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Innovations in Dutch person marking: grammaticalization, analogy, and typological rara
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In recent typological work, the rarity of so-called ‘grammatical agreement’ (Siewierska 1999) or ‘non-Pro-Drop’ (Dahl 1990) has been pointed out. This is the type of agreement in which an inflectional person marker is accompanied obligatorily by another person marker, as in the Standard Dutch example in (1).

\[(1) \text{Gaan} \text{-} \text{n} \text{ zij morgen naar Gent?} \]
\[\text{go-3PL they tomorrow to Ghent.} \]
‘Are they going to Ghent tomorrow?’

The typological rarity of the Dutch grammatical person marking system combines with intra-lingual instability when it comes to the dialects. Most notably, some dialects not only use inflectional affixes and pronouns for person marking, but also make an extensive use of bound, non-grammatical person markers, yielding clitic doubling patterns of the type exemplified in (2a). In addition, some dialects have extended the use of grammatical agreement to complementizers (2b) and to ja ‘yes’ and neen ‘no’ (2c).

\[(2) \text{a. Gaa-n} \text{=} \text{ze zij naar Brussel?} \quad \text{(Flemish)} \]
\[\text{go-3PL=they they to Brussels} \]
‘They say that they are going to Brussels.’

\[\text{b. Ze zegg-en da-n=ze naar Brussel gaa-n.} \quad \text{(Flemish, Hollandic)} \]
\[\text{They say-3PL that-3PL=they to Brussels go-3PL} \]
‘They say that they are going to Brussels.’

\[\text{c. Jaa-n=s.} \quad \text{(Flemish, Hollandic)} \]
\[\text{yes-3PL=they} \]
‘Yes, they do.’

From a functionalist point of view, the emergence of clitic doubling patterns in Dutch dialects, and of weak and clitic pronouns in general, can be considered an instance of grammaticalization. This grammaticalization seems to be triggered by the effects of the obligatory usage of subject pronouns: it enables language users to refer in a neutral, non-emphasized way to subjects. (2b) and (2c) are less straightforwardly explained, both functionally and typologically, even more so because these phenomena are predominantly found in the Flemish dialects where (2a) is found as well. In these dialects, the emergence of clitics in a way turns the traditional agreement endings obsolete, and one would expect the latter to be lost.

In my talk, I will try to account for this apparent paradox, by providing diachronic scenarios by which each of the phenomena under discussion have emerged. Drawing on data gathered for the syntactic atlas of the Dutch dialects (SAND, see also Barbiers et al. 2006), and using interpretative
principles for dialect maps tracing back to the first half of the 20th century (e.g., Bonfante 1947, see Chambers & Trudgill 1998 and De Vogelaer & Devos 2008 for recent discussion), it will be shown that patterns like (2b) and (2c) have developed by virtue of, rather than despite (2a). More particularly, the emergence of non-verbal agreement will be shown to be an instance of analogical extension, primarily affecting clitic contexts (see De Vogelaer & van der Auwera to appear and references cited there).

From this case study, a number of methodological conclusions can be drawn. First, the data underscore the need for dialectological research, almost all the interesting patterns are not available in Standard Dutch. Second, the need for a thoroughly geographical approach is highlighted, rather than a simple comparison of a restricted number of dialects. And third, diachronic pathways in specific languages may diverge substantially from what is typologically common.
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Third person plural in Finnish dialects: impersonal and personal uses
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In Standard Finnish, finite verbs agree with their subjects in person and number. In present-day colloquial spoken Finnish, number agreement is not typical. Idealizing somewhat, there are two different systems:

(1) Person paradigm of the verb *istua* ‘to sit’ (cf. Helasvuo 2006: 176)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Finnish</th>
<th>Colloquial Finnish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>istu-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>istu-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>istu-u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(In addition, compound tenses show number agreement in the participial main verb, also a matter of variation.) The topic of the present paper is the use of the 3rd person plural (PL3) form, usually indicated with the suffix *-vat/-vät*, as opposed to the SG3 form used with a plural subject.

We have investigated the phenomenon mainly from the large, syntactically coded corpus in the Syntax Archive (SA; University of Turku and Kotus). This corpus consists recordings from 132 locations: interviews with people born in the late 19th century, mainly discussing personal history, past customs and working methods. The following examples are from this corpus.

From a dialect perspective, things are more complex than (1). The PL3 form is uncommon, but not obsolete, in large areas that can be characterized as the “middle” of Finland (Häme, Savo and Ostrobotnian dialects), but more frequent in three borderline areas:

- Southwest (dialects that largely served as the basis for earliest Literary Finnish)
- Southeast (dialects mainly spoken in the areas evacuated during WW2)
- Northernmost North (particularly Western Lapland)

Our paper will discuss the structural and discourse properties of PL3 sentences in the “middle” area.

Another conspicuous feature is that PL3 forms tend to occur without an overt subject, contradicting the common truth about Finnish that third person subjects cannot be omitted. In our material, as much as 67 % of the occurrences contain no overt subject in the same simple clause. In the areas where PL3 is more common as such, an overt subject is relatively more common with it as well, making the PL3 form more like an agreement marker.

Especially in the Western parts of the “middle area”, there is a tendency towards a complementary distribution: speakers use either PL3 or the neutral SG3 form with an overt subject, but not both.
This has been treated in terms of system economy. Kallio (1978) reports figures as low as 3–11.5% for simultaneous presence of subject and PL3 form in the South Ostrobothnian dialects. This system is still used to some degree, although uniform use of SG3 prevails in present-day colloquial speech. Examples (2–3) illustrate the complementary distribution in the SA material. The referent is overt in the first mention, and subsequent mentions resort to the “bare” PL3 form. This holds across coordinated sequences (2) and other clause combinations, as well as over longer stretches of discourse (3).

(2) niin tottah {\textsuperscript{1}}niu \textit{nuoret} *\textit{huviteli} / ja *\textit{huvitellevat} nykkin. **niis
so of course young-PL\textsuperscript{1} have.fun-PST and have.fun-PL\textsuperscript{3} now,CLT those-INE
‘So of course young people had fun, and still have, in them [village weddings]’
(SA: West, Southern Ostrobothnia, Isojoki)

(3) [The speaker has fainted at work; “they” refer to his workmates.]

mull- oli *kyllä **pyärä
‘I did have a bike’

mutt- ei ne *anatum mum **pyärillä lähteet tulleen **kotios *sitt-
‘but they did not let me come home on the bike then’

että *täyty **kävellä . /
‘so [I] had to walk.’

*\textit{pelekäisivät} et *jos minä **kaalun sillä **pyärillä \textit{be.afraid-PST-PL\textsuperscript{3}}
that if I fall-1SG that-ADE bike-ADE
‘They were afraid I might fall down with the bike.’ (SA: West, Häme, Kuru)

However, there is another side to the PL3 form: it can be used impersonally in the sense discussed in Siewierska (2008). In (4), the first bolded occurrence is a SG3 verb with a plural pronominal subject, and the subsequent ones are rendered with PL3. The example therefore conforms to the economy-based pattern structurally, but the reference of the subject (\textit{ne}) is not disclosed but rather treated as irrelevant or self-evident (“people who know me”). A, the interviewer, has asked if B has some other names apart from Leena-Tiina.

(4) B: **ei / **ei *muuta kun / *Leena-Tiina /
‘No nothing else but Leena-Tiina’

voan **Hellukshan \textit{ne on} *kuhtuna.
but Hellu-TRA-CLT they be,3SG call.PCP
‘but they have called me Hellu.’

**Hellu... / **Helluks *kuhtuvat . /
Hellu... Hellu call-PL\textsuperscript{3}.
‘Hellu, they call me.’

A: Helluks \textit{kuhtuvat}
Hellu call-PL\textsuperscript{3}
‘Hellu, they call you.’

\textsuperscript{1} Nominative, present tense and 3\textsuperscript{rd} person singular not glossed.
In the SA corpus, the PL3 occurrences of the neutral speech act verb *sanoa* ‘to say, to call’ and the verb *kutsua* ‘to call’ are indeed predominantly impersonal in this sense. Impersonal PL3 comes very close to the impersonal passive, which is illustrated in (5).

(5) *siinä ol' *se / **vangin*vartija se **kuulu ** suuri **ukko / jota sa...
‘There was this prison guard, that famous big man who was - -’

*Nokkala **Heikiks sanottiin
lastname-GEN first-name-TRA say-PASS.PST
'- - was called Nokkalan Heikki.’ (SA: East, Savo, Pihtipudas)

This partial overlap of meaning, which is not restricted to speech act verbs, has been observed by, e.g., Mielikäinen (1984). The meaning difference involved is an open question. One hypothesis is that it is based on the inclusive/exclusive dimension, as the passive, unlike PL3, allows for the speaker to be included in the reference. This is a particularly natural hypothesis for dialects in which the passive form is routinely used as the PL1 verb form (see the right-side paradigm in 1). In (6), the speaker, herself a former servant, is discussing servants’ life in old times, and the PL3 forms seem to vaguely refer to the masters (farm-owners), while the passive in the last line is about the servants themselves and therefore includes the speaker. The excerpt is about Shrove Tuesday festive customs everybody joined in: sledding and ritual wishes for the year.

(6) **rei’ antovat jos ol *hankijaesta . /
sleigh-ACC give-PST.PL3 if was crusted.snow-PAR
‘They gave [us] a sleigh if the snow was hard.’

sillos sae *laskeem mäkiä . /
‘Then you could slide down the hills.’

**joskus *sitte / *pitivät **niinnii hyvällä *tuulella että /
sometimes then keep-PST.PL3 so-CLT good-ADE mood-ADE that
‘Sometimes they kept [us] in a good mood even so that - -’

**käöttivät **hevosella *jonnii matkam piähä . /
go.CAUS-PST-PL3 horse-ADE some distance away
‘- - they drove [us] some distance away with a horse.’

[2 sentences omitted]

*soatii **ajjoo vähä / *jossakii . //
b.e.allowed-PST-PASS drive a little somewhere
‘[We] could go for a little ride somewhere.’ (SA: East, Savo, Riistavesi 1)

Not all occurrences can be explained in this way, however. The main focus of the paper will be on the exact nature of the impersonal use of PL3, with speech act and other verbs. We will discuss the reference interpretation of PL3 sentences and compare it to the impersonal passive. We will also
consider the strength of the connection between the impersonal reading and lack of an overt subject; as can be seen from (4), this is not perfect. Word order is also of some interest, as there is a tendency for SG3 with an overt subject, rather than PL3, to be used in marked orders such as the first bolded occurrence in (4).
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Person marking is typically thought of as a property of finite sentences, and finite verb forms in particular. In contrast, non-finite clauses and verb forms are thought of as either dependent of the main clause with regard to subject (or actor) marking, or as having an overt subject but no person marking proper. Thus, roughly, finite verb forms do and non-finite verb do not tend to be marked for person (provided, of course, that the language in question has person marking in the first place).

This dichotomy also applies to Finnish verb forms in the sense that finite verb forms obligatorily have a person affix (or passive morphology), whereas infinitives and participles never do. However, this picture is somewhat confounded by the fact that a number of Finnish non-finite verb forms (essentially, all participles and some infinitives) can have a possessive suffix, morphologically identical to possessive suffixes found in nouns, and semantically corresponding to person marking in finite verbs.

The Finnish system of non-finite verb forms is, overall, rather complex. Morphologically speaking, there are four (or five) different infinitives, each of which has a defective case inflection paradigm. Together the defective paradigms of these different forms are in a complementary distribution, to the extent that it has been suggested that Finnish syntactically has only one infinitive (cf. Leino 2003: 99–111). This complementary distribution, and the whole Finnish infinitive system, is held together by a number of conventional infinitive constructions, specialized expression types which serve as usage contexts for specific infinitive forms. For example, the “long form” (or translative) of the 1st or A infinitive is predominantly used in the final construction which expresses purpose (1a), the 2nd or E infinitive inessive in the temporal construction which expresses simultaneous activity (1b), and the 3rd or MA infinitive adessive in a construction which expresses means of carrying out the action expressed by the main predicate (1c):

(1) a. Syötkö elääkseesi vai elätkö syödäksesi?
eat-2SG-QCL live-INF1-TRA-PX2SG or live-2SG-QCL eat-INF1-TRA-PX2SG
‘Do you eat in order to live, or live for eating?’

b. Kalle ajatteli Liisaa syödessään.
Kalle-NOM think-PST-3SG Liisa-PAR eat-INF2-INE-PX3SG
‘Kalle thought about Liisa when he ate.’

c. Nälkä lähtee syömällä.
hunger-NOM leave-3SG eat-INF3-ADE
‘Eating takes hunger away.’

For the purposes of this paper, the most notable forms are the so-called short form of the A infinitive (2a), the long form or translative of the A infinitive (2b), the inessive (2c) and instructive (2d) forms of the 2nd or E infinitive, and the instructive form of the 3rd or MA infinitive (2e):

2 Historically, this form is a lative case form. However, the lative case is no longer productive, and the form has been reanalyzed and is interpreted as more or less a nominative form in present-day Finnish.
In addition to these, there are several other infinitive forms in Finnish as well. However, these five forms are the only Finnish infinitive forms that may take a possessive suffix (which corresponds to the "subject" of the infinitive), as in e.g. (2b) and (2c) above.³

Some Finnish infinitive forms also have a passive variant. However, there are only three passive infinitive forms: the passive A infinitive (3a), the passive E infinitive inessive (3b), and the passive MA infinitive instructive:⁴

³ There is also the so-called ⁵th infinitive which obligatorily takes a possessive suffix, but as Maamies (1997) points out, instances of this form are best analyzed as a deverbal adverbs rather than infinitives, both synchronically and diachronically.

⁴ The so-called MA infinitive instructive is highly unlikely an instructive form in its origin. As e.g. Saukkonen (1965: 126–127) points out, it seems more plausible to analyze it historically as a lative rather than an instructive form. However, since the form is traditionally labeled as instructive, I shall use the conventional label.
As it happens, these two groups overlap. We may state this overlap by saying that the Finnish language only allows a passive form for those infinitive forms which also may take a possessive suffix. (We may also make this into a cline by pointing out that possessive suffixes are possible only for forms which may occur together with a genitive subject. Leino 2005 includes a broader discussion on this topic.)

Given that the passive is an integral part of the person inflection paradigm of Finnish finite verb forms, this raises the following question: is this distribution of the possessive suffixed forms and the passive forms an indication of an emerging person inflection system for infinitives? Is it the case that the passive infinitive forms complement the possessive suffix forms?

We may approach this question from several directions, and I can only take up a small selection of the whole problemacy in my paper. I shall focus on Finnish infinitive forms, leaving—mostly—aside participles and finite verb forms. Using dialect data, I shall look at the areal distribution, morphosyntactic and semantic functions, and possible morphological contexts of possessive suffixes as well as passive morphology in the Finnish infinitive system.

Roughly speaking, I shall assume two somewhat different points of view. First, a “systemic” point of view raises the general question as to whether infinitives in Finnish are becoming more finite-like through the emergence of the possessive suffix “person inflection” system. Second, a “subsystemic” point of view looks at the issue on the level of specific infinitive construction and aims at explaining the use of passive morphology and possessive suffixes one context at a time. The latter approach looks for emerging subsystems, constructions, in which infinitives show properties reminiscent of person inflection, but does not assume a developing overall system.
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Areal and typological perspectives on R-impersonals: the case of 3pl-impersonals and man-constructions in Europe
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As discussed by Malchukov & Ogawa (2009), impersonalization, if viewed as a departure from canonical subjecthood, may be triggered by a variety of properties: agentivity, animacy, topicality, definiteness and referentiality. This paper will be concerned only with impersonals triggered by a reduction in referentiality, R-impersonals, for short. R-impersonals have the appearance of regular, personal constructions but feature a subject which is human and non-referential. The non-referential human subject may be expressed lexically, pronominally or by the whole construction (see e.g. Creissels 2007, Siewierska 2008). While all R-impersonals, by definition, may be used in generic contexts to express non-referential human subjects, some are also used in episodic contexts to denote partially specified sets of human subjects and even referential indefinite ones. In the case of the latter, the non-referential use may even wane in favour of the episodic. This in turn may lead the relevant R-impersonal to enter the territory of one of the other type-of impersonals, especially of the topicality and definiteness based types.

In the languages of Europe, chief among the R-impersonals which evince not only non-referential but also referential uses and enter into competition with topicality and definiteness based-impersonals are third-person plural impersonals (3pl-Imps) and man-constructions (Man-Imps). The vast majority of European languages have at least one of these constructions and some have both. The European distribution of Man-Imps has been mapped by Giacalone Ramat & Sansò (2007). The current paper sets out to complement their findings by providing the relevant data relating to the distribution and use of 3pl Imps. It will be shown that despite the commonality of 3pl-Imps, they display certain areal patterns in their uses which both complement and intersect with those of Man-Imps, on the one hand, and the presence in a language of other R-impersonals, on the other. The use of 3pl-Imps and Man-Imps will also be considered from the point of view of the typology of the languages in question, in particular their propensity to have or not have null subjects (see e.g. Holmberg 2005, Cabredo Hofher 2006, Siewierska 2007) and possibilities of displaying OV order. Both of these typological properties will be shown to correlate with some aspects of the areal patterning of the use of Man-Imps and 3pl-Imps, once again confirming the strong contact influences among the languages of Europe.
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Estonian dialects show variation in marking the 1st person singular in indicative affirmative verb forms. Most of the Estonian dialects and Standard Estonian mark the 1st person forms with an explicit ending -n, while in the southern and western dialects, the ending -n has been lost. As a result, the 1st person verb forms are not as clearly identifiable and may be syncretic with some other verb forms:

- indicative present sg1: (ma) anna, võta, tule, saa ‘I give, take, come, get’
- imperative present sg2: (sa) anna, võta, tule, saa ‘Give! Take! Come! Get!’
- indicative present negative: (ma/sa/ta) ei/es anna, võta, tule, saa ‘(I/you/(s)he etc.) not give, take, come, get’

Estonian has an ambiguous agreement type, i.e. verb forms can be used with or without a personal pronoun (Siewierska 2004). The aim of this paper is to test the effect of the occurrence of the explicit 1st person ending in the pronoun ellipsis phenomenon. The main hypothesis is that there is a tendency to use the pronoun more often in dialects without explicit 1st person ending (-ø) than in dialects with -n.

-ø: siss lät’si ma Antsumäe Kuiva Jaan’i poolô then go-PST:SG1 Antsumäe:GEN Kuiva:GEN Jaan:GEN towards ‘then I went to visit Kuiva Jaan from Antsumäe’ (Vastseliina)

siss tuu-di tagasi sàul ol’i-viil kaits aasta-t velle man tüdruk then bring-PASS.PST back there be-PST:SG1 PTL two year-PAR brother:GEN at maiden ‘then (they) brought (me) back and there (I) was a maiden for two years at (my) brother’ (Rõngu)

We compare the 1st person forms from dialects with and without the explicit ending -n and test the different factors affecting the use of the pronoun in the same clause with the verb form.

We have taken into account 8 mainly grammatical and textual factors: presence or absence of the sg1 person ending, sub-dialect, tense (= present, simple past, present perfect and pluperfect), referential
distance (Givón 1983), text and sentence structure (= sg1 verb form occurs at the beginning of the new paragraph/thematic section or verb form occurs in coordinated clause or verb form occurs in subordinated clause), direct or indirect speech, if sg1 verb form occurs in the answer to a question or not and sg1 verb form occurs in repetition.

The study is based on more than 2100 tokens from the Corpus of Estonian Dialects. Data comes from 14 sub-dialects:

- 7 sub-dialects with -n
- 5 sub-dialects with -∅
- 2 sub-dialects with -n and -∅ (variation in 1st person ending)

The factors are tested using Varbrul (variable rules analysis). Varbrul measures the significance of each factor in the variation model and finds the most important group(s) of factors.

According to the analysis, the most important factor group affecting the use of the pronoun was referential distance followed by 2) text and sentence structure, 3) presence or absence of the sg1 ending, 4) sub-dialect and 5) tense (present or past). The results are rather surprising: as the 1st person is always obvious according to the context, we did not expect that the referential distance might show such high significance. The analysis also revealed that the differences between dialects are rather substantial. However, the differences are not based mainly on the use of -n or zero ending (-∅). For example, sub-dialect Kihelkonna (Insular dialect, -∅) showed very high percentage of occurrences of the 1st person singular pronouns (89%). At the same time, in another sub-dialect Rõngu with zero ending (Tartu dialect) the rate was only 58%.

To compare whether the results are related to the overall person paradigm, another research was conveyed. We analysed 1768 personal verb forms from 3 sub-dialect which were rather different by the use of the 1st person singular pronoun (Kihelkonna, Ambla, Vastseliina). In addition, with the factors and factor groups of the first study, two more factors were taken into account: the syntactic function of a previous reference and the feature affirmative/negative.

We expected that in Kihelkonna sub-dialect which showed the highest rate of the 1st person singular pronouns, there is an overall tendency to use the pronoun more often than in other dialects, but this was not true. Frequent use of the pronoun was related mainly to the 1st person singular. Thus, in Kihelkonna sub-dialect, the loss of the 1st person ending -n has influenced the use of the subject pronoun. In some other dialects, on the other hand, the loss of -n has not influenced the use of the pronoun (South Estonian).
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In Karelian dialects, the verbal personal forms are marked by person suffixes agglutinated in verb stems. Those personal forms are used in direct and relative meanings. When using the person forms of verbs in the direct meaning the sentential context proves it. The context only concretizes the person form. For example, in the clause A tuattuon'i muissan kun kaikki ruato (Kiestinki) ‘but I remember my father because he did everything’ the 1sg indicative form is used in the direct meaning and the context is no distinguishing feature in it. Instead, in the sentence Taigin illal sevoitat, sokkel huondeksel, päcin paneled pámmah (Vieljärvi) ‘you mix a dough in the evening, knead it in the morning, put it into a warm oven’ the 2sg indicative form is used in the relative meaning. To put it another words, it is used in the more generic or abstract meaning. Basically, this means that everybody does such and such. In this case, the meaning of the context is different from that of the verb form.

The differentiation of the personal endings is most clearly manifested in the indicative present and past tense in proper Karelian, which has eight endings as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative present</th>
<th>(kaččuо ‘see’)</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I p.</td>
<td>kaččo-n</td>
<td>kaččo-mma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II p.</td>
<td>kaččo-t</td>
<td>kaččo-tta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III p.</td>
<td>kaččo-u</td>
<td>kaččo-tta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative past</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I p.</td>
<td>kaččoi-n</td>
<td>kaččoj-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II p.</td>
<td>kaččoi-t</td>
<td>kaččoj-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III p.</td>
<td>kaččo</td>
<td>kaččoj-ja</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all Karelian dialects the ending of the 1sg is -n. Only in the Tihvin dialect this consonant may change into the preceding vowel with a nasal addition. In other words, we can interpret the following vowels -ã, -ä/combiningtildeaccent, -õ, -ö/combiningtildeaccent, -ũ, -ỹ, -ẽ as endings in the present tense (Mie varajaã, peitää/combiningtildeaccent, tuoõ, syöö/combiningtildeaccent, kučuũ, kysyỹ, tuleẽ) and -i in the past tense (tulii, toii, söii). The 1sg forms are used only in the direct meaning.

The 2sg ending is -t, e.g. Nyt sie lähet kotih (Uhtua) ‘now you go home’, sinä et lähte tälöäkinoh (Vielj.) ‘you don’t go to cinema today’. These forms are used both in direct and generic meanings. First, in the generic meaning, verb forms have the meaning of the 1sg, e.g: a mitäkaš šielä kylyššä ruat? – a mutt ei kun issut da hyö pesššäh varialuo (Kiestinki, NKK, I, 40) ‘And what do you do in the bathroom? Nothing but I sit and they wash my body’, a vičikōš ruadajes ku on mi čakkaa, kodih tulet – silmät on puhalduksis. (Kotkatj., OKP 1969, 143) ‘toiling in the bush, with so many midges, when I come home, my eyes are all swollen’. Second, these forms are used in the generic meaning ‘anyone’: koiratta mānet, iče voit kyličći proidie (Rukaj., NKK I, 162) ‘without a dog (you) go, (you) may pass’, konza dorogas tulet da čojun keitađ da juot sit (Vieljärvi, NKK I, 289) ‘when (you) come from travel and prepare tea and drink it’.

In the generic meaning these forms are generally used in proverbs, for example Koissa kun aššut, n’in kylässä issut, koissa kun issut, n’in kylässä aššut (Kontokki, KKS I, 81) ‘if you move at home, you sit as a guest, when you sit at home, then you move as a guest’, Kenen leibeä syöt, sen i pajuо
Whose bread you eat that song you sing’, Ai’jan vereen salbaat, mieron suudu et salbaa (Tulemaj., OKP 1969, 186) ‘Door of fence you may fasten, but people’s mouth you don’t’.

The 3sg present tense ending is -u or -y: kaččo-u, tuo-u, syö-y, vie-y ‘he/she looks, brings, eats, takes’. The past tense has no personal ending or it is zero: Talvi om pakkani n’ii s’ittă kesă tulou pouvempi (Oulanka) ‘If winter is cold, then summer will be warmer’, Häi la’d’uau halgoi (Kotkatj.) ‘He piles up firewood’, I muga i l’ähtyy (Kondusj) ‘And so he goes’.

In addition to the ending mentioned above, there are other endings too in Karelian dialects. The ending -pi, -bi is attached to monosyllabic stems and -vi to multi-syllabic stems: Poron pulkka potvottana, ajavi rinnan riivisoita, raikuttavi rasinahoja, poron pulkka puita lyöpi, perälauvat pehkoloita ajaesša aimo miehen (Kiestinki) ‘The reindeer’s sleigh goes along sinking swamps, along glades, the reindeer’s sleigh beating trees, the back-board bushes when goes the good man’, A sid jo voibi ajoa (Säämaj.) ‘And then one can go with a horse’.

The unique ending is -t, which is attached to monosyllabic stems: Pa’l’uo vielä kodva voit pidiä (Tolmačču) ‘That coat he can still wear a long time’. The common endings -u or -y are not attached to the verb stem because it would be hard or almost impossible to pronounce such triphthongs as *-oiu, *-äyu, *-uiu. The difficult combination has been replaced by the 2sg ending -t. This was possible because the 2sg person includes the generic meaning as well. For example, Loitomma panet, nin lähempä löyvät ‘If you put something further, you will find it closer’. A semantically close sentence is the following: Kalalla mänöy ketä vain ‘Anybody goes fishing’. If there had not been such a close connection between the 2sg and 3sg person forms, the transference of such endings would not have been possible. This development has not, however, led to the interference of those personal forms, because this concerns only a relatively narrow group of verbs.

In the Tihvin dialect the suffix -h, which is the 3pl ending, is also used in the singular: Miun tuatto mäni meččäh i maguah kovašša ‘My father has gone to forest and sleeps in a hut’, Ka jo hien jiäh kaheksi yöksi sinne ‘And he will stay there for two nights’. Kačo t’amä tuas hyppieh tämä hebone ‘Look at this horse, it is jumping again’. The reason for the transference is the same as in the last case. The 3sg and 3pl forms may have a very closely related function and thus either form can have a generic meaning, as is shown in the following clauses: Sanotah, jotta hiän tulou huomena kotih ‘They say that he will come home tomorrow’ and Voi tulla kotih huomena ‘He may come home tomorrow’. It seems that the ending -h has been transferred from the 3pl.

The following table shows all the 3sg endings with variations in all Karelian dialects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIALECTS</th>
<th>ENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-u</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-y</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pi</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-bi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-vi</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-t</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-h</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 1pl and 2pl indicative in the present tense (-mmV, -ttV) and in the past tense (-mV, -ttV, -jV) forms are used only in the direct meaning in all dialects: *Huomeneksella läksinä aivoseh* (Kiestinki) ‘in the morning we go early’, *Nyt akka myö hyötymä, kokonaizen laukan šaima šiitä linnušta* (Jyskyj.) ‘Now wife we got rich, we got a whole shop for that bird’, *Koume taloid ol'I, i paimendammo* (Kotkatj., LL, 74) ‘There were three houses and we are tending the cows’, *Synnyttämäš lapšen, kun työššä olima* (Vuokkiniemi, NKK I,101) ‘We gave birth to a child when we were working’, *I konza työššä löystätä?* (Tunkua, IKM, 30) ‘And when will you find him?’, *Mitä työšk eklen lauloja?* (Vuokkiniemi) ‘What were you singing yesterday?’.

In proper Karelian the endings of the 1pl and 2pl past tense indicative do not mean only the person since nowadays they also signify the past tense. Thus, the ending of the past tense -i becomes functionally redundant and it is left out if following a labial vowel: *myöš liikku-ma* ‘we were going’, *työšliikku-ja* ‘you were going’. In this case we may call them -i-less past tense forms.

In the majority of Karelian dialects, the 3pl indicative ending is -h. It is attached to a stem which resembles the Finnish passive stem. In the present tense it is attached to a passive weak stem (kačota-h) and in the past tense to a strong passive stem (kačotti-h). *Siitä tullah heimokunta* (Kiestinki) ‘Then come the relatives’, *Kai kyš k'į händä kačottih* (Valdai) ‘All the villagers were looking at him’, *Suvajah kaakin, štobi pyhämpeän olis pastettu ĺupoit* (Vielj.) ‘Everybody likes it if they have baked on Sunday’, *A koirainen kuundelu ikkoin al midä paštah* (Riipuskala) ‘And my dog is listening under the window to what they are saying’.

Karelian 3pl forms are close to the Finnish passive voice and historically they also have the same origin. In Karelian dialects they were used both in the active and the passive. The verb has the 3pl meaning when the persons are declared or they are other way known: *Tytöt lauletah hyväsistäh* ‘The girls sing well’. But these forms are used in the passive voice in such cases where the person has a general reference. In this case, the sentence has not and cannot have a subject: *Siellä lauletah hyväsistäh* ‘There they sing well’ (Finnish: *Siellä lauletaan hyvin*). Here the Finnish language uses both the active (*Tytöt laulavat hyvin* ‘The girls sing well’) and the passive voices (*Siellä lauletaan hyvin* ‘It is sung well there’).

The meanings of the 3pl are as follows:

1. **Doing something that is or was done by a group of people to which the speaker does not belong.** For example: *Konsa hyöš tullah?* (Oulanka) ‘When are they coming?’, *Kunne lapset mänthin?* ‘Where did the children go’, *Kai tytöt kiirehtetäh miähele manna* (Nekkula) ‘All the girls hurried to get married’, *Lapset händy suvaittih* ‘Children loved her/him’.

2. **Doing something that is done or was done by indefinite people.** In this case the clause has no subject. For example: *Kyš kylvetäh, ruuvvat šywäh, ukko lyväh, lähetäh poikeš* (Uhtua, KKN III, 135) ‘Sauna is taken, the food is eaten, an old man is hit and they go away’, *Ruaduo myöš i palkka maksetah* (Säänäj., KSA, 66) ‘By the work the salary is paid’, *Sid ruvethah salvamah* (Kotkatj., KKN II, 18) ‘Then a house is being built’.

Lauri Kettunen argued that the use of the subject with the passive predicate derives from Vepsian influence and it is a kind of a Vepsian substrate in Karelian (Kettunen L., 1943, 60-61). R. E. Nirvi, however, did not agree with him since in Karelian the use of the passive in the active meaning is widely spread and no dialect shows traces of active forms (Nirvi R. E., 1947, 13-15). He presented a
view that the use of the passive forms in active functions could have emerged in Karelian due to Russian influence, since Russian shows similar development (Nirvi R. E., 1947, 25).

In the Votic language, the same situation is also explained by Russian influence (Ariste P.1981). R. E. Nirvi considered that it would have been possible that the active use of the passive took place in Karelian independently, without any Russian influence. He notes that this might have resulted from the reflexive conjugation of the verbs. The verb forms such as lähtieh ~ lähtiäh ‘they go’ which have a hidden passive weak suffix \(-\delta V\) greatly resemble the forms of the 3sg of the reflexive conjugation. The ending \(-h\) may have functioned as the suffix of both the passive form and reflexive conjugation.

This may have given an impetus to the use of the passive forms in the functions of the 3sg and 3pl of reflexive conjugation. It is known that earlier the 3sg and 3pl forms were the same as the 1sg and 1pl forms are nowadays. This makes it possible to think that the passive forms were first used in the functions of the 3pl and that it was only later when this usage extended to the whole verb paradigm (Nirvi R. E., 1947, 28).

Generally speaking, other verb forms may also be used in parallel with the 3pl forms or instead of them. Thus, in Finnish dialects, it is possible to use the 3sg form instead of the 3pl. This usage can also be seen in some Karelian dialects close to the border Sinne kuin hyö män'i, n'in hyö sanottih (Tunkua, KKN III,71) ‘when they went there, they said’. Koissa kaotah, kun reissumiehet jo kot’ih tulou (Vuokkiniemi, KKN III,118) ‘At home they look when the travellers return’. Sepät takou pafassa (KKN III,119) ‘Smiths are hammering in the smithy’.

Abbreviations of the dialects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haal.</td>
<td>Haaljärvi</td>
<td>Sääm.</td>
<td>Säämjärvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jysk.</td>
<td>Jyskyjärvi</td>
<td>Tihv.</td>
<td>Tihvinä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kies.</td>
<td>Kiestinki</td>
<td>Tivd.</td>
<td>Tivdia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kond.</td>
<td>Konduši</td>
<td>Tolm.</td>
<td>Tolmačëu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paan.</td>
<td>Paanajärvi</td>
<td>Tunk.</td>
<td>Tunkua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paat.</td>
<td>Paatene</td>
<td>Usm.</td>
<td>Usmana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyh.</td>
<td>Pyhärjärvi</td>
<td>Viel.</td>
<td>Vieljärvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riip.</td>
<td>Riipuskala</td>
<td>Vit.</td>
<td>Vitele</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Meänkieli person system

Erling Wande
The Department of Baltic Languages, Finnish and German, Section for Finnish, Stockholm University
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Like Standard Estonian, the Kven language in northern Norway, the Võru language spoken in the south-east part of Estonia and Meänkieli in northern Sweden has existed for quite a long time. This has been under a fairly heavy impact from the high status majority language, namely Swedish. Impact of this kind has caused development for certain structures or certain local areas of the language structure towards analyticity in favor of more common syntheticity.

In several respects, this is the case with Meänkieli. For instance, for structures like in Swedish Det står en ren på landsvägen (‘There is a reindeer on the road’), Meänkieli uses a structure which is basically the same as in Swedish (or in English): Sielä oon yks poro tien päälä. This is with an informal subject, the numeral yks(i) ‘one’ used as an indefinite marker and a postpositional phrase. This can be compared to the Finnish sentence structure Maantiellä on poro, which is a more synthetic construction.

There are also other tendencies towards analyticity in the syntax of Meänkieli. For example, considering the inflection of verbs, the most far-reaching influence which might be the case for the necessive constructions in Meänkieli: the earlier morphologically uni-personal structure has gradually changed into the full (multi-)personal verb inflection paradigm with consequences of the direct object marking as well. This and some other cases of the necessive construction will be demonstrated in detail in my paper.

The investigation presented here is one part of a project concerning the development of the use of grammatical cases (i.e. nominative, partitive and genitive) in three Baltic-Finnic varieties existing in Sweden. Those are Meänkieli in northern Sweden (earlier called Tornevald Finnish), Estonian and Finnish in Sweden. The studies, carried out in Stockholm University and financed by the Swedish Research Council and Stockholm University, are parallel for these three varieties. The synchronic starting-point of the project is the fact that these three varieties exist in similar ecological environments, characterized by bilingualism among the speakers and permanent contact with the Swedish language. Therefore, it seems reasonable to hypothesize similar tendencies in the ongoing grammatical development in each language.

On the other hand, there are also interesting synchronic differences with regard to demographic aspects of the speaker communities and diachronic differences, especially for Meänkieli compared to the other two, with its hundreds of years of contact with Swedish. This makes also comparison to Standard Finnish and Standard Estonian both relevant and interesting. The third dimension of the project is comparisons with two minority languages in the peripheries of the Baltic-Finnic language area, the Kainu language spoken in northern Norway and the Võru language spoken in the south-east part of Estonia.

This paper will present the general outlines of the project and discuss a few specific features of the syntactic development of Meänkieli, namely the necessive construction and the grammatical marking of its direct object.
Tendencies in the use of person forms in Sweden Finnish

Raija Kangassalo
Centre for Finnish Studies
School of Education, Culture and Communication
Mälardalen University, Sweden
raija.kangassalo(at)mdh.se

Sweden Finns live in a multilingual and multicultural environment and come, in their every-day life, into contact with the Swedish language. Accordingly, Sweden Finnish is in a continuous language contact situation, and this situation leaves its traces on the language across several generations. This results in an expanding number of borrowed linguistic elements from Swedish to Sweden Finnish. Many of the generations that have grown up in Sweden are bilingual in Finnish and Swedish, most of them have Swedish as their strongest language, and the Swedish influences occur generally in the varieties of Finnish used by these generations.

In listening to spoken Sweden Finnish one gets the impression that Finnish varieties of the second and third generation speakers show greater influences from Swedish than the varieties of the first generation. In order to verify this hypothesis I have compared language samples of the first and the second generations of Sweden Finns. The material in this comparison was collected as a part of the project Baltic Finnic syntax in Sweden: the grammatical cases the nominative, the genitive and the partitive in Meänkieli, Sweden Estonian and Sweden Finnish (see Kangassalo et al. 2003). At the moment, I have not compared the Sweden Finnish material with a Finland Finnish material.

In the workshop I will present some results of a comparison concerning the use of some personal forms in Sweden Finnish. These findings include (1) the use of the personal pronouns he or ne ‘they’ with verb in singular or plural third person form, (2) the means of expressing the impersonal voice, and (3) some special types of clauses.

The A- and B-materials content language samples from the second generation, and the C-material consists of samples from the first generation. The A-material consists of tape recordings conducted by me, and B- and C-materials contain mostly radio interviews and working material of radio editors at Sisuradio, the Finnish radio channel in Sweden.

1. In standard Finnish, there is a distinction between the personal pronouns he and ne ‘they’. For people the pronoun he is most often used, while the pronoun for non-people is usually ne. The plural verbal ending vAt is used in both cases, e.g. he istuvat, ne istuvat ‘they sit’. In colloquial Finnish ne is used for people, too, and the singular third form of the verb is used instead of the plural third form, e.g. ne istuu ‘they sit’. In Sweden Finnish, most of the informants of the second generation use the personal pronoun ne for people, while the percentage of the informants using this form in the first generation is not that high. Only one third of the second generation informants use the verb ending vAt, as opposed to about two-thirds in the first generation.

2. Impersonal voice is expressed in the data with the passive verb form, with the generic clause, with the so-called generalizing ne ‘they’ -clause and with the so-called sinä ‘you’ -passive, which all are used in Finland Finnish, too. Almost all the informants in A-material use the passive form, while the percentage of the informants in the B- and the C-material is somewhat lower. Almost all the informants use the generic clause, but the percentage of users is highest in the second generation. The percentage of the users of the ne ‘they’ -clause is much higher in the A-material than in the B-
and the C-material. *Sinä* 'you' -passive is used in the second generation by more informants than in the first.

3.1. The subject in standard Finnish quantor clause is in partitive plural, e.g. *Meitä oli monta* 'We were many'. In the samples of the first Sweden Finnish generation, the only subject case is the partitive plural, and most of the informants in the second generation also use the partitive plural subject. The quantor clause with a nominative subject is probably not very common in Finland Finnish, not even in colloquial Finnish, but examples of its use exist.

The subject in the second Sweden Finnish generation is still quite often in nominative pl., e.g.

(1) *me olti-, oliko me noin kolme neljä siinä ryhmässä* (A4a)

We.NOM be.PASS.PST be.3SG.PST,QCL we.NOM about three four there group.INE

'We were-, there were about three or four of us in that group’

(2) *ne on niinku kakastoista ehkä jotaki* (A33a)

they-NOM be.3SG.PRS like twelve perhaps something

'They are like twelve or something.’

(3) *ne on kyllä vähä* (B16a)

they-NOM be.3SG.PRES PTL few

‘There is surely a little of them.’

(4) *nii mutta me ollaan nyt kymmenen pelaajaa* (B53b)

eyes but we.NOM be.PASS.PRES now ten player.PAR

‘Yes but there is now ten of us playing’

3.2. Some of the Sweden Finnish informants use a periphrastic necessive construction which consist of a verb *olla* ‘be’ and the passive present participle. It is commonly used in Finland Finnish, too. However, some of the second-generation informants use another construction that appears to be equivalent to the Swedish structure *det är bara att* + infinitive (‘it is only to’ + infinitive). The Finnish equivalent *se on* (*vaan*) (*ettää*) + infinitive has a necessive meaning. Because it may occur without *ettää* (‘that’), it formally resembles the participial construction.

(5) *netin kautta nii se on vaan klikata* (A1a)

net.Gen through so it be.3SG.PRS only click-INF

‘Through the internet then, you just have to click.’

(6) *koulussahan se on ettää tehä läksyt ja semmosta* (A29a)

school.INE,CLT it be.3SG.PRS that do.INF home work.PL and such.PAR

‘At school you have to do the home work and such.’

(7) *se on vaan niinku heti kerralla antaa niinko* it be.3SG.PRS only like immediately time-ADE give.INF like kymmentätuhatta enemmän (A4a)
ten thousand.PAR more

‘You just have to give ten thousands more at once.’

(8) *se on vaan nähä ku tekee niitä* (B41a)

it be.3SG.PRS only see.INF when make.3SG.PRES those.PAR

‘You just have to see when you make them’.
Ten percent of the second-generation informants use this construction. However, the construction does not occur in the samples of the informants who use the participial construction (‘be’ + participle), neither in the second-generation informants nor first. In discussions with some Finland Finns, both linguists and laymen, the infinitival (se on + infinitive) has appeared totally unknown. As a working name I call the structure “the Sweden Finnish necessive”.

In this workshop, I will present more results of the comparison of the different Sweden Finnish generations and discuss further the complex of the problem. Most of the changes can be considered language contact induced. Many of the changes are syntactic, and Heine and Kuteva (2005: 261) for instance consider that the borrowing of syntactical structures is quite usual.
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Competing strategies in person marking: double-marking vs. economy

Marja-Liisa Helasvuo
University of Turku
mlhelas(at)utu.fi

According to Sacks and Schegloff (1979), there is a general preference for minimization in reference to persons in conversation: reference to persons is “preferably done with a single reference form” (Sacks & Schegloff 1979: 16). To put it simply, in English the reference form functions as the subject, whereas for example in Hebrew, subject pronouns are typically ellipted and person reference is conveyed through agreement marking on the verb in past and future tenses (Hacohen and Schegloff 2006). Levinson (2007) discusses “optimizing” in reference to persons based on data from Rossel Island and notes that there are (at least) three principles at work: economy (cf. Sacks and Schegloff’s minimization), recognition (cf. Sacks and Schegloff’s recipient design), and circumspetion. According to the recognition principle, speakers should restrict the set of referents so as to achieve recognition. The economy principle says that speakers shouldn’t over-restrict the set of referents explicitly, and according to the principle of circumspetion, speakers should not over-reduce the set of referents explicitly.

In my presentation I will discuss these principles or strategies in the light of Finnish. In principle, the predicate verb agrees with the subject in number (singular vs. plural) and person (1st, 2nd and 3rd) in Finnish (see e.g. Helasvuo & Laitinen 2006). In standard Finnish, (non-3rd-person) subjects are generally not expressed (i.e. zero anaphora is the norm), and verbs are marked for person and number of the subject. In other words, standard Finnish follows the principle of minimization (cf. Sacks and Schegloff 1979) or economy (Levinson 2007). When subjects are overtly expressed, however, they carry out some special discourse function (e.g. contrast). The system of standard Finnish is thus similar to that of conversational Hebrew (cf. Hacohen & Schegloff 2006). In contrast, in colloquial Finnish it is more common for both the subject pronoun and the person marking on the verb to be overtly expressed. There is thus a preference for double-marking in the 1st and 2nd person rather than for minimization. In typological work, it has been noted that this kind of “grammatical agreement” or “non-pro-drop” is typologically rare (see Siewierska 1999, Dahl 1990). In colloquial Finnish, however, double-marking (“grammatical agreement”, “non-pro-drop”) is the norm, whereas single-marking (minimization) occurs in certain conversational contexts (such as in the answer part of a question – answer adjacency pair). — In my presentation, I will discuss the person marking system in different varieties of Finnish. My focus will be on 1st and 2nd person marking in conversational discourse, but I will compare my findings to data from other genres as well.
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Interactional and sociolinguistic aspects of 1st and 2nd person pronoun use vs. omission in spoken Finnish

Hanna Lappalainen
Research Institute for the Languages of Finland
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In my paper, I will discuss the use and omission of 1st and 2nd person pronoun subjects in spoken Finnish; my focus is in singular forms. The main data represent institutional conversations, videotaped service encounters at Finnish Social Security offices, but I will relate my observations from them to everyday conversations. Methodologically, the research is an example of conversation analysis, though the consideration of regional and social variation in the omission of the pronoun subject also requires the perspective of variation analysis.

Pro-drop in Finnish (as in other Finnic and Uralic languages) is based on the fact that person is indicated by verb inflection (cf. Lindström & Kalmus’s paper in the workshop). However, the pronoun subject in 3rd person is usually overt, especially in written Standard Finnish.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{minä} & \sim \text{mä laulan} \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{laulan} & \text{’I sing’} \\
\text{sinä} & \sim \text{sä laulat} \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{laulat} & \text{’you sing’} \\
\text{hän laulaa} & \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{laulat} & \text{’he/she sings’} \\
\text{me laulamme} & \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{laulamme} & \text{’we sing’} \\
\text{te laulatte} & \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{laulatte} & \text{’you sing’} \\
\text{he laulavat} & \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{laulavat} & \text{’they sing’}
\end{align*}
\]

The use of the pronoun subject has been a target of conscious standardization (Strellman 2005). Omission of a 1st and 2nd person subject has been recommended when it does not receive a particular stress. The effect of this norm can be seen by comparing the use of pronoun subjects, on the one hand, in written Standard Finnish and, on the other hand, in non-standard spoken Finnish; pronouns are used more frequently in spoken Finnish than in fiction (Duvallon 2005; Heinonen 1995; Lainio & Wande 1994; Lappalainen 2004, 2006a, c; Mauranen & Tiittula 2005; Paunonen 2001).

Although pronoun subjects are very frequent in non-standard spoken Finnish (around 70-90% of all the cases), they are not always present. On the basis of the earlier research, the omission is almost grammaticalized in certain contexts. Some adjacency pairs (a) and directives (b) are good examples of these structural omission cases. In addition to these, pro-drop is typical for some request types (c) and same-subject coordination (d).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ex. a. A:} & \quad \text{siä jätät sen sinne vielä.} \\
& \text{you leave-2 it-ACC there yet} \\
& \text{’you will leave it there yet’} \\
\text{B:} & \quad \text{enkä jätä (.) älä luule.} \\
& \text{neg-1-CLT leave neg-IMP think} \\
& \text{’no I won’t don’t imagine’}
\end{align*}
\]
Ex. b. yhtään et heitä enää.
anything NEG-2 throw anymore
‘don’t throw anything anymore’

Ex. c. sanotko henkilötunnuksen
say-2-Q identity number-ACC
‘would you tell me your identity number’

Ex. d. mä silloin pyysin niitä (. ja soitin ja olin hoitajan kans puhelimessa
I PTL asked them and called and was-1 nurse-GEN with phone-INE
‘I asked for them then and called and talked with the nurse in the phone’

Instead of these almost regular omission cases, my focus will be in the cases in which more variation occurs. I will discuss e.g. examples of declarative-formed questions, which are often used for clarification requests (a and b), utterances used for displaying ignorance (c and d), and cases in which the choice between T-forms (Fi. 2nd pers. sg. sinä) vs. V-forms (Fi. 2nd pers. pl. te) is problematic (e).

Ex. a tuota yksin asutte edelleen
well alone live-PL2 still
‘you live alone still don’t you’

Ex. b. sie et oo opiskelija
you NEG be student
‘you are not a student, are you’

Ex. c. en osaak kyl nyt vastata
NEG-1 can PTL now answer
‘I have no competence to answer’

Ex. d. enhäm mie siitä: itäettä se on työkkärin asia sitt(e)
NEG-1 CLI I it-PAR know that it is employment agency-GEN issue PTL
‘how could I know that – it’s the problem of the employment agency’

Ex. e. missä osoitteessa asut? vs. missä osoitteessa sä ~ sinä asut
where address-INE live-2 where address-INE you(sg2) live-2
‘which address do you live in’

The aim of my paper is to show how the interactional context and the on-going activity explain variation. By using or dropping a pronoun the speaker can position himself/herself and the others and control how visibly s/he presents her/himself or the others. Choosing pro-drop, he can present his activity as irrelevant or fade out the contrast between different addressing forms. The omission of the pronoun subject in declarative-formed questions is related to the word order; it is a means for foregrounding an object, a predicative or other complement instead of a subject. The prominence of the subject can also be indicated by the choice of the personal pronoun variant. In most of the Finnish dialects the most neutral variant in 1st and 2nd person singular is a form including only one syllable (e.g. mä, mää, mie; så, sää, sie) but the standard variants including two syllables (minä, sinä) are used beside these short and unstressed forms. The longer and more prominent variants are used especially in emphatic and contrastive cases.

My main data consist of 77 service encounters at Finnish Social Security offices. The encounters have been video-recorded in Hämë (Western Finland), Northern Karelia (Eastern Finland), Southern Lapland, and Helsinki. This research is part of a larger research project investigating interactive
practices in customer-service situations, coordinated by the Research Institute for the Languages of Finland (Sorjonen & Raevaara 2006). In addition to these institutional conversations, I have analyzed the use vs. omission of the pronoun subject in everyday conversations collected mostly in the Helsinki region.

According to my investigations on regional and social variation in the use of pronoun subjects, extralinguistic factors do not seem to be as essential as interactional ones when the omission of the pronoun is interpreted. However, I will pay attention to variation according to situation type. Spoken language is not homogenous, and every situation has its typical interactional features and norms. Concerning the omission of pronoun subject, the service encounters at social security offices seem to lie between the written standard and everyday conversations.
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The notion of commitment has various meanings in linguistics. In Speech Act Theory, the notion refers to speaker’s commitment to the action which is mentioned in a proposition. Commissive utterances are used as promises, offers, threats etc., and they refer to speaker’s own immediate or distant future action.

The following example shows how commissive utterances can be used in interaction. The example is a fragment of the conversation between a sales lady (S) and a customer (C) in a shoe shop. The sales lady passes a shoe towards the customer:

(1) 01 S: se on kolmekas nyt mutta
      it be-3sg 38 now but
      The size of that is 38 but

02 mä voisin hakkee ysi että mitä,
    I can-COND-1SG collect-INF nine-GEN that what
    I could get the size 39 so that…

03 C: miepä koeta ekana nüitä.
     I-CLT try-1SG first-ESS this-PL-PAR
     I shall try on these first.

Both the sales lady (on the line 2 mä voisin hakkee ‘I could get’) and the customer (on the line 3 miepä koeta ‘I shall try’) express a commitment to their own action which can be realized in immediate future. The pragmatic functions of the utterances are different: the sales lady makes an offer, whereas the customer rejects the offer by reporting the substitutive, immediate future action.

Irrespective of functional differences, there are certain syntactical similarities in the utterances:

1) there is an overt personal pronoun subject and
2) the predicate verb agrees with the subject in number and person (1st person singular).

Due to explicit person marking, it is obvious that the speaker of the utterance and the agent of the proposition are the same person. According to my investigations, 1st person singular forms are typical in commissive utterances, especially in conversational speech. Furthermore, it is common that a 1st singular pronoun coexists with a clitic. For example on line 3 the pronoun mie combines with the clitic -pä. The clitic emphasizes the pronoun and makes the subject more distinguishable.

However, there are also other, more implicit options. The speaker can refer to him-/herself by using 1st singular verb forms without a pronoun subject (a kind of pro-drop), 3rd singular verb forms (zero person and necesive structures with verb pitää ‘have to’) or passive forms (see examples 2–5 on the following page).
In my paper, I will focus on how the person is marked in commissive utterances. What kind of contexts favor the 1st singular forms and the emphatic clitics? On the other hand, for what reason the speaker chooses to use more implicit person marking instead of 1st singular forms? What is the role of pro-drop, zero and passive in commissive utterances? Can the person marking selection be described as a functional system?

I will show more evidence and detailed analysis based on empirical data which consist of video-recorded conversations between customer and shoe retailer in a local shoe shop in Sotkamo. The dialect spoken in Sotkamo represents Eastern Finnish dialects, and more specifically, one subgroup of Savo dialects.
Between passive and active: the impersonal obligation construction in Finnish
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Finnish has a specific periphrastic construction which expresses obligation or necessity. This obligation construction, as it is called here, is formed with the verb ‘to be’ in its 3rd person singular form (on) and a present passive participle (TAVA-participle) of the main verb. The construction is the most common expression of necessity in standard Finnish but it doesn’t occur in other Finnic languages. Though it is more typical of written, standard Finnish than colloquial Finnish, it’s dramatically more frequent in eastern dialects (Savo dialects) than in western dialects. (Ikola, Palomäki & Koitto 1989: 436; Pekkarinen 2000.)

As the main verb of the construction includes the passive marker, it could be regarded as a form of Finnish passive. In fact, the subjectless obligation construction such as in (1a) has an identical structure with passive compound tenses in Finnish, as shown by fabricated example (1b). The two constructions even have an identical history: both have derived from copula constructions with a predicate adjective.

\[
(1a) \quad \text{se karja on hoijettava aina} \\
\quad \text{it cattle be.3SG take care.PASS.PRS.PCP always}
\]

‘The cattle must always be taken care of’ (Sortavalama MA)

\[
(1b) \quad \text{se karja on hoidettu aina} \\
\quad \text{it cattle be.3SG.PRS take care.PASS.PST.PCP always}
\]

‘The cattle has always been taken care of’ (modified)

However, the obligation construction is not always subjectless but it may have an overt subject, though one displaying non-canonical coding. It fits in the pattern of the other verbs of obligation or recommendation in Finnish. In the Finnish necessity construction, the verb always appears in the 3rd person singular form, and the subject is marked with the genitive (see Laitinen 1997, Helasvuo & Vilkuna 2008).

\[
(2) \quad \text{meijjä ol tehtävä kovasti töetä teällä} \\
\quad \text{we-GEN be.3SG.PST do.PASS.PRS.PCP hard work-PAR here}
\]

‘We had to work hard here’ (Kannonkoski MA)

Although the genitive subject is characteristic for the modal verbs of necessity in Finnish, it is not obligatory. On the contrary, the oblique subject is often missing creating an open reference. The subjectless necessive verbs have been regarded as instances of zero construction (see Laitinen 2006). However, they differ from typical zero constructions in that their function is more similar to the passive, which is natural since the necessive verbs in Finnish do not conjugate in passive. Thus, the obligation construction in both (1a) and (2) could be replaced by a necessive verb and the infinitive form of the main verb.

In sum, the obligation construction has features of both the Finnish passive and the necessity construction, which is active in form. In the linguistic literature, both of the constructions have been described as impersonal based on the fact that they exhibit one or more properties of impersonal
constructions in the sense discussed by e.g. Helasvuo & Vilkuna (2008: 217, see also Siewierska 2008a and 2008b).

In my contribution for the workshop, I will survey the syntactic properties of the obligation construction sentences on the basis of data on vernacular Finnish. My data consists of about 1400 Obligation Construction clauses from collections of transcribed material from Finnish Dialects. The material was collected during the 1960’s and 70’s by interviewing old people on matters concerning the agricultural society in the early 20th-century, e.g. old farming methods, habits, beliefs, and other popular traditions of the society. Thus, the context of the data is typically generic.

In this data, the obligation construction is mostly subjectless, that is, the identity of the obliged person is left open. The preverbal position typical of subjects is usually filled by object as in passive sentences. I will argue that the obligation construction is used in the contexts in which it is important to point out that something is necessary but the obliged person is backgrounded. The primary genericity of the construction determines also the reference of the genitive subjects and the modal functions it can be used in.
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The subject of my presentation is the so called must clause or necessity construction, in the Kven language. In this presentation I will discuss the tendency in Kven to get more personal. For example, unlike in Finnish, the necessity predicates in Kven are in most cases not impersonal. They take a nominative subject and show person agreement (1). The main focus will be on must clauses (examples 1 and 2), but there will be other examples too.

(1) Enkä mie sais yhden matan jauhoin kassasta lainaxi pantin etestä on minula kaksi lehmä
‘Could I borrow some flour from the Fund on security, I have two cows - -’
toisen mie täytyn pannat pantixi.
one-ACC I-NOM must-SG1 give-INF1 security-TRA
‘ - -one I must give as a security.’ (JE 1881)

(2) Tässä meilä on pakko kurkistella ja kuunnella.
Here we-ADE be-SG3 necessity-NOM peep-INF1 and listen-INF1
‘Here we must peep and listen.’ (Alf Børsskog 2004)

The Kven language has undergone syntactic changes during its long coexistence with Scandinavian, Saami, Meänkieli and northern Finnish dialects. Some of those changes have been triggered by tendencies within the language itself, some by cross-linguistic interference. Thus, what comes to the personal modal constructions in Kven, one may ask whether it is a contact-induced change or language internal development?

The topic is divided into three parts. Firstly, I will introduce the necessity verbs in Kven and their personal agreement. Another point in demonstrating the personal character of must clauses in Kven is that an object in the necessity construction receives a marking (accusative), which brings the clauses syntactically closer to personal constructions. This is also illustrated in example (1).

The second part concerns necessity copula constructions such as (2). I will show how a human experiencer emerges in adessive and allative case in Kven. Besides, I would like to show how the copula construction of necessity can get the pronoun se ‘it’ on the subject place and ettää ‘that’ before the infinitive.

Finally I will give a brief overview of some other results of linguistic analysis that can contribute to the discussion personal versus impersonal in Kven. For example, the so called retrospective construction (tulla + past passive participle translative), where the primary argument is marked not with the genetive case but for example with adessive; or the so called personal tella-passive.

At the end of my talk, I would like to share more information about the material – the written texts in Kven from 19th century. This is a small material consisting of documents and letters from the Archive of the Poor Relief Fund in Kistrand Municipality in the North-Norway (1867-1911) that was recently found at the State Archive in Tromsø. These letters are the blessed rare treasure for the Kven language study because until now there where no evidence what so ever about the common people’s writings in Kven from the 19th century.
On the consequences of the use of passive forms with overt subjects in Kven and Finnish

Mihail Voronov
University of Turku
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Finnic languages make use of personal pronouns and/or verbal suffixes which also mark person. One particular feature of the person system in some Finnic languages is the passive form used to express 1st and 3rd person plural reference instead of the use of person-inflected verbs. In this case, person can be concluded by a personal pronoun only (or, alternatively, in the case of 3rd person plural, by the full NP subject). This kind of passive form usage differs from its basic use, among others, due to the fact that there is never an overt subject in a real passive clause; passivization in Finnic languages does not change the analysis of the object. My presentation deals with some issues connected to the use of passive forms in relation to 1st and 3rd person plural subjects, namely the functional overlap of 3rd person plural verb forms and passive forms in Kven and how this kind of use of passive forms has affected the real passive in Kven and Finnish.

In the same languages, passive forms are not really used in connection with both 1st and 3rd person plural and the phenomenon indeed has a separate origin in these persons. In regards to the first person plural, the use of passive forms is viewed as the result of the language’s internal development: the passive forms have already been used in the first person plural imperative from which have extended to other moods (Nirvi 1947: 39–40). In relation to 1st person plural, the passive forms are used mainly in Finnish.

The use of passive forms in connection with the 3rd person plural, for one, is a contact-induced phenomenon. The Russian non-specified third plural construction, which probably out of all Russian passive constructions corresponds the most to the Finnic passive, is its origin (Ariste 1941: 72–3, Nirvi 1947). The most established use of Finnic passive forms in connection with the 3rd person plural can be seen in Karelian. As in Russian, in which the 3rd person plural verb form is used in two ways (for 3rd person plural reference and in non-specified third plural construction), this practice has extended to Karelian as well. In contrast to Russian, the Karelian passive form has taken two functions in question. This can be due to the fact, among others, that the 3rd person form is prone to give way to other forms (Nirvi 1947: 19); for example, especially in colloquial Finnish, the 3rd person singular form is generally used instead of 3rd person plural. The use of passive forms in connection with 3rd person plural subjects in Kven has descended from Karelian (see e.g. Pääkkönen 1990).

This kind of use of passive forms differs from all other Finnic passive usage (including in combination with 1st person plural subjects) because in this use the agent of the passive form does not need to be animate. The explanation for this is in the fact that the phenomenon is contact-induced.
Functional overlap of 3rd person plural verb forms and passive forms in Kven

In Karelian, the use of passive forms in combination with the 3rd person plural subjects has completely displaced the original 3rd person plural verb form. This feature has not happened in Kven, in which the original 3rd person plural verb form has been preserved alongside the passive. The variation of 3rd person plural and passive forms is common throughout the Kven dialect region (for a detailed discussion about this variation, see Lindgren 1993).

The circumstance in which the 3rd person plural verb form and the passive form vary in 3rd person plural contexts, has led to the overlapping of the functions of these forms. The common norm in Kven is that the 3rd person plural verb (with or without a personal pronoun) is used correspondingly to the passive. This usage comes close to 3rd person plural generic use (see ISK: 1268; cf. the paper by Forsberg et al.). However, the use of the 3rd person plural in Kven it is not restricted to certain contexts but approaches the passive in its versatility. The overlapping of 3rd person plural forms and passive forms is also seen due to the fact that they are often used side by side, as in (1).

1. kalapalloja ei paisteta niitä keittävä (NA Kaivuono 10711:1)
   fish balls not fry+PASS them boil-3PL
   ‘They do not fry fish balls, they boil them.’

More direct evidence for the overlapping of the functions of passive forms and 3rd person plural verb forms can be seen in the examples in which the 3rd person plural verb form is used in contexts where its occurrence from its own basis is not possible. It is common to use the 3rd person plural in Kven, when speaking about one’s own actions and experiences (Lindgren 1993: 85). This kind of use corresponds to the passive used in reference to the speaker him/herself and his/her possible reference groups (see ISK: 1264–66).

Formal variation in which the 3rd person plural verb form and passive form vary in reference to 3rd person plural has extended to the passive. Thus the constructions shown in (2) have come to be interchangeable, i.e. passive forms can be used to express 3rd person plural meaning and 3rd person plural forms can be used correspondingly to the passive.

2. (ne ‘they’) + V+PASS ~ (ne ‘they’) + V+3PL

In this light, it stands to reason why one form has extended to encompass the 3rd person plural and passive in Karelian. Originally also in Karelian, when the 3rd person plural verb form and passive form have functionally merged together, formal variation (2) was found to be inconvenient and one form was generalised to the functions according to the Russian model. The preservation of Kven variation (2) is intelligible: its usage of the passive forms in relation to 3rd person plural subjects is a Karelian relic, a feature which originates from, but its development no longer directed by, Russian.

Grammatical consequences

The use of passive forms in combination with overt subjects differs from the use of the passive form in a real passive clause not only due to the presence of the subject. Here, I consider this to be another essential grammatical difference, which is different in relation to the 1st and 3rd person plural. At the same time, it can be seen that the use of the passive form in relation to overt subjects has affected the use of the real passive.
Finnish 1st plural + passive construction

Passive forms inflected in periphrastic tenses entail the auxiliary *olla* ‘to be’ in its 3rd person form and the past passive participle: *on syöty* [be+3SG eat-PASS+PST+PTCP] ‘has been eaten’. However, in the 1st plural + passive construction, the auxiliary is also generally in the passive form: *me ollaan syöty* [we be+PASS eat-PASS+PST+PTCP] ‘we have eaten’. The tendency towards system uniformity i.e. the analogy of the fact that the verb *olla* ‘to be’ is in the same form in active inflection for simple and periphrastic tenses, can be considered to be the cause of this phenomenon (cf. ISK: 1235–36).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mä oon (tässä)} & = \text{me ollaan (tässä)} \\
\text{I be+1SG (here)} & = \text{we be+PASS (here)} \\
\text{mä oon syöny} & = \text{me ollaan syöty} \\
\text{I be+1SG eaten} & = \text{we be+PASS eaten}
\end{align*}
\]

From 1st plural + passive constructions, passive double marking has extended to real passive clauses (Larjavaara 2007: 206).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{me ollaan (tässä)} & = \text{ollaan (tässä)} \\
\text{we be-PASS (here)} & = \text{be-PASS (here)} \\
\text{me ollaan syöty} & = \text{ollaan syöty} \\
\text{we be+PASS eaten} & = \text{be+PASS eaten}
\end{align*}
\]

Kven 3rd plural + passive construction

The singular nominal total object (of the affirmative clause) is in the accusative case (3). Originally, in some contexts, due to historical reasons, the nominative has instead been used (without impact on the meaning of the object). The passive clause is an example of this (4).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(3) mie panin nahan siihen (fabricated example)} \\
\text{I put+1PL hide+ACC there} \\
\text{“I put the hide there.”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(4) siihen panthiin nahka (NA Teno 9692:1)} \\
\text{there put+PASS+PST hide[NOM]} \\
\text{“The hide was put there.”}
\end{align*}
\]

However, the total object of the 3rd plural + passive construction stands mostly in the accusative (5). The extended use of the accusative object in real passive clauses (6) can be traced back to the 3rd plural + passive construction.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(5) ne oteethiin tyhä nahan (NA Kvalsund 10666:1)} \\
\text{they take+PASS+PST only hide+ACC} \\
\text{“They took the hide only.”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(6) meiän valtakuntaan valitethiin kuninkaan (NA Kaivuono 10710:2)} \\
\text{to our kingdom choose+PASS+PST king+ACC} \\
\text{“The king was chosen for our kingdom.”}
\end{align*}
\]

So, the grammar of the 1st/3rd plural + passive constructions contains some features, which originally have not been present in the grammar of the real passive. The features, however, have shown up in the real passive due to the 1st/3rd plural + passive constructions.
Data

NA = The Audio Recordings Archive, The Research Institute for the Languages of Finland.

References

Ariste, Paul 1941: *Vadja keelenäiteid*. Tartu: University of Tartu.
ISK = Hakulinen, Auli et al. 2004: *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: SKS.
Uses of passive inflection by Ingrian Finns in Estonia
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1. Ingrian Finns in Estonia

The study concerns Ingrian Finnish, which is a dialect of the Finnish language originally spoken in Russia around St. Petersburg. The informants of the study were born in the 1910s or 1920s and grew up in Finnish-speaking rural families. They were forced to leave their homes during World War II and after the war their families were settled in other parts of Russia, from where they soon fled to Estonia. The Ingrian Finns have always been a very small minority with a low social status. Cultural pressure of the Estonians has been overwhelming. The domain of Ingrian Finnish has become very restricted, and nowadays the language can be considered as dying; it was seldom completely transmitted to the second generation of Ingrian Finns in Estonia. Estonian was easily learned by Ingrian Finns because it is so closely related to Finnish, and due to its prestigious status it has become the dominant language for most people. Many of the informants can be described as rusty speakers of Finnish. It seems that lack of use has caused some degeneration of fluency in their native tongue. Due to a long and intensive contact, the Finnish of these speakers is heavily influenced by Estonian. The study is based on the Ingrian Finnish data collection of the University of Joensuu. The data consist of personal interviews made in Finnish during the 1990s in Ingria and in Estonia; the interviews were recorded and then transcribed. For the present study, I have used the Estonian part of the corpus (Ingrian Finns living in Tartu, Pärnu and Järvamaa: 37 interviews, 30 hours).

2. Characteristics of the Finnish passive

Morphological structure

− present and past tense: passive marker + marker for tense or mood + personal ending (no conjugation but a special personal ending for passive)
− negative, perfect and pluperfect: auxiliary verb olla 'be' and past participle passive

Table 1. Finnish passive verb morphology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>sanoltalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>past</td>
<td>sanolttilin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>on sanolttu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pluperfect</td>
<td>olli sanolttu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>sanolttalisilin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>ollisi sanolttu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>sanolttalkolon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>olikoon sanolttu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>sanolttelin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>lie\nee sanolttu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Syntactic and functional features (e.g. ISK 2004)
- no subject or agent
- the presupposed agent is an unspecified group of humans
- can be formed from intransitive verbs (except the personal passive)
- is used when the agent is unknown or the speaker avoids mentioning the agent (however, the agent is often implied in the context)

Impersonal passive: exclusive meaning (Shore 1986, 1988)
- often object in the theme position
- the identity or number of the agents is irrelevant
- the speaker is not involved in the action expressed by the verb

(1) Jussi vietiin poliisiasemalle.
   Jussi took-PST.PASS police.station-ADE
   'Jussi was taken to the police station.' (Shore 1988: 166)

Impersonal passive: inclusive meaning (Shore 1986, 1988)
- clause often begins with the verb
- agent is often determined by the context
- the speaker is or may be involved in the action
- common in requests and commands

(2) Ammutaahan hevosiaakin
    shoot-PASS-CLT horse-PL-PAR-CLT
    'They shoot horses, don't they?' (Shore 1988: 162)

(3) Juodaan näät ja lähdetään.
    drink-PASS these and leave-PASS
    'Let's have these drinks and go.'

Inclusive meaning + pronoun subject (colloquial, spoken Finnish)
- the clause contains a specific agent/subject: the first person plural pronoun
- morphological passive form as a part of personal inflection

(4) Me mennään ulos.
    We go-PASS out.
    'We will go out.'

Personal passive: stative and resultative passive constructions
- the object of an active clause is the subject of the passive clause
- formed only from transitive verbs
- verb agrees with subject in number and person

(5) Asia on hyvin hoidettu
    matter be-3SG well manage-PP
    'The matter is managed well'

(6) Sinä tulit valituksii
    you become-PST-2SG choose-PP-TRA
    'You were chosen.'
3. The Estonian passive

Morphological structure (e.g. Remes 1983)
- present tense indicative: passive marker + personal ending -kse
- present tense in other mood and past tense: passive marker + tense or mood marker
- negative, perfect and pluperfect: auxiliary verb olem 'be' and past participle passive
- no conjugation

| Table 2. Estonian passive verb morphology. |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------|
| Indicative                               | Affirmative    | Negative      |
| present                                 | saadetalkse    | ei saadelta   |
| past                                     | saadelti       | ei saadeltud  |
| perfect                                 | on saadeltud   | ei ole saadeltud |
| pluperfect                               | olli saadeltud | ei olnud saadeltud |
| Conditional                             | saadetalks     | ei saadetalks |
| present                                 | oleks saadeltud| ei oleks saadeltud |
| perfect                                 |                 |               |
| Imperative                              | saadetalggu    |                  |
| present                                 | ollgu saadeltud|                  |
| perfect                                 |                 |                  |
| Moduls obliquis                         | saadetaltav    | ei saadetaltav |
| present                                 | olevat saadeltud| ei olevat saadeltud |
| perfect                                 |                 |               |

Impersonal use (e.g. Erelt 2003, see also Torn 2002)
- in Estonian grammars, the equivalent of Finnish passive is often called impersonal
- no subject or agent; describes an action performed by an unspecified human agent
- can be formed from intransitive verbs
- is used when the agent is unknown or the speaker avoids mentioning the agent

(7) **Loetakse** raamatut.
read-PASS book-PAR
'The book is being read; someone is reading the book' (Erelt 2003: 102)

(8) Raamatud **loeti** läbi
book-PL read-PST-PASS through
'The books have been read through' (Erelt 2003: 102)

Personal passive (Torn 2002) or resultative/stative constructions (Erelt 2003)
- auxiliary verb olem 'be' + past participle passive
- the object of an active clause has become the subject of the passive clause
- the auxiliary agrees with subject in number and person
- is formed only from transitive verbs
- expresses "a state into which the subject's referent (object of action) has entered as a result of the action" (Erelt 2003: 103)

(9) **Uksed olid avatud**
door-PL be-PST-3PL open-PP
'The doors were open' (Erelt 2003: 103)
The *saama* passive (Torn 2002, Erelt 2003)

- auxiliary *saama* 'get; become' and infinitive (10)
- the construction can be used as a personal passive, especially if the speaker is the agent or one of the agents (11)

(10) Lapsed *said* ema käest *noomida*
    child-PL get-PST-3PL mother-GEN from reprimand-INF
    'The children were reprimanded by the mother' (Torn 2002: 100)

(11) Maja *kallal saab* kõvasti vaeva *nühtud*
    house with become-PR.3SG much trouble-PAR see-PP
    'A lot of effort is put into the house' (Erelt 2003: 103)

4. Preliminary observations and examples from the Ingrian Finnish data

In this paper, I will examine the uses of the Finnish morphological passive forms in the data collected from the Ingrian Finns. The focus is thus in spoken language and Finnish dialects with the additional perspectives of language contact and attrition. The examples are transcribed roughly and they mainly follow the standard Finnish orthography. A comma is used to indicate a brief pause in speech and a hyphen to indicate unfinished word forms. The Estonian-like elements are marked by italics.

Exclusive use of passive: generic (the agent is unimportant or irrelevant)

(12) joen toisella puolella siel oli se, *tehtas*
    river-GEN other-ADE side-ADE there be-PST.3SG it factory
    *siel tehtii, tapetia*
    there make-PST.PASS wallpaper-PAR
    'on the other side of the river there was a factory where wallpaper was made'

Exclusive use of passive: remembering the course of event during the war (the agent is military or another authority)

(13) sellaine mies *otetti, ja vietii vankittii*
    such man take-PST.PASS and take.away-PST.PASS arrest-PST.PASS
    ja *vieti pois*
    and take-away-PST.PASS away
    'such a man was arrested and taken away'

Exclusive use of passive: the speaker is the object of the action expressed by the verb

(14) sis meit *korjatti kokku ja sis meit saatteti kaivikkuttele*
    then we-PAR gather-PST.PASS together and then we-PAR send-PST.PASS trench-PL-ALL
    'then we were gathered together and sent to the trenches [i.e. to dig a trench]'
Inclusive use of passive: describing the old traditions (the speaker may have been involved in the action)

(15) **panti** semmonen penkki, sis **pantii** morsia ja
put-PST.PASS such bench then put-PST.PASS bride and
anoppi, istumaa sinne, ja sis **nostettii** heitää
mother.in.law sit-INF-ILL there and then lift-PST.PASS they-PAR
'the bride and the mother-in-law were told to sit at the bench and then they were lifted up'

Inclusive use of passive: the context implies that the speaker is involved in the action

(16) nelkymment seitsemäl *aastal* tulimma sihe ja niin kauvva
forty seven-ADE year-ADE come-PST-1PL here and so long
on eletty, eestiläisiin *hulkas* nyt
be-3SG live-PP Estonian-PL-GEN among now
'we came here 1947 and have lived among the Estonians since then'

Inclusive use of passive: a passive form with the first person plural noun

(17) myö **tyyttetti** kaikes kutes tuintii päeväs
we work-PST.PASS all-INE six hour-PL-PAR day-INE
'we worked all in all six hours a day'

(18) eikä me oltu metsäs koaettu sitä yhtäkää puuta vielä
NEG we be-PP wood-INE cut.down-PP it-PAR any-PAR-CLT three-PAR yet
'and we had not cut down any tree yet'

Exclusive and inclusive passives in one utterance (i.e. change in the perspective)

(19) no sieltä **annettiin**, jonku verran soatiin syyvä
well there-ABL give-PST.PASS some-GEN extent get-PST.PASS eat-INF
'they gave us [food], we got to eat something'

(20) sit ko me sinne **tulti**, sit meit **vietii** suur,
then when we there come-PST.PASS then we-PAR take-PST.PASS big
siel oli, kluubi suur. sinne **vietii**.
there be-PST.3SG club big there take-PST.PASS
'after we came there, we were taken to a big club'

Stative and resultative constructions: Estonian influence

(21) ompelukone jaa ja **oli** minulla **pantu** myös, tallin toisee nurkkaa
sewing.machine also and be-PST.3SG I-ADE put-PP also 'barn-GEN other-ILL corner-ILL
'I also had put the sewing machine in the other corner of the barn'

(22) navetat **olit** kaikki **paeaktività** tehtyt
barn-PL be-PST-3PL all slate-PL-ELA make-PP
'all the barns were made from slates'

(23) mul **on** kyl kaik **kirjutetut**
I-ADE be-PRS.3SG PTL all write-PP
'I have written them all'
Estonian influence in the passive forms

(24) *sis sanotti et nyt viiükse sauna*

then *say-PST.PASS that now take-PASS sauna-ILL*

'then it was said that we will be taken to the sauna now’

(25) *antti mul passi*

give-PST.PASS I-ADE passport

'I was given the passport’

(26) *miten nyt sanottaks*

how now say-PASS-COND
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### CONVENTIONS and ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>**</th>
<th>strong stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>weak stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>./</td>
<td>end of “sentence”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>adessive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAU</td>
<td>causative derivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>elative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>essive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL</td>
<td>illative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INE</td>
<td>inessive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td>instructive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR</td>
<td>partitive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>(impersonal) passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT</td>
<td>potential mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>past participle passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>simple past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTL</td>
<td>unspecified particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRA</td>
<td>transative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCL</td>
<td>question clitic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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