

Jussi YLIKOSKI (Oulu)

Remarks on Veps purposive non-finites

Based on a paper presented at the symposium "Reconnecting Finnic" held in Helsinki on 15–16 November 2002

1. Introduction

In this paper I explore part of the syntax and semantics of certain non-finite verb forms in Veps, one of the most endangered Uralic languages spoken in the European part of Russia. More precisely, the purpose of the paper is to re-examine what has been said about a specific usage of the Veps non-finite verb form in *-des* in previous general descriptions of Veps and the Finnic languages (Livonian, Estonian, Votic, Finnish, Ingrian, Karelian, Olonetsian, Lude and Veps). I will argue that the functions of the *-des* form labeled "purposive" in the previous literature have not been adequately understood, and that a better understanding is achieved by relating the use of the *-des* form to the purposive functions of the infinitives in *-da* and *-mha*.

This paper is intended primarily as a synchronic description of a small part of Veps grammar, although some diachronic and cross-linguistic remarks are also included. The structure of the paper is as follows: Section 2 presents a brief introduction to our current knowledge of purposive non-finites in Veps and other Finnic languages, while certain key concepts and terms are defined in Section 3. The purposive functions of the *-des* form and related non-finites are re-examined in Section 4; the purposive functions of the *-des* form are described as instances of the phenomenon labeled as *adverbial-gap purpose clauses*, as opposed to so-called *object-gap* and *subject-gap purpose clauses* with infinitives in *-da* and *-mha*, respectively. Briefly, the term *adverbial-gap purpose clause* refers to non-finite clauses that express actions where a central but non-agentive argument of the main clause occurs in a more peripheral (adverbial) semantic role, e.g. as an instrument or a locative. This and related concepts are explained at length in Section 3.

In Section 5, adverbial-gap purpose clauses are distinguished from purpose clauses expressed with the infinitive in *-da*, often preceded by the conjunction *miše* '(in order) that'. Various adnominal and adverbial properties of the *-des* form are examined in Sections 6 and 7 respectively. Section 8

presents a summarizing discussion, with additional comments on the problems of describing and understanding Veps non-finites; I also briefly discuss some of the differences between spoken and literary Veps and the similarities and differences between Veps and its neighboring languages.

The conclusions presented here are based on data consisting of nearly all of the dialect samples (excluding samples of metrical folk poetry) published in Finland and Russia during the period 1853–1982 (amounting to approximately 700 pages), and the recent translations of parts of the Bible (the Gospels and Acts, published in 1992–1999); these are enumerated in the list of data sources given at the end of the paper. It may be noted at the outset, however, that the examples given in previous descriptions of Veps for the non-finites in question fit quite smoothly into the patterns that I will propose in the following sections. Moreover, it will be seen that some examples presented in previous studies serve as further support for the findings and conclusions arising from my own data.

Finally, a few notes on the names given to the non-finites discussed in this article are in order. The standard names of the Veps non-finite verb forms are based on the peculiarities of the Finnish grammatical tradition. Consequently, non-finites formed with the suffixes *-da*, *-des* and *-mha* are known as “(the lative of) the first infinitive”, “the inessive of the second infinitive” and “the illative of the third infinitive”, respectively. However, as will be discussed in Section 2, only the non-finites in *-da* and *-mha* can be labeled as *infinitives* in the generally accepted sense of the word, while the main function of the non-finite in *-des* — and especially of its cognates in other Finnic languages — is that of a *converb*. I therefore prefer to speak of the “*-da* infinitive” and the “*-mha* infinitive”; but as for the non-finite in *-des*, I will simply call it “the *-des* form” rather than using the term *infinitive* — not to speak of the “second infinitive inessive”, as the Veps form relates to the inessive case only diachronically. This is also in line with the term “*des*-vorm” in the Estonian grammatical tradition. Furthermore, in the absence of all-Finnic suffixes for the non-finites in question, I occasionally use the Veps forms to refer to the use of these forms (i.e. of their variants) in Finnic as a whole.

2. Non-finites in *-des*, *-da* and *-mha* in Veps and other Finnic languages

The non-finite verb form which is the focus of this paper is formed by suffixing the formant *-des* (~ *-tes*) to the verb stem. The suffix is generally held to originate in an ancient verbal noun in **-tV* followed by the inessive case ending **-snA*, and it has developed into an opaque *converb* marker found

in every Finnic language (*-*tesnA* > Finnish *-tessA* and Veps, Estonian *-des* among others; see e.g. Saukkonen 1965: 21ff.; Laanest 1982: 245–247). Its probable original function as a marker of simultaneity of two states of affairs ('when V-ing') can be found in all Finnic languages; on the other hand, at least in Estonian and Livonian the same form is also used to express many other interpositional relations and is better described as a contextual converb (for contextual converbs see e.g. König 1995: 58; V. Nedjalkov 1995: 106–109; I. Nedjalkov 1998: 424).

When it comes to Veps, however, it has been noted that the *-des* form — labeled as “the inessive of the second infinitive” in accord with the Finnish grammatical tradition — is used in three obviously distinct functions: in addition to the all-Finnic temporal modifying function (1a), these forms are also used as secondary predicates in non-finite constructions occurring as complements to verbs of perception and cognition, i.e. in constructions reminiscent of *accusativus cum infinitivo/participio* in many other European languages (1b; see Kettunen 1943: 214, 496; cf. Ylikoski 2001: 215–216). The third main function of the *-des* form — and the main subject of this study — is illustrated in (1c):

(1)¹ a. *södēs* *ližootelomaa* *solan* (Kettunen 1943: 493)

eat.*des* add.1PL. salt.GEN

'We tend to add salt when eating.'

b. *nägin* *neičen* *sobiid* *pestēs* (Kettunen 1943: 496)

see.PAST.1SG [girl.GEN garment.PL.PART wash.*des*]

'I saw a girl washing clothes.'

c. *anda* *mileen* *muil* *pestēs* (Kettunen 1943: 495)

give.IMP.2SG LALL. soap wash.*des*

'Give me a piece of soap to wash.'

Although the existence of sentences like (1c) has been generally recognized in the previous literature, and there have even been attempts to explain how this function might have developed from the original temporal meaning, the actual characterizations of these constructions appear to be surprisingly minimal: according to Kettunen (1943: 192), the *-des* form “quite often expresses purpose”, or (1c) is an instance of “the purposive construction” (pp. 494–495). Very similar wordings can be found in Airila et al. (1945: 27) and Zajceva (1981: 270; 2001: 39–40), as well as in Penttilä (1942: 153), who states that the *-des* form — and its cognates in Karelian (see Section 8 below) — “expresses the aim of the action denoted by the main verb”.

Regrettably, such characterizations — based on Finnish grammatical notions, such as “purposive construction” or “sentence equivalent” — easily lead one to conclude that the *-des* form corresponds to the Finnish purposive converb in *-tAkse-* (“the translative case of the first infinitive”, followed by a possessive suffix) with the meaning ‘in order to V’. Even though the Veps *-des* form can at times be translated with the Finnish *-tAkse-*, it will be argued in the following that the purposive *-des* construction is semantically quite exceptional and has not as yet been adequately understood, while the characterizations cited above are better suited to describing the purposive use of the infinitive in *-da*, which corresponds closely to the Finnish *-tAkse-* and especially the English (*in order*) *to V*, the Russian (*čtoby*) *V-t'*, and their equivalents in many other languages (see Section 5).

In order to understand the purposive functions of the *-des* form, two other non-finites, the infinitives in *-da* (~ *-ta*) and *-mha* (~ *-maha*), also evidently have to be taken into account. These forms and their cognates in all Finnic languages are the most important non-finites of those used primarily as complements of verbs with meanings such as ‘begin’, ‘want’, ‘order’ and so forth; in other words, in functions that are characteristic of verb forms traditionally labeled *infinitives* (for the notion of *infinitive*, see e.g. Haspelmath 1989; Nedjalkov 1998: 421–422; Ylikoski 2003). The mutual relations between the two infinitives are fairly complex, and they are best understood in the light of their diachronic development, studied quite thoroughly by Saukkonen (1965, 1966).

In short, both infinitives have developed from directional case forms of earlier verbal nouns in different periods. The infinitive in *-da* (the “lative case of the first infinitive” in the Fennicist tradition) is older, morphologically opaque (without a case ending of any kind), and more vague and abstract in meaning. The infinitive in *-mha*, the “illative case of the third infinitive” appears to have developed later; its origin is still somewhat transparent, and it tends to be used as a complement of verbs with more or less concrete, directional meanings (e.g. verbs of motion; cf. 10c and 19). The transparent nature of the infinitive in *-mha* is also reflected in the fact that the “illative of the third infinitive” (*-mha*) bears a relation to the less frequent non-finites in *-mas* (the third infinitive inessive), *-maspäi* (elative) and *-mata* (abessive); these other forms are largely irrelevant to the topic at hand and will not be discussed here, but see e.g. Kettunen (1943: 496–500) and Laanest (1982: 247–248).

As the two infinitives largely correspond to single infinitives in many other languages, they can be characterized as occurring in a sort of complementary distribution. On the other hand, the close interrelations of these forms can also

be seen in the fact that some verbs can take both infinitives as their complements:

- (2) a. *en* *ǵuuda* *pesta* (Saukkonen 1966: 65)
 NEG.1SG have.time.CONNEG wash.*da*
 'I don't have time to wash.'

- b. *ed-ik* *ǵuuda* *čajud* *ǵomha* (Saukkonen 1966: 67)
 NEG.2SG-Q have.time.CONNEG tea.PART drink.*mha*
 'Don't you have time to drink tea?'

What is relevant to the present discussion, however, is the distinction between the functions of the two Finnic infinitives in sentences such as (3a–d); for the present purposes, the examples are first given from Finnish:

- (3) a. *Anna* *minulle leipää* (*jota*) *syöää* (~ **syömään*).
 give.IMP.2SG LALL bread.PART (REL.PART) eat.*tA* (~ **eat.mAAAn*)
 'Give me bread to eat.'

- b. *Anna* *minulle koira vartioimaan* (~ **vartioida*) *taloa*.
 give.IMP.2SG LALL dog guard.*mAAAn* (~ **guard.tA*) house.PART
 'Give me a dog_i to guard_i the house.'

The crucial point here is that in the Finnic languages one of the infinitives (Finnish *-tA* ~ Veps *-da*) is used when the object of the main clause refers to the patient of the verb in the infinitive form (e.g. 'bread' as the patient of 'eating' in 3a), while the other infinitive (Finnish *-mAAAn* ~ Veps *-mha*) occurs when the object of the main clause refers to the agent of the infinitive ('a dog' as the agent of 'guarding' in 3b). Unlike the Finnic languages, in many languages — for instance English or Russian — one and the same infinitive form can be used in both functions: i.e. *bread to eat*, *a dog to guard* or Russian *hleb est'*, *sobaku ohranjat'* with the same meaning. (The use of the relative pronoun *jota* in 3a will be discussed briefly below.) Now consider the following examples:

- (3) c. *Anna* *minulle saippua* (*jolla*) *pestä* (~ **pesemään*) *kädet*.
 give.IMP.2SG LALL soap (REL.ADE) wash.*tA* (~ **wash.mAAAn*) hand.PL
 'Give me a piece of soap to wash the hands (with).'

- d. *Anna* *minulle talo* (*jossa*) *asua* (~ **asumaan*).
 give.IMP.2SG LALL house (REL.INE) live.*tA* (~ **live.mAAAn*)
 'Give me a house to live (in).'

If the object of the main clause is neither the agent nor the patient of the infinitive, but rather refers to some other participant in the action denoted by the non-finite verb form, the infinitive in *-tA* is used (3c–d). The semantic role of the main clause object in relation to the action denoted by an infinitive can often be made more explicit with the help of case-inflected relative pronouns; such expressions principally correspond to the use of additional prepositions in the English translations of (3c), where *soap* refers to the **instrument** of ‘washing’ (*soap to wash (with)*) and (3d), where *house* refers to the **location** of ‘living’ (*a house to live (in)*). In contrast to English prepositions, the relative pronoun can also be used when referring to a patient role; in such cases the pronoun occurs in one of the object cases (e.g. partitive in *leipää jota syödä*, but *bread to eat* Ø in 3a).

In (3a–d), the forms and the functions of the infinitives are in close relation to the object of a transitive clause that expresses a change of possession. Exactly the same kinds of infinitival constructions may occur with certain intransitive clauses where the case marking of the subject partly corresponds to that of the objects of transitive clauses (for this type of “ergativity” in Finnish as representative of the Finnic languages, see e.g. Itkonen 1979). In such cases, the relations between the infinitives and the main clause subjects (4) correspond to the relations between the infinitives and the main clause objects in (3):

- (4) a. *Tässä on leipää (jota) syödä (~ *syömään).*
 here be.3SG bread.PART (REL.PART) eat.tA (~ *eat.mAAn)
 ‘Here is bread to eat.’
- b. *Tässä on koira vartioimaan (~ *vartioida) taloa.*
 ‘Here is a dog to guard the house.’
- c. *Tässä on saippua (jolla) pestä (~ *pesemään) kädet.*
 ‘Here is a piece of soap to wash the hands (with).’
- d. *Tässä on talo (jossa) asua (~ *asumaan).*
 ‘Here is a house to live (in).’

It must be admitted at this point that many of the sentences in (3, 4) are somewhat artificial, and some speakers of Finnish consider them highly unnatural, dialectal, archaic or even ungrammatical (cf. Leino 2003: 52–53 and references therein). I wish to make clear that these examples are mainly meant to serve as an introduction to the peculiarities of the Veps language, as many readers are presumably more familiar with Finnish than Veps. In addition, (3, 4) are intended to illustrate the “common Finnic” use of the two infinitives in a

system that is assumed to originate in Proto-Finnic, i.e. the ancestor of Finnish, Veps and the other Finnic languages.²

These uses of the two infinitives in Finnic have been quite thoroughly described in Saukkonen's (1965, 1966) investigation of the forms in question. It is important to note that he describes the uses of the two infinitives as basically the same in all Finnic languages. However, in the following sections I will present examples showing that the Veps infinitives in *-da* and *-mha* are used in sentences corresponding to (3a, 4a) and (3b, 4b) respectively, but the use of the infinitive in *-da* in sentences like (3c-d, 4c-d) is quite sporadic. Moreover, it will be shown that in these latter positions the non-finite in *-des* is used instead.

To begin with, I am proposing that (1c) is actually the Veps equivalent of Finnish (3c). In other words, (1c) seems to translate into 'Give me a piece of soap to wash with' rather than to 'Give me a piece of soap in order that I can wash'. What is more, nearly every instance of the so-called purposive *-des* form appears to fit into the pattern of sentences (3c-d, 4c-d); we can thus conclude that virtually every occurrence of the *-des* form in Veps can be considered either (i) a converb of simultaneity (1a), (ii) a perceptual or cognitive verb complement (1b), or (iii) a non-finite expressing the purpose for which the referent of a particular noun — such as the piece of soap in (1c) — is intended to be used.

In the corpus described in Section 1 I have found a total of 133 *-des* forms, of which 66 can be analyzed as temporal converbs (of the type seen in 1a; see also *tuudes* in 21); 15 of them function as perception and cognition verb complements (1b), and 44 — i.e. one third of all occurrences — can be analyzed as having a purposive meaning. In addition to the three main functions of the *-des* form and a couple of obscure sentences, I know of two cases where the *-des* form seems to function as a complement to verbs *kel'ta* 'forbid' and *vaikištuda* 'fall silent; refrain from speaking' (see Kettunen 1943: 494; Saukkonen 1965: 23–24 < NÄKM328).

In previous attempts to describe the nature of purposive *-des* forms, no attention seems to have been given to the actual lexico-syntactic collocations of *-des* forms, which quite closely parallel the use of the infinitives in *-da* and *-mha* in equivalents of Finnish (3a–b) and (4a–b). On the other hand, Saukkonen's description of the two infinitives seems to be somewhat ill-founded, in that he does not even mention the Veps *-des* forms while quite straightforwardly claiming that sentences such as (3c–d) and (4c–d) abound in all Finnic languages.

The non-finite constructions exemplified in (3, 4) seem to occur mainly in connection with various transitive verbs denoting acts of giving, taking,

asking, creating or manufacturing, or in intransitive sentences denoting the possession or existence of something concrete. In other words, there is almost always an NP that refers to a non-agentive participant in a possessive or (existential-)locative relation (4) or to a non-agentive participant in an event involving some kind of change in a possessive or locative relation (3). In agreement with the Finnish grammatical tradition, Saukkonen (1965, 1966) analyzes the infinitives in (3, 4) as adverbial modifiers (see also Dubrovina 1972). Following Saukkonen, some scholars of Finnish have remarked that such infinitives may be paraphrased with finite relative clauses and that in this respect they might be analyzed as adnominal modifiers, although they still have properties that make them appear adverbial — rather than attributive — non-finite constructions (see e.g. Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979: 379–380); Bartsch (1979: 20–21) speaks of “relative purpose constructions”.

As this study is intended as a preliminary exploration into one part of the syntax and semantics of the Veps *-des* form, and since the corpus on which the study is based is relatively small, I do not attempt to go in detail into the problem of whether these non-finites are in fact adverbial or adnominal. At this point, suffice it to say that the nature of the Veps equivalents to (3, 4) is evidently basically similar to that of the Finnish infinitives. Questions relating to the adverbial/adnominal nature of the *-des* forms are addressed in Sections 6 and 7, but the details are left to further studies.

Finally, it must be acknowledged that sentences like (3a) cannot ultimately be distinguished from the use of the *-da* infinitive in expressions of permission (cf. Saukkonen 1965: 219–229); in the same vein, the use of the infinitive in *-mha* is inseparably linked with more complement-like expressions of asking or having or ordering someone to do something (cf. Saukkonen 1965: 180–187). However, this need not be of great concern here, as the Veps *-des* form — which is the focus of this paper and to which the two infinitives are compared — is used in quite limited purposive functions only.

3. Notes on terminology

The description of part of the functions of the Veps non-finite in *-des* in the following sections touches upon a multitude of morphological, syntactic and semantic phenomena, most of which cannot be pursued in depth in the present article. In particular, it must be emphasized that the syntactic analysis of the non-finites in question is hindered by the relatively small number of concrete occurrences of these non-finites in the corpus and in previous studies of Veps. Furthermore, despite some seemingly unique features of Veps non-finites,

many of the questions concerning their syntactic statuses seem similar to the problems of describing analogous infinitives in many other languages as well.

For present purposes, it appears useful to distinguish between at least four different uses of non-finites, all of which might be characterized as "purposive" functions. In the sections to follow, I will refer to the non-finites exemplified in (3, 4) as **subject-gap purpose clauses** (SPCs), **object-gap purpose clauses** (OPCs) and **adverbial-gap purpose clauses** (APCs). These labels are based on Jones' (1991) study of various infinitival purpose clauses in English. By *SPCs* the author refers to infinitival clauses where the subjects of the actions denoted by the infinitives are not explicitly expressed, but rather "are felt to be more or less referentially dependent on overt NPs in S" (p. 25). In other words, the subject of an SPC is coreferential with an argument of the main clause; in the Chomskyan framework adopted by Jones, such missing subjects are seen as a result of "gapping" (whence the term *subject-gap purpose clause*). When applied to the description of Veps, Finnish and other Finnic languages, the notion *SPC* refers to non-finite clauses like (3b) and (4b), where *koira* 'dog' is the "gapped subject" of *vartioimaan taloa* 'to guard the house'.

Unlike Jones, I distinguish between **object-gap** purpose clauses and **adverbial-gap** purpose clauses. Jones (1991: 43) explicitly states that in his usage *OPC* refers to various "gapped" purpose clauses that are not *SPCs*. In the following sections I will restrict the meaning of *OPC* to those clauses where the gapped argument of the verb in the infinitive form is its object; put concretely, *leipää* 'bread' in (3a) and (4a) is the gapped object of the infinitive *syödä* 'to eat'. Adding to Jones' terminology, I have coined the term *APC* to describe non-finite clauses exemplified in (3c-d) and (4c-d), where *saippua* 'soap' and *talo* 'house' are neither agents nor patients of the infinitives but instruments (of washing) and locatives (of living), respectively.

It is important to distinguish between the syntactic functions of nouns (e.g. subject, object and adverbial modifier) and the semantic roles of their referents (e.g. agent, patient and instrument). Since the overt subjects, objects and adverbials of the "gapped" clauses are actually missing, the terms *SPC*, *OPC* and *APC* are in fact based on the semantics of the non-finite clauses. This is also reflected in the descriptions of the Finnic infinitives (such as in 3, 4), where the objects of transitive main clauses or the subjects of intransitive main clauses have been termed the "logical" subjects, objects or adverbials of the infinitives (see Saukkonen 1965, 1966; Dubrovina 1972: 18, 43); in other words, *SPCs*, *OPCs* and *APCs* have also been distinguished in Finnic linguistics. In principle, it would be more accurate to define such clauses in semantic terms — as agent-gap, patient-gap or instrument-gap purpose clauses

etc; as will be seen in the following sections, however, there is no real danger of misunderstanding the terms *SPC* or *OPC*. Moreover, it will become apparent that the notion *APC* nicely captures the essence of the purposive functions of the Veps *-des* form, as the term may be used to refer to various non-finite clauses where the "gapped" element is one of the peripheral participants of an action denoted by the non-finite (e.g. instrument, locative, accompaniment), while the infinitives in *-da* and *-mha* are used in "gapping" one of the core participants.

I emphasize that in this paper, terms such as *adverbial-gap purpose clauses* are to be understood metaphorically, as a convenient way of distinguishing between different kinds of non-finite clauses. Although I have adopted the terms *OPC* and *SPC* from Jones' (1991) formal approach to English infinitive clauses, I do not take a stand on whether there are some underlying structures from which the actual purpose clauses in Veps are derived by a specific process of "gapping". Likewise I do not necessarily use these terms in full agreement with Jones, nor is it my intention to make any definitive statements about similarities and differences between English and Veps. I am also not claiming that the three-partite division of gapped purpose clauses, into *SPCs*, *OPCs* and *APCs*, is a particularly elegant way to describe and analyze the Finnish infinitival constructions seen in (3, 4), since the manifestations of *OPCs* in (3a, 4a) and *APCs* (3c-d, 4c-d) do not essentially differ from each other. It might be added that largely the same phenomena have been described in other languages as well, though in yet other terms. For instance, Teleman et al. (1999: 602-605) describe Swedish infinitival *OPCs* and *APCs* under the label "infinitive phrase with an implicit dependent" (*infinitivfras med underförstådd bestämning*).

In addition to the three main types of gapped purpose clauses, one more type of purpose clauses must be distinguished. As we shall see in Section 5, the term *purpose clause* is usually used in describing a clause that expresses a relatively independent state of affairs that is the aim of the action denoted by the governing clause. Jones (1991) labels such infinitival purpose clauses *in order clauses* (*IOCs*), since in English such uses of the *to*-infinitive may often be preceded by the phrase *in order*. Whelpton (1995: 6) calls such clauses "Rationale Clauses", and he distinguishes them from the above-mentioned "gapped" clauses by the following properties:

- ([5]) David spoke to Damian in Welsh (in order) *e* [= empty position] to keep the gossip secret.
- ([6]) David spoke Welsh (in order) for Damian to feel more at home.

Rationale Clauses may be distinguished in four ways: (i) they need not contain any gap, as in ([6]); (ii) where there is a gap it must be in subject position, as in ([5]); and (iii) the gap must be controlled by the Agent (in ([5]), it is David who intends to keep the gossip secret, not Damian); (iv) they can generally be prefaced by the phrase *in order* [– –]. (Whelpton 1995: 6.)

I will return to these types of non-finite purpose clauses and their realization in Veps and other Finnic languages in Section 5. To sum up terminological issues: I use the terms *purpose clause* or *purposive functions* in a relatively broad sense, comprising the three main types of gapped infinitival clauses (3, 4) as well as the *in order* type of purpose clauses (5, 6). Moreover, when speaking of the Veps *-des* form, I use the attribute *purposive* to characterize practically every instance where the *-des* form is not used as a converb of simultaneity (1a) or as a perceptual or cognitive verb complement (1b).

Finally, it should be noted that the above citation suggests that *in order* clauses (or Whelpton's Rationale Clauses) too can be characterized as "gapped", in the sense that the agent of a same-subject purpose clause (5) is identical to the agent of the main clause. However, following this line of thought we could end up characterizing all of the purpose clauses in (3a–d) as "subject-gap purpose clauses", as the missing or "gapped" agents of eating, washing and living in (3a, 3c–d) are coreferential with the recipients of the main clauses. In order to avoid confusion, I confine the terms *SPC*, *OPC* and *APC* to clauses where the "gapped" subjects, objects and adverbials are coreferential with the objects of transitive main clauses (3) or with the non-agentive subjects of intransitive main clauses (4). I return to the covert subjects of APCs in Section 5.

4. Purposive functions of the *-des* revisited

The examples in the following sections are presented to demonstrate that one of the three functions of the Veps *-des* form is a quite specific one. Although generally labeled "purposive" in earlier descriptions of Veps, it hardly ever corresponds to purposives in a more standard sense of the word; examples of these will be presented in Section 5. Setting aside attempts to see synchronic and diachronic relations between the temporal (1a) and purposive (1c) functions of this form, I start by presenting some of the most illuminating examples of the three-way distinction of the non-finites in *-da*, *-mha* and *-des*, all of

which might equally well be characterized as "purposive". The most common main verb of such non-finites in my data is *antta* 'give'. Examples (7a–b) correspond closely to the Finnish sentences (3a–b):

- (7) a. *Siid molodieile anttaze čajud d'oda, kofiad,*
 then newlywed.PL.ALL give.3PL³ tea.PART drink.da coffee.PART
podnos paba stolale. (NÄKM122)
 tray put.3PL³ table.ALL

'After that, the newlyweds are given tea to drink, and coffee; the tray is put on the table.'

- b. *t'otuško, anda meilemoi koirad ehtatamha ivan*
 aunt give.IMP.2SG we.ALL dog.PART lead.mha I.
carevičan kod'he. (NÄKM411)
 C.GEN home.ILL

'Dear aunt, give us a dog to lead us to the home of Ivan Czarevich.'

čajud in (7a) refers to the patient of both the main verb (*anttaze*) and of the infinitive in *-da* (*d'oda*) whereas the infinitive in *-mha* (*ehtatamha* in 7b) is used when the patient of the main verb is the agent of the verb in a non-finite form (i.e. 'a dog' as the patient of 'giving' but as the agent of 'leading'). To use the terminology of Jones (1991), (*čajud*) *d'oda* in (7a) is an object-gap purpose clause, while (*koirad*) *ehtatamha ivan carevičan kod'he* in (7b) is a subject-gap purpose clause. However, as has already been said, the Veps equivalent of the Finnish *-tA* in (3c–d) is not usually the *-da* infinitive but rather the *-des* form. In addition to (1c), there are plenty of similar occurrences of the *-des* form referring to actions in which the patient of 'giving' is either an instrument of 'washing' (8a) or 'carrying' (8b), for instance, or — rather than an instrument in the everyday sense of the word — a vehicle for riding (8c) or a place for sleeping (8d). In other words, the *-des* clauses in (8a–d) are not OPCs or SPCs but APCs:

- (8) a. *nece rebaane jokś i muilpalan andoo*
 that fox run.PAST.3SG and piece.of.soap.GEN give.PAST.3SG
ivan cařovičale pestes. (NEV2:22)
 I. C.ALL wash.des

'The fox ran and gave Ivan Czarevich a piece of soap to wash (himself) with.'

- b. andoo *hänle mamš veden kandites seglan.* (NEV1:17)
 give.PAST.3SG (s)he.ALL mother water.GEN carry.*des* sieve.GEN
 'The mother gave her a sieve to carry water with.'
- c. anda *sõtää tatko minun mužikale hebošt*
 give.IMP.2SG *des* father I.GEN husband.ALL horse.PART
švirgahtades tämbää. (NEV1:70–71)
 gallop.*des* today
 'Dear father, give my husband a horse to gallop with today.'
- d. anda *miile osovii sija magates.* (NVM177)
 give.IMP.2SG we.ALL separate bed sleep.*des*
 'Give us a separate bed to sleep on.'

The infinitive in *-da* may occur in approximately the same function, but in practice this is quite rare; I return to this in Section 8 below. As opposed to *kandites* in (8b), *kantta* in (9) is a Veps example of the common Finnic usage of the infinitive in *-da* and its cognates:⁴

- (9) Andoi *hänle veden kantta seglan.* (NÄKM251)
 give.PAST.3SG (s)he.ALL water.GEN carry.*da* sieve.GEN
 'She gave her a sieve to carry water with.'

At this point Table 1 may be presented, illustrating the above three-way distinction between the Veps non-finites in *-da*, *-mha* and *-des*, as well as their relation to the corresponding non-finites in languages such as English and in other Finnic languages (represented in Table 1 by Finnish):

Table 1. Non-finite verb forms used in SPCs, OPCs and APCs in English, Finnish and Veps.

	English	Finnish	Veps
Subject-gap purpose clauses (SPCs) e.g. <i>a dog to guard</i>	<i>to V</i>	<i>V-mAAn</i>	<i>V-mha</i>
Object-gap purpose clauses (OPCs) e.g. <i>bread to eat</i>	<i>to V</i>	<i>(jota)jonka</i> <i>V-tA</i>	<i>V-da</i>
Adverbial-gap purpose clauses (APCs) e.g. <i>soap to wash (with)</i>	<i>to V</i> <i>(with/in/...)</i>	<i>(jolla)jossa</i> <i>V-tA</i>	<i>V-des</i> <i>(V-da)</i>

In addition to (7, 8), with *antta* 'give' as the main verb, the distinctions between the three non-finites can also be seen in (10a–c) and (11a–c). In (10), the finite clauses with the verb *pakita* 'ask for' express requests for specific possessive relations, and in (11), the main verb *jätta* 'leave (something somewhere)' refers to maintenance of the existing possessive or (existential-)locative relations:

- (10) a. *u hän durak ka dumaib, mise hänoo*
 but (s)he fool so think.3SG that (s)he.ADE

pakičobad heboožen sōdä. (NEV1:71)
 ask.3PL horse.GEN eat.3S

'But he, the fool, thinks they are asking for a horse to eat.'

- b. *hei pakičiba koirašt möst satmaha ivan carevičan*
 they ask.PAST.3PL dog.PART again lead.mha I. C.GEN

kodihe. (NÄKM413)
 home.ILL

'Once again, they asked for the dog to lead them to the home of Ivan Czarevich.'

- c. *hän tulob hebod gōtmaha i pakičeb vādrad*
 (s)he come.3SG horse.PART water.mha and ask.3SG bucket.PART

hebon gōttes. (OVR273)
 horse.GEN water.des

'He comes to water the horse and asks for a bucket to water the horse with.'

- (11) a. *Meil küläs kaiken narodan zmei söi,*
 we.ADE village.INE all.GEN people.GEN serpent eat.PAST.3SG

jät't' tol'ko üht mindai tänambäižeks päiviks
 leave.PAST.3SG only one.PART LPART today.TRA day.TRA

sōdä. (NÄKM471)
 eat.3S

'The dragon ate all the people in our village, he left only me (for himself) to eat today.'

- b. *a händast d'ättihe päčile tuhkad segloimaha.* (NVM173)
 but(s)he.PART leave.PAST.3PL.oven.ALL.ash.PART sift.mha
 'But they left her on the oven to sift ash.' (also Saukkonen 1965: 183)
- c. *ota kaik da tol'ko jäta mileen pert'*
 take.IMP.2SG everything and only leave.IMP.2SG LALL house
lapsiimu el'ades. (NVM6)
 child.PL.PROL live.des

'Take everything, just leave me the house to live in with the children.'

Again, the common Finnic purposive use of the infinitives in *-da* (10a, 11a) and *-mha* (10b, 11b) has been quite sufficiently described in Saukkonen (1965: 180–192, 208–217), whereas the use of the Veps *-des* form (10c, 11c) has not been mentioned in this connection. As in (1c) and (8a–d), the objects of the main clauses do not refer to the agents (cf. 10a, 11a) or to the patients (10b, 11b) of the actions expressed by the non-finites but rather to the **instrument** (of watering the horse, example 10c) or to the **location** (of living with the children, example 11c). Other occurrences of adverbial-gap *-des* clauses include sentences where transitive main clauses denote various acts of creating or manufacturing something, i.e. bringing something into existence. A certain similitude between the creation and the giving of something can be seen by comparing (8d) and (12):

- (8) d. *anda miile osovii sija magates.* (NVM177)
 give.IMP.2SG we.ALL separate bed sleep.des
 'Give us a separate bed to sleep on.'
- (12) *Tege miniin sija magattaha pandes.* (NÄKM247)
 make.IMP.2SG.LALL bed go.to.sleep.des
 'Make me a bed to go to sleep on.'

Example (13) serves to illustrate the type of sentence where the main verb, expressing manufacturing, is quite specific in meaning (*plet't'a* 'plait', i.e. 'make by plaiting'). In this example, the relations between the *-des* forms and the objects of the main clauses are not as prototypical as the instrument relations in (1c, 8a–c, 10c) or the locative relations in (8d, 12):

- (13) *pletin virzuid da stupnid, meršid,*
 plait.1SG birch-bark.shoe.PL.PART and sole.PL.PART knapsack.PL.PART

puzuižid marģiden poimdes, ġauhon pidados, surmán
 basket.PL.PART berry.PL.GEN pick.*des* flour.GEN keep.*des* grits.GEN

pidados, kalan ongitados čunžpuzuižed pletin
 keep.*des* fish.GEN angle.*des* wormbox.PL plait.1SG

katusutme. (OVR136)

small.cover.PROL

'I plait birch-bark shoes and soles, knapsacks, baskets to put ("pick") berries in, to keep flour in, to keep grits in; for angling, I plait covered boxes for angleworms.'

Although the plaited baskets, in a sense, are places where the flour and grits are kept, the locative relation is less obvious when speaking of baskets and picking berries. The semantic relation between angling and worm-boxes is even more abstract, but nevertheless quite clear. It is important to note at this point that there always appears to be an established relation between the *-des* form and the noun with which it occurs. Moreover, it seems that *-des* forms that cannot be analyzed as temporal converbs (cf. 1a) or as verb complements of perception or cognition (1b) never occur in contexts without an NP as a kind of semantic head of the *-des* form.

To return to intransitive sentences of the type illustrated by (4a–d) from Finnish: not much can be added to what has already been said about the distinct functions of Veps non-finites in *-da*, *-mha* and *-des*. The infinitive in *-da* is used when the non-agentive subject of the main clause refers to the patient (of eating and drinking; 14a), whereas the infinitive in *-mha* is used when the subject of the main clause denotes the agent (of eating; 14b). As might be expected, the *-des* form occurs in connection with nouns that are instruments of the actions denoted by the non-finite verb (i.e. shoes as an instrument of walking in 14c; money as an instrument of buying in 14d):

(14) a. *Mamuško, kacu mina löuzin pühkmuden i*
 mother look.IMP.2SG I find.PAST.1SG tablecloth.GEN and

kaikušt siad om meil šoda i d'oda. (NÄKM62)
 all.kinds.PART stuff.PART be.3SG we.ADE eat.*da* and drink.*da*

'Mother, look, I found a tablecloth and now we have all kinds of stuff to eat and drink.'

- b. *norau mārītas man, ājak sinaiž om*
 string.ADE measure.3PL land.GEN many.Q you.ADE be.3SG

ġedakoid, sömhü, näged, liibad. (OVR122)

eater.PL.PART eat.mha see.2SG bread.PART

'The land is measured with a string, to see how many eaters you have to eat (i.e., eating), you see, bread.'

- c. *ühted opotkad jaugas milaan läühü kävoodes,*
 one PL worn.birch-bark.shoe.PL foot.INE LADE barn.ILL walk.des

da ned-ki murenuded. (NEV1:55)

and they-PRT crumble.PTCP.ACT.PAST.PL

'I have only a pair of worn birch-bark shoes to walk to the barn with, and they too are broken.'

- d. *dengoid ele osttes, mända kuna-nibud' da*
 money.PL.PART is.not buy.des go.da somewhere and

miččehe-ni bohataha mužikaha öks da voruida hebo. (OVR19)

some.kind.ILL rich.ILL man.ILL night.TRA and steal.da horse

'There is [- We have] no money to buy [a horse]; I have to go somewhere, to stay overnight at some rich man's house and steal a horse.'

As with the transitive sentences in (13), *-des* forms may also occur with intransitive verbs with quite specific meanings, such as *ripta* 'hang, dangle' in (15). Again, it appears that the most important condition for a purposive *-des* form to occur in an intransitive sentence is that the main clause designates a possessive or (existential-)locative relation, so that the subject of the main verb does not play an agentive role.⁵ In accord with the previous examples, the *-des* form in (15) denotes the purpose for which the referent of the non-agentive subject of the main clause is used:

- (15) *Kauhaine lačus rippub veden ottes.* (NÄKM357)

scoop tub.INE hang.3SG water.GEN take.des

'A scoop is hanging in a tub for scooping water (with it).'

5. Non-finite means of expressing the interpositional relation of purpose in Veps

Although labeled “purposive” in previous descriptions of Veps, the functions of the *-des* form hardly ever correspond to the kinds of expressions that are generally known as purpose clauses. In addition to Whelpton’s (1995: 6) characterization of what he terms Rationale Clauses (see Section 3), some of the most explicit statements about the nature of purpose clauses can be cited from Haspelmath (1989: 304) and Givón (2001: 337):

The reference of subject of purpose clauses is most of the time predictable (i.e. it is **coreferential with the main clause subject**) because people are egoistic and **act** for their own purposes. (Haspelmath 1989: 304; emphasis mine.)

Purpose clauses, with their subject **most typically co-referential** with that of the main clause, signal **the purpose of the agent for acting** as they did in the event coded by the main clause. **The main clauses are thus typically active/agentive**, as in:

- ([16]) a. *He went out to look for his boy*
 b. *To go there, you must take the train*
 c. *In order to finish in time, she had to cut corners*
 (Givón 2001: 337; emphasis mine.)

In the preceding section, I did not pay attention to the possible coreference of the subjects of the non-finites and those of their main clauses. Turning back to the examples presented in the preceding section, we can say in brief that the gapped subject of a *-des* form is usually coreferential with the recipient or the benefactive of a transitive main clause denoting for instance giving (8a–d), leaving something in someone’s possession (11) or making, creating or manufacturing something (12). The subjects of the *-des* forms occurring with intransitive clauses are often coreferential with an adverbial argument indicating a possessor (14c–d). Nor is it unusual for the subject of a *-des* form to remain unspecified; see (13) and (15). In my data, the subjects of *-des* forms seem to be coreferential with those of their main clauses only when the main verb is *pakita* ‘to ask for’, i.e. a verb whose agent wishes to be the recipient of the resulting action (10c). A similar example is provided in (17) from Kettunen (1943: 213), with *sada* ‘to get’ as the main verb:

- (17) *vinad* *saimaa* *tol'ko* *kelen* *kasttes*
 liquor.PART get.PAST.1PL only tongue.GEN wet.des
 'We got liquor only to wet our tongues.'

Examples such as (16a–c) also show that purpose clauses may occur with agentive intransitive verbs (16a) as well; when occurring with transitive verbs, the action denoted by the purpose clause does not necessarily relate to the patient of the main clause in any way (16c). Admittedly, the semantic relation between the *-des* form and the thematic argument of the main clause seems at times to be quite distant, but it can nevertheless be explicated to some extent. Relations like that between 'worm boxes' and 'angling' in (13) or between 'liquor' and 'wetting the tongue' in (17) are some of the most extreme cases, but even there a syntactic and semantic resemblance to the most common — and in this sense prototypical — use of *-des* forms (i.e. those represented by 8a–d) is obvious.

A fact taken for granted in many definitions of purpose clauses is that they are adverbial clauses that express the purpose of the state of affairs — typically an action — denoted by the main clause as a whole, not merely the purpose for which a particular referent of an NP is used. In other words, purpose clauses express a mutual relation between two theoretically independent propositions; to quote Kortmann (1997: 86; 1998: 466), Purpose is an interclausal (or better, interpropositional) relation 'in order to *p*, *q*', i.e. a relation where "[the proposition] *p* is an intended result or consequence of [the proposition] *q* that is yet to be achieved". Kortmann (1997: 86) illustrates this relation with (18):

- (18) *I drove into London in order to buy a piano.*

Judging from my data, it seems unlikely that a *-des* form would — or even could — be used to translate the purposive clauses in (16) or (18). How, then, are sentences such as (16a–c) and (18) to be translated into Veps? In other words, how is the interpropositional relation of purpose (in the sense e.g. of Haspelmath 1989, Kortmann 1997, 1998, and Givón 2001) expressed in the language? Finite adverbial clauses aside, it is most important to note that purpose relations are also expressed by infinitival constructions that closely resemble the use of the infinitive in many other European languages. It seems possible to express purpose with a plain infinitive in *-da* (19); when expressing purpose, however, it is often preceded by the conjunction *miše* (*mišo*) (20) or *mišto* (21), both of which are also used as conjunctions introducing finite purpose clauses (for finite purpose clauses, see e.g. Kettunen 1943: 559–560):

- (19) *sid mesten nece mužik ajoo kevadoo, pašmha*
 then again that man ride.PAST.3SG spring.ADE plow.and.harrow.mha
kagrad semeta. (NEV2:42)
 oats.PART sow.da

'Then again, in the spring the man went to plow and harrow in order to sow oats.'

- (20) *onged tarbiž ezmai tacta kaikihe polihe,*
 hook.and.line.PL is.needed first throw.da every.PL.ILL side.PL.ILL
mišo tedištada, kus om kala. (OVR79)
 (in.order.)that find.out.da where.(INE) be.3SG fish

'At first one has to throw the hooks in every direction, in order to find out where the fish are.'

- (21) *mišto ii segoida tagas tuudes, roji dorogaižele*
 (in.order.)that NEG get.lost.da back come.des cast.PAST.3SG road.ALL
vouktid kivuzid. (NVM64)
 white.PL.PART small.stone.PL.PART

'In order not to get lost when coming back, he cast small white stones onto the road.'

According to my data, the use of the infinitive in *-da* is the standard means to express the 'in order to *p, q*' type of purpose in Veps. In accord with the generalizations made by Haspelmath (1989: 304) and Givón (2001: 337), the agents of purposive infinitives are usually coreferential with those of the main clauses. (For a different-subject use of the purposive infinitive, see example 34 below.) Such use of the infinitive in *-da* is quite common in most Finnic languages; the most remarkable exception is Finnish, with a special purposive converb in *-tAkse-* ('the translative case of the first infinitive'). Considering the attempts to describe the purposive use of the *-des* form, it is somewhat surprising that sentences like (19–21) have gone nearly unnoticed in previous descriptions of Veps.

The purposive functions of *-da* and its cognates in other Finnic languages, however, have been discussed by Saukkonen (1966: 136ff.) (see also Kettunen 1943: 489; Ikola 1960: 86–87). Saukkonen (1966: 146–150) notes that infinitives are often preceded by the same conjunctions that introduce finite purpose clauses; he sees such constructions (cf. 20, 21 and 34 below) as

hybrids of infinitival purposives and finite purpose clauses. However, it is worth noting that cross-linguistically it is quite common to augment purposive infinitives with such conjunctions; compare *čtoby* + infinitive ~ finite clause in Russian or *in order* + *to*-infinitive ~ *in order that* + finite clause in English, for instance. Haspelmath (1989: 302–303) explains phenomena like these as a result of **reinforcement** of the original purposive functions of the non-finite forms from which infinitives (i.e. non-finites used mainly in complement functions) often originate. In other words, the purposive use of the *-da* infinitive in Veps does not differ notably from the purposive infinitives in other, better-known languages; this may be one reason why it has not received much attention in the literature. (Note, however, that similarly to other Finnic languages, the purpose — or better, the purpose and direction — of motion is most often expressed by using the (illative) infinitive in *-mha*. See *pašmha* ‘to plow and harrow’ in connection with *ajoo* ‘went, rode’ in [19] and *gõtamaha* ‘to water’ with *tulob* ‘comes’ in [10c]; cf. also Kettunen 1943: 498–499; Saukkonen 1965: 59–65.)

To conclude this section, (22) from Kettunen (1943) demonstrates once more the different functions of purposive *-des* forms and the purposive use of the *-da* infinitive. The finite main clause denotes the act of making a leather band (i.e. a loop made of a strap of leather) for “the purpose” of putting one’s foot through it; this purpose is expressed by the APC *čokaites jougan*, while the ultimate goal of this action is the possibility of skiing, expressed by the infinitival clause *ajada suksil*:

- (22) *nahkaspäi särmaižen sukshe išktas naglaižil, čokaites*
 leather.ELA band.GEN ski.ILL nail.3PL nail.PL.ADE put.through.*des*
jougan ajada suksil (Kettunen 1943: 213)
 foot.GEN ride.*da* ski.PL.ADE

‘A leather band is nailed to a ski, to put a foot through in order to ski.’

6. Adnominal properties of the *-des* form

It was noted already in Section 4 that when the *-des* form is used in purposive functions there is always an NP in the main clause that can be thought of as some kind of a semantic head of the *-des* clause. In this section I discuss further examples that may support the idea that some instances of the *-des* form can be regarded as adnominal modifiers, i.e. as attributes. Some of the examples given are cited from Kettunen (1943), due to the lack of such a use of

the *-des* form in my own data; this might be taken as an indication of the relative scarcity of such phrases in actual language use. However, our understanding of the examples presented by Kettunen is hindered by the fact that the claimed NPs where the *-des* forms are said to function as attributes have been detached from their original contexts.

To begin with, I present one more set of sentences to illustrate the three-way distinction between non-finites in *-da*, *-mha* and *-des*.⁶

- (23) a. *neižne jo ani čoma nägehtada.* (NEV2:90)
 girl already very pretty glance.*da*
 'The girl is very pretty to look at.' (see also Saukkonen 1966: 180)
- b. Udali *sina devočkaine peitoižin vānmaha* -- (NÄKM231)
 clever you girl in.secret play.*mha*
 'Girl, you are clever to play hide-and-seek.'
- c. *nece puzu ani čoma suusniiden pandes i*
 this basket very good pasty.PL.GEN put.*des* and
garičuuden sades čoma (Kettunen 1943: 494; cf. example 13)
 cranberry.PL.GEN get.*des* good
 'This basket is very good to put pasties in and good to put ("pick")
 cranberries in.'

Again, all three Veps non-finites in (23a–c) correspond to the *to*-infinitive in English. The English equivalents of these constructions have gained attention in more formal approaches to language, and their relation to the constructions discussed in Section 4 has also been noted in the previous literature (see e.g. Jones 1991: 164–166 and references therein). Jones seems to analyze such infinitives too as instances of object/subject-gap purpose clauses; as a familiar example of the ambiguous nature of the English infinitive he mentions the sentence *The chicken is ready to eat*.

As for Veps as one of the Finnic languages, Saukkonen (1966: 171ff.) describes infinitives in *-da* and *-mha* (23a–b) as modifiers of adjectives that function as adjectival predicates in copular sentences; the semantic relations between the two infinitives and the main clause subjects are said to resemble those of the sentences described in Section 2 (examples 3, 4). Similar analyses of the Finnish cognates of the two infinitives can be found for instance in Ikola (1974: 76–77). An interesting characterization of the Finnish infinitive in *-ta* is offered by Dubrovina (1972: 41–44) who labels the use of *-ta* in sentences

such as (23a) and (23c) as “purposive-restrictive constructions”, where the infinitive restricts the meaning of the adjective. When applied to Veps, one could say that in (23c) for instance the basket is not described as ‘good’ in general; it is merely said that the basket is good when it comes to storing pasties and picking berries.

The fact that the semantic differences between the three non-finites are basically the same as in examples (7–15) once again underlines the importance of the nouns that might be characterized as semantic heads of the non-finites. Needless to say, the functions of the *-des* forms in (23c) are quite distant from those expressing a purpose relation of the type ‘in order to *p*, *q*’, discussed in the previous section. Nor is such an **interpropositional** relation expressed in (24):

- (24) *nece kour oukha höboide kattes.* (NVM182)
 this rug be.IMP.3SG horse.PL.GEN cover.*des*
 ‘Let this rug be to cover the horses.’

höboide kattes in (24) is hardly an optional non-finite adverbial clause expressing the purpose of the action denoted by a well-formed main clause. Rather, it functions as a complement (of the verb *olda* ‘be’), without which the sentence would be ungrammatical and senseless. However, in (24), too, the *-des* form obviously expresses the purpose for which a non-agentive referent of the noun — as is most usual, an artifact — is used as an instrument (cf. also 45 below).

The view that the *-des* forms might be seen as modifiers of nouns is not novel, but ideas concerning the adnominal nature of the *-des* form have been presented even more sporadically than its adverbial purposive functions. In his account of Veps syntax, Kettunen (1943: 192) casually states that “the inessive case of the second infinitive [i.e. the *-des* form], which quite commonly expresses purpose, may also appear as an attribute.” Kettunen evidently does not see much difference between the attributive and adverbial uses of the *-des* form. In speaking of the attributive use, he presents NP-like fragments such as *raudad lambhide kerites* [shears sheep.PL.GEN shear.*des*] ‘shears to shear sheep with’ and *pestezaze tazäine* [wash.*des*.REFL vessel] ‘a vessel for washing’, “a vessel to wash in” (p. 192) but also a couple of full sentences that do not essentially differ from the APCs presented in Section 4. For more examples of the attributive *-des* forms, Kettunen refers to pages where he describes *-des* forms as adverbial modifiers — also illustrated by similar NP-like examples disconnected from their assumed original sentential context; e.g. *labid lumen roides, sel’giteldes lumen* [shovel snow.GEN throw.*des* clear.up.*des* snow.GEN] ‘a shovel to throw snow, to clear the snow with’ (p.

495) and *henomban kalan taboiteldes kaleg* [small.COMP.GEN fish.GEN pursue.*des* net] 'a net to catch small fish with' (p. 213). For similar statements and context-free examples of the attributive use of the *-des* form see Airila et al. (1945: 25) and Zajceva (2001: 62–63).

Obviously, it is difficult to analyze fragments like *pestezaze tazdine* as something other than an NP where the *-des* form is a modifier of a noun. As my own data consist of longer passages of text, similar examples are not likely to occur. The answer to a riddle in (25) comes closest; note, however, the similarity to *magates* in (8d):

- (25) *Üol laudalaze, a päival trubalaze? – Sia magates.* (NÄKM36)
 night.ADE board.ADE.3SG but day.ADE tube.ADE.3SG bed sleep.*des*
 'A board at night, but a roll at daytime? — A bed to sleep on.'

In addition to (25), I have encountered two full sentences where the *-des* forms are strongly reminiscent of attributive modifiers of nouns rather than adverbially modifying the main verbs:

- (26) *miškale tuli jagos koiraine, griškale tuli*
 M.ALL come.PAST.3SG apportionment.INE dog G.ALL come.PAST.3SG
kažine, vaškale tuli viškites labidoine. (NVM60)
 cat V.ALL come.PAST.3SG winnow.*des* shovel

'When dividing the inheritance, Mishka got a dog, Grishka got a cat, Vanka got a shovel to winnow.'

- (27) *semetes päivän valičiba pilvesen ii-suren*
 sow.*des* day.GEN choose.PAST.3PL cloudy.GEN NEG-big.GEN
tulläiženke. (OVR85–86)
 wind.COM

'A cloudy and not-too-windy day was chosen for (the) sowing (day).'

In the original publication, the words (phrase?) *viškites labidoine* in (26) have been translated into Finnish by the compound word *viskuulapio* 'winnowing shovel, fan', as if *viškites labidoine* referred to a particular kind of shovel designed for the purpose of winnowing grain. Similarly, *semetes päivän* in (27) might be seen as a compound-like phrase referring to an established concept in Veps society (cf. the Russian translation *den' dlja seva* in the

original publication; *winning shovel* and *sowing day* in English). On the other hand, it is useful to note that in (26, 27) too, the *-des* forms occur in sentences that are consistent with the picture presented above: In (26), *labidoine* is the non-agentive subject of an intransitive clause expressing a change of possession, while the main verb *valita* 'choose' in (27) brings to mind transitive verbs like *antta* 'give' (8a–d), *pakita* 'ask for' (10c) and especially *otta* 'take', also possible with *-des* (cf. Kettunen 1943: 212, 278 and example 40 below).

It should also be noted that Penttilä (1942: 153) attempts to describe the purposive use of the *-des* form by stating that when translating it into Finnish, the postposition *varten* 'for (the purpose of)' should usually be used. Such translations — where *varten* takes a verbal noun as its complement — can also be found in the published texts on which this study is based, as well as in Kettunen's (1943) examples; see also Airila et al. (1945: 27) and Zajceva (2001: 40). In the same vein, some of the *-des* forms have been translated into Russian using the preposition *dlja* and a verbal noun, meaning 'for (the purpose of) V-ing' (in Zajceva 1981: 270 and OVR). The *-des* form, however, does not equal the adpositional phrases in Finnish or Russian. First of all, it remains a fact that the use of the *-des* form — unlike the uses of *varten*, *dlja* or *for* — seems to be rather restricted with respect to the main clause. Secondly, only the *-des* form can be described as *adverbial-oriented* (see below). Thirdly, the adpositions mentioned can in principle take any noun as their complement, not merely verbal nouns. The closest Veps equivalent to *varten*, *dlja* or *for* seems to be the postposition *täht*, predictably also possible with verbal nouns.

It was already mentioned in Section 2 that Finnish *-ta* infinitives in OPCs have occasionally been viewed as resembling attributes, mainly because of the possibility of paraphrasing them with finite relative clauses (see Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979: 379). In descriptions of English, there have been attempts to distinguish between so-called infinitival relative clauses and purpose clauses (see Jones 1991: 26–27 and references therein). Similarly, Telemann et al. (1999: 591–593) label Swedish infinitives such as *ett instrument (till) att mäta vibrationer med* 'an instrument to measure vibrations with' (p. 592) as infinitival attributes that characterize their head nouns in a way similar to relative clauses, although the authors admit that it is difficult to draw a line between the attributive and adverbial functions of the infinitive. In light of the relatively small number of purposive *-des* forms in my data (44 instances), it is not possible to say anything more definite about their attributiveness. At best, it can be concluded that forms like *viškites* in (26) and *semetes* in (27) might be

understood as modifying and restricting the meaning of the nouns *labidoine* and *päiv*. In other words, it might be possible to see *viškites labidoine* and *semetes päiv* in answers to such questions as 'what kind of shovel?' or 'which day?', whereas it is highly unlikely that forms like *pestes* in (1c) and (8a) — representing the majority of the purposive *-des* forms — could be understood as an answer to the question 'what kind of soap'.

Purposive infinitives and participles: differences and similarities

If the "head noun" of the *-des* form is always a non-agentive argument of the type described above, it is questionable whether any of the *-des* forms should be analyzed as attributes. Nevertheless, it is important to note that non-finites specialized for attributive functions are usually known as **participles**. Participles are generally defined as verbal adjectives; i.e. in addition to functioning as adnominal modifiers, their external morphosyntax is that of adjectives (see e.g. Haspelmath 1994: 152; 1996: 44, 52, 61; Ylikoski 2003: 188, 226–229). Veps *-des* forms lack such adjectival properties, however; most importantly, they do not agree with their "head nouns" in the way adjectives and the three participle forms do in Veps (see e.g. M. Zajceva 1981: 272–275; N. Zajceva 2000: 185–189). Apparently, the lack of adjectival properties is the main reason why the infinitives like (*čajud*) *d'oda* [tea.PART drink.da] or English (*tea*) *to drink* in (7a) have not been called participles either.

It is good to note that the semantic differences between the Veps non-finites in *-da*, *-mha* and *-des* can be defined in terms similar to many adjective-like participles that are, to use Haspelmath's (1994: 152–154) terminology, **inherently oriented** toward certain participants of the actions denoted by the verbs in the participle form. Just like passive participles are oriented toward their patients — i.e. the head noun of a passive participle is the patient of the action denoted by the verb in the participle form — the *-da* infinitives in (7a, 10a, 11a, 14a and 23a) are also oriented toward their patients; the agent-oriented *-mha* infinitives in (7b, 10b, 11b, 14b and 23b) in turn resemble active participles (cf. Leino 2003: 291–295). However, even though the *-des* forms might be characterized as inherently oriented toward the instrument and some other peripheral participants such as the locative (8d, 11c, 12 and 25) or the time (27) but not toward agents or patients, I am not aware of corresponding exclusively "adverbial-oriented" participles in any language, although they are in principle possible (see Haspelmath 1994: 153).

One of the reasons for contemplating the similarities between participles and the Veps non-finites discussed in this article is that the *-des* form is not the

only indeclinable non-finite whose functions resemble those of participles. At times, the patient-oriented *-da* infinitive appears to be used in contexts where it corresponds — in spite of not showing adjectival agreement with nouns — to the attributive use of the present passive participle, a productive verb form in other Finnic languages but survived only as relicts in Veps (see e.g. Kettunen 1943: 504–505; Zajceva 1981: 273). Compare (28a) with its Finnish translation (28b) where the infinitive is impossible:

(28) a. *ninga kudom sijäd da ninga kudom pidada*
 thus weave.IPL bed.linen.PL and thus weave.IPL [use.*da*]

rädomižime päivime kážipaikad, kudambou modon
 work.mine.PL.PROL day.PL.PROL hand.towel.PL] REL.ADE face.GEN

pühkim da kädod pühkim. (OVR142)
 wipe.IPL and hand.PL wipe.IPL

b. *Niin kudomme lakanat ja niin kudomme työpäivinä*
 thus weave.IPL bed.linen.PL and thus weave.IPL [working.day.PL.ESS]

*käytettävät (~ *käyttää) käsipyhkeet, joilla*
 use.PTCP.PASS.PRES.PL (~ *use.IA) hand.towel.PL] REL.PL.ADE

pyyhimme kasvot ja kädet.
 wipe.IPL face and hand.PL

'In this way we weave bed linens and in this way we weave hand towels to use on working days, with which we wipe our faces and hands.'

While comparing the functions of Veps infinitives and Finnish participles, it is worth making a digression into a less-known use of the above-mentioned participle in the neighboring Finnic languages, i.e. Lude and Olonetsian. Although traditionally labeled a **passive** participle in the descriptions of all Finnic languages, this non-finite is not only a passive participle, i.e. an exclusively patient-oriented participle. In Lude and Olonetsian, it is also used in a function characterized by Genetz (1884: 193), in his description of Olonetsian, as an "impersonal active participle with a genitive object". Genetz's examples include such phrases as *sobien pestäv poalikku* [garment.PL.GEN wash.PTCP.PASS.PRES thick.stick] 'a thick stick for washing clothes' (i.e. 'a stick to wash clothes with') and *aštieloin piettäv rundugu* [vessel.PL.GEN keep.PTCP.PASS.PRES shelf] 'a shelf to keep tableware on'. In Lude, one can find such examples as (29):

- (29) *šiid oli [––] čabaton ombeluzfabrik, toine soban*
 there be.PAST.3SG boot.GEN sewing.factory another [garment.GEN
ombeltau fabrik i nahkan pieksettau fabrik
 sew.PTCP.PASS.PRES factory] and [leather.GEN beat.PTCP.PASS.PRES factory]
oli, škola oli [––] (LT1:86)
 be.PAST.3SG school be.PAST.3SG

'There were ... a boot factory, another factory for sewing clothes, and a factory for tanning leather, and there was a school ...'

What Genetz calls an impersonal active participle seems to be not truly an active participle in the sense of being oriented toward the agent of the verb in the participial form; these participles are oriented toward peripheral participants, such as instruments (of washing) or locatives (related to storing tableware, sewing clothes, and tanning leather). Interestingly, such uses of the participle resemble the attributive-like uses of the *-des* form discussed above, two main differences being that (i) the Lude and Olonetsian participles show adjectival/participial agreement with the head noun and (ii) the participle also functions as a patient-oriented passive participle (in which respect it resembles the common Finnic use of the *-da* infinitive in both OPCs and APCs).⁷

There is one more type of Finnic non-finite construction that deserves mention here: in most Finnic languages, the *-da* infinitive in OPCs can often be replaced by the present passive participle in its translative form. Thus in addition to (*anna minulle leipä-ä syö-dä* [bread-PART eat-tA] '(give me) bread to eat' in (3a), it is possible to say *leipää syö-tävä-ksi* [bread-PART eat-PTCP.PASS.PRES-TRA], with the same meaning (see e.g. Saukkonen 1965: 209; Dubrovina 1972: 22–23, 35, 45; Leino 2003: 52–53, 309–313). As the participle is generally a passive participle, it cannot usually be used in constructions corresponding to the APCs discussed in this article. Although *talo asu-a ~ asu-ttava-ksi* 'a house to live (in)' (cf. 3d, 4d) is — somewhat idiosyncratically — possible, *saippua (jolla) pes-tä* 'a piece of soap to wash with' (3c, 4c) cannot be turned into **saippua pes-tävä-ksi* in Finnish. But given the instrument- and locative-oriented functions of the present "passive" participle in Lude and Olonetsian, it is entirely predictable to encounter sentences where the translative cases of the participle correspond to the APC functions of the Veps *-des* form. This is evidenced by (30) from Lude, whose morphological equivalent in Finnish would be ungrammatical; compare the participle *suadavakš* in (30) with the Veps *-des* form *sades* in (31):

- (30) *šügüžel küläš luaditai tal'vnuotad kalan*
 fall.ADE village.INE make.3PL winter.seine.PL fish.GEN

suadavakš. (LK8)

get.PTCP.PASS.PRES.TRA

'In the fall, people in the village make winter seines to catch fish with.'

- (31) *tegiba merdaižed kalan sades i noriid*. (OVR216)
 make.PAST.3PL fish.trap.PL fish.GEN get.*des* and cord.PL.PART

'They made fish traps to catch fish with, and cords.'

In other words, Lude and Olonetsian differ from Veps and Finnish (and possibly also from Karelian proper) in that the so-called passive participle — altogether absent from Veps — is used in the purposive functions that correspond to the OPCs and APCs headed by the infinitive in *-ta* in Finnish and the infinitive in *-da* and the *-des* form in Veps. Moreover, it appears that the situation is even more complicated in Lude, where according to my observations participles like *suadavakš* in (30) can be replaced not only by the infinitive in *-da* in its common Finnic function but — in a manner similar to the neighboring Veps — also by the *-des* form (see Section 8 for some further comments).⁸

Finally, it may be noted with regard to (28a) that forms in *-mine* (*rädomižime*) — in the Finnish-based grammatical tradition, the “fourth infinitive” — can also be used as attributes that to a certain extent resemble the attribute-like functions of the *-des* form, with the exception that *rädomižime* [work.*mine*.PL.PROL] agrees with the head noun in number and case. As the Finnish and Estonian cognates of this form are most often used as verbal nouns, the attributive use of the Veps *-mine* form might best be understood in the light of similar uses of the English *-ing* form (*rädo-mine* (~ *rad-mine*) *päiv* [work-*mine* day] = *working day*). (For more examples, see e.g. Kettunen 1943: 502–503; Airila et al. 1945: 25; Zajceva 2001: 63, 148.)

7. Adverbial properties of the *-des* form

After weighing the possibility of regarding at least some of the purposive *-des* forms as attributes of nouns, I wish to bring up some of the least attribute-like properties of purposive *-des* forms; these seem to suggest that it may be too early to make definitive statements about the status of *-des* forms at the present stage of research. We saw that there appears to be a gradual continuum, from

constructions of the type *antta N V-des* 'give N to V with/in' to sentences where the *-des* forms might be seen as modifiers of the nouns with which they occur rather than as adverbial modifiers of the main clauses (25–27). There also seems to be a continuum ranging from the instrument- and locative-oriented use of the *-des* form (i.e. 'N to V **with/in**') to constructions where the relations between the *-des* forms and the "gapped adverbials" are quite remote; recall the participant relations in (22) ('a loop to put one's foot through'), (17) ('liquor to wet our tongues with') and (13) ('?'worm boxes to angle with').

In light of these examples, it seems impossible to draw an absolute distinction between adverbial-gap purpose clauses and interpositional purpose clauses ("*in order* clauses"), which in a way are semantically independent of the governing clause. Unlike subject/object-gap purpose clauses, adverbial-gap purpose clauses refer to peripheral participants in actions, and the number of such participants (instrument, accompaniment, location, time etc.) is in principle infinite. It is always possible to perceive 'liquor' in (17) as some kind of participant in the act of 'wetting the tongue', or even 'worm boxes' in (13) as a participant in the act of 'angling'. Ultimately, this could lead to attempts to explain all kinds of purposive clauses as having a peripheral participant identical to an argument of the main clause. It must be admitted that the view that 'worm boxes' are a participant in 'angling', for instance, may appear as an artificial attempt to explain all instances of the *-des* form as APCs. However, examples like (13, 17 and 22) are quite exceptional in my data; (17 and 22) are cited from Kettunen (1943).⁹

As many as 24 occurrences out of the total of 44 purposive *-des* forms in my own data can be analyzed as instrument-oriented without any hesitation, and eight of the *-des* forms can be described as locative-oriented. This is why sentences like *anda mileen muil pestes* ('Give me a piece of soap to wash', 1b) have been characterized in the preceding sections as "prototypical". Note also that *antta* 'give' is the most common main verb with which the purposive *-des* form occurs (seven instances).

In addition to the seemingly quite independent *-des* constructions in (13, 17 and 22), the relative independence — and the adverbial nature, as opposed to the adnominal properties discussed in the previous section — of the *-des* constructions can also be seen in the way that the *-des* forms may have arguments of their own. The agent of the *-des* form usually coincides with the recipient or possessor of the main clause (see Section 5). Nevertheless, as can be seen in (32) from outside my own corpus, a purposive *-des* form can also have a subject of its own (cf. also example 50). Moreover, it should be noted that while the *-des* form as a temporal converb can have a genitive subject (e.g.

minun loites [I.GEN pray.*des*] 'while I am/was praying', Kettunen 1943: 196, 238), the subject of an APC is marked with the allative case (32, 50); this makes such constructions resemble the different-subject use of the *-da* infinitive, both in OPCs (33) and in "non-gapping" purpose clauses (34):

- (32) *tarbiž kudoda kel'ut kalale mündes* (Kettunen 1943: 213, 351)
 is.needed.knit.*da* small.tongue fish.ALL go.*des*
 'One has to knit the mouth (of a fyke net) for fish to go in.'

- (33) -- *kartohkoid ištuteliba vähän, vaiše ičele söda.* (OVR86)
 potato.PL.PART plant.PAST.3PL.little only self.ALL eat.*da*
 'They planted some potatoes, only for themselves to eat.'

- (34) *no spašt'a sinun hengen voib, miše adhu*
 but save.*da* you.GEN soul.GEN can.3SG (in.order.)that hell.ILL
sini ii putta. (OVR73)
 you.ALL NEG get.into.*da*

'But your soul can be saved, in order for you not to go to hell.'

The use of the *-des* form in APCs differs from both OPCs and SPCs in that the *-des* forms may have their own subjects (32, 50) **and** their own objects (8b, 10c, 13, 15, 17, 22, 23c, 24), since neither of these are "gapped" in the sense of being necessarily coreferential with an argument of the main clause. In the following example from folk poetry, the *-des* form seems to have both a subject and an object of its own (though *Sini* [you.ALL] might alternatively be analyzed as the recipient or benefactive of the event denoted by the main clause; compare *miniin* [I.ALL] in 12):

- (35) *Mina tegin kül'betin kol'mžiruižen /*
 I make.PAST.1SG sauna.GEN three-story.GEN
Sini i persken vastoides. (NÄKM348)
 [you.ALL and buttocks.GEN slap.with.a.sauna.whisk.*des*]

'I built a three-story sauna in order for you to slap your buttocks with a sauna whisk.'

It should be clear that this kind of independence from the main clause and its arguments brings the purposive use of the *-des* form quite close to the purposive *-da* clauses in (19–22) and (34). However, it must once again be

noted that even in (35), the *-des* clause fits perfectly into the picture presented in previous sections: The object of the main verb *tehta* 'do, make, manufacture' refers to the locative participant (i.e. a sauna) of the action denoted by the verb in the *-des* form; accordingly, a more literal translation of (35) might be "I built a three-story sauna for you to slap your buttocks with a sauna whisk in it".

8. Discussion and further remarks

In the previous sections, I have attempted to give a thorough account of the so-called purposive functions of the Veps non-finite in *-des*, which in my view are best understood in the light of analogous uses of the infinitives in *-da* and *-mha*. It would be tempting to assert that the mutual relations of the three non-finites correspond strictly to the picture presented in the previous sections. However, it seems impossible to validate these claims in absolute numbers, since some OPCs and SPCs can hardly be distinguished from other, complement-like functions of the infinitives. Furthermore, there are some instances in my data where the non-finites in *-da* and *-des* are used in a way that might be characterized as exceptional — at least until a better understanding of these forms is achieved.

It was mentioned already in Section 2 that the use of the *-da* infinitive in OPCs cannot be clearly distinguished from the infinitives occurring as complements to verbs of permission (e.g. *antta*, meaning not only 'give' but also 'let someone do something'). In the same vein, the infinitive in *-mha* in SPCs is linked with infinitival complements to verbs of manipulation ('ask/have/order someone to do something'). A further fact to keep in mind is that a large part of the well over one hundred "object-gap" infinitives in *-da* in my data consists of verbs *söda* 'eat' and *joda* 'drink', which often occur in expressions where the object of the infinitive — and of the main verb — is altogether absent. Saukkonen (1965: 166–167, 214–216) has rightly remarked that the infinitive forms in such idiomatic expressions are reminiscent of nouns denoting 'food' or 'nourishment':

- (36) *lapsed-ne voiketas, söda pakitas, a leibad eile* (OVR187)
 child.PL-DEF cry.3PL eat.da ask.3PL but bread.PART_{is.not}
 'The children are crying, asking to eat, but there is no bread.'

One might also ask whether any of the purposive *-des* forms have been idiomatized or lexicalized. On the basis of my data, there are no particularly

exceptional collocations for any of the *-des* forms; the most remarkable exceptions are the attribute-like *viškites* and *semetes* in (26, 27).

It was also noted in Section 4 that the infinitive in *-da* is sometimes used in contexts where the *-des* form is generally used; recall *veden kandites seglan* ‘a sieve to carry water with’ in (8b) and *veden kantta seglan* ‘id.’ in (9). In this connection, it is worth pointing out that all of the examples presented thus far have been taken from published samples of spoken Veps. The language of the Veps Bible translations (published during 1992–1999) appears to be heavily influenced by literary Finnish; possibly for this reason I have not found a single instance of a purposive *-des* form in these texts. Instead, the infinitive in *-da* is used in accord with similar uses of its cognates in Finnish and other Finnic languages:

- (37) *Ku heil molembil ei olend dengid*
 as they.ADE both.PL.ADE NEG.3SG be.PTCP.ACT.PAST money.PL.PART
maksta velg, rahanandai prosti heile molembile necen
 pay.da debt moneylender forgive.PAST.3SG they.ALL.both.PL.ALL that.GEN
velgan. (Luke 7:42; cf. 14d)
 debt.GEN

‘When neither of them had money to pay the debt (with), the moneylender forgave both of them their debt.’

- (38) *Konz tulin sinun kodihe, sinä ed*
 when come.PAST.1SG you.GEN home.ILL you NEG.2SG
 andand *vet jaugoid pesta, no hän* -- (Luke 7:44)
 give.PTCP.ACT.PAST water.PART foot.PL.PART wash.da but (s)he

‘When I came into your house, you did not give me water to wash my feet (with), but she ...’ (cf. 1c, 8a, and 50 below)

The marginality of (9) and (37, 38) can be seen in the fact that there are more than forty instances of purposive “adverbial-gap” *-des* forms in my data, but only nine *-da* infinitives in the same function, and only five of them occur outside Bible translations.¹⁰ The purposive use of the *-des* form is not fully absent in the literary language, either; consider (39, 40), encountered in a Veps school grammar from the first era of literary Veps in the 1930s as well as in a recent newspaper article. Once again, the *-des* forms occur in connection with main clauses denoting a state or a change of possession, and the possessors of the main clauses refer to the instrument participants (a bag and tableware) of the

events denoted by the *-des* forms and their objects (carrying books and drinking tea):

- (39) *[Neniden] knigoiden kandištes minei om*
 [those.GEN] book.PL.GEN carry.*des* LADE be.3SG

sumk. (Hämäläinen & Andrejev 1935: 53)

bag

'I have a bag to carry those books (in).'

- (40) *Erased akad otiba sured ombluzmašinad, [–] materijad*
 some.PL woman.PL take.PAST.3PL.big.PL sewing.machine.PL cloth.PL

kost'umaks, samovarid, astjoiden naboroid čajun jodes,
 costume.TRA samovar.PL vessel.PL.GEN set.PL.PART tea.GEN drink.*des*

kengi mida. (Kodima 11/2001)

who.PRT what

'Some women took large sewing machines, ... cloth for clothing, samovars, tableware sets to drink tea with; everyone took something.'

Much of the preceding discussion has centered on APCs and OPCs with non-finites in *-des* and *-da*, respectively. To give a fuller picture, it must be added that although the infinitive in *-mha* seems not to be used in APCs and OPCs, the non-finites in *-des* and *-da* are sometimes used in SPCs where the *-mha* form would be more expected. As for the Veps *-da* infinitive and its cognates in other Finnic languages, Saukkonen (1965: 193ff.; 1966: 173–174) has considered such functions as remnants of the time when the newer infinitive (*-mha*) had not taken over part of the functions of the older infinitive (*-da*). (For Veps examples, see Saukkonen 1965: 195, 197; 1966: 173.) Finally, I present the two occurrences from my data where the *-des* forms (41, 42) appear to be used in place of the infinitive in *-mha* (43):

- (41) *oli radai minain ottud parziden vedados.* (OVR105)
 be.PAST.3SG worker LADE take.PTCP.PASS.PAST log.PL.GEN pull.*des*

'I had a worker, hired to pull logs.'

- (42) *necon živatan hän kuti edelozo paukaž paimetos,*
 that.GEN animal.GEN (s)he as before hire.PAST.3SG shepherd.*des*

neco mecauk, a paimnele kebnemb paimeta linneb. (OVR149)
 that goblin but shepherd.ALL easy.COMP shepherd.*da* become.3SG

'He, the goblin hired, as before, that animal to shepherd, and it will become easier for the shepherd to shepherd.'

- (43) *potom hän otab stroimaha rahvast ningažo, kahcan*
 later (s)he take.3SG build.mha people.PART similarly eight
mest hän otab päivaks. (OVR127)
 man.PART (s)he take.3SG day.TRA

'After that, he also hires people to build, he hires eight men for a day.'

Not much can be said of (41, 42), although one might think of analyzing *parziden vedades* in (41) as an APC. It is in principle possible to think of the subject of the main clause (worker) as an accompaniment — rather than primarily as the main agent — in the act of pulling logs. Put concretely, instead of the SPC analysis 'I_i had a worker_j, hired to pull_j logs', (41) might be analyzed as 'I_i had a worker_j hired to pull_j logs **with**'. A comparable analysis of (42) seems impossible, although both (41) and (42) denote having or hiring someone to do something. It is also worth noting that the Russian translations of both (41) and (42) suggest the subject-gap infinitive reading (e.g. *Byl u menja rabotnik vzjat, vozit' brevna* for 41). The *-des* forms in (41, 42) are evidently rare exceptions that must be left unsolved for the time being.

In addition to the subject-gap *-des* forms in (41, 42), I have also encountered (outside my data) one instance where the *-des* form should probably be analyzed as an object-gap purpose clause:

- (44) *A lapsile enciklopedii sättub lugedes – kirjan*
 but child.PL.ALL encyclopedia be.suitable.3SG read.des book.GEN
kel' om kebn, a polen tedoid andaba
 language be.3SG easy but half.GEN information.PL.PART give.3PL
kuvad i fotod. (Kodima 2/2002)
 picture.PL and photograph.PL

'The encyclopedia is suitable for children to read — the language of the book is easy, and half of the information is obtained from the pictures and photographs.'

To conclude this synchronic study of the purposive *-des* form, some comments about the diachronic explanations offered in previous studies are in order. In every attempt to explain the origins of the functions discussed above,

the common Finnic use of the *-des* form as a temporal converb has been assumed to be the starting point from which the purposive function has developed. To back up their claims, Penttilä (1942: 155) and Kettunen (1943: 212–213, 495–496) have presented examples where the *-des* form can be understood both as a temporal modifier and as a purposive verb form. In their opinion, it is through sentences such as (45, 46) that the original temporal converb has been reanalyzed as a purposive form:

- (45) *humbar om surdes, da i soban pestes* (Kettunen 1943: 213)
 mortar be.3SG grind.*des* and and garment.GEN wash.*des*
 'The mortar is for/when grinding (flour) and washing clothes.'

- (46) *veič tarbiž kalan tehtes* (Kettunen 1943: 212)
 knife is.needed fish.GEN clean.*des*
 'A knife is needed for/when cleaning fish.'

In my view, in many examples presented as vacillating between the two analyses, the claims of semantic ambiguity are quite artificial. For instance, it is rather difficult to agree with Kettunen that the *-des* forms in (45) could be analyzed as temporal converbs ('The mortar is when grinding and washing clothes.') (cf. 24). The phrase *henomban kalan taboiteldes kaleg* [small.COMP.GEN fish.GEN pursue.*des* net] mentioned in Section 6 is also one of Kettunen's examples of ambiguous *-des* forms: He states that besides the meaning 'a net to catch small fish with', it can mean 'a net when catching small fish'. Examples such as (46), however, are more plausible. Kettunen (1943: 212–213, 278, 495–496) presents plenty of examples where the main clause is headed by the necessitative modal predicate *tarbiž* 'is needed'. Even if the *-des* form here is to be understood in its supposedly original temporal meaning, it is understandable that the semantics of such main clauses might have given the *-des* form a purposive reading. Once again, note that the *-des* forms in (45, 46) refer to activities (grinding flour, washing clothes and cleaning fish) in which artifacts such as a mortar or knife are used as instruments.

The purpose of this article is not to add to the explanations concerning the history of the *-des* form. However, it should be remarked that cognates of the Veps *-des* form do appear to have similar functions in other Finnic languages. Penttilä (1942) presents examples of apparently the same phenomenon from various dialects of Karelian, while Kettunen (1943: 495) remarks that the purposive functions of the *-des* form in Karelian presumably originate from Veps. Referring to a line of an Estonian folk poem, Tunkelo (1946: 271)

cursorily states that the purposive *-des* form has had a semantic equivalent even in early Estonian. Of great interest in this connection are the brief remarks by Neetar (2000: 181–182) on the use of the *-des* form in the Kihnu dialect of Estonian spoken on the island of Kihnu, situated off the southwest coast of Estonia. The core of her remarks is worth citing verbatim:

Kihnu murraku omapäraks on kahe sõnalised ühendid: *des*-vorm + substantiiv. Viimane märgib mitmesuguseid tarbeesemeid, ehitisi, ka ainet, loodusnähtusi, sellele eelnev *des*-vorm aga otstarvet, kasutusala, sobivust millekski. (Neetar 2000: 181)

A peculiarity of the Kihnu subdialect are the two-word compounds of the type “*-des* form + noun”. The latter refers to various utility articles, buildings, materials, and natural phenomena; the preceding *-des* form expresses a goal, a purpose of use, or suitability for something.

Neetar’s (2000: 181–182) examples include compounds such as *pestessiep* [wash.*des*.soap] ‘washing soap, soap for washing’ (cf. 1c and 8a), *pestesvesi* [wash.*des*.water] ‘washing water’ (cf. 50 below), *kastõskann* [water.*des*.can] ‘watering can’ (cf. 10c), *ootõsmaja* [swim.*des*.house] ‘swimming hall’ (cf. 11c) and *jalutõskepp* [walk.*des*.stick] ‘walking stick’. The resemblance to Veps should be quite obvious; ‘washing water’ compares to ‘water to wash with’, ‘a watering can’ is ‘a can to water with’ and so forth. Compare also *nõeldõslõng* [sew.*des*.thread] ‘sewing thread’ to the following example:

- (47) *tegi* *birbid* *sapkoiden ombuutes* (Zajceva 1981: 270)
 make.PAST.3SG waxed.thread.PART boot.PL.GEN sew.*des*
 ‘He made waxed thread to sew boots with.’

Neetar emphasizes (p. 182) that compounds like these are not known in any of the neighboring dialects; she also remarks that the *-des* form is otherwise used only as a simultaneous converb, while purpose is expressed exclusively by the infinitive in *-da* (cf. Section 5). Neetar is aware of the observations by Penttilä (1942) and Zajceva (1981) on the purposive *-des* forms in Veps and Karelian, but in the absence of this type of purposive *-des* clause (and those vacillating between purposive and temporal meanings, as in examples 45, 46) in Kihnu she assumes that the analogous functions of the *-des* form found on opposite sides of the Finnic area have evolved independently of each other.¹¹

The purposive *-des* forms presented by Penttilä and Kettunen do not

differ essentially from those presented in this article. I am aware, however, of one exceptional occurrence of the *-des* form in Lude:

- (48) *hüvin elädes ei pida pidada*
 well live.*des* NEG.3SG must.CONNEG have.*da*

läškut (Saukkonen 1965: 27 < LT1: 272)

laziness.PART

'In order to live prosperously, one must not be lazy.'

In citing (48) Saukkonen repeats Penttilä's and Kettunen's arguments, explaining that the purposive meaning ('in order to live prosperously') originates from the temporal meaning ('When living prosperously, one should not laze.'). Be that as it may, (48) is the only sentence I know of where the *-des* form must apparently be understood as a purposive verb form of the interpropositional type discussed in Sections 3 and 5, i.e. 'in order to *p*, *q*' without any "gapped" participants necessarily shared by *p* and *q*.

For the sake of completeness, I should add that although the Finnish cognate of the *-des* form, "the second infinitive inessive" in *-tessa*, is used in the standard language only as a converb of simultaneity, in non-standard varieties of the language one can come across some semantically purposive (and syntactically adverb-like) uses of forms such as vulgar *vittuillessaan* in (49) (cf. the standard purposive form *hämmentääkseen*; see Sections 2 and 5):

- (49) *Tuntuu myös hauskalta tehdä biiseihin lähes naurettavan*
 feel.PAST.3SG also fun.ABL make.*ta* piece.PL.ILL.almost laughable.GEN
70-luvun rock riffin päälle brutaalilla örinällä jotain
 70s.GEN rock.riff.GEN over brutal.ADE growling.ADE some
terroristijuttuja, ihan siis vittuillessaan ja
 terrorist.stuff.PL.PART just so be.nasty.*tessa*.3SG/3PL and
hämmentääkseen kuuntelijaa.
 confuse.*takse*.3SG/3PL listener.PART

(<http://www.angelfire.com/music2/extremefinland/kettunen.html> 21.8.03)

'It also felt like fun to make some terrorist stuff with brutal growling over the almost laughable rock riff of the 70s, I mean, just to be nasty and confuse the listener.'

Although very interesting, the status of sentences like (48) and (49) cannot be explored any further in this paper. Needless to say, many important questions

concerning the diachrony and synchrony of these non-finites must be left unanswered for the present. As the purposive functions of the *-des* forms are almost exclusively confined to the easternmost and most Russified variants of Finnic, it is important to note that we are nevertheless dealing with a phenomenon that appears not to have a parallel in Russian (Penttilä 1942: 155). Furthermore, as the purposive use of the *-des* form has been attested in all the main dialects of Veps and in the neighboring Finnic languages, such functions may have a long history in those languages. I might add that I have not noted significant differences between the Veps dialects with respect to the use of the *-des* form.

Finally — assuming that most of my own argumentation is correct — it is worth considering why the purposive functions of the *-des* form have been described so inadequately in previous studies of Veps syntax. Interestingly, it appears that some misstatements and omissions result from the fact that the Finnish scholars of Veps have approached Veps from the standpoint of their own language. It was mentioned already in Section 2 that the characterizations of the purposive *-des* form are reminiscent of the usual descriptions of the Finnish purposive converb in *-tAkse-*, although the closest equivalent to the Finnish *-tAkse-* in Veps is the infinitive in *-da*, often preceded by the conjunctions *miše* or *mišto* (see Section 5).¹² In general, however, the characterizations of the *-des* form are minimal, and the descriptions consist of lists of brief examples detached from their original contexts. References to the relations between the *-des* form and other non-finites are almost non-existent (but see Penttilä 1942: 154).

Despite some shortcomings in the studies mentioned above, what is most surprising is Saukkonen's (1965, 1966) two-part monograph on the history of the Finnic infinitives in **-tAk* and **-mAhAn*, i.e. the Veps infinitives in *-da* and *-mha* and their cognates in the other Finnic languages. Saukkonen cautiously delineates the syntactic functions and mutual relations of the two infinitives, but he does not seem to have devoted much attention to other non-finites that could certainly have contributed to a more comprehensive understanding of the infinitives, especially as a large part of his study is devoted to a description of the various purposive uses of the two infinitives (see Saukkonen 1965: 155–192, 208–218; 1966: 136–150, 171–180).

In addition to the infinitives in *-da* and *-mha*, Saukkonen pays attention to the Finnish non-finite in *-tAkse-* and to the use of the translative case of the present passive participle; both formations can sometimes be used in place of the *-da* infinitive in OPCs and even in APCs (cf. Section 6 and example 30 above; see also Saukkonen 1965: 159, 209, 217–218; 1966: 204). Neverthe-

less, it is remarkable that there is not a single mention of the use of the *-des* form in APCs. The purposive use of this form is only briefly mentioned in the introductory part of the study (Saukkonen 1965: 22, 27; example 48 above), and the complete neglect of the Veps *-des* form, whose functions are clearly on a par with those of the infinitives in *-da* and *-mha*, has ultimately led Saukkonen (1965: 211) to present the *-des* form in (50) as a Veps example of the *-da* infinitive in APCs:

- (50) *vett* (vezi) ladižaze (paba) vädroihe pestesaze
 water.PART (water.NOM) put.3PL (put.3PL) bucket.PL.ILL wash.des.REFL

molodieile. (NÄKM124, Saukkonen 1965: 211)

newlywed.PL.ALL

'They pour water into buckets for the newlyweds to wash themselves with.'

9. Conclusion

In the preceding sections, I have re-examined previous attempts to describe one of the three main functions of the *-des* form in Veps and have suggested that the so-called purposive functions of the *-des* form are best understood by considering them in relation to the infinitives in *-da* and *-mha*, which are also used in functions that may be characterized as purposive. Once again, it must be emphasized that these claims are based on rather limited data, and that most of my conclusions stem from the fact that it *seems* that nearly every instance of the purposive *-des* form can be described as an adverbial-gap purpose clause (APC); at the same time, the infinitive in *-da* seems to differ from its Finnic cognates in that it is used in similar functions only sporadically.

In this paper, I have described the syntax and semantics of the *-des* form mainly from a synchronic point of view. Moreover, the study has been confined only to Veps, although various similarities — and differences — between Veps and its neighboring languages call for further research in order to understand the past and present of the *-des* form and other related non-finites in the Finnic languages. It may be expected that the three-partite system of "gapped" purpose clauses in Veps will have typological importance as well. I am not aware of cross-linguistic studies on this topic, but it is probably safe to assume that the *-des* form — with its purposive functions almost without exception limited to what can be labeled adverbial-gap purpose clauses — is typologically quite rare, if not unique.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Esa Itkonen and the participants of the symposium as well as two anonymous referees for their constructive comments on earlier versions of this paper.

Notes

- 1 The examples cited in this article are presented in a strongly simplified orthography. The spoken language samples in the corpus have been written down over a long period of time in different variants of the Finno-Ugric transcription, and with various degrees of precision. As this paper is not intended to contribute to the phonetics or phonology of Veps, I have attempted to convert the phonetic script into a form that comes close to the nearly phonemic orthography of present-day literary Veps, yet maintaining dialectal differences within the language. The resulting appearance of the language data, however, remains uneven, since the morphophonology of the Veps dialects has not been fully described. For instance, many of the sound segments described as long monophthongs in the original texts may merely represent listeners' perceptions of what are phonologically diphthongs or clusters consisting of a vowel and the phoneme /l/. The examples from Lude, Olonetsian, Vote and Estonian have been similarly simplified.
- 2 At least in Finnish, the changes in the supposedly "original" functions of the Finnic infinitives seem to have partly resulted in more or less idiomatic uses of the infinitives. For instance, while the expression *saippua pestä kädet* [soap wash.TA hand.PL] 'a piece of soap to wash the hands (with)' is considered somewhat odd by many, superficially similar expressions like *rahaa maksaa velka* [money.PART pay.TA debt] 'money to pay the debt (with)' (cf. 37) are fully accepted.
- 3 The functions of the all-Finnic third person plural verb forms (eg. *paba* in 7a) and the so-called passive or impersonal verb forms (*anttaze* in 7a) have been intermingled in various ways in all Veps dialects (see e.g. Savijärvi 1990). For present purposes, I have glossed both variants simply as third person plural forms (cf. Zajceva 1981: 250–251; Savijärvi 1990).
- 4 Examples (8b) and (9) are taken from a story known by other Finnic peoples, too. Saukkonen (1965: 211 < VR151) cites the Vote sentence *hakka antõ siglaa vettä kanda* [old .woman give.PAST.3SG sieve.GEN water.PART carry.da] and its Estonian translation *Eit andis sõela vett kanda* [id.] as examples of the same phenomenon. For more examples of *-da* infinitives occurring in APCs with transitive main clauses, see Kettunen (1943: 489) for Veps and Saukkonen (1965: 209–212) for the Finnic languages in general.
- 5 The fact that practically every instance of the purposive *-des* form bears a relation to a non-agentive argument of the main clause fits well into Jones' (1991: 41) statements about the controllers of "gapped" purpose clauses in English: "The argument that invariably controls the [purpose clause] is called the "Theme" argument". In this connection, he refers to authors such as Andrews (1985: 70) who defines *Theme* as "a participant which is characterized as being in a state or position, or changing its position."
- 6 In sentences of the type illustrated by (23b), Veps also makes use of the "inessive case of the third infinitive" in *-mas* (cf. Kettunen 1943: 278, 497–498; Saukkonen 1965: 31, 44, 46). Sentences like (23c) are absent in my own data.

- 7 Similar adverbial-oriented uses of the present "passive" participle can also be found in Livonian and in some of the southern dialects of Estonian, apparently due to the influence of Latvian where (as well as in Lithuanian) the present "passive" participle is used in like manner (see eg. Sjögren & Wiedemann 1861: 148–149; Ambrazas 1990: 82ff.; Vaba 1997: 47–50).
- 8 The possibility of "replacing" an infinitival purpose clause with a finite relative clause or a participial clause (28–30) might be related to the fact that sentences like *Give me bread to eat* and *Give me bread that I can eat* or *Give me a piece of soap to wash* and *Give me a piece of soap with which I can wash* mean **almost** the same; compare the cross-linguistic diversity of perception verb complements, apparently related to the fact that sentences like *The father heard that his son was crying*, *The father heard how his son was crying* or *The father heard his son who was crying* refer to **nearly** identical situations.
- 9 Zajceva (2001: 40) presents the example *kiitta olut poigan naittes* [cookda beer.PART son.GEN marry.des] 'to brew beer for the son's wedding', which is quite apart from the APCs as described in this article. In the absence of more data, I will not attempt to explain away all such discrepancies, but it can be noted that even here, the main clause tells about manufacturing something; namely, beer, and the *-des* clause expresses the event for which the beer is made.
- 10 Another peculiarity of the language of the Veps Bible translations is that the *-des* form is quite often used to express manner, means or concomitant actions, not unlike the *-des* form in Estonian. There appears to be no such uses of the Veps *-des* form in spoken language samples.
- 11 Note that the view that the purposive functions of the Veps *-des* form may be best understood as instances of adverbial-gap purpose clauses firstly emerged in my mind solely on the basis of Veps data, and it was not until finishing the final draft of this paper that I encountered Neetar's (2000) remarks on the Kihnu dialect. The fact that nearly all of her examples of the compounded *-des* forms can be characterized as "adverbial-oriented" and "purposive" naturally calls for further investigation. See also Neetar (1981) for the use of the Estonian *-da* infinitive in attributive functions resembling that of Veps *pidada* in (28a).
- 12 Penttilä (1942: 153) states — by using the usual characterization of the Finnish purposive converb in *-tAkse-* — that "the inessive case of the second infinitive" in Veps and Karelian "expresses the aim of the action denoted by the main verb". Such a characterization seems quite infelicitous, especially as in most of his examples the main verb is either the semantically empty *olda* (*olla*) 'be' or there is no main verb at all (cf. 14c–d, 23c, 24, 45). Penttilä adds, however, that the Finnish translation of the non-finites in question must usually be made by using the postposition *varten* 'for'; this seems more plausible to me, too, although *varten* is also used in a number of functions where the *-des* form appears impossible (see Section 6).

Abbreviations

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1 | first person |
| 2 | second person |
| 3 | third person |

ABL	ablative
ACT	active
ADE	adessive(-ablative)
ALL	allative
COM	comitative
COMP	comparative
CONNeg	connegative
<i>di</i>	the infinitive in <i>-da</i>
DEF	definite marker
<i>des</i>	the non-finite in <i>-des</i>
ELA	elative
ESS	essive
GEN	genitive(-accusative)
ILL	illative
IMP	imperative
INE	inessive
<i>mAAAn</i>	the infinitive in <i>-mAAAn</i>
<i>mha</i>	the infinitive in <i>-mha</i>
<i>mine</i>	the non-finite in <i>-mine</i>
NEG	negation, negation verb
NOM	nominative
PART	partitive
PASS	passive
PAST	past tense
PL	plural
PRES	present tense
PROL	prolative
PRT	particle
PTCP	participle
Q	question marker
REFL	reflexive
REL	relative pronoun
SG	singular
<i>tA</i>	the infinitive in <i>-tA</i>
<i>tAkse</i>	the non-finite (purposive converb) in <i>-tAkse-</i>
<i>tessA</i>	the non-finite (simultaneous converb) in <i>-tessA</i>
TRA	translative

Data sources

Ahlqvist, August 1859. *Anteckningar i Nord-Tschudiskan*. Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae VI; Helsingfors. 49–113.

Apostoliden tegod. Kodypainduz. Stokgol'm & Helsinki: Biblijan kändmižen institut, 1999.

ÄVN = *Äänisvepsän näytteitä*. Keränneet ja julkaisseet Antti Sovijärvi ja Reino Peltola. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 171; Helsinki 1982.

- Evangelii Joannan mödhe*. Kodvpaïnduz. Stokgol'm & Helsinki: Biblijan Kändmižen Institut, 1993.
- Evangelii Lukan mödhe*. Kodvpaïnduz. Stokgol'm & Helsinki: Biblijan kändmižen institut, 1996.
- Evangelii Matvejan mödhe*. Kodvpaïnduz. Stokgol'm & Helsinki: Biblijan kändmižen institut, 1998.
- Hämäläinen, M. & F. Andrejev 1935. *Vepsan kelen grammatik kuumandele i nelländele klassale nacal'nijas školas*. Leningrad: Kirja.
- Kodima = [newspaper] *Kodima* 11/2001 and 2/2002. Accessed at <http://kodima.iaccesshost.com/kodima/104/3.htm> and .../107/3.htm on 31 August 2003.
- LK = *Lyydiläisiä kielennäytteitä*. Koonneet Heikki Ojansuu, Juho Kujola, Jalo Kalima ja Lauri Kettunen. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 69; Helsinki 1934.
- Lönnrot, Elias 1853. *Om det Nord-Tschudiska språket*. Helsingfors: J. C. Frenckell.
- LT1 = *Lyydiläisiä tekstejä I*. Kerännyt, kääntänyt ja julkaissut Pertti Virtaranta. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 129; Helsinki 1963.
- Markan evangelii*. Kodvpaïnduz. Stokgol'm & Helsinki: Biblijan Kändmižen Institut, 1992.
- NÄKM = *Näytteitä äänis- ja keskivepsän murteista*. Keränneet E. N. Setälä ja J. H. Kala. Julkaissut ja suomentanut E. A. Tunkelo apunaan Reino Peltola. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 100; Helsinki 1951.
- NEV1 = *Näytteitä etelävepsästä I*. Koonnut ja julkaissut Lauri Kettunen. Suomi IV, 18, 2; Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 1920.
- NEV2 = *Näytteitä etelävepsästä II*. Koonnut ja julkaissut Lauri Kettunen. Suomi V, 4, 1; Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 1925.
- NVM = *Näytteitä vepsän murteista*. Keränneet ja julkaisseet Lauri Kettunen ja Paavo Siro. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 70; Helsinki 1935.
- OVR = M. Zajceva & M. Mullonen: *Obrazcy vepsskoj reči*. Leningrad: Nauka, 1969.
- VR = P. Ariste: *Vadja rahvajutte Mati külast. Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituudi uurimused II* (1958): 148–166.

References

- Airila, M. & Aimo Turunen & Jussi Rainio 1945. *Vepsän opas*. Helsinki: Suomen kirja.
- Ambrazas, Vytautas 1990. *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskix jazykov*. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Andrews, Avery 1985. The major functions of the noun phrase. — *Language typology and syntactic description, I: Clause structure*. Edited by Timothy Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 62–154.
- Bartens, Raija 1979. *Mordvan, tšeremissin ja votjakin konjugaation infiniittisten muotojen syntaksi*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 170; Helsinki.
- Dubrovina, Z. M. 1972. *Infinitivy v finskom jazyke*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta.
- Genetz, Arvid 1884. *Tutkimus aunuksen kielestä: kielennäytteitä, sanakirja ja kielioppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Givón, Talmy 2001. *Syntax: an introduction II*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Hakulinen, Auli & Fred Karlsson 1979. *Nykysuomen lauseoppia*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Haspelmath, Martin 1989. From purposive to infinitive — a universal path of grammaticization. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 10: 287–310.
- 1994. Passive participles across languages. — *Voice: form and function*. Edited by Barbara Fox & Paul Hopper. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 151–177.
- 1996. Word-class-changing inflection and morphological theory. — *Yearbook of Morphology 1995*. Edited by Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 43–66.
- Ikola, Osmo 1960. *Das Referat in der finnischen Sprache: syntaktisch-stilistische Untersuchungen*. Annales Akademiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 121; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- 1974. *Lauseenvastikeoppia: nykysuomen lauseenvastikkeiden ja niihin verrattavien rakenteiden selvittelyä*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Itkonen, Terho 1979. Subject and object marking in Finnish: an inverted ergative system and an "ideal" ergative sub-system. — *Ergativity: towards a theory of grammatical relations*. Edited by Frans Plank. London: Academic Press. 79–102.
- Jones, Charles 1991. *Purpose clauses: syntax, semantics, and semantics of English purpose constructions*. Studies in linguistics and philosophy 47; Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kettunen, Lauri 1943. *Vepsän murteiden lauseopillinen tutkimus*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 86; Helsinki.
- König, Ekkehard 1995. The meaning of converb constructions. — *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective: structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms — adverbial participles, gerunds*. Edited by Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König. Empirical approaches to language typology 13; Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 57–96.
- Kortmann, Bernd 1997. *Adverbial subordination: a typology and history of adverbial subordinators based on European languages*. Empirical approaches to language typology 18; Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 1998. Adverbial subordinators in the languages of Europe. — *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Edited by Johan van der Auwera & Dónall P. Ó Baoill. Empirical approaches to language typology 20-3; Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 457–561.
- Laanest, Arvo 1982. *Einführung in die ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- Leino, Jaakko 2003. *Antaa sen muuttua: suomen kielen permissiivirakenne ja sen kehitys*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Nedjalkov, Igor' V. 1998. Converbs in the languages of Europe. — *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Edited by Johan van der Auwera & Dónall P. Ó Baoill. Empirical approaches to language typology 20-3; Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 421–455.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. 1995. Some typological parameters of converbs. — *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective: structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms — adverbial participles, gerunds*. Edited by Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König. Empirical approaches to language typology 13; Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 97–136.
- Neetar, Helmi 1981. Der *da*-Infinitiv als Attribut in estnischen Dialekten. — *Congressus Quartus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum*. Redigit Gyula Ortutay. III: *Acta sectionis linguisticae*. Curatores Gábor Bereczki & János Gulya. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 312–313.

- Neetar, Helmi 2000. Kihnu murraku kahest erijoonest. — *Inter dialectos nominaque: pühendusteos Mari Mustale 11. novembril 2000*. Koostanud ja toimetanud Jüri Viikberg. Eesti Keele Instituudi toimetised 7; Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus. 179–183.
- Penttilä, Aarni 1942. Suomenheimoiset sotavangit kielenoppaina. *Virittäjä* 46: 148–160.
- Saukkonen, Pauli 1965. *Itämerensuomalaisten kielten tulosijainfinitiivirakenteiden historiaa*. I: *Johdanto. Adverbaali infinitiivi*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 137; Helsinki.
- 1966. *Itämerensuomalaisten kielten tulosijainfinitiivirakenteiden historiaa*. II: *Adverbaali infinitiivi (täydennys). Adnominaali infinitiivi. Absoluutti infinitiivi. Elliptinen infinitiivi*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 140; Helsinki.
- Savijärvi, Ilkka 1990. Passiivin ja monikon 3. persoonan suhteesta vepsän kielessä. — *Laatokan piiri: juhlakirja Heikki Leskisen 60-vuotispäiväksi 10.10.1990*. Toimittaja: Helena Suni. Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 60; Helsinki. 158–174.
- Sjögren, Joh. Andreas & Ferdinand Joh. Wiedemann 1861. *Livische Grammatik nebst Sprachproben*. Im Auftrage der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften bearbeitet und mit einer historisch-ethnographischen Einleitung versehen von F. J. Wiedemann. Joh. Andreas Sjögren's gesammelte Schriften, Band II, Theil I; St. Petersburg.
- Teleman, Ulf & Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson 1999. *Svenska Akademiens grammatik*. 3: *Fraser*. Stockholm: Svenska Akademien & Norstedts Ordbok.
- Tunkelo, E. A. 1946. *Vepsän kielen äännehistoria*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Vaba, Lembit 1997. *Uurimusi läti-eesti keelesuhetest*. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Instituut & Tampere: Tampereen yliopiston suomen kielen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitos.
- Whelpton, Matthew 1995. The syntax and semantics of infinitives of result in English. Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, Oxford. Accessed at <http://www.ifi.ox.ac.uk/~whelpton/Files/DPhil.pdf> on 8 December 2002.
- Ylikoski, Jussi 2001. Havaintoja komin konverbeistä. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 89: 199–226.
- 2003. Defining non-finites: action nominals, converbs and infinitives. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 16: 185–237.
- Zajceva, M. I. 1981. *Grammatika vepsskogo jazyka: fonetika i morfologija*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- [Zaitseva, Maria] 2001. *Vepsän kielen leuseoppia*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 241; Helsinki.
- Zajceva = Zaiceva, N. G. 2000. *Vepsän kelen grammatik*. II: *Verboiden kändluz, verboiden nimiformad, kändamatomad sanad*. — *Grammatika vepsskogo jazyka*. II: *Slovoizmenitel'nye i imennye kategorii glagola, neizmenjaemye časti reči*. Petrozavodsk: Izdatel'stvo Petrozavodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.

Jussi Ylikoski <jussi.ylikoski@oulu.fi>

Giellagas Institute

Box 1000

90014 University of Oulu, Finland