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Abstract

The goal of this work is to describe the domain of predicative possession in South Saami, a Finno-Ugric language spoken in Sweden and Norway. Data has been elicited from native speakers of South Saami, and the analysis has been carried out within a general functional-typological framework.

In South Saami, four different predicative possessive constructions are used: (1) a habeo-verb construction, (2a) a genitive possessive without copula, (2b) a genitive possessive with copula, and (3) a locational possessive. The latter is not described in the grammars. The have-possessive and the genitive possessives occur frequently and are used to encode all notions of possession. The use of the locational possessive is restricted to inanimate possessors. Distribution of the constructions varies among the speakers. Examples for the have-possessive construction present the greatest structural variation. The four possessive constructions are set within a typological context.
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Sammandrag


Analysen visar att i sydsamiska används fyra olika konstruktioner för att uttrycka predikativt ägande: (1) en habeo-verbkonstruktion, (2a) en genitivkonstruktion utan kopula, (2b) en genitivkonstruktion med kopula, och (3) en lokativkonstruktion. Den senare omnäms inte i de existerande grammatiska beskrivningarna, och konstruktionen är begränsad till inanimata ägare. Verbkonstruktionen och de båda genitivkonstruktionerna förekommer frekvent i materialet och används för alla possessiva relationer. Fördelningen av de olika konstruktionerna varierar hos talarna. Den största strukturella variationen återfinns i habeo-verbkonstruktionen. De fyra possessivkonstruktionerna sätts i uppsatsen in i en typologisk kontext.

Nyckelord

Elicitering, finsk-ugriska, habeo-verb, predikativt ägande, språkbeskrivning, samiska, sydsamiska.
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1. Introduction

The present thesis describes the functional domain of predicative possession in South Saami, a Finno-Ugric language spoken in Sweden and Norway by about 400 native speakers. Possession is considered a universal domain in languages, however the structural encoding of the feature differs in the world’s languages.

In South Saami, predicative possession is encoded by several different constructions, which vary in use between speakers.

In the existing grammatical descriptions of the language, a have-possessive, as in (1), and a genitive possessive construction are mentioned. However, the use of and possible differences between the verb possessive and the genitive possessive are not described. Furthermore, the genitive possessive has two sub-types: a “bare” genitive possessive, as in (2), and a genitive plus copula construction, as in (3). Yet another construction used in South Saami is a locational possessive, as exemplified by (4), marked with the inessive on the possessor. This latter construction is not mentioned in previous grammars. An example for each of the four possessive constructions are given below (own data; the speaker is referred to in the fourth line in square brackets):

(1) tjjdtji bijle-m âtma
mother[NOM.SG] car-ACC.SG have.PRES.3SG
‘Mother has a car’
[Younger Northern 1:6]

(2) dov bijle?
2SG.GEN car[NOM.SG]
‘Do you have a car?’
[Younger Southern 1:43]

(3) mov leah plaave tjelmie-h
1SG.GEN be.PRES.3PL blue eye-NOM.PL
‘I have blue eyes.’
[Older Southern: 8a]

(4) burt-sne nieljie juelkie-h
table-INESS.SG four leg-NOM.PL
‘The table has four (table)legs’
[Younger Northern 1:32]

My goal with this work is to describe the use and distribution of the different predicative possessive constructions by analysing data elicited from native speakers of South Saami. Furthermore, I will discuss the co-occurrence of these four constructions in South Saami, and I seek to explain the varying use of the constructions among my consultants. The thesis is positioned in the framework of functional theories of grammar.

In the present study, only predicative possession is investigated. I understand predicative possession as stating, or establishing, a possessive relation, as in Elliot has a book. Predicative
possession contrasts with adnominal, or attributive, possession (*Elliot’s book*), in which possessive relations are presupposed or implied. These are not covered in this work.

1.1 Organisation of the work

The work is organised as follows: In chapter 2, I shall address theoretical issues surrounding predicative possession, and I will present a sociolinguistic characterisation and grammatical profile of South Saami. I will also look closely at the existing literature that describes South Saami predicative possession. Research questions and some limitations are presented in chapter 3. The methodology is discussed in chapter 4. In chapter 5 I shall present the results of this study, and in chapter 6 I shall present an overview of predicative possession in three related Saami languages. A discussion of the results is offered in chapter 7. Finally, in the conclusion, the main findings are summarised. The appendix consists of a transcript of all elicited data.

1.2 Presentation of examples

All examples in South Saami are presented in the following way: In line (i), the example is written in the South Saami orthography,¹ and morphemes are glossed in line (ii) using the Leipzig Glossing Rules. The example is translated into English in line (iii). The square brackets in line (iv) refer to the speaker and the number in the dataset elicited from this speaker. Examples are numbered from one (1) onwards throughout the thesis. The following is a schematic example:

(No.)  
(i) South Saami orthography  
(ii) MORPHEME GLOSSING  
(iii) ‘English translation’  
(iv) [speaker code: number of example]

Morpheme boundaries of case suffixes are generally glossed. Verb paradigms however are quite complex in South Saami, due to stem alternations.² I have not found a satisfactory way of glossing morphemes of verbs. As the examples do not depend on such an analysis, morpheme boundaries of verbs are not glossed in this work. I thereby follow glossing traditions of other authors describing South Saami, such as Siegl (2012).

¹ See section 2.2.5 in this thesis; written South Saami originating in Norway uses partly different vowel letters than those in Sweden.
² Please see the appendix for a paradigm of the habeo-verb *utnedh*. 
2. Background

The background chapter is divided into four parts. In the first part (2.1), theoretical issues of predicative possession are presented. In the second part (2.2), the South Saami language and its sociolinguistic profile are introduced. A grammatical profile of South Saami is given in the third part (2.3). The fourth part (2.4) includes a survey of the existing descriptions of South Saami with respect to predicative possession.

2.1 Theory and typology of predicative possession

In this part, some basic assumptions of possession will be addressed in the next section (2.1.1). Conceptual notions of possession are introduced in section 2.1.2, and a typology of predicative possessive constructions is presented in section 2.1.3. Their distribution in the languages of the world is presented in section 2.1.4.

The literature on the topic is enormous and it is outside the scope of this work to give a detailed overview. The work of Stassen (2009) and Heine (1997) have been chosen as the most relevant ones for the present study. The theoretical background is based on these sources.

2.1.1 Basic assumptions

A fundamental precondition for a possessive relation is the presence of a possessor and a possessed (or possessee).\(^3\) The relation between these is “asymmetric” (Stassen 2009:11), in that the possessor controls the possessed. There are different ways to classify and define possession and its subdomains, and many parameters can be relevant in the encoding of possession in the world’s languages. Therefore, it is neither feasible nor the purpose of this thesis to present a comprehensive account of possession.

Nevertheless, some basic distinctions have to be mentioned. When describing possession, a basic distinction between two types of possession has to be made, namely between *attributive* (or adnominal) and *predicative* possession (cf. Stassen 2009:26). As already mentioned, the present study is concerned with *predicative* possession. Predicative possession can be said to state, or establish, a relation of possession, as in the sentence *Elliot has a book*. Attributive possession on the other hand presupposes this possessive relation, as in *Elliot’s book*. These two types are usually marked differently. However this is not necessarily always the case (Heine 1997:27).

A theory which aims at describing the conceptual domain of possession in general is the *Locationalist hypothesis*, formulated in modern times by Clark (1978), and cited in Stassen (2009:12). This theory argues that the concept of possession is related to the notion of location (ibid.:11ff.). In many languages of the world, the marking of possession and the marking of location are either “parallel” or even “identical” (ibid.:12) – again, however, this is not universal.

In this thesis, I will use a functionalistic approach to identify predicative possession and to distinguish between other types of existential clauses.

---

\(^3\) I will use the term *possessed* in this thesis.

\(^4\) For an account of attributive possession, see e.g. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2001).
2.1.2 Conceptual properties: Notions of possession

As indicated above, there are numerous approaches to the domain of possession and its expressions in language. It is generally accepted that possession is conceptually variable across the languages of the world, as possession is “basically a social concept” (Stassen 2009:7). In this section, conceptual properties of possession are briefly reviewed, based on Heine (1997:33–41). These notions have proven relevant and helpful when investigating predicative possession in South Saami. The classification takes into account the properties of the possessor (e.g. human/non-human) and the possessed (e.g. animate/inanimate), and the type of relation of possession (e.g. physical, abstract, or temporal possession, as well as alienable or inalienable). All of these different kinds of possession are illustrated below with examples from Heine (1997) for the most part; some come from Stassen (2009).

The notion of alienability is very important in the theory and description of possession. Alienable and inalienable possession present conceptually quite different notions. Alienable possession is hardly controversial; in many ways, it presents a standard possessive notion. According to Stassen, this type “indicates ‘ownership’ in the narrow juridical sense.” (Stassen 2009:16). Inalienable possession on the other hand has been the matter of debate. It has been discussed whether inalienable possession, also called “inherent”, “intimate” or “inseparable” (Heine 1997:10), is in fact a type of (true) possession (ibid.:17). It has been proposed that inalienable possession might be described as a lexical feature instead (Heine 1997:17). However, I believe that, when carrying out a description of possession in a specific language, the category of alienability should not be neglected. This point of view is supported by the fact that a possessed in some languages can be marked both as alienable and inalienable (cf. Heine (1997:17–18) and the examples provided there).

Physical possession

When the possessor and the possessed are “physically associated with one another at reference time”, the possessive relation can be described as physical (a) (Heine 1997:34):

(a)  I want to fill in this form; do you have a pen?

Temporary possession

Temporary possession implies that the possessor may “dispose of” the possessed but does not legally own it, as in example (b) (Heine 1997:34):

(b)  I have a car that I use to go to the office but it belongs to Elliot.

Permanent possession

In permanent possession, the possessor is the legal and official owner of the possessed (c) (Heine 1997:34):

(c)  Elliot has a car but I use it all the time.

Stassen, for instance, excludes inalienable possession from his work (Stassen 2009:24).
This notion of possession describes the prototypical case of alienable possession as Stassen (2009:16) defines it.

Abstract possession

Relations where the possessed is “a concept that is not visible or tangible, like a disease, a feeling, or some other psychological state”, as in example (d), are classified as abstract possession (Heine 1997:34):

(d) They have no time/no mercy.

Inalienable possession

Inalienable possession is defined as a relation where the possessed is inseparable from the possessor (Heine 1997:34). Both body-parts and kinship are part of this category (e):

(e) I have blue eyes/two siblings.

Inanimate inalienable possession

Inanimate entities are understood as being possessors as well. The notion of inanimate, inalienable possession is also called “part-whole relationship” (Heine 1997:35): “[T]he possessor is inanimate, and the possessee and the possessor are conceived of as being inseparable”. An example is presented in (f):

(f) The room has two windows. That tree has few branches.

Inanimate alienable possession

Possessive relations where the possessor and the possessed are inanimate but separable are classified as inanimate alienable possession (g):

(g) That tree has crows on it. The library has a lot of books.

As already mentioned, it is questionable whether inanimate possessive relationships should be classified as true possession, as this notion “does not involve control of the possessor over the possessee.” (Stassen 2009:17). However, Heine (1997:36) treats such notions as possession, the main reason being that many languages (including English) encode this notion identically to other, more “prototypical” notions of possession. I will follow this classification and include this kind of inanimate possessive relation in my study.

Other notions may require different coding in languages of the world; in English, they are all expressed with the transitive verb have. This means that different notions can coincide in a construction, as the following example characterises (Heine 1997:35): I have your book, but I have it at home: the predicative possession is both temporal and physical.

Apart from these notions, there are other features that might be relevant for the present study which are not mentioned in Heine (1997). Thus, in addition to the notions described
above, the following features are taken into account in the investigation of predicative possession in South Saami: Is there a difference between a pronoun and a noun possessor? Is there a difference between a human and an animate, non-human possessor? Does number or person play any role? Is definiteness of the possessor relevant? How are kinship relations encoded? Is negated possession expressed in the same way?

2.1.3 A typology of predicative possession

Having become acquainted with the different notions of possession, the next issue at hand is to check the cross-linguistic distribution of the different encodings of predicative possession. The following is an overview of some of the main structural strategies used to encode predicative possession. As it will become apparent, only a handful of the constructions of predicative possession are relevant for South Saami; that is, the locational, the genitive and the have-possessive. However the complete synopsis is relevant in order to better situate South Saami in a typological context.

The overview, including analyses and terminology, follows Stassen’s typology (2009). I will use the term possessor (PR) and possessed (PD) in this work.

Stassen’s typology of possession is based on “the encoding of the possessor and the possessee in terms of their grammatical function” (Stassen 2009:48; my italics). It comprises four basic types of predicative possession, and a number of “non-standard” types (which, however, according to Stassen, can be aligned with the four basic types (Stassen 2009:48)). The following subsections present the four basic types as well as a fifth relevant type, a genitive possessive. The first three possessive types have in common the characteristic of being syntactically intransitive (Stassen 2009:49).

2.1.3.1 Locational possessive

The first basic type in Stassen’s typology is the so-called locational possessive (ibid.:48). The predicative possession is expressed with a locative or existential sentence, usually containing an intransitive verb to be or to exist. In a “limited number of cases” (ibid.:49), this verb may not be present.

The locational possessive is defined with the following three features (ibid.:49–50): First, it is a “construction [that] contains a locative/existential predicate, in the form of a verb with the rough meaning of ‘to be’. ”; second, it is a construction in which the possessor is marked in “some oblique, adverbial case form” (including case affixes or adpositions); third, it is a construction in which the possessed is marked as the “grammatical subject of the predicate”, fulfilling all the morphosyntactic requirements of a subject, such as agreement with the verb, or being marked with the subject case. A schematic glossing of the construction takes the following form (5) (Stassen 2009:50):

(5) At/to PR, (there) is/exists a PD.

An example can be found in (6) (Cited from Stassen 2009:52). Even North Saami exhibits this structure, as presented in example (7):
Samoan (Austronesian, Polynesian)

\[\text{sā i ai iā Sina se ta’avale}\]

PAST exist to S. ART car

‘Sina had a car.’ (Marsack 1975:54)

North Saami (Uralic, Finno-Ugric)

\[\text{Máhte-s leat odda sabahe-t}\]

Matthew-LOC.SG be.PRES.3PL new ski-NOM.PL

‘Mattis has new skis.’ (Nickel 1994:495)

Remember, however, that the existential verb does not necessarily have to be present in all languages.

The locational possessive type is frequent in the world’s languages, especially in Eurasia (Stassen 2009:277ff). The norm in Uralic languages is a locational possessive (cf. e.g. Abondolo 1998:33, or Stassen 2009:296).

2.1.3.2 With-possessive

The \textit{with-}possessive is an intransitive possessive construction in the form of an existential sentence as well. Compared to the locational possessive, these two types present “morpho-syntactic mirror images of one another” (Stassen 2009:54): the possessor (PR) functions as subject, and the possessed (PD) takes oblique marking. Usually, the \textit{with-}possessive is a construction containing an existential verb ‘to be’; again, there are instances where the verb is not present (Stassen 2009:54). The structure can be symbolised as in (8):

\[(8) \quad \text{PR is/exists with a PD.}\]

Characteristic for the possessor is a marking with for instance a case marker related to a comitative (ibid.:55). (Other names for this possessive type are thus \textit{comitative} possessive, ibid.) The Papuan language Amele (9), and the Afro-Asiatic language Hausa (10), are languages which use the with-possessive (Examples cited in Stassen 2009:56):

9. Amele (Papuan, Madang)

\[\text{ija sigin ca}\]

1SG knife with

‘I have a knife’ (Roberts 1987:81)

10. Hausa (Afro-Asiatic, Chadic)

\[\text{Ya-nàa dà kudii}\]

3SG.M-CONT with money

‘He has money’ (Wolff 1993:495)

The frequency and the geographical distribution of \textit{with-}possessives are more limited than the other possessive constructions, i.e. the \textit{have-} and the locational possessive (ibid.:55).
2.1.3.3 Topic-possessive

The third intransitive type of possession, also formed from an existential sentence, is called *topic*-possessive. The topic-possessive shares some characteristics with the locational possessive (Stassen 2009:57): the existence of an existential verb and the marking of the possessed as the subject of the clause. It differs in the way that the possessor is marked as the “sentence topic” (ibid.:58), a marking that restricts the reference domain of the possessor (ibid.). The possessor thus “indicates the setting or background of the sentence” (Stassen 2009:58). A schematic description of this type is given in (11) (ibid.):

(11) *(As for) PR, PD is/exists.*

The construction’s definition by Stassen (2009:58) comprises, again, the existence of an existential verb ‘to be’, the possessed marked as the subject of the clause, and the possessor marked as the sentence topic of the clause. Mandarin provides an example for this type (12) (Example cited in Stassen 2009:59):

(12) Mandarin (Sino-Tibetan, Sinitic)

*Tā yǒu sān-ge háizi*  
3SG exist three-CLASS child

‘S/he has three children’ (Li and Thompson 1981:513)

The construction is slightly less frequent than the locational possessive in Stassen’s sample (ibid.:59). However “in the areas in which it occurs it usually forms the uncontested option” (ibid.).

2.1.3.4 Have-possessive

The *have*-possessive, the fourth basic type of possession, is defined as a syntactically transitive construction (Stassen 2009:62). The *habeo*-verb (Stassen uses the term *have*-verb) is a transitive verb which is unrelated to any existential or locative verb ‘be, exist’ in a given language (ibid.). Thus, the *have*-possessive neither forms an existential sentence, nor is it associated with the concept of location.

The construction is characterised by the possessor being marked as agent, and the possessed being marked as patient (ibid.). In languages with accusative alignment, the possessor is marked as the verb’s subject, and the possessed as its direct object (The majority of this type in Stassen’s sample have accusative alignment (ibid.).) The schematic structure is as follows (13):

(13) *PR has a PD.*

Apart from containing a transitive verb, the *have*-possessive is defined as a construction with the possessor being marked as the agent/subject, and the possessed being marked as patient/direct object of the clause (Stassen 2009:62). See the following example (14), cited in Stassen (2009:576):
Lithuanian (Indo-European, Baltic)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aš} & \quad \text{turià} & \quad \text{laũkà} \\
1\text{SG.NOM} & \quad \text{have.PRES.1SG} & \quad \text{field.ACC}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I have a field’ (Senn 1929:24)

This type is especially typical for Indo-European languages, but it is found in many other languages around the world (Stassen 2009:560), including Uralic languages. The following example (15) is from Pite Saami (Wilbur 2014:200), a Saamic language closely related to South Saami. The backlash \(<\backslash>\) indicates a “morpheme via stem alternation (not segmentable)”.

Pite Saami (Uralic, Finno-Ugric)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{jut} & \quad \text{almatj} & \quad \text{adna} & \quad \text{jāhk-o-v} \\
\text{if} & \quad \text{person\textsc{NOM}.SG} & \text{have\textsc{3SG}.PRES} & \text{believe-NMLZ-ACC.SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘If one has faith’ (Wilbur 2014:200)

Often, a \textit{habeo}-verb is recruited from another verb that describes “physical control or handling” (Stassen 2009:63), for instance “get, grab, seize, take, obtain”, which then undergo “semantic bleaching” (ibid.). Other sources of \textit{habeo}-verbs listed by Heine include verbs such as ‘hold’, ‘carry’, ‘get’, ‘find’” (Heine 1997:48). (Such a development seems to be the case for the South Saami \textit{habeo}-verb; see section 2.4.6 for the verb \textit{utnedh} ‘have’ in South Saami.)

2.1.3.5 Genitive possessive

According to Stassen, all other typologically possible types of possessive constructions can be incorporated in the typology presented above (Stassen 2009:70). Any possible subtype, despite being opaque or in some way different from the standard constructions, can be analysed as belonging to one of the four types introduced above. However, as this author points out, some typologies include a fifth type, the genitive possessive (which Stassen calls adnominal possessive (Stassen 2009:107)). It is a “relatively rare” possessive type compared to the four main types (ibid.:112), but this type is of relevance to this thesis and will thus be presented separately in this section.

The genitive possessive construction shares several features with the locational, \textit{with}- and topic possessives. It consists, in its standard version, of an intransitive existential clause containing a verb ‘to be/exist’. A schema is represented below (Stassen 2009:107):

\[
\text{PR’s PD is/exists}
\]

The grammatical subject of the clause is the possessed, just as in the previously mentioned three standard types formed with existential sentences. The possessor, however, is marked “‘genitival’”, that is, the possessor acts as a modifier of the possessed. Interestingly this construction recruits already existing marking of (adnominal/attributive) possession to express even predicative possession (Stassen 2009:107; Heine 1997:58). The grammatical marking of the possessor, usually a case or an affix, is identical with the marking in adnominal/attributive constructions.
There is, however, some variation (with)in the genitive possessive. The standard version marks the possessor overtly; however, many languages do not show overt marking of the possessor but a zero-encoding instead (Stassen 2009:110). Stassen differentiates thus between two subtypes of the genitive possessive: (i) a marked variant (the possessor is overtly marked with a genitive) and (ii) an unmarked/zero variant (ibid.:112). Type (i) is slightly more frequent in Stassen’s sample (ibid.).

Languages in which the genitive possessive type can be found are represented in most parts of the world (cf. Stassen 2009:108ff). Amongst the examples listed is Nenets (17), a Uralic language:

(17) Nenets (Uralic, Samoyedic)
   a. Nalgu-n porgo-da t’ana
      woman-GEN dress-her exist.3SG.PRES
      ‘The woman has a dress’ (Hajdú 1963:112)

   b. Nalgu-n porgo-da
      woman-GEN dress-her
      ‘The woman’s dress’ (Hajdú 1963:112)

In Nenets, predicative and attributive possessives differ with respect to the presence or absence of an existential verb.

In the genitive possessive, the existential verb, or the copula, does not necessarily have to be present. As will be shown, South Saami makes use of a genitive predicative possessive construction both with and without copula, and thus does not make the same strict distinction between attributive and predicative possession as in Nenets (17).

2.1.4 Overview of the distribution of predicative possession

The distribution of (at least some of) the possessive constructions is “almost certainly not random” (Stassen 2009:54). Therefore, an overview of the geographical spread of the types is of interest. In chapter 117 of WALS, Stassen (2013) provides a survey of the possessive types in 240 of the World’s languages, which will be presented in this section.

The typological classification of the survey is similar, but not identical to Stassen (2009). In the typological classification in WALS, the four main types of predicative possession are named (i) have-possessive, (ii) oblique possessive, (iii) a topic possessive and (iv) a conjunctional possessive. The conjunctional possessive is in principle the same as the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessive type</th>
<th>Frequency in the sample</th>
<th>Colour on map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Have’</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locational</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctional</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Distribution of have-possessives in Stassen (2013).
with-possessive. The oblique type consists of two subtypes, the locational and the genitive possessive. (That is, the genitive possessive is given equal status to the locational possessive, in contrast to in Stassen (2009).) The table above (Table 1) shows the distribution of predicative possessives among the 240 sampled languages. In this 2013 survey, the most frequent possessive type is the have-possessive, closely followed by the conjunctional possessive. The locational and topic possessive share a third position, and the genitive possessive occurs the least in the sample. The sample in Stassen (2009) is larger than in the WALS chapter (Stassen 2013), and arrives at a different conclusion. In the 2009 study, the locational possessive is the most frequent type (Stassen 2009:50).

The geographical distribution of the possessive types is represented in the following map (Stassen 2013):

![Map 1. Geographical distribution of predicative possessive constructions (Stassen 2013). See table 1 for values.](image)

All possessive types have areas in which they occur at a higher frequency (Stassen 2009:64). The have- and the locational possessive can be attested around the globe. The distribution of the conjunctional and the topic possessives is clearly focussed around some core areas.

However, of relevance to the present study are the have-, the genitive and the locational possessive types within the Eurasian region. All three types are found in this region. Both the have-possessive and the locational possessive are “ancient option[s]” in Indo-European languages (ibid.:560). In the sample, Swedish is one example of a language with a have-possessive. In Uralic languages, the locational possessive can be said to be the norm (ibid.:296) – Finnish is coded for the locational type – but other Uralic languages, such as Khanty, use a have-possessive. Two Uralic languages, Mordvin and Nenets, are coded for the genitive type (see the two red dots closest to the Scandinavian Peninsula and furthest north).

In order to provide a better understanding of South Saami, the language and its context are introduced in the following subchapter.
2.2 Genealogical and sociolinguistic profile of South Saami

South Saami is an endangered language spoken by the Saami, the indigenous people of Scandinavia. Some content in this chapter is neither strictly related to possession nor to linguistics; however, I believe that it is important nonetheless to help the reader understand the current situation of South Saami, the language which is, after all, the subject of this thesis.

In the following sections, when I speak of the Saami or the South Saami, I refer to the people; when I refer to the language, I will use the indefinite wording Saami or South Saami. I will use the (North Saami) term Sápmi to refer to the entire land of the Saami people, and South Sápmi to refer to the area of the South Saami (see 2.2.3).

2.2.1 Linguistic genealogy

The Saami languages form a sub-branch of the Finno-Ugric language family. South Saami is classified as the southernmost language of the West Saami sub-family (Sammallahti 1998:22). The endonym is Åarjelsaemien giele, ‘South Saami language’; the ISO 639-3 code is [sma].

![Figure 1. South Saami within the Saamic branch of Finno-Ugric languages.](image)

The Saami languages constitute a dialect continuum. This means that adjacent varieties may be mutually intelligible, but the further apart one goes, the less communication remains possible between speakers. Communication between a South and an Ume Saami speaker is feasible, whereas a South and a North Saami speaker would not be able to understand each other.

South Saami is located at the continuum’s southern end, and has only one neighbour, the closely related Ume Saami.

2.2.2 Number of speakers

The number of speakers of South Saami is difficult to determine, as there is no record of native speakers in Sweden or Norway. A language survey for the Saami languages in Norway, carried out in 2012, failed to gather enough data to make a statement about the number of South Saami speakers (Solstad et al. 2012). The Ethnologue ascribes South Saami 300 speakers in Norway and 300 in Sweden, that is, a total of 600 speakers (Lewis et al. 2016). Sammallahti (1998:1)

---

6 For an overview over the Saami people and its history, see samer.se.

7 See for instance Parkvall (2015) about the number of speakers of languages spoken in Sweden, and the challenges of calculating these numbers. Parkvall does not take into account different Saami languages.
estimates 300–500 speakers. It is probably reasonable to assume that there are about 300 to 400 native speakers of South Saami.

The Saami, like many other indigenous people, had (and have) to face discrimination of their language and culture. The 20th century was plagued with heavy assimilation politics (Norwegian fornnorskingspolitikk, Swedish assimileringspolitik) from the Scandinavian governments, resulting in many Saami not being able to speak their own language (the Saami were simply forbidden to use their language) (cf. e.g. Blokland & Hasselblatt 2003:122–123). The oldest generation of South Saami native speakers will soon pass away, and the younger generation’s proficiency in South Saami is limited due to the assimilation politics. However, interest for learning the language is increasing, as are the possibilities for doing so. It is possible that the number of speakers will increase, or at least stabilize, in the future (David Kroik, p.c.).

2.2.3 Territory

The speakers of South Saami are mostly located in a rather large area which I will refer to as South Sápmi. South Sápmi reaches from Idre in Sweden and Røros in Norway in the south to the Ume River (Umeälven) in the north (see map 2). South Saami is mainly spoken in the provinces of North-Trøndelag and southern Nordland in Norway; and in Sweden it is spoken in northern Dalarna, Härjedalen, Jämtland and parts of Västerbotten. South Saami is an administrative language in a number of municipalities in the area, and an official/equal language in two Norwegian municipalities: in Snåase (Norw. Snåsa) since 2008, and in Raarvihken (Norw. Røyrvik) since 2013 (regjeringen.no).
The map needs some further clarification. The area of Sápmi, the land of the Saami, is based on established maps reflecting the region where Saami live and have lived (and/or co-existed with Scandinavians). Sápmi, i.e. also South Sápmi, is a cultural region with no official borders, and many Saami would say that the eastern border is in fact the coast line. A historical map of Sápmi would have covered a greater area southwards (Zachrisson 1997; in particular p.9, 177, 219), and would certainly have included the coastal regions.

As with any language of the world, South Saami is not necessarily confined to one particular geographical area, but may be spoken outside Sápmi (for instance, in Oslo and Stockholm). Furthermore, a number of Saami are engaged in reindeer herding; a family may thus move between a number of different locations. This mobility means that a rather small group of speakers may cover a much larger area than just one single location. Thus, speakers of South Saami are found in the area depicted as South Sápmi, as well as outside this area. As it is not exactly known how many South Saami people (or speakers) there are, and where they live, a map showing the actual spread of South Saami is not possible to draw. Furthermore, the language boundary of South Saami is neither clear nor certain (see for instance Larsson 2012).

In that respect, the South Saami area above reflects both a cultural and a linguistic area.

2.2.4 Dialects

South Saami is usually grouped into a northern and a southern dialect (Sammallahti 1998:24). Differences between the dialects are mainly reflected in vocabulary and phonology, but also in the grammar. For examples in lexical differences, see the dictionary by Bergsland & Magga (1993). A detailed description and of the dialects can be found in Bergsland (1946:VII–X).

A phonological difference is found in word final b/m: Whereas the southern dialect has the (older) word final -m as in åtna-m ‘I have’, the northern dialect has developed a final -b as in åtna-b ‘I have’ (Sammallahti 1998:25). The accusative suffix thus is -m in the south but -b in the north.

Examples of lexical variation are numerous and easily found in the dictionary referred to above. An example of a function word is the contrasting connector ‘but’: southern speakers tend to use the word bene ‘but’, whereas northern speakers tend to use muhte ‘but’ (cf. North Saami muhto ‘but’).

2.2.5 Orthography

South Saami is one of seven Saami languages that have an official orthography. The South Saami orthography was officially accepted in 1978 (Bergsland 1994:14). It is written in the Latin script, and includes special characters from the Swedish/Norwegian alphabet: <å, ö/ø, ä/æ, Å> (texts from Norway use <ø æ> and texts from Sweden use <å ö ä>). Phonemes that are not expressed by the standard characters are represented as combinations of standard characters, especially affricates (e.g. <tj> for [ʦ]). (The North Saami orthography, for instance, chose special characters, e.g. <č š ž>.) This has the advantage that South Saami may be written

---

8 Other classifications are also possible. Hasselbrink (1983) for instance distinguishes between southern, central and northern South Saami
9 Kilding, Skolt, Inari, North, Lule, Ume and South Saami have an official orthography. The Ume Saami orthography was officially accepted on April 6, 2016.
without complications on a regular set of keys on a computer or other devices, which facilitates the use of South Saami in for instance text messages.

2.2.6 Language use in media and internet

South Saami is used in media. The Norwegian Saami radio has a short news broadcasting in South Saami twice a week, the South Saami magazine, and a news page in South Saami. The Swedish Saami radio station (Sameradion) broadcasts the same South Saami news contribution as the Norwegian station. On March 18, 2016, for the first time, a talk show in South Saami (Steinfjell & Steinfjell), was broadcasted (to appear once every week). This talk show is broadcasted in Norway, Sweden and Finland. The (North) Saami newscast Oddasat sometimes features news in South Saami, or interviews speakers that talk South Saami. The Swedish utbildningsradion (‘education radio’) presents a number of programs in South Saami.

Apart from a number of publications of children books written in South Saami by South Saami native speakers, the language is used on Facebook and to some extent in blogs. Parish magazines regularly publish texts in South Saami. The Saami newspaper Samefolket sometimes includes texts in South Saami. The youth magazine Nuorat features texts in different Saami languages, including South Saami. Most municipalities in which South Saami is an administrative language provide a South Saami version of their home pages, as do many other organisations, such as universities and the Swedish parliament.

In summary, South Saami is a small and endangered language, but seems to be fairly active in media. One of its greatest challenges is to bridge the geographical gap between many of its speakers. In that respect, social media and new media (e.g. online news papers, blogs, wikis) constitute good opportunities.

2.3 Grammatical profile of South Saami

In this third part of the background chapter, a number of grammatical features of South Saami are presented. Some of the features are unique to South Saami, others are also found in the neighbouring Saami languages (which will not be discussed further). The features listed below will assist the comprehension of the examples presented in the results chapter of this thesis.

In contrast to other Saami languages, South Saami has no consonant gradation, i.e. a consonantal stem alternation. South Saami on the other hand makes use of umlaut vowel assimilation, triggered by the vowel of the final syllable (i.e. a suffix, usually person or number markers) (Magga & Magga 2012:22). In (18), the third person singular suffix -a causes the stem vowel /i/ to change into /ä/: /i/ → /ä/ before /a/.

(18)  bissedh  >  bessa
      wash.INF  wash.PRES.3SG
     ‘to wash’  ‘s/he washes’ (Magga & Magga 2012:23)

South Saami verbs inflect for singular, dual and plural number (ibid.:2). Pronouns have singular, dual and plural forms as well, whereas nouns distinguish only between singular and plural (ibid.:41:51). Verbs and nouns agree in person and number as in (19):
(19) *maana-h stååkedieh*
child-NOM.PL play.IND.PRES.3PL
‘The children play.’ (Magga & Magga 2012:171)

South Saami has nominative-accusative case alignment, as presented in (20):

(20) *manne bierne-m vuajneme*
1SG.NOM bear-ACC.SG see.PAST.PTCP
‘I saw a bear.’ (Magga & Magga 2012:185)

As this example further illustrates, the standard word order in South Saami is *subject object verb* (SOV) (ibid.:192). The accusative and the genitive cases are marked differently (in other Saami languages, they can be conflated) (Magga & Magga 2012:40). Direct objects are generally marked with the accusative (ibid.:211), but plural objects can be marked with the nominative plural as well, if “the entities or persons denoted by the object constitute a pair or belong together” (ibid.:210):

(21) *gaameg-h noelebe jih suejnie-h buhtjiedibie*
shoe-NOM.PL take.off.PRES.1PL and shoe.grass-NOM.PL wring.PRES.1PL
‘We take the shoes off and squeeze out the water from the shoe-grass.’ (Magga & Magga 2012:210)

(Magga & Magga explain that a pair of shoes is considered belonging to a certain person, and ‘shoe-grass’ (used for stuffing leather shoes) refers to a specific amount of grass for each shoe (ibid.).) An alternative, and probably more elegant, analysis is to assign two plural object cases to South Saami (Blokland & Inaba 2015:378).

Adnominal possession can be, at least traditionally, marked with possessive suffixes, which are inflected for person and number:

(22) *tjidttjie – tjædtje-dh*
mother[NOM.SG] mother-PX.2SG.NOM
‘mother – your mother’ (Magga & Magga 2012:49)

Interrogative clauses can be marked with interrogative pronouns or adverbs (23a), with question particles (23b) or with intonation alone (23c). The question particle is not obligatory.

(23) a. *gåessie datne båatah?*
when 2SG come.PRES.2SG
‘when do you come?’

b. *mejtie viehke-m daarpesjh?*
Q help-ACC.SG need.PRES.2SG
‘Do you need help?’
Negation is expressed with a negation auxiliary ‘not.be’ and a non-finite negation form of the main verb, the *connegative*. The negative auxiliary in South Saami marks person, number, mood and tense (Magga & Magga 2012:38):

(24) \textit{idtjih guarkah} \hspace{1cm} \textit{NEG.AUX.PAST.2SG understand.CONNEG}

‘You did not understand.’ (Magga & Magga 2012:208)

For a comprehensive account on negation in South Saami, see Blokland & Inaba (2015).

The numeral \textit{akte} ‘one’ and the third person pronoun \textit{dihte} can be used respectively as indefinite and definite articles (Magga & Magga 2012:223). However, this is not an obligatory marking.

(25) \textit{bienje akte måaroe-m bärre} \hspace{1cm} \textit{dog[NOM.SG] one bone-ACC.SG animal.eat.PRES.3SG}

‘The dog eats a bone.’ (own data; [Younger Southern 1:21])

An important feature of South Saami is its tendency to omit copulae (Siegl 2012:206; Magga & Magga 2012:39; 182–184; 193).

(26) \textit{aehtjie lea gåete-sne} \hspace{1cm} \textit{father[NOM.SG] is house-INESS.SG}

‘Father is home.’ (Magga & Magga 2012:193)

When the copula is included, it can function as an emphatic marker (Bergsland 1994:37; Magga & Magga 2012:39).

2.4 Treatment of predicative possession in existing South Saami descriptions

This section contains a summary of what has been written in the grammars about predicative possession in South Saami. For this reason, the following literature reflects the current understanding of this feature.

The subsections which follow are organised chronologically, starting with the oldest source. To aid with discovery of relevant information within the available grammatical descriptions, three questions were posed: What does the grammar say about the genitive in its predicative possessive use? Is the verb \textit{utnedh} found, mentioned, or commented on in the description? Is there any information about the inessive used in predicative possession?

In addition to investigating the available grammars, the final sub-section includes a description of the verb \textit{utnedh} as it appears in the available dictionaries.
Apart from the works listed below, there are several other descriptions of South Saami, which will not be discussed here. Some of these descriptions are sketch grammars that do not cover predicative possession (such as Nilsson-Mankok’s *Systematik i Sydsamiskan, Vilhelmina-Vefsn* (1975)). Other sources that may be relevant but which are not included at this point are written in a language that presents a barrier. For completeness, two titles have to be mentioned at this point: the grammar and dictionaries by Halász (1886; 1891), written in Hungarian, and the recent dissertation in Finnish by Inaba (2015) about the Finnish datival genitive, which includes a chapter about South Saami.10

2.4.1 Lagercrantz (1923): *Sprachlehre des Südlappischen*

Eliel Lagercrantz’ description of the South Saami dialect of Vefsn is based on a corpus that the author collected on site in 1921. The municipality Vefsn is located in Nordland, Norway, and represents thus the very north of South Sápmi.

Notes on the genitive in predicative possessive use are found: “As subject predicate, the genitive in combination with the auxiliary marks the possessor” (Lagercrantz 1923:18). Note that the author’s example (27) includes the copula (auxiliary). However, the example, opening with *juo* ‘yes’, is clearly an answer to a question. The copula could therefore be understood to be emphatic (cf. my results in section 5.6, especially example 69):

(27)  *juo, mov leah gaarrowe-h golme-n jaepie-n*

   yes 1SG.GEN be.PRES.3PL clothes-NOM.PL three-GEN.SG year-GEN.SG

   ‘Yes, I (do) have clothes for three years!’ (Lagercrantz 1923:18; my glossing)

A second example of the genitive possessive found in the description (ibid.:4) is of a similar emphatic nature. The genitive possessive without copula is, as far as I am aware, not mentioned in the description.

Within a section on the use of auxiliaries, the verb *utnedh* ‘have’ is mentioned (ibid.:60). The following example (28) is provided (my glossing; the words in brackets do not follow the contemporary South Saami orthography):

(28)  *mejtie naan (suulie-b) åtnah? –

   Q some side.dish-ACC.SG have.PRES.2SG

   ‘Do you have any side dish?’

   åtnab, men ieb (guit) (buosmie-b) utnieh.

   have.PRES.1SG but NEG.AUX.PRES.1SG dry.ATTR food-ACC.SG have.CONNEG

   ‘I (do) have, but I have no dry food.’ (Lagercrantz 1923:60)

No examples of the inessive being used possessively were found in this description.

10 In this chapter, Inaba mentions the inessive possessive in South Saami a number of times (Inaba 2015:172–206) (Rogier Blokland, p.c.).
2.4.2 Bergsland (1946): Røros-Lappisk Grammatikk

Bergsland’s grammar is a monograph which attempts to provide a structural description of South Saami from a synchronic perspective. The passage on the use of the genitive indicates that the genitive is used to mark the possessor in predicative possessives (ibid.:136), but no further discussion of the construction is given. The following example (29) of a “bare” genitive possessive (without the copula) was found in another section of the grammar. The author notes that this predicative possessive construction is identical with the attributive use.

(29) mov maana
1SG GEN child[NOM.SG]
‘I have a child.’ (Bergsland 1946:281; my glossing)

As far as I am aware, the verb unnedh ‘have’ is not mentioned in the description. The inessive was not found in predicative possessive use.

2.4.3 Bergsland (1994): Sydsamisk grammatikk

Bergsland’s grammar from 1994 contains the following description of the genitive construction: the clauses of attributive possession can be “turned around”, resulting in a semantic change that the subject is said to “have or own” something (ibid.:53). The examples comprise of the bare genitive construction or the genitive plus copula construction (30) (my glossing):

(30) Laara-n (lea) bienje
Lars-GEN.SG (be.PRES.3SG) dog[NOM.SG]
‘Lars has a dog.’ (Swe/Norw. Lars har hund/ Lars har en hund)

The verb unnedh ‘have’ is not discussed in this grammar, but I did find an example of it being used within a different section of the grammar (my glossing):

(31) stoerre krievvie-m utnin
big.ATTR reindeer.herd-ACC.SG have.PAST.3PL
‘They had a big reindeer herd.’ (Bergsland 1994:59)

A possessive construction marked with the inessive was not found.

2.4.4 Vangberg & Brandsfjell (2007): Sørsamisk for nybegynnere

The most recent textbook for South Saami, used both in Sweden and Norway to teach and learn South Saami, is Sørsamisk for nybegynnere (‘South Saami for beginners’). When searching for examples of predicative possession in the book, I was only able to find the genitive construction. The rather vague explanation is given that the verb ‘to have’ in South Saami is the same as ‘to be’; the function of the genitive is not explained (Vangberg & Brandsfjell 2007:82). As a result, the only possessive construction described in the textbook is the genitive possessive construction with the copula, as in the following example (32) (my glossing):
 Maarja- lea bienje
   Marja-GEN.SG be.PRES.3SG dog[NOM.SG]
'Marja has a dog' (Vangberg & Brandsfjell 2007:82)

The genitive construction without the copula is not mentioned. The textbook does not mention the verb *utnedh* ‘have’, neither does it mention the inessive possessive.

2.4.5 Magga & Magga (2012): *Sørsamisk grammatikk*

The most recent grammatical description of South Saami, published in 2012, mentions two predicative possessive constructions: the verb *utnedh* ‘to have’ (Magga & Magga 2012:208), and the genitive construction (ibid.:212). About the verb is written that it can be used like the Norwegian *ha* ‘have’ (which may be seen as equivalent to English *have*) (2012:208). Examples include a number of possessive notions such as kinship, inanimate, temporary, and concrete possession. Other uses of *utnedh* (cf. section 2.4.6 and section 5.9) are not mentioned.

Concerning the genitive construction, the grammar provides examples with and without the copula (the auxiliary verb *lea* ‘be’), see (33)–(34) (my glossing):

(33)  *Laara-n lij bienje*
     Lars-GEN.SG be.PAST.3SG dog[NOM.SG]
     'Lars had a dog.' (Magga & Magga 2012:212)

(34)  *Aehtjie-n løyves voesse*
     father-GEN.SG heavy.ATTR sack[NOM.SG]
     'Father has (or had) a heavy sack.' (Magga & Magga 2012:212)

Interestingly, example (34) is translated both into the present and the past tense in the grammar, though without further comments. Potential differences in the semantics or structure of the predicative and attributive constructions are not mentioned. Theoretically, (34) could therefore also be understood as ‘Father’s heavy sack’. The grammar makes no comment on the fact that predicative and attributive possessives may resemble one another.

2.4.6 The verb *utnedh*

Besides the grammars, there are several dictionaries for South Saami, which I consulted about the verb *utnedh*. The meanings provided by the various dictionaries are listed below. As some of the works are much older than the others, we must consider the diachronic use of *utnedh*.

The oldest dictionary in my selection is the South Saami–Hungarian/German dictionary by Halász (1891), in which *utnedh* is listed as *haben; halten, behalten; brauchen, gebrauchen* ‘have; hold, keep; use, utilize’ (Halász 1891:25). Lagercrantz translates the verb as ‘have (not auxiliary), hold, use’ (Lagercrantz 1939:15). In Bergsland & Magga’s dictionary from 1993, an additional meaning is listed: ‘have; use; hold; consider (sth. as sth.)’ (Bergsland & Magga 1993:332). The online dictionary *Nedtedigibaakoe* quotes the three meanings ‘have; use; consider’, providing the following examples (35)–(37) (my glossing):
(35)  ‘to have, to own’
Manne veaskoe-m åtnam
1SG bag-ACC.SG have.PRES.1SG
‘I have a bag.’

(36)  ‘to use’
giele-m utnedh
language-ACC.SG use.INF
‘to use a language’

(37)  ‘to consider, to regard sth as sth’
Manne åtnam dihte dan stoerre
1SG consider.PRES.1SG 3SG so big
‘I think this is big’ (note the word order!) (Nedtedigibaakoe)

The most recent dictionary of South Saami was published in 2015 (Israelsson). In this work, utnedh is solely translated as ha (äga) ‘have (own)’ (Israelsson 2015:338). When searching the dictionary’s Swedish entries for anse, tycka ‘consider, think of’ (ibid.:171), and använda ‘use, make use of’ (ibid.:11), utnedh was not listed among the meanings; the verb bruka ‘use, utilise’ however is translated as utned (ibid.:25).

The verb utnedh exists in all Saami languages (Lehtiranta 2001:10). The historical meaning of the transitive verb utnedh is ‘hold, keep; use’ (Lehtiranta 2001:10). Historically the verb did not function as a habeo-verb. In all of the dictionaries listed above, the possessive use of the verb is stated, as are several other uses. Synchronously, the verb seems to be used primarily in its possessive function.

As example (28) shows, it can be assumed that utnedh was being used as a habeo-verb as early as 1939 (Lagercrantz 1939:15), and probably even as early as 1891 (see Halász 1891:13). Other uses of the verb, such as in example (36) and (37), will be examined in the study. I will argue for a semantic bleaching of the verb utnedh, from various, more concrete meanings towards the more abstract meaning of possession.

2.5 Summary of the background chapter

In this background chapter, theoretical concerns surrounding predicative possession were addressed, and the South Saami language was introduced. In the first part, I showed that there is a range of conceptual notions of possession, and the main ways of encoding predicative possession in the world’s languages were presented. In the second part, South Saami was placed in its sociolinguistic context, and aspects of the language’s structure were described in part three. Part four consists of a literature review of different grammars of South Saami with respect to the features that are relevant to predicative possession.

We can summarize that the have-possessive and the locational possessive are frequent in the world’s languages. South Saami is a small Uralic language, surrounded by two strong North Germanic languages, Norwegian and Swedish. For Uralic languages, the locational possessive is fairly typical; in West Uralic languages we also find genitive possessives (there are, of course,
exceptions to both). In most Indo-European, and especially Germanic languages, the predominant type is the *have*-possessive; both Swedish and Norwegian align to this pattern.

In the available descriptions of South Saami, mainly genitive possessives are mentioned. A *habeo*-verb is only mentioned explicitly in one description (Magga & Magga 2012). Other ways of encoding predicative possession are not described.
3. Purpose of the study

My goal in this study is to analyse and describe predicative possession in South Saami, and thus contribute to the description of South Saami as a whole. I also hope that this study will contribute to our understanding and knowledge of predicative possession in general, as it is carried out within a functional-lypological framework.

The focus of this study is the variation, distribution and use of different constructions that express predicative possession in contemporary South Saami. One further aim of this thesis is to describe and explain the speaker-internal variation of the use.

Predicative possession is investigated with respect to the encoding of different notions of possession, in order to create a functional description of the possessive constructions used in South Saami. There is certainly an assumption that have-possessive and genitive possessive constructions are typical in South Saami, although I do not intend to allow this assumption to blind me from the possibility that there may be other constructions.

3.1 Research questions

In the present study, the following research questions will be addressed:

- Which predicative possessive constructions are used in contemporary South Saami?
- How are these constructions used?
  - Which possessive notions can be encoded by the respective construction?
  - What influences the choice and the use of a certain construction?
- What structural variation within a construction can be found?
- Does the system differ between speakers? If so, how can the speaker-internal variation of predicative possessive constructions be explained?
- How can the presence of different predicative possessive constructions in South Saami be explained? What can be said about the history and origin of these constructions?

3.2 Limitations

This study has a number of limitations: First, only one method, elicitation, is used to investigate the feature. Elicitation is an efficient method for investigating a certain feature of a language, but the data do not always show natural language use. The time frame of this master’s project only allowed me to elicit data from six speakers of South Saami (See section 4.2 for a discussion of elicitation). In addition to elicitation, there was initially the intention to attempt a corpus investigation, in order to triangulate the data. I had started with this investigation, but later on, I had to discard this part for a number of reasons aside from the limited timeframe (See section 4.1 for a discussion of my choice of methods). Statistical statements on the frequency and distribution of different possessive constructions are thus not included in the study (but are an interesting further research question).
4. Methodology and data collection

In this chapter, the methodology and issues concerning the data are presented. The chapter is divided into three parts. In the first part, I will explain the choice of data sources. In the second part, the benefits and limitations of elicitation are discussed. The third part is concerned with the metadata about the native speakers of South Saami who participated in the study.

4.1 Choice of data source

South Saami is by no means an undescribed language. Literature on the language is available (see section 2.4), and there is also literature in the language (see section 2.2.6). There is even an online corpus of South Saami (SIKOR) with approximately 700,000 tokens. SIKOR stands for Saami International KORpus. The corpus is provided and maintained by the University of Tromsø, Norway (UiT).

As mentioned above, initially a corpus study was planned as a second, complementary method, with the aim to achieve triangulation of the results. A corpus can provide authentic, natural data, and, due to its size, facilitates statistical statements. However, for several reasons, this investigation had to be excluded from the study at a later stage. There were some technical problems in searching the corpus for the relevant constructions. For instance, the genitive predicative possessive can be identical in structure with the genitive attributive possessive. My limited competence in South Saami presented a further hindrance in working with the data in an efficient way. Furthermore, the corpus consists to a large extent of two text genres that are not representative for contemporary spoken South Saami. The first genre consists of biblical and religious texts which often present archaic language; the second genre consists of translations of contemporary administrative texts such as municipality home pages. Investigating the corpus as such would thus result in highly skewed and partly outdated findings. Lastly, some speakers of South Saami\textsuperscript{11} have judged the corpus’ language on one hand to be highly influenced by its Scandinavian source,\textsuperscript{12} and sometimes ungrammatical on the other. For these reasons, the corpus investigation was discarded. However, the corpus does include a number of genuine South Saami texts, which are of value to a future investigation of the matter.

For the present study, I have decided to focus on elicited data instead.

4.2 Elicitation

Elicitation is an efficient and reasonably fast method to gather language data (Bowern 2008:73), which made it a preferable approach in the present study. In elicitation, a consultant, i.e. a native speaker of a language, is asked to provide sentences that contain the feature of interest. There is, however, some criticism levelled at this method, and a number of limitations. It is not my intent to account for a detailed discussion of the method. However, some basic issues will be addressed in section 4.2.3.

\textsuperscript{11} One of these speakers is a PhD student of linguistics at Umeå University; another speaker has been working as a translator herself and was highly aware of a strong Scandinavian influence in her own translations.

\textsuperscript{12} Spoken South Saami is, of course, also influenced by Scandinavian.
Six native speakers of South Saami were consulted for the present study. The consultants are presented in section 4.3. Data was gathered in March and April of 2016. Four speakers were visited personally, and two speakers were interviewed via Skype. Five of the six elicitation meetings were audio-recorded.

4.2.1 Elicitation process

The elicited data are partly based on translation of sentences that I provided and partly on answers to questions; speakers were asked to respond in South Saami to a question that I asked in Swedish, in the most natural possible way. A limited number of questions were asked in South Saami. The questions are presented in the appendix of this thesis. Context for the sentences (e.g. “known information”, definiteness of possessor and possessed etc.) was provided with as much detail as possible. These comments on the context are partly included in the transcription. The aim, by asking questions instead of asking for a simple translation, was to minimise influence from Scandinavian language structure (e.g. word order, predominant use of the habeo-verb). However, the Scandinavian influence is of course still present, not least due to the general context of elicitation.

The questions and example sentences were constructed with respect to the notions of possession described in Heine (1997) and Stassen (2009) (see chapter 2 in this thesis). Apart from these notions, there are other features that might be relevant for the present study which are not mentioned in Heine (1997). Thus, in addition to the notions described in section 2.1.2, the following features are taken into account in the investigation of predicative possession in South Saami: Is there a difference between a pronoun and a noun possessor? Is there a difference between a human and an animate, non-human possessor? Does number or person play any role? Is definiteness of the possessor relevant? How are kinship relations encoded? Is negated possession expressed in the same way?

All speakers were asked the same or similar questions. However, follow-up questions and the initiative of the speaker in providing additional information and other constructions often resulted in different sets of data for each speaker. As a consequence of the analysis of results from the first elicitations, later elicitations provide more fine-grained questions and some additional features that were not addressed earlier. A typical question-answer pair is the following:

(38)  (Me):  *Har du syskon?*  
‘Do you have siblings?’

(Consultant):  *Mov akte vielle jih akte åabpa*  
1SG.GEN one brother[NOM.SG] and one sister[NOM.SG]  
‘I have a/one brother and a/one sister.’

[Younger Northern 2:15a]

The answer represents a kinship possessive relation, with a human possessor and human possessed.

When I asked for a translation of a sentence, I aimed at creating a context or a storyline to the example sentence, which the speaker could relate to. The sentence in question was thereby
set in a context to a certain extent. See the appendix for the basic set of questions and examples used in the elicitation.

What makes the field work situation with South Saam slightly unusual is the fact that many South Saami speakers have studied Saami (usually South Saami, but sometimes also North Saami) to some degree. This means that many speakers were able to analyse their own examples, and comment on the structure

4.2.2 Analysis of the data

All elicited examples were analysed with respect to the notions and parameters of possession. The possessive constructions are tagged for the type of construction (“verb, GEN, GEN+COP, INESS”) and the notion of possession (e.g. physical, temporal, abstract, kinship etc.). The possessor was tagged for animacy, human/non-human, number & person, noun/pronoun; the possessed was tagged for animacy and alienability. Each clause was tagged for tense (present/past) and polarity (affirmative/negative). Definiteness (of the possessor) is not tagged but is taken into account in the analyses. The table number 2 below is an excerpt of this data and shall serve as an example of how I arrived at the results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>Anim PR</th>
<th>Hum PR</th>
<th>Pron PR</th>
<th>Anim PD</th>
<th>Alien PD</th>
<th>PRES</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>Notion</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1SG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Kinship</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (1SG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kinship</td>
<td>GEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (1SG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (1SG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Body part</td>
<td>GEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (1SG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Body part</td>
<td>GEN+COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 (1SG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>GEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 (3SG)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Part in entity</td>
<td>INESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0 (3SG)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Part of entity</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 (3SG)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Body part</td>
<td>GEN(Zero)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 (1SG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Body part</td>
<td>GEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 (1SG)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?Animal</td>
<td>GEN+COP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Excerpt of the analysis table of the first younger northern consultant YS1.

A feature coded with <1> applies to the example, a feature coded <0> does not apply to it. For instance, the example number (1) of table 2 has a possessor that is animate, human and a pronoun; the possessed is animate and inalienable, the clause is in present tense and not negated. The notion expressed is kinship, the possessive construction used is the have-possessive. The sentence is presented below (39):

(39) jaavoe man akte åahpa-m åtnam 
    yes 1SG.NOM one sister-ACC.SG have.PRES.1SG
    'Yes, I have a sister'
    [Younger Southern 1:2a]

The possible encodings of possessive notions by different constructions are presented in chapter 5 under section 5.3.
4.2.3 Limitations of elicitation

Elicitation is a method that presents several challenges and a number of problems. One main challenge is to “move away from assumptions from the languages you know well”, in order to detect other, new structures (Bowern 2008:102). Furthermore, an analysis must not be based on just a few sentences; that is, a structure has to be confirmed with different variables and by different speakers (ibid.:76). A related problem is that, to a large extent, the elicitation questions direct the answers, and may thus create a bias in the data. In other words, “you only get what you ask for”, and it is possible to miss or overlook relevant features. It is also natural that analyses of the earliest data may result in hypotheses that influence subsequent elicitation (ibid.). Therefore, it can be beneficial to meet the same consultant several times.

An advantage of elicitation is the possibility for “negative data”, that is, judgements about the grammaticality, acceptability and unacceptability of the sentences by the consultants (ibid.:78). In my case, such questions led to valuable comments on differences between prescriptive and descriptive language. Beside the possibility of testing for certain constructions, it is also possible to ask the consultant for slight modifications of the example provided.

There is another classical problem inherent to elicitation. It has to do with the context, and the awareness of one’s own language. Speakers may think that they use (or do not use) a certain construction or pronunciation but actually use other constructions or deviations of the norm in naturally occurring speech (see e.g. Sakel & Everett 2012:117–120). This is a problem that I encountered several times during the data collection. Here is one particular example:

One of the consultants used a locational possessive construction to encode all types of inanimate possessors, for instance “the car has new tyres” (40), the car being marked with the inessive. I tested with another speaker whether she would use this locational possessive, using this example. However, that speaker did not accept this particular sentence (41a). Instead of possession, the sentence was interpreted as “in the car, there are new tyres”. Having hinted at the locational possessive, which the speaker had not been aware of, the speaker said that she would not use an inessive construction for expressing predicative possession. In later data, however, I was able to confirm that this speaker in fact did use the inessive construction (example 41b) – though not to the same extent as the first speaker.

(40) Younger Northern 1:

\[
\text{bijle-sne orre jerrie-h} \\
\text{car-INESS.SG new tyre-NOM.PL} \\
\text{‘The car has new tyres.’}
\]

[Younger Northern 1:17]

---

13 Some consultants call the contemporary, prescriptive South Saami rikssydsamiska, ‘Standard South Saami’.
The example shows that a speaker’s intuition might be disturbed by comments on the construction, or the bi- or multilingual setting of elicitation (using a meta-language; translating constructed examples).

However, due to the method’s efficiency in gathering relevant data quickly, elicitation was judged to be the most suitable method for the present study nonetheless.

4.3 Metadata of the speakers

When I selected the speakers, I strived to achieve a spread in geography and in age. I carried out elicitation with six South Saami speakers in total. Three speakers represent southern South Saami (one older, two younger speakers), and three speakers represent northern South Saami (again one older and two younger speakers). Of the six speakers five are native speakers of South Saami, and one has excellent proficiency in South Saami, acquired from the age of five onwards. All speakers that I had contacted about participation in the project responded positively and were willing to participate.

In the following sections, the metadata of each speaker are presented. These metadata are important for understanding the speaker’s background and for better evaluating the data. Each speaker is given a transparent name that indicates geographical origin and age.

In the result chapter, I decided to neutralize the category of biological sex of the speakers, and I will therefore use the female singular pronoun with generic reference in that chapter.

4.3.1 Ethical aspects

The consultants were informed about the ethical and anonymous treatment of their data prior to the data collection. The data are treated according to the ethical guidelines provided by The Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet 2002).

4.3.2 Younger Northern (1)

The first younger northern consultant (YN1) is a 27 years old female native speaker of South Saami living in North-Trøndelag, Norway. The speaker is multilingual and a native speaker of South Saami, North Saami, Norwegian and Swedish. The South Saami part of her family is originally from Majavatn, Nordland. The speaker uses South Saami daily, both within and outside her family. She writes and reads South Saami regularly. According to the speaker, she uses South Saami slightly more often than North Saami. The speaker has had some work as a translator where she translated municipal documents and a number of school texts. She eventually quit working as a translator, partly due to frustration over divided opinions on how
she should translate (i.e. “grammatically correct” South Saami, or South Saami “the way the people would say it.” Cf. section 5.8).

The speaker’s family is mainly engaged in reindeer herding; the speaker herself has had several, additional occupations, including Saami craftwork (North Saami duodji), which she has been studying.

Two elicitation sessions on one day were carried out in the speaker’s home town.

4.3.3 Younger Northern (2)

The second younger northern speaker (YN2) is a 28 years old male native speaker from Snåase, Trøndelag (Norway). The speaker’s family are native speakers of South Saami on the paternal side, and the speaker’s mother is an L2-speaker of South Saami. YN2 is a native speaker of Norwegian and South Saami. He speaks South Saami almost on a daily basis. The speaker’s father is engaged in reindeer herding; he was known among other South Saami speakers to use and teach many “old”, “genuine” words of South Saami.

The speaker studied South Saami A and B at Umeå University in 2006 and 2014, he was familiar with linguistic terms and had a great awareness for his own language.

Elicitation was carried out at two different occasions via Skype. The second time was after Easter. During this holiday, the speaker used a lot of South Saami in communication, which, according to him, set him in a better “South Saami mode” for the second elicitation.

4.3.4 Older Northern

The older northern (ON) speaker is an 80 years old woman living in the area of Grövelsjön, northern Dalarna (Sweden), which belongs to the southern South Saami area. She has been living there since the 1960s. The consultant is originally from Vilhelmina, which belongs to the northern South Saami area, and her language contained distinct features characteristic of northern South Saami. Therefore, she is classified as a northern speaker. She is a native speaker of South Saami and Swedish. The consultant does not speak South Saami daily, as there are no other speakers in the area; however she writes and reads South Saami regularly. Her family is engaged in reindeer herding. Her mother and grandmother used to be consultants to Gustaf Hasselbrink, the author of a comprehensive South Saami dictionary and grammar (Hasselbrink 1983).

The elicitation session took place at the speaker’s home in northern Dalarna.

4.3.5 Younger Southern (1)

The first younger southern consultant (YS1) is male and 18 years old. He is from the area around Røros, Norway, which belongs to southern South Sápmi. Since 2014 he has lived in Gävle, Sweden. The consultant is a native speaker of South Saami and Norwegian, and also speaks Swedish. His mother is a native speaker of South Saami and Norwegian, and also speaks Swedish. His father is a native speaker of South Saami. His father is a South Saami who, due to assimilation politics (fornorskningspolitikk), did not learn South Saami. YS1 speaks South Saami regularly and almost daily, however South Saami is not the dominant language at his home. He uses South Saami in other means of communication such as SMS and Facebook messages. He speaks South Saami mainly with the family and with his teacher during mother
tongue tuition (*hemspråksundervisning*) (the teacher is also from southern South Sápmi), and with a small number of people in his age group.

The speaker had a great awareness for the southern South Saami dialect, and was using vocabulary that belong to the southern dialect of South Saami.

The elicitation session took place in the consultant’s current home town.

4.3.6 Younger Southern (2)

The second younger southern speaker is a 24 years old woman from the area around Røros, Norway, currently living in Jokkmokk, Sweden. The consultant is not a native speaker of South Saami; she has learned South Saami from the age of five onwards and gained fluent proficiency during her teen years. However, she has learned South Saami in a “native speaker environment” and through native speakers. The speaker had a great awareness of grammar and was studying South Saami frequently through older South Saami narratives. She has also studied North Saami at Umeå University (with a focus on grammar) and in Kautokeino, Norway, (with a focus on spoken language).

The speaker has few people that she communicates regularly in South Saami with, but she regularly writes and reads South Saami. She sees a growing interest for South Saami, but does not perceive the number of speakers to be increasing yet.

The elicitation session was carried out at one occasion via Skype.

4.3.7 Older Southern

The older consultant representing southern South Saami is an 82 years old man. He was born and raised in Mittådalen, Jämtland (Sweden). He moved to Stockholm at the age of 16 to attend a technical school (*verkstadsskola*), but has also spent a couple of years in Jokkmokk, Sweden (which is located within the Lule Saami area). His native languages are Swedish and South Saami. He has used South Saami regularly, but not daily, over the past decades. He has even been a language mentor (*hemspråkslärare*) for South Saami.

Elicitation took place in Stockholm.
5. Presentation of the results

Predicative possession in South Saami is expressed by several different constructions: a have-
possessive and two kinds of locational possessives. In my analysis, I will differentiate between
the following four constructions: (i) a have-possessive using the transitive verb utnedh ‘to
have’; (ii) a “bare” genitive possessive without an existential verb present; (iii) a more standard-
like genitive possessive including a copula; (iv) a locational possessive in which the possessor
is marked with an inessive, and the existential verb is absent. These four constructions will be
described in detail in the following sections 5.4, 5.5, 5.6 and 5.7.

However, before describing these constructions in detail, an overview of the possessive
notions expressed by each of the constructions is presented in the following section 5.1, and the
qualitative and quantitative distribution of the four possessive constructions in the data are
discussed in section 5.2 and 5.3, respectively. Some comments made by the speakers about the
constructions are presented in 5.8, and the contemporary use of the habeo-verb among the
consultants is reviewed in section 5.9.

5.1 Qualitative distribution of possessive constructions among the speakers

In a general sense, the system, i.e. the use of the four different constructions of the six speakers
in the elicited data, is quite coherent. However, there are differences among the speakers worth
mentioning. The distribution of the different constructions by the consultants I interviewed is
presented in the table below. The have-possessive (“habeo”) was used by all speakers. Five of
six speakers used the genitive possessives (“GEN” for the bare genitive possessive and
“GEN+COP” for the genitive possessive with copula). The inessive construction (“INESS”) was used and/or accepted by all speakers, but differed considerably in its extent (see 5.7). A
plus < + > in table 3 symbolizes existence of the feature, and a minus < - > its absence. The
plus signs marked with parentheses will be discussed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YN1</th>
<th>YN2</th>
<th>ON</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>YS1</th>
<th>YS2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>habeo</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN+COP</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INESS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Qualitative distribution of possessive constructions among the speakers.

The interesting cases are those in which a consultant did not use all constructions. These
cases will be revised briefly in the following paragraphs.

In the elicitation session, the older southern speaker (OS) did not use the genitive plus
copula possessive, and provided only hesitantly one example with the bare genitive
possessive. Prior to the interview with the consultant, we both attended a South Saami class. In
this particular lesson, the students were taught that predicative possession in South Saami is
expressed with the genitive possessive only (following the textbook by Vangberg & Brandsfjell
from 2007, presented in section 2.4.4). During the class, the speaker reacted to this and
commented that this does not feel natural for her idiolect. In the following elicitation, the speaker provided in the very first example a genitive possessive, referring to the previous class. However, the consultant did not use the genitive possessive in any of the other examples during the elicitation. Two interpretations are possible: (a) The genitive construction was given solely in reference to the textbook and the previous class – and the genitive possessive is generally not part of OS’ idiolect; (b) The absence of the genitive possessive during the elicitation was a kind of hypercorrection or avoidance of the prescriptive position of the textbook, and in natural speech, the genitive possessive would be found in OS’ language. At the current stage, I can neither argue for (a) nor (b).

The older northern speaker (ON) did not use the inessive construction in an example where another consultant, YN1, had used the inessive. When I asked, the consultant did not accept the inessive in the particular example. However, another inessive possessive construction that I asked was accepted with a minor adaption: The consultant repeated the example but added the copula to the construction (see example 78 in section 5.7). The older northern speaker seemed to use the inessive construction in a more limited context than the younger northern speaker (YN1). That she used the copula in the construction could be explained by her age: Concerning the copula in the genitive possessive, the consultant said that “nowadays, they [the younger speakers of South Saami] do no longer use lea [‘be’]”. See also section 2.3, where I mentioned that South Saami is prone to omit the copula.

The third speaker that did not use the inessive construction immediately was the second younger northern consultant. Two elicitations were conducted with YN2. During the first elicitation, the speaker did not provide an inessive construction and said that she would not use the construction, but understood it nonetheless. The second elicitation took place after Easter, a holiday in which the speaker had used South Saami more frequent than usual. In this second elicitation, the speaker confirmed that she would indeed use the inessive construction in some contexts.

These three situations clearly reflect a problem of elicitation (cf. section 4.2). A description based on naturally occurring speech data would have minimised such issues.

5.2 Quantitative distribution of the possessive constructions among the speakers

In this section, the quantitative distribution of the possessive constructions in the elicited data is presented. Apart from differences between the speakers, there are differences in the distribution of the constructions within one speaker’s data. The elicited data is subject to bias and influence from the questions and follow-up questions that were asked, in addition to the methodological problems mentioned above. For these reasons, the numbers in the table below do not reflect a natural, authentic distribution of the different constructions and they cannot be given any statistical relevance. However, all speakers were asked the same or similar questions and presented the same or similar examples. Also, a similar number of examples were elicited from each consultant. Therefore, I think a quantitative overview is still of interest. See the following table number 4:
In total, 243 predicative possessive constructions have been elicited. The *habeo*-verb construction and the (bare) genitive construction both occur frequently and seem to be used the most in contemporary South Saami. The second type of genitive possessive, the one with a copula, seems to be used less frequent than the bare genitive possessive. The two genitive possessives together represent a frequently used strategy for expressing predicative possession in South Saami. The inessive construction is used the least and to a varied extent among the speakers.

The younger southern speaker YS1 provided five examples of zero-encoded predicative possessive constructions (this construction is discussed in section 5.5.1). I will argue that the zero-encoded possessive is a subtype of the genitive possessive. The zero-encoded possessives are included in the number in the genitive possessive slot of YS1; the number in parentheses excludes these examples.

In the following section, the use of the different constructions is presented.

### 5.3 Use of the possessive constructions

In the background section 2.1.2, several possessive notions were introduced. A number of additional parameters, such as tense or polarity, were mentioned in the method section 4.2.1. Different possessive notions can require different marking strategies in the world’s language; the parameters were believed to possibly have an influence on the choice of certain possessive constructions in South Saami.

As explained above in section 4.2.2, all elicited examples are tagged for different notions of possession and a number of other parameters. Considering the entire data, there is no clean, coherent pattern of the use of possessive construction to encode a certain possessive notion across the speakers. In the data set of one speaker, tendencies can be found, but these usually do not hold for the data sets of other speakers. Patterns of preferences for constructions are often ambiguous and contain exceptions in most cases. Nonetheless, a number of common observations can be made.

The general statements that are true for all elicited data are the following:

1. All notions of possession can be expressed with the *have*-possessive.
2. All notions of possession can be expressed with the bare genitive possessive.
3. No difference is made between temporal and permanent possession.
4. No difference is made between alienable and inalienable possession.
5. No difference is made between physical and abstract possession.
The following preferences are observed:

6. There is a preference to express inanimate possession by the inessive.
7. There is a preference to encode physical and abstract possession by the habeo-verb and by the genitive possessives.

There is an observable tendency for the inalienable possessive notion “body parts” to be expressed with a genitive possessive. The genitive possessive with copula seems here to be preferred over the bare genitive possessive. However, in the elicited data, four of six speakers used parallel the have-possessive to encode possession of body-parts.

The habeo-verb originates in a verb of physical control (see 2.4.6 and the discussion in 7.1); however, the have-possessive was not observed to be used more frequent for possessive notions involving physical control.

Regarding the additional parameters mentioned in section 2.1.2, the following statements can be made: There seems to be no difference in the choice of construction depending on the person and number of the possessor, nor on the presence of a pronoun/proper noun possessor. Definiteness of the possessor does not cause any difference in marking. No preference (of the have- or the genitive possessives) was found when expressing kinship relations. Possessive relations in the past tense can only be encoded with the have-possessive or the genitive possessive with copula; the copula is necessary as it marks tense. No difference in the choice of possessive constructions was found in sentences with different polarity (affirmed/negated).

An intriguing question to ask is what determines the choice of the genitive possessive(s) and the have-possessive. The consultants could generally not point out any difference in meaning between a have-possessive construction and a genitive possessive construction of the same example. When both constructions are possible, they are perceived as equally good or equally correct. Some consultants (e.g. YN2) said that the use of the habeo-verb is more inherent to less formal, everyday language use, whereas the genitive possessive was judged more genuinely South Saami. It has been shown that there is no difference in the possessive notions that can be encoded with the two construction types. However, in the context of a dialogue, or in a pair of questions, the choice of the respective construction is defined by the previous construction. For instance, if a question is asked using the genitive possessive, the genitive possessive has to be used in the answer as well. A question-answer pair, such as (42) is a mismatch and usually avoided (cf. Younger Southern 2:9):

(42) A: mah datne bijle-m atnah?
Q 2SG car-ACC.SG have.PRES.2SG
‘Do you have a car?’

*B: jaavo lea mov bijle.
yes 1SG.GEN be.PRES.3SG car[NOM.SG]
‘Yes, I have a car.’
The only acceptable answer for B would be a have-possessive construction. Thus, the possessive construction chosen in a first utterance determines the possessive construction used in a second utterance.

In my analysis, I am differentiating between the two genitive possessives, i.e. the bare genitive possessive without copula, and the genitive possessive with copula. I motivate this distinction in a semantic difference. The copula plus genitive possessive seems to put emphasis on the phrase, as in (43):

(43) jaavoe mov lea aaj datovre
    yes 1SG GEN be.PRES.3SG also computer[NOM.SG]
    ‘Yes, I do own a computer too.’
    [Younger Northern 1:3]

The consultant explained that she used the copula in the genitive possessive in order to signal that she, “just like anyone else”, also has a computer.

Several of the consultants explained that the copula adds emphasis to a sentence; however, it was also pointed out that in some sentences, the copula has a more neutral meaning and is “naturally part of the phrase”, as in (44):

(44) mov leah plaave tjielmie-h
    1SG GEN be.PRES.3PL blue eye-NOM.PL
    ‘I have blue eyes’
    [Younger Northern 1:13]

A diachronic development could possibly also be worth considering. In section 2.3 I mentioned that South Saami is prone to omit copula. The older northern speaker commented on the use of the copula, saying that “nowadays, people don’t use lea [‘be’] anymore”.

With the present data, the question of what triggers a speaker to choose either the have- or a genitive possessive construction cannot be answered satisfactorily. More data from spontaneous, natural speech or dialogues are required to answer this question.

I will now describe the four possessive constructions in detail. Most constructions have a “standard” formation and some slight variations. By “standard” I mean a clausal construction that exhibits the expected agreements, for instance agreement of noun and verb in person and number. First, I will describe the have-possessive.

5.4 The have-possessive

A have-possessive is defined as a transitive clause containing a habeo-verb that is not related to an existential verb (see section 2.1.3.4). The possessor is marked as the agent/subject of the clause; in South Saami, this is the unmarked nominative. The possessed functions as the direct object of the clause and is generally marked with the accusative in South Saami. The habeo-verb in South Saami is the transitive verb utnedh ‘have’. In example (45), the standard construction is presented. (Note that the indefinite article akte ‘one’ is used in the example, and that the article is marked with the accusative; this is not obligatory and does not always occur.)
(45) manne akte-m peanna-m atnam
   1SG.NOM one-ACC.SG pen-ACC.SG have.PRES.1SG
   ‘I have a/one pen.’
   [Older Southern: 3]

The possessor is a pronoun in the nominative, the possessed is a noun marked with the accusative. The habeo-verb occurs clause-final (South Saami word order is SOV), and agrees in person and number with the subject.

In possessive constructions, singular possessed are marked with the accusative case (as in example ((45)); the possessed is the direct object of the clause and thus typically marked with the accusative case. If the possessed is in the plural, it is marked with the nominative case in the entire elicited data, as in the following examples (46) and (47). (See even section 2.3; in South Saami, plural objects can also be marked with the nominative, if subject and object “belong together”.)

(46) manne maana-h atnab
   1SG.NOM child-NOM.PL have.PRES.1SG
   ‘I have children.’
   [Older Northern: 2]

(47) mov fuelhkie aaj bovtj-h utnieh
   1SG.GEN family.NOM also reindeer-NOM.PL have.PRES.3PL
   ‘My family also has reindeer.’
   [Older Southern: 9]

In the data, plural possessed are marked with the nominative, regardless of the possessive notion expressed in the construction. The accusative plural was not used in any of the examples. This contrasts with Pite Saami in which plural possessed are marked with the accusative (cf. example (92)). Possession thus constitutes a relation of “belonging” that qualifies for marking plural objects with the nominative.

In some examples, the object was found to be zero-marked, i.e. in the nominative, even in the singular:

(48) jaavoe man akte åabpa åtnam
   yes 1SG.NOM one sister[NOM.SG] have.PRES.1SG
   ‘Yes, I have a sister.’
   [Younger Southern 1:2b]

However, it seems that encoding a singular object with the nominative is restricted to kinship terms, as in example (48) above.

In the have-possessive construction, the personal pronoun may be omitted as in (49):

14 The older northern speaker ON used the final -b (instead of -m) characteristic for the northern South Saami dialect. See section 2.2.4.
If the pronoun is omitted, the subject is only marked on the verb; thus, it is inflected to indicate person and number of the possessor. The data is not exhaustive enough to state whether omitting the pronoun is more frequent in one specific person, e.g. in the first person.

In other instances, a lack of agreement between subject and verb was found, as in (50):

\[(50) \text{manne plaave tjelmie-h åtna} \]
\[1SG.NOM \text{blue eye-NOM.PL have.PRES.3SG} \]
\[\text{‘I have blue eyes.’} \]
\[\text{[Younger Southern 1:18]} \]

The possessor is a first person singular pronoun, the verb is marked with the third person singular form. This strategy is not restricted to younger speakers as demonstrated by the following example:

\[(51) \text{manne akte bijle-m åtna} \]
\[1SG.NOM \text{one car-ACC.SG have.PRES.3SG} \]
\[\text{‘I have a car […]’} \]
\[\text{[Older Southern: 13]} \]

The third person singular form of the verb was used for all numbers and persons of the subject, and seems to be a default verb form in many constructions. As far as I am aware, this strategy is not mentioned in the existing literature. It remains to be investigated to which extent the third person singular verb form is used as a “default” form of other verbs as well.

Word order can vary; instead of SOV, SVO may occur at times, but this is non-standard word order, and it appears to be the exception. Both younger and older speaker exhibit this feature:

\[(52) \text{bijle åtna nieljie jearr-h} \]
\[\text{car[NOM.SG] have.PRES.3SG four wheel-NOM.PL} \]
\[\text{‘The car has four wheels.’} \]
\[\text{[Older Northern: 15]} \]

Several speakers were aware of this fact and explained that this is due to Norwegian/Swedish influence.

Negated possessive constructions using the *habeo*-verb are usually expressed as in the following example:

\[\text{[Younger Southern 1:19]} \]

\[^{15}\text{The older southern speaker OS regularly pronounced <åtna> as [atna] and not as [otna].}\]
The negative auxiliary agrees with the subject, i.e. the possessor, and the main verb is in the connegative form. In the following example, the negative auxiliary does not agree with the subject in number, and the main verb is not in the connegative, but in the “default” third person singular:

(54)  
\[
\text{ij mov eejtegh bienje-m åtna} \\
\text{NEG.AUX.3SG 1SG.GEN parents.NOM.PL dog-ACC.SG have.PRES.3SG}
\]

‘My parents do not have a dog.’
[Younger Southern 1:3b]

In example (54), the function of the negative auxiliary seems to be closer to a negation particle, as it does not encode person, number and tense (cf. Blokland & Inaba 2015:386; this type occurs even in literary texts). It should be mentioned that the consultant who provided sentence (54) also provided an alternative with proper agreement, and was aware of the lacking agreement in (54) (see section 5.8).

In past tense constructions, tense is marked regularly on the habeo-verb:

(55)  
\[
\text{ovtsne bienje-m utnim, valla daelie dihte båarhte} \\
\text{earlier dog-ACC.SG have.PAST.1SG but now 3SG.NOM away}
\]

‘I have had a dog earlier but it is gone (dead) now.’
[Younger Northern 2:18]

The have-possessive construction showed considerable variation. In summary, based on the elicited data, it is possible to disregard the agreement between the predicate and the subject; the third person singular verb form seems to be a default that can refer to all persons and numbers. The possessed is usually marked with the accusative in the singular, and always marked with the nominative in the plural. The possessor, especially if it is a pronoun, can be omitted. No structural deviation was found to be dependent on the speaker’s age or geographical origin. However, the great majority of examples conform to the “standard” and show proper agreement. Several times, a consultant provided a standard construction but added a divergent, “colloquial” construction.

5.5 The bare genitive possessive

For the following reasons, I will discuss the two genitive constructions separately. First, in this chapter, the genitive possessive without copula is presented. I will call this construction the bare genitive possessive. As this construction seems to be more frequent and more neutral (less emphatic) than the other genitive possessive with copula, it will be treated first.
A genitive possessive is defined as an existential clause in which the possessor is marked by the genitive, and the possessed is (zero-)marked by the nominative. Syntactically it differs from the *have*-possessive, as the *possessed* is marked as the clause’s subject, and the possessor is marked with an oblique case (the genitive). An existential verb ‘be, exist’ is optional in South Saami. This means, the predicative possessive construction can be identical with an attributive possessive construction, as in (56):

(56) \[
\text{mov aahka} \\
1SG.GEN grandmother[NOM.SG] \\
‘I have a grandmother’ \\
[Younger Northern 1:20c]
\]

The possessor is marked with the genitive, the possessed is zero-marked (the nominative). No copula occurs. This means that the predicative possessive can be identical in structure to the attributive possessive, i.e. the sentence (56) could possibly also be understood as ‘my grandmother’ (cf. example 64 below).

A functional evaluation of the use of the bare genitive possessive shows that a construction such as (56) does indeed express predicative possession. In my data, several questions about possession were answered with the bare genitive possessive:

(57) Me: “Do you have a brother?”
YN1: \[
\text{mov vielle} \\
1SG.GEN brother[NOM.SG] \\
‘I have a brother.’ \\
[Younger Northern 1:44]
\]

(58) Me: “How would you ask me if I own a car?”
YN2: \[
\text{dov bijle?} \\
2SG.GEN car[NOM.SG] \\
‘Do you have a car?’ \\
[Younger Northern 2:23]
\]

(59) Me: “Ask me if I have a cell phone that you can borrow.”
YS1: \[
\text{dov mobijle?} \\
2SG.GEN cell.phone[NOM.SG] \\
‘Do you have a cellphone?’ \\
[Younger Southern 1:46]
\]

However, there is also a structural difference to the attributive possession which becomes evident when there is, for instance, an article or a particle included in the construction, see (60):

(60) \[
\text{mov akte vielle} \\
1SG.GEN one brother[NOM.SG]
\]
‘I have a brother’
[Older Northern-21a]

The clause in example (60) cannot function as a nominal phrase, i.e. it cannot be read as ‘*my one brother’, but only as ‘I have a brother’ (Both the second younger northern and the first younger southern provided this judgement). In the following example (61), an emphatic article hov\(^16\) is placed between the possessor and the possessed:

\[(61)\] kraana-n hov göökte bijl-h
neighbour-GEN.SG EMP two car-NOM.PL
‘The neighbour has two cars.’
[Younger Northern 1:49]

Again, this sentence can only be read as ‘the neighbour has two cars’ and it cannot function as a nominal phrase.

The examples above have either a pronoun or an animate noun possessor. Other examples of the bare genitive possessive include proper noun possessors and inanimate possessors:

\[(62)\] Anna-Söfe-n golme niejt-h
Ann-Sophie-GEN.SG three girl-NOM.PL
‘A-S has three daughters.’
[Younger Northern 2:46]

\[(63)\] bijle-n orre dekk-h
car-GEN.SG new tyre-NOM.PL
‘The car has new tyres.’
[Younger Northern 2:6]

The possessor can also constitute an adnominal possessive phrase as in (64):

\[(64)\] mov bijl-n orre dekk-h
1SG.GEN car-GEN.SG new tyre-NOM.PL
‘My car has new tyres.’
[Younger Northern 2:35]

The ‘car’ is both the possessed in the attributive possessive/noun phrase ‘my car’ and the possessor in the predicative possessive. That means, the ‘car’ as a possessed (PD) is also marked as possessor (PR).

Bare genitive possessive constructions with an animate, non-human noun possessor (‘the dog has a bone’) are not found in the data. In contrast to the have-possessive construction

\(^{16}\) See Kroik (2006).
described in 5.4, the bare genitive possessive shows little variation. The variation that can be found in the data is the presence or absence of articles or particles as in example (60) and (61).

The bare genitive possessive is used in questions with a question particle as in (65):

(65)  
mejtie  
dov  
bijle?  
Q  
2SG.GEN  
car[NOM.SG]  
‘Do you have a car?’  
[Younger Northern 1:36]

In my data, only the bare genitive possession was used in combination with a question particle, never the genitive plus copula possessive.

5.5.1 Zero encoding

In a number of examples, the younger southern speaker YS1 provided the following construction (I repeated the sentence to test whether I had heard something wrong, but the speaker confirmed it and repeated the sentence):

(66)  
bienje  
krævies  
voepte  
dog[NOM.SG]  
grey  
hair.human[NOM.SG]  
‘The dog has grey hair.’  
[Younger Southern 1:42]

The possessor is not marked with a genitive but is zero-marked. The possessed is also zero-marked. No possessive suffix is used.

Stassen writes that in some languages, adnominal possession is zero-marked, i.e. possessor and possessed are simply juxtaposed (Stassen 2009:110). He notes that “this zero-marked variant of attributive possession has its parallel in the predicative possession encoding” (ibid.:111). Thus Stassen differentiates between two kinds of adnominal predicative, i.e. genitive, possessives: a marked variant (in which the possessor is overtly marked and which Stassen reserves the term genitive possessive for), and an unmarked variant (in this subtype, the possessor is zero-marked) (Stassen 2009:112).

This latter, unmarked type of adnominal predicative possession occurs in my elicited data for South Saami, if only marginally. I regard the unmarked type as a subtype of the genitive possessive, and will call it zero encoding. Another example is given below:

(67)  
mov  
motorsygkele  
orre  
geengker-h  
1SG.GEN  
motorcycle[NOM.SG]  
new  
tyre-NOM.PL  
‘My motorcycle has new tyres.’  
[Younger Southern 1:54]

17 Just to be clear, Stassen understands “zero-encoding” to be an existential possessive construction in which the predicate (the existential verb) is not expressed, i.e. zero (Stassen 2009:79).
A possible alternative analysis could be that in this zero encoding possessive in South Saami, the *habeo*-verb is omitted and the possessed is not marked with the accusative. However, I discard this alternative analysis, for the following reason: South Saami is known, and prone, to omit auxiliaries in possessive clauses and in other constructions. That main verbs on the other hand can be omitted is not mentioned in the existing literature, and seems to be unlikely for the *habeo*-verb from a functional point of view.

5.6 The genitive plus copula possessive

The second genitive possessive is a construction which in fact represents the typologically unmarked, “standard” genitive possessive as described in Stassen (2009:107). In order to distinguish between the previously described bare genitive possessive in South Saami, I will call this construction the **genitive plus copula possessive**. The same defining criteria that apply to the bare genitive apply to this construction, though the copula is present in this type. The copula occurs in second position, between the possessor and the possessed.

In the elicited data, the construction is used less frequently than the bare genitive possessive, and it is at least sometimes used in different contexts. A standard, neutral version of the genitive plus copula construction is given below (68):

(68) bienje-n leah nieljie juelkie-h
    dog-GEN.SG be.PRES.3PL four leg-NOM.PL
    ‘A dog has four legs.’
    [Younger Northern 2:4]

The possessor is marked with the genitive. The possessed uses the nominative subject case and agrees with the existential verb *leah* ‘be’. As mentioned in section 2.3, the presence of the copula in South Saami can have an emphatic function. This seems to be true for the genitive possessive, at least in the present tense and in affirmative sentences. A typical sentence with the genitive plus copula possessive can be seen in the following example (69):

(69) jaavoe mov lea aaj datovre
    yes 1SG.GEN be.PRES.3SG also computer[NOM.SG]
    ‘Yes, I do also have a computer.’
    [Younger Northern 1:3]

When asked why the auxiliary was used here (the previous example in the elicitation was a bare genitive possessive construction), the speaker said that she wanted to emphasize that she owns a computer as well, just like “any other” person. However, as (68) above shows, it does not always have to be emphatic.

There are some circumstances which require the copula to be present. First, these are past tense possessive constructions as in (70):
Here, my findings differ from Magga & Magga (2012:212). In example (34) above, Magga & Magga provided a translation of a bare genitive possessive construction both in the present and in the past tense. However, these authors did not explain this circumstance in any way.

Second, all negated genitive possessives contained the negation auxiliary, which is a negative copula (71):

(71)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{ijje}, & \text{ij} & \text{mov} & \text{bijle} \\
\text{no} & \text{NEG.AUX.PRES.3SG} & \text{1SG.GEN} & \text{car[NOM.Sg]} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘No, I don’t have a car.’

[Younger Northern 1:4]

Negation is encoded with the negative auxiliary, which therefore has to be present and cannot be omitted. The negative auxiliary usually agrees with the possessed in person and number. See the following example:

(72)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{eah} & \text{mov} & \text{naan} & \text{maana-h} \\
\text{NEG.AUX.3PL} & \text{1SG.GEN} & \text{some} & \text{child-NOM.PL} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I don’t have children.’

[Younger Northern 1:21]

However, there was some variation in the marking of sentences with negative polarity. In the following example, the negative auxiliary agrees with the possessor instead:

(73)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{ijje}, & \text{im} & \text{mov} & \text{naan} & \text{bijle} \\
\text{no} & \text{NEG.AUX.1SG} & \text{1SG.GEN} & \text{some} & \text{car[NOM.SG]} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘No, I don’t have a car’

[Younger Northern 2:22]

The genitive plus copula construction can be used emphatically, but the copula does not always have this function. Many examples of the genitive possessive with copula in my data are non-emphatic. In some contexts, the copula is required syntactically: the copula is always present in genitive possessives in the past tense. In negated possessive constructions, the auxiliary encodes negation and thus has to be included.
5.7 The inessive possessive

A previously not described possessive construction in South Saami is a locational possessive. However, it is mentioned in some examples in Inaba (2015:172–206) (see section 2.4). In South Saami, the possessor is marked with the inessive case in this construction, therefore I will call it the *inessive possessive*. Its use seems to be more limited than the other possessives, and the examples in the data show a considerable variation. Some consultants use the construction rather frequently, others use it only in a few instances. However, the elicited examples of this construction have some features in common.

A locational possessive (Stassen’s term) is defined similarly as the genitive possessive: the possessive consists of an existential clause with an existential verb, the possessor is marked as the object of the clause, and the possessed is the clausal subject. In South Saami, the existential verb is not present in the standard inessive possessive. By *standard* I mean the most frequent type of construction found in my data. An example is presented below:

(74)  
gärja+gåete-sne  jeenj  gärja-h  
book+house-INESS.SG  many  book-NOM.PL  
‘The library has many books.’  
[Younger Southern 1:32]

The possessor is marked with the inessive, the possessed is marked with the nominative and functions as the subject of the clause. The possessive notion expressed in example (75) was provided or accepted by most speakers.

(75)  
tjiehtjeli-snie  buertie  jih  göökte stovl-h  jih  tv  
room-INESS.SG  table[NOM]  and  two  chair-NOM.PL  and  TV[NOM.SG]  
‘The room has a table, two chairs and a television.’  
[Younger Northern 1:34]

All examples of this possessive construction have an inanimate possessor in common. Both alienable (as in example 74 and 75 above) and inalienable possession as in example (76) can be expressed:

(76)  
dihte  muere-sne  jeenje  äeksie-h  
DEF  tree-INESS.S  many  branch-NOM.PL  
‘This tree has many branches.’  
[Older Southern: 12]

The most controversial example was the following (77), provided by the younger northern speaker YN1. Of all my consultants she used the inessive possessive the most frequently and in the greatest number of contexts.
(77)  
\begin{verbatim}
burt-sne  nielje  juelkie-h
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
table-INESS.SG  four  leg-NOM.PL
\end{verbatim}

‘The table has four legs.’

[Younger Northern 1:32]

Most speakers understood this sentence as ‘on the table, there are four legs’. The clause is in fact identical to a locational clause \textit{X is in/on Y}. Thus, there is both a structural and a semantic overlap of predicative possession and existential sentences in examples like (77). It seems to be little agreement between speakers regarding the proper use of the inessive possessive constructions. The older northern consultant provided an inessive possessive only when tested. However, the construction she provided included the copula/existential verb ‘be’:

(78)  
\begin{verbatim}
gärja+gåete-sne  leah  jeenj  gärja-h
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
book+house-INESS.SG  be.PRES.3PL  many  book-NOM.PL
\end{verbatim}

‘The library has many books.’

[Older Northern: 19]

This construction conforms to the standard locational possessive as defined by Stassen (see section 2.1.3.1). In my data, the inessive possessive with copula is provided once by the older northern consultant ON and once by the younger northern YN1.

In a few examples, some consultants added a verb \textit{gååvnesidh} ‘exist’ to the inessive construction. See example (79):

(79)  
\begin{verbatim}
dan  tjiehtjeli-snie  göökte  klaas-h  gååvnesieh
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
def  room-INESS.SG  two  window-NOM.PL  exist.PRES.3PL
\end{verbatim}

‘In this room, there are/exist two windows.’

[Older Southern: 19]

This construction is not used to express predicative possession. The verb is not used as an existential verb in other predicative possessive constructions; it occurs clause-final and not in the slot of the copula \textit{leah} ‘be’. Parallel to (79), the following construction was provided:

(80)  
\begin{verbatim}
dan  tjiehtjele-snie  göökte  klaas-h
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
def  room-INESS.SG  two  window-NOM.PL
\end{verbatim}

‘This room has two windows.’

[Older Southern: 14]

The speaker was clear about the difference in meaning between (79) and (80). However, it is difficult to point out a semantical difference between these sentences. Further research on the topic would be valuable.

It would also be interesting to see how the inessive possessive is constructed in the past tense, and in negated clauses (The data does not include such constructions). In the genitive possessive, the copula is necessary to mark these features.
5.8 Speakers’ comments on the constructions

Several consultants commented on their own examples, and explained why they had chosen a certain construction. These comments provide valuable information on how the individual speakers perceive the meaning of a construction. Some of the comments are presented in this section.

It has already been mentioned in the thesis that there is a prescriptive norm for South Saami. All consultants were aware of this norm. Often, they would distance themselves from this norm, pointing out that the norm might be “grammatically correct”, but does often not reflect the language that South Saami native speakers use. Several speakers therefore were taught (and had adopted this view) that their own language is (grammatically) not correct – despite representing natural language use.\(^{18}\)

The *habeo*-verb *utnedh* was judged to involve a more physical possession than the genitive possessives. Some consultants said they would prefer to use *utnedh* for notions such ‘I have a pen’, where the possessed is “owned” or held in a physical way, and that they would tend to avoid using the *habeo*-verb for inalienable notions such as body parts and kinship. Another comment was that *utnedh* is used more often for temporary possessive relations, or for possessive relations in which the possessed can be “used” for something. The examples in the data do not distinctly confirm these views. However, this might be a limitation of the method and data. Natural occurring language data, with many different contexts, could provide an answer to this. Some consultants said that the dominance of the *habeo*-verb is due to Scandinavian influence. (However, remember, for instance, that the older southern speaker used the verb almost exclusively.)

I explained above that a mismatch of a question-answer pair with different constructions is avoided (cf. example 43). The first younger northern speaker (YN1) pointed out that it very much depends on “the way you ask” whether the *have*- or the genitive possessive is more appropriate to use. She provided the following example:

\[(81)\] **Question:** *Do you have a brother?* (Swe. Har du en bror?)
**Answer:** *mov vielle.*
1SG.GEN brother[NOM]
‘I have a brother.’
[Younger Northern 1:52a]

\[(82)\] **Question:** *Does anybody have a brother?* (Swe. Har någon en bror?)
**Answer:** *manne vielle-m átnam.*
1SG brother-ACC have.PRES.1SG
‘I have a brother.’
[Younger Northern 1:52b]

\(^{18}\) I believe that South Saami is in a peculiar situation; on the one hand, it is a small, endangered language, and efforts should be made to revitalize and stimulate language use. On the other hand, there is a prescriptive norm and high expectations of what South Saami should be like. I think this ambiguity is a sensitive issue; the language of native speakers should be treated carefully and with respect, especially when teaching any kind of prescriptive norm.
Answering the question posed in (82) with the same answer as in (81) would not be proper South Saami, according to the consultant.

Several times, a consultant would provide two answers to a question; a “grammatically correct” clause, and a colloquial form. An example of this is the disagreement of the predicate and subject, and the use of the “default” third person singular form of the verb. The speaker commented on this construction saying, (recording [YS1_1; 09:10]) “dihte [referring to the 3SG form] works everywhere, and people understand, and that is what you want when you talk.” However, the speaker added: “But if you write, then you think much more about the correct inflection of the words.” The following example was provided; (83) constitutes the sentence with standard agreement, (84) is the more colloquial sentence:

(83) eah mov eejhtegh bienje-m utnieh
    NEG.AUX.3PL 1SG.GEN parents.NOM.PL dog-ACC.SG have.CONNEG
    ‘My parents do not have a dog.’
    [Younger Southern 1:3a]

(84) ij mov eejhtegh bienje-m åtna
    NEG.AUX.3SG 1SG.GEN parents.NOM.PL dog-ACC.SG have.PRES.3SG
    ‘My parents do not have a dog.’
    [Younger Southern 1:3b]

In (83), the negative auxiliary eah ‘NEG.AUX.3PL’ agrees in person and number with the subject eejhtegh ‘parents’. The connegative form utnieh ‘not.have’ is used for the main verb (this form, however, happens to be identical with the 3PL present tense form). In (84) on the other hand, there is a mismatch in number between the negative auxiliary ij ‘NEG.AUX.3SG’ and the subject eejhtegh ‘parents’. Also, the main verb åtna ‘has’ is not in the negative but in the positive/affirmative form. That means, the negation is only marked once, in the negative auxiliary, and not twice as in the standard construction. The use of ij in example (84) is described as “particle-like” in Blokland & Inaba (2015:386) (see also example (54) in this thesis). This use of the negative auxiliary as a particle can reflect yet another influence from the Germanic languages (possession in Germanic languages is negated by a particle). Blokland & Inaba describe a number of other contexts in which the 3SG negative auxiliary is used as a negation particle (ibid.).

One speaker had encountered situations in which the prescriptive norm was perceived as interfering with her language, i.e., the norm was judged better or more correct than her own language.

Some consultants (e.g. the older northern) had a clear opinion about when the use of the genitive plus copula possessive was required (85), and when the copula did not add information to the sentence and could be left out (86 and 87). The sentence in example (85), the consultant explained, could be an answer to the question *do you have green eyes?*
The copula *lea* ‘be’ lays emphasis on (the character of) the possessed, and should not be omitted in this case. However, in the following example (86), the copula was judged to be optional:

(86)  
\[\text{mov lea akte peanna maahtah löönedh}\]  
\[1SG.GEN be.PRES.3SG one pen[NOM.SG] can.PRES.2SG borrow.INF]\n
‘I have a pen that you can borrow.’

[Older Northern: 5a]

The consultant held the view that speakers of South Saami today use the copula to a lesser extent. A judgement about the optionality or obligatoriness of the copula earlier on cannot be made at this point. Making a copula fully obligatory may indeed be interpreted as emphatic. A diachronic investigation of the use of the copula in genitive possessives, and more data of contemporary spoken South Saami would be necessary to draw any conclusions.

5.9 Other uses of the verb *utnedh*

According to several South Saami dictionaries, the verb *utnedh* has a number of other meanings apart from ‘have, own’ (see section 2.4.6), namely ‘to use’, ‘to hold’ and ‘to consider’. In the elicitation, I aimed at stimulating for uses of *utnedh* meaning ‘to use’ and ‘to consider’. However, none of the consultants used *utnedh* with these senses. Instead, the verbs *provhkedh* ‘use’ and *tuhtjedh* ‘consider, think (of sth.)’ were used:

(88)  
\[\text{Im gäessie gännah bijle-m provhkem}\]  
\[\text{NEG.AUX.1SG when EMP car-ACC.SG use.PRES.1SG}\]

‘I will never use a car.’

[Younger Southern 1:1]

(89)  
\[\text{manne tuhtjem dov reektes}\]  
\[1SG.NOM consider.PRES.1SG 2SG.GEN right[NOM.SG]\]

\[saemie-n lieredh\]

Saami-GEN.SG learn.INF

‘I think/believe that you have the right to learn Saami’

[Younger Southern 1:52]
The online dictionary *Nedtedigibaakoe* provides a number of example sentences with these meanings. These examples were tested with some of the consultants. The examples were understood, but the consultants said that they would not have used *utnedh* in the respective examples. One speaker said that she possibly could have used *utnedh* in some of the examples. Another speaker reacted to the examples and said that the sentences did not sound natural. A comment from the younger southern consultant (YS2) summarizes the use of *utnedh* with meanings other than ‘to have’ quite well: She said that she *knows* that *utnedh* can mean ‘to consider’, but she had not *heard* this use herself.

The semantics of the verb *utnedh* are further discussed in section 7.1.

### 5.10 Summary

In the elicited data, four constructions are used to express predicative possession. The general use of the constructions among the speakers was similar, and most consultants provided all four constructions. However, the extent to which the four constructions were used by the consultants differed. The *have*-possessive and the genitive possessives are used frequently and can encode all notions of possession.\(^19\) The inessive possessive seems to be restricted in use and occurs only in inanimate possessive notions. No clear pattern of preference for one of the constructions to encode a certain notion of possession was found in the data.

The variation in use of the constructions among the speakers cannot be explained by areal distribution or age. More probable seems to be an explanation based on “individual” variation: South Saami is spoken mainly in a few “strongholds” such as larger families, or in certain areas that provide education (e.g. in Snåsa, Norway). It could be possible that in these areas, different standards evolve, and preferences for particular constructions are developed.

In order to provide a better understanding of predicative possession in the Saami languages and to contextualize the current study, the next chapter provides an overview of predicative possession in three other Saami languages.

---

\(^{19}\) This result conforms to the assumptions of Blokland & Inaba (2015:378).
6. Predicative possession in Ume, Pite and North Saami

The following is a brief overview of predicative possession in three Saami languages; South Saami’s closest neighbours Ume and Pite Saami, and North Saami, the Saami language with the most speakers.

6.1 Ume Saami

Literature on Ume Saami is scarce. According to a textbook for Ume Saami (Wiinka 2015), this language, most closely related to South Saami, uses both a habeo-verb (atnet ‘to own’) and a locational possessive with copula:

(90) ietni-enne leh niejte
mother-ESS.SG be.PRES.3SG daughter[NOM.SG]
‘Mother has a daughter.’

(91) mu-esne leh bile
1SG-INESS be.PRES.3SG car[NOM.SG]
‘I have a car.’ (examples from Wiinka 2015:60; my glossing)

The use of the inessive and essive is said to occur in free variation; in the southern part, the inessive is used more frequently, and in the northern parts of the Ume Saami area, the essive is used more frequently (Wiinka 2015:60).

An interesting fact is that the textbook clearly prescribes the use of the locational possessive, and discourages the use of the habeo-verb (despite pointing out that the verb has been part of the language for more than two centuries; ibid.). The locational possessive is judged to be more genuinely “Lappish”, a term used to denote Saami by the author (!).

6.2 Pite Saami

In Pite Saami, the typical way of expressing predicative possession is a have-possessive, using the verb atnet ‘have’ (Wilbur 2014:237). The stem ini- is an allophone of adne- (Joshua Wilbur, p.c.):

(92) ja dä ini-jmä gusa-jd
and then have-1PL.PAST cow-ACC.PL
‘And then we had cows.’ (Wilbur 2014:237)

The possessed is marked with the accusative plural (cf. section 5.4; in the elicited data of South Saami, no possessed in the plural were marked with the accusative but with the nominative plural instead).

The locational possessive exists in Pite Saami as well:
(93) **muvne lă akta mánná**
1SG.INESS be.3SG.PRES one child[NOM.SG]
‘I have one child.’ (Wilbur 2014:236)

However, this inessive construction is judged to be rare in Pite Saami and occurred mostly in elicitation (Wilbur 2014:236).

### 6.3 North Saami

The standard form of predicative possessive in North Saami is a locational possessive (Nickel 1994:495):

(94) **min bussá-s leat alit čalmmi-t**
1PL.GEN/ACC cat-LOC.SG be.PRES.3PL blue eye-NOM.PL
‘Our cat has blue eyes.’

The possessor is marked with the locative and the possessed is marked with the nominative. The copula agrees with the possessed.

Dialectal, especially in the southern North Saami area, the *habeo*-verb *atnit* is used to express predicative possession (Eriksen 2009:62).
7. Discussion

General typologies of predicative possession give the impression that typically there is one single way to encode predicative possession in a specific language. However, there are many languages which use several different constructions to express predicative possession. Often, there is one construction that is clearly dominant (cf. Stassen 2013). In the case of South Saami such dominance is not very clear, which made the current investigation interesting.

Four different predicative possessive constructions in South Saami were described in the results chapter. Of these, the have-possessive and the genitive possessives had been mentioned in previous literature. The difference between the bare genitive possessive and the genitive plus copula possessive seems to be a semantic one (the copula expresses emphasis). However, the copula is also required syntactically in the past tense, as tense is marked on the copula. Some instances of zero-encoded, zero-marked “juxtaposed” possessive constructions are included in the data. This construction has been assigned to the genitive possessives. The inessive possessive construction has only been mentioned rarely in earlier literature (cf. Inaba 2015). It is generally zero-encoded, i.e. used without the copula.

Some speakers did not seem to make use of all four identified possessive constructions. Neither did all speakers use the constructions to the same extent (that is, some speakers seem to have preferences for a particular construction). However, these two issues could reflect a methodological problem.

In the next section (7.1), I aim to explain the co-occurrence of the different predicative possessive constructions in South Saami, focusing especially on the have-possessive. In the section after next (7.2), I attempt to explain the variation of use of these four constructions among different speakers.

7.1 The possessive constructions

There are several aspects that ought to be considered regarding the presence of the different possessive constructions in South Saami, and their typological context.

In general, a have-possessive is not a typical possessive encoding strategy in Finno-Ugric languages (Stassen 2009:296). South Saami thus seems to be divergent in this respect. However, the adjacent Saami languages Ume and Pite Saami (and to some extent even Lule Saami) use the same verb to express predicative possession. A habeo-verb therefore seems to be fairly usual for the southern Saami languages spoken on the Scandinavian Peninsula. Yet, the misconception that the (southern) Saami languages do not use a have-possessive is still present among some individuals.20

Stassen shows in his study that many languages develop a have-possessive from other possessive types (2009:208ff). This development is called have-drift, defined as a process of transitivisation, in which possessive markers are incorporated into an existential verb (Stassen 2009:209). The have-possessive constitutes a “‘terminal zone’ in the diachronic development of possession constructions.” (ibid.:209). That is, they are not known to develop any further. Such have-drifts can especially occur in languages with a conjunctional possessive, and they

---

20 One of the consultants told me that she had heard a professor claim during a lecture some time ago that “the Saami languages do not have a verb ‘to have’” – which left her rather puzzled [OS_1_2016-03-13].
are much rarer in languages with locational possessives (ibid.:230). For the South Saami have-possessive, any form of transitivisation or have-drift can be disregarded. No re-analysis of constituents from the existential possessive constructions, or transfer of markers from these into the have-possessive has taken place in South Saami.

A more plausible explanation of the have-possessive in South Saami is to argue for a process of semantic change of the habeo-verb utnedh. It has been explained that a habeo-verb often originates as a verb that expresses physical control. A typical semantic field of such a verb is hold, keep, grasp. The habeo-verb in South Saami has been recruited from a verb of this type. According to the dictionaries, especially the older ones, the verb utnedh means – along with ‘have, own’ – also ‘hold, keep’, ‘use’ and ‘consider’. There is evidence for the possessive use of utnedh as early as 1891 (e.g. Halász 1891:13). Clear examples where the verb is used meaning ‘hold, keep’ are not found in the literature. Examples of ‘consider’ and ‘use’ are provided in the online dictionary Nedtedigibaakoe. These two uses of utnedh were tested with the consultants; the results indicate that today the verb is predominantly used in its possessive meaning. Other uses were partly accepted, but in general were not favoured by the speakers.

The development that utnedh has undergone is twofold: First, the verb has undergone a semantic change from concrete meanings (‘keep, hold’ and ‘use; consider’) to the highly abstract meaning of possession; second, by this change, the verb has gained another domain (i.e. possession), and lost other domains (‘keep, hold’ no longer exist; ‘use, consider’ are no longer in use). That means, the verb is used in new contexts. The extension in the use of the habeo-verb in South Saami is certainly influenced by language contact to Swedish and Norwegian. (Possession in Norwegian and Swedish is expressed with a verb ha ‘have’; although the verb is also used as an auxiliary – in contrast to South Saami.)

However, regardless of this influence, the semantic change of utnedh from a verb with concrete meanings into a verb with an abstract meaning follows general cross-linguistic tendencies. The development from a verb of physical control into a habeo-verb is described as “semantic bleaching” by Stassen (2009:63). This opens up for the following thought: the first step in the process of grammaticalization is defined as semantic bleaching, labelled desemanticalization (Heine & Kuteva 2002:2). It has been shown that utnedh fulfils the criteria of semantic bleaching, hence, desemanticalization. The second step of grammaticalization is called extension. This occurs when the item in question is used in new contexts. This accounts for utnedh as well; the verb is used in new contexts. Furthermore, Heine & Kuteva (2002) describe one type of grammaticalization as a TAKE > H[ave]-possessive grammaticalization process (ibid.:185–186), in which a verb ‘take’ constitutes the source for a have-possessive. The South Saami verb utnedh seems to fit into this classification. The next step in grammaticalization is a loss of morphosyntactic features (decategorialization), followed by phonetic erosion (Heine & Kuteva 2002:2; cf. also Lehmann 2015:15). These two latter steps are not observed in the case of utnedh.

Judging whether the habeo-verb in South Saami undergoes a process of grammaticalization or not can be a matter of perspective. In some points of view, grammaticalization is a binary concept, i.e. “something is either grammaticalized or not grammaticalized”, as stated in Lehmann (2015:13). Another perspective is represented by Lehmann (2015). He argues that grammaticalization should be understood as a “process of gradual change”, which also might
be “open-ended” (Lehmann 2015:15). According to the latter perspective, it would be possible to label the change of *utnedh* in South Saami as a process of grammaticalisation. However, this is a matter of perspective, and this interpretation will not be discussed further at this point.

Important to the present study is the semantic change and change in use that *utnedh* has undergone in South Saami (It would be of interest to investigate the semantics and use of “*utnedh*” in Ume, Pite and Lule Saami. In the Pite Saami grammar (Wilbur 2014), there are several examples with the verb *atnet* ‘have’ which seem to indicate stronger extension of the verb than one would find in South Saami. The examples include sentences such as ‘I have an Arjeplog frock on’ (Wilbur 2014:249), ‘I want to have fish’ (ibid.:238), ‘They had a good summer’ (ibid.:36), and ‘But you can’t have too big of a fire’ (ibid.:241).)

In short, the *habeo*-verb in South Saami originated as a verb of physical control and has undergone a semantic change towards an abstract meaning.

The second main type of predicative possession in South Saami is the genitive possessive. Genitive possessives are known to occur in West-Uralic languages. However, none of the neighbouring Saami languages, including Ume and Pite Saami, are known to use a genitive possessive. In existing descriptions, there is no discussion about the development of the genitive possessive in South Saami. When comparing the South Saami genitive possessive to Nenets, a Samojedic language in the Uralic family, another difference becomes obvious: Nenets distinguishes between predicative and attributive possession by the presence or absence of the copula. In South Saami, such a distinction is neutralized; even the genitive construction without copula expresses predicative possession. This means that there are two genitive possessive constructions in South Saami: one with a copula (the more “standard” version), and one “bare”, or zero-encoded genitive, without a copula. It has been pointed out that the two constructions seem to be used in slightly different contexts. South Saami is said to be prone to omit the copula in constructions. This would imply that the standard genitive possessive existed before the bare genitive possessive; the bare genitive possession could have evolved from the standard genitive possessive by omitting the copula. As the bare genitive possessive seems to occur more frequently and seems to be less emphatic, the use of the copula was able to be re-analysed and is now often used with an emphatic meaning.

A new finding in this thesis was the use of a locational possessive in South Saami, which is not mentioned in previous literature (apart from Inaba 2015). The inessive possessive construction in South Saami can be identical to a locational clause; the concept of possession in this construction is clearly related to the notion of location (and thereby to the *locationalist hypothesis*).

The use of the inessive possessive is limited, and the extent to which it is employed seems to be quite speaker-dependent. Age or geography was not a relevant criteria for its use, although the first younger northern speaker used the locational possessive most frequently. Taking into account that locational possessives are a frequent strategy in Finno-Ugric, and Saami languages, it should not surprise us to find South Saami using this strategy. The adjacent language Ume Saami is said to use an inessive construction to express predicative possession (apart from the *habeo*-verb *atnet*). It has been shown that, at least to a certain extent, Pite Saami also has this construction. In North Saami, the locational possessive is the norm. Therefore, South Saami seems to conform to the general typological profile of the Saami languages in this respect. An
interesting characteristic of this construction is its restriction to inanimate possessors in South Saami. Furthermore, in my data, almost all locational possessive constructions are bare/zero-encoded, i.e. they are used without a copula. Due to the limited amount of data, no differences in the use of these two subtypes were found. More data is necessary in order to describe the use, or possible patterns, more thoroughly.

### 7.2 Variation amongst the speakers

The overall use of the different possessive constructions among the speakers is comparable and somehow similar. However, there are some differences between the speakers, as illustrated in section 5.1 and 5.2. An evaluation, as sound as possible with the present data, of what triggers the choice of different possessive constructions has been given above. In general, the genitive and the verb are used to a similar extent, there is no evident semantic difference between the constructions. The choice of the genitive versus the have-possessive seems to be based on extra-structural parameters and on the context.

An intriguing question to ask is why some consultants use a particular construction more than another. For instance, the older southern consultant used almost exclusively the have-possessive; the second younger northern consultant provided only very few examples with the have-possessive; the first younger northern consultant used the bare genitive possessive construction much more often than the genitive plus copula possessive, and the inessive possessive much more frequently and consistently than all other consultants. The second younger southern consultant (the only non-native speaker) used all four constructions quite evenly.

Age and geographical origin of the speaker as such were not found to be relevant in the present data. A third possible parameter would be the individual proficiency of a speaker. I mentioned that context may influence the choice, and I have explained above that I am aware that my data is likely to be biased towards certain constructions. However, I also pointed out that the numbers of their distribution are still of interest. I will for now assume that the distribution is not entirely at random, and does in fact reflect the speaker’s language.

In endangered languages, speakers can have different levels of proficiency; some speakers may be native speakers who use the entire inflectional system, whereas other speakers may be less confident in their language use. Schmidt (1985) carried out a study about younger speakers of Dyirbal; she investigated the language system of speakers with different levels of proficiency in Dyirbal. Their respective system differed from each other, but the results pointed out that the system of each speaker was coherent in itself, and not at random. That is, an individual’s imperfect language did not represent a haphazardly, “incorrect” system, but constituted rather an incomplete but consistent system.

I believe that this explanation cannot be transferred to the present situation in South Saami. The consultants were, with one exception, native speakers which use their language daily, or at least regularly. Usually they speak South Saami in their families; for the younger speakers, this includes especially the older family members (who have to be assumed to be fully proficient native speakers). Therefore, it seems highly unlikely that the (younger) speakers would use “ungrammatical” constructions. It does not seem feasible to explain the variation in South Saami by different levels of proficiency. Also, some of the diverging, non-standard examples
in my data are described by other authors as well (i.e. the particle-like use of the negative auxiliary, see section 5.4; cf. Blokland & Inaba 2015). A new finding, however, is the use of the third person singular verb form as a default form: instead of proper agreement between subject and verb, the third person form is used generic. I have shown that this is not restricted to younger speakers, and it is possible that this strategy reflects Scandinavian influence on the language.

However, I think that an explanation for the variation can be found in the somehow separated speaker communities that a family, or other groups of speakers, may constitute. According to Schmidt’s (1985) study, the system of an endangered language usually becomes more divergent than in larger, constitutionalized languages. South Saami is a rather small language, and its speakers often live far apart from each other. Thus communication in South Saami mainly takes place between the same people (i.e. within a family, or within a school class, or within other speaker communities). Communication and thus “exchange” of language with speakers outside this group is limited. (Cf. the comment of the second younger northern speaker YN2 in 4.3.3; previous to the second elicitation, she has been talking more South Saami than usual and commented that she was in a higher “Saami mode” than in the first elicitation.) South Saami is spoken in some defined areas or within a defined group of speakers. Such a group does not have to be defined geographically and may also represent a family whose members live further apart. It seems reasonable to assume that in these “speaker groups”, different standards can have evolved, or have been passed on from older speakers. The use of a certain construction, for instance the use of the inessive possessive, may therefore become more frequent or consistent in one speaker group than in another.

Another interesting fact in this respect is that all speakers had a clear opinion of what is prescriptively “correct” South Saami. This prescriptive norm usually differed from their own language and own standards. Speaker would often differentiate between a “grammatically correct” language (the prescriptive), and their own language or “the way people actually say it”. Some speakers had experienced prescriptivism that judged their own language as being wrong.²¹ Often, such judgements came from (Scandinavian) teachers of South Saami, who were neither native speakers nor Saami. This might have influenced the system of an individual speaker as well.

The individual language, the influence of Scandinavian, and the degree of “Saami mode” seem to be relevant aspects in answering this question. However, a larger sample of naturally occurring language, as well as more consultants, would be necessary to draw further, sound conclusions. Neither a functional nor a structural explanation for the varying use of the inessive possessive was identified in the data.

²¹ The older southern speaker said that, once, a “professor held a presentation about the Saami languages and told us that there is no verb ‘to have’ in Saami”; the speaker felt questioned and confused. This anecdote hints at the responsibility which comes along when working with endangered, native people’s languages; false facts can possibly harm the speaker’s confidence and in turn the language use.
8. Conclusion

The aim of the study has been to describe the functional domain of predicative possession in South Saami. Previous to the study, two possessive constructions were known to exist in South Saami: A have-possessive and a genitive possessive. In the present study, yet another construction, a locational possessive, has been described. The have-possessive is expressed with the habeo-verb utnedh. The genitive possessive has two subtypes: a genitive possessive construction without copula, and a genitive possessive with copula. The first has a neutral meaning, whereas the second can be used emphatically. The locational possessive is encoded with the inessive case, and is used almost exclusively without copula.

The have-possessive and the genitive possessives can express all kinds of possessive notions. There are little restrictions for the use of these constructions, and they occur frequently in the data. The inessive construction is only used for inanimate possessors and occurs much less frequently.

The question of what influences the choice and the use of a certain construction could not be fully answered. Several different parameters seem to influence the choice for a particular construction, such as context or individual language. No structural patterns were identified to influence the use of the have-possessive or the genitive possessive. No evident semantical difference between the two constructions was found.

The have-possessive construction showed considerable structural variation, such as (lacking) agreement of subject and predicate (the third person singular as default), change in word order (SOV > SVO), omitting of the pronoun possessor, and non-standard marking of negation. The genitive plus copula construction is required to be used in past tense clauses and in negation, as tense and negation are marked on the copula.

The system between the speakers differs. However, in general, all constructions were provided by all consultants. Geographical origin or age was not found to be relevant in the variation.

We encounter several different strategies that encode the domain of predicative possession; some of them must be inherited since they are found in other Saami varieties as well as in other Uralic languages; others are obviously a result from intensive language contact. The have-possessive is expressed with a habeo-verb that has undergone a semantic change from a verb of physical control. The frequency and the use of the construction is quite certainly influenced by the Scandinavian languages. The genitive possessive with copula is typical for western Uralic languages; however, it is surprising that this possessive type is not found in adjacent Saami languages. The locational possessive, usually zero-encoded, is typical for many Uralic, and Finno-Ugric, languages. It is found in most adjacent Saami languages.

A limitation of the present study is the relatively small number of native speakers that have been consulted, and that the description is based on elicited data rather than on natural occurring speech. These issues would have to be addressed in further research.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Inflectional paradigm of *utnedh* ‘to have’

The forms in parentheses represent alternative forms, usually found in the northern South Saami dialects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INF</th>
<th>utnedh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>åtnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>åtnah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>åtna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>utnien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>utnede (utniejidien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>utniejägan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>utnebe (utniejibie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>utnede (utniejidie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>utnieh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>utnim (utniejim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>utnih (utniejih)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>utni (utnieji)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>utnimen (utniejimen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>utniden (utniejiden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>utnigan (utniejigan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>utnimh (utniejimh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>utnidh (utniejidh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>utnin (utniejin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>utnieh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>utneden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>utnede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNEG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>utnieh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST PTCP</td>
<td>åtneme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerund</td>
<td>utnieminie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbgenitive</td>
<td>utnien</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Elicitation questions

These questions and examples are the basic set used in the elicitation. Similar or identical possessive notions were asked several times and at different places with purpose. My aim was to minimize and check if the use of a construction in a previous example influenced the next. The letter <Q> in front of the clause indicates that the example was asked as a question, a <T> indicates translation. The questions were asked in Swedish.

1. Q: Har du syskon?
2. Q: Har du hund?
3. T: Jag har haft en hund men den är död nu
4. T: Hunden hade grått hår.
5. T: Hunden har en boll.
6. Q: Har dina föräldrar hund?
7. Q: Har du bil?
8. T: Jag har ingen bil, men min bror har bil
9. Q: Har dina föräldrar bil?
10. T: Bilen har nya däck
11. T: Jag har en bil (som jag brukar köra till jobbet med), men det är min mammas bil/ det är min mamma som äger den.
12. Q: Har du barn?
13. T: Min syster har barn
14. T: [NAME] har tre barn
15. Q: Vilken ögonfärg har du?
16. T: Jag har blont hår
17. T: Jag har långt hår, men min syster har kort hår.
18. T: Jag har en ny mobiltelefon!
19. T: Jag har en penna
20. T: Jag har en penna (som du kan låna)
21. T: Jag har en penna (som jag själv kan anteckna något med)
22. T: Jag hade en penna, men jag har tappt den
23. T: Det här är inte min bok, det är bibliotekets.
24. T: Biblioteket har många böcker
25. T: Boken är tjock, den har många sidor
26. T: Trädet har många kvistar
27. T: Jag hade en cykel men den blev stulen
28. T: Cykeln har gamla däck (de måste bytas)
29. T: Hunden har fyra ben
30. T: Min mamma har en bil men min syster använder den hela tiden
31. T: Rummet har två fönster
32. T: Rummet har ett bord och två stolar.
33. T: Bordet har fyra ben
34. T: Min bil, som jag har haft i tio år, har väldigt gamla däck (de måste bytas)
35. T: Jag hade en bil men den har jag sålt
36. Q: ask me: Har du bil?
37. Q: ask me: Har du hund?
38. T: Jag har inga pengar
39. T: Mormor hade tre syskon
Appendix 3: Elicited data

The following is a transcript of the elicited data from all six consultants. Not all examples are glossed entirely.

Elicitation session 1
Date: 2016-03-13
Consultant: Older Southern

1. mah dov naan peanna?
   Q 2SG.GEN some pen.NOM
   ‘Do you have a pen?’
   [OS_1; 03:00]
   (Provided hesitatingly)

2. mah datne naan penna-m atna?
   Q 2SG.NOM some pen-ACC have.PRES.2SG
   ‘Do you have a pen?’
   [OS_1; 03:10]
   Cf. (1) and (2); I got the impression that the speaker liked (2) better than (1).

3. Manne akte-m peanna-m atnam
   1SG.NOM one-ACC pen-ACC have.PRES.1SG
   ‘I have a pen’
   [OS_1; 03:30]
   >This is the “most naturally” way to say.

4. Manne mejadresse-m atna
   1SG mail-address-ACC have.PRES.3SG
   ‘I have an e-mail address’
   [OS_1; 05:30]
   >The verb is in the 3SG!

5. Manne akte daatovre-m atnam ja dam manne provhkem
   1SG one computer-ACC have.PRES.1SG and 3SG.ACC 1SG use.PRES.1SG
   ‘I have a computer and I use it’
   [OS_1; 05:50]
   (Pronunciation ja ‘and’, not jih)

6. manne akte-m bijle-m atnam
   I one-ACC car-ACC have.PRES.1SG
   ‘I have a car’
   [OS_1; 07:00]
   >not sure about the ACC form of akte ‘one’

7. Q: Did you use to have a dog?
   gaessie bovtsen+skååje-sne dellie manne bienje-m atnam
   when reindeer+forest-INESS then 1SG.NOM dog-ACC have.PRES.1SG
   ‘When (I am) in the reindeer forest [working with reindeers], then I have( =use??) a dog’
   [OS_1; 09:00]
8a bienje  meatan utnedh
  dog[NOM] with have.INF
  ‘Have a dog with (you)’
  [OS_1; 10:00]

8b provhkem    utnedh    meatan
  usually.have.PRES.1SG(“bruka”) have.INF with
  ‘I use to have a dog with (me)’
  [OS_1; 10:00]

9 mov  fuelkie aaj  bovhtj-h  utnin
  1SG.GEN family[NOM] also  reindeer-NOM.PL have.PAST.3PL
  ‘My family had also reindeers’
  [OS_1; 13:30]
  > bovtje is the southern variant for ‘reindeer’; northern dialects use bovtse

10 mov  tjitdjie  gujht(e)  jaa  mov  aajja  gujht(e)  lij
  1SG.GEN mother[NOM] PRTCL  yes  1SG.GEN granddad[NOM] PRTCL  be.PAST.3SG
  there(3SG.INESS)

desnie  bovṭj-h  utnin
  there  reindeer-NOM.PL have.PAST.3PL
  ‘Back then, my mother, yes, my grandfather when he was, they had reindeers there’
  [OS_1; 14:10]

11 mohte  mov  aehtjie  guhte  dellie  hov  ???  handelsstaden
  But  1SG.GEN father[NOM] Q.PRON.SG.NOM PRTCL/then PRTCL  commercial.town
  ‘But my father who then ??? handelsstaden’
  (OS’ father was part of the “commercial town”) 
  [OS_1; 14:25]

12 dihte  dajve  mij  […]  voesste?  Härjedal-sne  desnie  gujht
  DEF area[NOM] REL.PRON.3SG  Härjedalen-INESS 3SG.INESS  PRTCL

  mov  aehtjie  aaj  bovṭj-h  atna
  1SG.GEN father[NOM] also  reindeer-NOM.PL have.PRES.3SG
  ‘This is the area in which […] ??? in Härjedalen [a Swedish province] there my father also
  has(!) reindeers.’  [OS_1; 14:50]

13 T: I have a car, but it is not my car, it is my brother’s car.
  Manne  akte  bijle-m  atna,  mohte  ij  lea  dihte
  1SG.NOM  one  car-ACC  have.PRES.3SG but  NEG.3SG be.PRES.3SG  3SG.NOM

  mov  bijle,  dihte  mov  vielle-n  bijle.
  1SG.GEN  car.NOM  3SG.NOM  1SG.GEN brother-GEN  car.NOM
  ‘I have a car, but it is not my car, it is my brother’s car’
  [OS_3; 01:30] > atna is in the 3SG!

14 T: I have blue eyes.
  Manne  provne  tjelmie-h  atnam
  1SG.NOM  brown.ATTR eye-PL have.PRES.1Sg
‘I have brown eyes’
[OS_3; 3:30]

15 T: I have skills (Swe. kunskap).
manne maahtoe-m atna
1SG skills-ACC have.PRES.3SG
‘I have skills’
[OS_4; 05:30]
>atna in the 3SG!

16 T: the tree has many branches
dihte muere-sne jeenje àeksie-h
DEF tree-INESS many branch-NOM.PL
‘This tree has many branches’
[OS_4; 06:20]
>“The speaker tried to construct the meaning with the verb, but hesitated, and said that
no, the verb is not used here.”

17 dan muere-sne jeenje àeksie-h gååvnese
3SG.GEN tree-INESS many branch-PL exist.PRES.3SG
‘On this tree exist/are many branches’
[OS_4; 07:30]

18 T: The room has two windows
dan tjehtjeli-snie göökte klaas-h
3SG.GEN room-INESS two window-NOM.PL
‘The room has two windows’
[OS_4; min 08:05]

19 T: The room has two windows.
dan tjehtjeli-snie göökte klaas-h gååvnese
3SG.GEN room-INESS two window-PL exist.PRES.3SG
‘In this room there are two windows’
[OS_4; min 08:50]

20 T: This book has many pages.
dan gärje-sne jeenje bielie-h gååvnese
3SG.GEN book-INESS many page-PL exist.PRES.3SG
‘In this book there are many pages’
[OS_4; 09:40]

21 T: My computer has a lot of unnecessary programs.
dihte dan ov-novhts(?). program atna ... utnieh
DEF 3SG.GEN un-necessary program have.PRES.3SG ...3PL
‘This computer has unnecessary programs’
[OS_4; 16:50]

22 T: I have a headache.
mov ðejie-h säjierieh
1SG.GEN head-PL hurt.??...PRES.3PL
‘my head hurts’ ~‘I have a headache’
[OS_4; 19:30]
23 mov baenie-h jäelalh
1SG.GEN tooth-PL hurt.?? PRES.3PL
‘my teeth hurt’
[OS_4; 21:00]

24 manne ruder-ste
1SG back-ELAT
‘my back hurts’
[OS_4; 24:00]
NB. Expressing pain of body parts with the elative is still the default, according to OS.

25 mov juelkie tjööpkeme
1SG.GEN ben[NOM] broke.PERF.PRTCP
‘My leg is broken’
[OS_4; 24:45]

26 åååh manne dejeenje vuoi(?) dahte mui(?) daepien(?)
‘oh I have forgotten so much’
[OS_4; 27:40]

27 Im mujhtieh gaanah
NEG.1SG remember.CONNEG EMP.PRTCLE
‘I don’t remember’
[OS_4; 27:45]

28 manne dejeenje åsselommes atnam
1SG PRTCLE many thought have.PRES.1SG
‘I have so many thoughts’
[OS_4; 28:30]

29 dihte aehhtjien nome-sne
3SG.NOM father.NOM name-INESS
‘He has grandfather’s name’
[OS_4; 43:00]

30 man akte maana-m atnam
1SG.NOM one child-ACC have.PRES.1SG
‘I have a child’
[OS_4; 45:30]
NB man and not manne

31 mov bijle badde golme hjul-h utnieh
1SG.GEN car[NOM] only three wheel-PL have.PRES.3PL
‘my car has only three wheels’
[OS_4; 46:50]

32a & b manne akte bijle-m atnam, maf?badde golme hjul-h utnieh
1SG one car-ACC have.PRES.1SG that only three leg-PL have.PRES.3PL
‘I have a car, which only has three wheels’
[OS_4, min. 47:45]

NB. About akte as an article: “We use it. But the text books say that this is not used.” (OS_4; 47:50)
Elicitation session 2
Date: 2016-03-15
Consultant: Younger Northern 1

1 Answer to the question “do you have a pen?”
   Mov peanna mahta dam löönedh
1SG.GEN pen.NOM
‘I have a pen’
[YN1_1; 01:00]

2 Juo åtnam mejadresse-m
   Yes havePRES.1SG mail+address-ACC
‘yes, I have an email address’
[YN1_1; 02:00]
(hesitated; started with “mov”, then switched to utnedh)
OBS word order

3 Jaavoe mov lea aaj datovre
   Yes 1SG.GEN be.PRES.3SG also computer.NOM
‘yes, I have also a computer’
[YN1_1; 02:40]

4 ijj, ij mov bijle
   no 3SG.PRES.NEG 1SG.GEN car.NOM
‘No, I don’t have a car’
[YN1_1; 04:30]

5 tjidtjie goh ahkje åtna bijl-h
   Mother CON father have.PRES.3SG(1) car-PL
‘mother and father have cars’
(>indefinite object may be marked with the NOM)
OBS word order!

6 tjidtjie bijle-m åtna
   mother.NOM car-ACC have.PRES.3SG
‘mother has a car’

7 mijjieh utnejibie akte bienjem
   1PL.NOM have.PRES.1PL one dog-ACC
‘we have a dog’

8 mijjieh aapetijem bienjem åtneme/utneme
   1PL.NOM hela tiden dog-ACC have.PRES.1PL
‘we have always had (a) dog’
[YN1_1; 11:00]

9 mov lea bijle, muhto dihte bijle vielle-n
   1SG.GEN.be.PRES.3SG car.NOM but this car.NOM brother-GEN
‘I have a car, but it belongs to my brother’
Lit.: ‘I have a car, but it is my brother’s’
10a & b  mov bijle-sne, mam be luukie jaepe-n åtneme,   
GEN.1SG car-INESS, ??? 10 year-GEN have.PTCP

lea (OR åtna(!?)) gaaj boaries jerrieh
be.PRES.3SG really/very old tyre-PL
‘my car, that I have had for ten years, has really old tyres’

[YN1_2] 11  dahte viellen bijle, muhte manne dihte deenie vuojam.
DEF brother-GEN car.NOM but I drive-PRES.1SG
‘This is my brother’s car, but I drive it (“all the time”)’

11  dahte viellen bijle, muhte manne dihte deenie vuojam.
DEF brother-GEN car.NOM but I drive-PRES.1SG
‘This is my brother’s car, but I drive it (“all the time”)’

12  viellen bijle, meenje manne vuojam
‘my brother has a car, but I drive it’

13  mov leah plaave tjelmieh
1SG.GEN be.PRES.3PL blue eye-PL
‘I have blue eyes’

14  dan(dennie?) tjejtelesne göökte klaas
DEF room-INESS two window
‘this room has two windows’

15  tjejtelesne burtie aaj
room-INESS table.NOM also
‘the room has also a table’

16  dan(n?)je gärjesnegellie särjåeh
This(?) book-INESS many-page-PL
‘this book has many pages’

17  bijle-sne orre jerrieh
car-INESS new tyre-PL
‘the car has new tyres’

18  Mov åeje säråeh
1SG.GEN head hurt
‘I have headache’

19  mov jienje åssjalommes
1SG.GEN manythought
‘I have many thoughts’

20a  mov maana
1SG.GEN child.NOM
‘I have (a) child’
[YN1_2; 17:40]

20b  mov maana-h
1SG.GEN child-PL
‘I have children’
[YN1_2; 17:40]
20c  mov aahka
   1SG.GEN grandmother[NOM]
   ‘I have a grandmother’
   [YN1_2; 18:00]

21  eah mov naan maana-h
   3PL.NEG  1SG.GEN some child-PL
   ‘I don’t have children’
   [YN1_2; 21:30]

22  kraana-h eah dah naan maana  utnieh
   Neighbours NEG.3PL
   ‘the neighbours don’t have children’

23  eah dah naan maana  utnieh
   NEG.3PL
   ‘they don’t have any children’

24  dov reaktoe ööhpestimmie oadtjoedh
   2SG.GEN right education get
   ‘you have (a) right to receive education’

25  dihte ahhka-n nomme oadtjeme
   3SG.NOM grandmother-GEN name.NOM.get.PTCP
   ‘she has grandmother’s name’
   (lit.: “she got grandmother’s name”)

(Session 2)

26  mov lea gärja, muhte dihte biblioteke-n
   1SG.Gen be.PRES.3SG book.NOM but
   3SG.NOM library-GEN
   ‘I have a book, but it is the library that owns it’
   Lit.: ‘I have a book, but it is the library’s’
   [rec 2 session 2, min. 23:30]

27  bienje ånehks goelk-h  åtna
   Dog.NOM short hair(animal)-PL have.PRES.3Sg
   ‘the dog has short hair’
   [YN1_4; 01:30]

28  bienje juelk-ets, barre golme  juelkie-h  åtna
   dog.NOM leg-less only three leg-PL have.PRES.3SG
   ‘the dog is legless, it has only three legs’

29  bienje måaroe-m kehleminie
   dog.NOM bone-ACC chew.PTCP
   ‘The dog chews on a bone’
   (sentence provided after asking for a sentence “the dog has a bone”)

30  bienje tjenkere-m åtna
   dog.NOM ball-ACC have.PRES.3SG
   ‘the dog has a ball’ (to play with)
31 *bienje beapmoeh gaare-sne åtna*
dog.NOM food bowl-INESS have-PRES.3SG
‘the dog has food in its bowl’

32 *burt-sne nieljie juelkie-h*
table-INESS four leg-PL
‘the table has four legs’
[recording 1 session 2, min 08:00]

(Testing for poss suffixes:)

33 *mov ahṭje*
‘my father’

Mov kraana
‘my neighbour’

Mov luhketäjja
‘my teacher’

34 *tjehtjeli-snie buértie jih gökte stovl-h jih tv*
Room-INESS table.NOM jih two chair-PL CON television
‘the room has a table, two chairs and a TV’
[YN1_4; 12:30]

35 *mov guhkies voept-h*
1SG.GEN long.ATTR hair(human)-PL
‘I have long hair’
[recording 1 session 2; min 14:00]

36 *mejtiedov bijle?*
Q 2SG.GEN car.NOM
‘do you have a car?’
[YN1_4; 14:30]

37 *mejtiedov bijle daesnie?*
Q 2SG.GEN car.NOM here
‘do you have a car here?’
[rec 1 session 2, min. 15:00]

38 *mejtiegie akt bijle-m åtna?*
Q ? one car-ACC have.PRES.3SG (!)
‘do you.PL have a car?’
[rec 1 session 2, min. 15:10-16:30]

39 *Laila dihte vielle-m åtna*
Laila 3SG.NOM brother-ACC have.PRES.3SG
‘Laila has a brother’
[rec 2 session 2, min 00:30]

40 *dihte åabpa-m åtna*
3SG.NOM sister-ACC have.PRES.3SG
‘Laila has a sister’
ibje beetnegh utnieh
‘we have no money’
(The speaker said that this feels not quite naturally to say; “to be without sth”, or “to lose sth”, the speaker said, is formed with the ELAT instead. E.g. reindeer-ELAT, money-ELAT. [rec. 2 session 2, min. 04:00])

dah bienj-h utnieh
3PL.NOM dog-PL have.PRES.3PL
‘they have dogs’
[YN1_5, min. 05:30]

(vielle-m åtnam
brother-ACC have.1SG
‘I have a brother’
[YN1_5, min. 06:15]

(as an answer to the question “do you have a brother, the speaker explained, she would say (42)):)

mov vielle
1SG.GEN brother.NOM
[rec 2 session 2, min. 06:25]

mijseamma nomme-m utniejibie
‘we have the same name’
(“but this is not a thing I would say”)

mejtiedov bijlette?
Q 2SG.GEN ticket
‘do you have (the/a) ticket?’
[rec 1 session 2, min. 17:50]

Anna bijle-m åtna OR Anna-n bijle
Anna car-ACC have.PRES.3SG Anna-GEN car.NOM
‘Anna has a car’
>depends on the situation, if verb or GEN
“Who has a car?” – >verb

Lisa jih Lars bijle-m utniehgan
‘Lisa and Lars have a car’
(first verb form provided: åtna (3SG). Corrected to utnieh (3PL), then to 3DU). [rec 2 session 2, min. 17:30]
(According to the speaker, the dual forms are not used regularly)

kraana-n hov göökte bijl-h
neighbour-GEN EMP two car-PL
‘the neighbours have two cars’

mejtiedov kraana naan bijle-m utnieh/åtna?
Q 2SG.GEN
‘do your neighbours have a car?’
I utnieh/åtna is changed, the speaker seems to vary between these forms!
[rec 1 session 2, min. 16:45]

51 bibloteke-sne  gellie gärja-h
‘the library has many books’
[rec 2 session 2, min. 24]

VERB:
The speaker said that the use of the verb in sentences like “The car has old tyres” would feel very
“grammatically correct”, and that the speaker might have used this construction in a
South Saami class, but this is no construction the speaker would use in her language.
[recording 1 Session 2; min 00:00]

“åtna” fells like something “jag tar i” (something I can touch/grab/hold,” hä I väskan’ ‘put in a bag’),
and would therefore not fit if talking about a person. A person is nothing you can “own”.
[rec 2 session 2, min. 08:00]

[Rec 2 session 2, min. 09:00]:
Peannam åtnam  Or  Mov peanna: Difference: depends on how you ask. if someone asks “har någon
en penna?” då kunde jag svara ”ja, mov peanna, mahte dam löönedh”. If, on the other
hand, someone sits and has to write, and has no pen, and looks around, searching for a
pen, and I have a pen, då kan jag säga “aa men manne peannam åtnam”. GEN and verb
depends on situation.

52 Speaker provided these pairs:
Do you have a brother? – mov viellem. I have a brother. [10:00]
Har någon en bror? – manne viellem åtnam [10:30]
According to the speaker, “det är stor skillnad på hur man frågar”.

Någon kommer och behöver en bil, och säger ”har du en bil?” , och jag har ingen bil, men
grannarna har bil, då skulle jag säga: ”Ij muv naan bijle, muhto krannan! Kraanan hov göökte
bijl” [rec 2 session 2, min 19:55]”

Mov lea bijle,  men ii lea daesnie. [rec 2 session 2, min 21:25] GEN + COP!!! (lea
poängterar att jag har en bil, men att den inte finns här/tillgänglig)

Elicitation session 3
Date: 2016-03-19
Consultant: Older Northern

1 manne bijle-b atnab
1SG car-ACC have-1SG
‘I have a car’

2 manne maana-h atnab
1SG child-NOM.PL have.PRES.1SG
‘I have children’

3 mov akte maana
1SG.GEN one child[NOM]
‘I have a /one child’
4a mov peanna mah dat(ne) löönedh  
1SG GEN pen[NOM] REL PRON 2SG borrow  
‘I have a pen that you can borrow’

4b mov lea* akte peanna mah dat löönedh  
1SG GEN be.3SG one pen[NOM] REL PRON borrow 2SG  
‘I have a pen that you can borrow’  
*According to the speaker, lea ‘be’ may be left out.

4c mov akte peanna mah dat löönedh  
1SG GEN one pen REL PRON 2SG borrow  
‘I have a pen that you can borrow’

5 manne bienje-b atnab  
1SG dog-ACC have.PRES.1SG  
‘I have a dog’  
Speaker’s comment: “in this clause, I say that I own a dog” (‘då förklarar jag att jag har en hund’)

6 mov kraana bienje-b utnieh  
1SG GEN neighbour[NOM] dog-ACC have.PRES.3PL  
‘my neighbour(s) have a dog’  
Speaker’s comment: the regular word for neighbour is kraana from Swedish granne. Another word is sijteneaja “the one next to oneself in a siida (summer/temporary camp)”

7a mov leah* plaave t jelmie-h  
1SG GEN be.PRES3PL blue eye-PL  
‘I have blue eyes’  
*Speaker’s comment: lea lays emphasis on the expression; possibly as an answer to the question “do you have green eyes?” The speaker said that “nowadays, they don’t use the lea anymore”:

7b mov plaave t jelmie-h  
1SG GEN blue eye-PL  
‘I have blue eyes’

8a tjiehtjele-n leah* göökte oks-h  
room-GEN be.PRES3PL two door-NOM.PL  
‘the room has two doors’  
Again, the auxiliary was not compulsory:

8b tjiehtjele-n göökte oks-h  
room-GEN two door-NOM.PL  
‘the room has two doors’

9 tjiehtjeli-snie gov neseh buertie jih stovl-h  
room-INESS exist.PRES.3PL table[NOM] CON chair-NOM.PL  
‘in the room exist a table and two chairs’

10 mov âejjie-h saejredeh  
1SG GEN head-NOM.PL hurt.PRES.3PL  
‘I have a headache’ Lit.: ‘My head hurts’
mov rūtje bokhtjede?
1SG.GEN back hurt?
‘my back hurts’

mov tjåejjie bokhtjede?
1SG.GEN stomach hurt?
‘my stomach hurts’

dan gärja-n gellie saerjoeh
3SG.GEN book-GEN many page-PL
‘this book has many pages’
The word dan could possibly also be a particle and not a personal pronoun.

bijle atna nieljie jearr-h
3SG nom four wheel-PL
‘the car has four wheels’
OBS word order! SVO and not SOV!

bijle-nnieljie jearrh (leah)
car-GEN four wheel-PL (be.PRES.3PL)
‘the car has four wheels’
Again, leah may be left out. Compare 14 & 15; both were given equal status when there was no context given.

dihte aahka-n nomme atna
3SG.NOM grandmother-GEN name.NOM have.3SG
‘she has grandmother’s name’
COMENT: The speaker provided this sentence without hesitance, but added that this is something one would normally not say, rather something like (18):

dan nomme seammagoh aahka-n
3SG.GEN name.NOM same as grandmother-GEN ‘She has the same name as grandmother’

gärje+gåetie-nleah jeenj gärja-h
book+house-GEN be.3PL many book-PL
‘the library has many books’
COMMENT of the speaker: “då talar jag om att där, på biblioteket, finns många böcker”. The emphasized, new information is “many”, not that a library supplies books. I tested if the speaker accepted the same construction which the younger/northern/female speaker had provided (library in INESS). The sentence was accepted, however with a copula (!):

gärje+gåete+sne leah jeenj gärjah
Book+house-INESS be.3PL many book-PL
‘In the library, there are many books’
COMMENT of speaker: “Detta är mer förklarande, mer ny information”. The new information would be what a library is; that a library is a place which has many books. (>>‘A library has many books’ (!))

mov (lea) akte vielle
1SG.GEN be.3SG one brother
‘I have a brother’

COMMENT: the lea was, according to the speaker, optionally. She did not provide a second construction with untedh (cf. (2-3)). (a=without lea, b= with lea)

21 buertie-n-nieljie juelkie-h
table-GEN four leg-PL
‘the table has four legs’

COMMENT: The speaker would not accept a construction table-INESS (cf. younger/northern/female speaker); this, according to the speaker, would mean that the legs are on top of the table.

22 buertie nieljie juelkie-hatna
table.NOM four leg-PL have.3Sg
‘the table has four legs’

23 bienje-n leah nieljie juelkie-h
dog-GEN be.PRES.3PL four leg-PL
‘the dog has four legs’

24 dihte bienje-n, mij golme juelkieh, dihte 3SG.NOM dog-GENREL.PRON three leg-PL 3SG ‘this dog, which has three legs, is oldest’

boaras-aboh
old-SUP

COMMENT: the sentence was thought as an answer to the question: “which of the dogs outside in the backyard is oldest?”

25 bienje muarrom kneekeme
dog.NOM chew (swe. gnaga)
‘the dog has a bone’
Lit.: ‘the dog is chewing on a bone’ [CHECK!]

26 manne bijle-b atnab, badth dihte mov vielle-n
1SG.NOM car-ACC have.PRES.1SG 3SG.NOM 1SG.GEN brother-GEn
‘I have a car (which I use to drive to work with), but it is my brother’s’

27a & b mov bijle-n, mam (leam) atname luhkie
1SG.GEN car-GEN, which be.PRES.1SG have.PTCP ten

jaepie-n, dan leah boaries jaerr-h
ten-GEN, 3SG.GEN be.PRES.3PL old.ATTR.tyre/wheel-PL
‘my car, which I have had for ten years, has old tyres’

28 mov vielle bijle-b atna, badth manne dam nohtjade-m
1SG.GEN brother.NOM car-ACC have.PRES.3SG but 1SG.NOM 3SG.ACC use-PRES.1SG
‘my brother has a car, but I use it all the time’

29 Alternative to (29):
mov vielle-n bijle, muhte [...]  
1SG.GEN brother-GEn car.NOM but
‘my brother has a car, but [...]’
Volaxn bijle
1SG GEN car.NOM
Translation and explanation by the speaker:
’min ägande bil’; ”det är bilen som jag äger”
’my owning car’ = the car owned by me

31 – ii, Meehe-n bijle
– NEG*, Meehe-GEN car.NOM
‘no, but Meehe has a car’
(Do you have a car?) – No, but Meethe has a car

*Used as “no”. The NEG AUX is in the 3SG, which could be a shortening of “it is not”.

Elicitation session 4
Date: Session 1: March 22, 2016. Session 2: April 6, 2016
Speaker: Younger Northern 2

Session 1. (March 22, 2016)

1 (The speaker was asked to tell about the family, and suppose that I do not know anything about the family or its members)
Mov lea vielle, dihte båaras-åbpoe manne-ste
1SG GEN be.PRES.3SG brother.NOM 3SG old-COMP 1SG ELAT
‘I have a brother, who is older than me’

2 Mov vielle bienje-m åtna
1SG GEN brother.NOM dog-ACC have.PRES.3SG
‘my brother has a dog’

3 bienje lea båeries jih baenehts
dog.NOM be.PRES.3SG old.PRED and toothless
‘the dog is old and has no teeth’
Lit.: ‘the dog is old and teethless’

4 “Describe how a dog looks like; tell us that it is an animal with four legs”
bienje-n leah nieljie juelkie-h
dog-GEN be.PRES.3PL four leg-PL
‘a dog has four legs’

COMMENT: when asked about why choosing utnedh ‘have’ in (2) but the genitive construction in (4), the speaker said that this felt better, more natural. To use utnedh in (4) would work as well, but did not feel as right/natural as the genitive construction.

5 Mov lea bijle, valla lea dihte 1SG GEN be.PRES.3SG car.NOMCON be.PRES.3SG 3SG
‘I have a car, but it is my brother who owns it’
mov viell.
1SG GEN brother.NOM
Lit.: ’I have a car, but it is my brother’s’

COMMENT 1: The speaker pointed out that vielle ‘brother’ “does not have to have the -e at the end”, i.e. the form viell was judged more fitting than vielle.
Comment 2: valla ‘but’ is a “biblical” word for ‘but’, which the speaker decided to fit good or sound good. There is a great variation of a contrasting connector in South Saami, with some debate as to how “correct” these are.

6 bijle-norre dekk-h
car-GEN new.ATTR tyre-PL
‘the car has new tyres’
Comment: the word dekk ‘tyres’ could be an ad-hoc loan from Scandinavian; the speaker hesitated a bit but seemed to make things easy and simply pick the Scandinavian word. At least, the South Saami dictionary (Bergsland & Magga 1993) do not list this word.

7 (The speaker was asked to explain what a library is; i.e. a place that has a lot of books. I am not entirely certain, but I think I asked the speaker to say “The library has many books”, i.e. the library was definite.)
gärje+gæetie-njinnje gärja-h
book+house-GEN manybook-PL
‘The library has many books’

8 danne(??) gärja-n gellie bielie-h
DEM book-GEN manypage-PL
‘this book has many pages’

9 COMM: The speaker was asked to imagine a hotel room description.
rumme-n/tjiehtjele-n buertie jih göökte stovl-h
room-GEN table.NOM and two chair-PL
‘the room has a table and two chairs’

10 tjiehtjele-n aaj göökte klaas-h
room-GEN also two glass-PL
‘the room has also two windows’

COMMENT: I asked if the speaker also accepts an INESS construction (‘room’ in the inessive). The speaker said that he would have understood it, but he complemented the sentence with a verb “exist”, and said that this sentence does not express possession for him, but rather a description of what there is to be found in the room.

11 mov lea provne tjelmie-h
1SG.GEN be.PRES.3SGblue-ATTR eye-PL
‘I have blue eyes’

12 buertie-nnielie juelkie-h
table-GEN four leg-PL
‘the table has four legs’

Session 2. (April 6, 2016)

The speaker had reflected on the inessive construction since the first time, and provided this sentence. As an example, the speaker provided (13). However, he confirmed several times that a sentence like (14) would feel more natural (“Ae ville ha foretrekkt det”) than the genitive construction. The speaker said that she thinks that “hvilken person som helst” (‘any person’) could have said this.
13  suohkie-ŋ ñellie ñaksie-ŋ
    tree-GEN manybranch-NOM.PL
    ‘The three has many branches’
    [YN2_II; 02:50]

14  gärja+gået-sne  ñeenj gärja-ŋ
    book+house-INESS manybook-NOM.PL
    ‘the library has many books’
    [YN2_II; 03:00]

15a  Question: Do you have siblings? / Har du syskon?
    Mov akte vielle jih  akte ñabpa
    1SG.GEN one brother[NOM] and one sister[NOM]
    ‘I have a(one) brother and a(one) sister’
    [YN2_II; 04:50]

15b  Mov  lea  vielle jih  mov  lea
    1SG.GEN be.PRES.3SG brother[NOM] and 1SG.GEN be.PRES.3SG
    ñabpa
    sister[NOM]
    ‘I have a brother and a sister’
    [YN2_II; 04:55]
    [YN2_II; 06:05]

15b was judged more genuinely SSa by the speaker than 13a (i.e. the articles were judged less
authentic)

16  Question: Do you have children? Har du barn?
    ii,  if  mov  naan  maana(h?)
    no  NEG.3SG 1SG.GEN somechild[NOM(PL?)]
    ‘no, I don’t have children’
    [YN2_II; 06:15]

17  im  mov  naan  bienje
    1SG.NEG 1SG.GEN some dog[NOM]
    ‘I don’t have a dog’
    [YN2_II; 06:25]

18  (Translation; context given: “think that you had a dog, but that the dog is dead now”) 
    ovsne  bienje-m  utnim,  valla  daelie  dihte  båarhte
    Förut dog-ACC have.PAST.1SG but  3SG
    ‘I have had a dog but DIHTE is dead now’
    [YN2_II; 06:50]

19a  bienje-ŋ lij  kraeveis goelk-ŋ(?)
    dog-GEN be.PAST.3SG greyy.ATTR animal.hair-PL
    ‘the dog had grey hair’
    [YN2_II; 07:50]

19b  dan lij kraeveis  goelk-ŋ
    3SG.GEN be.PAST.3SG grey.ATTR hair(animal)-PL (???
    ‘the dog had grey hair’
    [YN2_II; 08:35]
20  bienje-n lea tjengere
dog-GEN be.PRES.3SG ball[NOM]
[YN2_II; 08:50]

21  bienje tjengere-m átna
dog[NOM] ball-ACC have.PRES.3SG
‘the dog has a ball (to play with)’
[YN2_II; 09:10]
(provided as a possible alternative, “kan vel også si”. Judgement: 21 is more “Dagligt talspråk” than 20 [YN2_II; 09:30])

22a  Question: Do you have a car? / Har du bil?
ljie, im mov naan bijle
no NEG.1SG 1SG GEN some car[NOM]
‘no, I don’t have a car’
[YN2_II; 09:45]

22b  ljje, ij mov naan bijle
no NEG.3SG 1SG GEN some car[NOM]
‘no, I don’t have a car’
[YN2_II; 09:45]

23  (Context: simply ask me if I have a car.)
dov bijle?
2SG GEN car[Nom]
‘do you have a car?’
[YN2_II; 10:00]

24a & b  Im mov naan bijle, valla mov viell(e)-n lea bijle
NEG.1SG 1SG GEN some car[NOM] but 1SG GEN brother GEN be.PRES.3SG car[NOM]
‘I don’t have a car, but my brother has a car’
[YN2_II; 10:50]
The –e in viell-e can be omitted in the genitive form viellen> vielln

25a & b  (personal name possessor instead of noun possessor as in (24))
im mov naan bijle, valla Ánta-n lea bijle
NEG.1SG 1SG GEN some car[NOM] but Andrew GEN be.PRES.3SG car[NOM]
‘I don’t have a car, but Andrew has a car’
[YN2_II; 11:15]

26  (Context: think that you had a car, but you have sold it)
Manne leam bijle-m utneme, valla dam leam duokeme
‘I had a car but this is sold’
[YN2_II; 11:30]

27  Question asked in SSa: guktie dov tjielmieh vuajna? ‘How does your eyes look (like)’?
mov tjielmie-h leah pruvna
1SG GEN eye-PL be.PRES.3PL brown.PRED
‘My eyes are brown’
[YN2_II; 12:40]
Question asked in SSa: mij tjielmieh dante åtnah? ‘Which eyes do you have?’  
(Both questions asked in South Saami were accepted by the speaker at once)  
mov leah provne tjielmie-h  
1SG. GEN be.PRES.3PL brown eye-PL  
‘I have brown eyes’  
[YN2-II; 15:30]

Context: tell a friend (on the phone) that you have a new cell phone.  
Mov lea orre telephone  
1SG. GEN be.PRES.3SG new.ATTR cell phone[NOM]  
‘I have a new cell phone’  
[YN2-II; 16:00]

govlh annjie mov lea orre telefonel  
Listen. IMP.2SG here 1SG. GEN be.PRES.3SG new.ATTR cellphone[NOM]  
‘I have a new cell phone’  
[YN2-II; 16:20]

Context given: tell someone about how you and your brother “Andrew” look like; he has long hair and you have short hair.  
Ánta-n lea guhkies vuopte, mov åanaksh  
Andrew-GEN be.PRES.3SG long human.hair 1SG. GEN short  
‘Andrew has long hair, I (have) short (hair)’  
[YN2-II; 17:10]

>Tell someone that your brother Andrew owns a car, but you use it all the time.  
Daate(?) (lea) Ánta-n bijle, valla manne dihtedan provhkem  
‘this is Andrew’s car, but I use it all the time’  
[YN2-II; 18:00]  
Possession of definite possessed! Cf. “this motorcycle is John’s” (Stassen)

Ánta-n lea bijle, valla manne dihtedan provhkem  
Andrew-GEN be.PRES.3SG car[NOM] but 1SG 3SG 3SG.ACC use.PRES.1SG  
‘Andrew has a car, but I use it all the time’  
[YN2-II; 18:30]

Context; you changed from winter- to summer tyres, which are new.  
bijle-n orre dekk-h  
car-GEN new tyre-PL  
‘The car has new tyres’  
[YN2-II; 18:40]

mov biji-n orre dekk-h  
1SG. GEN car-GEN new tyre-PL  
‘My car has new tyres’  
[YN2-II; 19:30]  
Note that the –e in bijl-e is omitted in the genitive.

manne bienje-m vójnem, dan lij barre gulme juelkie-h  
1SG dog-ACC see.PAST.1SG 3SG. GEN be.PAST.3SG only three leg-PL  
‘I saw a dog that only had three legs’  
[YN2-II; 20:10]
Context: We are sitting next to each other and I need to write something but do not have a pen. I ask: “Do you have a pen that I can borrow?” – how would you say this?

*dov peanna maam mahtamlöönedh?*  
2SG.GEN pen[NOM] which can.PRES.1SG borrow  
‘do you have a pen that I can borrow?’

when asking for a repetition of sentence (38)/repeating it myself, I made some mistakes, and got corrected with the following variation of (38), with the GEN + copula construction:

*dov lea peanna maam mahtam îöönedh?*  
2SG.GEN be.PRES.3SG pen[NOM] which can.PRES.1SG borrow  
‘do you have a pen that I can borrow?’  

Suppose you had a pen which I could have borrowed, but you had lost this pen.

*Mov lij peanna, valla dam bijsteli*  
1SG.GEN be.PAST.3SG pen[NOM] but 3SG.ACC lost??  
‘I had a pen, but I lost it’

Imagine the following situation: You are sitting somewhere reading a book, and someone approaches you and asks: Is this your book? – No, this is not my book, this is the library’s (book). The library has many books.

‘is this your book – no, this is the library’s book; the library has many books’

then, you describe the book more closely; you say: this book is thick, it has many pages

*Daate gärja jassies, dan leah gellie bielie-h*  
DEF book thick 3SG.GEN be.PRES.3PL many page-PL  
‘this book is thick, it has many pages’

*Ánta sygkele-m utnie, valla guhkte dam tjokhste*  
‘Andrew had a bicycle, but it got stolen’

(The speaker did not know why s/he used the verb here and not the GEN construction)

Translate: Anne-Sofi has children/ A-S har barn (“in general”)

*Anna-Söfe maana-h åtna*  
A-S child-PL have.PRES.3SG  
‘Anna-Sofie has children’
Speaker: “If I had said that A-S has many (three) children, I would have said this:
Anna-Söfe-n golme maana-h
A-S-GEN three child-PL
‘A-S has three children’
[YN2-II; 25:15]

Anna-Söfe-n golme niejt-h
A-S-GEN three girl-PL
‘A-S has three daughters’
[YN2-II; 26:00]

The speaker continues: “If you had asked me tomorrow, I might have said the following”:
Anne-Söfe golme niejt-h åtna
A-Sthree girl-PL have.PRES.3SG
‘A-S has three daughters’

Elicitation session 5
Younger Southern 1
Date: 5 April 2016

1 Im guessie gannah bijle-m provhke-m
1SG.NEG when EMP car-ACC use.PRES.1SG
‘I will never use a car’
[rec1, min 00:30]

2a Jaavoe man akte åabpa-m åtna-m
Yes 1SG.NOM one sister-ACC have.PRES.
‘yes, I have a sister’
[rec1, min 06:00]
COMM: the accusative suffix -m was not necessary, according to YS.
OBS the speaker used the shorter form man “I” instead of manne “I”

2b Jaavoe man akte åabpa åtna-m
Yes 1SG.NOM one sister
‘yes, I have a sister’
[rec1, min 06:20]
The accusative is not needed to mark ‘sister’.

2c Im mov vielie åerpenh
1SG.NEG 1SG.GEN more siblings.NOM
‘I don’t have more siblings’
[rec1, min 06:30]

3a Eah mov eejhtegh bienje-m utnieh
NEG.3PL 1SG.GEN parents.NOM dog-ACC have.CONNEG
‘no, my parents do not have a dog’
[rec1, min 08:30]
Comment of speaker: this is “grammatically correct”; probably would rather say (3b):

3b ij mov eejhtegh bienje-m åtna
NEG.3SG 1SG.GEN parents.NOM dog-ACChave.PRES.3SG
‘no, my parents do not have a dog’
[rec 1, min 08:50]

According to YS1, both the negation verb and the finite verb do not have to agree with the subject in number. In spoken, colloquial South Saami, the 3SG form is often used for a 3PL subject (as in 3b). (Cf. even several small “corrections” of 3SG>3PL in YN1’s examples.) (“dihte works everywhere”)

4  im mov naan bienje
NEG.1SG 1SG.GEN some dog.NOM
‘I don’t have a dog’
[rec1, min 09:50]

5a  im mov naan bijle
NEG.1SG 1SG.GEN some car.NOM
‘I don’t have a car’
[rec1, min 10:00]

5b  im mov naan bijle gannah
NEG.1SG 1SG.GEN some car.NOM !förstärkande
‘I do not have a car’
[rec, min 10:20]

6  jaavoe mov åabpa bijle-m utna
Yes 1SG.GEN sister.NOM car-ACC have.PRES.3SG
‘yes, my sister has a car’
[rec1, min 11:00]
OBS pronunciation [utna] and not [åtna]

7  jaavoe Marja bijle-m utna
Yes Marja car-ACC have.PRES.3Sg
‘yes, Marja has a car’
[rec 1, min 11:20]

8  jaavoe mov motor-sygkele
Yes1SG.GEN motorcycle.NOM
‘yes, I have a motorcycle’

9  edtjedh addem orre aaj åestedh
Jag ska köpa en ny
[rec1, min 12:10]

(from here – translation)

10 mov motor-sygkele-m åtnam, beene dihte åabpa-n motorsygkele
‘I have a motorcycle, but it is my sister’s/my sister who owns it’
[YS1_1; 13:00]
OBS double possessive marking in the beginning! I asked and he confirmed. He presented a variation in (11):
11 manne motor-sygkele-m åtnam
[rec1, min 14:00]
"om jag inte hade böjt åtnam (1SG), so "utnedh", then i would have said "manne motor-sygkele åtnam" [rec1, min 14:00]"

12 mov motor-sygkele båeries gangker-h åtna
1SG.GEN motorcycle old.ATTR wheel-PL have.PRES.
'my motorcycle has old tyres'
[rec1, min 15:20]

13 doete motor-sygkele båeries gangker-h åtna
DEM.3SG motorcycle old.ATTR wheel-PL have.PRES.
'this (closer to you) motorcycle has old tyres'
[rec1, min 16:15]

14 (presupposed question: which eye color do you have?)
Mov plaave tjelmie-h
1SG.GEN blue eye-PL
'I have blue eyes'
[rec1, min 16:35]

15 (question):
guktiedov tjelmie-h vuojno?
Q.PRON 2SG.GEN eye-PL look.PRES.3SG
'how do your eyes look (like)'
[Y51_1; 17:30]

16 (answer):
mov leah plaave tjelmie-h
1SG.GEN be.PRES.3PL blue eye-PL
'I have blue eyes'
[Y51_1; 17:40]

17 (question):
mij tjelmie-h datne åtna?
REL.PRON eye-PL 2SG.NOM have.PRES.3SG
'which eyes do you have' ("vilka ögon har du?")
[Y51_1; 17:50]
(this would be a possible question in conversation, according to the speaker)

18 (answer):
Manne plaave tjelmie-h åtna
1SG.NOM blue eye-PL have.PRES.3SG
'I have blue eyes'
[Y51_1; 18:35]

19 (possible answer 2):
Plaave tjelmie-h åtnam
Blue eye-PL have.PRES.1SG
'I have blue eyes'
[Y51_1; 18:40]
20 akte bienje nieljie jueljie-h åtna
One.INDEF dog.NOM four leg-PL have.PRES.3SG
‘a dog has four legs’
[YS1_1; 19:30]

21 bienje akte måaroe bårroe
Dog.NOM one bone eat(only animal).PRES.3SG
‘the dog eats a bone’
[YS1_1; 19:50]
OBS pronunciation bårroe and not bårra

22 “grammatically correct”:
Bienje akte-m måaroe-m bårroe
Dog.NOM one-ACC bone-ACC eat(only animal).PRES.3SG
‘the dog eats a bone’
[YS1_1; 20:00]

23 (presupposed question: what has the dog?)
bienjetjengkere åtna
dog ball.NOM
‘the dog has a ball (to play with)’
[YS1_1; 21:00]

24 (Question: do you have a pen (that I could borrow)?)
Jaavoe, peanna-m åtnam, sijth lōōnedh?
Yespen-ACC have.PRES.1SG want.PRES.2SG borrow.INF
‘yes, I have a pen, do you want to borrow?’
[YS1_1; 21:30]

25 (situation: do you have a pen (that you can use and write with)?)
Jaavoe peanna-m åtnam, mij mahta provhkedh
Yespen-ACC have.PRES.1SG
‘yes, I have a pen which I can use’
[YS1_1; 22:30]

26 Marja akte motor-sygkele-m åtna, beene manne dihte abpetijem provhkem
Marja one motorcycle-ACC have.PRES.3SG but 1SG.NOM 3SG.NOM always use.1SG
‘Marja has a motorcycle, but I use it all the time’
[YS1_1; 23:20]

27 (Situation: description of a hotel room)
Daate tjiehtjelestoerre jih göökte klaas utneh
‘this room is big and has two windows’
[YS1_2; 00:20]

28 tjiehtjele akte buertie jih göökte stovlh utnieh
‘the room has one table and two chairs’
[YS1_2; 01:30]

29 tjiehtjele-snie aaj akte tv-n
‘In the room, there is also a TV’ (på rummet finns också en tv)
[YS1_2; 02:00]
30 (Question: is this your book?)
ijje mov gärja
No this is not my book
[YS1_2; 03:40]

31 Manne löömenem gärjegåeteste
I borrowed it from the library
[YS1_2; 03:50]

32 Gärjegåetesne jeenj gärja-h
The library has many books
[YS1_2; 04:10]

33 (hur är boken?)
Gärja jeenj bielieh åtna
‘the book has many pages’
[YS1_2; 05:00]

34 testing: do you accept “gärjesne jeenj bielieh”? [YS1_2; 05:30]
>Yes, I could have said this as well. “Det funkar absolut”
At this point, the speaker said that she thinks that she is influenced by Norwegian in the way she says something in South Saami. As an example she named word order, that she uses Norwegian SVO instead of SOV, but maybe less the way she constructs parts of the sentences.

35 testing: Tjehtjelesnie buertie jih göökte stovlh
>is okay, but would have used utnedh. Depends on situation. Needs to be in “South Saami mode”. [07:30]

36 govilh annje manne orre teñene-m ådtjeme
Listen here 1SG.NOM new phone-AC
‘by the way, I have a new cellphone’
[YS1_2; 10:40]

37 mov orre mejadresse-m åådtjeme
1SG.GEN new mail.address-ACC get.PERF.PART
‘I got a new mail address’
[YS1_2; 12:00]

38 Satne aajja-n nomme
3SG.NOM grandfather-GENname.NOM
‘he has grandfather’s name’
[YS1_2; 13:00]

39a & b mov bijle, mij luhkie jaepie åtneme, båeries gangker-h
‘my car, which I have had for ten years, has old tyres’
[YS1_2; 14:00]

40 mov bijle orre gangker-h åtna
‘my car has new tyres’
[YS1_2; 15:00]
test: bijlesne orre gangkerh? >not accepted. [YS1_2; 15:20]

bienjekraevies voepte
Dog.NOM
‘the dog (DEF) has grey hair’
!!!!!!!OBS possessor is in the NOM!!!
COMMENT: the speaker did not use the word for animal hair (goelke).
[YS1_2; 16:30]

mov veelkes voepte
‘I have blonde (white) hair’
>as a description of oneself to a person that does not know the speaker
[YS1_2; 17:40]

(“if I was asking someone in town”)
dov bijle?
‘do you have a car?’
[YS1_2; 19:00]

dov mobijle/telephone?
‘do you have a cellphone’ (that I could borrow)
[YS1_2; 19:20]

dov mobijle mij mahta löönedh?
‘do you have a cellphone that I could borrow?’
[YS1_2; 19:45]

mov buertie nieljie juelkie-h åtna
‘my table has four legs’
[YS1_2; 21:00]

doete buertie nieljie juelkie-h åtna
‘this table (closer to you) has four legs’
[YS1_2; 21:40]

test: burtsne nieljie juelkieh >not accepted. [YS1_2; 22:00]

burt-sne nieljie klaas-h
tabl four glass-PL
‘on(top of) the table there are four glasses’
[YS1_2; 22:15]

mov jeenj åssjalommes
1SG.GEN manythought/idea
‘I have many thoughts’
[YS1_2; 23:20]

manne tuhtjem dov reektes saemienlieredh
‘I think/believe/know that you have the right to learn Saami’
[YS1_2; 24:40]
Im mov naan beetnegh
‘I don’t have any money’
[YS1_2; 25:30]

mov motorsygkele orre geengker-h
1SG.GEN motorcycle[NOM] new tyre-PL
‘my motorcycle has new tyres’
[YS1_3; 00:10]

testing the following sentence: YES (accepted)
mov bijle orre geengker-h
1SG.GEN car[NOM] new tyre-PL
‘my car has new tyres

> The speaker was very clear about the case of the possessor noun (in the NOM) in (54) and (55) (!).

test; mov bijlen orre geengkerh >NO; NOT accepted [YS1_3; 00:30]

test: Mov bijle orre geengkerh åtna
>YES. [YS1_3; 01:00]

har du en hund?
Im mov naan bienje, beene mov lij bienje
‘I don’t have a dog, but I had a dog’
[YS1_4; 00:00]

or, second alternative, but feels less natural
Im mov naan bienje, beene mov bienje utnieh

Elicitation session
Younger Southern 2
Date: 8 April 2016

1 Q: do you have siblings?
Ij leah, eah leah. Manne aajnagke.
NEG.3SG be.INF NEG.3PL be.PRES.3PL 1SG
‘It is not, I don’t have (siblings). I am the only child.’
[YS2_1; 01:50]

2 T: I have a sister.
Mov lea åaabpa
1SG.GEN be.PRES.3SG sister[NOM]
‘I have a sister’
[YS2_1; 02:10]

3 Q: Do you have a dog?
Ja mov lea bienje
Yes1SG.GEN be.PRES.3SG dog[NOM]
‘yes, I have a dog’ [YS2_1; 02:40]
T: I had a dog but it is dead now
Mov lij bienje meene(?) i lea vielie
1SG.GEN be.PAST.3SG dog[NOM] but NEG.3SG be.PRES.3SG more
‘I had a dog but he is “is no longer” (=he is dead now)’
[YS2_1; 03:10]

5a T: The dog had grey hair
jih dihte bienje kraevies goelk-h utni
and this dog[NOM] grey animal.hair-PL have.PAST.3PL
‘and this dog had grey hair’
[YS2_1; 03:50]

(5b) was provided as another possibility:

5b T: The dog had grey hair
Dan bienje-n lin naa kraevies goelk-h
3SG.GEN dog-GEN be.PAST.3PL PRT grey animal.hair-PL
‘this dog had grey hair’
[YS2_1; 04:00]

When asked if the constructions meant any different to the speaker, the speaker could not point out any difference.

6 T: The dog has a ball (to play with)
Bienjetjengkere-m åtna
Dog[NOM] ball-ACChave.PRES.3SG
‘the dog has a ball’
[YS2_1; 05:50]

[At this point, the speaker said that she could guess what I was looking for in the elicitation. (The speaker was the only one that commented on that; the comment was on her initiative. She said that an answer depends very much on how you ask, and provided the following example: If someone asks:

7 maa dov bienje?
Q 2SG.GEN dog[NOM]
‘do you have a dog?’
[YS2_2; 06:45]

Then, the speaker said, an answer would be:

8 ja, naa mov lea bienje
YesPRTCL 1SG.GEN be.PRES.3SG dog[NOM]
‘yes well I have a dog’
[YS2_1; 06:45]

‘-but if someone would use ‘utnedh’ instead, I would answer using ‘utnedh’ as well:”

9 datne bienje-m åtna?
2SG dog-ACChave.PRES.
‘do you have a dog?’
[YS2_1; 06:50]
then, the speaker said, she would use “atnam” ‘I have’. A “mismatch” of these construction in a question-answer pair is highly avoided.

Context given: you tell a friend that your parents have a dog.

Mov eejhteg-i j bienje
1SG GEN parents-GEN.PL dog[NOM]
‘my parents have a dog’
[YS2_1; 08:30]

mov aehjtje-n tjdjtjien-bienje
1SG GEN father-GEN mother-GEN dog[NOM]
‘my father and mother have a dog’
[YS2_1; 08:35]

Context: asking someone if s/he has a car “here”/available, knowing the person in questions owns a car:

gaa bijle-m atnah desnie
Q car-ACC have.PRES.2SG here(3SG.INESS)
‘do you have (your) car here?’
[YS2_1; 09:30]

Context: asking a person if s/he has a car without knowing if the person in question owns a car:

gaa dov bijle desnie
Q 2SG GEN car[NOM] here(3SG.INESS)
‘do you have (a) car here?’
[YS2_1; 09:50]

gaa de(?) dov bijle
Q
‘äger du en bil?’
[YS2_1; 10:00]

T: the car has new tyres
Dan bijle-n orre dekk-h aaj
3SG GEN car-GEN new tyre-PL also
‘the car has new tyres’
[YS2_1; 10:50]
Comment of the speaker: it would be weird to use “utnedh” here.

T: I have blue eyes
Mov leah kråvna tjelmie-h
1SG GEN be.PRES.3PL blue eye-PL
‘I have blue eyes’
[YS2_1; 14:00]

Mov kråvna tjelmie-h
1SG GEN blue eye-PL
‘I have blue eyes’
[YS2_1; 14:00]
>“the auxiliary is not necessary”
Q: Context: the teacher asks you if you have a pen (to write with), assuming that you should have a pen with you. What would you answer?
Ja manne peanna-m atnam
Ja 1SG
[YS2_1; 16:00]

Comment of the speaker: “mov” would feel weird here; “there is no need to say that I own a pen, the teacher knows that I have a pen.

Q: Context: asking someone else if they have a pen that you can borrow:
Gah dov naan peanna munnjen
? 2SG.GEN some pen[NOM] 1SG.ILL
’doy you have a pen for me?’
[YS2_1; 16:45]

Concerning (19), this would have been the construction that the speaker would have used “without thinking what is best” [YS2_2; 00:20]

T: Yes, I have a pen that you can borrow
Jaa, mov lea peanna dutnjien
Yes1SG.GEN be.PRES.3SG pen[NOM] 2SG.ILL
‘yes, I have a pen for you’
[YS2_2; 00:45]

T: I had a pen but I lost it
Mov lij peanna jookte men manne dasseme daelie/ gaervie damme
‘I had a pen but I lost it’
[YS2_2; 01:00]

T: My grandmother had three siblings
Mov aahka-n golme åerpenh
1SG.GEN grandmother-GEN three siblings[NOM]
‘My grandmother has three siblings’
[YS2_2; 02:00]

(as an alternative to (22))
Mov aahka golme åerpenh utnieji
1SG.GEN grandmother[NOM] three siblings[NOM]have.PAST.3Sg
‘my grandmother had three siblings’
[YS2_2; 02:15]

The speaker could not say which construction feels better or more natural; (22) and (23) were seen as interchangeable.

T: Context: Think that you read a hotel brochure that describes the different rooms. One room, the brochure tells you, has two windows. How would you say that sentence; “the room has two windows”?
Desnie göökte klaas-h
3SG.INESS two window-PL
‘it has two windows’[YS2_2; 03:50]
25 Testing if the possessor can be a noun also:
Denje tjihtjel-isnie göökte klaas-h
?? room-INESS two window-PL
‘this room has two windows’
[YS2_2; 04:20]
(denje – rel.pron?)

26 T: Describe the room more in detail; say “the room has a table and two chairs”
tjihtjel-isnie burtie jih göökte stovl-h
room-INESS table[NOM] and two chair-NOM.PL
‘the room has a table and two chairs’
[YS2_2; 05:40]

27 T: describe the table; “the table has four legs”
Dan buertie- n njeljie juelkie-h
3G.GEN table-GEN four leg-NOM.PL
‘the table has four legs’
[YS2_2; 06:30]

28 Testing for burtsne njeljie juelkieh [YS2_2; 07:00]
>Not accepted. The speaker said that feels weird. The speaker compared this sentence to
the inessive used with ‘room’; “to say that a room has (=owns) something feels weird, it feels
more natural to say that something is in the room.” > That is, the speaker does not
perceive the INESS construction as possession.
I tested and asked if the construction in (24)-(26) has in fact an omitted existential verb ‘to be, exist’.
It was confirmed that the construction does not have an existential verb; a sentence like
*tjihtjelisnie göökte klaash leah ‘in the room there are two windows’ was not accepted.

29 T: ask me if I have a car
Gaa dov bijle?
Q 2SG.GEN car[NOM]
‘Do you have a car?’
[YS2_2; 08:00]

30 T: ask me if I havea dog
Gaa dov naan bienje?
Q 2SG.GEN some dog[NOM]
‘do you have a dog?’
[YS2_2; 08:40]

31 T: Context given: you are sitting and reading a book that you borrowed from a library,
someone comes and asks if this is your book. You explain that it belongs to the library, and
you say: the library has many books.
Gärja+gået-sne desnie jeenje gärja-h
Book+house-INESS 3SG.INESS many book-PL
‘the library has many books’
[YS2_2; 09:25]

32 Testing if (31) works also without desnie – was accepted
Gärja+gået-sne jeenje gärjah
33  T: describing the book more in detail: the book has many pages.
    Gärsne jeenje sájro-∅ bielie-∅
    Book-INESS manyside-PL, side-PL
    ‘the book has many pages’
    [YS2_2; 10:50]

34  As an alternative to (33), the speaker provided (34), which “also works”:
    Gärs-e jeenje bielie-∅
    Book-GEN manypage-PL
    ‘the book has many pages’
    [YS2_2; 11:00]
    The speaker repeated the inessive construction again after (34).

35  bielie-snejul-∅
    Car-INESS wheel-PL
    ‘in the car, there are wheels’
    [YS2_3; 00:20]

General comment by the speaker: a possible difference between the genitive construction and the verb could be whether I know if someone possesses something or not. [YS2_3; 01:00]

36a & bMov tjëdjtje-∅ biæle men ëabpa atna dam dæle 1SG.GEN mother-GEN
car[NOM] but sister[NOM] have.PRES.3SG 35g.ACC now
    ‘my mother has a car, but my sister has it now’
    [YS2_3; 02:20]

37a & bT: Context: Someone asks you if you have a car, and you answer: I don’t have a car, but my brother does.
    lj leah mov naan biæle, men vielle-lea biæle
    3SG.NEG be.INF 1SG.GEN some car[NOM] but brother-GEN be.PRES.3SG car[NOM]
    [YS2_3; 04:15]

The speaker pointed out that normally, she would not say such long sentences. She provided (38):

38  lj leah, Vielle-lea
    3SG.NEG be.INF brother-GEN be.PRES.3SG
    ‘no, my brother has’
    [YS2_3; 06:00]

39  T: I have a car that I use to go to school with, but my sister owns it.
    manne biæle-m atnam mejnie skavl-eše vuajam men dihtæ ëabpa-n biæle
    1SG car-ACC have.PRES.1SG REL.PRON.COM.SG school-ILL drive.PRES.1SG but
    35g.NOM sister-GEN car[NOM]
    ‘I have a car that I go to school with but it is my sister’s/ but my sister owns it’
    [YS2_3; 06:45]

The following alternative was provided:

40  Biæle-m atnam mejnie skavl-eše vuajam. Dihtæ ëabpa-n biæle
    Car-ACC have.PRES.1SG REL.PRON.COM.SG school-ILL drive.PRES.1SG 35g.NOM
    sister-GEN car[NOM]
    ‘I have a car that I go to school with but it is my sister’s/ but my sister owns it’
    [YS2_3; 08:00]
T: I had a bicycle that got stolen
Mov lij sygkele maam manne-ste sualadin
1SG.GEN be.PAST.3SG bicycle[NOM] REL.PRON.SG.ACC 1SG.ELAT steal.3PL (!!?)
‘I had a bike that got stolen’
[YS2_3; 11:30]

Asking if (41) can be expressed with the habere-verb as well was confirmed and the following sentence provided:
Sygkelem utnim maam manne-ste sualadin bicycle[NOM] have.PAST.1SG REL.PRON.SG.ACC 1SG.ELAT steal.PAST.3PL
‘I had a bike that got stolen’
[YS2_3; 12:20]

Sygkele-m maam vijhte jaepie-n atneme, dan bâeries dekk-h bicycle-ACC REL.PRON.SG.ACC five year-GEN have.PAST.PRTC 3SG.GEN old tyre-PL
‘the bicycle that I have had for five years has old tyres’
[YS2_3; 14:00]

Eah leah beetnegh.
NEG.PRES.3PL be.PRES.3PL money
‘I have no money’
Lit.: (there) is no money
[YS2_3; 14:50]

T: I have many thoughts.
Ussjedalleminie think.GERUND
‘I am thinking’ >verb.
[YS2_3; 15:40]

manne rudtje-ste
1SG back-ELAT
‘My back hurts’
[YS2_3; 17:00]

manne âejjij-ste
1SG head-ELAT
‘I have a headache’ (strong!)
[YS2_3; 17:40]

Âejjieh saejriedieh
Head-PL hurt.PRES.3PL
‘my head hurts’ ~ ‘I have a headache’ (“More usual; less strong”)  
[YS2_3; 17:50]

The speaker said that she would never say a sentence like (49):
*Manne giete-m atnam
1SG hand-ACC have.PRES.1SG
‘I have a hand’
[YS2_4; 01:30]
>A possible situation where this sentence could be used is as an answer to the question *gusnie*? ‘where?’ – as if the focus was that the hand was hidden. It is clear that I *have* a hand.

50      mov  giete
1SG.GEN hand[NOM]
‘I have a hand’
[YS2_4; 02:30]

51      mov  lea  giete
1SG.GEN be.PRES.3Sg  hand[NOM]
‘I do have a hand’ (“förtydligande”)
[YS2_4; 02:50]