (sg.) read’

- b. *ljdži-tož-a-dj*
 read-CONV-*a*-POSS.2PL
 ‘until you (pl.) read’

Consequently, it seems that in Udmurt, the vowel *a* – whatever its origin – is prone to appear in those contexts in which the morpheme order is CxPx. In Komi, this vowel only appears in the inessive-illative and instrumental case forms of nouns.

4.3.2. The comparative forms of the negative converbs

Examples of the use of the comparative suffix in the negative converbs were only encountered in the Udmurt corpus of the present study. As was mentioned before, Perevoščikov (1959: 48) interprets the meaning of the combination of the negative converb and comparative as ‘not quite’.

- (73) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art146.html>>
Ožgarci šorj kjšnomurt oskĵ-tek-ges ućk-i-z: [--]
 soldier direction.ILL woman believe-ABE-COMP look-PST1-3SG
 ‘The woman looked at the soldier not quite believing: [--]’

4.3.3. Postpositions and coaffixes

As was mentioned before, postpositions have been attached to some Komi converbs. In the case of the negative converb, the suffix has a variant in *-tegmoz*, in which the postposition *moz* ‘like’ has been agglutinated into the abessive suffix and reanalysed as part of the suffix:

- (74) Komi (ÖKK 2000: 387)
Teđli-teg-moz lebjšt-i-snj kĵk vežon.
 notice-ABE-like fly-1PST-3PL two week
 ‘Two weeks flew by unnoticed.’

According to ÖKK (2000: 387), *moz* does not bring any semantic or functional addition to the negative converb; the same applies to the Komi variants *-teğja*, *-teğa* in which an adverbial coaffix is attached to the form. Unlike the coaffixes found in the abessive case forms of nouns in Komi dialects, these forms of the negative converbs are not followed by a possessive suffix. None of these extended forms were found in the study corpus.

In Udmurt, the abessives do not have extended forms, but the negative converb can be accompanied by a postposition such as *kadʹ* (Example 75), *muzen* (Example 76) and *śamen* (Example 77) all of which have the meaning ‘like’:

(75) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art252.html>>

Šoka-nj dištj-tek kad' puk-i-z bides zal.
 breath-INF dare-ABE like sit-1PST-3SG whole hall
 'The whole hall sat as if not daring to breath.'

(76) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art400.html>>

Zal tjr lukašk-em kaljk šoka-tek mužen kılz-e.
 hall full gather-PTC.PST people breath-ABE like listen-PRS.3SG
 'The people who have filled the hall listen (like) without breathing.'

(77) Udmurt <<http://old.udmdunne.ru/articles/art377.html>>

Už no kapci-jen, šed-tek šamen šotsk-e ni.
 work even light-INS notice-ABE like give.in-PRS.3SG any.more
 'Even work is easy, like you didn't notice it any more.' (Lit. 'Even work gives [itself] in lightly, like without noticing any more.')

In the last example, the form *šedtek* 'without noticing' is exceptional: its stem is *šedj-* 'notice, feel', but it has lost its stem vowel in this form. The same form is found in another postpositional construction, *šedtek šorjś* that has a fixed meaning 'unexpectedly, out of the blue'. However, *šedjitek* is also attested. (GSUJa 1962: 28.)

5. Conclusions

It was suggested in the introduction of the study that the uses of the abessive in both nominal and verbal categories should be considered together to find the similarities and differences between the functions of the actual abessive case of nouns and the negative converbs of verbs. In the course of the study, several similarities were pointed out.

First of all, as is known from existing literature, the abessive forms of both nominal and verbal categories are usually employed as adverbials, but references have been made to the use of these forms in attributive positions in both Komi and Udmurt. This study showed that the conditions of the attributive use are largely the same irrespective of whether we are dealing with a nominal or a verbal constituent: the abessive forms of both are most likely to appear in an attributive position if the head of the construction is a deverbal noun. Examples of abessive attributes of lexical nouns are scarce in both languages. Secondly, it was argued that the abessive forms of both nouns and verbs can be used as obligatory complements of verbs meaning 'stay, be left', 'leave' and 'be; live' in both languages.

The largest differences between the nominal and verbal abessives, of course, are in the semantics of the constructions themselves. The abessive forms of nominal categories express the absence of a referent in a given situation, whereas abessive verb forms are used to denote the absence of an action. Another notable difference has

to do with person marking. The person is expressed by using the possessive suffixes, but the nominal and verbal abessives are different both in respect to the form and the function of the person marking. In nouns, the possessive suffixes are used to mark the possessor of the referent in question, whereas in verbs, they mark the subject of the negative converb. However, in both nouns and verbs the possessive suffixes can be used to encode the entity or the action as topicalized or focused or definite. Yet another function was mentioned with regard to the abessive forms of pronouns, where the possessive endings are used redundantly to mark the same person as the pronoun itself. The formal differences are based on how the possessive suffixes are attached to the nominal or verbal forms.

When comparing the abessive forms of Komi and Udmurt, it was discovered that the forms and the functions largely correspond to each other in the two languages. This result was also expected on the basis of earlier literature. However, certain differences were pointed out that can be ascribed to changes that must have taken place after the break-up of Proto-Permic. First of all, the abessive is used more often in Udmurt than in Komi. This difference has partly to do with the fact that in Udmurt, the abessive can be attached to certain word forms that cannot take this suffix in Komi. These include certain adverbs and pronominal forms. Moreover, the negative converbs are more often used as obligatory complements of verbs meaning ‘stay, be left’, ‘leave’ and ‘be; live’ in Udmurt, whereas in Komi, they have partly been replaced by a construction formed with the particle *ne* ‘not’ and an infinitive. In Udmurt, an extension of the use of the negative converb as a complement to certain other verbs has taken place, probably by analogy with the Turkic languages.

Differences in the person marking of Komi and Udmurt abessives were also detected. As for the nominal categories, there are differences in the morpheme order of the possessive ending and the abessive case ending so that, in Udmurt, the order is always PxCx, whereas extensive variation can be found in the Komi forms. It was argued that the differences are due to the Proto-Permic reordering of the noun declension, especially when it comes to the possessive forms. The original morpheme order has probably been preserved in Udmurt, while in Komi, variation has started to occur. In verbal abessives, person marking is more extensive in Komi but practically non-existent in modern Udmurt. In the Udmurt examples that can be found, the position of the possessive suffixes differs greatly from what is found in nouns. In the negative converbs, the possessive suffix follows the abessive ending, but an additional vowel *a* is inserted between the two. The origin of this vowel is unknown, but it can also be found in some parts of the possessive declension in both Komi and Udmurt. In Komi, there are also certain coaffixes that appear between the abessive ending and the possessive ending especially in some dialects, but these affixes are probably related to an ancient suffixes of adverbs that was either a derivational or a declensional element.

It was argued in the introduction that the abessive case is, in many ways, a conservative category in the Permic languages. Considering its uses in the modern languages, this assumption seems to hold. The abessive has maintained its form and function quite consistently in both Komi and Udmurt and in both nominal and verbal

categories. However, this does not mean that it has remained totally unchanged. What is needed in future studies to further clarify these changes is, firstly, to compare the abessive to the uses of the caritive ending in the Permic languages and, secondly, the uses of both of these elements in other Uralic languages.

Abbreviations

1	first person	FREQ	frequentative
2	second person	FUT	future tense
3	third person	GEN	genitive
1PST	first past tense	ILL	illative
2PST	second past tense	INE	inessive
ABE	abessive	INF	infinitive
ABL	ablative	INS	instrumental
ACC	accusative	NEG	negative element
ADJ	adjective	NMLZ	nominalizer
ADV	adverb	OPT	optative
ADVL	adverbial case	PL	plural
CAR	caritive	POSS	possessive suffix
CNG	connegative form	PRED	predicate marker
COM	comitative	PRS	present tense
COMP	comparative	PRT	particle
COND	conditional	PST	past tense
CONV	converb	PTC	participle
DAT	dative	SG	singular
DET	determinate	SUPERL	superlative
ELA	elative	TERM	terminative
EX	existential		

References

- Alhoniemi, Alho 1985: *Marin kielioppi*. Apuneuvoja suomalais-ugrialaisten kielten opintoja varten X. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Bartens, Raija 1993: Permiläiset *l ja s* -koaffiksit. – *Sananjalka* 35: 23–42.
- Bartens, Raija 2000: *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 238. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Baker, Robin 1985: *The Development of the Komi Case System. A Dialectological investigation*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 189. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Bubrix 1949 = Бубрих, Д. В. 1949: *Грамматика литературного коми языка*. Ленинград: Издательство ленинградского государственного ордена Ленина университета имени А. А. Жданова.
- Csepregi, Márta 2000: Abessiivi, karitiivi: suffiksi yli sanaluokkarajojen. – Tõnu Seilenthal (ed.), *Congressus Nonus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum 7.–13.8.2000. Pars IV. Disertationes Sectionum: Linguistica I*. Tartu. 181–189.
- Csúcs, Sándor 2005: *Die Rekonstruktion der permischen Grundsprache*. Bibliotheca Uralica 13. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

- Суранов 1995 = Цыпанов, Е. А. 1995: Отрицательный инфинитив в коми языке. – Г. В. Федюнёва (ed.), *Грамматика и лексикография коми языка*. Труды Института языка, литературы и истории. Выпуск 58. Сыктывкар: Российская академия наук, Уральское отделение. 132–140.
- Суранов 1997 = Цыпанов, Е. А. 1997: *Причастие в коми языке: история, семантика, дистрибуция*. Екатеринбург: Российская академия наук, Уральское отделение.
- Суранов 2007 = Цыпанов, Е. А. 2007: *Видза олан. Самоучитель коми языка*. Сыктывкар: Анбур.
- Fokos-Fuchs, D. R. 1958: Die Verbaladverbien der permischen Sprachen. – *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. Tomus VIII. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 273–342.
- GSUJa 1962 = Перевошиков, П. Н., Вахрушев, В. М., Алатырев, В. И., Поздеева, А. А. & Тараканов, И. В. (eds) 1962: *Грамматика современного удмуртского языка. Фонетика и морфология*. Ижевск: Удмуртское книжное издательство.
- GSUJa 1970 = Алатырев, В. И., Вахрушев, В. М., Захаров, В. Н. & Калинина, Л. И. (eds) 1970: *Грамматика современного удмуртского языка. Синтаксис простого предложения*. Ижевск: Удмуртия.
- Hamari, Arja 2001: *Negaatio komin kielessä*. An unpublished licentiate thesis. Turku.
- Haspelmath, Martin 1995: The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category. – Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König (eds), *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective. Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms – Adverbial Participles, Gerunds*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 13. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, Martin 1996: Word-class-changing inflection and morphological theory. – Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds), *Yearbook of Morphology 1995*. 43–66.
- Honti, László 1995: Zur Morphotaktik und Morphosyntax der uralischen/finnisch-ugrischen Grundsprache. – Heikki Leskinen (ed.), *Congressus octavus internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum 10.–15.8.1995. Pars I: Orationes plenariae et conspectus quinquennales*. Jyväskylä. 53–82.
- Huumo, Tuomas 2005: Onko *jäää*-verbin paikallissijamäärittteen tulosijalla semanttista motivaatiota? – *Virittäjä* 109: 506–524.
- Itkonen, Terho 1983: Välikatsaus suomen kielen juuriin. – *Virittäjä* 87: 190–229.
- Itkonen, Terho 1992: Ugrilaisten kielten karitiivista. – Pál Deréky, Timothy Riese, Marianne Sz. Bakró-Nagy & Péter Hajdú (eds), *Festschrift für Károly Rédei zum 60. Geburtstag*. *Studia Uralica* 6. *Uralistikai tanulmányok* 3. *Linguistica Series A, Studia et dissertationes* 8. Wien – Budapest: Institut für Finno-Ugristik der Universität Wien. 221–237.
- Janhunen, Juha 1982: On the structure of Proto-Uralic. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen XLIV*. 23–42.
- Kel'makov, Valentin & Hännikäinen, Sara 1999: *Udmurtin kielioppia ja harjoituksia*. Apuneuvoja suomalais-ugrilaisien kielten opintoja varten XIV. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Kel'makov, Valentin & Saarinen, Sirkka 1994: *Udmurtin murteet*. Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 47. Turku: Turun yliopisto.
- Kondrat'eva & Fedorova 2004 = Кондратьева, Н. В. & Федорова, Л. П. 2004: *Удмуртский язык. Начальный курс. Учебное пособие для студентов гуманитарных факультетов*. Ижевск: Министерство образования Российской Федерации, Удмуртский государственный университет.

- Korhonen, Mikko 1981: *Johdatus lapin kielen historiaan*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 370. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- A. Kövesi, Magda 1965: *A permi nyelvek ősi képzői*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Luutonen, Jorma 1997: *The Variation of Morpheme Order in Mari Declension*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 226. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Lytkin 1977 = Лыткин, В. И. 1977: *Историческая морфология коми языка*. Пермь – Сыктывкар: Министерство высшего и среднего специального образования РСФСР.
- Miestamo, Matti 1998: Affirmaation ja negaation symmetriasta maailman kielissä. – Anneli Pajunen (ed.), *Kieliopillistumisesta, analogiasta ja typologiasta*. Suomi 185. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 182–216.
- Miestamo, Matti 2005: *Standard Negation. The Negation of Declarative Verbal Main Clauses in a Typological Perspective*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 31. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. 1995: Some typological parameters of converbs. – Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König (eds), *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective. Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms – Adverbial Participles, Gerunds*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 13. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 97–136.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. 1998: Converbs in the languages of Europe. – Johan van der Auwera & Dónall P. Ó Baoill (eds), *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*. Empirical approaches to language typology 20. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 421–455.
- Nevis, Joel A. 1986: Decliticization and deaffixation in Saame: abessive *taga*. – Brian D. Joseph (ed.), *Studies on language change*. The Ohio State University working papers in linguistics 34. Columbus: The Ohio State University. 1–9.
- Norde, Muriel 2009: *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ÖKK 2000 = Федюнёва, Г. В. (ed.) 2000: *Õня коми кыв. Морфология*. Сыктывкар: Коми небӧг лэдзанін.
- Perevoščikov 1959 = Перевощиков, П. Н. 1959: *Деепричастия и деепричастные конструкции в удмуртском языке*. Ижевск: Удмуртское книжное издательство.
- Rédei, Károly 1978: *Syrjänische Chrestomathie. Mit Grammatik und Glossar*. Studia Uralica. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Finno-Ugristik der Universität Wien. Band 1. Wien: Verband der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaften Österreichs.
- Saxarova & Sel'kov 1976 = Сахарова, М. А. & Сельков, Н. Н. 1976: *Ижемский диалект коми языка*. Сыктывкар: Коми книжное издательство.
- Serebrennikov 1963 = Серебренников, Б. А. 1963: *Историческая морфология пермских языков*. Москва: Издательство Академии Наук СССР.
- SKJa 1955 = Лыткин, В. И. (ed.) 1955: *Современный коми язык. Учебник для высших учебных заведений. Часть первая. Фонетика, лексика, морфология*. Сыктывкар: Коми книжное издательство.
- Sorvačeva & Beznosikova 1990 = Сорвачева, В. А. & Безносикова, Л. М. 1990: *Удорский диалект коми языка*. Москва: Наука.
- Sorvačeva & Saxarova & Guljaev 1966 = Сорвачева, В. А. & Сахарова, М. А. & Гуляев, Е. С. 1966: *Верхневычегодский диалект коми языка*. Сыктывкар: Коми книжное издательство.
- Stipa, Günter 1960: *Funktionen der Nominalformen des Verbs in den permischen Sprachen*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 121. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

- Stolz, Thomas & Stroh, Cornelia & Urdze, Aina 2006: *On Comitatives and Related Categories. A Typological Study with Special Focus on the Languages of Europe*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 33. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Терляшина 1964 = Тепляшина, Т. И. 1964: О суффиксах сравнительной степени в северо-западных удмуртских диалектах. – Б. А. Серебренников, В. И. Лыткин, К. Е. Майтинская, Г. М. Керт & М. И. Зайцева (eds), *Вопросы финно-угорского языкознания. Грамматика и лексикология*. Москва: Наука. 136–145.
- Терляшина & Lytkin 1976 = Тепляшина, Т. И. & Лыткин, В. И. 1976: Пермские языки. – В. И. Лыткин, К. Е. Майтинская & Карой Редעי (eds), *Основы финно-угорского языкознания. Марийский, пермские и угорские языки*. Издательство Наука. 97–228.
- Uotila, T. E. 1933: *Zur Geschichte des Konsonantismus in den permischen Sprachen*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne LXV. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Vojvǵv koživ* 1997 = *Войвыв кодзув* 5/1997. *Быд тӧлысья литературно-художественной журнал*. Сыктывкар: Коми гижысьяслӧн котыр, Коми республикаса печать управление.
- Ylikoski, Jussi 2001: Havaintoja komin konverbeistä. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 89. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 199–226.
- Ylikoski, Jussi 2003: Defining non-finites: action nominals, converbs and infinitives. – *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 16. Helsinki: The Linguistic Association of Finland. 185–237.
- Ylikoski, Jussi 2009: *Non-finites in North Saami*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 257. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Žilina 1985 = Жилина, Т. И. 1985: *Лузко-летский диалект коми языка*. Москва: Наука.

Arja Hamari <arja.hamari@helsinki.fi>