

**Atte Huhtala, University of Turku & University of Tartu**

## **Preliminary Remarks on Expressions of Approximative Movement and Marking of Vicinal Goal in European Uralic**

In this presentation, I will provide an overview on spatial grammatical units which bear the sense of approximative directionality on European Uralic, mainly Finnic and Permic. I will also discuss the semantics of approximative movement in regard to a less studied semantic role, Vicinal Goal.

Some branches of European Uralic (Finnic, Mordvin, Permic, Hungarian) exhibit a sizable inventory of local cases, which in addition to the system of spatial adverbs and adpositions (mostly postpositions, in Finnic also prepositions) allow for a wide variety of strategies to describe space and spatial movement in language.

Approximative movement can be defined as such movement, where the Theme of the expression, or, by following cognitive semantics terminology, Trajector, approaches the Landmark, but does not end up being in contact with the latter, or its location does not coincide with that of Landmark. In other words, the endpoint of the transfer of Theme is the general vicinity or proximity of the Landmark, not the Landmark itself.

From typological point of view, some of the core aspects for understanding the semantics of approximative expressions are on the one hand goal bias (as introduced by Bourdin 1997), which is understood as the tendency of languages to describe goals in greater detail than sources, on the other hand the concept of differential Goal marking and Vicinal Goal, a semantic role related to Goal. Goal and Vicinal Goal serve both as the final positions of the moving entity's path, but whereas in the case of Goal the entity often enters or partially coincides with the landmark's space, this is not true for the Vicinal Goal. The notion of Vicinal Goal is so far relatively understudied (see Kittilä & Ylikoski 2011 and Luraghi 2017).

The function of coding Vicinal Goal in many European Uralic languages is often performed by adpositions and grammatical cases, namely allative and approximative (Kittilä & Ylikoski 2011: 2). Previous studies suggest a tendency towards animacy being an important factor impacting the interpretation between Goals and Vicinal Goals, which will be further assessed in the presentation.

## Sources

Bourdin, Philippe 1997. On goal-bias across languages: modal, configurational and orientational parameters. In Bohumil Pale (ed.), *Typology: prototypes, item orderings and universals. Proceedings of LP'96*. Charles University Press, Prague, 185–218.

Kittilä, Seppo & Ylikoski, Jussi 2011. Remarks on the coding of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal in European Uralic. *Case, animacy and semantic roles*, 29–65.

Luraghi, Silvia 2017. Differential goal marking vs. differential source marking in Ancient Greek. *Space in diachrony*, 119-145.