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Periphrasis, the use of two independent word forms to serve the function of a single inflected word, is usually associated with verbal systems. However, it occurs also in nominal systems. Using the canonical approach to formulate the criteria for nominal periphrasis, I analyse instances of periphrasis in three Samoyedic languages (Tundra Nenets, Forest Enets and Nganasan) where it approaches the canonical ideal, and compare these to the case systems of Romanian, Armenian and Archi where the periphrasis is further away from the canonical centre. An important advantage of the canonical approach is that it provides an instrument to investigate periphrastic realisations in finer detail, and takes periphrasis as an integral part of the morphological and syntactic systems of an individual language.
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1. What is periphrasis?

Periphrasis is a situation when a multiword (syntactic) expression fills a cell in an inflectional paradigm: “When a form in a paradigm consists of two or more words it is periphrastic” (Matthews 1981: 55). Matthews’ definition makes explicit the dual nature of periphrasis: it belongs to both the syntactic and the morphological systems of a language where it is found and must be considered from these two angles. For the purposes of this paper I will distinguish among three notions: “synthetic” refers to inflected forms consisting of one word, “analytic” denotes any multiword constructions and “periphrastic” is used for the analytic constructions which belong to the morphological paradigm of the word. Claiming that an analytic construction should be considered part of a morphological paradigm (periphrasis) requires careful argumentation, which I will be presenting below for each case under discussion.
In Western Mari a syntactic expression əʃ kolə̂ (3sg) functions as a past I negative form of the verb ‘die’ and fills a cell in an otherwise synthetic paradigm (Table 1).

The paradigm in Table 1 shows forms of the verb ‘die’ in third person singular. This particular paradigm shows an intersection of two features: tense and polarity, where all cells but one are filled with synthetic forms. It is important to remember that each cell in this paradigm represents a person-number paradigm: there is a past I affirmative paradigm with six cells (three persons by two numbers), past II affirmative paradigm, and so forth. The periphrastic forms also have a paradigm of their own.

Linguists mostly talk about verbal periphrasis, though there is no reason why other word classes should be excluded from the discussion: “…in current usage the term *periphrasis* is almost always applied to verbal constructions although there is nothing in its definition that would require such a restriction” (Haspelmath 2000: 655).

Blake (1994: 9–13) uses the term “analytic case markers” for languages like Japanese which do not have a case feature in their inflectional system, and use adpositions where inflectional languages use case (namely, to mark the relationships between the predicate and its arguments). These should not be mixed with instances of periphrasis, which by definition is an interaction of syntax and morphology and therefore the existence of a morphological case system in the language is a precondition for identifying periphrasis. Ackerman and Stump (2004: 152) present an example from Tundra Nenets where several cells in the noun paradigm are filled by syntactic phrases. I will discuss this in more detail in Section 3.1.

In this paper I will demonstrate that there are other languages besides Tundra Nenets which have periphrastic expressions in their nominal systems. To recognise them as such I will use the canonical approach, which allows for calibrating phenomena in terms of their closeness to the canonical centre rather than making a black and white distinction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAST I</td>
<td>kolə̂š</td>
<td>əš kolə̂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST II</td>
<td>kolen</td>
<td>kolə̂δe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(based on Ackerman & Stump 2004: 127)
2. Canonical approach

When linguistic definitions are applied to particular language phenomena, there are often clear cases where nobody questions that the phenomenon satisfies the definition, as well as peripheral instances. However, as soon as data from genetically unrelated and typologically diverse languages are taken into consideration, it becomes clear that strict definitions requiring a yes/no answer on whether each phenomenon satisfies them do not always work. It has been shown that to define a linguistic phenomenon in a typological perspective, a set of general criteria is needed. Hopper and Thompson’s paper on transitivity (1980) is a good example of such an approach. Based on the syntactic and semantic behaviour of verbs observed in non-related languages of the world, they have worked out a set of criteria that can be applied to structurally diverse languages to assess the degree of transitivity.

The canonical approach\(^1\) however, works differently. The definitions are taken to their logical end point, and the criteria for the phenomenon in question are elaborated on a theoretical basis and used to define a multidimensional space where concrete instantiations of the phenomenon in question can be placed. One important characteristic of the approach is that defining the criteria is taken as a starting point, while the most canonical instance, the point where all criteria converge, is a theoretical construct. The canonical instantiation can be extremely rare or not found in real languages at all. While applying this approach to periphrasis found in nominal systems, we will see that this is indeed the situation: by defining the criteria, we can construct what the most canonical instance would look like. But we will see that none of the languages considered in this paper represent such an instance, though some come very close to the canonical ideal.

A first attempt at working out the criteria for periphrasis within the canonical approach to typology has been made in Brown et al. (forthcoming b), and I will use some of their criteria to assess the canonicity of the instances of nominal periphrasis found in several languages. The dimensions along which the criteria should be placed are easy to define: since periphrasis is a morphological and a syntactic phenomenon, its canonical instances should satisfy the criteria for canonical morphology and canonical syntax.

Criteria related to canonical morphology (following Brown et al, forthcoming b):

Criterion 1: a periphrastic construction realises a (canonical) grammatical feature
Criterion 2: a periphrastic construction occupies a cell in an otherwise inflectional paradigm
Criterion 1 implies that a periphrastic construction satisfies the criteria established for grammatical features (see Corbett, 2010 and forthcoming) and therefore:

- expresses grammatical meaning;
- is regular and obligatory;
- is exhaustive, i.e. applies to the whole lexicon (of a relevant lexical class).

Corbett (2010) postulates other criteria for canonical features, two of which are important to mention here: (1) each value has a distinct dedicated form; (2) a feature must be established independently of the other features (so if a language distinguishes three genders in the singular but no genders in the plural, the feature GENDER in that language is not fully independent and therefore not fully canonical). There is also a distinction between morphosyntactic and morphosemantic features: the presence of the former is required by the syntactic rules of a language and they are more canonical as features.

Criterion 2 is illustrated by the Mari example above; a paradigm can only be constructed if there are two (canonically: morphosyntactic) features the intersection of which creates the cells of the paradigm.

**Criteria related to canonical syntax.**

Criterion 3: a canonical syntactic phrase consists of two words and their syntactic relations are in line with the rules of the language.

A canonical periphrastic construction consists of two words identifiable on phonological and syntactic grounds; these words must be independent, i.e. have usage outside the periphrastic construction. The construction should obey the general syntactic rules of the language.

Criterion 4: a canonical syntactic phrase has an identifiable head.

This criterion is self-evident for syntactic constructions. By definition, a syntactic phrase has a head and a dependent, where each element has lexical meaning and bears some morphosyntactic information. However, for many periphrastic constructions the auxiliary bears all the morphosyntactic information and the lexical part provides the semantic information. This problem is sometimes resolved by distinguishing between the ‘categorial head’ (auxiliary) and the semantic head or ‘categorial core’ (lexical verb). These two notions of ‘head’ converge in synthetic forms, but diverge in periphrastic constructions (Blevins, forthcoming). Criterion 4 will be applied in its weaker form, so the head of the periphrastic construction will be defined as ‘categorial head’.
In this paper, I deal with instances of nominal periphrasis in case paradigms, and once the criteria have been defined, it is possible to construct the canonical instantiation of a periphrastic case:

- it appears in the language which has a feature case in its inflectional system;
- it fills a cell in a paradigm, created by the intersection of two morphosyntactic features; e.g. we would normally expect number to intersect with case;
- the case value in question has a grammatical usage (as opposed to a purely semantic one), i.e. there must be verbs requiring this particular value for valency (this relates to the morphosyntactic / morphosemantic distinction);
- its usage is obligatory;
- its realisation is regular, i.e. there should be no choice of the categorial head;
- it is exhaustive, i.e. applicable to all nouns in the language;
- the function word must be in line with the general syntactic rules of the language. For example, if the language uses postpositions in general, the periphrastic construction must contain a postposition as well (rather than a preposition);
- there is an identifiable (categorial) head.

In what follows I will present several instances of periphrastic realisation of case and assess their canonicity.

3. Example of periphrastic case: Samoyedic

Three closely related Uralic languages of the Samoyedic branch: Tundra Nenets, Forest Enets and Nganasan have periphrastic expressions in their noun paradigms. For our purposes, it is important to look at these three languages for two independent reasons: First, all three languages use (historically) the same postposition to express periphrastic case. Secondly, all three languages are endangered (Ethnologue lists 20 speakers for Forest Enets, 500 speakers for Nganasan, and Nikolaeva estimates the number of Tundra Nenets speakers as 25,000), and some data are only available for some but not other languages.

3.1 Periphrastic case in Tundra Nenets

Tundra Nenets is the least endangered language of the three, and has more readily available data (I use both published sources and data obtained during consultations with Irina Nikolaeva). Nouns in Tundra Nenets inflect for case and number distinguishing six cases and three numbers as shown in Table 2.
The cells in bold are filled with a syntactic phrase, namely the genitive plus a postposition n’a- in the appropriate case form: its dative is n’ah, the locative is n’ana and so on. It is clear that these cells are required to be filled: the value dual and four case values (dative, locative, ablative and prosecutive) can be established independently of the periphrastic forms.

The word order of postpositional phrases is fixed in Tundra Nenets, and nothing can be inserted between the noun and the postposition, so one might propose interpreting phrases such as tex°h n’ah (reindeer.dat.du) as one word. But the phonotactic rules of Tundra Nenets make such an analysis impossible: [h] cannot occur in the middle of the word, and four case values in the dual are therefore realised by syntactic rather than morphological structures.

The syncretism of three direct cases in the dual might lead one to think that the dual does not have the case feature at all, and the constructions with the postposition are just ordinary syntactic constructions. But the paradigm of the personal pronouns makes such analysis impossible. Pronouns in Tundra Nenets inflect for the same three numbers and seven cases as the nouns and have synthetic forms throughout the paradigm, as Table 3 demonstrates. It shows the paradigm for the first person pronoun only, but the second and third person pronoun paradigms have the same structure.

It can be argued that nominals in Tundra Nenets inflect for seven cases and three numbers, though it is not unheard of for pronouns to realise more feature-value combinations than nouns.

Tundra Nenets periphrastic case forms thus constitute part of the inflectional paradigm and have grammatical meaning (case-number combination), which is obligatory, regular and exhaustive.

*Obligatoriness*: If two objects are meant, and no numeral is used, the speaker must use the dual, while the plural always means ‘more than two’.

### Table 2. A paradigm of Tundra Nenets noun ti ‘reindeer’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATIVE</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>tex°h</td>
<td>tiq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCUSATIVE</td>
<td>tim</td>
<td>tex°h</td>
<td>ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENITIVE</td>
<td>tih</td>
<td>tex°h</td>
<td>tiq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATIVE</td>
<td>texnah</td>
<td>tex°h n’ah</td>
<td>tex°q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATIVE</td>
<td>tex°na²</td>
<td>tex°h n’ana</td>
<td>tex°qna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLATIVE</td>
<td>texad°</td>
<td>tex°h n’ad°</td>
<td>texat°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSECUTIVE</td>
<td>tex°na</td>
<td>tex°h n’amna</td>
<td>teqm°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Salminen (1997) via Ackerman and Stump (2004: 152), with thanks to Irina Nikolaeva.
Regularity of expression: Despite the fact that there are several postpositions in Tundra Nenets, only *n’ah* is used to express neutral locative semantics, and *n’ah* is the only postposition available when the oblique case is used grammatically (is specified by the valency of the verb). For example, ‘want’ governs the dative (object), ‘be afraid’ governs the ablative (stimulus/source), ‘think of’ governs the prosecutive (theme). For these verbs, when the noun is in the dual, there is no choice of postposition.\(^3\)

Exhaustiveness: All nouns that inflect for number and case have the constructions with *n’ah* available.

The next question is whether the periphrastic constructions form a phrase according to the syntactic rules of Tundra Nenets. The postpositions in Tundra Nenets govern the genitive, but since all forms of the direct cases are syncretic in the dual, we cannot say whether this is so here. The possessive forms, however, resolve this issue. Table 4 shows part of the paradigm for the noun *ter°* ‘your reindeer’.

In the possessive paradigm, the genitive dual has a distinct form *tex°yut°*, and it is used to form the periphrastic expressions.

### Table 3. A paradigm of the Tundra Nenets first person pronoun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATIVE</td>
<td><em>man°</em></td>
<td><em>mənh</em></td>
<td><em>man°aq</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCUSATIVE</td>
<td><em>s’iq°m°</em></td>
<td><em>s’id°n’ih</em></td>
<td><em>s’id°naq</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENITIVE</td>
<td><em>s’iq°n°</em></td>
<td><em>s’id°q°n’ih</em></td>
<td><em>s’id°q°naq</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATIVE</td>
<td><em>n’aøn°</em></td>
<td><em>n’an°ih</em></td>
<td><em>n’a°naq</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATIVE</td>
<td><em>n’an°n</em></td>
<td><em>n’an°n°</em></td>
<td><em>n’an°naq</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLATIVE</td>
<td><em>n’adan°</em></td>
<td><em>n’ad°n°</em></td>
<td><em>n’ad°naq</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSECUTIVE</td>
<td><em>n’amnan°</em></td>
<td><em>n’amnan°</em></td>
<td><em>n’a°mnanaq</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Salminen (1997:131), with thanks to Irina Nikolaeva.

### Table 4. A partial possessive paradigm of Tundra Nenets *ter°* ‘your reindeer’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATIVE</td>
<td><em>ter°</em></td>
<td><em>tex°yut°</em></td>
<td><em>tid°</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCUSATIVE</td>
<td><em>temt°</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENITIVE</td>
<td><em>tent°</em></td>
<td><em>tex°yut°</em></td>
<td><em>tit°</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATIVE</td>
<td><em>texant°</em></td>
<td><em>tex°yut°</em></td>
<td><em>n’ah</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATIVE</td>
<td><em>tex°nant°</em></td>
<td><em>tex°yut°</em></td>
<td><em>n’ana</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLATIVE</td>
<td><em>tex°d°nant°</em></td>
<td><em>tex°yut°</em></td>
<td><em>n’ad°</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSECUTIVE</td>
<td><em>tew°nant°</em></td>
<td><em>tex°yut°</em></td>
<td><em>n’amna</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Salminen (1998:30–31), with thanks to Irina Nikolaeva.
Syntactic criterion 4 requires an answer to the question of whether the construction has an identifiable head. The head of the phrase must represent the morphosyntactic locus, but here the features of the periphrastic construction are distributed among its members: the lexical noun expresses the number value (dual) and the postposition bears the case endings. However, n’ah behaves like a head in that it requires a certain form of the lexical word (the genitive). Another test for headedness is the possibility of head omission in the coordinate constructions. No data are available for Tundra Nenets on this issue, but data from its close relative Forest Enets provide examples with conjoined phrases (§3.2).

Before we turn to Forest Enets, it has to be said that there are some complications to the picture presented above. First, postpositional phrases do not have exactly the same range of meanings as the synthetic forms. To express locational meanings in the singular and the plural, Nenets nouns have two options: to use a synthetic form or the postpositional phrase, where the synthetic form in, say, ablative would mean ‘from X’, and the postpositional phrase (with the postposition in the ablative) would convey a more general sense of location (‘from the direction of X’). The dual forms of noun do not have this option: the only available realisation is the postpositional phrase where this semantic distinction neutralises. Another complication is that the postpositional phrase in the dual is not available in all contexts. Sometimes a quantification by the numeral ‘two’ is the only grammatical choice. Nikolaeva (forthcoming) claims that the choice between the dual form and the numeral ‘two’ (which takes singular argument) correlates with definiteness and/or discourse givenness. This seems to tell us more about the way the number system works in the language rather than about periphrasis itself.

3.2 Periphrastic case in Forest Enets

In terms of feature-value inventory, the nominal paradigm in Forest Enets looks very similar to the Tundra Nenets one, and the oblique cases in the dual are formed by (historically) the same postposition as in Tundra Nenets. The data were obtained in the field in summer 2008 by Andrey Shluinsky (see also Šluinskij)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATIVE</td>
<td>bunki</td>
<td>bunki-xiʔ</td>
<td>bunki-ʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATIVE</td>
<td>bunki-d</td>
<td>bunki-xiʔ ne-ʔ</td>
<td>bunki-xiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLATIVE</td>
<td>bunki-xoz</td>
<td>bunki-xiʔ ne-ʔ</td>
<td>bunki-xit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATIVE</td>
<td>bunki-xon</td>
<td>bunki-xiʔ ne-n</td>
<td>bunki-xin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on: Šluinskij (2008), with thanks to Olesya Khanina.
2008), and he remarked that despite the fact that the language is on its way to extinction, most of the speakers did not show much hesitation in producing the forms in question (though not in all contexts).

In Forest Enets, we are also dealing with a two-word construction: First, the cluster [ʔn] is prohibited. Second, a sonogram of the recording of the phrase containing the dual ablative form of ‘dog’ (Picture 1) shows a clear pause before the postposition (highlighted):

(1) bunki-xiʔ ne-z seju-ʔ kanli
dog-DU PS.DU-ABL heart-NOM.SG.1SG go.away.3SG
‘I was frightened by two dogs [= My heart went away from two dogs].

Forest Enets provides the evidence for treating the postposition as the head of the syntactic phrase. Consider the following examples where two nouns in the dual are conjoined:

(2) bɔgul’a-xiʔ sami-xiʔ ne-z seju-ʔ kanli
bear-DU wolf-DU PS.DU-ABL heart-NOM.SG.1SG go.away.3SG
‘I was frightened by two bears and two wolves [= from two bears and two wolves my heart went away].’

(3) mod1 bunki-xu-n’d te-xu-n’d ne-ʔ txa-z2
1SG dog-DU-PL/DU.1SG deer-DU-PL/DU.1SG PS.DU-DAT get.used-1SG
‘I got used to my two dogs and two reindeer.’

In (2), bɔgul’a-xiʔ ‘two bears’ and sami-xiʔ ‘two wolves’ depend on the same postposition nez, which provides the necessary case form (the ablative). Note that, unlike the ablative, the dual gets realised twice (suffix -xiʔ), which shows the different nature of the two features: the number is realised synthetically while the case is realised periphrastically. Example (3) shows possessed nouns, and the situation is the same: bunki-xu-n’ʔ ‘my two dogs’ and te-xu-n’ʔ ‘my two deer’ are both governed by the postposition neʔ in the dative. Forest Enets therefore, provides the syntactic data to support the claim that the Samoyedic periphrastic case forms are canonical syntactic phrases.
If we talk about the morphological canonicity of these constructions, the Forest Enets instances of nominal periphrasis must be put further from the canonical centre than examples from Tundra Nenets: First, in Forest Enets the plural can be used instead of the dual to mean ‘two’ (Andrey Shluinsky, p.c.). This makes the Forest Enets dual in general less canonical as a grammatical feature value. Second, in some contexts the speakers used the numeral ‘two’ and the singular form of the nouns, as in (4) below (though this possibility exists in Tundra Nenets as well):

(4) ʃizi te-xon kanli-ziʔ
    two reindeer-LOC.SG leave-1SG
    ‘I went on two reindeer.’

In other contexts, however, the speakers produced the expected forms without any difficulty (as in (5) below) or agreed that the form suggested by the linguist is grammatical (as is the case in (6)):

(5) kasa-xu-nŋ? ne-ʔ edima-ziʔ
    sibling-DU-PL/DU.1SG PS.DU-DAT be.glad-1SG
    ‘I am/was glad to (see) my two brothers.’

(6) modj kasa-xu-nŋ? ne-ʔ barziŋa-ziʔ
    1.SG sibling-DU-PL/DU.1SG PS.DU-DAT anger-1SG
    ‘I am angry with my (two) brothers.’

Forest Enets is on the brink of extinction, and the speakers’ hesitation and the usage of the numeral can be explained by this. It is important to point out, however, that the examples we have where the speakers did use the dual plus ne- all concern the grammatical usage of the case (‘be frightened’ + ablative, ‘get used’ + dative, ‘be glad’ + dative, ‘be angry’ + dative).

Table 6. Paradigm of the Nganasan noun baŋ ‘dog’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATIVE</td>
<td>baŋ</td>
<td>baŋ-koŋ</td>
<td>baŋ-ŋə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENITIVE</td>
<td>ban-ŋc</td>
<td>baŋ-kiŋc</td>
<td>ban-ʊŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCUSATIVE</td>
<td>ban-ŋc</td>
<td>baŋ-kiŋc</td>
<td>ban-ŋj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATIVE-LATIVE</td>
<td>ban-təc</td>
<td>baŋ-kiŋc na-ŋc</td>
<td>ban-diŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>ban-tənu</td>
<td>baŋ-kiŋc na-nu</td>
<td>ban-diŋnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>baŋ-kaŋta</td>
<td>baŋ-kiŋc na-tə</td>
<td>baŋ-ɡiriŋta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROL</td>
<td>ba-mənu</td>
<td>baŋ-kiŋc na-mənu</td>
<td>baŋ-ʊumənu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.1 *Periphrastic case in Nganasan*

In Nganasan the noun paradigm looks similar to the Tundra Nenets paradigm, except for the case labels. I use the grammar by Tereščenko (1979) and the data obtained in the field by Maria Brykina and Valentin Gusev in 2007–2009. The paradigm of the Nganasan noun is shown in Table 6. Note that the dual forms use (historically) the same postposition as Tundra Nenets and Forest Enets.

When talking about the dative-locative dual forms, Tereščenko lists the following postpositions:

(7) turku-gi ńi-c
    lake GEN.DU on-LAT
    ‘towards the surface of two lakes’

(8) turku-gi kuńd’i-c
    lake GEN.DU inside-LAT
    ‘into the inside of two lakes’

(9) turku-gi bəndu-c
    lake GEN.DU above-LAT
    ‘above two lakes’

(10) turku-gi ŋil’-c
    lake GEN.DU under-LAT
    ‘towards under two lakes’
Tereščenko (1979: 73)

From this, one may conclude that in Nganasan there is a choice of postpositions to form the locative case in the dual ("In Nganasan a variety of postpositions is reported that can be used both in this context and in other contexts" — Shluinsky 2010). However, according to Brykina and Gusev, when one uses phrases like (8)–(10) above in the singular and in the plural, the same postpositions are used. The only semantically ‘empty’ postposition is the postposition na- shown in Table 6. It is used, for example, to mark the agent of a passive verb:

(11) d’esj-gai-tü na-c səbkü-l’a-ʔa
    father GEN.DU-3SG near-LAT kiss PASS-PFV
    ‘She was kissed by her parents.’
Compare to the agent in the singular:

(12) d’ed’i-təc-ti̮ səbkü-l’a-ʔa
    father LAT-3SG kiss PASS-PFV
    ‘She was kissed by her father.’
Nganasan, therefore, uses the postposition *na-* in the same way as Tundra Nenets and Forest Enets. As far as we know, all Nganasan nouns can have periphrastic dual forms, and the usage of the dual is obligatory. As for the syntactic canonicity of these constructions, there is not enough data available to make a judgement.

### 3.3 Periphrastic case in Samoyedic: Summary

Samoyedic case represents an instance of periphrasis which is very close to the canonical centre, yet it is not fully canonical: First, there is not enough information for all languages (‘no data’ cells in Table 7). Second, the semantic complications in Tundra Nenets and the unexpected gaps in usage mentioned for Tundra Nenets and Forest Enets make it not as regular as one would expect a canonical morphosyntactic feature to be and therefore less canonical as instances of periphrasis. However, I am unaware of examples that would come any closer to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Canonicity of the periphrastic case in Samoyedic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instance of fully canonical periphrastic case:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tundra Nenets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
canonical ideal. Table 7 lists the characteristics we expect from the canonical periphrastic case (repeated from Section 2)

It is quite possible that periphrastic case was inherited by these three languages from an earlier stage. If this is true, the periphrasis in the Samoyedic nominal paradigm shows the same robustness that can be observed in the synthetic part of the paradigm: All Samoyedic languages have preserved the number system with three values and the old case system (which for proto-Samoyedic is reconstructed as having four oblique cases: lative, locative, ablative and prolative).

4. Less canonical instances of periphrastic case

In this section I will discuss instances of the syntactic realisation of case in the following three languages: Romanian, Armenian and Archi. All of these instances are less canonical than the Samoyedic examples shown above, but each deviates from the canonical ideal in a different way. Romanian comes closer to the canonical centre than the others, so I will begin with it.

4.1 Periphrastic case in Romanian: masculine proper nouns

Romanian nouns have a lexical category of gender distinguishing masculine, feminine and neuter, and inflect for number (singular and plural) and case (nominate/accusative and genitive/dative). The definite article is suffixed to the noun and takes case-number inflections. The instances of periphrastic case are found in the paradigms of masculine proper nouns. Let us consider the paradigms for the common nouns first.

Table 8. Declension of Romanian indefinite nouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>neuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG PL</td>
<td>oameni</td>
<td>casă</td>
<td>pai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM/ACC</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>case</td>
<td>paie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN/DAT</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>case</td>
<td>paie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘man, person’ ‘house’ ‘straw’

Based on Daniliuc & Daniliuc (2000: 35)

In addition to the morphological types shown above, there are the following possibilities for the number of forms a noun can have:
– some masculine nouns (such as pui ‘chicken’) have the same forms in all cells;
– some feminine nouns have just two forms: one in the singular and one in the plural (similar to what shown here for the masculine noun);
– all neuter nouns behave like the example in Table 8, having only one form in the singular and one form in the plural.

Only feminine indefinite nouns distinguish among case forms in the singular. Definite nouns distinguish case-number values in all genders, as shown in Table 9.

There is more uniformity across genders in the declension of definite nouns, which may be an indication that the case-number combination is expressed by the definite article rather than the noun itself. The fact that the definite article attaches to the plural form rather than a stem also points to the same direction. Masculine indefinite nouns that do not inflect (such as pui ‘chicken’) also distinguish four forms when they are definite (two in each number), as Table 10 demonstrates.

Before we turn to periphrastic ways of realising case, it is clear that case in Romanian is not a very canonical feature: indefinite masculine and neuter nouns do not distinguish case at all, and not every cell in the feminine paradigm has a distinct form. The case feature therefore is not fully independent (if there were no feminine gender and no definite forms, one could hardly talk about a case feature in Romanian) and the forms of different values are not all distinct.

Romanian proper nouns behave differently. Feminine proper nouns have the same distribution of forms as the feminine common nouns shown above (i.e. distinguishing nominative/accusative and genitive/dative), while masculine proper nouns use the definite article lui for genitive/dative, as examples below demonstrate.
(15) feminine proper noun:
  surîsul Gioconde-i
  smile Gioconda-GEN/DAT
  ‘Gioconda’s smile’

(16) masculine proper noun:
  cartea lui Ion
  flower DEF. GEN/DAT John
  ‘John’s book’
  (Cornilesuc, 1995: 7)

(17) feminine proper noun:
  i=am dat carte-a Laure-i
  DAT.SG=have.1SG given book-DEF Laura-GEN/DAT
  ‘I have given the book to Laura.’

(18) masculine proper noun:
  i=am dat carte-a lui Radu
  DAT.SG=have.1SG given book-DEF GEN/DAT Radu
  ‘I have given the book to Radu.’

Compare the last example to the usage of common masculine definite nouns:

(19) i=am dat carte-a copil-ului
  DAT.SG=have.1SG given book-DEF child-DEF.GEN/DAT
  ‘I have given the book to the child.’
  (Examples 17–19 are from Bernard Comrie and Martin Maiden, p.c.)

Romanian first names do not normally have plurals. The paradigm for masculine and feminine first names is shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Declension of masculine and feminine first names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG, masculine</th>
<th>SG, feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM/ACC</td>
<td>Radu</td>
<td>Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN/DAT</td>
<td>lui Radu</td>
<td>Laure-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Daniliuc & Daniliuc (2000: 38))

For Romanian first names, there is no inflectional paradigm where there would be a number-case feature intersection, and we can only establish the genitive/dative value for the masculine first names by analogy with the behaviour of common nouns and with the singular paradigm of feminine first names. However, surnames in -escu do have a plural form, which has a synthetic realisation of the genitive/dative. In the singular the genitive/dative is realised periphrastically; compare:
(20) i=am dat carte-a lui Popescu
   dat.sg=have.1sg given book-def def.gen/dat Popescu
   'I gave Popescu the book'

(21) le=am dat carte-a Popeşti-lor
   dat.pl=have.1sg given book-def Popescu-def.gen/dat
   'I gave the Popescus the book'

(Martin Maiden, p.c.)

So at least for surnames we can say that there is a paradigm displaying number-case feature intersection where one cell is filled by the periphrastic form, as demonstrated in Table 12.

Table 12. Declension of surnames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM/ACC</td>
<td>Popescu</td>
<td>Popeşti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN/DAT</td>
<td>lui Popescu</td>
<td>Popeşti-lor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Martin Maiden (p.c.) pointed out that there is some evidence that the periphrastic realisation of the genitive/dative is taking over: in colloquial registers the use of lui in dative function is spreading to feminine names (22) and to pronouns (23):

(22) i=am dat carte-a lui Silvia
   dat.sg=have.1sg given book-def def.gen/dat Silvia
   'I gave Silvia the book'

(23) i=am dat carte-a lui asta
   dat.sg=have.1sg given book-def def.gen/dat this.one
   'I gave the book to him (to this one).

Compare those to the standard Romanian:

(24) i=am dat carte-a ast-uria
   dat.sg=have.1sg given book-def this.one-dat
   'I gave the book to him (to this one)'

Besides this, in some dialects (e.g., Istro-Romanian, spoken by about 500 people in Croatia) lui (in the form lu) is generalized as a genitive/dative marker to all nouns and pronouns. In this variety lu can (optionally) be used together with a case-ending in the feminine singular. For example, ‘vaka ‘cow’ has a purely periphrastic form lu ‘vaka, and as a variant lu ‘vak-e, which uses both definite article and genitive/dative case ending. (Martin Maiden, p.c.)

Romanian presents a situation different from what we saw in Samoyedic: First, case is not a canonical feature in this language. Second, the periphrastic realisation...
of case is only available for a subset of nouns. For masculine first names, there is no paradigm created by the intersection of two morphosyntactic features; we can only postulate a case-number paradigm by analogy with common nouns, feminine proper names and masculine surnames. The periphrastic realisation of case is regular and obligatory but not exhaustive.  

4.2 Periphrastic case in Eastern Armenian: Locative

An interesting situation is presented by the behaviour of the locative case in Modern Eastern Armenian. There are some lexical items that have synthetic realisation of the locative case and some lexical items that can only realise the locative meaning using the postpositional construction. But unlike in Romanian, there is a semantic motivation for different behaviour.

Nouns in Eastern Armenian distinguish two numbers and six cases. Table 13 shows the declension of the most productive declension class (i-declension).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATIVE</td>
<td>sar(ə)</td>
<td>sar-er(ə)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENITIVE</td>
<td>sar-i</td>
<td>sar-er-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATIVE</td>
<td>sar-i(n)</td>
<td>sar-er-i(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLATIVE</td>
<td>sar-icʰ</td>
<td>sar-er-icʰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUMENTAL</td>
<td>sar-ov</td>
<td>sar-er-ov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATIVE</td>
<td>sar-um</td>
<td>sar-er-um</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The locative is mostly used with nouns referring to places. There is however, an alternative way of expressing the locative meaning by using postpositions:

(25) Yerevan-um / Yerevan-i mej
    Yerevan-LOC / Yerevan-GEN in
    ‘in Yerevan’⁹ (Comrie 1986: 86)

(26) pʰ’oyocʰ-um / pʰ’oyocʰ-i mej
    street-LOC / street-GEN in
    ‘in the street’ (data from EANC online, with thanks to Victoria Kurshudian)

Though all nouns allow the use of the postpositional phrase to express locational meaning, nouns denoting some sort of location show a strong tendency to use the locative case and not the postposition, as shown by the data from Eastern Armenian National Corpus:
(27) ‘in the field’: synthetic locative dašt-um 8 077 tokens
postpositional phrase dašti me înt̑ 293 tokens

‘in the bedroom’: synthetic locative nnjasenjak-um 128 tokens
postpositional phrase nnjasenyaki mej 1 token

‘in Yerevan’: synthetic locative Erevan-um 11 528 tokens
postpositional phrase Erevani mej 60 tokens

(Arkhangelskiy and Semyonova, forthcoming)

For these nouns, the meaning of the postpositional phrase is nearly synonymous with the meaning expressed by the synthetic locative, though there are contexts where there is a (slight) difference in the meanings expressed by these two forms.

For the nouns that are not names of places but which can be thought of as places (for example, those that can serve as containers), the use of the locative case is possible, but the postpositional phrase is preferred:

(28) tupʰ-um / tupʰ-i mej (preferred)
box-loc / box-gen in
‘in the box’ (Comrie 1986: 88)

In idiomatic usages, where no contrast in locational orientation is possible, the locative is preferred:

(29) hodvac-n ays ɡarkʰ-um e
article-def this book-loc is
‘The article is in this book.’ (Comrie, 1986: 88)

For the nouns denoting humans the only possibility of expressing the locative meaning is the construction with the postposition mej:

(30) ays avazak-i mej mi kʰani lav hatkulʰyunner kan
this brigand-gen in some good qualities there are
‘There are some good qualities in this brigand.’ (Comrie 1986: 88)

| Table 14. Paradigm of kʰyur ‘sister’ |
|-------------|-------------|
|            | SG          | PL            |
| NOM         | kʰyur(ə)    | kʰyur-ner(ə)  |
| GEN         | kʰr-oj      | kʰyur-ner-i   |
| DAT         | kʰr-oj(ə)   | kʰyur-ner-i(n)|
| ABL         | kroj-icʰ    | kʰyur-ner-icʰ |
| INSTR       | kroj-ov     | kʰyur-ner-ov  |
| LOC         |             |               |

(Based on Dum-Tragut 2009: 76)
(31) mard-u mẹj e Astvac-ə…
    person-gen in is God.nom-def
    ‘There is God in (every) person’ (Arkhangelskiy and Semyonova, forthcoming)

The grammar by Dum-Tragut (2009) provides the form of the synthetic locative for most of the declensions, noting that its usage is restricted by the semantics of the noun. However, for the oğ-declension, which comprises kinship terms and some other nouns denoting humans, it is claimed that there is no synthetic form of the locative at all. The paradigm for the noun k’yur ‘sister’ is shown in Table 14.

The data from the corpus (EANC) confirm Comrie’s claim that, for location nouns, the synthetic locative is the most frequent way of realising the locative meaning. For other nouns, for example for those that can denote some sort of containers, the postpositional phrase is used much more frequently. For the nouns denoting humans, the postpositional phrase is the only way of realising the locative meaning (this is in line with what the grammar and the speakers of Armenian say about the personal nouns). Table 15 depicts the frequency of use for some nouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lexeme: number of tokens</th>
<th>synthetic locatives</th>
<th>postpositional constructions with mej</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pʰoγocʰ street’</td>
<td>45 467</td>
<td>11 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k’ağak’ town’</td>
<td>98 029</td>
<td>20 696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tun ‘house’</td>
<td>12 2279</td>
<td>1 876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tup ‘box’</td>
<td>3 639</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mard ‘person’</td>
<td>292 774</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erexa ‘child’</td>
<td>76 133</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(EANC: [http://www.eanc.net/](http://www.eanc.net/))

Temporal relations are also expressed by the locative, and for nouns such as ‘hour’, ‘minute’, ‘day’, ‘year’ etc, there are two possibilities: the synthetic locative form or the construction with mej. However, in this case, there is a clear semantic difference: the synthetic locative expresses the idea of a period of time whereas the postposition denotes a point along a time scale; compare:

(32) tas-ə rope-um es inčʰ karog em anel?
    10.NOM-DEF minute-LOC 1SG.NOM what.NOM able be.PRS.1SG do.INF
    ‘What can I do in ten minutes?’ (Arkhangelskiy and Semyonova, forthcoming)
At that moment, there was no peace and quiet in the village anymore.

(Arkhangelskiy and Semyonova, forthcoming)

In temporal expressions, the frequency of usage of the synthetic locatives is close to the frequency of the postpositional constructions; in the corpus, the word žam 'hour' has 110 tokens of synthetic locatives and 195 tokens of the postpositional construction.

There are therefore two ways of realising the locative in Eastern Armenian: synthetically using the ending -um, and periphrastically using the construction consisting of the genitive and the postposition mej. These two possibilities are distributed in the lexicon: some nouns have a clear preference for the synthetic forms, some nouns have a preference for the periphrastic realisation, and some (temporal expressions) are in between. This makes the Armenian locative a non-canonical case, though one criterion according to which we make this judgement depends on our interpretation of the case realisation: if we believe that the synthetic case realisation of the case is primary, then the fact that not all nouns have it means that the locative is non-exhaustive. If, however, we believe that the periphrastic realisation has the same morphological status as the synthetic one, then the locative violates the criterion of the regularity of the expression.

Another factor that decreases the canonicity of the Eastern Armenian locative is the fact that it is a purely morphosemantic case: there are no verbs that govern the locative.

The expression of the periphrastic locative is regular: there are several locational postpositions in Armenian such as vora 'on', but it there are no examples in the corpus of using it with mard 'person', erexa 'child' or the personal pronouns.

Nouns for which periphrasis is the only possibility of realising the locative make a coherent, semantically motivated group: nouns denoting persons. This also makes this instance of periphrasis less canonical: semantics should not interfere with morphological realisations. The semantic motivation, however, works fully only for the nouns: personal pronouns allow the usage of the synthetic locative (examples 35–36), and the preference for the periphrastic form is only a tendency (though a rather strong one, as Table 16 demonstrates).

(34) inčʰ es tesn-um nran-um
what you see-ptcp.prs he-loc
‘What do you see in him?’ (Dum-Tragut 2009: 125).

(35) naʰ karolacʰ-av ir mej už gtn-el anmiȷ̌apes
he.nom can-aor-3sg he.gen in power.nom find-inf immediately
Nominal periphrasis

haparchant-al-u
resign-inf-dat
‘He could find power in him to immediately resign.’ (Dum-Tragut 2009: 125).

Here the only anomaly is the synthetic locative of the first person plural pronoun (mezænum). It can be explained by an idiomatic usage of this form meaning ‘among us, between us’ (note that for nouns, the meaning such as ‘among people’, ‘among children’ will be expressed by the postposition mej — Victoria Khurshudian, personal communication).

Armenian is interesting because the number of case values depends on our interpretation of the periphrastic realisation of the locative: if we view it as ‘normal’ though morphologically irregular realisation, then we can postulate the locative case for the of-declension (the one comprising kinship terms).

The situation in which nouns denoting humans do not take the (synthetic) locative is rather common: for example, in Basque, personal nouns also take postpositions instead of the locative form, and this is the only reason why the grammar postulates the feature of animacy (Hualde and de Urbina 2003: 116).

4.3 Periphrastic case in Archi: The use of a syntactic construction as an alternative

Nouns in the Nakh-Dagestanian language Archi distinguish among the ten (non-locative) cases shown in Table 17.
Three of these cases, similative, causal and comparative, have an alternative means of expression by postpositions; compare:

(36) a. tuw ɬːanna-q'ɗi qe-r
    he  woman(ii).obl.sg-sim dance-IPFV
b. tuw ɬːonnol baran qe-r
    he  woman(ii)[ABS.sg] like dance-IPFV
'The dances like a woman.'

(37) a. w-irχʷ-mul-li-ši zon q'as::e<w>ti
    1SG-work-MSD-OBL.SG-CSL 1SG[ABS.sg] tired-<1.SG>become.PFV
b. w-irχʷ-mul sababši zon q'as::e<w>ti
    1SG-work-MSD[ABS.sg] because 1SG[ABS.sg] tired-<1.SG>become.PFV
'I am tired because of working.'

(38) a. dogi niʃi-χur t'i
    donkey(iv)[ABS.sg] horse(iii).OBL-SG-COMPAR be.small
b. dogi noʃ kelaw t'i
    donkey(iv)[ABS.sg] horse(iii)[ABS.sg] than be.small
'A donkey is smaller than a horse.'

The postpositional variants are used more frequently than the synthetic forms of the cases: this was my personal impression from listening to Archi during fieldwork, and the speakers confirmed that they have the same impression: in the same contexts, the postpositions are more likely to be used. There is no sufficiently large Archi corpus to verify this claim.
Archi shows only a tendency to replace a synthetic form by the periphrastic one, and these instances are on the very periphery of the periphrastic expression of case: the periphrastic realisation is not obligatory and does not enter the paradigm created by the intersection of two features: there is no indication that periphrastic forms are more likely to be found in just one cell (for example, in the singular). These three cases are purely semantic, there are no verbs governing them, and probably what we see here is the tendency of eliminating three cases from the paradigm, i.e. changing the paradigm itself rather than an example of preserving the paradigm by filling cells with periphrastic forms, as was the case in Samoyedic, or keeping the paradigm structure uniform across the lexicon as was the case with Romanian and Armenian.

If the synthetic forms go out of usage completely, we will not be able to talk about periphrasis here at all, but at the moment the postpositional phrases represent variants of synthetic forms and therefore it seems that they must be included in the paradigm and viewed as peripheral instances of periphrasis.

4.4 Non-canonical periphrastic case: Summary

Table 18 summarizes my estimation of the canonicity of the instances found in the three languages discussed in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instance of fully canonical periphrastic case:</th>
<th>Romanian</th>
<th>Armenian</th>
<th>Archi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morphology appears in a language which has a feature of case in its inflectional system</td>
<td>√ / x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fills a cell (or cells) in a paradigm, created by the intersection of two morphosyntactic features</td>
<td>√ / x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has grammatical usage</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>its usage is obligatory</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√ / x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>its realisation is regular</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is exhaustive</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax if a function word is used, it must be in line with general syntactic rules of the language</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is an identifiable (categorial) head</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combination of a tick and a cross in the first cell of this table (for Romanian) means that the feature case is Romanian is not fully canonical, as was discussed in Section 4.1. The next line also contains a tick and a cross for Romanian: here,
the tick stands for the masculine surnames, which have synthetic case forms in the plural, but periphrastic case forms in the singular, hence the feature intersection (recall Table 12); the cross stands for the masculine first names that do not have the plural forms. Crosses for Armenian and Archi show that there is no feature intersection: where a periphrastic case exists, it takes the whole “slab” of the paradigm, filling the cells both in the singular and in the plural. Both Armenian and Archi periphrastic cases are purely semantic, hence the crosses in the “grammatical usage” line. The usage of periphrastic case is obligatory for certain nouns in Romanian, and obligatory for some nouns in Armenian, but only an alternative for some other nouns (hence “✓ / x” in the cell), and is never obligatory in Archi. As for the exhaustiveness, only Archi can be thought of as satisfying this criterion, but then one has to remember that despite being available for all nouns, the periphrastic case is obligatory for none.

The instances discussed above are canonical syntactic structures in the languages where they are found. Although the definite article in Romanian is an enclitic and always attaches to the first constituent of an NP, there are other articles such as al and cel which can be used in front of the NP, so the usage of lui in its genitive and dative function obeys the existing syntactic rules of the language. The postpositions in Armenian and Archi govern the “correct” cases (the genitive and the absolutive respectively).

5. Conclusions

In this paper I demonstrated that periphrasis can be found not only in verbal systems but also in nominal systems, where it realises a morphosyntactic feature. With regard to verbal systems, the periphrastic expressions are most often found for morphosemantic features such as tense and aspect.

The most canonical instance was found in the Samoyedic languages where the case system is old (probably inherited from previous stages in the language history) and robust. The periphrastic realisations show the same diachronic stability as the system of synthetic cases.

The canonical approach allows us to define a set of criteria valid for defining periphrasis across word classes. Another important advantage of the canonical approach is that it provides an instrument to investigate the periphrastic realised in finer detail, and view them as part of the morphological and syntactic systems of a language they are found in. In this paper I assessed the canonicity of periphrastic expressions against the canonicity of the grammatical feature (case) represented by the language of the investigation, and highlighted the particular interest of the Samoyedic system.
Abbreviations used:

1,2,3 — persons
I, II, III, IV — genders
ABL — ablative
ABS — absolutive
ACC — accusative
AOR — aorist
CAUS — causative
GEN — genitive
COMPAR — comparative
CSL — causal
DAT — dative
DEF — definite
DU — dual
INF — infinitive
INSTR — instrumental
IPFV — imperfective
LAT — lative
LOC — locative
MASC — masculine
MSD — masdar
NOM — nominative
OBL — oblique
PASS — passive
PFV — perfective
PL — plural
PROL — prolative
PROSEC — prosecutive
PRS — present
PS — postposition
PTCP — participle
SG — singular
SIM — simulative
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2. ° is a vowel phoneme which adds extra mora.

3. Ackerman and Stump (2004) divide Nenets cases into “grammatical” (nominative, accusative and genitive) and “local” (the rest) and claim that periphrastic expressions appear in the cells which “contain the most marked value for case...as well as the most marked value for number” (p.152). However, the fact that all the “local” cases have grammatical uses, makes the claim about markedness less persuasive.

4. There are accusative and genitive cases in Enets, but we do not show them here.

5. I leave out the vocative, because not all nouns have it. Vocative aside, Daniliuc & Daniliuc (2000) postulate four cases: nominative, accusative, genitive and dative. Presumably, these are distinguished on the basis of their syntactic functions and by analogy with the pronouns and pronominal clitics. In this paper, I use NOM/ACC and GEN/DAT.
6. This concerns the only the feminine proper nouns ending in -a. If a personal proper noun ends in anything other than a, then it is invariant, regardless of the sex of the referent. Genitive/dative case for this type is indicated by prefixing the form lui to the name (Martin Maiden, p.c.).

7. The subset of nouns for which there is periphrastic realisation forms a coherent, easily identifiable group (masculine names), but there is no semantic motivation for why only these nouns lack the synthetic expression of case. A morphological analogy is probably at play here: Female common indefinite nouns distinguish more case values than nouns in other genders, and that is probably why feminine proper names have the synthetic expression of case while masculine first names do not.

8. There is a debate on how many cases should be distinguished for nouns: the genitive and the dative in Eastern Armenian are always syncretic. Here I follow the practice adopted in Eastern Armenian National Corpus and distinguish them (http://www.eanc.net/).

9. For place names, there is also a possibility of expressing general locative meaning without any marking: Aprum em Yerevan ‘I live in Yerevan’. Note, however, that this option is only available for the locational verbs, and sentence such as ?Utum em Yerevan ‘I eat in Yerevan’ will be only marginally acceptable (Comrie 1986: 86–87)

10. Compare defective paradigms: for example, the nouns that lack plurals for semantic reasons (such as nouns denoting liquids) will be less suitable candidates for being treated as morphologically defective. I use the same reasoning in assessing the canonicity periphrasis: the periphrastic expression should be there for purely morphological reasons rather than having a semantic motivation.
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