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BACKGROUND

• The productive spatial case system of Mordvin languages in the basic declension consist of five cases
  • In definite declension there is basically one GOAL-oriented case, so there is no variation in the coding of GOAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>PATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inessive</td>
<td>elative</td>
<td>illative/lative</td>
<td>prolative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• There must be some explanation for the asymmetricity present in the GOAL-oriented cell in the case system
PREVIOUS STUDIES

• The distribution of the two GOAL-oriented cases has been explained differently
  • Lative is used only with certain nouns (GMJa 1962, Bartens 1978)
  • Lative is used to express DIRECTION, illative is used to express GOAL (GMJa 1962, GMJa 1980, Bartens 1999, EK 2000, MK 2000)
  • The distribution of illative and lative is based on the dimensions of the Landmark entity (Alhoniemi 1985, Bartens 1999)
  • The distribution of illative and lative is based on the type of the Landmark entity (MK 2000, EMJa 2018)
• All of the explanations capture a part of the general explanation
COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE OF LANGUAGE

- There are no elements without meaning in languages
- Encyclopedic knowledge is used to structure the language
- Humans can conceptualize language external situations in different ways
  - Some conceptualizations can be a part of the grammar
- Conceptualized situations have always a Trajector (most prominent participant), and one or more Landmarks (important, but less prominent participants, settings etc.)
  - Expressions coded with a spatial case are always Landmarks
- Cases have meanings (functions) that can have contextual variants (different contexts give a different interpretation to instances of the same meaning)
DATA

• 200 examples of Erzyan illative and iative
  • From the MokshEr corpus (University of Turku)
  • Consists of inflected nouns and relative nouns (postpositions and adverbs)
  • Mokshan data is not systematically studied, but corresponding examples to Erzyan data were collected

• Data was analyzed based on different Landmark features and properties of the predicate
  • E. g. size, dimensionality, and abstractness of the Landmark entity; type (movement, directed, undirected etc.) of action, activity/stativity of the predicate
The meanings (functions) of illative and lative in Erzya

- The same meanings are found in Moksha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>GOAL-ORIENTED PATH</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TEMPORAL</th>
<th>STAYING</th>
<th>DIRECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contextual variant</td>
<td>ENDPOINT</td>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>APPEARANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illative</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lative</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meanings of goal-oriented cases in Erzya differ only in frequency.
THE VARIATION OF ILLATIVE AND LATIVE IN GOAL-ORIENTED PATH AND DIRECTION

• The use of illative and lative seems to vary according to the following parameters
  • The referent of the Landmark noun is known (1a) or unknown (1b) in the discourse
  • The movement of the Trajector is up to (2a) or towards (2b) the Landmark
  • The referent of the Landmark noun can (3a) or can’t (3b) be perceived at once or as a unit
  • At the end of the movement of the Trajector, it occupies a functionally significant (4a) or minor (4b) part of the Landmark
  • The Landmark is a concrete (5a) or an abstract (5b) entity
• The parameters should be considered as tendencies, and there can be dialectal, idiolectal, and situational variation in the choice between the GOAL-oriented case in Mordvin languages
The referent of the Landmark noun is known/unknown

(1a) Moksha (MokshEr-V.3/V.2 additions/Moksha/Moksha-2006_3_6-7.txt)

Мольбы кафонест, сипяясь шкестаманц, сувать кудозонза.
Mol'-si't' kafo-ne-st shka-sta pako-stam-nc suva-sta
-go-PST1.3PL two.together-3PL break-PST1.3PL>3SG latch-POS.S.GEN.3SG enter-PST1.3PL
kudo-za-na.

house-ILL-POS.S.GEN>3PL

‘They walked together, broke the latch [and] entered their house.’

(1b) Moksha (MokshEr-V.3/V.2 additions/Moksha/Moksha-2006_7.56-72.txt)

Бага пачходе Пургэз вел’и
Vaga paχxod-s Purgaz vel'i

look come-PST1.3SG Purgyaz village.LAT

‘And look, he came to the village of Purgyaz (…))'
THE MOVEMENT OF THE TRAJECTORY IS UP TO/TOWARDS THE LANDMARK

(2a) Erzya (MokshEr-V.3/V.2 additions/Erzya/Syatko-2007_1_84-93.txt)

(….) сон, тебе модакажерч, кеккь варынокю (….)

son, t’ebe modakatvarč, kekk-s vafa-so-nzo

3SG like mole hide-PST1.3SG hole-ILL-POS3SG

‘(…) s/he hid to her/his hole like a mole (…)’

(2b) Erzya (MokshEr-V.3/V.2 additions/Erzya/Syatko-2006_1_79-84.txt)

(…) вальске марто автобуссо съртась велев.

valsk-s marto avtobus-so sruga-s vePev-v.

morning with bus-INE depart-PST1.3SG village-LAT

‘(…) in the morning s/he left with a bus to [lit. towards] the village.’
THE REFERENT OF THE LANDMARK NOUN CAN/CAN’T BE PERCEIVED AT ONCE OR AS A UNIT

(3a) Moksha (MokshaEr-V.3/V.2 additions/Moksha/Moksha-2006_3_3-5.txt)
И домашке сельмезон ванье.

\[
I \ \text{ломан-кы} \ \text{шел-ма-вань} \ \text{ван-г}
\]
and human-TRA eye-ILL-POS5.1SG look-PST1.3SG

‘And it looked me into the eyes like [lit. as] a human.’

(3b) Moksha (MokshaEr-V.3/V.2 additions/Moksha/Varia-2/Pinjasov.txt)
(…) и снялаба ужълыдь ванье вирь шири (…)

\[
I \ \text{sашкава} \ \text{усал д’р-н} \ \text{ван-г} \ \text{вб-к} \ \text{sнн}
\]
and so pity-INF look-PST1.3SG forest-GEN.DEF.SG edge.LAT

‘(…) and s/he looked with pity towards the forest’s edge (…)’
AT THE END OF THE MOVEMENT OF THE TRAJECTOR, IT OCCUPIES A FUNCTIONALLY SIGNIFICANT/MINOR PART OF THE LANDMARK

(4a) Erzya (MokshEr-V.3/V.2 additions/Erzya/Syatko-2008_11_133-143.txt)

Азорось совась кудол.

doref-s sors-s kudo-s.

lord-NOM.DEF enter-PST1.3SG house-ILL

"The lord entered the house."

(4b) Erzya (MokshEr-V.3/V.2 additions/Erzya/Syatko-2007_3_126-127.txt)

(…) кона 1465-е ве нест э сась служао Московов Иван III Васильевичнень.

kona 1465- Ord ije-te za-s siuta-to Moskova-v

who 1465-ORD year-ELA leave-PST1.3SG work-INF2 Moscow-LAT

Ivan III Vasilievich,dat.

Ivan III Vasilievich-DAT

‘(…) who left in year 1465 to Moscow to work for Ivan III Vasilievich.’
THE LANDMARK IS A CONCRETE/AN ABSTRACT ENTITY

(5a) Erzya (MokshEr-V.3/V.2 additions/Erzya/Syatko-2008_10_122-124.txt)

Базаргыйтъ ясъетъ ясъетъ, сова тейкъ лавкас.

Bazar-go-št’ /jakš-te-št’, /zava-št’ vejke lavkas.

bazaar-PROL-DEF go-PST1.3PL-go-PST1.3PL enter-PST1.3PL one shop-ILL

‘They wandered around in the bazaar [and] entered [lit. into] a shop.’

(5b) Erzya (MokshEr-V.3/V.2 additions/Erzya/Syatko-2008_8_40-47.txt)

— Сдат, Мариа, мон нейкъ молин милиция!‘

— Sod-at, Marija, mon vejke mol’-an mil’ičija-v!

know-PRES.2SG Marija ISG immediately go-PRES.1SG militia-LAT

‘You know, Marija, I’ll go immediately to the militia!’
THE MOTIVATION OF THE VARIATION

• The common denominator in the previous examples is the specificity of the Landmark
  • Specificity is a measure of how prominent, exact, meaningful etc. the conceptualization of the Landmark is
  • The variation is based on the conceptualization of the Landmark as more or less specific
  • More specific Landmarks take illative as their GOAL-oriented case
  • Less specific Landmarks take lative as their GOAL-oriented case
  • Note that same kind of referent can be conceptualized as more or less specific depending on the situation
CONCLUSION

• The variation of GOAL-marking in Mordvin languages can be explained by the concept of specificity
  • Specificity is manifested in the conceptualization of the Landmark
• This explanation covers all of the explanations proposed earlier
  • Expressing DIRECTION/GOAL (GMJa 1962, Bartens 1978, GMJa 1980, Bartens 1999, EK 2000, MK 2000) is incorporated as one of the parameters
  • Dimensionality of and type of the Landmark (Alhoniemi 1985, Bartens 1999, MK 2000, EMJa 2018) are subparts of the functional dimension
  • The use of lative only with certain nouns can be a reflex of any of the parameters in the texts that are used as data in the studies (GMJa 1962, Bartens 1978)
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