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Abstract
This article discusses the morphology, syntax and semantics of the previously underdescribed denominal formations in -raejkiem and -raejkien in present-day written South Saami, and their etymological and functional counterpart -räjge in Lule Saami. As the topic has been mostly described in occasional dictionary entries but largely ignored in grammatical descriptions, the present article provides the first grammatical description of formations such as South Saami loedteraejkiem ‘along the track’ and okseraejkien ‘through the door’, and the corresponding luoddarájge and uksarájge in Lule Saami. The detailed morphosyntactic and semantic analysis suggests that -raejkiem/-raejkien and -ràjge – originating in the genitive and accusative forms of the nouns for ‘hole, opening’ – have many case-like features that make them look like modern equivalents of the so-called prolative (‘along, through, via’) case reconstructed in the (Pre-)Proto-Saami predecessors of these westernmost Uralic languages. In a wider perspective, the development of the case-like -raejkiem/-raejkien and -räjge prolatives from compound nouns challenges received views about diachronic interrelations of compounding, derivation and inflection.

Keywords: compound nouns, local cases, Lule Saami, prolative, South Saami

1. Introduction
South Saami and Lule Saami, spoken in central parts of Norway and Sweden, are two of the westernmost languages of the Uralic language family. With approximately 500 and 700 speakers, respectively, both languages are being transmitted to new generations; they have an established status as literary languages, and they are used in modern media and various other, albeit limited, domains of society. This article describes and discusses the existence and use of two case-like formatives in modern literary South Saami and Lule Saami, with occasional references to their counterparts in other Saami languages.¹

According to the received view, the grammatical structures of the Saami languages belong to the most “Indo-Europeanized” among the Uralic languages; their morphology exhibits a comparatively high degree of fusionality, and their syntax is in many ways quite similar to that of their Scandinavian neighbors. On the other hand, the Saami languages are quite ordinary Uralic languages of Europe, and the westernmost Saami languages can actually in many respects be characterized as more conservative than their sister languages to the east. As regards the topic of this paper, Table 1 illustrates the inventories of the eight acknowledged productive morphological cases in South Saami and Lule Saami noun declension – clearly smaller inventories than in the best known Uralic languages: Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian – but larger than in any of the Indo-European languages of Northern Europe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Saami</th>
<th>Lule Saami</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¹ I wish to thank Henrik Barruk, Lotta Jalava, Laura Janda, Maja Lisa Kappfjell, Lars-Gunnar Larsson, Bruce Morén-Duolljá and Sandra Nysto Ráhka for their valuable help and comments on earlier versions of this paper. While expressing my special thanks to the native speaker linguists Maja Lisa Kappfjell (South Saami) and Sandra Nysto Ráhka (Lule Saami) for insightful and inspiring comments about my findings and emerging intuitions of their languages, I wish to emphasize that I have deliberately refrained from extending and diversifying the topic and methods of the present observational description of written language data to the study of spoken language or a pursuit of grammaticality judgments by native speakers. It goes without saying that I am solely responsible for the views expressed in this paper.
The case paradigms of Table 1 include three local cases – illative (‘to’), inessive (‘at, in’) and elative (‘from’). However, the topic of this paper is a grammatical category that could be considered the fourth local case of South Saami and Lule Saami. Unlike the situation in the best known Uralic case systems of Hungarian or those of the Finnic branch, the Saami languages do not have parallel series of local cases that can be labeled as internal, external and vicinal cases (see, e.g., Kittilä & Ylikoski 2011). On the contrary, the case-like category to be discussed in the following sections is conceptually on a par with the established local cases, especially if viewed from the Hjelmslevian (1937) point of view where the category called prosecutive is a part of a symmetrical four-way system that can be described by the combinations of features [+from] and [+to]; see also Blake (2001: 38–39) who favors the term perlative, apparently unknown in Uralistics.2 As for the type of cases known as prolatives by many Uralists, Haspelmath (2009: 515) refers to traditions that use labels like prosecutive (as also used in Permic and Samoyedic linguistics), perlative, traversal, translative, vialis and mediative for approximately the same purpose.

To use the traditional terminology of Saami, Finnic and Mordvin linguistics, prolative forms (cases, adverbs, adpositions) have positive values for both features [+from] and [+to]. A neat example of the theoretical symmetry of the system is provided by the forms for the Lule Saami place name Váhtjer (~ Jielleväre, Swedish Gällivare) in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[+from]</th>
<th>[-from]</th>
<th>[+to]</th>
<th>[-to]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prolatives (Path)</td>
<td>illative (Direction)</td>
<td>prolatives (Source)</td>
<td>inessive (Location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Váhtjerik ‘via Váhtjer’</td>
<td>Váhtjerij ‘to Váhtjer’</td>
<td>Váhtjeris ‘from Váhtjer’</td>
<td>Váhtjerin ‘in Váhtjer’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The semantic relations between the so-called prolative forms and the three local cases of Lule Saami.

A less formal way of defining prolatives such as Váhtjerik is to call them expressions of path or route. In other words, they usually do not refer to the source (‘from’) nor the goal (‘to’) of motion, but to the path from the source of a motion to its goal. However, unlike the local case forms Váhtjeris, Váhtjerin and Váhtjerij, the prolative Váhtjerik has not been regarded as a case form proper, as it is only one of about a half dozen attested Lule Saami words containing the marker -(i)k with a spatial prolative meaning. In fact, the form Váhtjerik has been mentioned only by Wiklund (1901; 1915: 37) and occasional scholars citing him.3

2 The terminology and notational devices vary. For example, when defining and describing mutual relations of various spatial relations in terms of the features called [+from] and [+to] here, Hjelmslev (1937) speaks of distancing (éloignement) and approaching (rapprochement), whereas Riemsdijk and Huijbregts (2007: 343) speak of inchoative and telic.

3 Wiklund’s original spelling Vāhtērik is relatively close to the modern orthography of Lule Saami (Váhtjer : Váhtjeris : Váhtjerin : Váhtjerij; hence Váhtjerik), but for the purposes of the present paper, the huge variation of earlier scholarly transcriptions has been reduced to minimum by transforming nearly all South, Lule as well as
Nevertheless, the suffix -k and its cognates have gained attention to the extent that it is precisely this morpheme that is known as “the prolative” in descriptions of Lule Saami and elsewhere in Saami linguistics. To make the issue more complicated, the term is also used for certain temporal adverbs such as Lule Saami giessék ‘in summer’ (← giessē ‘summer’) or South Saami giesēge (← giesie) id. that actually seem to outnumber the spatial noun-based -k prolatives in most Saami languages. In this paper, the term prolative is used mostly as a semantic label to comprise basically all kinds of ‘through, along, via’ morphemes as described above; cf. Blake (2001: 38–39, 203) who uses the term perlative as a designation for analogous morphological cases “expressing ‘through’, ‘across’ or ‘along’”, but does not refrain from characterizing the dative in Pitta-Pitta as a case with “the perlative function” (‘through; across’) (ibid. 127).

This paper focuses on another kind of construction that deserves the label “prolative” in at least as great a degree as the -k forms, as they are almost without exception restricted to expressions of paths and routes. Although the locality of Váhtjer, for example, does not seem to constitute such a path in itself, paths are manifested in referents such as doors, resulting in expressions like South Saami okseraejkiem or Lule Saami uksarájge, both meaning ‘through the door’. More obviously than the -k element of Váhtjerik, formants such as -raejkiem and -råjge are apparently rather productive means of creating new prolative expressions in the written language data available. Furthermore, as will be seen further below, the morphosyntax of such formations suggests that -raejkiem and -råjge are case-like suffixes that can be best understood by comparing them with less controversial local cases and other spatial grams4 within South Saami and Lule Saami.

The structure of the paper is as follows: Section 2 provides a brief introduction to the case systems of the westernmost Saami languages and to the position of the so-called prolatives within Saami linguistics. Section 3 is the main body of the paper that provides a description of the “new” prolatives in South Saami (-raejkiem, -raejkien) and Lule Saami (-råjge), beginning with the history of their research (3.1), next scrutinizing the morphosyntactic properties of the constructions in question (3.2), then turning to their semantics – including deviating usages of Lule Saami -råjge in functions more typical of directional cases – (3.3), and further to the plural equivalents of the prolative singular formations (3.4). In conclusion, Section 4 draws the threads together and provides a general discussion of the topic by relating the present observations to the established views of the Saami case declension. In addition to discussing the position of the “old” and “new” prolatives within South Saami and Lule Saami noun inflection, it is shown that the languages in question, backed up by supplementary observations on other Saami languages, also offer new insights to the more typological studies on the development of case markers in general as well as to our synchronic understanding of prolative cases in particular.

Most examples come from the multi-genre corpora of South Saami and Lule Saami (approximately 450,000 and 1,000,000 words, respectively) originally published within about the past three decades and made available by SIKOR corpus at UiT The Arctic University of Norway. Although much of the data comes from a comparatively large corpus with respect to the size of the language communities, this study is predominantly qualitative. Furthermore, although the territories of South Saami and Lule Saami are wide and at present rather

---

4 Following Svorou (1994), I use the term (spatial) gram as a cover-all for different types of grammatical elements, such as case suffixes, adpositions and adverbs – including the grammaticalized -raejkiem and -råjge formations regardless of the ultimate morphosyntactic interpretation.
fragmented, questions of language-internal geographical variation fall outside the scope of the current investigation.

Before commencing with the analysis, there is a potentially important reservation to be made: word forms ending in -raejkiem/-raejkien and -råjge are not very frequent. For example, in the corpora of 450,000 and 1,000,000 words, the forms in question constitute less than 0.01% of the total of word forms in the corpora: the total of 31 in South Saami (19 -raejkiem, 12 -raejkien) and 86 in Lule Saami (-råjge), and even these numbers include ordinary compound nouns that are not relevant for the purposes of the present study (e.g., in the South Saami postpositional phrase haevtieraejkien nille [grave.hole.GEN onto] ‘on(to) the grave hole’). While the frequency of a given phenomenon cannot be used as a decisive criterion for approving or denying category membership of morphological cases, for example, it must be recognized that the formations to be discussed play a statistically marginal role in both languages.

2. Saami case systems and the so-called prolatives

Among the nine contemporary Saami languages, the eight-case declensions of South Saami and Lule Saami (as well as those of the closely related Ume Saami and Pite Saami in between) are structurally quite similar. They have all maintained the Proto-Saami distinctions between the genitive and the accusative on one hand and between the inessive and the elative on the other, whereas the partitive and abessive have fallen out of use – or at least out of inflection. The latter, in turn, have maintained their status a part of case paradigms in languages such as Aanaar (Inari) Saami and Skolt Saami located to the east of North Saami, a language with only six morphological cases.5

Sammallahti (1998: 203–204) presents a reconstruction of the Pre- and Proto-Saami declension with potentially as many as thirteen cases. Two of them, “?Lative” in *-n/k/s (for which see, e.g., Ylikoski 2011) and “?Prolative” in *-ko (> *-gō) are cautiously presented with question marks. Although Sammallahti’s Proto-Saami reconstructions include prolatival forms for ‘hut’, ‘cap’ and ‘island’, the semantics of the proposed case is not described, and the term prolative otherwise occurs only in etymologies for words like South Saami giesege, Lule Saami giessek mentioned above. Such words include temporal adverbs for ‘in fall’, ‘in winter’, ‘in spring’, ‘at night’, ‘during the daytime’, but also deictic adverbs such as North Saami gokko ‘at which place; by which way’, dakko ‘around there; that way’ (= South Saami gogkoe, dajkoe, Lule Saami gåggu(s), daggu), or the South Saami adverb gáavtoeh ‘in the center’. The above-mentioned Lule Saami Váhtjerik ‘via Váhtjer’ has certainly been connected to the very same prolatival in *-ko (e.g., Beke 1911: 475), but from the perspective of inflectional case morphology, it appears questionable to what extent such prolatives play a productive role in Saami morphology, and it actually appears questionable to what extent they ever did, as Sammallahti’s question marks also suggest. I will return to the possible remnants of truly prolatival “path” semantics of *-ko in Section 4.

Although the languages in question do not possess suffixes that could be regarded as obvious prolatival cases, the overall system of spatial interrogatives and deictics, as well as adpositions and formally identical adverbs, and other adverbs such as those referring to cardinal or relative directions include many semantically uniform sets whose members come in fours instead of threes. Table 3 depicts a part of such series in South Saami. Some of the series quite clearly show that many of the adpositional series stem from case-marked relational nouns of Proto-Uralic or otherwise ancient origin, but from a synchronic perspective these sets are more or less opaque and partly suppletive.

5 For the purposes of this paper, I disregard the issue of the South Saami and Lule Saami successors of the Proto-Saami abessive case that has been gradually losing ground in Saami languages (cf., e.g., Bergsland 1946: 186–187; Spiik 1989: 34ff., 100; Sammallahti 1998: 63, 70).
Table 3. Illative-inessive-elative-prolative systems of certain spatial expressions (cases, adverbs, adpositions) in South Saami (data mostly adapted from Magga & Magga 2012).

As regards the contents of Table 3, analogous data could be provided for all Saami languages, the major difference being that in the languages to the northeast of Lule Saami, the “inessive” and “elative” categories have merged to one (labeled “locative”). It is notable that the eastern merger has not affected the case suffixes only, but has changed the entire system for the “inessive” and “elative” cases while leaving the prolative category intact, as if to underline the symbiosis of local cases and other functionally equivalent categories.

The contents of the prolative column are quite heterogeneous, however. Not only is a prolative case marker missing, but some prolative adverbs (e.g., gogkoe, dajkoe, noerhtego, vuelege) go back to the element *-ko discussed above, whereas some other prolatives end in -m, and some are etymologically different from the rest of the series (bijjelen and rastah for ‘over’ and tjïrrh for ‘through (inside of)’) or are altogether missing. However, the postpositions ending in -m are formally identical to or at least reminiscent of the accusative case forms of relational nouns. However, as regards ordinary nouns, the accusative case as in Oslovem [Oslo.ACC] is normally the case of the direct object only, whereas to convey prolative semantics, postpositions such as baaktoe must be used (e.g., Osloven baaktoe [Oslo.GEN via] ‘via Oslo’). On the other hand, prolative functions of accusative-marked nouns are not unknown either, as shown by Examples (1–2) from South Saami and (3) from Lule Saami:

1) South Saami
   Daate barre dam aktem geajnoem jåhta.
   3SG only DEF.ACC one.ACC road.ACC travel.3SG
   ‘S/he is only traveling along that one road.’ (SIKOR)

2) South Saami
   Daelie jis mijjen almetjh aaj geajnoebealine årroeminie,
   now again 1PL.GEN human.PL also road.side.PL.LOC live.PROG
   njieljenska[a]-vhte gäetine gusnie ij riehpeneraejskiem
   four.cornered house.PL.INE where NEG.3SG smokehole.raejkiem
tjuetsieh jallh åbroeh. (or: smokehole.opening.ACC)\(^6\)
snow.CNG or rain.CNG
‘Nowadays, we, too, live along roads, in four-cornered houses where it does not snow
or rain in through the smokehole.’ (SIKOR)

(3) Lule Saami
Nagertjalmij idedis skåvllåbálggáv vådtsiv.
sleepy.eye.PL.COM morning.ELA school.path.ACC walk.PST.1SG
‘In the morning I walked along the path to school very tired.’ (SIKOR)

The main topic of the present investigation are prolatively-used compound-like formations
such as riehpeneraejkiem (2) that looks like the accusative form of riehpene+raejkie
[smokehole+opening] just like in (1) where we see the accusative of geajnoe ‘road’ and in (3)
the accusative of skåvllåbálges ‘school path’. Furthermore, in addition to the prolative
accusatives of the above examples and the Lule Saami accusative plural gájnojt in (4) below,
there are certain less expected instances of genitive-like forms in more or less similar
functions. Put concretely, these formations are virtually always what seem to be genitive
forms of compounds whose head is the word for ‘hole’ or ‘opening’, namely South Saami
raejkie and Lule Saami rájgge.\(^7\)

(4) Lule Saami
Állumuk vådtsáj dassta dan goahtáj, gen vuorro
people leave.by.foot.PST.3SG from.there it.GEN house.ILL who.GEN turn
lij tjàhkalsgüossiit biebmat, vuorrasa bálgesrájge ja
be.PST.3SG meeting.guest.PL.ACC feed.INF old.PL path.rájge and
nuora julisti tetjasa gájnojt.
young.PL roam.PRS.3PL REFL.GEN.3PL way.PL.ACC
‘People walked away from there to the house whose turn it was to feed the guests of the
revival meeting; the elderly went along the path, and young people roamed their own
ways.’ (SIKOR)

(5) South Saami
Dagke ædtjem dàálvodh riehpeneraejkiem jallh aaj
whether shall.1SG chase.INF smokehole.raejkiem or also

---

\(^6\) For the purposes of the present paper, the elements -raejkiem, -raejkien and -rájge, as well as their plural
counterparts will be glossed as such; i.e., as [X-raejkiem] instead of predetermined [X-opening.ACC] or [X-PROL]
and so forth.

\(^7\) Sandra Nystø Ráhka (p.c.) has remarked that the Lule Saami noun rájgge also has an inherent meaning of path,
and especially when in the accusative (rájgev) it could be also analyzed in the meaning ‘pathway,
passage’. However, in the authentic written language data on which the present study is based, the meanings of
the plain, uncompounded nouns rájgge and raejkie are both quite like those of English hole, ranging from ‘a
hollow place in the ground’ (i) to ‘perforation made by piercing’ (ii):

(i) Lule Saami
\[Muoohtagij \quad rággev \quad bálj.\]
snow.ILL hole.ACC dig.PST.3SG
‘S/he dug a hole in the snow.’ (SIKOR)

(ii) South Saami
\[Hei \quad Malena, \quad åådtjeme \quad leah \quad raejkieh \quad bieljine?\]
hey M. get.PST.PTCP be.2SG hole.PL ear.PL.INE
‘Have you got holes in your ears, Malena?’ (SIKOR)
båassjoeraejkien
rear.entrance.of.a.Saami.tent.raejkien
‘Well, let me chase them through the smokehole or through the rear entrance.’ (Bull & Bergsland 1974: 87)

However, although the South Saami sentences of (2) and (5) do refer to true openings in the smokeholes and in the innermost parts of traditional Saami dwellings, Lule Saami bálgesrájge of (4) – or its South Saami equivalents baalkaraejkiem (Example 28 below) and baalkaraejkien – do not refer to any kind of holes in paths. In light of these and other features of the formations in question, they must rather be analyzed as instances of case-like morphemes -rájge, -raejkiem/-raejkien that are deliberately used in order to give NPs (headed by lexical nouns such as those meaning ‘path’) unambiguously prolative meanings. Moreover, the use of what look like genitive forms – -rájge instead of accusative -räjgev, -raejkien instead of -raejkiem – is not compatible with the normal case semantics of these languages: Unlike the accusatives, the genitives generally do not have prolative functions in South Saami or Lule Saami (see especially Bergsland 1946: 136–138; Bartens 1972: 50, 53; 1978: 18). The following sections will scrutinize the nature of these morphemes.

3. South Saami -raejkiem/-raejkien, Lule Saami -rájge
Before taking a look at the history of research concerning the formations in question, the following three Saami translations of a Bible verse raise many research questions in a condensed form:

(6)   Aanaar Saami
a. Moonnâđ poskis poortist siisâ.
go.IMP.2PL narrow gate.LOC to.inside
Lule Saami
b. Tjágŋit gártjes uksarájge!
enter.IMP.2PL narrow door.rájge
South Saami
c. Tjaangede dan gaertjies oksen tjïrrh.
enter.IMP.2PL DEF.GEN narrow door.GEN through
‘Enter through the narrow gate.’ (EMM & SIKOR: Matthew 7:13)

According to the traditional linguistic terminology and all descriptions of the Saami languages, Aanaar Saami poskis poortist ‘through the narrow gate’ (6a) is an unambiguous NP with its head in an adverbial local case form, namely the locative which largely corresponds to the South and Lule Saami inessive and elative cases. The South Saami dan gaertjies oksen tjïrrh (6c) in turn is a postpositional phrase headed by the adposition tjïrrh ‘through’. However, the Lule Saami words gártjes uksarájge (6b) do not constitute a prima facie NP nor a prima facie PP either. Even though one can think of uksarájge as referring to a door opening (nominative uksarájgge) instead of just a door, it is preceded by an adjective that in this sentence could indeed act as a modifier of a noun for ‘opening’ too, but similar modifiers are also possible with formations such as bálgesrájge ‘along the path’ (4) above. Furthermore, it can be repeated that the genitive case does not generally have a prolative function in Lule Saami (see also Section 3.3 below).

This said, the formations in question hardly fit the pre-existing concepts of morphological case on the one hand, or that of adposition on the other. It will be argued below that uksarájge
(6b), not unlike South Saami okserækjkiem and okseræjkien (47) for that matter, are manifestations of case-like categories semantically reminiscent of a number of so-called prolative or prosecutive cases in other Uralic languages.8

3.1. History of research
Possibly because of their unprecedented position among more prototypical representatives of case suffixes and adpositions, the research history on -raejkiem/-raejkien and -råjge consists of brief, scattered and contradictory remarks only, and this holds true for their counterparts in other Saami languages as well. The formations in question have been mainly described in dictionaries rather than in grammatical descriptions; in other words, as part of the lexicon instead of the grammatical structure.

The Lule Saami element appears to have first been mentioned by Halász (1885 s.v. rajêkie, räjêkie) in his dictionary of Lule and Pite Saami where no attention is paid to possible case forms of the noun for ‘hole’ (‘lyuk, nyilás; loch, öfnung’). Halász’ examples consist only of compounds without translations: “uksa-r.; veaga-r. Arv. [=Årviesjávrrie/Arvidsjaur Ume Saami]; palhkies-r. id.; johko-r. folyó mente | der weg, welchen ein fluss fliesst”. In the modern Lule Saami orthography the initial parts would be uksa ‘door’, vedda ‘road’, bálges ‘path’ and jåhkå ‘river’, but while it seems that the compounds are implicitly presented as nouns in their nominative forms, the semantics of the words like (?)bálgesrájgge (“path hole”) remains obscure, although jåhkårájgge ‘river bed’ is more understandable (see below).

Halász (1885) was soon followed by Wiklund (1890: 101) who under the noun råjgge ‘hole’ calls the genitive råjge (alternatively råjg) a postposition, and his only example does indeed present what looks like a postpositional phrase with the complement in the genitive case, as usual with Lule Saami adpositions:

(7) Lule Saami

\[ \text{Maná mijá luotta råjge!} \]
\[ \text{go.IMP.2SG 1PL.GEN track.GEN råjge} \]
‘Go along our track!’ (Wiklund 1890: 101)

However, Wiklund seems to have made a mistake and later understood the issue better, as in the vocabulary of his Lule Saami textbook (1901; 1915: 232) he presents a similar, but crucially different example:

(8) Lule Saami

\[ \text{Mijá luoddarájge manáj.} \]
\[ \text{1PL.GEN track.råjge go.PST.3SG} \]
‘S/he went along our track.’ (Wiklund 1915: 232; the original hyphenated luödda-raikē)

The element -råjge has never been mentioned in grammatical descriptions of Lule Saami (most notably Spiik 1989). However, in the major dictionary by Grundström (1946–1954 s.v.

---

8 The prolative use of the Aanaar Saami locative (6a) has parallels in other Saami languages northeast of Lule Saami, but the corresponding use of the western elative – one of the two cognates of the eastern locative – is marginal and has escaped the notice of earlier scholars (cf. Bartens 1972: 123). Not unlike the locative in the east, the Lule Saami elative expresses both real and fictive motion through openings such as gates and windows (cf. Note 14):

(iii) Lule Saami

\[ \text{De gullájma juts\[a\]v, valla ittij juhta} \]
\[ \text{DPT hear.PST.1PL noise.ACC but NEG.PST.3SG noise window.ELA come.CNG} \]
‘We heard the noise, but it didn’t come from the window.’ (SIKOR)
rai’kē) the entry for the noun rājgge ‘hole, opening’ includes the secondary function of the form -rājg(e), characterized as “genitive singular as the latter part in compounds” meaning ‘through, along, by’.

9 Grundström’s examples include that of Wiklund’s (8) in the fragmented form mijā luoddarājge, as well as the isolated compounds jāhkārājge (← jāhkā ‘river’), miehttsarājge (← miehtts ‘woods’; also mentioned by Wiklund 1915: 222), bālgesrājge (← bālges ‘path’), rājggerājge (← rājgge ‘hole’), uksarājge (← uksa ‘door’) and rahterājge (← rahte ‘road’) – all based on nominative singular forms; i.e., à la luoddarājge instead of luotta rājge. The exact nature of the “compounds” (Swedish sammansättningar, German Zusammensetzungen) or their word-class membership remains unspecified, however.

Similar forms occur later in Korhonen (2007) and Kintel’s (2012) dictionaries, but apparently the only grammar-oriented descriptions of Lule Saami -rājge are presented in Bartens’ (1972: 50, 53; 1978: 15, 18–20) studies on the syntax of cases and other spatial expressions in Aanaar, North and Lule Saami. Presenting three example sentences, she describes them as expressions of path, and points out that the -rājge forms are the only instance of the Lule Saami genitive being used in a prolative meaning (-rājgev with the accusative marker will be discussed in Section 3.3 below). Bartens also interprets these formations as compounds, instead of suffixed forms. As for unambiguous, transparent -rājgge (pro genitive -rājge) compounds in the nominative, one of the most important compounds with respect to grammaticalization of the prolative -rājge seems to be jāhkārājgge ‘river bed’ that occurs also in later dictionaries and will be returned to immediately below (see also Section 3.3 further below).

As regards the westernmost Saami languages, the first example was likewise presented by Halász (1891 s.v. rai’kē) who in his dictionary of South (and Ume) Saami mentions one compound, obviously analogous to Lule Saami jāhkārājgge ‘river bed’: “jeänuo-r. (...) folyam medre | flussbe[t]t”; i.e. a designation to a river bed (cf. modern South Saami jeanoe ‘large river’). However, the prolative formations in oblique case forms were not described before Lagercrantz (1923: 17) who states in his South Saami grammar that the genitive formations in -raejkien, and also the genitive plural -reejki (for which see Section 3.4), in sentences like (9) are instances of a genitive that expresses the direction (!) of motion (“gibt die Richtung einer Bewegung an”):

(9) South Saami

Gogkoe  edjim  tjaangedh, oksen  baaktoe vij
which.way shall.1SG enter.INF  door.GEN through or
baaşjoeræejkien?
rear.entrance.of.a Saami.tent.raejkien
‘Which way shall I go: through the door or through the rear entrance?’ (Lagercrantz 1923: 17)

On the other hand, in his subsequent dictionary of the language, Lagercrantz (1926: 133) states that these genitives are used as postpositions and have the meaning ‘through, along’, but in spite of being called a postposition, his only example is written in a single undivided word (strä’jmierejki; <stræjmierejki> of Example 30 below). However, the following grammarians have remained very taciturn when presenting examples such as (10–11):

(10) South Saami

Dah  vuölkin  vuejien  dam  loedteræejkien.
3PL  leave.PST.3PL  ride.CVB  DEF.ACC  track.of.a.herd.of.reindeer.in.snow.raejkien

9 In Grundström’s translation, ‘genom, efter, längs efter, ut i / durch, nach, längs, entlang, hinaus in, hinaus auf (acc.)’. 
‘They left, riding along the track of the reindeer herd.’ (Bergsland 1994: 66)

(11) South Saami

Tjaetsie-ledtie vöölki haelehten johkeraejgien.

water.fowl leave.PST.3SG fly.CVB river.raejgien

‘The water fowl flew off along the river.’ (Bergsland 1994: 66)

Sentences (10–11) presented by Bergsland (1994: 66) are modified from his original examples (Bergsland 1946: 137) and further reproduced by Magga and Magga (2012: 222), but none of the three major descriptions is explicit enough to state whether the formations are to be considered case forms of the noun raejgie, or compounds of some kind, or maybe postpositions such as Lagercrantz (1926) does. The orthographical choices reveal little either: for pedagogical purposes and due to general variation of South Saami orthography in this respect many authors write -raejgien with a preceding hyphen despite the analysis presented.10 As with Lule Saami -räije, occasional examples of isolated -raejkiem/-raejgien forms also occur in the recent practical dictionaries of South Saami (Bergsland & Magga 1993; Magga 2009). However, a more explicit yet conceptually obscure analysis has been presented in Hasselbrink’s scholarly dictionary which first describes the noun raejgie ‘hole, opening’ by stating that its oblique cases can be used as “adverb-building postpositions” (adverbbildende Postpositionen) that do not govern any cases (of complements) but rather make up compounds with the stem; in other words, -raejkiem/-raejgien are characterized as “suffixal postpositions” meaning ‘through, along’ (Hasselbrink 1981–1985: 1051–1052).

As regards other Saami languages with corresponding formations, the research history is quite similar. Space does not allow a full account here, but it can be noted that Nielsen (1912: 4–5; 1926: 291, 297, 315; 1932–1962 s.v. raiˈge, -rai) and Bartens (1972: 50, 53; 1978: 14–15, 18–20) have considered such formations to be compound nouns, but the most recent dictionaries label corresponding North Saami formations as adverbs (e.g., Sammallahti & Nickel 2006 s.v. -räigge, -räi). Hence, it remains unclear whether forms such as johkaråigge ‘along the river’ ought to be understood as “compound adverbs”; such a category has not been in use otherwise in Saami linguistics. Finally, Ylikoski (2009: 198–199) has briefly pointed out that many features of North Saami -räi(gge) point to the theoretical possibility of regarding the element as a kind of case suffix. This element is further described in Ylikoski (2014) from a decidedly North Saami perspective. Although intentionally left outside the main scope of the present study, the North Saami prolatives show both similarities and differences in comparison with South and Lule Saami with richer case morphologies, and the two studies can thus be seen as complementing each other.

The material origin of these formations is quite obvious: The pan-Saami noun for ‘hole, opening’ and the genitive and accusative cases all go back to Proto-Saami (*rājkē, *-n, *-m). Nevertheless, it is truly difficult to decide whether a formation like riehpeneraejkiem (2, 5) is to be analyzed 1) as consisting of a compound noun riehpene+raejkie [smokehole+opening] in the accusative case with a prolative meaning or rather 2) as the noun riehpene ‘smokehole’ followed by a gram -raejkiem possibly best understood as a more or less indivisible whole – a kind of case suffix, a kind of postposition or possibly something in-between – meaning ‘through’. It is obvious that on many occasions the latter alternative is the only sensible one. While doors have openings too (cf. uksaråige in 6b), the North Saami noun räigi is also given a dictionary translation ‘long valley’ (Nielsen 1932–1962 s.v.), and the Lule Saami noun jåhkåråigge has been defined as ‘river bed; coulee’ continually since Halåsz (1885) up to Kintel (2012). This of course makes formations like North Saami johkaråigge, Lule Saami

---

10 For the purposes of the present paper, all such hyphens have been omitted, so as to produce uniform glosses without illicit hyphenation.
(SaaL) jàhkàrájge and South Saami (SaaS) johkeræjkien (11) ‘along the river (bed)’ somewhat transparent, whereas entities like paths (4) and tracks (7–8, 10) hardly have openings as a prerequisite for using the prolatives in question.

It is only understandable that many lexicographers have translated the morpheme with German, Norwegian and Swedish prepositions equivalent to ‘through, along, via, by’. However, such formations – be they parts of “compounds”, “adverbs”, or “postpositions” or “suffixal postpositions” – have been mostly described in dictionaries focusing on the lexical meanings of words, or otherwise apart from other spatial grams such as unambiguous local case markers, unambiguous adpositions or other prolate adverbs and particles (as seen in Table 3), and as a consequence they have not been described from morphological or syntactic perspectives, and even their semantics has been defined through translational equivalents only, but not as part of a larger whole of spatial expressions. The following sections focus on the morphological, syntactic and semantic features of the morphemes -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge in South Saami and Lule Saami respectively. Put concretely, I will discuss the position of the formations such as Lule Saami uksarájge (6b) in relation to what are traditionally considered unambiguous case forms such as the Aanaar Saami locative poortist (6a) or unambiguous postpositional phrases like South Saami oksen tjïrrh (6c) in Saami linguistics and elsewhere.

I will return to the research history of these phenomena in more detail in Section 4 that also presents some additional observations on other Saami languages such as Ume Saami and Pite Saami spoken in the areas between South Saami and Lule Saami territories.

3.2. Morphosyntax
To my knowledge, the internal morphosyntax of -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge constructions has never received explicit attention among scholars, although this approach seems to provide one of the most natural perspectives in attempting to understand these admittedly aberrant formations better. Most of the examples in the previous literature consist of individual word forms detached from authentic or potential contexts in which they occur in natural language. Admittedly, most occurrences consist of individual word forms such as riehpeneraejkiem ‘through the smokehole’ (2) or those seen in (4), (5) and (9), but even the truncated dictionary entries have occasional cues that can tell more. One of those is the genitive modifier mijá ‘our’ in mijá luoddarájge ‘along our track’ in (8) mentioned by Wiklund. While such a genitive is an entirely normal modifier for a nominal complement of an adposition, this is not generally the case for the modifiers of compounds, if one were to analyze formations such as riehpeneraejkiem as (endocentric) nouns, and SaaL bálgesrájge (4) or SaaS loedteraejkiem (10), for example, as some kind of extensions of such.

In practice, the only morphological remark made about the internal structure of the constructions in question is the recognition of the genitive/accusative (-raejkiem/-raejkien) variation in South Saami. The possible semantic differences between the two variants will be discussed in more detail in Section 3.3, but it is enough to note that the accusative (-raejkiem) has been characterized as having a more definite meaning than the genitive. This in turn is much in line with a fact that has not gained attention despite constructions such as dam loedteraejkiem (10) presented by Bergsland (1946: 137; 1994: 166), and Magga and Magga (2012: 222): To begin with, although dam and other forms of dïhte ‘it; he, she’ is traditionally labeled as a demonstrative and personal pronoun, it is here often glossed as DEF, as the element has been grammaticalized to the extent that in many contexts it can be characterized as a definite article (cf. Magga & Magga 2012: 223). Therefore, it ought not to come as a surprise that many of the -raejkiem forms are preceded by a definiteness marker that agrees in the accusative case just like when preceding ordinary nouns such as garse ‘rapids’ in (12) and sjeltiem ‘village’ in (13):
(12) South Saami

Guktie dihte gujht galki **dam** johkeraejkiem jih bijjelen **dam**
so.that 3SG still must.PST.3SG DEF.ACC river.raejkiem and over DEF.ACC
garsem.
rapids.ACC
‘However, he had to get across the river and over the rapids somehow.’ (Bull 2000: 132)

(13) South Saami

Dan **spaajhte dam** jaevrieraejkiem dennie fâskoes lopmesne jähta,
so fast DEF.ACC lake.raejkiem DEF.INE light snow.INE move.3SG
guktie eah mahte maam gånnah vuejnieh aarebi goh **dam**
so.that NEG.3PL almost what.ACC even see.CNG before when DEF.ACC
jitjejke sjeltiem mahte vaesieminie jih dah ràantjoe[h]
selfsame village.ACC almost pass.PROG and DEF.PL reindeer.bull.PL
aelkieh såajmanidh.
begin.3PL slow.down.INF
‘It is possible to move over the lake in the powder snow so fast that they can see hardly anything before they almost pass the very village, and the draught reindeer begin to slow down.’ (SIKOR)

It would be quite unintuitive to consider -raejkiem a postposition (Lagercrantz 1923, 1926) or “suffixal postposition” (Hasselbrink 1981–1985) that takes its modifiers in the nominative (johke, jaevrie) but the modifier of the modifier in the accusative. Of course, the function of **dam** in (12–13) is not to refer to the definiteness of an imaginary “river hole” or a “lake hole”, but to that of the river and the lake. The following examples illustrate other possible modifiers of -raejkiem/-raejkien and -râjge:

(14) South Saami

Goh bussesne tjahkesjim, skeamtjoejim jih tjoerim **bussen**
when bus.INE sit.PST.1SG get.ill.PST.1SG and must.PST.1SG bus.GEN
klaaseraejkiem voeksedidh.
window.raejkiem vomit.INF
‘As I was sitting on the bus, I felt sick and had to vomit out the window.’ (SIKOR)

(15) Lule Saami

Viehká **tjarggis bâlgesrâjge**, vielggis åbbåsa tjadá.
run.3SG hard path.râjge white deep.untouched.snow.GEN through(.inside)
‘S/he runs along a hard path, through the deep untrodden snow.’ (SIKOR)

(16) Lule Saami

Tjaskes goade birra, gâvmná áhtjes láhttv ja
nip.3SG house.GEN around find.3SG father.GEN.3SG ski.track.ACC and
vuoddjá vaden **dan** ådâ láhhttorâjge.
drive.off.3SG again that.GEN new ski.track.râjge
‘S/he nips around the house, finds his/her father’s tracks and sets off along the new track again.’ (SIKOR)

(17) South Saami
‘Sometimes the brook may spring along that kind of small gorge down into the mountain valley.’

The South Saami phrase *bussen klaaserajkien* (14) is structurally and semantically analogous to Lule Saami *mijá luoddarájge* discussed above: they do not refer to “our track holes” nor to “a window hole of the bus”, but to “our track” and “a window of the bus” instead, whereas the “holes” in the genitive are actually non-lexical spatial grams for ‘through, along’ in both languages.

In (15–17), the formation in question have other kinds of modifiers: the Lule Saami adjectives *tjarggis* ‘hard’ and *ådå* ‘new’ as well as South Saami *dagkere* ‘that kind of’. They, too, must be interpreted as modifiers of the lexical nouns for ‘path’, ‘ski track’ and ‘small gorge, small ravine’ instead of non-existent holes or openings there; the same goes for *gártjes uksarájge* ‘through the narrow door’ seen in (6b). Although (17) is taken from one of the first grammatical descriptions of South Saami, the fact that these kinds of prolatives take adjectival modifiers has not been discussed in any earlier studies. Moreover, it can be noted that the Lule Saami phrase *dan ådå láhttorájge* includes a demonstrative pronoun in the genitive case, comparable to the genitive form of the South Saami deictic or demonstrative adjective *dagkere* ‘that kind of’. The use of the genitive in this kind of position is fully in line with the morphosyntax of the unambiguous local cases of the language (see Table 4 below).

The NP-ness of the prolative constructions is further illustrated by the following example:

(18) Lule Saami

\[ Valla kårja sinna luojteđuvviv vuolus rájgeråjge mij \]

but basket.GEN in let.down.PASS.PST.1SG downward opening.RÁJGE REL

\[ stáda muvran lij ja náv de suv giedaj sissta \]

town.GEN wall.INE be.PST.3SG and thus DPT 3SG.GEN hand.PL.GEN from.inside bessiv.

get.loose.PST.1SG

‘But I was let down in a basket through an opening in the city wall, and so escaped his hands.’ (SIKOR: 2 Corinthians 11:33)

Firstly, this is a prima facie example of a grammaticalization that has proceeded so far that the originally lexical element can be attached to the very morpheme in which it has its material origin: To be sure, *rájgeråjge* does not mean ‘of a hole of a hole’ or even ‘of a hole passage’ but ‘through an opening’. From a purely morphological perspective, it would be equally possible to create reduplicative compounds such as “*stádastáda*” [town(GEN).town(GEN)] or “*muvramuvran*” [wall.wall.INE] or even “*rájgerággeråjge*”, but only *rájgeråjge* makes sense here because it is not a reduplicative compound noun but instead the noun *rájge* ‘hole, opening’ followed by the prolative gram -råjge ‘through’. Secondly, as regards syntax, this occurrence comes with a postmodifying relative clause typical of nouns such as the lexical noun *rájgge* ‘opening (that was in the city wall)’ here.11

11 Although analogous modifiers of compound heads in true, more lexical compounds are not entirely impossible in Saami languages, phrases such as Lule Saami *stuorra jåhkågátten* ‘by the bank of the big river’ instead of ‘by the big bank of the river’ (iv) are nevertheless marginal exceptions to the general rule according to which the default meaning of *småva sierggaduhpo* means ‘small clusters of downy willow’ instead of ‘clusters of small
As a conclusion it is possible to present Table 4 that illustrates the internal morphosyntax of the Lule Saami prolative phrases in relation to that of the unambiguous cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>dat</th>
<th>åhtjes</th>
<th>ådå</th>
<th>lâhtto</th>
<th>mav</th>
<th>gávnaj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that</td>
<td>father.GEN.3SG</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>ski.track</td>
<td>REL.ACC</td>
<td>find.PST.3SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘that/the new ski track of his/her father s/he found’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Example paradigm of a Lule Saami noun in singular case forms including the case-like prolative, accompanied by with demonstrative, genitive and adjectival modifiers and relative clauses. The relevant local case suffixes and the prolative marker are in boldface.12

When put in an appropriate context, the prolatives look very much like case forms. The above examples strongly suggest that the prolatives in question behave very much like unambiguous case forms within an NP. However, I am not aware of any possessive suffixes attached to these formations, but in any case possessive suffixes are very infrequent in both South Saami and Lule Saami, and mostly confined to kinship terms and other inalienable nouns that hardly match with nouns denoting paths. (See, e.g., Spiik 1989: 53–55; Magga & Magga 2012: 49; of the many example sentences of this paper, the only possessive suffixes can be seen in Lule Saami åhtjes ‘his/her father’s’ (16) and gierugam ‘my beloved’ (36).) The plural equivalents of the formations seen thus far will be discussed separately in Section 3.4.

3.3. Semantics
As the formations in question originate in the compound nouns for holes and openings, it is understandable that many instances of the actual use refer to motion through openings such as smokeholes (2) and door-like openings (5) of traditional Saami dwellings, or through more timeless openings such as doors (6b). The prolative (‘through, along, via, by’) meaning in contrast to expressions of goals, stative locations and sources is evident in all of the examples seen above. Bartens (1978) is apparently the only scholar to have characterized the formations in -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge explicitly as “prolatives”, along with other prolative grams akin to those of the right-hand column of Table 3 in Section 2. This is also implicitly reflected in Bergsland’s (1994: 166) short remark of the fact that -raejkiem/-raejkien are used as answers to the question gogkoe ‘which way?’. See also Example (9), here repeated for convenience:13

(9) South Saami
downy willow’, although the stuctural distinction is not that significant in this very context (see also Bartens 1978: 106–107):

(iv) Lule Saami
Ja gávnnuji ållu smávva sierggaduhpo stuorra jåhkågåten.
and exist.3PL much small downy.willow.cluster.PL big river.bank.INE
‘And there are small many clusters of downy willow by the bank of the big river.’ (Pirak 1993: 214)

12 Although prescriptive grammarians accept only so-called partitive (identical to nominative) demonstratives as modifiers of elative nouns, the genitive forms are also in use (cf. Spiik 1989: 58).
13 Cf. also the Pite Saami example (38) in Section 4.1 below.
Gogkoe edjemed tjaangedh, oksen baaktoe vij
which.way shall.1SG enter.INF door.GEN by or
båassjoeraejkiem?
rear.entrance.of.a.Saami.tent.raejkiem
‘Which way shall I go: by the door or through the rear entrance?’ (Lagercrantz 1923: 17)

The above example also includes the nearest semantic equivalent of -raejkiem, namely the postposition baaktoe. Unlike the prolativ e adpositions of Table 3, baaktoe and its Lule Saami counterpart baktu are neutral with respect to relative directions. In other words, they do not tell whether the path goes behind, in front of, under, or over (e.g., bijjelen of Example 12) or through the inside of (SaaS tjirrh, SaaL tjadá) the noun referent. On the other hand, -raejkiem/-raejkiem and -rájge differ from more and less specialized prolativ e adpositions also in that they are used in spatial functions only, whereas baaktoe and baktu phrases, for example, can express instrument-like abstract routes such as in SaaS e-páasten baaktoe [e-mail.GEN by] ‘by e-mail’ and SaaL stáhtabudsjehta baktu [state.budget.GEN by] ‘through the state budget’.

Most occurrences of the prolatives in question do not refer to motion through concrete openings, but rather to more or less natural paths of motion from a source to a goal, such as tjåhkavalís bálgesrájge goahtáj [meeting.ELA path.rájge house.ILL] ‘along the path from the revival meeting to the house’; cf. Example 4), although it is rarely relevant to express all these reference points in the same sentence. However, as purposeful motion usually involves both a starting point and an end point, most prolativ e forms are based on nouns with “one-dimensional” referents, in other words nouns which are conceptualized as one-dimensional paths with two end points (path from A and B), along which someone or something is moving. In addition to the South Saami loedteraejkiem ‘along the track of the reindeer herd’ (10), johkeraejkiem ‘along the river’ (11) and golletjeraejkiem ‘along the small gorge’ (17), and Lule Saami luoddarájge ‘along the track’ (8), bálgesrájge ‘along the path’ (4) and láhttorájge ‘along the ski track’ (16) seen above, the following examples refer to roads (19–20), tracks (21) and fjords (22):

(19) South Saami
Gellielaaketje bijligujmie åarjede båetieh geajnoeraejkiem
diverse car.PL.COM from.south come.3PL road.raejkiem
gaarkesen.
go.after.each.other.CVB
‘They come along the road with all kinds of cars are from the south, one after another.’
(SIKOR)

(20) South Saami
Doen gijren goh lim gåatan vuejieminie universiteeteste dellie
that.GEN spring.GEN when be.PST.1SG home.ILL drive.PROG university.ELA then
jaahkeaeltoe jîh voenjeelaaltoo geajnoeraejkiem dâástoehim.
fetus.doe and doe.of.third.year road.raejkiem encounter.PST.1SG
‘That spring, as I was driving home from the university, I encountered two reindeer
does (a pregnant one and one of three years) along the road.’ (Kappfjell 2013: 59)

Not all such prolatives refer to concrete motion between the A and B ends of a one-dimensional axis however. In (19), geajnoeraejkiem does express a route from south to north, and the one in (20) refers to another, a road back home from the university, but it does
not express true motion along this path but a kind of fictive motion where the two reindeer are encountered when positioned “along the road” in the sense of ‘in the course of driving along the road (from A to B)’. Sentences like this can be taken as further evidence of the grammaticalized function of -raejkiem; cf., e.g., *A bird sat along the ledge* as an example of a similar gram that is used to refer to “a point located on a bounded linear extent” (Talmy 2000b: 215).

Example (21) in turn can be considered a more prototypical instance of fictive motion along what Talmy (2000a: 138) calls coextension paths. As the static snow under a track left by grazing reindeer freezes and becomes *gebrie*, hard crusty snow that supports animals, it constitutes a natural path for reindeer and humans, but while *gebrie* comes into being, the only motion is that of a language user’s that fictively moves across the space:

(21) South Saami

\[ \text{Gosse } \text{sjaedtieraejkiem } \text{dellie } \text{gebrie } \text{sjaedta} \]  
\[ \text{to.where } \text{track.of.grazing.raejkiem } \text{then } \text{hard.crusty.snow } \text{become.3SG} \]  
\[ \text{dejtie } \text{gievæltse-ræntfojde. (Bull & Bergsland 1974: 28)} \]  
\[ \text{it.PL.IIL } \text{toboggan-reindeer.bull.PL.ACC} \]  

‘The place where the snow along the tracks of grazing becomes hard and crusty for the draught reindeer.’

Lule Saami *vuodnarájge* ‘along the fjord’ in turn refers to the metaphorical path of losing the monetary output of the local community to the big world:

(22) Lule Saami

\[ \text{Rudá } \text{vuodnarájge } \text{davás mannui, dàssju virgålattjaj } \text{værrorudá} \]  
\[ \text{money.PL fjord.rágje seaward go.3PL only employee.PL.GEN tax.money.PL báhtsi.} \]  
\[ \text{remain.3PL} \]  

‘The money is lost along the fjord up to the ocean, only the taxpayers’ taxes remain.’ (SIKOR)

However, although expressions like the ones seen above most often refer to motion along a linear extent, the expression *dam johkeraejkiem* of (12) – seen above and repeated here – occurs in a story where it is obvious from the context that the intended motion of a herdboy is not to go ‘along the river’ but to get ‘across the river’ instead:

(12) South Saami

\[ \text{Guktie } \text{dihte gujht galki } \text{dam } \text{johkeraejkiem } \text{jih bijjelen } \text{dam} \]  
\[ \text{so.that 3SG still must.PST.3SG DEF.ACC river.raejkiem and over DEF.ACC garsem.} \]  
\[ \text{rapids.ACC} \]  

‘However, he had to get across the river and over the rapids somehow.’ (Bull 2000: 132)

Among objects that can be characterized as two-dimensional instead of one-dimensional paths, roads and rivers, by far the most common are doors and windows, although in the prolative expressions the focus is on the openings instead of two-dimensional surfaces typical of such artifacts. However, while the very purpose of a door is to be a channel of motion, concrete motion ‘through the window’ as in (14) is not among the main functions of windows. Rather, windows prototypically function as paths of light and vision that are
cross-linguistically coded much like motion and can also subsumed under the notion of fictive motion (cf. Talmy 2000a: 115–116; Slobin 2008). Consequently, some of the most common types of -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge are expressions such as SaaS klaaseræjkiem vuartasjïdh [window.râjge look.INF] ‘look through the window’ and SaaL vinndekrâjge gehittjat ‘id.’.14

Other examples of “two-dimensional” paths include referents such as the lake in dam jaevrieraejkiem (...) jåhta ‘moves over the lake’ (13) where the prolatve refers to the frozen and snowy surface of the lake. A similar example is provided by jiengeraejkiem ‘over the ice’ (23), and here, too, it is important to note that the prolatve construction does not express an exact pathway from A to B, but rather a surface which is neither the stative location of an event nor the sole source or the goal of dynamic motion.

(23) South Saami

Dah jis guth eah buetehth juelkiej nelnie tjåadtdjodh,
3PL in.turn which.PL NEG.3PL manage.CNG foot.PL.GEN on stand.INF
dah jis amma onne tjielkettjigujmie jiengeræjkiem, veaksehke
3PL in.turn certainly little toboggan.DIM.PL.COM ice.raejkiem strong
giitigujmie, klaahkaj vieken bestehten jiijemsh
arm.PL.COM ski.pole.PL.GEN by.means.of thrust.CVB REFL.ACC.3PL
juhtiehtieh.
drive.forward.3PL.
‘Those, in turn, who can’t stand on their feet, they surely ride their little toboggans over the ice, thrusting themselves forward with strong arms and ski poles.’ (SIKOR)

The prolatve formations of South Saami and Lule Saami are very similar irrespective of whether they are viewed from a morphological, syntactic or semantic perspective or generally as case-like categories among the unambiguous local cases of the respective languages. The only remarkable semantic difference between the -raejkiem/-raejkien forms and the -rájge form is that apparently only the latter is also used in the following way:

(24) Lule Saami

Ja ijät de miehtserâjge maná, ja mån iv dieide
and night.PL.ACC DPT woods.râjge go.2SG and 1SG NEG.1SG know.CNG
majt dâppe barga!
what.PL.ACC there work.2SG
‘And at night you go to the woods, and I don’t know what you’re doing there!’
(SIKOR)

(25) Lule Saami

De lij juo niejdda almatjïja masst[a]m ja
DPT be.PST.3SG already daughter human.PL.ILL assimilate.PST.PTCP and
hájggådij dallàrájge dajt njálga biebmojt.
thrust.PST.3SG fire.râjge that.PL.ACC delicious food.PL.ACC
‘But the daughter [of a stâllo, evil giant] had assimilated to people already, and she thrust the delicious [stâllo] food into the fire.’ (SIKOR << Qvigstad 1929: 530)15

(26) Lule Saami

14 Cf. also Example (iii) in Note 8.
15 Cf. Qvigstad’s (1929: 531) Norwegian translation Da var datteren alt blitt folkevant, og hun kastet den gode maten i varmen.
Ja hæssta diedon balláj, ja nav manáj Vuodnarájge
and horse of.course get.scared.PST.3SG and thus go.PST.3SG Norway.rájge
run.CV
‘And the horse got scared, of course, and galloped to the Norwegian side of the border.’
(SIKOR)

In contrast to the one- and two-dimensional paths discussed thus far, entities like woods (24), fire (25) and Norway (26) could perhaps be characterized as “three-dimensional” objects that are not prototypical paths per se. The translations of the examples show the only logical interpretations of the -rájge forms that must be understood as expressing directions instead of paths here. Although such formations are not attested in South Saami, similar phenomena can be found in North Saami and among the occasional -rääigi formations of Aanaar Saami. The phenomenon has been noted by Bartens (1978: 19) who characterizes such formations as “illatival”. Indeed, all -rájge forms of (24–26) could be replaced with the default directional case, illative, forms mæhttsáj ‘to the woods’, dållåj ‘into the fire’ and Vuodnaj ‘to Norway’ without apparent changes in propositional meaning. As a matter of fact, miehttsérájge of (24) is a translation from a North Saami sentence with the illative vuovdái.16 On the other hand, the difference between the directional and prolative meanings of -rájge is captured in the sentence pair (22) and (26): the toponym Vuodna of Vuodnarájge ‘to Norway; across the Norwegian border’ originates in the name for long, conceptually “one-dimensional” marine pathways such as the one referred to by vuodnarájge ‘along the fjord’.

However, it can be observed that the directional -rájge forms are used specifically in contexts where the sentences have a relatively strong force-dynamic meaning in the sense of Talmy (2000: 409ff.) and especially Fekete et al. (2013) who discuss the force dynamics of prolative (quasi-)adpositional phrases in Finnish. Unlike the Finnish constructions, however, the -rájge forms of (24–26) do not express motion through the woods, fire or Norway, but those landmarks refer to directions of inherently force-dynamic events such as thrusting food violently into the fire (25) or bolting and galloping to another side of a state border (26). On the other hand, the force-dynamic semantics of the -rájge directionals appears to be even more recognizable in contexts with neutral motion verbs such as ‘go’ (24), as it seems to be the very -rájge alone that conveys the abruptness of and latent resistance towards the event described.

As a matter of fact, Bergsland (1946: 137) also states in his early grammar that South Saami formations in -raejkiem and -raejkien both answer the question gåabph ‘in which direction’, but neither his examples nor my own data clearly support this claim (but see Example 31). As mentioned above, in a later grammar Bergsland (1994: 166) instead describes these forms as answers to the question gogkoe ‘which way?’, and this view is repeated by his successors (Magga & Magga 2012: 222). However, all of the aforementioned sources also pay attention to the existence of both -raejkiem and -raejkien formations, and describe their mutual differences unanimously as a question of definiteness: Most recently, the element with the accusative marker -m has been plainly said to express a more definite path than the one with the genitive -n (Bergsland 1994: 166; Magga 2009 s.v. langs; Magga

---

16 Cf. the North Saami original in its entirety:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(v)</th>
<th>North Saami</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ijaid</td>
<td>fás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night.PL.GA</td>
<td>DPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barggat.</td>
<td>work.2SG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘And at night you go to the woods, and I don’t know what you’re doing there!’ (Vars 2002: 13)
& Magga 2012: 222), but in light of my own data it is easier to understand Bergsland’s early hesitation in trying to characterize -raejkien as expressing “a looser (or more indefinite) contact” and being “less ‘extensive’” than -raejkiem despite the fact that “the difference can be difficult to grasp”. Frankly, the only tentative indication of the claimed definite vs. indefinite distinction in all available South Saami data is the occasional co-occurrence of the definite demonstrative determiner dam with -raejkien (10, 12–13), but such determiners are not fully absent for the genitival -raejkien either:

(27) South Saami

Dellie limen tjoejkeminie dan jaevrieraejkien.
then be.pst.1DU ski.PROG it.GEN lake.raejkien
‘At that time we were skiing over the lake.’ (Bergsland & Hasselbrink 1957: 41)

The -raejkiem form is about twice as frequent as -raejkien, but I fail to see that the latter type (such as dan jaevrieraejkien ‘over the lake’ above or bussen klaeseraejkien voeksididh ‘vomit out the bus window’ in Example 14) were considerably less definite than the former. On the contrary, there are also -raejkiem forms that can hardly be understood to be definite, such the following beginning line of a story:

(28) South Saami

Saemie dalva tjoejken baalkaraejkiem, gåvla gïehtjh raavkh.
Saami arrive.3SG ski.CVB path.raejkiem hear.3SG look.IMP.2SG ghost.PL
‘A Saami is approaching on skis along a path, and lo, he hears a ghost.’17 (Bergsland 1992: 327)

Finally, it can be mentioned that among nearly one hundred occurrences of genitive-like -raige prolatives of Lule Saami, I have encountered only one authentic -raigev (cf. the accusative marker -v):

(29) Lule Saami

De hehkkat bådij hubllo háleda uksarájgev sisi.
DPT suddenly come.pst.3SG bumblebee want.CVB door.raigev to.inside
‘Suddenly, a bumblebee came and wanted to enter through the door.’ (SIKOR)

Among the many -raige forms listed in Lule Saami dictionaries, I am aware of only one -raigev, but it is not very informative either. It was mentioned in Section 3.1 that in his recent dictionary, Kintel (2012) presents the noun jåhkårájgge with the meaning ‘river bed; coulee’ (Norwegian ‘elvefar’). Among his one- and two-word examples we find multiple mentions of bådij jåhkårájge ‘came along the river bed’ (‘den kom langssetter elfefaret’), but also the same form jåhkårájge as a synonym to the postpositional phrase jågå milta [rive.GEN along] ‘along the river’ (‘langs elva’). What is more, there is a single mention of vádsset jåhkårájgev ‘to walk along the river bed’ (‘gå etter elfefaret’).

Not much can be said about a possible semantic difference between jåhkårájge and jåhkårájgev – all examples have been translated with definite nouns. Likewise, it is difficult to see how the meaning of uksarájgev (29) would differ from uksarájge of (6b). Interestingly, however, although -raigev formations like these have not been mentioned elsewhere, it is precisely these kind of accusatival prolatives that are more in line with the case semantics of Lule Saami in general, whereas the genitive-like -raige forms are actually an exception from

the otherwise non-prolative semantics of the genitive case (Bartens 1972: 53). Conversely, the dominance of -rájge suggests that the function of the element is that of an independent grammatical morpheme whose meaning is clearly different from the sum of its etymological parts.

3.4. Prolative plurals

The general description of the use of formations in -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge can be concluded with short remarks on occasional plural equivalents of the prolative forms that usually have singular form and singular meaning. As regards prolate plurals, modern language data provide a picture that is somewhat different from that of earlier descriptions. The corresponding North Saami -ráigge aside (Bartens 1978: 18–19; Ylikoski 2014), apparently the only mentions of plural prolate forms are presented by Lagercrantz (1923: 17; 1926: 133):

(30) South Saami

\[\text{Skoehteste vinhtsem straejmiereejki bæjse.}\]
\[\text{punt.3SG boat.ACC stream.reejki upward}\]

‘He propels the boat with a pole upward along the stream.’ (Lagercrantz 1923: 17; 1926: 133)

(31) South Saami

\[\text{Manne gållagim båajhtoeh gïejereejki.}\]
\[\text{1SG get.lost.PST.1SG wrong track.reejki}\]

‘I strayed along a wrong path.’ (Lagercrantz 1923: 17)

The above English translations are based on Lagercrantz’s German translations, and it is remarkable that the meaning of (-)reejki – the plural genitive of (-)raejkie – is presented as singular. Moreover, båajhtoeh gïejereejki of (31) might be better understood as having a directional instead of purely prolate interpretation. These kinds of formations cannot be found in the works of later scholars, and they also seem to be absent in present-day written South Saami. However, my own data include the following sentences with -raejkieh – the plural nominative of (-)raejkie – that have not been discussed in earlier descriptions of the language:

(32) South Saami

\[\text{Siejhme almetjh leah dan guhkiem gaataraejkieh vaadtsehtjamme}\]
\[\text{ordinary human.PL be.3PL so long street.raejkieh stroll.PST.PTCP}\]
\[\text{gylmeme jeatjah ståvroeh krielpesjamme.}\]
\[\text{freeze.PST.PTCP other rule.PL demand.PST.PTCP}\]

‘Ordinary people have long been strolling along streets, freezing and demanding a new government.’ (SIKOR)

(33) South Saami

\[\text{Geajnoeraejkieh, bàalkaraejkieh bàetieh vaalmerden, jih gosse}\]
\[\text{road.raejkieh path.raejkieh come.3PL go.after.each.other.CVB and when}\]
\[\text{dan staellien baaktoe bàetieh dellie tjøødtjehtieh, jih gaajhkene lehkesne}\]
\[\text{DEF.GEN stable.GEN by come.3PL then stand.3PL and everywhere}\]
\[\text{govloè laavloeminie jih skovhtjeminie.}\]

---

18 Cf. Lagercrantz’ (1923: 17) German translation Ich irrte mich und folgte einer unrichtigen Spur.
be.heard.3SG sing.PROG and make.a.noise.PROG

‘They come along roads and paths, following one another, and as they come to the stable they stand by, and singing and praising can be heard everywhere.’ (SIKOR)

(34) South Saami

Men gææhtedh Maajja, jis vuajnih bovtside, aellieh goh
but watch.IMP.2SG M. if see.2SG reindeer.PL.ACC NEG.IMP.2SG DPT
faærh dæj bovtsi minngesne dielhtieraejkieh goh.
fare.CNG il.PL.GEN reindeer.PL.GEN after glacier.raejkieh DPT

‘But watch out, Maajja, if you see the reindeer, don’t follow the reindeer along glaciers.’ (Bull & Bergsland 1974: 42)

In fact, the dictionary by Bergsland and Magga (1993) includes an entry for dielhtie-raejkieh with the Norwegian translation ‘bortetter isbreen’, i.e., singular meaning ‘further along the glacier’, but as far as can be judged from the contexts, the above -raejkieh formations all refer to plural referents – streets, roads, paths and glaciers – that function as multiple paths of strolling, coming and faring. In other words, the element -raejkieh does not refer to a plurality of holes or openings (raejkie), but to that of the lexical heads of these formations. Despite their novelty in the description of the language, they are – not unlike Lule Saami -rájgev (29) pro -rájge – actually more in line with the normal case semantics of South Saami: The plural equivalents of the accusative, not only as the case of the object but also as the case of prolative adverbial modifiers such as geajnoem of Example (1), are not plural genitives but (indefinite) plural nominatives and (definite) plural accusatives instead (see, e.g., Bergsland 1946: 132; Magga & Magga 2012: 222). I am not aware of the South Saami plural accusatives raejkide or reejkide being used in prolative functions. However, the only attested occurrence of a plural prolative in Lule Saami does have an accusative ending instead of the genitive (*-rájgij) that would otherwise be the most probable counterpart of the genitival -rájge:

(35) Lule Saami

Gierugam le gasella lágášj, nuorra ruoppisgätte muoduk.
beloved.1SG be.3SG gazelle.GEN like young deer.GEN alike
Ge, suv goahteguoran; guovllá rájgerájge, sálvvorájgijt guovllá.
lol 3SG.ACC courtyard.INE peek.3SG hole.rájge crack.rájgijt peek.3SG

‘My beloved is like a gazelle or a young deer. Look! There he stands behind our wall, gazing through the windows, peering through the lattice.’ (SIKOR: Song of Songs 2:9)

Hapax legomena such as sálvvorájgijt here – which in itself is analogous to the accusative plural gäjnojt in (4) and has a parallel in North Saami (see Example 39 below) – must certainly be interpreted with a grain of salt, but the above plural formations as a whole add to our understanding of the nature and position of the South Saami -raejkiem/-raejkien and Lule Saami -rájge(n) prolative formations within the grammatical structure of these languages. The following section pulls the above observations together and provides a general discussion of the topic by relating the prolative formations to the established views of the case declensions of South Saami and Lule Saami.

4. Discussion and further remarks
4.1. “New” and “old” prolative suffixes in western Saami
Although the main focus of the present study is on the prolative -raejkiem/-raejkien and -räjge formations as used in written South Saami and Lule Saami, respectively, it is also instructive to take a look at the analogous phenomena in the neighboring Saami languages:\(^{19}\)

(36) Ume Saami

(...), heärggie lij vanjiggame spájtta viegarájgiev, (...) reindeer.bull be.PST.3SG run.fast.PST.PTCP fast road.räjgiev (“accusative”) ‘The reindeer bull had run quickly along the road.’ (Schlachter 1958: 242)

(37) Ume Saami

mijjan luaddarájgien
1SG.GEN track.räjgien (“genitive”) ‘along our track’ (Moosberg 1918)

(38) Pite Saami

kuggos kalhkaw vaníhkāštė, uksa-räikē vai skarrū-räikē?
which.way shall.1SG run.INF door-räikē or rear.entrance.of.a.tent-räikē (“gen.”) ‘Which way shall I run, through the door or through the rear entrance?’ (Halász 1893: 139)

(39) North Saami

Jogat golgagohte båktenannáma sálvoráiggiid,
rivet.PL flow.INCH.PST.3PL continental.bedrock.GA crack.räiggi
båktešlájaid (dipma ja garra) rájáid räigge, synklinálaid ja
rock.type.PL.GA soft and hard border.PL.GA räigge syncline.PL.GA and
muđui ovddeš áiggiid gobádagaid rágge.
otherwise earlier time.PL.GA depression.PL.GA rágge
‘The river began to flow along fissures in the continental crust, along borders of rock types (soft and hard), along synclines and other ancient depressions.’ (Isaksen 1998: 30)

The above examples illustrate that Ume Saami – with possibly less than ten native speakers north of the South Saami territory – is analogous to South Saami in showing what seems to be free variation of the accusative and genitive forms of the morpheme for ‘hole’. With its genitive modifier, the disconnected phrase (37) from a lexical archive is fully analogous to those of Lule Saami discussed in Section 3.1.

As for the likewise seriously threatened Pite Saami, geographically and structurally transitional between Ume Saami in the south and its closest sister language Lule Saami in the north, -räikē (38) goes back to the genitive. In other words, the Ume Saami and Pite Saami formations are syntactically and semantically quite like those of South Saami and Lule Saami, respectively. However, apparently the only occasion that these constructions have gained at least some attention is Bartens’ (1978: 19) short mention and three other examples in her monograph on the interplay of synthetic and analytic expressions of spatial relations throughout the Saami area.

Finally, although (39) is not a most prototypical example of North Saami (-)räigge (the so-called allegro form of the singular genitive-accusative räiggi of räigi ‘hole’), it illustrates the fact that in spite of the compound morphology manifested in formations like sálvoräigge ‘through/along the crack’ or the plural (båktenannáma) sálvoräiggiid ‘along fissures (in the continental crust)’ analogous to the Lule Saami plural accusative sálvoväiggiit seen above

\(^{19}\) Hyphens in (36–38) derive from the original sources.
(35), the morpheme is also used as a postposition that governs the genitive-accusative case, e.g., rájáid ‘(along) borders’ and gobádagaid ‘(along) depressions’.

The relative uniformity and the wide distribution of the “hole” prolatives suggests that the phenomenon in question has been a part of the grammars of western Saami languages, even in the vicinity of their noun inflection, for quite some time. Nevertheless, the only grammatical morpheme labeled as “the prolative” in Saami linguistics has an entirely different form and a rather different grammatical status, too. Some examples and suggestions on the origin of the “prolatives” such as Lule Saami giessek ‘in summer’ (← giesse ‘summer’) or South Saami giesege (← giesie) id. have already been presented in Section 1 that also included a short mention of the Lule Saami word form Váhtjerik ‘via Váhtjer’. Now consider the following examples of the -k prolative that supposedly goes back to the (Pre-)Proto-Saami case suffix *-ko (Sammallahti 1998: 203):

(40) Lule Saami

\[\text{Ulmutja soap[p]tsun aktan ja ulmutja rahtjin}\]

human.PL get.on.PST.3PL together and human.PL strive.PST.3PL

\[\text{bienajda, duoladagu gá galggin Tjierrigis várrek}\]

prayer.meeting.PL.ILL for.example when must.PST.3PL Tjierrik.ELA via.mountain

\[\text{Uhtsvuodnaj: Mij vättsjima Tjierrigis várrij.}\]

Utsvuodna.ILL 1PL walk.PST.1PL Tjierrik.ELA mountain.ILL

‘People got on together, and they strove for the prayer meetings, for example when they were to go from Tjierrik to Utsvuodna across the mountains. We walked from Tjierrik up to the mountain.’ (SIKOR)

(41) Lule Saami

\[\text{Sån iesj tjuooggá rájdujn hässtatjielká mañen ja}\]

3SG REFL ski.3SG reindeer.caravan.COM horse.sled.GEN behind and

\[\text{ällo manáj jåvrrek åbbåsa tjadá.}\]

herd go.PST.3SG via.lake deep.untouched.snow.GEN through(.inside)

‘He himself is skiing with the reindeer caravan behind the horse sled, and the herd went across the lake through deep untrodden snow.’

(42) Lule Saami

\[\text{Lögdeån li tjuovvo rájá (3. kárttaduoddetjála): Lögdeälvena}\]

Lögdeå.INE be.3PL following border.PL 3. map.appendix Lögdeälven.GEN

\[\text{njálmes Nordmalingsfjärdena njálmmáj ädnok Klösforsenij,}\]

outlet.ELA Nordmalingsfjärden.GEN outlet.ILL along.large.river Klösforsen.ILL

\[\text{dan manjela rahlev Yttre Lemesjöaj, vijdábut rahlev Flärkej (...)}\]

that.GEN after road.ACC Yttre.Lemesjö.ILL further road.ACC Flärke.ILL

‘Lögdeå has the following boundaries (Map Appendix 3): From the outlet of Lögdeälven to the outlet of Nordmalingsfjärden, along the river to Klösforsen, after that along the road to Yttre Lemesjö, then further along the road to Flärke, ...’ (SIKOR)

20 When speaking of “western Saami languages”, I am not taking a stance on whether or not the Saami branch must be strictly divided to two – Western Saami and Eastern Saami with capital letters – along the phonologically significant, but lexically less decisive border between North Saami and Aanaar Saami. For a comprehensive discussion of these issues, see Rydving (2013).

21 While jåvrrek ‘along the lake’ (41) and tjarggis bälgesrájge ‘along a hard path’ (15) refer to natural paths of motion, both sentences contain the postpositional phrase åbbåsa tjadá ‘through deep untrodden snow’ that describes more of an obstacle for the agents in motion.
As regards the use of noun-based -k prolatives in truly prolative functions, the above sentences are probably the first full sentence examples ever presented for any of the Saami languages; the apparently later development of temporal adverbs such as the above-mentioned giessek and giesege ‘in summer’ need not concern us here. In addition to Våhtjerik ‘via Våhtjer (village)’, värrek ‘along the mountain’ and jåvrrek ‘along the lake’, Wiklund (1915: 37) also mentions the formations gaddek ‘along the shore’ and Huhttánik ‘via Huhttán (village)’ as examples of the Lule Saami prolative case, formed with the -(i)k ending attached to the nominative stem. In Wiklund’s (ibid. 36) words, the prolative as well as the abessive case (‘without’) are morphological cases on a par with the eight cases presented in his own paradigms as well as mine (Tables 1 and 4), but he admits that these two cases are not that common in use, and this has been the reason for leaving them outside the morphological paradigms (but see ibid. 26–27). His examples also include adverbs such as nuorttak ‘along the north side’ (← nuortta ‘north’), an obvious cognate of South Saami noerhtege id. seen in Table 3. Wiklund specifies that the use of the prolative is restricted to few nouns with locational referents, and that the case is used in singular only. Unfortunately, he does not present a longer list of the possible forms that his examples are intended to exemplify. None of the later descriptions of Lule Saami grammar (Spåk 1989: 90–91) or lexicon seem to provide more information than the existence of the form nuorrek ‘by sea’ that certainly fits the pattern although I have not seen it in use outside of most recent dictionaries (Korhonen 2007 s.v.; Kintel 2012).

In addition to the descriptions of Lule Saami, the -k prolatives have also gained attention in Lehtiranta’s (1992: 113–114) grammar of Pite (Árjepluovve) Saami. Quite like Wiklund, Lehtiranta describes the Pite Saami abessive as a marginal, only partly productive case, and ends his subsection on the case morphology to additional observations on the “prolative-temporal adverbial derivational affix -k”. He emphasizes that the suffix deserves to be mentioned because of having been preserved in Pite Saami better than in the neighboring languages, and his noun-based examples of prolatives consist of the Lule Saami -like jaav’riek ‘along the lake’, kaa’tiek ‘along the shore’ and vaarriek ‘along the mountain’ supplemented by sievvak ‘by sea’ and vuopmiek ‘through the woodland’ with no attested counterparts in Lule Saami despite the cognate nouns sjieva ‘sea(water)’ and vuobme ‘forest, woods’. For Lehtiranta’s original sources and earlier remarks on the Lule and Pite Saami -k prolatives, see, e.g., Halász (1896: xvi), Beke (1911) and Lagercrantz (1926: 95); Halász (1892: 267) also presents a clause-like word pair varrēk mammā [via.mountain go.3SG].

In spite of the uncertain status of the *ko prolate in Proto-Saami (Section 2 and Sammallahti 1998: 203), the suffix has for long been considered to have a cognate in the prolative cases of the two Mordvin languages, Erzya and Moksha (-ga/-ka/-va; see, e.g., Wiklund 1928: 344; GMYa 1962: 80, 147–151). Indeed, it is even possible to present a set of alleged cognate forms with more or less identical meanings in Mordvin and Lule (and Pite) Saami (Table 5). Example (43) illustrates that the usage of the Erzya prolative eērkeva is functionally similar to that of Lule Saami jåvrrek ‘along, over the lake’ (41), or South Saami jaevrieraejkiem id. (13) for that matter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILL *sen</th>
<th>Lule Saami</th>
<th>Erzya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INE *sna</td>
<td>jåvva-j</td>
<td>eērke-s ( хръкес)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA *sta</td>
<td>jāvre-n</td>
<td>eērke-se ( хръкесэ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROL *-kV</td>
<td>fāvrre-k</td>
<td>eērke-va ( хръкева)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 As a matter of fact, even Bergsland and Hasselbrink (1957: 23) once described South Saami words like biejege ‘during the daytime’ and gogkoe ‘which way’ as instances of the prolative case which they characterized as one of the “less common and partly irregular cases”.
Table 5. The Lule Saami local cases (including the -k prolative) and their Erzya counterparts exemplified with the words for ‘lake’.

(43) Erzya

Менелесь — ваздо-сънь. Эзганзо, вейке-омбоце мельга, састо, састо
Meńel´eś — valdo-seń. Ezganzo, vejke-omboce mel´ga, sasto, sasto

sky.DEF bright-blue along.3SG one-another after slowly slowly
увить ашио пельньеть, тече сътьмеванькс эрькева локсейтъ.
ujit´ ašo pel´ńet´, t´eke se´tme vańks ẽrkeva lokśejt´.
float.3PL white cloud.DIM.PL like pacific clean lake.PROL swan.PL

‘The sky is bright blue. Along the sky, little white clouds are floating slowly, slowly one after another, like swans along a serene, pristine lake.’ (Klyuchagin 2012)

However, although the -k prolatives in Lule and Pite Saami appear to be very old, phonologically and morphologically unproblematic – or even quite neat in declensional paradigms à la Váhtjerij : Váhtjerin : Váhtjeris : Váhtjerik (Table 2) – and semantically functional (as seen in the interplay with the elative and illative in 40), there seem to be no obvious reasons to consider them as unquestionable case forms. In short, the noun-based -k prolatives of the present-day written Lule Saami are almost entirely limited to two lexemes, jävrrek and várrek, that are the most common such prolatives in a corpus of nearly million word forms (SIKOR) and elsewhere. In the written Lule Saami texts available, the only other -k prolative I am aware of is ädnok (← ädno ‘large river’) of (42). What is more, I am not aware of any instances of -k prolatives with noun-like internal syntax, i.e. adnominal modifiers comparable to those seen with a host of -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge forms in the preceding sections. On the contrary, even in the text originally containing the ädnok sentence (42), the most common alternative in similar prolative contexts is the accusative noun that is able to have demonstrative modifiers (cf. Table 4):

(44) Lule Saami

(...) vijdábut dav änov dan sadjáj gånnå (...) 

further that.ACC large.river.ACC that.GEN place.ILL where

‘...further along the river to the place where...’ (SIKOR)

The above examples may depict the last remnants of a case marker that has possibly been used in more wide-spread prolative functions as part of the nominal inflection. However, as the origins and earlier functions of the element -k remain largely unknown, and most of the denominal -k (or -k > -t such as in North Saami geasset ‘in summer’) forms in Saami languages are temporal adverbs, it is somewhat paradoxical that the suffix is nevertheless labeled as “the prolative” of the Saami languages. On the basis of the written sources available, it is tempting to say that the noun-based -k prolatives of Lule and Pite Saami are more or less lexicalized adverbs, no matter what their status might have been in earlier language states. In the Lule Saami corpus of approximately 1,000,000 words the element -k appears quite unproductive, and the existing formations lack case-like morphosyntax (e.g., adnominal modifiers and plural forms). As for their semantics, it is difficult to make sound generalizations on the basis of three known -k prolatives in authentic sentence contexts: ädnok (42) refers to a one-dimensional path along a river, whereas várrek (40) and jävrrek (41) appear to have more like a ‘via’ meaning in the sense of referring to paths that pass over a mountain or a lake.

However, the above observations are definitely not to say that more -k prolatives do not exist in other registers and potentially larger corpora of written material. As kindly remarked by Sandra Nystø Råhka (p.c.), a native speaker of Lule Saami, not only prolative forms such
as várrek ‘along the mountain’ (40) or nuorrek ‘by sea’ mentioned in dictionaries, but also forms like miehtsek (← miehtse ‘forest; wilderness’) can be used in the colloquial language, and they need not be considered as peculiar as the written language data might suggest. On the other hand, in the absence of clearly case-like properties such forms are still perhaps better compared to semi-productive denominal adverbs such as the “reciprocal” or “combinatory” adverbs in -lakkoj (e.g., giehta ‘hand; arm’ → giehtalakkoj ‘hand in hand’, sijddo ‘side’ → sijddulakkoj ‘side by side’ and vuorro ‘turn’ → vuorrulakkoj ‘by turns’).

4.2. -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge in relation to South Saami and Lule Saami noun inflection

After a digression on the -k prolatives and its possible position within the noun inflection of Lule Saami and Pite Saami, as well as the glance at the comparable local cases in Mordvin, it is instructive to turn back to the -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge forms in order to see to what extent they can or cannot be regarded as part of noun inflection, adverb derivation, compounding or other morphological processes. Unlike the -k prolatives, the -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge formations do have morphosyntactic features typical of South and Lule Saami nouns in all cases (Table 4). Though not that frequent in the corpora, these formations can be attested for dozens of nouns, and new formations can apparently be created when semantically feasible. However, the details of their productivity fall outside the present descriptive, non-experimental study. As was mentioned in the introduction to this paper, formations in -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge are not common – being found less than once in 10,000 words in both South and Lule Saami. As for morphological productivity, however, the token frequency of a bound morpheme is less important than its type frequency, but given the rather low frequency of individual tokens, the type frequencies of -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge cannot be high either.

In the electronic corpora of 450,000 South Saami tokens and 1,000,000 Lule Saami tokens (SIKOR), there are nine types of South Saami -raejkiem forms, four ending in -raejkien, and for Lule Saami 15 different -rájge prolatives, and one instance of -rájgev (uksarájgev). The most comprehensive dictionaries list more such formations, although almost always without sentence contexts that could help us understand their true nature. As the more experimental questions of productivity are deliberately left for future studies, I present a summary of my findings from all the relevant sources in Table 6.

Data sources | South Saami: -raejkiem, -raejkien; plural -raejkieh | Lule Saami: -rájge, -rájgev; plural -rájgijt
---|---|---


Table 6. Noun stems of South Saami and Lule Saami prolativ formations in various sources of this study.

As the question of productivity also includes aspects like the number of neologisms or diachronic productivity (see Haspelmath & Sims 2010: 114ff.), it can be noted that by far the most frequent prolativ formations in both languages are based on fairly recent Scandinavian loanwords SaaS klaase (← Scand. glass) and SaaL vinndek (← vindu); cf. also SaaL væddja/väddja (← Norwegian veg/vei, Swedish väg). Furthermore, the existence of the diminutive-based prolatives like SaaL uvsasjräge and SaaS golletjeraejkien (17) look like one-time formations. As for semantics, it was seen in Section 3.2 that the use of -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge is limited to contexts with spatial meanings – but including various subtypes of fictive motion. Abstract “prolativ” postpositional phrases such as e-påasten baaktbe [e-mail.GEN by] ‘by e-mail’ and ståhtabudsjehta baktu [state.budget.GEN by] ‘through the state budget’ cannot be turned to -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge forms, however.

On the other hand, the prolativ functions of the latter comprise not only concrete holes per se, or motion or visual path through two-dimensional referents such as windows as well as motion along one-dimensional paths, but the South Saami formations can also refer to prolativ motion across one-dimensional referents (johkeraejkiem ‘across the river’ in 12). Furthermore, the semantics of the Lule Saami -rájge prolativ occasionally extends to expressions like Vuodnarágje ‘to Norway; across the Norwegian border’ (26). (However, it seems impossible to have forms such as *Váhtjerrágje in the meaning of ‘via Váhtjør’ of Váhtjerik discussed above.) Therefore, there are also semantic grounds to regard the -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge forms as relatively grammaticalized spatial grams in these languages, be they case forms, postpositions or something else. Within larger systems of spatial expressions in the respective languages, it is difficult to assign these formations any other readily available positions than that of the empty slot in the upper right hand corner of Table 3 for South Saami, or that tentatively occupied by the Lule Saami adverb jávrrek in Table 5.

What, then, if anything, prevents us from regarding -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge as prolative case markers? Their low frequency or the apparent lack of possessive suffixes cannot be among the most convincing arguments in rejecting such an alternative, as frequency is only a relative metric, and possessive suffixes seem to be virtually absent among the use of cases such as the essive in both South Saami and Lule Saami. However, the position of the singular-cum-plural essive within the case paradigms also shows that even though -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge do have occasional plural variants (Section 3.4), the case system can do without such forms. On the other hand, the formal correspondences between singular and plural case forms are so heterogeneous that the somewhat unexpected plurals -raejkieh and -rájgiej conform to the already asymmetric pattern quite well. Finally, the unsettled issue on the claimed semantic difference between South Saami -raejkiem and -raejkien could for the time being be ignored by considering the two variants as...
allomorphs whose conditioning needs further study. With all these biased reservations, the morphemes in question could in principle be described as part of the revised case paradigms seen in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Saami</th>
<th></th>
<th>Lule Saami</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>okse</td>
<td>oksh</td>
<td>uksa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>oksen</td>
<td>oksi</td>
<td>uvsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>oksem</td>
<td>okside</td>
<td>uksaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illative</td>
<td>oksese</td>
<td>okside</td>
<td>uksaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inessive</td>
<td>oksesne</td>
<td>oksine</td>
<td>uvsan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elative</td>
<td>okseste</td>
<td>oksijste</td>
<td>uvsas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prolative</td>
<td>okseraejkien</td>
<td>okseraejkien</td>
<td>uksarájge(v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>oksine</td>
<td>oksigujmie</td>
<td>uvsajn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essive</td>
<td>oksine</td>
<td>uksan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. The South Saami and Lule Saami case systems including prolative formations exemplified with the words for ‘door’ (revision of Table 1).

Further limitations are needed though. It is difficult to imagine adjectives in the prolative form, but this could be explained by semantic reasons. What might be more important is the fact that the prolative case is also absent in the pronominal inflection – although it can be added that the essive case forms of personal and demonstrative pronouns are likewise virtually absent or at best occasionally mentioned in the grammatical descriptions, and apparently entirely absent in the modern corpora of hundreds of thousands words (cf., e.g., Spiik 1989: 52ff.; Magga & Magga 2012: 50ff.).

After all the arguments presented in favor of analyzing the morphemes in question as case suffixes, it must be acknowledged that they do not quite look like case suffixes: -raejkiem and -rájge look like the genitive forms for ‘hole’, and -raejkiem and -rájgev seem to be accusatives. Indeed, in South Saami it is even possible to encounter postpositional phrases where okseraejkien complements the postposition tjírrh that governs the genitive case, although sentences like (46) are more representative of forms such as okseraejkien:

(45) South Saami

Geerve lea buektiehtidh oksem dahpedh juhkoë äeksieh jih
difficult be.3SG manage.INF door.ACC close.INF because branch.PL and
båeries lasth okseraejkien tjírrh båetieh.
old leaf.PL door.raejkiem (here: door.opening.GEN) through come.3PL

‘It is difficult to close the door, as branches and old leaves are coming in through the door.’ (SIKOR)

(46) South Saami

Okseraejkien båata, gualpan snåhkere.
door.raejkiem come.3SG floor.ILL stumble.3SG

‘S/he comes through the door and stumbles to the floor.’ (SIKOR)

Although (45) can be considered as pleonastic, it is grammatically possible and thus shows that okseraejkien can be understood as a compound noun, too. However, sentences like (46) and the existence of bálgesrájge ‘along the path’ (4) and other prolatives without reference to openings of any kind, and at least formations like Lule Saami rággerájge ‘through the hole’ (18) must be considered as something else than a genitive form of a compound noun (‘of a hole of a hole’). This repeated (see Section 3.2), it can be observed that the semantics of the
Saami ‘hole’ morphemes is not semantically different from that seen in the Finnish postposition-cum-noun läpi ‘through; hole’, or the development of the English through from a noun with more or less similar meaning (OED s.v. through), as evidenced by the Gothic counterpart of Lule Saami räjgerájge (18), in this context represented by the more exact nállosjalmmerájge (46b):

\[(46)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Lule Saami</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. azitizo ist ulbandau pairh pairko neplos galei̇jan (...)</td>
<td>easy.N.CMPV be.3SG camel.DAT through hole.ACC needle.GEN go.INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Kamellaj le álkkep nállosjalmmerájge mannat (...)</td>
<td>camel.ILL be.3SG easy.CMPV eye.of.a.needle.räjge go.INF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle...’ (Wulfila & SIKOR: Mark 10:25)

4.3. Inflection vs. compounding – an unusual tug-of-war

It appears that the most fundamental difficulties in understanding the grammatical nature of the formations in question ultimately boils down to a matter of morphology rather than of syntax or semantics. More exactly, the problems arise from the unorthodox grammaticalization path along which these new prolatives have developed: Unlike what is considered to be most common cross-linguistically as regards local cases and other adverbial cases, the Saami prolatives do not originate in adpositional phrases, but instead, the agglutination of -raejkiem/-raejkien and -räjge seems to have taken place originally on the lexical level, as part of everyday compounding of independent nouns referring to holes and openings on the one hand, and to their “hosts” such as doors and windows on the other. Another impetus may have been given by compounds of the type Lule Saami jåhkårájgge ‘river bed’ and South Saami jeanoeraejkie id. that may have promoted the use of the emerging prolative with reference to other one-dimensional paths such as tracks and roads. On the other hand, the only examples of the nouns jåhkårájgge and jeanoeraejkie can be found in dictionaries (see Section 3.1), but they are absent from SIKOR corpus and other sources of the present investigation.

It is, of course, true that many adpositions that later became case affixes often ultimately go back to noun and verb forms. However, it is usually taken for granted that their way to affixhood has gone through adpositions and clitics (see, e.g., Blake 2001: 161ff.; Kulikov 2009 and references therein), but there are no convincing signs of such earlier phases in the westernmost Saami languages.\(^{23}\)

However, the grammaticalization process seems to have proceeded without haste, as the prolative forms still look like compounds, although especially Lule Saami -räjge clearly dominates over the accusatival -räjgev that would be more expected due to the secondary prolative functions of the accusative (cf. Examples 3–4).\(^{24}\) What is even more interesting is

\(^{23}\) The postpositional use of North Saami (-)ráigge seen in (39) seems to be a fairly recent development not accepted by all speakers (see Ylikoski 2014). Example (7) by Wiklund – born in 1868 – must be excused as a mistake that any teenager could have made while documenting unknown languages in the 1880’s.

\(^{24}\) Perhaps the closest – but not at all puzzling – formal parallel to the compound-like -räjge prolative are Lule Saami compounds usually consisting of stems for cardinal and relative directions followed by the accusative form bieliev of bielle ‘side’. However, while the accusative forms such as nuortasjbieliev [northern.side.ACC] ‘along the north side’ and oarjásjbieliev [southern.side.ACC] ‘along the south side’ have prolative meanings, this is fully in line with the functions of the accusative (but not those of the genitive such as rájge ‘of a hole’).

Furthermore, the compounds are transparent and unambiguous parts of the full paradigms of words like nuortasjbielle ‘north side’ (: nuortasjbielen [northern.side.INE] ‘at the north side’ : nuortasjbielles
that it appears that the continuum between bounded prolative morphemes and independently compounded ‘hole’ nouns has prevailed for centuries, extending from the westernmost Saami languages to North Saami and to some extent even up to Aanaar Saami (Bartens 1972, 1978; Ylikoski 2014).

To be sure, the Saami prolatives in question are only one example of the difficulties in trying to cling to the textbook definitions of traditional Eurocentric linguistic terms and concepts such as “suffix”, “compound”, “case”, “inflection” and “derivation”. Without attempting to contribute to the most fundamental issues regarding our understanding of such concepts, I still wish to take the opportunity of pointing out that an overwhelming part of morphosyntactic literature is content to operate with synchronic dichotomies such as adpositions vs. cases, word formation vs. inflection, within word formation compounding vs. derivation, and ultimately derivation vs. inflection. What is more, the mainstream theories of language change also operate with such dichotomies, the natural direction of change usually being from the former to the latter (i.e., from adpositions to cases, from compounding to derivation, and from derivation to inflection; see, e.g., Hagège 2010; Dressler et al. 2005; Booij 2000; ten Hacken 2000).

True, the unidirectionality of change has been rightly contested by research on degrammaticalization, for example (e.g., Norde 2009), and Haspelmath (2007: 123) has pointed out that “among typologists the belief that grammatical categories are language-particular and pre-established categories do not exist is now widely shared”. However, I am not aware of ready-made schemes in which the path from compounds would lead directly to inflection, even though this would suit the South Saami and Lule Saami prolatives quite well. On the contrary, it appears that the received view on the intermediary derivational slot preordained to -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge is expressed in statements such as DeLancey’s (2004: 1597): “Occupying the middle ground between lexicalization and pure grammaticalization is the development of derivational morphology”. Nevertheless, the analysis of the “new” Saami prolatives suggests that there are few explicit reasons to label them as adverbs only because their endings do not behave like (heads of compound) nouns, but do not look like prototypical case suffixes either. For the sake of comparison, the few Lule Saami forms in -k (Section 4.1) seem to fit the category of denominal adverbs very well. On the other hand, it is fully possible to hypothesize that the grammaticalization path from compounds to case-like formations has included a phase in which the predecessors of modern-day -raejkiem/-raejkien and -rájge have been less case-like adverbial elements.25

While it would be overly simplistic to reduce the entire question of the exact status of a case-like morpheme to the question of possible adnominal modifiers of semantic heads, the same factor has also been applied for other Uralic languages such as Estonian (Nevis 1988)

[extended notes]

[25] In fact, it seems that when used in directional (instead of prolate) meanings, the Lule Saami -rájge forms such as (hájppájje) dálárájge ‘(thrust) into the fire’ in (25) do not, and possibly cannot, have adnominal modifiers the same way the prolate -rájge forms do. On the other hand, it is notable that while the modern language data from South Saami does not contain adjectival modifiers, those can be seen in some of the earliest descriptions of the language; cf. dagkeren golletjeraejkien ‘along that kind of small gorge’ (17) and báajhtoeh giejereejki ‘along a wrong path’ (31).
and Hungarian (Kiefer 1987), both famous for dozens of morphological cases. Here it is of particular interest to pay attention to the so-called temporal case of Hungarian: Although the agglutinative suffix -kor is formally and etymologically identical to the still existing noun kor ‘period, era, age’ of the same language, “temporal case forms” such as ötkor ‘at 5 o’clock’ and karácsonykor ‘at Christmas’ are, to my knowledge, not usually considered as compound nouns but most traditionally as case forms, although they lack many morpho(phono)logical, syntactic and semantic properties typical of less disputable cases of the language. However, when Kiefer (1987) proposes to reduce the inventory of Hungarian cases from 28 to 18, his foremost argument for downgrading -kor to an adverbial derivational suffix is the fact that forms such as éjfélkor ‘at midnight’ cannot take adnominal modifiers in phrases like *holdfényes éljélkor “at moonlit midnight”. In the opposite vein, as Pete (1999) argues for opposite views whose details need not concern us here, he remarks that the ungrammaticality of Kiefer’s example is not due to a non-case nature of -kor, but to the fact that the phrase *holdfényes éjfél ‘moonlit midnight’ is ungrammatical even in the nominative. Indeed, the Hungarian temporal can be accompanied by modifiers such as those of the phrases az első karácsonykor [DEF first Christmas.TEMP] ‘on the first Christmas’ or a következő regisztrációkor [DEF forthcoming registration.TEMP] ‘at the time of next registration’.

Samoyedologists have also highlighted the importance of adnominal modifiers as a criterion of a case. The so-called essive-translative markers of Tundra Nenets (-ŋæ) and Forest Enets (-Vš) have not been considered as unambiguous case suffixes and Tundra Nenets forms such as organizatorŋæ ‘as an organizer’ (48) have also been labeled as denominal adverbs, mostly due to the lack of number and possessive forms otherwise a central part of Samoyedic nominal inflection. However, Nikolaeva (2014: 39–40) and Jalava (2014) point out that the essive-translative can have a genitive modifier, and for this reason Jalava regards the essive-translative as a minor case. Referring to similar reasons, Siegl (2013: 166–167) characterizes the Forest Enets essive-translative, along with the prolative marker -Vn, as a minor case on the borderline between inflection and derivation. Both languages use their essive-translatives in NP-like constructions comparable to the Saami prolatives and the Hungarian temporal:

(48) Tundra Nenets

Конференция’ организатор’ŋэ
Konferentsijah organisatorŋæ
conference.GEN organizer.ESSTR
Saamskij universitetskoj kolledž
Sámi University College

ŋэвысь.
ŋæwiś.
be.INDIR.PST.3SG
‘The organizer of the conference was the Sámi University College.’ (Naryana vynder
30.9.2010, p. 10; courtesy of Jalava 2014)

(49) Forest Enets

bunki aga bunkiš kaňi točgud kaňu
dog.1SG big dog.ESSTR go.3SG then die.ASS.3SG
‘My dog became old and then he died.’ (Siegl 2013: 166)

To end the present discussion on the problems of trying to draw exact borders between cases and non-cases in Saami languages, or languages like Hungarian, Tundra Nenets and Forest Enets for that matter, one theoretical yet perhaps not so practical solution could be the concept of so-called transpositional or word-class-changing inflection put forward by Haspelmath (1996; see also Haspelmath & Sims 2010: 257–262) who differentiates between external and
internal word-classes of a word form: in a prototypical example of word-class-changing inflection, a formation such as a participle preserves the “lexeme word-class” (verb) which determines the internal syntax of the phrase or clause headed by the form in question. At the same time, however, the syntactic status of the word form outside its phrase, that is, its external morphology and syntax depends on its new “word-form word-class” (adjective).

In this perspective, it might be possible to consider the above-mentioned formations with noun-like internal syntax but perhaps not enough external case-like features (such as established plural forms or possessive suffixes) as instances of word-class-changing inflection; in other words, as noun that behave as adverbs. On the other hand, however, it has been argued that especially as regards inflected “adverbs”, it is difficult to point out any unambiguous features that would make adverb-like verb forms or noun forms truly “adverbs”: In other words, it would actually be possible to characterize all adverbial case forms as “adverbial noun forms” or “nominal adverbs”, if this is to mean something more inflectional than denominal adverbs (cf. Ylikoski 2009: 179–180).

5. Conclusion
As an interim conclusion, it can be said that the South Saami morpheme(s) -raejkiem/-raejkien – rather than the accusative raejkie-m ‘hole (acc.)’ or the genitive raejkie-n ‘of a hole’ – and Lule Saami râjge are case-like, but not unambiguously inflectional case suffixes that have a spatial semantic function that has often been termed “prolative” in Saami linguistics and largely in the research traditions of other Uralic languages such as Erzya and Moksha. In their normal prolate functions, like in the phrases bussen klaaseraejkien ‘through the bus window’ (14) and dan ådå lähttorájge ‘along the new ski track’ (16), the forms in question are syntactically and semantically distinct from their material origin in compounds headed by nouns for ‘hole, opening’. Interestingly, these phenomena appear so similar in the two languages that it has been possible to present a parallel description of both -raejkiem/-raejkien and -râjge, and their analyses actually complement each other.

More important than providing a definitive label for these formations is a due description of the phenomena that have remained underdescribed, partly misunderstood and even ignored by earlier scholars of Saami languages. As the traditional grammar categorizes morphemes in terms of prototypical inflection, derivation and compounding, it is understandable that morphemes as atypical as -raejkiem/-raejkien and -râjge have not automatically fallen into the paradigm tables or other ready-made slots available. However, the above discussion shows that it is also necessary to carve out space for these formations in grammatical descriptions of South Saami and Lule Šaami, and likewise in those of Ume Saami (36–37) and Pite Saami (38). Until now, descriptions of -raejkiem/-raejkien and -râjge have been almost exclusively confined to telegraphic dictionary entries. The so-called prolate in -k such as Lule Saami jávrrek (41), however, hardly deserves attention as a case proper, as it occurs in only a limited number of forms – in spite of the possibility of a greater history that may extend up to the prolate case forms of the Mordvin languages (Table 5).

It is somewhat unfortunate that in Saami linguistics the term “prolative” is often used to refer to non-prolative, and even non-spatial, denominal adverbs such as South Saami giesege ‘in summer’, biejege ‘during the daytime’ and Lule Saami giessek, biejyvek id. However, it is to be hoped that these two entirely different phenomena will be kept separate in spite of the common label for case-like morphemes that may arise and replace earlier functionally similar morphemes in their original functions. Regardless of the labels assigned to the elements -k and -ge, and -raejkien/-raejkien and -râjge altogether, and regardless of their exact interpretation, it is important to be aware of the existence of this new type of prolate expression in the westernmost Uralic languages described in the preceding sections. Some of
the central questions to be left for future research include the questions about the productivity, semantic differences and distribution of the prolatives in -k and -ge, and -raejkien/-raejkiem and -rājge, respectively. Furthermore, the relation of these formations and the prolate functions of the accusative and elative (seen in Examples 1, 3 and 44 as well as in Note 8) call for further research. Finally, it must be emphasized that the present empirical study is based almost solely on the written registers of South Saami and Lule Saami; the present-day spoken languages and their speakers’ intuitions are thus also left for future research and alternative research methods.

In addition to the Mordvin languages already discussed above (see also GMYa 1962: 80, 147–151), other Uralic languages with analogous morphological cases – be they prolatives, prosecutives or transitives – include Veps of the Finnic branch (Tikka 1992: 160–178; Grünthal 2003: 162ff.), the Permic languages (Lakó 1951), and the Samoyedic branches (see, e.g., Janhunen 1998: 469; Siegl 2013: 165). However, while it might even be tempting to claim that such ‘through, along’ cases are actually a more characteristic feature of Uralic case systems than the often-hailed distinction between the so-called internal and external local cases (Finnic and Hungarian only), it must be remembered that corresponding cases can also be found throughout the globe. It is to be hoped that the future areal-typological studies focusing on this underdescribed type of local cases can shed more light to our understanding of the prolatives in South Saami and Lule Saami – and vice versa.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>first person</th>
<th>ESS</th>
<th>essive</th>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>second person</td>
<td>ESSTR</td>
<td>essive-translative</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>third person</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>genitive-accusative</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>PROL</td>
<td>prolate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>assertive (mood)</td>
<td>ILL</td>
<td>illative</td>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPV</td>
<td>comparative</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNG</td>
<td>connegative</td>
<td>INCH</td>
<td>inchoative</td>
<td>PTCP</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>comitative</td>
<td>INDIR</td>
<td>indirective (mood)</td>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVB</td>
<td>converb</td>
<td>INE</td>
<td>inessive</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>SaaL</td>
<td>Lule Saami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
<td>SaaS</td>
<td>South Saami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>neuter</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPT</td>
<td>discourse particle</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative verb</td>
<td>TEMP</td>
<td>temporal (case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>elative</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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