

Non-finites in North Saami

SUOMALAIS-UGRILAISEN SEURAN TOIMITUKSIA
MÉMOIRES DE LA SOCIÉTÉ FINNO-UGRIENNE
257

Jussi Ylikoski

Non-finites in North Saami

SOCIÉTÉ FINNO-UGRIENNE
HELSINKI 2009

Jussi Ylikoski: *Non-finites in North Saami*
Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia =
Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 257.

Layout Anna Kurvinen

Copyright © 2009 Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura —
Société Finno-Ougrienne — Finno-Ugrian Society
& Jussi Ylikoski

Orders — Tilaukset

Tiedekirja
Kirkkokatu 14
FI-00170 Helsinki
www.tiedekirja.fi
tiedekirja@tsv.fi
FAX +358 9 635 017

ISBN 978-952-5667-07-3
ISSN 0355-0230

Vammalan Kirjapaino Oy
Sastamala 2009

Abstract

The thesis consists of five articles and an introduction with a summarizing and complementing overview of the articles.

The study describes the morphology, syntax and semantics of non-finite verb forms in contemporary literary North Saami. According to the received view, there are about a dozen non-finites in North Saami, but the morphosyntax and semantics of these have not yet been investigated thoroughly. In the present study, these verb forms are re-evaluated from the functional-typological perspectives of general linguistics: they are further classified into the subcategories of infinitives, participles, converbs and action nominals.

A major portion of this study discusses adverbial non-finites or converbs and comparable action nominal constructions, the types of constructions in which many of the independent converbs originate. On the basis of abundant data on actual language use, it is concluded that contemporary North Saami possesses both old and more recently developed non-finites that have not received due attention in earlier descriptions of the Saami languages, whereas certain alleged non-finites are better analyzed as belonging to the lexicon rather than productive inflection. An important result of the study is that there are as many as six converbs and five participles in the language. The study provides a comprehensive description of the use and mutual relations of these verb forms.

In addition to the literary language and traditional dialects of North Saami, the study also addresses corresponding non-finites in the immediately neighboring Saami languages. Attention is also paid to the influence of the surrounding national languages (Norwegian, Swedish and Finnish) on the morphosyntax of the Saami languages, especially in translations.

The North Saami system of non-finites is undergoing a process of restructuring, and the rise of new non-finites through agglutination and analogy indicates that the Saami languages have developed not only in the direction of the fusional western European type of language, but recent developments also point back to an agglutinative type characteristic of the Uralic languages. Contemporary North Saami exhibits considerable morphological variation that may diminish in the future either as a result of unconscious change in the language or through conscious language planning.

Abstrákta

Nákkosgirjijutkamuš *Non-finites in North Saami* sisttisdoallá vihtta artihkkala ja láidehusa mii čohkke ja dievasmahttá artihkkaliid dutkanbohtosiid.

Dutkamuša fáddán lea ii-finihtta vearahámiid morfologiija, syntávsa ja semantihka guorahallan erenoamážit dálá čállojuvvon davvisámegielas. Árbevirolaš oainnu mielde davvisámegielas leat sullii dusen ii-finihtta vearahámi, muhto daid morfosyntávssalaš ja semantihkalaš iešvuodat leat eanas báhcán almmá vuđolaš dutkama haga. Dán dutkamušas duot hámit analyserejuvvojit dábalaš gielladiehtaga funkcionála-typologalaš doahpágiiguin maid vuodul maiddái sámegeiela ii-finihtta vearahámit juhkkojit funkšuvnnaideaset mielde viidáseappot infinitiivvaide, partisihpaide, konvearbaide ja dahkunomenii.

Váldooassi dutkamušas gieđahallá sámegeiela adverbála vearahámiid dahjege konvearbaide ja daidda laktáseaddji dahkunomenráhkadusaid main mánga iehčanas konvearahámi leatge historjjálaččat gárggiidan. Viiddes dutkanmateriála vuodul árvoštallojuvvo, ahte dálá davvisámegielas gávnojit sihke boares ja ođđaset ii-finihtta vearahámit mat eai leat váldon doarvá vihtii ovdit sámegeiela govvádusain; nuppe dáfus ovddit dutkanárbevierru ovdanbuktá ii-finihtta sojahanhápmiin dihto leksikaliserejuvvon dáhpháhusaid maid ii sáhte atnit aitosaš produktiiva vearahápmiin. Dutkamuša váldoboáduš lea oaidnu, ahte dálá davvisámegielas leat juobe guhtta konvearba- ja vihtta partisihppahámi. Dutkamuš sisttisdoallá vuđolaš govvadásu duoid hámiid geavaheamis ja daid siskkáldas gaskavuodain.

Davvisámegiela čállingiela ja árbevirolaš suopmaniid lassin dutkamušas guorahallojit davvisámegiela lagamus oabbágeielaid seammasullasaš ii-finihtta hámit, ja vihtii váldojuvvojit maiddá davvisámegiela hállanguovllu váldogielaid iešgudetlágan váikkuhusat sámegeielaid morfosyntáksii, erenoamážit jorgalusaid bokte.

Dutkamušas čájehuvvo, ahte davvisámegiela ii-finihtta vearahámiid vuogádat lea ođasmuvvamin, ja mángga ođđa vearahámi šaddan sihke agglutinašuvnna ja analogiija bokte čájeha, ahte sámegeielat eai leat gárggiidan dušše fusionála oarjeeurohpálaš giellatiippa guvlui, muhto geiela varas nuppástusat doalahit maiddá geiela álgoálgosaš, urálalaš geielaide mihtilmas agglutinatiiva iešvuodaid. Dálá davvisámi čállingielas vihtto mánggalágan morfologalaš variašuvdna, mii sáhtta boahteáiggis stáđasmuvvat juogo geiela lunddolaš gárggiideami dahje didolaš giellagáhtendoaimmaid bokte.

*Caick åbmeg adne sijen pãddos /
ia caick maite ålmai auteses walda alme wuold
adna sijen pãddos.*

Sarnotee

Acknowledgements

I have been studying the morphology, syntax and semantics of the non-finite verb forms in North Saami for quite some time. Now, it is time to draw together the threads, and this includes much more than simply presenting those concrete example sentences, references and pieces of analysis from which my dissertation has been woven. I would like to express my gratitude to many people and institutions.

My foremost gratitude goes to professors Esa Itkonen and Pekka Sammallahti who have guided my academic life in a way that could be characterized as complementary distribution. Even though it does seem possible that I could have become a linguist in other environments as well, it seems impossible to imagine having acquired my personal enthusiasm and passion for linguistics—both as a discipline and a profession—without having heard the most lucid and stimulating lectures by Esa Itkonen at the University of Turku beginning with my first-year studies in general linguistics in 1995. In the same vein, while it may well seem possible for non-native scholars of North Saami to progress in studying the language, the very beginning of such an enterprise would have been quite troublesome without the immense knowledge of the Saami languages presented in the numerous dictionaries and other publications of Pekka Sammallahti under whose supervision I have had the privilege of shaping the present study into its final form. In addition to his unfailing willingness to share both explicit and tacit knowledge of Saami linguistics, I am especially grateful to him for the most fruitful and inspiring discussions in which the students such as myself have always had a right to hold their own views.

On my way towards the completion of the present study, I have also had a number of other important teachers and mentors. Not unlike the whole tradition of Saami linguistics, this study is rooted in the wider field of Uralic linguistics, and my understanding of the Saami languages would certainly be much narrower without the broader picture of the whole language family provided by professors Alho Alhoniemi and Sirkka Saarinen of the University of Turku where I took my first steps in the direction of the pre-doctoral odyssey that is now coming to its

end. I am also happy to express my thanks to professor Kaisa Häkkinen whose concise yet profound lectures on the Saami languages and their history provided me with my first insights into the subject matter of this research. As regards the theoretical and methodological foundation of my work, I am also indebted to professor Anneli Pajunen, a typologically-minded syntactician who was the first person to explicitly encourage me to become a linguist with a decidedly functional-typological perspective on the morphology and syntax of the Uralic languages.

I also wish to express my gratitude to the pre-examiners, professor Ole Henrik Magga and associate professor Nils Øivind Helander from the Sámi University College in Guovdageaidnu. Their criticism, suggestions for improvements, additions and deletions, as well as words of encouragement were very important in the final stages of my research project.

In addition to my official supervisors and teachers during the years, I have also been fortunate in having a large number of colleagues and friends in those universities and departments in which I have worked, beginning with the School of Finnish and General Linguistics (University of Turku) on to the Giellagas Institute for Saami Studies (University of Oulu), the home institution of the present study, and ultimately the Department of Finno-Ugrian Studies (University of Helsinki) where the finishing touches to my study were completed. Even though it seems impossible to present a complete list of all those who have had a positive influence on my thoughts and actions, I cannot refrain from emphasizing as a source of work motivation the importance of the relaxed yet purposeful atmosphere at the Giellagas Institute with its *mii* spirit, for my part further condensed into the *moai* spirit of the room I shared with Ante Aikio, my foremost interlocutor and collaborator and the most patient private teacher of North Saami. I also wish to explicate my thankfulness to Tuomas Magga who first offered me the opportunity to work at Giellagas as well as to Marjatta Jomppanen for the many discussions concerning the non-finites in Saami languages. Furthermore, professors Anni-Siiri Länsman and Veli-Pekka Lehtola as well as Piia Juuso, Outi Länsman, Anna Morottaja, Minna Rasmus and other colleagues and students created an invaluable Saami environment wherein I was awarded excellent opportunities for learning so much about the Saami languages and Saami culture. *Ollu giitu didjiide buohkaide!*

Outside Giellagas, my most dedicated and stimulating fellow Uralist over the years has been Nobufumi Inaba in Turku: *Ysteuen / mine kijten sinua palion caffen ia neuuon pitemisen tedhen*. Other colleagues without whom my research and academic surroundings would have been much less enjoyable include Laura Arola, Gergely Dusnoki, Riho Grünthal, Arja Hamari, Leena Huima, Johanna Ijäs, Lotta Jalava, Petri Kallio, Seppo Kittilä, Paula Kokkonen, Leena Koleh-

mainen, Eino Koponen, Matti Miestamo, Krista Ojutkangas, Janne Saarikivi, Janne Savela, Ulla Vanhatalo and Timo Viitanen.

I am also thankful to the anonymous reviewers of the original papers for the remarks that contributed to the improvement of the papers, as well as to Gabriele Schrey-Vasara for translating two of the papers into German, Tomi Marin for checking the English of another paper, Káre Vuolab-Lohi the North Saami of two others, and finally Dennis Estill for checking the English of the present introductory overview and Anna Kurvinen for her excellent assistance as publishing secretary. In addition to my home institutions during the years, I wish to express my gratitude to the financial and academic support provided by the Finno-Ugrian Society, the Langnet Graduate School in Language Studies and the Tyyni Tani Foundation of the University of Oulu. I also wish to thank the Finno-Ugrian Society for publishing my study.

I also wish to acknowledge that my understanding of languages and the art of practicing linguistics has been greatly influenced by the words of Saint Mark the Evangelist and the late docent Ruben Turakainen.

My all-embracing thanks go to my dear wife Ilona and our children Ali, Aili (*Hello Kitty*) and Seelim—such a joyful crew whose fields of interest have constantly included so many of the other delights in life (jumping, pink, route maps, mashed potatoes, Sachertorte, you name it) that they have never had the time to overestimate nor encourage others to overestimate the importance of such things as the contents or schedule of a dissertation of any kind. *Kiitos, kaverit!*

Finally, I wish to express my gratitude to my mother and the memory of my late father from whom I inherited this love for languages and with whom I had innumerable discussions on languages from early childhood on until the time when I completed the manuscript for this dissertation in the spring of 2008. This book is dedicated to him.

Helsinki
December 2008
Jussi Ylikoski

Contents

Part I: Summarizing and complementing overview

Abstract	5
Abstrákta	6
Acknowledgements	7
Abbreviations	13
1. Introduction	14
1.1. The object of the study	16
1.2. The methodological framework of the study	21
1.3. The materials of the study	24
2. The main results of the original papers	28
2.1. Defining non-finites (Ylikoski 2003a)	28
2.2. On the adverbial non-finite constructions in North Saami (Ylikoski 2002, 2004a)	32
2.3. The curious non-finite in <i>-nláhkai ~ -nládje</i> (Ylikoski 2006a)	47
2.4. On the functions of adpositions in North Saami (Ylikoski 2006b)	54
2.5. Conclusions	60
3. Additional observations on the system of non-finites in North Saami	62
3.1. On the criteria for identifying non-finite verb forms (with special reference to verbal-noun based constructions)	62
3.1.1. What counts as a non-finite verb form?	63
3.1.2. Historical background of the “new” verbal-noun based non-finites in <i>-ndihte</i> , <i>-miin</i> and <i>-nláhkai</i>	66
3.1.2.1. The purposive converb in <i>-ndihte</i> and related phenomena in North Saami and its nearest relatives	68

3.1.2.2.	The instrumental converb in <i>-miin</i> and related phenomena in North Saami and its nearest relatives	80
3.1.2.3.	The non-finite in <i>-nláhkai</i> and related phenomena in North Saami and its nearest relatives	88
3.1.3.	More marginal verb-like formations based on adverbial verbal noun constructions	96
3.1.4.	Other related phenomena: the rare instances of deverbal nouns with objects	103
3.1.5.	On the morphological independence of the non-finites in <i>-ndihte</i> and <i>-nláhkai</i> : the role of conjunction reduction in North Saami inflection and derivation	116
3.2.	The subsystem of participles revisited	128
3.2.1.	The received view: two or three participles	129
3.2.2.	Passive participles	136
3.2.3.	The negative participle	161
3.2.4.	Summary of participles	182
4.	Concluding remarks and further perspectives	186
4.1.	Summary of the synchronic description	186
4.2.	Diachronic perspectives	190
4.2.1.	The emergence of new non-finites —rehabilitating the agglutinative technique in North Saami?	191
4.2.2.	Conclusion: user-based approaches to the dynamics of the North Saami non-finites	201
References		208
Data sources		208
Data sources: North Saami literary language		208
Data sources: North Saami dialects		209
Data sources: Inari Saami		210
Data sources: Lule Saami		211
Data sources: Skolt Saami		211
Data sources: other languages		211
Other references		212

Part II: Original papers

1. Defining non-finites: action nominals, converbs and infinitives.
– *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 16: 185–237. (2003)
2. Zu den adverbialen Nominalkonstruktionen im Nordlappischen.
– *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 57: 68–166. (2002)
3. Zu den adverbialen Nominalkonstruktionen im Nordsaamischen II.
Finale Konstruktionen.
– *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 58: 57–161. (2004)
4. Davvisámegiela *-nláhkai* ~ *-nládje* -suffiksála ii-finihtta
vearbaráhkadusat.
– *Sámi dieđalaš áigečála* 1/2006: 18–38. (2006)
5. Fuomášumit sámegiela adposišuvnnaid funkšuvnnain: ovdamearkan
alde- ja *ala-*postposišuvnnaid ii-lokála geavaheapmi.
– *Sámi dieđalaš áigečála* 1/2006: 39–61. (2006)

Abbreviations

1	first person	IMPR	impersonal
1 _{INF}	the so-called first infinitive (Finnish)	INCH	inchoative
2	second person	IND	indicative
2 _{INF}	the so-called second infinitive or action locative (North Saami)	INE	inessive
2 _{INFINE}	the so-called second infinitive inessive (Finnish)	INF	infinitive
3	third person	INT	interrogative pronoun
3 _{INFILL}	the so-called third infinitive illative (Finnish)	LOC	locative
5 _{INF}	the so-called fifth infinitive (Finnish)	M	masculine
ABE	abessive	MOM	momentative
ABL	ablative	N	noun
ACC	accusative	NEG	negative element
ACT	active	NEGSUP	the so-called negative supine (North Saami)
ACTESS	the so-called action essive (North Saami)	NMLZ	nominalizer
ADE	adessive	NOM	nominative
ADJ	adjective	OBL	oblique stem
ADV	adverb	PA	possessive adjective
AG	agentive (passive participle)	PART	partitive
ATTR	attributive	PASS	passive
CAUS	causative	PL	plural
CMPR	comparative	POSS	possessive pronoun
COM	comitative	PROG	progressive
COMP	complementizer	PRS	present
COND	conditional	PRT	particle
CONNEG	connegative	PST	past
CONV	converb	PTC	participle
DIM	diminutive	Px	possessive suffix
DU	dual	Q	question marker
ELA	elative	REC	reciprocal
ESS	essive	S	sentence
F	feminine	SG	singular
FREQ	frequentative	STEM	a latter part of a bipartite stem
GA	genitive-accusative	SUPERL	superlative
GEN	genitive	TRA	translative
GER	gerund	TRANSF	transformative
ILL	illative	V	verb
IMP	imperative	VABE	the so-called verb abessive (Saami)
		VGEN	the so-called verb genitive (North Saami)
		VN	verbal noun

1. Introduction

There are about a dozen non-finite verb forms in North Saami. Most of these have been known for a couple of centuries, while some others have remained largely unnoticed and undescribed until the present study. The latter include such verb forms as the converbs of purpose (e.g. *lohkandihte* ‘in order to read’) and means (*lohkamiin* ‘by reading’) or the negative participle (*logakeahtes* ‘unread’).

The main aim of this study is to provide a detailed account of the inventory and use of non-finite verb forms in contemporary written North Saami. The study consists of five separately published articles and the present overview that summarizes—and expounds on—the main results of the original papers. The theoretical and methodological basis of the study has been determined by traditional descriptive linguistics along with the more new-fashioned perspectives of functional-typological linguistics. In accord with such underpinnings, the findings and conclusions of the study are intended to contribute to the typological knowledge of non-finite verb forms at a more general level as well.

This overview is written in such a way as to be accessible and intelligible to readers not familiar with the original papers published in English, German and North Saami. The structure of the overview is as follows: The present Section 1 serves as a brief introduction to the object and methods of the study. Section 2 summarizes the main results and conclusions of the five original papers, most of which concentrate mainly on the use of various adverbial non-finite forms in North Saami. After this, Section 3 aims at a more comprehensive picture of the entire system of non-finites in the language. On the bases of the findings presented in original papers as well as a number of new observations of actual language use, it is once more asserted that the received view of the Saami non-finites needs considerable revision: certain alleged non-finites are better analyzed as something other than productive verb forms, whereas as many as five or six “new” non-finite formations should be given the independent status of a verb form. At the end, Section 4 relates the revised view of non-finites to the larger context of the typological characteristics of Saami morphology and syntax. In contrast to the prevailing view that the recent development of the Saami languages has made once agglutinative languages appear outstandingly fusional among the Uralic languages, it can now be seen that within the set of non-finites as well as in some other areas of inflection and derivation, many developments point back to a more agglutinative type. Section 4 also presents a summarizing discussion with additional comments on the implications of the results for the future research of North Saami and other Saami languages, and defines some of the practical needs of North Saami language planning, standardization and education.

The original papers on which the present overview of the North Saami non-finites is based are the following:

1. Defining non-finites: action nominals, converbs and infinitives. – *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 16: 185–237. (2003) (hereinafter: Ylikoski 2003a)
2. Zu den adverbialen Nominalkonstruktionen im Nordlappischen. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 57: 68–166. (2002) (Ylikoski 2002)
3. Zu den adverbialen Nominalkonstruktionen im Nordsaamischen II. Finale Konstruktionen. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 58: 57–161. (2004) (Ylikoski 2004a)
4. Davvisámegiela *-nláhkai* ~ *-nládje* -suffiksála ii-finihtta vearbaráhkadusat. – *Sámi dieđalaš áigečála* 1/2006: 18–38. (2006) (Ylikoski 2006a)
5. Fuomášumit sámegiela adposišuvnnaid funkšuvnnain: ovdamearkan *alde-* ja *ala-*postposišuvnnaid ii-lokála geavaheapmi. – *Sámi dieđalaš áigečála* 1/2006: 39–61. (2006) (Ylikoski 2006b)

It is worth emphasizing at the very beginning that a distinguishing feature of this study is that its parts have been written at very different stages of the linguistic competence of the author. If weighted by the number of pages, the major part of the original papers—papers 2 and 3 (Ylikoski 2002, 2004a)—has been written by an outside observer of Saami languages. During 2001–2003, I approached the literary North Saami mainly from the perspective of an “armchair scholar” of Uralic (Finno-Ugric) languages, with hardly any contact with the Saami themselves and without any serious attempt to master the language in such a way that I would be able to use it for active communication.

During 2004–2007, I continued my work in a Saami environment, the Giellagas Institute for Saami Studies at the University of Oulu, where North Saami is the main medium of all daily communication. As a consequence, I gained a totally new, much broader and deeper insight into North Saami, manifested in such things as the ability to compose papers 4 and 5 (Ylikoski 2006a, 2006b) in that very language itself. At this stage—not to speak of the final phase of writing the present overview—my ability to rely on my own intuition, albeit newly and incompletely acquired intuition about the language is altogether different now from what it was during my early years of study.

Against this background, it is to be expected that the constant growth of my language skills has from time to time led to some apparent changes in my linguistic argumentation. However, the way I have experienced and analyzed

North Saami has not undergone any fundamental changes over the years. In other words, it appears to me that even the most original—and most salient—conclusions presented in the first papers remain valid, not least because of the most cautious attitude with which those remarks had to be made at that time.

As can be inferred even from the list of original papers presented above, the results of the present study are intended to influence multiple audiences within linguistics. Firstly, some of the findings have already been presented to a general, typologically-minded linguistic audience (Ylikoski 2003a). Secondly, a significant portion of the concrete description of North Saami has been published in German, following the traditional conventions of Uralic linguistics such as labeling the language *Nordlappisch* (Ylikoski 2002), nowadays considered more or less derogatory not only by the Saami, but by many outsiders as well. Thirdly, another part of the findings has been written and published in North Saami which hopefully has made the results of the study better known also outside the traditional boundaries of the more institutionalized Uralic and typological linguistics. In other words, this study is meant to contribute to the general linguistic discussion by providing a description of the morphology, syntax and semantics of the non-finite verb forms in a lesser-known indigenous language of Northern Europe as well as to the traditional scholarly knowledge of the Saami languages within Uralic linguistics in general and within Saami linguistics itself. Furthermore, it is to be hoped that the results of the present study can also be put to practical use within the Saami community when dealing with the challenges of language education, language planning and the revitalization of North Saami and other Saami languages.

1.1. The object of the study

The objective of this study is to describe the morphology, syntax and semantics of non-finite verb forms in North Saami. North Saami is by far the most widely spoken language of the Saami (Sami, Sámi, Lapp) branch of the Uralic language family, with approximately 15,000–25,000 speakers—presumably around 75 percent of the speakers of all nine Saami languages—traditionally living in the northernmost parts of Norway, Sweden and Finland, and nowadays also in the largest cities outside the traditional Saami area. North Saami has an established status as a literary language: the first North Saami writings were published as early as the 17th century, and at present, this language is used widely in all kinds of written media (e.g. newspapers, magazines, variety of books and the internet). — For more information on the current status and role of the Saami languages in the Saami community, see, for example, Mørck & T. Magga (2002) and Eira (2004).

In regard to morphosyntax, the Saami languages are in many ways quite ordinary Uralic languages of Europe. For example, nouns are declined in two numbers (singular and plural) and in about half a dozen cases (nominative, genitive-accusative, locative, illative, comitative and essive in North Saami). Tense, aspect and mood are expressed not only by means of inflection but also by periphrastic predicates and rich derivational morphology. As regards word order, the Saami languages have properties of both the head-final and head-initial language type. For example, adpositions are more often postpositions than prepositions, and adjectival modifiers precede nouns, although the most neutral simple sentence word order is SVO in nearly all Saami languages and not SOV which is considered the most original Uralic word order. True, there are some more “exotic” phenomena such as a category of dual number in the pronominal and verbal morphology, but in general—and especially if viewed from a truly global perspective of linguistic diversity—all Saami languages are morphosyntactically quite close to the language type known as Standard Average European (e.g. van der Auwera 1998a: 814ff.; Haspelmath 1998, 2001). In fact, it appears to me that a language such as North Saami could well be regarded as belonging to the same peripheral zone of the SAE area as related Finnic languages such as Finnish and Estonian according to Haspelmath (1998: 273). — For grammatical sketches of North Saami, see, for example, Korhonen (1988) and Sammallahti (1998a); for more detailed descriptions of the Saami languages and their history, see Korhonen (1981a) and Sammallahti (1998b).

Given the sociolinguistic situation of North Saami, it is not surprising that this language is also the best described language of the Saami languages. However, it appears that the present understanding of certain parts of the grammar constantly suffers from anachronism caused by the history of Saami linguistics: Up to the past few decades, the Saami languages have traditionally been viewed as a more or less homogenous sub-branch of the Uralic language family, and in accordance with the predominantly diachronic perspectives of traditional Uralistics, descriptions of the Saami languages have often been based and concentrated on the common heritage of all Saami languages—or “the Saami language” despite its mutually unintelligible “dialects”—rather than the actual synchronic states of individual languages.

More than once, this has led to situations in which even the basic cornerstones of the grammar have been described on the basis of a reconstructed structure of Proto-Saami. To give examples from the description of the inflectional paradigm of nouns, the North Saami locative was earlier (see e.g. Nielsen 1926; R. Bartens 1972) described as the so-called “inessive-elative” with two distinct functions corresponding to the inessive and elative cases of the sister languages and common ancestors of the Saami languages. Much in the same vein, the

genitive (Proto-Saami **-n*) and the accusative (**-m*) were kept totally separate from each other long after they had merged into one case that is still labeled the “genitive-accusative”. Moreover, the nowadays well-known degrammaticalization of the Proto-Saami abessive **-ptākeḡ* or **-ptāken* to the North Saami postposition *haga* ‘without’ did not gain much attention before Nevis (1986); in spite of its clearly adpositional nature in North Saami, *haga* used to be—and still occasionally is—described anachronistically as the abessive case, not unlike the true abessive cases in other Saami languages and many other Uralic languages (see Section 3.1.5 for details).

The study and description of the non-finite verb forms have not escaped a distortion caused by the above-mentioned foundations of traditional Saami linguistics. Therefore, the following study attempts to provide a revised account of the inventory of non-finites in North Saami. The non-finites and their use are described mainly from a synchronic point of view, but due to the certain peculiarities of the history of Saami linguistics, it would be quite unnatural to refrain from commenting on the historicizing views of earlier research. Furthermore, it appears that the inflectional morphology of North Saami is currently in the process of a restructuring, producing more or less marginal formations that cannot be described and evaluated satisfactorily without a somewhat panchronic view of language. When viewing the North Saami non-finites from historical and areal perspectives, the points of view are mostly limited to the immediately neighboring Saami languages (Lule Saami in the southwest, Inari and Skolt Saami in the east) and the major languages of the countries in which North Saami is spoken (Norwegian, Swedish and Finnish); in this study, almost nothing will be said about languages such as South Saami or Ter Saami, the remotest Saami languages at the southwestern and northeastern ends, respectively, of the whole Saami area.

The data presented in this study consists mainly of contemporary literary North Saami. As the language in question is an endangered minority language with less than 30,000 speakers, some representatives of historical Uralistics and typological linguistics may consider literary Saami languages more or less artificial constructs in comparison with the authentic spoken languages. However, it appears to me that there is no special reason to distrust the genuineness of written Saami significantly more than the authenticity of written English, German or Finnish (note, however, the indisputable effects of the minority status of the language, discussed in Section 4.2.2). As for the well-known influence of the major languages on Saami, there would seem to be no fundamental differences between the spoken and written language; Scandinavisms and Fennicisms can be seen and heard fairly equally in registers of both types.

As regards the topic of this study, a few additional remarks must be made. In many respects, North Saami is a relatively “normal” synthetic European language with dozens of verb forms. Most of these are “finite” in the traditional sense of the word, many of the others being indisputably “non-finite”. This means that the latter are productive inflectional verb forms that do not have the characteristic properties of “finite” verb forms: they do not function as the only predicates of independent main clauses and they are not sensitive to such categories as tense, mood, or aspect; neither are they marked for person and number—at least not by the same morphemes as those forms that are considered “finite”. However, verbal negation in Saami and most other Uralic languages is often expressed by periphrastic constructions consisting of a negative auxiliary verb with the lexical verb in a special form that is often labeled the “connegative” form. The North Saami connegatives are not marked for person or number—this information is coded in the negative verb—but tense and aspect are expressed by the connegative form (e.g. *i-n boađe* [NEG-1SG come.CONNEG(.PRS)] ‘I don’t come’, *i-n boahtá-n* [NEG-1SG come-CONNEG.PST (= come-PTC.PST)] ‘I didn’t come’, *i-n boađá-še* [NEG-1SG come-CONNEG.COND] ‘I wouldn’t come’).

Negative formations of this kind do not easily fit into the traditional dichotomy of finite vs. non-finite forms. The connegatives of the Uralic languages are seldom analyzed as non-finite forms proper, but a notable exception to the most usual practice of Uralists is found in Saami linguistics: Korhonen (1974) and Sammallahhti (e.g. 1998a, 1998b) present the connegatives among the non-finite or “nominal” verb forms. One of the few reasons for making such a decision seems to have been the absence of person and number marking in these forms; a more syntactic criterion would be that the connegatives do not occur as independent predicate verbs but only as inseparable parts of morphologically analytic predicates, to complement the negative auxiliary. However, other scholars have not considered these forms non-finites, and even in Korhonen (1981a: 305–310), the connegatives are no longer considered non-finites, but the negative formations—always consisting of more than a single verb-like word form—are described as a phenomenon of its own, completely outside the scope of either finite or non-finite forms.¹

As discussed at length in Ylikoski (2003a), it is the usual practice of both the traditional grammarians of most European languages and modern typologists to see and describe the inventory of non-finite verb forms in a given language as a coherent, functional subsystem of the conjugation. In light of this, it is all the more important to note that when including connegative forms in the group

¹ Similar uncertainty can be found in descriptions of other Uralic languages; see, for example, Erelt et al. (1997: 238–239) for Estonian and Hakulinen et al. (2004: 150–152) for Finnish.

of non-finites, Korhonen and Sammallahti do not attempt to describe the Saami non-finites as a functional whole. Indeed, it seems to me that such an enterprise (i.e., the attempt to relate the syntactic and semantic functions of the connegatives to the functions of the infinitives, participles and the like) would not be particularly fruitful. For these reasons, the connegative forms fall outside the scope of this study.²

Viewed from the functional-typological perspective adopted in this study, the non-finites of North Saami include verb forms that are not used as main predicates but rather occur in subject and object positions or as adverbial or adnominal modifiers. The most prominent subtypes of such verb forms are commonly known as *infinitives*, *participles*, *converbs* (or *gerunds*) and *verbal nouns* (or *action nominals*); these categories are defined in more detail in Ylikoski (2003a) that served as the theoretical background for the other, more descriptive original papers. Ylikoski (2002) describes the North Saami converbs expressing events simultaneous to those expressed by their main clauses. This paper was directly followed by Ylikoski (2004a) on non-finites indicating the purpose of the events expressed by the main clauses. In addition to the purposive converbs proper, the purposive and locative functions of the infinitives are examined in relation to their other functions in the language. The subject matter of Ylikoski (2006a) is the non-finite with the most untypical range of functions in the language: besides various adverbial functions, the non-finite in *-nláhkai* is also used attributively, which opens a new perspective on the subsystem of North Saami participles (discussed in more detail in Section 3.2 below). Though the main focus of Ylikoski (2006b) is on adpositions rather than non-finites as such, the paper complements other studies by providing a descriptive account of the “normal” use of adpositions in language (as opposed to certain suffixed adpositions in the non-finites discussed in Ylikoski 2002, 2004a and 2006a). On the other hand, the paper also adds to the understanding of the Saami infinitives by drawing attention to previously undescribed types of adpositional infinitival constructions in North Saami.

Although a large part of the original papers are most explicitly focused on various adverbial uses of the non-finite verb forms, their content actually encompasses nearly all of the non-finite verb forms of the language. The breadth of this underlying perspective will be made more visible in Section 3 and finally in Section 4 where the entire system of North Saami non-finites is presented as a more or less coherent interconnected whole.

² The verb form labeled as the past connegative by Sammallahti (1998b: 102) is—except for the forms *lea-n* [be-CONN. PST] vs. *lea-maš* [be-PTC. PST]—formally and historically identical with the past participle described in Sections 2.3 and 3.2.1.

1.2. The methodological framework of the study

This study is based on the theoretical concepts and methodological tools of traditional descriptive linguistics. This means that the non-finite verb forms of the contemporary literary North Saami are described without resorting to specific theoretical frameworks of a formal or otherwise ephemeral nature. However, this does not mean that the traditional concepts could not be refined or new clarifying concepts added; in fact, even the definitions of such concepts as *infinitive* and *converb* have been slightly revised (especially in Ylikoski 2003a) in order to obtain a more accurate and revealing picture of the system of non-finites in Saami and elsewhere, for that matter.

In order to justify the above-described “atheoretical” framework of the study, it is worth drawing attention to the notion of *basic linguistic theory*, most notably espoused by R. M. W. Dixon (1997: 128–135):

Over the past few hundred years work has been done on languages from every part of the world, with many aspects of linguistic theory being rethought, reformulated and refined as a result.

The term Basic Linguistic Theory has recently come into use for the fundamental theoretical concepts that underlie all work in language description and change, and the postulation of general properties of human language. (Dixon 1997: 128)

On another occasion, Dixon explained the concept and application of basic linguistic theory in the following words:

These [type of descriptive grammars] are written in terms of what can usefully be called ‘basic linguistic theory’, the analytic apparatus which has evolved over the past two thousand and more years—positing formal criteria for what is a word, or a relative clause; deciding between alternative possibilities of analysis; and relating the structural features of a given language to cross-linguistic generalizations about category composition and interrelations. (Dixon 1996: 839)

It seems that this clearly articulated idea of an unwritten basic theory that “underlies all work in language description” has been recently welcomed and accepted by many linguists, especially those working in the field of typological or descriptive linguistics (see e.g. Noonan 2006; Dryer 2006; Nichols 2007). Dixon (1997: 131) and many other proponents of basic linguistic theory explicitly confront this traditional framework with “a number of restricted sets of formalisms, that have been called ‘theories’”. As noted by Dixon, the latter are rarely put to real work in order to produce comprehensive grammatical descriptions based on

a particular framework, whereas the ordinary descriptive grammars of individual languages are usually written in the spirit of basic linguistic theory. Basic linguistic theory is also asserted to differ from formal frameworks in that the study of language relies on careful and independent analysis of real language data, in opposition to the formalists' practices of "slipping bits of the language into pre-ordained pigeon holes" (Dixon 1997: 133).

Although the present study can be at best only a modest part of a more comprehensive description of North Saami, the study is indeed based on these very basic linguistic methods and concepts of traditional grammar-writing. Furthermore, as regards the language material on which the study is based, it can be observed that more than once have I considered it appropriate to refer to examples found "outside my primary corpora" (e.g. Ylikoski 2002: 111; 2004a: 68, 109–119, 154; 2006b: 53–55), thus showing more adherence to the description of the language as such than to sticking to a mechanical description of the predetermined corpora, in the same way that I have not been enslaved to predetermined formal theories of morphosyntax.

When speaking of describing a Saami language within the framework of basic linguistic theory, as well as the central role of actual language data in this study—especially as conducted in Finland—one cannot avoid remembering and partially rehabilitating the methodological views of Paavo Ravila, a distinguished Finnish scholar of Saami and other Uralic languages. As early as 1951, he anticipated the Dixonian concept of basic linguistic theory in the following words:

Paras kielioppi on se, jossa runsas, luotettava ja hyvin järjestetty aines itse puhuu puolestaan peittymättä kirjavien uusien termien ja kyseenalaisten käsitteiden hämähäkinverkkoon. (Ravila 1951: 120 [1967: 35])

The best grammar is the one in which a plentiful, reliable and well-organized data speaks for itself without getting hidden under the cobweb of variegated neologisms and dubious concepts.

The above quotation has received considerable attention among Finnish linguists. Many scholars consider it a famous guideline for linguistic research, whereas others may prefer to characterize the quote as infamous. For example, in describing the history of linguistics in Finland, Karlsson (1997: 70) interprets these words as a "sign of deep skepticism towards the mainstreams of general linguistics of the latter half of the 20th century", and Hakulinen (1993: 24) goes so far as to consider the very citation as a warrant for condemning Ravila as the foremost demagogue of Finnish linguistics.

Leaving the evaluation of Ravila's personality and work to others (e.g. Karlsson 1997: 67–74; Esa Itkonen 1999: 47–61; 2004), it suffices here to recognize that many of Ravila's methodological comments were written in response to generative linguistics and its structuralist predecessors. This in turn makes the similarity between Ravila's and Dixon's views and tones all the more obvious: for them, the essence of linguistics lies in the traditional, unbiased and unwhimsical study of naturally occurring language. It should also go without saying that when speaking of the linguist's task of describing languages in such a way that the data speaks for itself, Ravila is certainly not urging the grammarian to present the data without explicitly discussing and justifying the results of the analysis:

Mutta hän ei suinkaan kuvaa ja luetteloï, vaan hän kiinnittää huomionsa yhtäläisyyksiin ja eroavuuksiin sekä tosiasioiden välillä vallitseviin säännöllisiin suhteisiin. (Ravila 1941 [1967: 24])

But s/he is by no means portraying and cataloging, but rather s/he is paying attention to similarities and differences, and to regular relationships between the facts.

To sum up, this study of the North Saami non-finites is methodologically based on a common foundation shared by traditional Uralic (Finno-Ugric) studies and modern-day descriptive and typological linguistics, here represented by the counterrevolutionary statements of Ravila and Dixon who desire that linguists present the results of their objective yet original and meaningful studies within a timeless and long-lasting framework of the most traditional linguistic thinking, thus attempting to avoid the dangers of “pre-ordained pigeon holes” and the “cobweb of variegated neologisms and dubious concepts”.

The partially diachronic (or panchronic) perspectives of this study are much in line with Ravila's view of the organic nature of language (see e.g. Ravila 1941 [1967: 25]). Furthermore, as the subparts of this study have been written at various levels of competence in the language, I also feel it necessary to explicitly recognize the importance of the linguist's intuition as the primary tool in linguistic analysis. Without even attempting to contribute to the philosophical or psychological understanding of intuition, I still wish to take the opportunity of pointing out that the use of intuition is not limited to the study of one's native language; rather the possibilities and the limits of intuitive knowledge of language always accompany the study of more or less foreign languages as well. — As regards the intuitions of the Saami themselves, I have had many privileges of discussing various linguistic issues with native speakers of North Saami, but I have deliberately refrained from extending and diversifying the topic and

methods of the present study to a systematic pursuit of grammaticality judgments; see, however, a short description of a pilot experiment of this kind at the end of Section 4.2.

1.3. The materials of the study

As mentioned earlier, the actual linguistic data presented in this study consists mainly of contemporary literary North Saami. A large part of the original papers were based on limited sets of data that made it possible to perform not only qualitative but also some quantitative analyses of the phenomena studied (e.g. Ylikoski 2002: 95, 113; 2004a: 104–106; 2006b: 41–42, 45, 48). On the other hand—as already mentioned in the previous section—I felt it important not to let the predetermined set of data override the more detailed reality of North Saami, and thus have not refrained from providing additional data from outside the primary research material (e.g. Ylikoski 2002: 111; 2004a: 68, 109–119, 154; 2006b: 53–55). Moreover, in Ylikoski (2006a: 21) it is stated that the material of the study—nearly four hundred non-finites in *-nláhkai* at the moment—was collected from thousands of pages of literary Saami without specifying individual sources (unless referred to as sources of concrete examples in the paper), not to speak of providing a complete list of all the texts that I have read in order to learn more and more about the language, including the specific topic of the very paper.

The present overview section of this study is based on the multitude of written—and spoken—Saami with which I have become acquainted over recent years. In accord with the mainstream tradition of grammatical description, the results and analyses presented are essentially qualitative in nature, not quantitative, even though occasional mention is made as to whether such and such formations, constructions or some of their syntactic and semantic functions are attested widely, sometimes, more seldom or not at all in North Saami.

To be more precise about the amount of data behind the concluding description of North Saami non-finites presented in Sections 3 and 4, I wish to explicate that my data include inter alia all the material that has been listed in the bibliographies of Ylikoski (2002, 2004a, 2006a, 2006b). One of the most useful sources for finding more or less normal and stylistically neutral examples of various phenomena of the language have been the computer files containing about 150 issues of the newspaper *Min Áigi*, kindly provided to the Giellagas Institute for Saami Studies (University of Oulu, Finland) by the Language Bank project of the Nordic Sami Institute (Guovdageaidnu, Norway). In addition to these, two very important types of source must be specified: Firstly, even though

the results of this study are intended to contribute mainly to the synchronic description of modern-day North Saami, this is done not only with reference to previous studies on the topic but also with reference to the primary data of these earlier studies, that is, to the written and published samples of various dialects of North Saami and even the neighboring Saami languages. This means that the various non-finite phenomena in the contemporary literary language are described, analyzed and considered as more or less “old” or “new” against a background of the more classical language represented by the nearly two thousand pages of dialect texts—practically all published samples of North Saami as well as of Inari, Skolt and Lule Saami—that I have gone through during the years 2004 and 2005, that is, after writing the original papers Ylikoski (2002, 2003a, 2004a). These publications are listed in their entirety in the bibliography of this overview (Data sources).

Secondly, I wish to clarify that—in the absence of official electronic corpora of the Saami languages—many of the findings presented in the following sections have been confirmed, sharpened and even initiated on account of having the chance to compile a personal corpus of various electronic Saami texts found mostly in the internet. My own electronic corpus consists of a constantly enlarging folder with a total of 796 PDF files; consequently, “querying” has been limited to searching for simple strings of letters. The content of the corpus is quite variable, ranging from formal translations of hundreds of legislative documents to electronic books and journals (e.g. *Sámis* and *Reindriftsnytt/Boazodoallo-odđasat*). In many of these documents, North Saami is only one of the languages used, and therefore it has been hard to estimate the exact size of the Saami corpus; however, it might be safe to assume that there are more than three million North Saami word forms in the corpus folder.³

As regards the linguistic content of the aforementioned electronic text files and many other contemporary media texts used in this study, it cannot be overemphasized that their language often differs remarkably from that of old dialect samples that could be characterized as a kind of classical North Saami. Even though these two text types may be placed at opposite ends of a long continuum of varieties that all must be regarded as representing a language called “North Saami”, the research material as a whole certainly does not form a cohesive, naturally occurring language system shared by a particular language community in a particular time or place. Furthermore, the source texts of many of the

³ On October 23rd 2007, a combined search of the complementizer *ahte* in the corpus of 796 PDF documents (see Section 1.3) produced a total of 49,750 instances of this central word whose overall frequency is about 1.5 percent in written North Saami: in a frequency list compiled by the Saami language technology project Giellatekno at the University of Tromsø, based upon a corpus of 4,116,196 lemmas, there were 62,243 (1.51%) occurrences of *ahte* (<http://giellatekno.uit.no/words/lists/sme/ll-freq.10000.html>, accessed on 30.1.2008).

most novel examples, especially those presented in Section 3, admittedly suffer from a more or less literal translation of Norwegian, Swedish and Finnish into Saami languages. Hence, there definitely cannot exist or have existed any fluent speakers or writers of North Saami who would be able to accept all of my research material as grammatical, correct North Saami. This fact also casts a seeming shadow over my attempt to follow the methodological guidelines of Rivila (1951: 120) cited in the previous section: although I have attempted to let “the plentiful, reliable and well-organized data speak for itself”, the reliability of my data must surely be understood in the sense of being a reliable account of the past and present of the various varieties of North Saami, but not always as a reliable account of what is a common norm shared by all native speakers. I further wish to specify that being aware of the ungrammaticality of many of my examples for many speakers of North Saami, I have consciously abstained from discussing any hapax legomena—despite the interest they tend to evoke—with the exception of those presented by earlier scholars of North Saami grammar. Even though only two attested instances of a phenomenon are enough to make a preliminary generalization, most of my generalizations on given phenomena are certainly based on a greater number of—and thus more reliable—occurrences in various sources.

A few words on the notation and conventions used in this study are also in order. As in the original English and German language papers (Ylikoski 2002, 2003a, 2004a), all examples are glossed morphologically (given the limits of the considerable fusional nature of the Saami languages, cf. Ylikoski 2002: 158–159 n. 4; 2004a: 152 n. 3) throughout this overview as well. Nevertheless, the underlying principles of glossing are now slightly different from earlier, as in this overview I have followed the semi-standard conventions known as the Leipzig Glossing Rules (developed by Bernard Comrie, Martin Haspelmath and Balthasar Bickel), currently available on the website of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology (<http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php> [February 2008 version]). As previously in Ylikoski (2002, 2003a, 2004a), the segmentation of the morphemes glossed is mostly based on the morphological description of North Saami in Sammallahti (2001).

In spite of the use of the Leipzig Glossing Rules as my major guidelines, however, I have continued the somewhat less common practice of leaving the most debatable grammatical morphemes without unambiguous glosses. In the original papers (especially Ylikoski 2002, 2004a), formations such as <*juhkandihte* ~ *juhkan dihte*> ‘in order to drink’ were glossed as *juhka-ndihte* [drink-*ndihte*] ~ *juhka-n dihte* [drink-*n dihte*] instead of exposing one or more of the competing analyses (e.g. [drink-CONV] or [drink-VN(.GA) for]) at first glance. Even though the very formation in *-ndihte* is now occasionally boldly glossed as [V-CONV],

some more obscure forms are always glossed more neutrally (e.g. *einnost-uvvi* [predict-*uvvi*] ‘to be predicted; predictable’ in Example 180 below). However, the surface variation among formations such as *-nláhkai*, *-nláhkái* and *-nládje* (or *-ndihte* ~ *-ndihtii* in Ylikoski 2002, 2004a) has been evened out by choosing the most common variants as the standards that are used both when glossing (e.g. *einnost-anláhkai* ~ *einnost-anláhkái* ~ *einnost-anládje* ~ <*einnost-anláhkai*> etc. [predict-*nláhkai*]) and when referring to them as “the non-finite in *-nláhkai*” and so forth.

The dialectal examples cited in this overview (in Section 3) are presented in the modern standard orthography. The spoken language samples of the Saami languages have been recorded over a long time period in different variants of Finno-Ugric transcription and outdated orthographies, and with various degrees of precision. As this study is not intended to contribute to the phonetics or phonology of Saami, I have converted the various scripts into a form that comes as close as possible to the present-day orthography of literary North Saami (i.e. the common orthography adopted in 1979) as well as the contemporary orthographies of other Saami languages. However, when presenting examples of the older literary languages, the orthography has not been modernized.

2. The main results of the original papers

This section provides a summary of the main findings and conclusions presented in the five original papers of this study. The summary is deliberately kept brief in order to avoid repeating many of the more minute details once again in Sections 3 and 4 where the non-finite verb forms of North Saami are presented as a more comprehensive whole.

2.1. Defining non-finites (Ylikoski 2003a)

Of the original papers, that entitled “Defining non-finites: action nominals, converbs and infinitives” (Ylikoski 2003a) elucidates the theoretical and conceptual basis of the description of non-finite verb forms in the Saami languages as well as in other languages of a synthetic type, that is, in inflectional—and most notably European—languages with a more or less clear distinction between the verb forms traditionally characterized and labeled as “finite” and “non-finite”. The emphasis in this paper is on establishing consistent definitions of the most common subcategories of non-finite verb forms. In regard to the general applicability of such more or less idealized subcategories, it is stated that “it seems unquestionable that the categories infinitive, participle, converb and action nominal are, to quote Haspelmath (1995: 1) on converbs, ‘*universally applicable* or *crosslinguistically valid* in the sense that they are found in various languages irrespective of their genetic and areal connections, and must be seen as belonging in some way or other to universal grammar” (Ylikoski 2003a: 186).

It may be said that these categories are part of the core concepts of traditional linguistic thinking or the so-called basic linguistic theory discussed in Section 1.2 above. However, an exception to the “traditionality” of the above-mentioned notions is the fact that the label *converb* is a relatively new term whose use has until recently been limited to the study of the so-called Altaic languages.⁴

⁴ According to Haspelmath (1995: 46) and van der Auwera (1998b: 273), the term *converb* was originally coined by the Finnish Altaicist Gustaf John Ramstedt (1903: 3) who defined Khalkha Mongolian converbs as verb forms that are used only as modifiers of predicate verbs:

Nach ihrer syntaktischen funktion können die khalkhassischen verbalformen, die als lebendige gebrauchstypen die jetzige konjugation ausmachen, in drei gruppen eingeteilt werden.

1. Solche, die nur **prädikativ** stehen, d. h. immer eine abgeschlossene aussage bilden: — **echte verbalformen** od. **verba finita**.

2. Solche, die sowohl als **prädikative** wie als **beliebige andere teile** des satzes und verschiedenartiger wortgefüge verwendet werden: — **nomina verbalia**.

3. Solche, die nur als **prädikatsbestimmungen**, nie als prädikate abgeschlossener sätze vorkommen: — **converba**.”

(Ramstedt 1903: 3; emphasis in the original. A similar division is also found in his Korean grammar [Ramstedt 1939: 68–69].)

The term was introduced to a wider audience most notably in Haspelmath & König (1995) where converbs are generally paraphrased as *verbal adverbs* or *adverbial verb forms*, thus denoting the same concept as the terms *gerund* and *adverbial participle* (or French *gérondif* and Russian *деепричастие*) in many grammatical traditions. The notion has been subsequently adopted by many linguists (e.g. van der Auwera 1998b and I. Nedjalkov 1998), and also further defined by Haspelmath (1996, 1999), van der Auwera (1998b) and Tikkanen (2001).

However, as discussed at length in Ylikoski (2003a), it appears that in the recent typological literature on non-finite verb forms, those linguists defining notions such as “converb” have more than once been misled and confused by the inaccurate use of terms such as *adverb* and *adverbial*, so that non-finites have been defined both in terms of (i) their word-classes and (ii) their syntactic functions, often without differentiating between the two perspectives. What is more, such inaccuracies have also created problems in viewing converbs in relation to other non-finites, most notably *infinitives*, *action nominals* (*verbal nouns*) and *participles*, as these traditional terms have lacked precise definitions as well.

In short, Ylikoski (2003a) offers solutions to the disparity of attempts to define these major subcategories of non-finite verb forms. Among other things, it is proposed that one key to a better understanding of non-finites lies in recognizing the fact that there is no one-to-one correspondence between such categories as *adverb* and *adverbial*. Put concretely, being an *adverbial verb form* does not entail that the form in question would be a *verbal adverb*, that is, something “verbal” belonging to the word-class of adverbs, any more than “adverbial noun forms”, that is, nouns in adverbial cases such as Saami *biilla-s* [car-LOC] ‘in a car’ or *biilla-in* [car-COM] ‘with a car’ should be labeled “nominal adverbs”. To give another example (1), this means that the North Saami adverbial verb form *sahá-miin* [saw[V]-CONV] ‘by sawing’—more common in Finland than in Norway and Sweden—is hardly more of an adverb than *sahá-in* [saw[N]-COM] ‘with a saw’, the likewise adverbial comitative form of the noun *sahá* ‘saw’ (cf. a Finnish equivalent of this example in Ylikoski 2003a: 205):

- (1) *Piera čuoŋpai muoraid sahámiin ~ saháin.*
Piera čuoŋpa-i muora-i-d sahá-miin ~ sahá-in.
 Piera fell-PST.3SG tree-PL-GA saw[V]-CONV ~ saw[N]-COM
 ‘Piera felled the trees by sawing them ~ with a saw.’

Even though converbs such as *sahámiin* above are still generally characterized as verbal adverbs (e.g. Booij 2005: 102), I wish to re-emphasize the claim asserted in Ylikoski (2003a: 196, 205, 229–230) that actually, converbs do not possess any properties allowing them to be characterized as verbal adverbs, not least

because of the fact that adverbs as a word-class do not usually have any specific morphological or syntactic properties that would distinguish them from other constituents in adverbial positions. However, if viewed from a diachronic perspective, it is clear that individual instances of converbal verb forms may be lexicalized into adverbs (and into adpositions and conjunctions), but such lexemes are better characterized as deverbal adverbs rather than verbal. Once again, the diachronic tendencies of adverbial verb forms are analogous to adverbial case forms of nouns being lexicalized into indeclinable adverbs and adpositions.

In defining converbs, I have also emphasized the importance of remembering that converbs typically function as optional and not obligatory adverbial modifiers of verbs and clauses, whereas the concept of “infinitive” may be seen—and defined—as some kind of counterpart to such free adverbial verb forms: infinitives may be roughly defined as non-finite verb forms that function as obligatory arguments or so-called complements in a sentence—in the sense that includes not only (i) the object and subject complements to various “modal” (and e.g. manipulative, desiderative and evaluative) verbs and adjectives but also (ii) the more or less obligatory use of the same forms as directional-purposive adverbial modifiers. Hence, it appears that converbs and infinitives may be defined in terms of their ideally complementary syntactic functions, without making unwarranted claims about their “new”, non-verbal word-classes.

In contrast to the function-based definitions of converbs and infinitives, it is maintained—largely in accord with other scholars—that the so-called *action nominals* can be defined as verbal nouns that, by definition, are nominalized verbs that denote actions or processes (in opposition to, e.g., the (de)verbal nouns denoting agents or other participants in the actions denoted by the verb stem). As nouns, action nominals have basically all the morphological and syntactic properties of prototypical nouns and therefore it would be superfluous to describe such non-finites by their syntactic functions which are essentially the same as the various functions of any nouns. However, it is legitimate to raise the question of whether it is appropriate to consider such nouns as non-finite verb forms at all; perhaps it would be more proper to regard such nominalizations as belonging to the domain of derivation rather than inflection?

Admittedly, various action nominals have morphosyntactic properties that make such a prototypical notion fluctuate between the more prototypical manifestations of inflection and derivation. In Ylikoski (2003a), this problem is handled with the aid of the concept of “word-class-changing inflection” by Haspelmath (1996) who differentiates between external and internal word-classes: in a prototypical example of word-class-changing inflection, a word form such as a verbal noun preserves the “lexeme word-class” (verb) which determines the internal syntax of the phrase or clause headed by the form in question; at the same time,

however, the syntactic status of the word form outside its phrase, that is, its external morphology and syntax depends on its new “word-form word-class” (noun).

Needless to say, there is a continuum of variation in action nominals and other borderline cases so that there are seldom definitive answers regarding the position(s) of action nominals in individual languages. Moreover, it is true that in most of European languages—including Saami—the action nominals preserve the internal syntax of verbs to a limited degree only, but when defining other, typically more verbal non-finites such as infinitives and converbs as well as their relations to action nominals it has proved useful to view all such formations on a similar level, that is, as instances of non-finite verb forms that by definition differ from the prototypical finite verb forms. In Ylikoski (2003a: 193) as well as in the rest of the original papers the term *action nominal* (*Nomen actionis*, *dahkunomen*) is used to refer to fully regular, productive verbal nouns such as the *-ing* gerund in English, but not to the quite idiosyncratically derived deverbal nouns such as the English *destruction*, *collapse* or *discovery* (cf. *destroying*, *collapsing* and *discovering*).

The fourth common subcategory of non-finites, *participles*, are discussed and defined more briefly, largely due to the acceptance of the conventional view that participles are best defined as verbal adjectives even though they often lack such explicitly adjectival properties as comparative and superlative degrees. However, as the functions of both participles and underived adjectives are mostly attributive and predicative, it does not appear entirely unreasonable to think of characterizing participles as “attributive verb forms”, that is, on a par with adverbial verb forms (converbs) and “argumental” verb forms (infinitives).

To sum up the central arguments concerning the main functions of the four main types of non-finites as well as my own views on the relevance of defining these categories as instances of word-class-changing word formation, Table 4 of Ylikoski (2003a: 228) is reproduced as Table 1 below:

<i>Non-finite verb form:</i>	infinitive	converb	participle	action nominal
<i>Syntactic function:</i>	argument (= subject, object, obligatory adverbial)	(free) adverbial (= adjunct)	attribute (+ adjectival predicate)	— (those of nouns)
<i>“New word-class”:</i>	—	—	adjective	noun
<i>Direction of lexicalization (in the broad sense that comprises the development of grammatical words):</i>	noun, adverb	adverb, adposition, conjunction	adjective (→ noun)	noun

Table 1. The four main types of non-finite verb forms, their syntactic functions and “new word-classes” (revision of Table 3 [of Ylikoski 2003a: 198]).

In addition to the synchronic views presented above, it is argued in Ylikoski (2003a) that the mutual relations of various non-finites are best understood by examining them from both the synchronic and diachronic perspectives simultaneously as, for example, both converbs and infinitives often have their origins in case-marked action nominals.

2.2. On the adverbial non-finite constructions in North Saami (Ylikoski 2002, 2004a)

The remainder of the original papers deal explicitly with the description of contemporary North Saami. The paper entitled “Zu den adverbialen Nominalkonstruktionen im Nordlappischen” (Ylikoski 2002) together with its continuation “Zu den adverbialen Nominalkonstruktionen im Nordsaamischen II. Finale Konstruktionen” (Ylikoski 2004a) provide quite a comprehensive assessment of the adverbial non-finite verb forms in the language. Although the focus is on various adverbial uses of the non-finites, they are viewed as part of a larger system of non-finites. For example, it is acknowledged that for many of the Saami non-finites, adverbial uses comprise only a part of the syntactic functions in which they may occur, and therefore it has been important to view adverbial uses (especially of the infinitives and the verbal noun) in light of the other and often more essential functions of such non-finites.

The former paper (Ylikoski 2002) focuses on the non-finites that describe interpositional relations between simultaneous events (e.g. manner, means, concomitance, and simultaneity proper), whereas the latter (Ylikoski 2004a) describes the non-finites indicating the purpose of the events expressed by the main

clauses. In addition to benefiting from the traditional basic linguistic concepts used in the earlier descriptions of Saami grammar, the semantic analyses of such adverbial non-finite clauses and their mutual relationships have gained from the recent typological studies on converbs (e.g. Haspelmath & König 1995) and especially from the conceptual framework presented in Kortmann's (1997, 1998) study of adverbial subordination in European languages. On the other hand, I have not deemed it necessary to resort to the more idiosyncratic concepts such as the so-called clause equivalent (Saami *cealkkavástta*, Finnish *lauseenvastike*) that has been used to refer to certain non-finite clauses by earlier grammarians of the Saami and Finnic languages (cf. Ylikoski 2002: 71–72); the advantages of this concept has also been questioned recently by Ole Henrik Magga (2007).

As a whole, the syntax of the Saami languages has not been studied in the same depth as, for example, their lexicon and historical phonology. This is also the case with the grammatical description of non-finites whose actual usage is, in fact, often quite marginalized in descriptions of other languages as well. In the history of Saami linguistics, the most detailed descriptions of the whole inventory of non-finites have been presented in the two standard grammars of North Saami, that is, Nielsen (1926) and Nickel (1994). In addition, the historical morphology of the Saami non-finites has been described at length in Korhonen (1974). The syntactic and semantic functions of various infinitival complements are described in great detail by Saukkonen (1965, 1966), O. H. Magga (1984, 1986), Koskinen (1998) and Jomppanen (2005, 2006, forthcoming) as well as Sammallahti (2005) in his description of North Saami syntax, but the adverbial and attributive uses of the present-day non-finites did not receive much attention until the present study. It is precisely the continuous wealth of research on non-finite complementation that has reduced the need for an in-depth description of the infinitives in the present study. To date, the most comprehensive description of the various syntactic functions of the Saami infinitive has been presented by Saukkonen (1965, 1966).

When recapitulating the main points in Ylikoski (2002, 2004a), it appears appropriate to use Nickel's (1994) grammar as a reference point that represents a widely accepted contemporary view of the inventory of non-finites in North Saami (see also e.g. Pope & Sára 2004; Sammallahti 1998a, 1998b, 2005). In addition to the three connegative forms left outside the scope of this study earlier in Section 1.1⁵, Nickel describes North Saami as having the non-finite verb forms

⁵ Nickel (1994: 63) does not appear to be content with these kinds of non-finites either: when describing the morphology of the non-finites, he merely mentions the existence of three (present, potential and conditional) connegative forms, specifying that “for practical reasons” these verb forms are rather described elsewhere, that is, in the section on the various periphrastic finite verb formations (pp. 59–63). — Unlike Sammallahti (1998b: 102, 223), Nickel (1994: 60) and Korhonen (1974) do not differentiate a past connegative from the formally identical “perfect” (= past) participle described in Sections 2.3 and 3.2.1.

presented in Table 2 (where the non-finites are ordered a bit differently for the present purposes):

non-finite verb form (the label in Norwegian)	marker	‘divide’	rough translation
infinitive (<i>infinitiv</i>) ⁶	- <i>t</i>	<i>juohkit</i>	‘(to) divide’
action locative (<i>aktio lokativ</i>)	- <i>mis/-mes</i>	<i>juohkimis</i>	‘from dividing’
action (<i>aktio</i>)	- <i>n/-pmi</i>	<i>juohkin</i>	‘(act of) dividing’
present participle (<i>presens partisipp</i>)	- <i>i</i>	<i>juohkki</i>	‘dividing (one)’
past participle (<i>perfektum partisipp</i>)	- <i>n</i>	<i>juohkán</i>	‘(having) divided’
gerund (<i>gerundium</i>)	-(<i>d</i>) <i>ettiin</i>	<i>juogedettiin</i>	‘while/in dividing’
verb abessive (<i>verbabessiv</i>)	- <i>keahtá</i>	<i>juogekeahtá</i>	‘without dividing’
verb genitive (<i>verbgentiv</i>)	- \emptyset	<i>juogi</i>	‘(by way of) dividing’
positive supine (<i>positive supinum</i>)	- <i>žit/-žžat</i>	<i>juogážit</i>	‘in order to divide’
negative supine (<i>nektende supinum</i>)	<i>ama-Px</i> (+ <i>V-t_{inf.}</i>)	<i>amas juohkit</i>	‘in order not to divide; lest s/he divide’
action essive (<i>aktio essiv</i>)	- <i>min/-me(n)</i>	<i>juohkimin</i>	‘in the act of dividing’

Table 2. The North Saami non-finite verb forms according to Nickel (1994: 63–68).⁷

As the main focus of Ylikoski (2002, 2004a) is on the adverbial uses of the non-finites, relatively little is said about the verb forms mainly occurring in complement and attribute positions. For example, most fundamental functions of the infinitive in *-t* as complements of various verbs (2) are mentioned quite non-chalantly, even though considerable attention has been given to the less central adverbial functions of the infinitive (especially in Ylikoski 2004a). However, the argument function assigned to the infinitives in Table 1 must be interpreted in a broad sense that also includes the use of the infinitive in constructions that may alternatively be regarded as consisting of a modal auxiliary verb followed by the main verb in the infinitive form. It is notoriously difficult if not impossible to make a sharp distinction between auxiliaries and lexical verbs. A case

⁶ After describing the infinitive, Nickel shortly and rather idiosyncratically mentions a periphrastic formation labeled as “perfect (or past) infinitive” (*perfektum infinitiv*) that is said to consist of the infinitive *lea-t* [be-INF] and the past participle, such as *lea-t juohká-n* [be-INF divide-PTC.PST] ‘to have divided’; cf. the finite perfect tense formations such as the homonymous (*don/mii/sii*) *lea-t juohká-n* [2SG/1PL/3PL be-2SG/1PL/3PL divide-PTC.PST] ‘you/we/they have divided’.

⁷ The formation of the non-finites is here presented in a highly simplified form. In accord with the overall fusional nature of North Saami morphology, some of the markers have one or more allomorphs, and different suffixes are often attached to different verb stems. For thorough morphological and phonological descriptions of these forms in literary North Saami and the various dialects on which the literary norms are based, see especially Korhonen (1974) and Sammallahti (1998b).

in point is the verb *galgat* ‘must’ + infinitive in (2): as noted by O. H. Magga (1986: 10–11), it is not uncommon to observe scholars such as Nielsen (1926: 174, 380) and Korhonen (1962: 235–236) hesitating in analyzing constructions such as *galgga-i juhka-t* [must-PST.3SG drink-INF] ‘had to drink’ with statements that the “auxiliary” (and not the main verb) *galggai* is followed by the “object” (rather than the main verb) *juhkat*. By means of a more fine-grained analysis (O. H. Magga 1986: 158–159) it is also possible to describe certain occurrences of *galgat* as semi-auxiliaries.⁸

- (2) *Piera álggii ~ hálidii ~ máhtii ~ galggai ~ gearggai ~ vajálduhtii juhkat vuola.*
Piera álggi-i ~ hálid-ii ~ máhti-i ~ galgga-i ~
 Piera begin-PST.3SG ~ want-PST.3SG ~ be.able-PST.3SG ~ must-PST.3SG ~
geargga-i ~ vajálduhti-i juhka-t vuola.
 have.time-PST.3SG ~ forget-PST.3SG drink-INF beer.GA
 ‘Piera began ~ wanted ~ was able ~ had ~ had time ~ forgot to drink beer.’

As for the adverbial functions, it is demonstrated that such use of the infinitive is mostly limited to contexts in which it may be seen as a somewhat obligatory directional complement of verbs of motion (3), even though it also appears impossible to draw a clear dividing line between the directional-purposive infinitives and a more marginal and previously (i.e., before Ylikoski 2004a: 66–68) undescribed use of the infinitive in contexts in which the non-finite clauses cannot be regarded as directional but purely as purposive and fully optional adverbial modifiers (4).⁹

- (3) *Piera bođii ~ vulggii ~ čohkánii juhkat vuola.*
Piera bođi-i ~ vulggi-i ~ čohkán-ii juhka-t vuola.
 Piera come-PST.3SG ~ go-PST.3SG ~ sit.down-PST.3SG drink-INF beer.GA
 ‘Piera came ~ went ~ sat down to drink beer.’
- (4) *Piera dagai rihkkosa juhkat vuola.*
Piera daga-i rihkkos-a juhka-t vuola.
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA drink-INF beer.GA
 ‘Piera committed a crime in order to drink beer.’

⁸ It appears that within Uralistics, the very concept of auxiliary verbs has gained one of the strongest footholds in the descriptions of Saami languages—apparently due to the influence of the grammatical tradition of the Germanic languages—whereas in, for example, Finnish linguistics, this concept has not been utilized to the same extent (see also O. H. Magga 2004b).

⁹ The continual referring to beer-drinking and criminality in the examples of this overview derives from Nikanne’s (1997) illuminating examples of the mutual relationships of Finnish converbs, utilized and further developed in Ylikoski (2003a).

In the same vein, the functions of the non-finite usually labeled as the “action locative” are not described in complete detail, but mainly in relation to the local uses of the infinitive (3) and the so-called action essive (see Examples 19–21 below). However, I have continuously (Ylikoski 2002: 77ff., 2004a: 75ff.; see also Ylikoski 2003a: 213–216) expressed my view that this non-finite—historically the locative form of the verbal noun (“action”)—would be best labeled “the second infinitive” as it has been earlier by Bergsland (1961: 27–28) and O. H. Magga (1980: 34). Some of the most infinitive-like functions of this verb form (often as complements of various verbs implying not to do something) can be seen in (5), whereas (6) depicts its more concrete separative functions where the meaning of the “second infinitive” is in stark contrast with that of the directional “first infinitive” (3):

- (5) *Piera heittii ~ biehttalii ~ balai ~ vajálduhtii juhkamis vuola.*
Piera heitti-i ~ biehttal-ii ~ bala-i ~ vajálduht-ii
 Piera cease-PST.3SG ~ refuse-PST.3SG ~ fear-PST.3SG ~ forget-PST.3SG
juhka-mis vuola.
 drink-2INF beer.GA
 ‘Piera ceased ~ refused ~ was afraid ~ forgot to drink beer.’
- (6) *Piera bodii juhkamis vuola.*
Piera bodi-i juhka-mis vuola.
 Piera come-PST.3SG drink-2INF beer.GA
 ‘Piera came from drinking beer.’

Despite the many minor problems of drawing clear lines between the most abstract domains of these two non-finites (where their functions may show a somewhat complementary distribution)¹⁰ and their concrete local (directional vs. separative) functions, both of these fit quite well into the traditional concept of “infinitive”, that is, both are non-finite verb forms that occur primarily as complements without exact meanings of their own.

As regards the verbal noun labeled the “action” in traditional Saami grammar (e.g. Nielsen 1926, Nickel 1994), it can be characterized as a quite ordinary action nominal, that is, a verbal noun denoting actions or processes. Not unlike other nouns, verbal noun constructions may occur, inter alia, as subjects (7), objects (8), and adverbial modifiers that may be both obligatory (9) and optional (10). As nouns, verbal nouns may also have attributive modifiers of their own,

¹⁰ On other occasions, though, the first and the second infinitive may appear interchangeable, for example, *vajálduhtii juhkat ~ juhkamis* ‘forgot to drink’ in (2) and (5) (cf. Ylikoski 2003a: 218; 2004a: 76, 79).

for example, the adjective *badjelmearálaš* ‘excessive’ in (9) or the pronoun *diet* ‘that’ in (7):

- (7) *Diet vuola juhkan ii leat dearvvašlaš.*
Diet vuola juhka-n ii lea-t dearvvašlaš.
 that beer.GA drink-VN NEG.3SG be-CONNeg healthy
 ‘That beer-drinking is not healthy.’
- (8) *Piera álggii ~ heittii fas vuola juhkama.*
Piera álggi-i ~ heitti-i fas vuola juhka-m-a.
 Piera begin-PST.3SG ~ cease-PST.3SG again beer.GA drink-VN-GA
 ‘Piera began ~ ceased the beer-drinking again.’
- (9) *Mun gal in beroš badjelmearálaš vuola juhkamis.*
Mun gal i-n beroš badjelmearálaš
 1SG really NEG-1SG care.CONNEG excessive
vuola juhka-m-is.
 beer.GA drink-VN-LOC
 ‘I don’t really care about excessive beer-drinking.’
- (10) *Piera dagai rihkkosa vuola juhkama manjá ~ ovdal.*
Piera daga-i rihkkos-a vuola juhka-m-a manjá ~ ovdal.
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA beer.GA drink-VN-GA after ~ before
 ‘Piera committed a crime after ~ before drinking beer.’

Some of the most important results of Ylikoski (2002, 2004a)—and also of Ylikoski (2006a)—relate to the many non-finites that have branched off from the inflectional paradigm of the verbal noun; one of these is the above-mentioned “action locative” that has both morphological and syntactic properties that distinguish this infinitival verb form from the “action” proper. As will be discussed in more detail below, perhaps the most significant difference is that the verbal noun cannot have same kind of object complements as most other non-finite verb forms; cf. the ungrammaticality of **juhka-n vuola* [drink-VN beer.GA] ‘drinking beer’ in contrast to *vuola juhka-n* [beer.GA drink-VN] ‘drinking of beer’ and like constructions in (7–10)—or even the compound *vuolla-juhka-n* [beer-drink-VN]—where *vuola* must be considered a prenominal genitive(-accusative) (resp. nominative) attribute of a word form that might well be regarded as a **d**everbal noun, that is, a result of derivation rather than of verbal inflection.

As regards the present and past participles in *-i* and *-n* seen in Table 2 above, these verb forms are left largely unmentioned in Ylikoski (2002, 2004a), but I will return to these forthwith in Section 2.3 below.

The main focus of Ylikoski (2002, 2004a) is on the remainder of the non-finites presented in Table 2, that is, on those formations that may be—or at least have been (13)—characterized as non-finite verb forms that may be used as adverbial modifiers the following way:

- (11) *Piera dagai rihkkosa vuola jugadettiin(is).*
Piera daga-i rihkkos-a vuola juga-dettiin(-is).
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA beer.GA drink-GER(-3SG)
 ‘Piera committed a crime while drinking beer.’
- (12) *Piera dagai rihkkosa jugakeahtta vuola.*
Piera daga-i rihkkos-a juga-keahtta vuola.
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA drink-VABE beer.GA
 ‘Piera committed a crime without drinking beer.’
- (13) *??/*Piera dagai rihkkosa juga vuola.*
*??/*Piera daga-i rihkkos-a juga vuola.*
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA drink.VGEN beer.GA
 ‘Piera committed a crime (by) drinking beer.’
- (14) *Piera bodii ~ vulgii ~ čohkánii jugažit vuola.*
Piera bodi-i ~ vulggi-i ~ čohkán-ii juga-žit
 Piera come-PST.3SG ~ go-PST.3SG ~ sit.down-PST.3SG drink-SUP
vuola.
 beer.GA
 ‘Piera came ~ went ~ sat down to drink beer.’
- (15) *Piera dagai rihkkosa amas (son) juhkat vuola.*
Piera daga-i rihkkos-a ama-s (son) juhka-t vuola.
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA NEGSUP-3SG (3SG) drink-INF beer.GA
 ‘Piera committed a crime in order not to drink (= “lest he drink”) beer.’

The most important characteristic of Examples (11–13, 15) is that the words *Piera dagai rihkkosa* constitute the complete, well-formed sentence ‘Piera committed a crime’ (see also Examples 4 and 10 above). This means that the non-finite clauses that follow this main clause provide additional information concerning the circumstances of the act of committing the crime. In other

words, the optionality of the non-finites in (4, 10–13, 15) differs from the more or less obligatory use of the infinitives in sentences such as (2) and (5) where sequences such as *?Piera álggii* ‘Piera began’, *?Piera hálidii* ‘Piera wanted’ or *?Piera heittii* ‘Piera ceased’ must be considered, if not ungrammatical, at least elliptical.

As regards the semantics of the adverbial non-finites, each of these have a quite specific meaning of their own. So-called gerunds such as *jugadettiin* ‘while drinking’ (11) act as temporal modifiers to the extent that this verb form may be generally characterized as a converb of simultaneity or simultaneous converb, whereas so-called verb abessives such as *jugakeahtta* ‘without drinking’ (12) denote so-called negative concomitance, which in (12) means specifying that the crime was not accompanied by beer-drinking.

In contrast to the largely uncontroversial nature of the gerund and the verb abessive, however, the so-called verb genitive (*juga* in Example 13) serves as an example of historical baggage accumulated in the descriptions of the individual modern Saami languages. As discussed in considerable detail in Ylikoski (2002), it appears that the formation and use of the verb genitive is largely limited to certain lexicalized expressions, most notably to those describing manners of motion, for example, *Piera bodi-i viega ~ vácci* [Piera come-PST.3SG run.VG ~ walk.VG] ‘Piera came running ~ walking’, and despite a long tradition of considering the verb genitive a non-finite verb form, it is hard to find good morphological and syntactic reasons for doing so. In contrast, it even seems to be the case that verb genitives are not formed productively from all verb stems and even the attested forms generally lack all the morphosyntactic properties typical of verbs (e.g. direct objects such as *vuola* ‘beer’ in the apparently ungrammatical sentence 13). Therefore, it is suggested that these formations should not be considered a part of productive verb inflection, but rather as a somewhat unproductive subclass of deverbal adverbs. (For more details, see also Section 3.1.2.2)

The status of the so-called supines in (14) and (15) is not entirely unproblematic either. In fact, the positive supine in *-žit* has not been presented in many modern descriptions besides Nickel (1994: 67–68, 478–479), who also makes it clear that in North Saami, this form is used only in “some few dialects in the west”. Indeed, it is shown in Ylikoski (2004a) that the supine is virtually unknown in standard written North Saami. However, its use in certain Torne Saami dialect writings as well as its frequent use in the neighboring Lule Saami language provides evidence that the use of the supine is not limited to the directional-purposive complements of motion verbs (14) as suggested by the examples in the previous studies, but the supine is—not unlike the infinitive illustrated by Example (4)—also used in fully optional non-directional purposive clauses (16):

- (16) *Piera dagai rihkkosa jugažit vuola* (Torne dialect of North Saami)

Piera daga-i rihkkos-a juga-žit vuola.

Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA drink-SUP beer.GA

‘Piera committed a crime in order to drink beer.’

As regards the other type of “supines” seen in Table 2, the so-called negative supine exemplified by *ama-s juhkat* ‘in order not to drink’ in Example (15) cannot be regarded as a non-finite verb form as such, but rather as a peculiar type of construction in which the infinitive in *-t* is preceded by the grammatical element *ama-* and a possessive suffix attached to it—and optionally followed by the subject noun or pronoun in the nominative case. As the semantic function of the negative supine is to express negative purpose, this construction can generally be translated into English by the expressions *in order not to...* or *in order that not...*, but a more literal equivalent is found in the expression *lest + N + the bare infinitive* such as *lest he drink*.

The last non-finite presented in Table 2 is the verb form in *-min ~ -me(n)*. In spite of the historicizing label “action essive” in standard Saami grammars, it has been well understood that this non-finite is—both formally and functionally—completely separate from the true essive case forms of the verbal noun. It is also well known that the action essive is mainly used with the verb *leat* ‘be’ to form the periphrastic progressive (17) and it is also used as secondary predicates in constructions occurring as complements to verbs of perception and cognition (18), that is, in constructions reminiscent of *accusativus cum infinitivo/participio* in many other European languages:

- (17) *Piera lea ~ lei juhkamin vuola.*

Piera lea ~ le-i juhka-min vuola.

Piera be.3SG ~ be-PST.3SG drink-ACTESS beer.GA

‘Piera is ~ was drinking beer.’

- (18) *Mun oidnen ~ muiten Piera juhkamin vuola.*

Mun oidne-n ~ muite-n Piera juhka-min vuola.

1SG see-PST.3SG ~ remember-PST.3SG Piera.GA drink-ACTESS beer.GA

‘I saw ~ remembered Piera drinking beer.’

In some dialects as well as in the literary language, the action essive may also be used in functions of the so-called action locative or second infinitive. This means that in place of *juhkamis* in Examples (5–6), it would also be possible to use the action essive *juhkamin* or especially the westernmost variant *juhkame*. However, the action essive may also be used as more or less free adverbial modi-

fiers, expressing actions that are concomitant with the states or actions expressed by governing motion (19–20) or posture (21) verbs:

- (19) *Piera finai pubas juhkamin vuola.*

Piera fina-i puba-s juhka-min vuola.
 Piera go(.and.return)-PST.3SG pub-LOC drink-ACTESS beer.GA
 ‘Piera went to a pub to drink beer (and came back).’

- (20) *Piera jođii ~ váccašii ~ viegai birra gili juhkamin vuola.*

Piera jođi-i ~ váccaš-ii ~
 Piera move(.continually)-PST.3SG ~ walk.about-PST.3SG ~
viega-i birra gili juhka-min vuola.
 run-PST.3SG around village.GA drink-ACTESS beer.GA
 ‘Piera strolled ~ walked ~ ran around the village drinking beer.’

- (21) *Piera čohkkái ~ čuoččui šiljus juhkamin vuola.*

Piera čohkká-i ~ čuočču-i šilju-s juhka-min vuola.
 Piera sit-PST.3SG ~ stand-PST.3SG yard-LOC drink-ACTESS beer.GA
 ‘Piera was sitting ~ standing in the yard drinking beer.’

Of those types of action essive constructions seen in (19–21), previous studies have identified only the first type (19) where the main verb describes a singular act of going somewhere and then returning. However, the action essive may also be used with other verbs of motion (20) in order to describe actions that are, in a sense, repeated from place to place. In addition to motion, the governing verb of the sentence may denote stationary positions such as sitting or standing (21), and it also appears that such constructions are sometimes quite analogous to the progressives seen in (17).

When viewed from a more diachronic perspective, this variety of functions of the action essive is the quite understandable outcome of a verbal noun in the locative¹¹ case, so that the above examples may be thought of as meaning—or at least having originally meant—something like “Piera was (seen) ~ strolled ~ sat ~ in the act of drinking beer”. Moreover, the idea that the action essive can be viewed as a kind of locative-progressive verb form may help to understand that the relative obligatoriness/optionality of these forms often depends on the presence of true locative modifiers in the sentence. For example, *juhkamin vuola* in (19) may be perceived as an optional modifier (characterized as expressing some

¹¹ According to the received view, the so-called essive case (-*n*) of the modern Saami languages goes back to the Uralic locative case in *-*na/-nä*.

kind of “locative concomitance” in Ylikoski 2002: 142) of the well-formed sentence *Piera finai pubas* ‘Piera visited a pub’, whereas the truncation *?Piera finai* ‘Piera visited’ may be complemented by the locative *pubas*, although also by the non-finite construction alone, resulting in the sentence *Piera finai juhkamin vuola* ‘Piera went to drink beer (and came back)’ where, in turn, the non-finite construction is perceived as more obligatory than in (19).

In spite of many additions to our knowledge of the non-finite formations listed in Table 2, the most noticeable findings presented in Ylikoski (2002, 2004a) are the two completely “new” non-finite forms:

- (22) *Piera dagai rihkkosa juhkamiin vuola.*
Piera daga-i rihkkos-a juhka-miin vuola.
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA drink-CONV beer.GA
 ‘Piera committed a crime by drinking beer.’
- (23) *Piera dagai rihkkosa juhkandihte vuola.*
Piera daga-i rihkkos-a juhka-ndihte vuola.
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA drink-CONV beer.GA
 ‘Piera committed a crime in order to drink beer.’

It is true that especially sentences such as (23) have gained some attention since Friis (1856: 215) and Nielsen (1926: 383, 388, 390), but these formations have been analyzed not as verb forms of their own, but rather as somewhat distracting exceptions of the otherwise noun-like morphosyntax of the verbal noun. However, it is asserted in Ylikoski (2002, 2004a) that non-finites such as *juhkamiin* in (22) should no longer be analyzed as comitative case forms of the verbal noun, and nor should formations of the type *juhkandihte* (or the more common orthographic variant <*juhkan dihte*>) be seen as peculiar cases of postpositional phrases such as *juhka-m-a dihte* [drink-VN-GA because]. Instead, it is maintained that these non-finite formations are best analyzed as instances of the previously unidentified converb of means in *-miin* (22) and the purposive converb in *-ndihte* (23).

To begin with the converb in *-miin*, the main reason for analyzing *juhkamiin* in (22) as a verb form independent of the verbal noun is that the patient of drinking, *vuola* [beer.GA], does not precede, rather it follows, the non-finite predicate. As mentioned earlier in connection with Examples (7–10), the verbal noun proper cannot take the same kind of object complements as most other non-finite verb forms. However, it would seem that the only morphosyntactic feature that clearly differentiates the latter non-finites from the verbal noun is the possibility of a VO word order: the patient marking of the verbal nouns resembles that of possessors in ordinary noun phrases, and it seems that a VO order has emerged after a reanalysis of the genitival attributes of verbal nouns (GN) as objects of

verb forms (OV); the case-marking of the attribute/object—the genitive-accusative case—has not been subject to change.¹²

Even though the verbal noun may have preceding genitive(-accusative) attributes referring to the patients of actions denoted by the underlying verbs (i.e., *vuola juhka-n* [beer.GA drink-VN] ‘drinking of beer’), it is impossible to form noun phrases such as **juhka-n vuola* [drink-VN beer.GA] ‘drinking beer’. Hence, it ought to be equally impossible to come across sentences such as (22) in which the word referring to the patient follows the verbal noun, but such sentences do nevertheless occur. It appears that the most elegant explanation for such a mismatch would be that non-finite constructions such as *juhkamiin vuola* (22) are analyzed as something other than verbal nouns, that is, as converbs.

In further support of the claim that such clauses should not be regarded as verbal noun constructions, it is shown in Ylikoski (2002) that the actual occurrences of individual formations in *-miin* must be analyzed on the basis of the so-called internal syntax of the constructions in which they occur. In short, it can be stated that formations such as *juhkamiin* may show **either** explicitly verbal **or** explicitly nominal properties. The most unambiguous sign of the verbal nature of the non-finite is its ability to take an object that follows its head. However, in constructions with reverse word order such as (22'), it usually remains ambiguous whether to consider the non-finite as an ordinary case form of the verbal noun or, rather, as a converb form with an object preceding its head:

(22') *Piera dagai rihkkosa vuola juhkamiin.*

Piera daga-i rihkkos-a vuola juhka-m(-)iin.

Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA beer.GA drink-VN-COM / drink-CONV

‘Piera committed a crime by (the) drinking (of) beer.’

Despite the ambiguity of many actual occurrences of non-finites in *-miin*, it is possible to pinpoint explicitly nominal features such as pronominal and adjectival attributes that can modify a verbal noun (24) but not a non-finite that is verbal to the degree that it may have an unambiguous object (25). On the other hand, the latter kind of true verb forms may instead have adverbial modifiers such as *badjelmearálaččat* ‘excessively’ in (26), which in turn—just like an object fol-

¹² As noted in Ylikoski (2002: 102, 159 n. 8; 2004a: 94), it is in a way possible to differentiate between “genitive” attributes and “accusative” objects in numeral expressions with a numeral greater than ‘one’. In object position, the numeral determiners of NPs such as *guokte* ‘two’ in the sentence *Piera juga-i guokte vuola* [Piera drink-PST.3SG two(.NOM) beer.GA] ‘Piera drank two beers’ are in the nominative case whereas in attribute position the numeral is in the genitive-accusative case, for example, *guovtti vuola haddi* [two.GA beer.GA price] ‘the price of two beers’ and, in the same vein, *guovtti vuola juhka-n* [two.GA beer.GA drink-VN] ‘drinking of two beers’ instead of the object case (i.e., **guokte vuola juhka-n* [two(.NOM) beer.GA drink-VN] ‘id.’). However, due to the marginality of such NPs in object and attributive positions—and their virtual absence among the most problematic non-finites in the research material—this feature could not be used as a discriminant in Ylikoski (2002, 2004a).

lowing the non-finite—cannot be combined with the explicitly nominal features of the verbal noun (*dainna* in 26):

- (24) *Piera dagai rihkkosa dainna badjelmearálaš vuola juhkamiin.*
Piera daga-i rihkkos-a da-inna badjelmearálaš vuola
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA that-COM excessive beer.GA
juhka-m-iin.
 drink-VN-COM
 ‘Piera committed a crime by that excessive beer-drinking.’
- (25) **Piera dagai rihkkosa dainna badjelmearálaš juhkamiin vuola.*
 **Piera daga-i rihkkos-a da-inna badjelmearálaš*
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA that-COM excessive
juhka-miin vuola.
 drink-CONV beer.GA
 ‘*Piera committed a crime by that excessive drinking beer.’
- (26) *Piera dagai rihkkosa (*dainna) juhkamiin vuola badjelmearálaččat.*
*Piera daga-i rihkkos-a (*da-inna) juhka-miin*
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA (that-COM) drink-CONV
vuola badjelmearálačča-t.
 beer.GA excessive-ADV
 ‘Piera committed a crime by (*that) drinking beer excessively.’

As stated above, the converb in *-miin* is mostly a converb of means which also seems, to some degree, to be separating this non-finite from the formally identical comitative formations that are—in accord with the semantics of the comitative case in general—quite often used to express manner and concomitance as well.

To return to the purposive converb in *-ndihte* in Example (23), this verb form has a number of features that distinguish it from verbal noun constructions. In addition to the syntactic verbal characteristics identical to those of the converb in *-miin* (22, 25–26), the outward appearance of the verb form deviates from the default use of the genitive-accusative case form of the verbal noun: instead of <*juhkandihte*> or <*juhkan dihte*> the expectable form of the adpositional phrase is *juhka-m-a dihte* [drink-VN-GA because], on a par with *juhka-m-a manjá/ovdal* ‘after/before drinking’ in Example (10). However, *juhkan-* in *juhkandihte* is not really the regular nominative form (cf. Example 7 above) either, as demonstrated by formations such as *muitalandihte* ‘in order to tell’ where *muitalan-* differs from both the regular nominative (*muitaleapmi*) and the genitive-accusative

(*muitaleami*) forms of the verbal noun. Instead, *juhkan-* and *muitalan-* are formally identical to the verbal noun formations used as the first elements of compound words such as *juhka-n-čáhci* [drink-VN-water] ‘drinking water’ or *muitala-n-cealkka* [tell-VN-sentence] ‘declarative sentence’, thus suggesting that formations such as <*juhkandihte*> or <*juhkan dihte*> can be perceived as some kind of amalgamation of the verbal noun and the formative *dihte*.

The above view is also supported by the fact that in contrast to normal adpositional phrases, such compounds are quite often written as a single word. Admittedly, it is more common to write these parts separately, but it is asserted in Ylikoski (2004a) that in light of all those features that suggest that these formations are no longer adpositional phrases but verb forms of their own, it is only reasonable to assume that many writers chose not to break such unitary word forms up. Due to the rationality behind such decisions, the suffix *-ndihte* and certain comparable formations are presented as single orthographic units throughout this overview, with the exception of retaining the originality of authentic examples in the literary languages.

In addition to the morphological-orthographical differences between the converb in *-ndihte* and the verbal noun constructions from which the former has obviously originated, the opposition *juhkandihte* vs. *juhkama dihte* has clear correlates at both the syntactic and semantic levels. In short, the former most often have unambiguous post-verbal objects as well as adverbial modifiers typical of verb forms (23, 27), whereas the latter constructions are modified by adjective and genitive(-accusative) attributes instead (28). As regards the semantic differences between the two types, the converb in *-ndihte* is clearly a converb of purpose whereas in adpositional phrases such as *vuola juhkama dihte* in (28), the general meaning of the postposition *dihte* remains so wide as to express not only future purpose but also—and apparently more often than not—unintentional cause, that is, a state of affairs that prototypically precedes the action denoted by the main clause:

- (27) *Piera dagai rihkkosa (*badjelmearálaš) juhkandihte vuola*
(badjelmearálaččat).
*Piera daga-i rihkkos-a (*badjelmearálaš) juhka-ndihte*
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA (excessive) drink-CONV
vuola (badjelmearálačča-t).
 beer.GA (excessive-ADV)
 ‘Piera committed a crime (*excessive) in order to drink beer
 (excessively).’

- (28) *Piera dagai rihkkosa (badjelmearálaš) vuola juhkama dihte*
 (*badjelmearálaččat).
Piera daga-i rihkkos-a (badjelmearálaš) vuola
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA (excessive) beer.GA
*juhka-m-a dihte (*badjelmearálačča-t).*
 drink-VN-GA because (excessive-ADV)
 ‘Piera committed a crime because of (excessive) beer-drinking
 (*excessively).’

Aside from the converb in *-ndihte*, one also occasionally comes across syntactically and semantically identical formations in *-nvárás*, *-nváste* and *-nnammii* (*juhkanvárás*, *juhkanváste*, *juhkanammii*) based on the postpositions *várás* ‘for (the purpose of)’, *váste* ‘id.’ and *nammii* ‘for, per’ that could, in fact, be considered semantically more predictable than *-ndihte* whose semantics is clearly constricted in comparison to the regular adpositional use of *dihte*. However, “adpositional” non-finite formations like these are clearly delimited to the expression of purpose, so that variation among the formations *-ndihte* (~ *-ndihtii*) ~ *-nvárás* ~ *-nváste* ~ *-nnammii* might be best analyzed as a kind of allomorphy of the purposive converb. It is also remarkable that in contrast to the mostly argument-like directional use of the purposive infinitive (3), the verb forms in *-ndihte* ~ *-nvárás* ~ *-nváste* ~ *-nnammii* appear to function as truly purposive adverbial modifiers of all kinds of verbs. At any rate, it can be generalized that purposive verbal non-finites such as *juhkandihte* ~ *juhkanvárás* ~ *juhkanváste* ~ *juhkanammii vuola* ‘in order to drink beer’ represent an internally coherent category that has neither morphological nor syntactic counterparts among other adpositional verbal noun constructions (see Section 3.1.3, though):

- (10) *Piera dagai rihkkosa vuola juhkama manjá ~ ovdal.*
Piera daga-i rihkkos-a vuola juhka-m-a manjá ~ ovdal.
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA beer.GA drink-VN-GA after ~ before
 ‘Piera committed a crime after ~ before drinking beer.’
- (29) **Piera dagai rihkkosa juhkanmanjá ~ juhkanovdal vuola.*
 **Piera daga-i rihkkos-a juhka-n-manjá ~*
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA drink-n-after ~
juhka-n-ovdal vuola.
 drink-n-before beer.GA
 ‘Piera committed a crime after ~ before drinking beer.’

To return to the inventory of North Saami non-finite verb forms, as presented in Table 2 the facts appearing in Ylikoski (2002, 2004a) imply at least the following

revisions to the Saami grammatical tradition: the so-called verb genitive (13) and the positive and negative supines (14–15) hardly deserve to be described as being among the non-finite verb forms in the language. To sum up, the verb genitive is hardly neither a “verbal” or otherwise productive inflectional form but rather a partially productive means of deriving deverbal adverbs of manner. The supine in *-žit* in turn appears to be a productive verb form, but nowadays only in the westernmost dialects, not in the standard literary language.¹³ As regards the so-called negative supine, the phenomenon in question is definitely not a verb form but a specialized infinitival construction that is syntactically and semantically reminiscent of *lest* plus infinitive in English (cf. also Example 101 below).

The rebuttal of the above-mentioned non-finites is, in a way, counterbalanced by the introduction of two previously unrecognized non-finites in Ylikoski (2002, 2004a). Even though the converbs in *-miin* and *-ndihte* may have some features that make their independence seem partly questionable, it is nevertheless reasonable to maintain that these new non-finites have branched off from the regular verbal noun construction to the extent that when describing the whole system of non-finite verb forms in the language, it is far more important to pay attention to the fully productive non-finites in *-miin* and *-ndihte* than, for example, to the much less productive and less verb-like verb genitive which is regularly presented as a verb form in all the descriptions of North Saami. In spite of the predominantly synchronic viewpoint of Ylikoski (2002, 2004a), it is also noticed that the disparity between the views of traditional Saami grammarians and the actual contemporary use of the Saami non-finites suggests that the converbs in *-miin* and *-ndihte* are, in a way, replacing the older non-finites with nearly identical functions as verbal adverbials denoting manner or means (the verb genitive) and purpose (the supine).

2.3. The curious non-finite in *-nláhkai* ~ *-nládje* (Ylikoski 2006a)

The paper entitled “Davvisámegiela *-nláhkai* ~ *-nládje* -suffiksála ii-finihtta vearbaráhkadusat” provides one more amendment to the inventory of non-finite verb forms in contemporary North Saami. As with the arguments offered in favor of the independent status of the converbs in *-miin* and *-ndihte* (Ylikoski 2002, 2004a), it is suggested that formations such as *juhkanláhkai* or *juhkanládje* in (30–32) should not be regarded as instances of the verbal noun followed by the

¹³ As noted by Korhonen (1974: 15, 198–199), the supine was also known to earlier grammarians (e.g. Leem 1748) describing the more eastern variants of North Saami. As for the use of the supine in Lule Saami, see also Examples (68) and (217a) below.

adverb or postposition *láhkai ~ ládje*¹⁴ ‘in the manner of’ but as manifestations of an independent non-finite verb form in *-nláhkai ~ -nládje*:

- (30) *Vuolla lea (beavddi alde) juhkanláhkai (= juhkanládje).*
Vuolla lea (beavddi alde) juhka-nláhkai.
 beer be.3SG (table.GA on) drink-nláhkai
 ‘The beer is (on the table) ready to drink.’
- (31) *Pieras lei vuolla juhkanláhkai (= juhkanládje).*
Piera-s le-i vuolla juhka-nláhkai.
 Piera-LOC be-PST.3SG beer drink-nláhkai
 ‘Piera had a beer to drink.’
- (32) *Piera loktii iežas vuola baksamiidda juhkanláhkai (= juhkanládje).*
Piera lokti-i ieža-s vuola baksam-ii-dda
 Piera raise-PST.3SG REFL.GA-3SG beer.GA lip-PL-ILL
juhka-nláhkai.
 drink-nláhkai
 ‘Piera raised his beer to his lips, (to the position of being) ready to be drunk.’

While it is quite clear that the formation in *-nláhkai ~ -nládje*—the non-finite in *-nláhkai* for short—is morphologically, syntactically and semantically distinct from the more expectable verbal noun constructions of the type *juhka-m-a láhkai* [drink-VN-GA in.the.manner] ‘in the manner of drinking’, it is rather difficult to describe the exact functions of this verb form. In fact, the syntactic and semantic features of the *-nláhkai* constructions do not appear to fit into the traditional categories (or “basic linguistic theory” discussed in Section 1.2) very well.¹⁵ However, most of the nearly four hundred instances of the non-finite in *-nláhkai* studied in Ylikoski (2006a) resemble in some way Examples (30–32) where *juhkanláhkai* is used to describe the state of a central participant (e.g. the theme in Examples 30–31 or the patient in 32) in the main clause. In (30–32), the relationship between *juhkanláhkai* and the noun *vuolla* ‘beer’ corresponds to that between a transitive action (drinking) and its patient, but the meaning of the non-finite may also be oriented to other participants such as agents (33) or instruments (34) of the actions (leaving, stabbing) they denote:

¹⁴ The forms *láhkai* and *láhkái* go back to the illative form *láhkái* of the noun *láhki* ‘manner’; the variant *ládje* appears likewise to be related to the noun *sládja* (~ **ládja*) ‘sort, kind’ (Pekka Sammallahti, personal communication).

¹⁵ Rather, it appears that here we are dealing with the kind of phenomenon that Haspelmath (2007: 122) had in mind when suggesting that “almost every newly described language presents us with some ‘crazy’ new category that hardly fits existing taxonomies”.

- (33) *Piera lei vuolginláhkai.*
Piera le-i vuolgi-nláhkai.
 Piera be-PST.3SG leave-nláhkai
 ‘Piera was ready to leave.’
- (34) *Pieras lei niibi čuggenláhkai.*
Piera-s le-i niibi čugge-nláhkai.
 Piera-LOC be-PST.3SG knife stab-nláhkai
 ‘Piera had a knife ready to stab (with).’

In Ylikoski (2006a), non-finites such as *juhkanláhkai*, *čuggenláhkai* and *vuolginláhkai* above are characterized as “predicative” (Saami *predikatiivvalaš*) in accord with the Saami and Finnic grammatical tradition wherein the term “predicative (adverbial)” may also be used to refer to elements that are morpho-syntactically adverbial but semantically predicative-like in describing one of the nominal constituents in the sentence. When characterizing the non-finite in *-nláhkai* as predicative, I refer to sentences in which it is possible to point out a noun or pronoun (e.g. *vuolla* ‘beer’ in Examples 30–32, *Piera* in 33 or *niibi* ‘knife’ in 34) that can be thought of as a kind of a semantic head of the non-finite verb form: Even in dynamic and lexically complex sentences such as (32) the use of the non-finite could be “transformed” into a simple predicative sentence of the type *X lea V-nláhkai* (i.e., *vuolla lea juhkanláhkai* in this case).

Even though the non-finites in Examples (30–34) are best translated by referring to the certain kind of “readiness” of the beer (30–32), *Piera* (33) or the knife (34), it appears that the non-finite in *-nláhkai* does not carry a specific modal meaning possibility or ability in itself. For example, the Example (31) could as well occur in a context (e.g., if preceded by the sentence ‘We were unable to leave immediately, because...’) in which the non-finite clause would more likely have a pragmatic interpretation of necessity, although the general function of these predicative modifiers is plainly to refer to the latent action that may take place in the near future—or even at the moment (35):

- (35) *Restaurán̄gas leat mánggalágan vuollagat juhkanláhkai ~ välljenláhkai.*
Restaurán̄gas lea-t mánggalágan vuollag-at
 restaurant-LOC be-3PL many.kind beer-PL
juhka-nláhkai ~ vällje-nláhkai.
drink-nláhkai ~ choose-nláhkai
 ‘There are many kinds of beer to drink ~ choose from in the restaurant.’

As regards the explicitly verbal features of the “new” non-finites, the formation in *-nláhkai* is not quite as clear a case as the non-finites in *-miin*, *-ndihtē* or *-mis* presented in the previous section. As most of the actual occurrences of the *-nláhkai* form are semantically patient-oriented (30–32, 35), it is often unreasonable to postulate the existence of a post-verbal object that as such would be the clearest indication of the verbal nature of the formation (cf. *??Piera had a beer to drink beer*). However, it is not uncommon for the non-finites in *-nláhkai* to have adverbial modifiers (33'), and the sporadic occurrences of post-verbal objects (see Ylikoski 2006a: 34) suggest that in principle, it ought to be possible to compose sentences like (34') as well:

- (33') *Piera lei vuolginláhkai gávpogii.*
Piera le-i vuolgi-nláhkai gávpog-ii.
 Piera be-PST.3SG depart-*nláhkai* city-ILL
 ‘Piera was ready to leave for the city.’
- (34') *(?)Pieras lei niibi čuggenláhkai Joavnna.*
(?)Piera-s le-i niibi čugge-nláhkai Joavnna.
 Piera-LOC be-PST.3SG knife stab-*nláhkai* Joavnna.GA
 ‘Piera had a knife ready to stab Joavnna (with).’

About nine out of ten *-nláhkai* forms occur in the above-mentioned “predicative” functions where the main clause denotes either a static state of affairs (30–31, 33–35) or transition to such a state (32). However, this form also appears to be used for adverbial modifiers in practically all kinds of clauses, and such *-nláhkai* forms are most often used as free modifiers to describe the manner or means of the main action. As an adverbial of manner or means, the non-finite in *-nláhkai* is reminiscent of the above-mentioned non-finite in *-miin* (22). The exact semantic functions of the *-nláhkai* form still remain somewhat obscure, but the most notable difference between the two forms appears to be that the non-finite in *-nláhkai* often carries a flavor of “resemblance” so that it could be described as having a kind of simulative irrealis meaning. In other words, whereas the non-finite in *-miin* refers to the actual performance of the act denoted by the verb (e.g. *juhkamiin* ‘by drinking’ in Example 22 repeated here), the non-finite in *-nláhkai* is more often used to describe a manner that only resembles such an act (36–37):¹⁶

¹⁶ It appears that many speakers of North Saami consider sentences like (36–37) rather unnatural in spite of the rather widespread occurrence of sentences such as those documented in the original paper and those to be discussed in Section 3.1.2.3.

- (22) *Piera dagai rihkkosa juhkamiin vuola.*
Piera daga-i rihkkos-a juhka-miin vuola.
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA drink-CONV beer.GA
 ‘Piera committed a crime by drinking beer.’
- (36) (?)*Piera dagai rihkkosa leaikkastallanláhkai.*
 (?)*Piera daga-i rihkkos-a leaikkastalla-nláhkai.*
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA trifle-nláhkai
 ‘Piera committed a crime (as if only) trifling [i.e., for the fun of it].’
- (37) (?)*Piera gaccai ~ vuohpui máli juhkanláhkai.*
 (?)*Piera gacca-i ~ vuohpu-i máli juhka-nláhkai.*
 Piera-LOC spoon-PST.3SG ~ devour-PST.3SG soup.GA drink-nláhkai
 ‘Piera spooned ~ devoured the soup as if by drinking.’

In addition to the adverbial uses of the non-finite in *-nláhkai*, this form also occurs as an attribute, i.e. in syntactic positions where the non-finites clearly modify nouns rather than verbs or main clauses as a whole. For a better understanding of the position of such non-finite constructions in the language, it is good to return to the traditional view of the system of Saami non-finites presented in the previous section.

As already seen in Table 2, the traditional Saami grammar recognizes two participles, i.e. the present participle in *-i* and the past participle in *-n*.¹⁷

- (38) *Vuola juhkki olbmot máhttet návddašit eallimis.*
Vuola juhkk-i olbmo-t máhtte-t návddaš-it eallim-is.
 beer.GA drink-PTC.PRS human-PL be.able-3PL enjoy-INF life-LOC
 ‘People who drink beer know how to enjoy life.’
- (39) *Vuola juhkan olbmot sáhttet gal dahkat rihkkosiid.*
Vuola juhka-n olbmo-t sáhtte-t gal
 beer.GA drink-PTC.PST human-PL may-3PL to.be.sure
dahka-t rihkkos-ii-d.
 make-INF crime-PL-GA
 ‘People who have drunk beer may commit crimes, though.’

¹⁷ Even though the past participle *juhkan* in (39) is homonymous with the nominative form of the verbal noun (7), they together definitely represent two distinct categories in the language. In contrast to verbs such as the *a*-stem *juhkat*, verbs such as the *i*-stem *juohkit* ‘divide’ in Table 2 have diverse forms—the verbal noun *juohkin* vs. the past participle *juohkán*—in these two categories.

Not much needs to be said about the present and past participles in (38–39) at this occasion, as they largely correspond to their namesakes in many other European languages. However, both of these forms are active participles, and according to the received view, there are no special passive participles or other passive non-finites in Saami. Instead, the semantically passive non-finite and finite verb forms alike are created by means of the fully productive derivational morphology which makes it possible to convert in principle any transitive verb to a passive verb, e.g. *juhkat* ‘drink’ → *juhkkojuvvot* ~ *juhkkot* ‘be drunk’, *dahkat* ‘do, make’ → *dahkkojuvvot* ~ *dahkkot* ‘be done, made’. As a result, the verb forms such as *juhkk(juvvo)t* ‘be drunk’ and *juhkk(juvvo)min* ‘(in the process of) being drunk’ are not seen as the “passive infinitive” or the “passive action essive” of *juhkat* but as the infinitive and action essive forms of the passive derivative of *juhkat*.

In the same vein, the passive equivalents of the past participles like *juhkan* (39) are of the type *juhkk(ju(vvo))n* ‘(one that has been) drunk’ (40).¹⁸ However, it appears to have escaped the notice of the Saami grammarians that for some reason, the present participles (38) do not have a passive equivalent of the logically deducible type **juhkk(juvvo)jeaddji* (41)—such forms simply cannot be attested anywhere:

- (40) *Piera feasttas juhkk(ju(vvo))n vuollagat ledje hui divrasat.*
Piera feastta-s juhkk-o(ju(vvo))-n vuollag-at le-dje
 Piera.GA party-LOC drink-PASS-PTC.PST beer-PL be-PST.3PL
hui divrasa-t.
 very expensive-PL
 ‘The beers that were drunk at Piera’s party were very expensive.’
- (41) *??/*Piera feasttas juhkk(juvvo)jeaddji vuollagat leat hui divrasat.*
*??/*Piera feastta-s juhkk-o(juvvo)-jeaddji vuollag-at*
 Piera.GA party-LOC drink-PASS-PTC.PRS beer-PL
lea-t hui divrasa-t.
 be-3PL very expensive-PL
 ‘The beers that are (or: will be) drunk at Piera’s party are very expensive.’

¹⁸ Incidentally, the passive derivative of the verb *juhkat* ‘drink’ is homonymous with that of the verb *juohkit* ‘divide, distribute’, so that forms like *juhkk(juvvo)t*, *juhkk(juvvo)min* and *juhkk(ju(vvo))n* could also mean ‘to be divided’, ‘(in the process of) being divided’ and ‘(one that has been) divided’, respectively. While past participles such as *juhkkojuvvon* and *juhkkon* are in a regular relation to the stems *juhkkojuvvo-* and *juhkk-*, the third variant *juhkkojun* is somewhat of an exception within the paradigm of passive verbs (see Korhonen 1974: 92–93; R. Bartens 1978a: 76–77; Sammallahti 2005: 61).

Nevertheless, to return to the non-finite in *-nláhkai*, it is fascinating to see that the same verb form that most typically occurs as a patient-oriented predicative-like adverbial (30–32, 35) can also be found in a syntactic-semantic function where it would be most logical to find the virtually nonexistent “passive present participle” in **-o(juvvo)jeaddi* (cf. Example 41 above):

- (42) (?)*Piera feasttas juhkanláhkai vuollagat leat hui divrasat.*
 (?)*Piera feastta-s juhka-nláhkai vuollag-at lea-t*
 Piera.GA party-LOC drink-nláhkai beer-PL be-3PL
hui divrasa-t.
 very expensive-PL
 ‘The beers that will be drunk at Piera’s party are very expensive.’

The attributive use of the *-nláhkai* form is nevertheless rather marginal, and all attested instances—around twenty occurrences in all—occur in texts that may have been translated into Saami from Finnish passive present participles or Norwegian adjectives. However, attributive *-nláhkai* constructions like (42)¹⁹ suggest that this non-finite also functions as a true passive present participle, and this may ultimately help us better understand many of the predicative-like non-finites represented by Examples (30–35) above. As it turns out, it might also be possible to view the “passive” *juhkanláhkai* of (30–32, 35) as a predicative use of a passive present participle whose past equivalent would indeed be the past participle of the passive verb *juhkko(juvvo)t* (30):

- (30) *Vuolla lea juhkanláhkai.*
Vuolla lea juhka-nláhkai.
 beer be.3SG drink-nláhkai
 ‘The beer is ready to drink.’
- (43) *Vuolla lea juhkko(ju(vvo))n.*
Vuolla lea juhkk-o(ju(vvo))-n.
 beer be.3SG drink-PASS-PTC.PST
 ‘The beer has been drunk.’

As regards the status of the *-nláhkai* forms in the language, even in the logically unavoidable absence of direct objects as a sign of a true verb form, it is precisely the attributive functions where this formation is furthest away from its formally still quite transparent origins: from the synchronic perspective, attribu-

¹⁹ Authentic examples (including some of those presented in Ylikoski 2006a) are presented and discussed in detail in Section 3.2.2 below.

tive modifiers such as *Piera feasttas juhkanláhkai (vuollagat...)* in (42) simply cannot be seen to have much in common with the adpositional phrases meaning ‘in the manner of V-ing’ (cf. the complete unnaturalness of translations such as ‘*The beers in the manner of drinking at Piera’s party are...’). As a consequence, it appears most appropriate to regard these productive and adverbially modified formations as verb forms of their own.

2.4. On the functions of adpositions in North Saami (Ylikoski 2006b)

The fifth original paper, “Fuomášumit sámegeiela adposišuvnnaid funkšuvnnain: ovdamearkan *alde-* ja *ala-*postposišuvnnaid ii-lokála geavaheapmi”, offers a decidedly different perspective on the adverbial non-finites in the language. As stated repeatedly in the previous Sections 2.2 and 2.3, a significant part of the argumentation in Ylikoski (2002, 2004a, 2006a) is based on the fact that the morphological, syntactic and semantic features of the non-finites in *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai* are quite different from the normal use of adpositions such as the postpositions *dihte* ‘because of, for (the purpose of)’ and *láhkai* ‘in the manner of’. However, as mentioned in Ylikoski (2006b), there has been surprisingly little empirical research on the normal use of the Saami adpositions, especially those with other than locative functions. Focusing on the non-spatial functions of the primarily spatial postpositions (*n*)*alde* ‘on’ and (*n*)*ala* ‘onto’ (e.g. *beavddi alde* [table.GA on] ‘on the table’, *lávddi ala* [stage.GA onto] ‘onto the stage’), this paper sheds light to the manifold role of adpositions and their relations to the adverbial cases (especially the locative, illative and comitative) in this language with half a dozen inflectional cases and dozens of adpositions.

In this case study of the ordinary use of some of the most common adpositions in North Saami it is seen that there are not many fundamental differences in the syntactic-semantic functions of adpositions and adverbial cases. When reviewing the “locational” postpositions *alde* and *ala* and their relation to the similarly “locational” cases locative and illative, it is seen that as many as one third of the sample of 1628 occurrences of *alde* and *ala* are not unambiguously locative in meaning. For example, adpositional phrases are used to express physical and psychic states (e.g. *olles miela-i-d alde* [full mind-PL-GA “on”] ‘in one’s full senses’) or means (e.g. *ieža-s burssa alde* [REFL.GA-3SG wallet.GA “on”] ‘at one’s own cost’), or the postpositions may have other functions such as the at best metaphorical locative use of *ala* in expressions such as *lihter-a ala* [liter-GA “onto”] ‘per liter’ or *buot ilgadisvuoda-i-d ala* [all hardship-PL-GA “onto”] ‘in addition to all the hardships’.

Special attention is given to the use of adpositional phrases as obligatory complements of certain verbs and adjectives; *ala*, for example, is used especially with verbs expressing negative emotions, for example, *váidal-it mu joavkku ala* [complain-*INF* 1*SG*.*GA* team.*GA* “onto”] ‘complain about my team’, whereas *alde* may be used especially with verbs having competitive or reciprocal meaning (and often a negative connotation), for example, *riidal-it luopmán-ii-d alde* [quarrel-*INF* cloudberry-*PL-GA* “on”] ‘quarrel over cloudberryes’ and *vuorbádalla-t su biktas-ii-d alde* [cast.lots-*INF* 3*SG*.*GA* clothe-*PL-GA* “on”] ‘cast lots for his clothes’. Furthermore, as the complemental functions of still another postposition, *birra* (primarily ‘around, about’), in turn, are mainly confined to the complementation of speech act verbs and related verbs of communication and cognition (e.g. *muital-it ~ diehti-t sámi-i-d birra* [tell-*INF* ~ know-*INF* Saami-*PL-GA* about] ‘tell ~ know about the Saami’), it is also remarked on that the influence of Scandinavian prepositions on the use of Saami postpositions has not been as straightforward as has sometimes been proposed. More exactly, the complemental use of *birra* cannot be considered a direct calque of the Norwegian and Swedish *om*. These adpositions correspond to each other only in certain contexts (e.g. *muitalit/diehtit sámiid birra ~ Norwegian fortelle/vite om samene*), whereas in many other contexts the translational equivalent of *om* is *alde* (e.g. *riidalit luopmániiid alde ~ krangle om multer* and *vuorbádallat su biktasiid alde ~ kaste lodd om klærne hans*). (Most often, though, *om* may be translated—and *birra* and *alde* replaced—by the locative case, for example, *muital-it ~ diehti-t sámi-i-n* [tell-*INF* ~ know-*INF* Saami-*PL-LOC*] ‘tell ~ know about the Saami’, cf. *muitalit ~ diehtit sámiid birra* ‘id.’ or *riidal-it luopmán-ii-n* [quarrel-*INF* cloudberry-*PL-LOC*] ‘quarrel over cloudberryes’, cf. *riidalit luopmániiid alde* ‘id.’.)

Even though the paper presents a quite general approach to the role of adpositions in Saami, its contribution to the study of non-finites lies in describing and discussing the use of true, unsuffixed adpositions in clause combining, that is, as a device for creating complex adverbial clauses that may have finite as well as non-finite predicates. As seen earlier in Sections 2.2 and 2.3, only certain exceptional “postpositions” may occur in a suffixal position in non-finites such as *juhkandihte* (23) or *juhkanláhkai* (30–32) whereas formations such as **juhka-n-manjá vuola* [drink-*n*-after beer.*GA*] or **juhka-n-ovdal vuola* [drink-*n*-before beer.*GA*] (29) are impossible. In fact, since non-finites of the latter kind—or **juhka-n-alde* [drink-*n*-on] and **juhka-n-ala* [drink-*n*-onto] for that matter—simply do not exist, they are not even hypothesized in Ylikoski (2006b). When speaking of the use of adpositions such as *alde* and *ala*, it is as well to note the existence of sentences such as (44–45):

- (44) *Leansmánni lea bargamin dan ala ahte čielggadit rihkkosa.*
Leansmánni lea bargamin dan ala ahte
 district.constable be.3SG work-ACTESS it.GA onto COMP
čielggad-it rihkkos-a.
 solve-INF crime-GA
 ‘The district constable is working on solving the crime.’
 (“The district constable is working on that, that s/he will solve the crime.”)
- (45) *Leansmánni lea bargamin dan ala ahte (son) čielggada rihkkosa.*
Leansmánni lea bargamin dan ala ahte (son)
 district.constable be.3SG work-ACTESS it.GA onto COMP (3SG)
čielggad-a rihkkos-a.
 solve-3SG crime-GA
 ‘The district constable is working on solving the crime.’
 (“The district constable is working on that, that s/he will solve the crime.”)

The use of *ala* in Examples (44–45) is motivated by the verb *bargat* ‘work (on), strive’ that often takes *ala* as its postpositional complement. However, these complements do not consist of the postposition and the pronoun *dat* (genitive-accusative *dan*) only, but the pronoun functions as a dummy element that in a way “nominalizes” the infinitival (44) and finite (45) clauses preceded by the complementizer *ahte*. In other words, constructions like *dan ala ahte* + infinitive (44) or *dan ala ahte* + finite clause (45) can be regarded as adpositional phrases in which the adposition is complemented by infinitival and finite clauses, respectively.

As noted in Ylikoski (2006b: 52–53), the use of adpositions in such functions is not radically different from the better-known constructions of the type *Lensmannen strever/arbeider med (~ for) å [oppklare forbrytelsen]*_{infinitival clause} or *Lensmannen strever/arbeider med (~ for) at [han skal oppklare forbrytelsen]*_{finite clause} in the neighboring Norwegian as well as in Swedish. The main difference between Saami and Scandinavian constructions appears to be that the dummy pronoun *dat* occurs quite obligatory with Saami postpositions—not unlike the pronoun *se* in the similar nominalization strategy “*se, että* [it COMP] + finite clause” in Finnish—but the corresponding *det* in Scandinavian prepositional constructions is far less common. As in Norwegian and Swedish, the use of adpositional infinitives of this kind in Saami seems to be limited to cases in which the main clause and the infinitival clause share the same subject (44), whereas a corresponding finite clause may also have a subject of its own:

- (46) *Leansmánni lea bargamin dan ala ahte rihkus čielggaduvvo.*
Leansmánni lea bargamin dan ala ahte rihkus
 district.constable be.3SG work-ACTESS it.GA onto COMP crime
čielggad-uvvo.
 solve-PASS.3SG
 ‘The district constable is working on solving the crime.’
 (‘The district constable is working on that, that the crime will be solved.’)
- (47) *Leansmánni lea bargamin dan ala ahte su bargit čielggadit rihkkosa.*
Leansmánni lea bargamin dan ala ahte
 district.constable be.3SG work-ACTESS it.GA onto COMP
su bargit čielggadit rihkkosa.
 3SG.GA employee-PL solve-3PL crime-GA
 ‘The district constable is working on getting his/her employees to solve the crime.’
 (‘The district constable is working on that, that his/her employees will solve the crime.’)

When an infinitive or a finite clause is “nominalized” by a preceding dummy pronoun and the complementizer, this means that the syntactic domain of infinitives and complemental *ahte* clauses is, in principle, widened from the subject and object positions to those of all ordinary nouns: in addition to being used as the formal complement of adpositions like *ala* in (44–47), the dummy *dat* may also be inflected in all cases, thus giving rise to a number of other types of subordinate clauses as well. For example, *dan ala* of (44–47) could in principle be replaced by the illative *dasa* (i.e., ...*lea bargamin dasa ahte...* ‘...is working on that, that...’). Furthermore, verbs such as *šiehttat* ‘agree’ may be complemented by analogous constructions with *alde* and *birra* as well as the locative case (i.e., *šiehtta-t dan alde ~ dan birra ~ da-s ahte bargat ovttas* [agree-INF it.GA on ~ it.GA around ~ it-LOC COMP work-INF together] ‘agree to work together’) and the verb *ákkastallat* ‘argue’ takes corresponding comitative complements of the type *ákkastalla-t da-inna ahte X lea Y* [argue-INF it-COM COMP X be.3SG Y] ‘argue with the fact that X is Y’ and so forth.

In addition to *ala*, *alde*, *birra* and other adpositions that may be used to fill the adposition slot in complement constructions of the type *dan* + postposition + *ahte V-t_{inf}/S* (or preposition + *dan* + *ahte V-t_{inf}/S*), it is only predictable that many formally similar constructions may also be used as free adverbial modifiers with clear semantic functions of their own. Such adverbial constructions in turn take us back to the various adverbial non-finites discussed in the previous

sections: the functional similarity between free adpositional infinitivals and con-verb forms is most evident in the following examples with purposive (48) and instrumental (49) semantics:

- (48) *Piera dagai rihkkosa dan várás (~ dihte) ahte juhkat vuola.*
Piera daga-i rihkkos-a dan várás (~ dihte) ahte
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA it.GA for (~ because) COMP
juhka-t vuola
 drink-INF beer.GA
 ‘Piera committed a crime in order to drink beer.’ (Cf. *juhkandihte* ‘in order to drink’ or equally possible *juhkanvárás* ‘id.’ in Example 23.)
- (49) *Piera dagai rihkkosa dan (~ dakko) bokte ahte juhkat vuola.*
Piera daga-i rihkkos-a dan (~ dakko) bokte
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA it.GA (~ that.way) through
ahte juhka-t vuola.
 COMP drink-INF beer.GA
 ‘Piera committed a crime by drinking beer.’ (Cf. *juhkamiin* ‘by drinking’ in Example 22.)

Even though the postposition *ala* does not generally have the same kind of purposive meaning as *várás* and *dihte* (48), the actual language use described in Ylikoski (2006b: 54) includes Example (50) whose *dan nala ahte* clause may best be explained as an incidental extension of the established construction *bargat + dan ala ahte* (44–47):

- (50) *Mun lean álot vuodján dan nala ahte beassat riikkajovkui, ja dál jáhkán*
buoret vejolašvuodaid go goassege ovdal.
 (Ylikoski 2006b: 54 < *Min Áigi* 15.1.1997, p. 5)
Mun lea-n álot vuodjá-n dan nala ahte
 1SG be-1SG always race-PTC.PST it.GA onto COMP
beassa-t riikka-jovku-i, ja dál jáhká-n buore-t
 get-INF state.GA-team-ILL and now believe-1SG good-CMPR
vejolaš-vuoda-i-d go goassege ovdal.
 possible-hood-PL-GA than ever before
 ‘I have always raced (≈ “strived by racing”) in order to get into the national team, and now I believe that I have better possibilities than ever before.’

In addition to the infinitival clauses of the type *dan* + postposition + *ahte V-t*, it is also stated briefly in Ylikoski (2006b) that some other adpositions such as *sadjái* ‘instead’ in (51) may take the complement *go* in place of *ahte*. Furthermore, it is mentioned that when augmented with prepositions such as *earret* ‘besides’ in (52), the non-finite construction may consist of the preposition and the infinitive only, that is, without a dummy pronoun or a complementizer:

- (51) *Piera dagai rihkkosa dan sadjái go juhkat vuola.*
Piera daga-i rihkkos-a dan sadjái go juhka-t vuola.
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA it.GA instead COMP drink-INF beer.GA
 ‘Piera committed a crime instead of drinking beer.’
- (52) *Earret (dan ahte) juhkat vuola, de Piera dagai rihkkosa maddái.*
Earret (dan ahte) juhka-t vuola, de Piera
 besides (it.GA COMP) drink-INF beer.GA PRT Piera
daga-i rihkkos-a maddái.
 make-PST.3SG crime-GA also
 ‘Besides drinking beer, Piera also committed a crime.’

As for the semantic functions of the adpositional infinitival clauses exemplified by (48–52), it is evident that they, too—most visibly those of (48–49)—are functionally on a par with the many non-finite verb forms that express mutual interpropositional relations between conceptually independent propositions denoted by the main clauses and subordinate clauses, that is, relations such as similarity, means or purpose. Resorting to the concepts and terminology applied in Kortmann (1997: 79–89; 1998: 464–468), the constructions *dan sadjái go V-t* (51) and *earret (dan ahte) V-t* (52) may be described as expressing the interpropositional relations called *substitution* (‘*p* instead of *q*’) and *addition* (‘*p* in addition to *q*’), respectively.

In spite of the importance of the above-mentioned adpositional infinitive clauses to the general description of North Saami, Ylikoski (2006b) by no means attempts to survey the whole array of adverbial non-finites of this kind or their finite equivalents. However, the observations presented in the paper still provide quite a new perspective on the use of adpositions as well as on the use of the infinitive in North Saami. This is due to the rather surprising fact that in spite of the comparatively high frequency of such constructions, they seem to have passed completely unnoticed in earlier descriptions of Saami languages. In fact, even grammarians as prominent as Nielsen (1926: 189) and Nickel (1994: 166) go as far as to explicitly state that the use of the Saami infinitive differs from that of Norwegian in that the former is never used with adpositions.

Awareness of the above-mentioned adpositional clauses also adds to our understanding of the infinitive in *-t*: North Saami has more in common with the neighboring Scandinavian languages than had previously been thought. Moreover, adpositional infinitives (especially those such as *earret juhkat* ‘besides drinking’ in 52) can also be compared with the infinitivals in Romance languages such as French where the plain infinitive—that is, the infinitive form without a complementizer like Saami *ahte* or Scandinavian *at(t)/å*—may be preceded by various prepositions. As remarked in Ylikoski (2003a: 214 n. 9, 224 n. 11), such prepositional infinitives occur both as complements of various verbs and as more optional adverbial modifiers with “adverbial” meanings of their own, which eventually makes them reminiscent of verbal nouns in adverbial adpositional phrases; cf. the English translation of the Saami and French adpositional clauses *earret juhkat* and *sauf boire* ‘besides drinking’. Observations like these also give further support to the traditional view (opposed by Haspelmath 1989: 288; see Ylikoski 2003a: 210) that infinitives—in Saami and elsewhere—are in themselves quite meaningless verb forms whose semantic functions are largely determined by the governing verbs or, as it seems, by the governing adpositions as well.²⁰

2.5. Conclusions

To sum up the main results of the three original papers (Ylikoski 2002, 2004a, 2006a) on the mostly adverbial non-finite constructions in North Saami, it may be concluded that in contemporary literary North Saami, there are not only two verb forms that might be labeled as infinitives (in *-t* and *-mis*), two quite ordinary (present and past) participles and one action nominal (i.e., a verbal noun which may be perceived as a borderline case between verb conjugation and deverbal nominal derivation), but also as many as five or six non-finite verb forms that always or at least predominantly occur in positions that may be characterized as adverbial. However, there is considerable variation in the “adverbial” nature of these non-finites; some of these have the clear semantic function of expressing specific interpositional relations between the states of affairs denoted by the main clause and the non-finite subordinate clause, whereas other forms may be better described with respect to their aspectual features, for example.

The adverbial non-finites that most clearly express semantic relations between two logically independent propositions can quite safely be labeled as *converbs*, that is, non-finite verb forms that prototypically occur as free adverbial

²⁰ When it comes to the syntactic-semantic roles of the infinitives in adpositional infinitive clauses (44–52), the infinitives may be characterized as arguments of adpositions, not unlike when speaking of their prototypical use as arguments of verbs (see Section 2.1 and Table 1 there).

modifiers or adjuncts of full well-formed clauses. The clearest representatives of such non-finites in North Saami include the gerund in *-dettiin*, the non-finite in *-miin* and the non-finite in *-ndihtē*. These verb forms function as free adverbial modifiers of simultaneity (11), means (22, 26) and purpose (23, 27), respectively.

The so-called verb abessive in *-keahtta* is a bit less obviously a representative of converbs. In spite of its prevailing use as a free adverbial modifier expressing so-called negative concomitance—that is, the absence of concomitance of an event X (such as beer-drinking in Example 12)—it is also used as a complement of certain verbs (e.g. *guodđit* ‘leave (un-V-ed)’) and as a lexical main verb in the periphrastic negatives with the auxiliaries *leat* ‘be’ and *orrut* ‘be, dwell’ (Ylikoski 2002: 134; 2004a: 84–85). The common essence of these adverbial and predicative functions will be discussed in more detail in Section 3.2.3 where the syntactic functions of the verb abessive will be compared with those of the negative participle in *-keahtes*.

Furthermore, the so-called action essive in *-min* is an adverbial non-finite as well, even though it does not have an interpositional semantic function in such a way that the verb form could be freely attached to all kinds of clauses (such as in *Piera dagai rihkkosa* in Examples 10–13, 15–16) to give additional information on temporal, causal or other such relations between the states of affairs denoted by the main clause and the non-finite clause. However, as can be seen in Examples (17–22) above, the syntactic features and the progressive-locative meaning of the action essive (‘in the act of V-ing’) still bear much resemblance to the locative origins of this verb form. Much the same goes for the non-finite in *-nláhkai* which quite often occurs in positions reminiscent of the use of the word *láhkai* ‘in the manner of’ (see Examples 36–37 and Section 3.1.2.3). However, the participle-like use of the non-finite in *-nláhkai* (42) calls for more attention to the mutual relations between various attributive, predicative and adverbial non-finites in the language (see Section 3.2.2 below).

As regards to the grammaticality of the examples seen above, it must be admitted that in spite of the common standard literary use of North Saami, there are significant areal differences in the use of the non-finites, and therefore many Saami speakers may consider some of my examples more or less unnatural or even ungrammatical. These issues will be discussed in further detail in Sections 3 and 4 where the main aim will be to provide a concluding update on the possibilities of identifying and evaluating various kinds of “new” non-finite verb forms in contemporary North Saami.

3. Additional observations on the system of non-finites in North Saami

This section provides a number of additional remarks on the North Saami non-finites described in the original papers and the previous Section 2 summarizing the results of the aforementioned papers. In order to gain a better understanding of the inventory of non-finite verb forms in the language, it appears important to once more focus on the various non-finite constructions based on the less marked, noun-like usage of verbal noun constructions. This is done in Section 3.1 where many of the findings and claims presented in the original papers are sharpened and backed up with additional observations on the modern literary language as well as the spoken and earlier written varieties behind the contemporary written standard. Furthermore, even though the original papers are mainly concerned with the two infinitives, the verbal noun and especially the adverbial verb forms and the mutual relations of these verb forms, in order to revise the whole picture of the North Saami non-finite system one also needs to take a look at the participial subsystem of the non-finites. This is accomplished in Section 3.2 where it will be seen that not only the mainly adverbial non-finite in *-nláhkai* (Section 2.3) but even the so-called action essive and the verb abessive (Section 2.2) are closely related to the non-finites that may justly be considered participles. The revised overall view of the Saami non-finites is ultimately summarized in Section 4 where the non-finite system and its most recent developments are viewed in the wider context of the morphological and syntactic features of contemporary North Saami.

3.1. On the criteria for identifying non-finite verb forms (with special reference to verbal-noun based constructions)

In the original studies (especially Ylikoski 2002, 2004a, 2006a) recapitulated in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 above, the most novel observations and the most original thoughts on the North Saami non-finite verb forms have centered on the verbal noun in *-n/-pmi* and a number of non-finite formations that have morphological, syntactic and semantic features that distinguish them from the ordinary unmarked usage of the verbal noun. However, many of the statements made in Ylikoski (2002, 2004a) were presented somewhat cautiously due to the relatively small and stylistically limited set of data—and due to the author's more limited knowledge of the language at that time.

In returning to some of the questions that were left open in the original papers, this section seeks to present a more resolute and more conclusive conviction concerning the nature of the various “new” non-finites and their independence from the verbal noun constructions in which they originate. As mentioned in Section 1.3, this is achieved by relying on a much larger amount of data that comprises practically all the main domains of the language: My present understanding and intuition of the phenomena in question is based, *inter alia*, on reading through thousands of pages of North Saami fiction and non-fiction books, newspapers, magazines, etc. The most concrete study material also includes thousands of non-finite constructions found in the nearly two thousand pages of dialect texts in North Saami and the neighboring Saami languages. Furthermore, in recent years I have gained a much greater personal insight into the language by actually mastering it also as an active speaker and writer.

In addition to repeating and refining parts of my former arguments, this section also has the function of discussing and commenting on the views presented in the most recent literature on the same issues, most notably by Sammallahti (2005, 2007) whose views on the Saami non-finites differ to some extent from those presented in Ylikoski (2002, 2004a). Before turning to the actual discussion of the various phenomena surrounding the North Saami verbal noun, I wish to point out that in the sections that follow, I will systematically refrain from using the term “action nominal”—although used in Ylikoski 2003a and Section 2 above—despite the fact that I consider the term the most appropriate label for fully productive verbal nouns that are used to denote actions, states and processes instead of actors, for example.²¹ This is done in order to avoid any unnecessary confusion caused by the disparate interpretations of the traditional Lappologist notion of “action” (North Saami, Norwegian and Finnish *aktio*, German *Aktion*) by various linguists. When citing other scholars, the morphological terms “action”, “action nominative”, “action genitive” and “deverbal action noun” will always be enclosed in scare quotes whereas the term “verbal noun” will be used as the most neutral label for the ordinary action nominal as defined in Ylikoski (2003a).

3.1.1. What counts as a non-finite verb form?

Before commencing with the actual Saami data, it is appropriate to state that when thinking of distinguishing between “non-finite verb forms” and various formations that should not be labeled as such in one individual language, such

²¹ That is, agent nouns such as those identical to the present participle in North Saami (see Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2) represent certain type of verbal nouns as well.

demarcation need not be as hopeless an enterprise as it may seem in the light of the various typological studies on the topic (see e.g. Lehmann 1988; Haspelmath 1995: 20–27; van der Auwera 1998b; Tikkanen 2001: 1115–1116; Nikolaeva 2007). As already stated in Ylikoski (2003a) and Section 2.1 above, I have attempted to refine the definitions of non-finite verb forms in a way that ought to work quite well at least for European inflectional languages such as the Saami languages. However, as the thoughts presented in Ylikoski (2003a) are mainly devoted to understanding of the mutual relations of non-finites, it may still be repeated that the non-finite verb forms as a whole have been said to differ from the so-called finite verb forms in that the former “are not usually marked for such categories as tense, mood, aspect, person or number, and they do not function as only predicates of independent sentences” (Ylikoski 2003a: 186).²²

In spite of scrutinizing various definitions of infinitives, converbs and verbal nouns, I have not tried to explicate precise and unambiguous criteria on what exactly does count as a non-finite verb form, but rather accepted that formations such as the Saami verbal noun may vacillate between inflection and derivation (see Sections 2.1 and 2.2). Indeed, it appears to me that the task of identifying a non-finite verb form usually means the task of drawing a line between word formation (i.e., derivation) and inflection, which in turn involves the task of weighing whether the word forms in question are sufficiently “verbal” in order to be labeled as verb forms instead of being regarded as mere derivations of verbal stems. In other words, a formation like the Saami verbal noun may be considered a non-finite verb form or a deverbal, that is, verb-derived noun. Much the same goes for differentiating between verb forms known as participles and formations better defined as deverbal adjectives, and, *mutatis mutandis*, between converbs and deverbal adverbs (and sometimes deverbal adpositions and conjunctions as well, see Ylikoski 2003a: 220–223, 228).

As regards the more global question of demarcating inflection and derivation, one of the most economical yet quite comprehensive answers is provided by Korhonen (1981a: 287–288) who lists no more than three criteria for identifying a non-finite verb form: 1) non-finite verb forms have “verbal modifiers”, that is, the internal syntax of the stem’s word class instead of that of other parts of speech, manifested in traits such as accusative objects and adverbial modifiers; 2) non-finite verb forms are productive, that is, they are formed in a productive and formally regular manner from all verbs and 3) non-finite verb forms are constant in meaning, that is, the semantic relation between a non-finite and

²² This kind of traditional understanding of (non-)finiteness places the Saami connegative verb forms (Section 1.1) in an intermediate position: even though not marked for person or number and not functioning as the only predicate verbs, they are marked for tense and mood and are a syntactically inseparable part of morphologically analytic finite predicates.

the verbal stem is not subject to coincidental variation, as often is the case with derivation. It must be acknowledged, though, that the inventory of such criteria could certainly be more fine-grained as well; for example, Korhonen (1974: 9–14) presents five criteria for non-finite verb forms, whereas Dressler (1989) has listed as many as twenty criteria for distinguishing between the processes of inflection and derivation across languages (for more ponderings on these issues, see e.g. Dressler et al. 2005).

However, as seen in the original papers and Section 2 above, it is sometimes rather difficult to rely on the three criteria mentioned above. For example, the North Saami verbal noun is a formation that is formed fully productively, the semantics of the form in question is generally regular (certain randomly lexicalized verbal nouns aside, cf. Ylikoski 2002: 103–104, 121–122; 2004a: 92, 102), but their internal syntax is normally rather nominal, that is, different from that of less controversial verb forms. However, as the presence or absence of verb-like internal syntax is usually most obvious with regard to the marking of patients,²³ one has to remember that this criterion is by definition inapplicable in analyzing formations with “passive”, patient-oriented semantics. This has earlier been seen in connection with the non-finite in *-nláhkai* (Section 2.3 above) and will be taken up again when discussing the passive participles in more detail in Section 3.2.2.

In addition to the three criteria mentioned above—**1) preservation of the internal syntax of the stem, 2) productivity and 3) semantic regularity**—there appears to be a need for a fourth criterion, especially in relation to certain borderline cases such as the non-finite constructions historically related to the Saami verbal noun, that may generally be regarded as one of the non-finite verb forms. For the present purposes, this fourth criterion can be provisionally characterized as **4) opacity**, in the sense that it refers to the internal opacity or indivisibility of a non-finite marker. That is to say, an opaque non-finite formation does not depend on other non-finites so that the given form could be perceived as a transparent combination of two or more dependent morphemes, but is an indivisible, independent whole. To be specific, a non-finite verb form may originate in more complex formations such as the verbal noun (*-n* : *-m-*) and the essive (*-(i)n*), locative (*-(i)s*) or comitative (*-(i)in*) cases, but when viewed from a synchronic perspective, the so-called action essive (*-min* ~ *-me(n)*), the action locative or second infinitive (*-mis* ~ *-me(s)*) and the “action comitative”²⁴ (*-miin*) cannot be described merely as sums of their parts but as verb forms different from the regular inflectional forms of the verbal noun. As seen in the original

²³ For example, the Saami verbal noun does not have unambiguous accusative objects (see Section 2.2 above) yet may nevertheless take certain types of adverbial modifiers (see Ylikoski 2002: 115; Sammallahti 2005: 102, 104, 122, 177).

²⁴ After the identification of this verb form in Ylikoski (2002), it has been referred to as the “action comitative” (*aktio komitatiiva*) by Sammallahti (2005: 161; 2007: 6).

papers and in Section 2, such verb forms differ from the original verbal noun constructions both in terms of morphology, syntax and semantics (see e.g. Ylikoski 2004a: 120).

The main point of the opacity criterion is that the description of such opaque formations cannot be directly deduced from the descriptions of other verb forms (e.g. the verbal noun), which means that they are independent verb forms that need to be described independently from their historical backgrounds. Bearing in mind this amendment to the three other criteria presented by Korhonen (1981a: 287–288), it appears to me that it is fairly easy to determine the boundaries of the system of non-finite verb forms in contemporary written North Saami as well as in other varieties of the language. The internal boundaries of the system of non-finite verb forms, that is, the mutual boundaries between the four cross-linguistically valid subtypes of non-finites were defined earlier in Ylikoski (2003a) and Section 2.1 above.

3.1.2. Historical background of the “new” verbal-noun based non-finites in *-ndihte*, *-miin* and *-nláhkai*

In the original papers (Ylikoski 2002, 2004a, 2006a), the independence of the non-finites in *-miin*, *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai* was argued by referring, inter alia, to the following examples:

- (53) *Danne mii ge leat oskugoahtán Kristus Jesusii vai mii dahkkojuvvošeimmet vanhurskkisin oskumiin Kristusii, eat ge dahkamiin láhkadaguid. Dasgo ii oktage olmmoš dahkkojuvvo vanhurskkisin láhkadaguid dahkamiin.* (Ylikoski 2002: 91, 104 < OT: Galatians 2:16)
- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| <i>Danne</i> | <i>mii=ge</i> | <i>lea-t</i> | <i>osku-goahtá-n</i> | <i>Kristus</i> | <i>Jesus-ii</i> |
| therefore | 1PL=also | be-1PL | believe-INCH-PTC.PST | Christ | Jesus-ILL |
| <i>vai</i> | <i>mii</i> | <i>dahkk-ojuvvo-š-eimmet</i> | <i>vanhurskkis-in</i> | | |
| in.order.that | 1PL | make-PASS-COND-1PL | righteous-ESS | | |
| <i>osku-miin</i> | <i>Kristus-ii</i> , | <i>eat=ge</i> | <i>dahka-miin</i> | <i>láhka-dagu-i-d.</i> | |
| believe-CONV | Christ-ILL | NEG.1PL=and | do-CONV | law-deed-PL-GA | |
| <i>Dasgo ii</i> | <i>oktage</i> | <i>olmmoš</i> | <i>dahkk-ojuvvo</i> | | |
| for | NEG.3SG | anyone | human | do-PASS.CONNEG | |
| <i>vanhurskkis-in</i> | <i>láhka-dagu-i-d</i> | <i>dahka-m(-)iin.</i> | | | |
| righteous-ESS | law-deed-PL-GA | do-VN-COM / do-CONV | | | |
- ‘Therefore we, too, have come to believe in Christ Jesus, so that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by doing the works of the law, because no one will be justified by doing the works of the law.’

- (54) *Leavggat (fánat) ja vearjoamearkkat geavahuvvojedje soahtamiin čalmmustandihtii, gos soalddáhiid iešguđet soahteveahka lei.* (Ylikoski 2004a: 114 < <http://odin.dep.no/archive/krdvedlegg/01/15/Samis005.pdf> 16.10.2003)

Leavgga-t (fána-t) ja vearjo-mearkka-t geavah-uvvo-jedje
 flag-PL (banner-PL) and weapon-mark-PL use-PASS-PST.3PL
soahta-m-ii-n čalmmust-andihtii, gos soalddáh-ii-d iešguđet
 battle-VN-PL-LOC indicate-ndihte where soldier-PL-GA each.GA
soahte-veahka le-i.
 war-troop be-PST.3SG
 ‘Flags (banners) and coats of arms were used during battles in order to indicate where each troop was located.’

- (55) *Hávlár leai fatnasis láddagasas báhčínláhkái čáhcelottiid.*
 (Ylikoski 2006a: 34 n. 5)

Hávlár lea-i fatnas-is láddagasas báhči-nláhkái
 shotgun be-PST.3SG boat-LOC loaded shoot-nláhkai
čáhce-lotti-i-d.
 water-bird-PL-GA
 ‘The shotgun was in the boat, loaded ready to shoot waterfowl.’

As mentioned previously in Sections 2.2 and 2.3, it has been claimed that formations such as *dahkamiin* ‘by doing’ (53), *čalmmustandihtii* ‘in order to indicate’ (54) and *báhčínláhkái* ‘ready to be shot with’ (55) can be considered independent non-finite verb forms that differ syntactically from regular verbal noun constructions in having post-verbal objects such as *láhkadaguid* ‘the works of law’ (53)²⁵, the clause *gos soalddáhiid iešguđet soahteveahka lei* ‘where each troop was located’ (54) and *čáhcelottiid* ‘waterfowl’ (55), respectively. Furthermore, the formations *čalmmustandihtii* (54) and *báhčínláhkái* (55) differ from the use of the verbal noun proper also morphologically (*čalmmustandihtii* pro *čalmmusteami dihtii*; *báhčínláhkái* pro *báhčima láhkái*) as well as semantically, as their meanings cannot be straightforwardly inferred from those of the postpositions *dihte* ~ *dihtii* ‘because of, for (the purpose of)’ and *láhkái* ~ *láhkai* ~ *ládje* ‘in the manner of’. Finally, even the occasional orthographic practice of writing these formations as unitary word forms instead of <*čalmmustan dihtii*> or <*báhčín láhkái*> strongly suggests that many speakers of North Saami feel that the formations no longer consist of two independent word forms but only one. In fact, it would

²⁵ Unlike *dahkamiin láhkadaguid*, the phrase *láhkadaguid dahkamiin* in (53) can also be interpreted as a verbal noun phrase with a pronominal genitive(-accusative) attribute (see Ylikoski 2002: 104).

be quite difficult to consider the non-finites in (54–55) as something other than independent verb forms.

The above claims were expressed quite cautiously in the original studies for which it was hoped that more extensive data and further research in the North Saami dialects and other Saami languages would yield a better understanding of the statuses and roles of these non-finites in the Saami languages. For example, it was acknowledged that the relative morphological transparency of the postpositions *dihte* and *láhkai*, especially in the occasional instances of conjunction reduction such as *nanne-n- ja ovddid-andihte vuoseh-an-giela* [strengthen-*n*-and develop-*ndihte* show-VN-language.GA] ‘in order to strengthen and develop the sign language’ (Ylikoski 2004a: 112–113, 136–141) and *oidni-n ja dutka-n láhkái* [see-*n* and study-*nláhkai*] ‘visible and “studyable”’ (Ylikoski 2006a: 33–34) may be in need of a more thorough examination. Now, after having gone through the much more extensive and diverse research material described in Sections 1.3 and 3.1 above, I am even more convinced of the independence of these forms. However, it is somewhat regretful to say that while gaining confirmation of the validity of my earlier hypotheses and analyses, the task of going through nearly all the dialect samples of North Saami and its nearest relatives was not especially fruitful in the sense of providing new information that would have significantly added to the initial guesses expressed previously in the original papers.²⁶ It appears that the non-finite in *-ndihte* is a somewhat old, well-established converb form that can be attested in its wide use in many traditional dialects as well as in older written forms of the language, but nevertheless, this verb form is almost non-existent in neighboring Lule, Inari and Skolt Saami. As for those non-finites in *-miin* and *-nláhkai* (especially its participial functions), however, their use appears to have begun or at least accelerated quite recently, especially under the influence of similar verb forms in Finnish.

3.1.2.1. The purposive converb in *-ndihte* and related phenomena in North Saami and its nearest relatives

As discussed in Ylikoski (2004a: 107, 116–117, 147–150), the non-finite in *-ndihte* appears to be a verb form with many “alloforms” such as *-ndihtii*, *-nvárás*, *-nváste* and even *-nnammii* (see Section 2.2 above), without any apparent differences in meaning. It was also mentioned that the dialectal distribution of such formations has already been studied by Hans-Hermann Bartens (1986), but unfortunately

²⁶ As an anecdotal side note, my experiences with dialect material such as that of the Máttavuotna dialect (MSFOu 61)—the source of Examples (58, 71 and 130)—seem to be partly similar to those described by their collector Paavo Rivila in the foreword of his own dissertation (1932: III): “Der Dialekt von Maattivuono bietet der Forschung keinen besonders neuen und interessanten Stoff dar, wie ich anfangs gehofft hatte. Ich habe jedoch die Resultate meiner Arbeit nicht in meiner Schreibtischschublade liegen lassen wollen, sondern bringe den wichtigsten Teil davon in dieser Form an die Öffentlichkeit.”

without a clear distinction being made between the non-finites in *-ndihte* and verbal noun constructions of the type *-ma/-mi dihte* even though he states that constructions with the “action + postposition [*dihte, várás, vástē*]” and an object can be found only to the east of the so-called Swedish Saami.²⁷ Furthermore, it has been tentatively suggested (Ylikoski 2004a: 149–150) that whereas the most unmarked non-finite means of expressing purpose in standard North Saami is the non-finite in *-ndihte*—for example, *geahččal-an dihtii Filip-a* [test-*ndihte* Philip-GA] ‘(He asked this) in order to test Philip’—the corresponding expressions in the neighboring languages consist of verbal noun constructions with no morphological, syntactic or semantic signs of independence, cf. Inari Saami *Filippus keččáláddá-m tiet* [Philip(.GEN) test-VN.GEN for] ‘id.’ and Skolt Saami *I’llep kiččēlōddá-m diōtt* [Philip(.GEN) test-VN.GEN for] ‘id.’ in the east, and the so-called supine in Torne Saami (see Example 14 in Section 2.2) and Lule Saami (*Filippos-av gähhtjal-ittjat* [Philip-ACC test-SUP] ‘id.’) further to the southwest.

Even though there are quite a lot of published Saami dialect texts at our disposal, they do not cover all dialect areas well enough to provide a complete picture of the spoken language. However, the available research material quite clearly shows that the non-finite in *-ndihte* (~ *-ndihtii*) and especially that in *-nvárás* have for long been in use in many parts of the North Saami area, as dozens of examples could be presented both from the mainland dialects of eastern (56) and western (57) Finnmark Saami and from the coastal dialects of Sea Saami (58) and Torne Saami (59), as well as from the Finnish (56) side of the border and Norway (57–59) (see also H.-H. Bartens 1986: 22). Furthermore, it may be seen that the formations in *-ndihte* and *-nvárás* may occur—sometimes even within one and the same idiolect—without apparent differences in their semantic functions (cf. Ylikoski 2004a: 106, 115–116).²⁸

- (56) *Dalle isit ja eamit vulge meahccái, ja eamit guoddá dan riebančivgga gurutbeale ovdajuolggis nu ahte seaibi guoská eatnamii, heahppášandihhtii beađuid.*

(MSFOu 68: 70, Ohcejohka, Juhani Nuorgam 1932)

<i>Dalle isit</i>	<i>ja</i>	<i>eamit vulge</i>	<i>meahccái-i,</i>	<i>ja</i>	<i>eamit</i>
then	husband	and wife	leave.PST.3PL forest-ILL	and	wife
<i>guoddá</i>	<i>dan</i>	<i>rieбан-čivgga</i>	<i>gurutbeale</i>	<i>ovda-juolggi-s</i>	<i>nu</i>
carry.3SG	it.GA	fox-cub.GA	left-hand	fore-leg-LOC	so

²⁷ The term *Swedish Saami* is traditionally employed with reference to the westernmost Saami varieties including Lule Saami but not the Torne Saami dialect of North Saami despite its intermediate status between Lule Sami and the rest of the North Saami dialects.

²⁸ However, in spite of constructions such as *ásah-an vástē* [establish-*nvástē*] ‘in order to establish’ and *álggah-an nammii* [establish-*nmammii*] ‘id.’ in the contemporary literary language (Ylikoski 2004a: 117–118), I have not been able to find similar non-finite formations in dialect texts, even though Bartens (1986: 22) does mention one occurrence of *vástē* in such a position.

ahte seaibi guoská eatnam-ii, heahppáš-andihtii beađu-i-d.
 COMP tail touch.3SG ground-ILL disgrace-ndihtie beast-PL-GA
 ‘Then the husband and his wife go to the forest and the wife is carrying
 the fox cub by the left foreleg so that the tail touches the ground, in order
 to disgrace the beasts.’

- (57) *De šattai fas idit; diibmodahkki manai fas gávpogii dego ohcanvárás
 dinesa ja barggu.* (LES 2: 198, Guovdageaidnu, Lars Gaino 1878)
De šatta-i fas idit; diibmo-dahkk-i mana-i
 PRT become-PST.3SG again morning clock-make-PTC.PRS go-PST.3SG
fas gávpogi-i dego ohca-nvárás dines-a ja bargg-u.
 again town-ILL as.if seek-nvárás income-GA and work-NMLZ.GA
 ‘Then morning came again; the clockmaker went to town again as if in
 order to seek income and work.’

- (58) *Son manai skihpáriiddis lusa ja sii hálidedje earát maid vuolgit
 vuorusteaset dohko čohkkát bivdinvárás návddi.*
 (MSFOu 61: 21, Máttavuotna, Matti Noste 1930)
Son mana-i skihpár-ii-dd-is lusa ja sii hálid-edje
 3SG go-PST.3SG friend-PL-GA-3SG up.to and 3PL want-PST.3PL
earát-t maid vuolgi-t vuoru-st-easet dohko
 other-PL also leave-INF turn-LOC-3PL thither
čohkká-t bivdi-nvárás návddi.
 sit-INF hunt-nvárás creature.GA
 ‘He went over to his friends, and the others also wanted, in their turn, to
 go and sit there in order to hunt those creatures.’

- (59) *De oažžu nubbi dan guoktásis miela vuohčit piilla dan alla olbmo
 njálbmái, go dat caggastan njálmmis biepmu váldindihhte.*
 (LES 2: 564, Ivvárstádit, Ole Jonsen 1883)
De oažžu nubbi dan guoktás-is miela vuohči-t
 PRT get.3SG other it.GA pair-LOC desire.GA shoot-INF
piilla dan alla olbmo njálbmái-i, go dat
 arrow.GA it.GA high.ATTR man.GA mouth-ILL when it
caggast-an njálmmi-s biepmu váldi-ndihtie.
 gape-PTC.PST mouth.GA-3SG food.GA take-ndihtie
 ‘Now, one of those two decides to shoot an arrow into the mouth of the
 fine gentleman, when he has opened his mouth agape in order to take in
 food.’

It may also be recalled that non-finite formations in *-ndihte* and *-nvárás* have been used and even described as early as the 19th century (Friis 1856: 215; Ylikoski 2004a: 132, 147), so that it is safe to say that they have a rather established status in the language overall. However, even though the non-finite in *-ndihte* is also in frequent everyday use in the daily Saami media (newspapers, radio, television, internet) most of which is located in Norway, sentences such as (23, 27, 56–59) still have a sense of foreignness for many of the Finnish Saami.

As regards the status of the non-finite in *-ndihte* in the continuum-like area of the Saami languages, we seem to be dealing with a phenomenon that has a more or less established status throughout the North Saami area, although the verb form—that is, an independent verb form in opposition to the verbal noun constructions mentioned above—in question appears to have been quite unknown in the neighboring sister languages. As already mentioned in Section 2.2 and Ylikoski (2004a: 122–125; see also H.-H. Bartens 1986: 22), the Torne Saami dialect may be viewed as a kind of transitional zone between the more eastern dialects of North Saami and Lule Saami in the southwest: in the Torne dialect, the North Saami purposive non-finite in *-ndihte* is used in addition to the similar purposive use of the infinitive in *-t* and especially the so-called supine in *-žit* which may be characterized as the default purposive non-finite in Lule Saami. Even though it has been repeatedly stated (Section 2.2 and Ylikoski 2002: 109–112; 2004a) that the outward appearance of the non-finite in *-ndihte* differs from the regular verbal noun constructions with the true, predictable genitive-accusative form (*-ma/-mi dihte*), one of the oldest Torne Saami dialect samples nevertheless does include an idiolect in which the shortened formation *-ndihte* appears to have the unreduced variants *-ma dihte* and *-mi dihte* as well. The idiolect of Ole Jonsen from Ivvárstádit (Example 59 above) also contains purposive constructions (60–61) that differ from verbal noun constructions only syntactically (in having post-verbal objects such as *olbmuid* in 60), and not morphologically (cf. the more expectable *goddalandihte* and *geahččalandihte*):

- (60) ..., *dalle go gárjil leai luovos ja golggai badjeriikka ja mearrariikka badjel goddaleami dihte olbmuid*. (LES 2: 594, Ivvárstádit, Ole Jonsen 1883)
- | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------------|
| <i>dalle</i> | <i>go</i> | <i>gárjil</i> | <i>leai</i> | <i>luovos</i> | <i>ja</i> | <i>golgga-i</i> |
| then | when | enemy | be-PST.3SG | loose | and | wander-PST.3SG |
| <i>badje-riikka</i> | <i>ja</i> | <i>mearra-riikkabadjel</i> | <i>goddal-eami</i> | <i>dihte</i> | | |
| upper-realm.GA | and | sea-realm.GA over | kill(.MOM)-VN.GA | for | | |
- olbmui-d*.
human-PL-GA
- ‘...at the time when the enemy (“Karelians”) were loose and wandered around the upper kingdom and the coastal kingdom in order to kill people.’

- (61) ..., ja de bajádallagođiiga daid luovos geđggiid badjálaga **geahččaleami dihte**, goabbá lea gievrerat,... (LES 2: 682, Ivvárstádit, Ole Jonsen 1883)
- ja de bajádalla-gođi-i-ga da-i-d luovos
 and PRT lift.up.frequently-INCH-PST-3DU it-PL-GA loose
 geđggi-i-d badjálaga geahččal-eami dihte, goabbá
 rock-PL-GA one.upon.the.other clarify-VN.GA for which
 lea gievrera-t
 be.3SG strong-CMPR
 ‘...and they began to pile those loose rocks one upon the other in order to find out who was the strongest.’

For the sake of completeness, it must certainly be mentioned that even though I only became aware of non-finite constructions of the type *-ma/-mi dihte* and a following object (60–61) after my original papers (Ylikoski 2002, 2004a) were published, I have come across a few instances of the above-mentioned constructions in the contemporary written language as well. Even though it may be best to regard sentences such as (62–63) only as dubious exceptions among the many thousands of *-ndihte* forms in the same research material, it is worth noting that even those language users who have ended up expressing themselves with unitary word forms such as <*loktemadihte*> (62) and <*dustemadihte*> (63)—that is, in place of the predictable *loktendihte* and *dustendihte*—seem to have felt that these constructions really differ from postpositional phrases such as *daid ealahusaid loktema dihte* ‘because of the strengthening of these livelihoods’ and *dán positiivlaš ovdánahttima dustema dihte* ‘because of meeting the positive development’:

- (62) *Muhto mis lea[t] maid mánga ealahusat nugo eanandoallu, bivdu, guolasteapmi ja sáhtta maid lasihit turismma dasa, main ii leat doaibma-plána ii sámedikkis, ii guhtege bellodagas dahje organisašuvnnas, mii čajeha got galgá bargat **loktemadihte** daid ealahusaid ja oažžut virggalaš dovddastusa daid ovddas, lohka Håkan Jonsson.* (<http://www.samiradio.org/article.php?articleID=12780> 16.2.2008 [2.4.2003])
- Muhto mi-s leat maid mánga ealahusa-t nugo*
 but 1PL-LOC be.3PL also many livelihood-PL such.as
eanan-doall-u, bivdu, guolast-eapmi ja sáhtta maid
 land-hold-NMLZ hunt-NMLZ fish-VN and may.3SG also
lasih-it turismma da-sa, ma-i-n ii lea-t
 add-INF tourism.GA it-ILL REL-PL-LOC NEG.3SG be-CONN
doaibma-plána ii sáme-dikki-s, ii guhtege
 action-plan NEG.3SG Saami-parliament-LOC NEG.3SG any

bellodaga-s dahje organisašuvnna-s, mii čajeh-a got galgá
 party-LOC or organization-LOC REL show-3SG how must.3SG
barga-t loktemadihte da-i-d ealahusa-i-d ja oažžu-t
 work-INF raise-madihte it-PL-GA livelihood-PL-GA and get-INF
virggalaš dovddastus-a da-i-d ovddas, lohká Håkan Jonsson.
 official recognition-GA it-PL-GA for say.3SG Håkan Jonsson
 ‘But we also have many forms of livelihood such as agriculture, hunting,
 fishing, and one may also add tourism to those forms, for which neither
 the Saami Parliament nor any of the political parties or organizations
 has an action plan, and from this it can be seen that we must strive to
 strengthen these forms of livelihood and gain for them official recogni-
 tion, says Håkan Jonsson.’

- (63) *Dustemadihte dán positiivvalaš ovdánahttima, fertet sáhttit fállat*
orronbáikkiid ođđa ássiide. (<http://web3.custompublish.com/getfile.php/374334.743.fubqvetrw/kommunenytt+II+2006.pdf> 13.12.2007)
Duste-madihte dán positiivvalaš ovdánahtti-m-a, ferte-t
 confront-madihte this.GA positive develop-VN-GA must-1PL
sáhtti-t fálla-t orro-n-báikki-i-d ođđa ássi-i-de.
 be.able-INF offer-INF dwell-VN-place-PL-GA new inhabitant-PL-ILL
 ‘In order to respond to positive development, we must be able to offer
 accommodation to new inhabitants.’

However, the idiolect of the above-mentioned Ole Jonsen (59–61) also contains less ambiguous verbal noun constructions in which “objects” are expressed with prenominal genitive(-accusative) attributes (64). Moreover, the intermediate status of the very same dialect is further underlined by the simultaneous existence of the semantically identical supine in sentences such as (65):

- (64) *Nuppi juovlabeaivvi iđidis vulge su olbmot su ohcama dihte dohko, gosa*
son leai suhkan, ja sii gávdne vancca.
 (LES 2: 370, Ivvárstádit, Ole Jonsen 1883)
Nuppi juovla-beaivvi iđid-is vulge su
 second.GA Christmas-day.GA morning-LOC leave.PST.3PL 3SG.GA
olbmo-t su ohca-m-a dihte dohko, gosa son lea-i
 human-PL 3SG.GA seek-VN-GA for thither whither 3SG be-PST.3SG
suhka-n, ja sii gávdne vancca.
 row-PTC.PST and 3PL find.PST.3PL boat.GA
 ‘On the morning of Boxing Day her kin went to seek her at the place to
 which she had rowed, and they found the boat.’

- (65) ..., *ahte dat sápmelaččat, gosa son leai vuolgán gearjideažžat, leat váldán ja goddán dan gearjid[eaddji gerega, ja...*

(LES 2: 370, Ivvárstádit, Ole Jonsen 1883)

ahte dat sápmelačča-t, gosa son lea-i vuolga-n
 COMP it.PL Saami-PL whither 3SG be-PST.3SG leave-PTC.PST
gearjid-eažžat, lea-t váldá-n ja goddá-n dan
 beg-SUP be-3PL take-PTC.PST and kill-PTC.PST it.GA
gearjid-eaddji gerega, ja
 beg-PTC.PRS old.woman-GA and
 ‘...that those Saami to whom she had gone to beg killed this beggar woman, and...’

It is also good to confirm in this context that the non-finite in *-ndihte* indeed seems to lack similarly established verbal counterparts (i.e., formations independent of the verbal noun) in the neighboring Saami languages: As mentioned in Ylikoski (2004a: 148), the patient of the Inari Saami *V-m tiet* [V-VN(.NOM/GEN/ACC) for] is regularly a genitive attribute that precedes the verbal noun. Prenominal plural accusatives such as *poosijd kiirjijd in poosi-j-d kiirji-j-d viežžá-m tiet* [holy-PL-ACC book-PL-ACC retrieve-VN.GEN for] ‘in order to retrieve the holy books’ mentioned in Ylikoski (2004a: 148; occurring originally in MSFOu 167: 337) cannot be found in the literary Inari Saami, although they are not entirely unique in the dialect material (66) where it is also possible to come across similar constructions that may be interpreted as having clausal objects (67):

- (66) *Tääl mun poottim tuu vievsás reengá aappijd uáinim tiet.*

(MSFOu 167: 233, Aanaar, Iisakki Mannermaa 1886)

Tääl mun pootti-m tuu vievsás reengá
 now 1SG come-PST.1SG 2SG.GEN strong.ATTR hired.man.GEN
aappi-j-d uáini-m tiet.
 strength-PL-ACC see-VN.GEN for
 ‘Now I came, in order to see the strength of your strong servant.’

- (67) *Te jurdelij, it sun kal kyellin muttá jieijás já mana vääрпи siisá, ko toh keesih, keččalim tiet, it sun kal kyevti kárbá kooskân piäsá ige taarbâš kodettid jieijas nyettipootân moonnamááin.*

(MSFOu 167: 251, Aanaar, Juho Petteri Lusmaniemi 1886)

Te jurdel-ij, it sun kal kyelli-n
 PRT think(.MOM)-PST.3SG COMP 3SG to.be.sure fish-ESS
muttá jieijá-s já mana vääрпи siisá, ko
 change.3SG REFL.ACC-3SG and go.3SG fishing.place.GA into as
to-h keesi-h, keččal-im tiet, it sun kal kyevti
 it-PL pull-3PL try-VN.GEN for COMP 3SG to.be.sure two.GEN

kárbá kooská-n piäsá i=ge taarbáš
 boat.GEN middle-ILL get.3SG NEG.3SG=and need.CONNEG
kode-tt-id jieija-s nyetti-pootâ-n moonna-m-ááin.
 catch-CAUS-INF REFL.ACC-3SG seine-bottom-ILL go-VN-COM
 ‘Then it struck her that she would turn herself into a fish and go to the
 fishing area when the others were pulling in [the seine], in order to try, to
 be sure, to get into the middle of the two boats, and need not get killed by
 going to the bottom of the seine.’

As regards Skolt Saami—the other neighboring sister language east of North Saami—the example *puõccu-i-d jeä’lte-m diõtt* [reindeer-PL-ACC(!) keep-VN.GEN because] ‘because of keeping reindeer’ mentioned by Korhonen (1974: 29) and Ylikoski (2004a: 148–149) appears to remain a hapax legomenon in all of the dialectal and literary language material I have become acquainted with.

On the other hand, it is quite interesting to take a look at the western side of the North Saami area as well. Namely, in spite of the full productivity and the considerable frequency of the purposive supine in *-tjit/-tjät* in Lule Saami, one still occasionally comes across non-finites in *-mdiehti*, that is, formations fully analogous to the *-ndihte* in North Saami:

- (68) *Bådådjo allaskåvllå vaddá ietjas studentajda tjehpudagáv ja máhtukvuodav mij sijáv dáhkkida bargatjit mijá guovte-kultuvralasj sebrudagán, ja bargatjit nannim diehti sáme dutkamav ja guoradallamav allaskåvlån ja Árran julevsáme guovdátjin Divtasvuonan*
 (<http://www.nsr.no/Files/MidtreNordland.pdf> 25.1.2007)
Bådådjo alla-skåvllå vaddá ietja-s studenta-j-da
 Bådådjo.GEN high.ATTR-school give.3SG REFL.GEN-3SG student-PL-ILL
tjehpudagá-v ja máhtukvuoda-v mij sijá-v dáhkkid-a
 competence-ACC and proficiency-ACC REL 3PL-ACC qualify-3SG
barga-tjit mijá guovte-kultuvralasj sebrudagá-n, ja barga-tjit
 work-SUP 1PL.GEN two.GEN-cultural society-INE and work-SUP
nanni-m diehti sáme dutka-m-av ja guoradalla-m-av
 strengthen-*mdiehti* Saami study-VN-ACC and analyze-VN-ACC
alla-skåvlå-n ja Árran julev-sáme guovdátj-in
 high.ATTR-school-INE and Árran Lule-Saami center-INE
Divtasvuona-n
 Divtasvuodna-INE
 ‘Bådådjo/Bodø University College offers its students competence and
 a proficiency that prepares them for work in our bicultural society, and
 provides work designed to strengthen the Saami studies at the University
 College and Árran Lule Saami Center at Divtasvuodna/Tysfjord.’

- (69) *Dát sisadná pensumgirjálásjuodav ja lågådallamijt ávddánahttet aktan Bodø Allaskåvlåjn, ja Nordlándá sáme guovdátjijn teknihkalasj vædtsagijt ávddánahttet váj máhtti duosstot studentajt áhpadahttemdiehti sáme ja álgoálmukássjij birra, oanep ájggegåvdajn.*

(<http://web3.custompublish.com/getfile.php/528944.927.sppbvdbprt/Jahkediehto+06.pdf> 18.12.2007)

Dát sisadná pensum-girjálásjuoda-v ja lågådalla-m-ij-t
 this include.3SG assignment-literature-ACC and lecture-VN-PL-ACC
ávddánahtte-t aktan Bodø Alla-skåvlå-jn, ja
 develop-INF together Bodø(.GEN) high.ATTR-school-COM and
Nordlándá sáme guovdátj-ij-n teknihkalasj vædtsag-ij-t
 Nordlándá.GEN Saami center-PL-INE technical facility-PL-ACC
ávddánahtte-t váj máhtti duossto-t studenta-j-t
 develop-INF in.order.that be.able.3PL welcome-INF student-PL-ACC
áhpadahttemdiehti sáme ja álgoálmuk-ássji-j
 teach-CAUS-mdiehti Saami and indigenous.people-matter-PL.GEN
birra, oanep ájggegåvda-j-n.
 about short-CMPR time-period-PL-INE

‘This includes the development of textbooks and lectures in collaboration with Bådådđjo/Bodø University College, as well as the development of technical facilities at the Saami centers in Nordlándá/Nordland so that they will be able to welcome students in order to be taught about Saami and indigenous affairs in shorter periods.’

In light of occasional orthographic units such as *áhpadahttemdiehti* (69), it seems plausible to label this formation as the “non-finite in *-mdiehti*” (i.e., instead of *<-m diehti>*). Exactly like the North Saami *-ndiehtte*, the Lule Saami non-finites in *-mdiehti* are not formally based on the predictable genitive forms (*nannima*, *áhpadahttema*) of the verbal noun but on the shortened variants that are not always identical to the nominative either. Furthermore, as Lule Saami has preserved the distinction between the genitive and accusative cases, it can be seen that the non-finites in *-mdiehti* are clearly followed by accusative objects (*sáme dutkamav ja guoradallamav* in Example 68 pro genitive *sáme dutkama ja guoradallama*) in contrast to the genitival attributes of the more common and most predictable verbal noun constructions exemplified in (70):

- (70) *Ja sujna guhti munji hálaj lij gállemihitto, stáda ja uvsaj ja muvra mihtti-ma diehti.* (ÅT: Revelation 21:15; cf. the North Saami counterpart of this example in Ylikoski 2004a: 108)

Ja sujna guhti munji hálaj lij
 and 3SG.INE who 1SG.ILL speak-PST.3SG be-PST.3SG

gálle-mihtto, stáda ja uvsa-j ja muvra
 gold-measure city.GEN and door-PL.GEN and wall.GEN
mihhti-m-a diehti.
 measure-VN-GEN because
 ‘And the one who spoke to me had a gold measuring rod for measuring
 the city, its gates and its wall.’

Even though the non-finite in *-mdiehti* appears to be a rather marginal phenomenon in Lule Saami—sentences such as (68–69) have not been reported in any of the previous studies on Saami non-finites and they also appear to be unknown in the classical language of dialect texts (such as those published in LES 2) where the supine is used instead—and one may even be tempted to regard some instances as direct calques from North Saami (although I have not found concrete evidence for this), it is remarkable that all Lule Saami non-finites in *-mdiehti* (68–69) differ from verbal noun constructions (70) both in terms of morphology and syntax. I have not found intermediate constructions like those of Torne Saami (60–61) even though such constructions ought to be quite predictable transitional formations if viewed from a diachronic dialectological perspective.

To conclude this brief dialectological survey of the background of the North Saami non-finite in *-ndihte* and its relations with the regular verbal noun constructions, the coordination of such non-finites does not reveal significant differences between the modern literary language and the spoken language either. It was noted in Ylikoski (2004a: 112–113, 136–141) that two or more non-finites in *-ndihte* may be coordinated either “normally” or the coordination may involve a sort of conjunction reduction that can easily be regarded as a trace of the internal syntax of those adpositional phrases in which this verb form originated. This means that instead of a synchronically more predictable way of producing non-finite clauses such as *nanne-ndihte ja ovddid-andihte vuoseh-angiela* [strengthen-*ndihte* and develop-*ndihte* show-VN-language.GA] ‘in order to strengthen and develop the sign language’, it is also possible to use a reduced variant, that is, *nannen- ja ovddidandihte vuoseh-angiela* ‘id.’ (see the original example in Ylikoski 2004a: 113). As shown by the following examples, this kind of variation (71–72 vs. 73–74) occurred even in the spoken North Saami of the 19th and the early 20th century:

(71) *De ledje guokte rivttes olbmo váldojuvvon gitta dain beatnat-njunne-turkkain buoidudan- ja borrhándihitii.*

(MSFOu 61: 65, Máttavuotna, Piera Guttormsen 1930)

De le-dje guokte rivttes olbmo váld-ovejvo-n
 PRT be-PST.3PL two real.ATTR human.GA take-PASS-PTC.PST

gitta da-i-n beatnat-njunne-turkka-i-n buoidud-an- ja
 fastened it-PL-LOC dog-nose-Turk-PL-LOC fatten-n- and
borra-ndihtii.
eat-ndihte

‘Now there were two real people that were captured by those dog-faced Turks in order to be fattened and eaten.’

- (72) *De dáhpáhuvai, ahte doavttir fertii muitalit, ahte son lei addán dan ráv-
 vaga dutnje dalle dušše bilkidan- ja nárreredandihte; “muhto dáidá leat
 šaddan dutnje ávkin.”* (LES 2: 272, Guovdageaidnu, Lars Gaino 1878)
De dáhpáhuva-i, ahte doavttir ferti-i muital-it, ahte
 PRT happen-PST.3SG COMP doctor must-PST.3SG tell-INF COMP
son le-i addá-n dan rávvag-a dutnje dalle
 3SG be-PST.3SG give-PTC.PST it.GA advice-GA 2SG.ILL then
dušše bilkid-an- ja nárrered-andihte; “muhto dáidá lea-t
 only mock-n and ridicule-ndihte but may.3SG be-INF
šadda-n dutnje ávki-n.”
 become-PTC.PST 2SG.ILL benefit-ESS
 ‘Then it happened that the doctor had to relate how he had given this
 advice to him at that time only in order to mock and ridicule him, [adding
 that] “But it seems to have been good for you.”’

- (73) *De oinnii son, ahte sii ledje viggan ráhkadit moadde lahta dakŋasiin ja
 lavnnjiin suhkandihte dahje vuodjandihte daiguin gáddái;...*
 (LES 2: 606, Kárášjohka, G. Balke, 1880s)
De oinni-i son, ahte sii le-dje vigma-n ráhkad-it
 PRT see-PST.3SG 3SG COMP 3PL be-PST.3PL try-PTC.PST build-INF
moadde lahta dakŋas-ii-n ja lavnnji-i-n suhka-ndihte
 couple(NOM) raft.GA twig-PL-LOC and turf-PL-LOC row-ndihte
dahje vuodja-ndihte da-i-guin gáddái;
 or swim-ndihte it-PL-COM shore-ILL
 ‘Then he saw that they had tried to build some rafts from twigs and turf
 in order to row or float ashore with them.’

- (74) *..., son čiehkádii suollemasat uvnna duohkáii viessočihkii gullandihte ja
 oaidnindihte, movt álgá dat buotdiehtti doavttir meannudit daid ruđaid
 birra.* (LES 2: 268, Guovdageaidnu, Lars Gaino 1878)
son čiehkád-ii suollemasa-t uvnna duohká-i viesso-čihki-i
 3SG hide-PST.3SG secret-ADV oven.GA back-ILL house-corner-ILL
gulla-ndihte ja oaidni-ndihte, movt álgá dat buot-dieht-i
 hear-ndihte and see-ndihte how begin.3SG it all-know-PTC.PRS

doavttir meannud-it da-i-d ruđa-i-d birra.
 doctor act-INF it-PL-GA money-PL-GA about

‘...she hid herself secretly behind the oven in the corner of the house in order to hear and see how the omniscient doctor would act concerning the money.’

The role of the above-mentioned optional conjunction reduction will be discussed in the wider context of similar phenomena in North Saami morphology in Section 3.1.5.

The non-finite in *-ndihte* was clearly in wide use even in the spoken language of previous centuries, although it appears to me that it has been increasingly used at the expense of the variant *-nvárás* (57–58). As regards the very emergence of this new category, it appears that in spite of the etymological transparency of the suffixes *-ndihte* and *-nvárás*, the existing dialect material does not enable us to identify a specific place or time of birth of this most obviously North Saami innovation. The only qualitatively significant—albeit quite superficial—change in the use of these formations appears to have taken place in the contemporary literary language where this formation is increasingly being written as an undivided whole instead of two orthographically independent word forms.

I have not conducted any systematic research on the various stages of the literary language, as such a study would require entirely different research material. However, even though all previous grammars and other descriptions of these forms constantly describe *V-n* and *dihte* as consisting of two separate word forms—and this practice seems to be strictly followed at least in the non-fiction books published so far—the same formations are nowadays quite commonly written as single word forms in newspapers and other daily media. For example, in a sample of about 150 issues of the newspaper *Min Áigi* from 1995 and 1997 (see Section 1.3), the non-finite *<-ndihte>* occurs 17 times and *<-ndihtii>* 7 times, even though the variants *<-n dihte>* (65 occurrences), *<-n dihtii>* (25) and *<-n várás>* (1) are nearly four times more frequent. In the absence of a more recent corpus, my intuition says that these ratios are much the same in the newspapers of 2008; see also the figures revealed by a Google search mentioned at the end of Section 3.1.4 below.

As it would appear that the still most common orthographical practice of regarding *V-n* and *dihte* as separate words is held as an implicit standard even in the most recent educational literature on North Saami, this issue of two alternative orthographies and possibly different analyses under the external surface will be discussed further in Section 4.2.2.

3.1.2.2. The instrumental converb in *-miin* and related phenomena in North Saami and its nearest relatives

The description of another “new” non-finite presented in the original study (Ylikoski 2002), that is, the converb of means (*-miin*), did not involve special problems although the form in question has previously been regarded plainly as a comitative case form of the verbal noun. Indeed, the converb in *-miin* is still formally identical to its origins, and it does not have unambiguous signs of semantic independence either, since one of the core functions of the comitative case is to express the means or instruments of the actions denoted by the predicate verb (cf. Example 1 in Section 2.1). This means that the only feature that clearly distinguishes the converb from its nominal origins is its ability to take post-verbal objects and other arguments and modifiers typical to verbs but not to nouns. As regards the claimed independence of the non-finite in *-miin*, the revisionist view expressed in Ylikoski (2002; repeated in 2004a: 93, 96–98; 2006a: 18, 34–35) has also been endorsed by Pekka Sammallahti in his recent monograph on Saami syntax (2005: 161, 274–275) where this verb form is characterized as a “converb modifier” (*konvearbamodifikáhtor*) on a par with its negative counterpart, the verb abessive in *-keahtta*.

Not unlike in the description of the converb in *-ndihte* (Ylikoski 2004a), the basis of the original study of the converb in *-miin* (Ylikoski 2002) was almost exclusively synchronic. It was only cursorily suggested, in the absence of concrete diachronic or dialectological research, that the verb form in *-miin* may have acquired its independence from the verbal noun construction as a consequence of the gradual morphological, syntactic and semantic erosion and loss of productivity of the verb genitive that has traditionally been considered an “original” Saami converb with various non-temporal semantic functions, that is, means, manner and concomitance but whose formation and use is nowadays largely limited to certain lexicalized expressions, mostly adverbs of manner (see especially Korhonen 1974: 191–196 and Ylikoski 2002: 88–97, 149–151). On the other hand, it was also noted that the “predictable” occurrences of the verb genitive, that is, those predictable in light of the accounts of previous grammarians, have also at times been replaced by the gerund in *-dettiin*, the verb form that primarily expresses the simultaneity of two events. It is quite customary to come across sentences such as (75) with the verb forms *čadah-ettiin* [pass-GER] and *studere-miin* [study-CONV] accompanied by objects (*dán guhkes sámegiela linjjá*) and adverbial modifiers (*viššalit*), whereas it seems virtually impossible to encounter verb genitives in similar contexts (75’):

- (75) *Dán guhkes sáme-gielalinjja čadahettiin ja viššalit studeremiin*
lea of[a]hppis buorre vejolašvuohta čadahit almmola[s] sáme-giela
gielladutkosa. (Min Áigi 15.7.2005, p. 7)

Dán guhkes sáme-giela-linjja čadah-ettiin ja
 this.GA long.ATTR Saami-language.GA-program.GA pass-GER and
viššal-it studere-miin lea oahppi-s buorre vejolašvuohta
 diligent-ADV study-CONV be.3SG student-LOC good possibility
čadah-it almmolaš sáme-giela giella-dutkos-a.
 pass-INF public Saami-language.GA language-exam-GA
 ‘By passing the long Saami language program and studying diligently,
 the student will have good chances of passing the official language
 exam.’

- (75') *??/*Dán guhkes sáme-gielalinjja čadat [pass.VGEN] ja viššalit studere*
[study.VGEN] lea oahppis buorre vejolašvuohta čadahit almmolaš sáme-
giela gielladutkosa.

The marginality or downright ungrammaticality of verb genitive clauses such as (75') does not become evident in the previous literature where the verbality—for example, the possibilities of taking objects—of the verb genitive has not been discussed explicitly. As mentioned in Ylikoski (2002: 89), the verb genitive has been almost unanimously regarded as one of the verb forms, with the exception of Nielsen (1926: 182–183) and Erkki Itkonen (1960: 72) whose description of the formation is slightly separate from that of the other non-finites. Also, Sammallahiti (2005: 161) describes the use of the formation *čuoigga* [ski.VG] ‘skiing, on skis’ as a so-called adverb modifier (*advearbamodifikáhtor*) among other adverbs (e.g. *nu* ‘so’, *čábbá-t* [beautiful-ADV] ‘beautifully’), in opposition to the use of the converbs in *-miin* and *-keahtá* as so-called converb modifiers.²⁹

²⁹ In Ylikoski (2002: 89), it was shown that the verb genitive may also occur in certain adverb-like expressions of states, such as with the preposition *lahka* ‘near’ in the phrase *lahka jámi* [near die.VG] ‘about to die’. Another type of semantically related (proximative) function of the verb genitive is its infrequent occurrence in more or less lexicalized reduplicative constructions as seen in the following sentence:

- (i) *Olbmot orrot oal[á]t baláskan, soapmásat orrot ge duodai navdimin ahte dákkár stáhta lea*
njulgestaga boadi boadi dahje jo gahča gahča. (Min Áigi 14.2.1997, p. 3)
Olbmo-t orro-t oalát balásk-an, soapmás-at orro-t=ge duodai
 human-PL seem-3PL fully frighten-PTC.PST some-PL seem-3PL=indeed really
navdi-min ahte dákkár stáhta lea njulgestaga boadi boadi
 suppose-ACTESS COMP of.this.kind state be.3SG downright come.VG come.VG
dahje jo gahča gahča.
 or already fall.VG fall.VG
 ‘People appear to be quite alarmed, and some actually seem to believe that such a [Saami] state
 will really be established soon (“is coming-coming”), or is already on the verge of being created
 (“is falling-falling”).’

In addition to the lexicalized expression *čárvvu čalmmi-i-d* (~ <*čárvvu čalmmiid* ~ *čárvvučalmmiid* ~ *čárvvočalmmiid*>) [clamp.VG eye-PL-GA] ‘with one’s eyes clamped shut’ discussed in Ylikoski (2002: 93–94, 113, 144, 160 n. 15), I am aware of only two clear instances of a verb genitive followed by an object. One of them occurs at least twice in the linguistic discussion of the North Saami non-finite constructions (76), and the other can be found in a novel written in the Torne Saami dialect that differs from the standard literary North Saami in many other respects as well (77):

(76) *Máhtte vulggii njurggu čappa nuohta.*

(Nickel 1994: 407; O. H. Magga 2007: 282)

Máhtte vulggi-i njurggu čappa nuohta.

Máhtte leave-PST.3SG whistle.VGEN pretty.ATTR tune.GA

‘Máhtte went away, whistling a pretty tune.’

(77) *De lávlo ovtta lávlaga, ja bohte guotti giissá olggos.* (Einejord 1986: 76)

De lávlo ovtta lávlag-a, ja bohte guotti

PRT sing.PST.3PL one.GA song-GA and come.PST.3PL carry.VGEN

giissá olggos.

coffin.GA out

‘Then they sang a song, and came out carrying the coffin.’

It was also remarked in Ylikoski (2002: 148–152) that, if it can be assumed that North Saami is in a process of replacing the verb genitives (75') with other non-finites (75), the rise of the converb in *-miin* and the semantic expansion of the gerund seem to have parallels in the neighboring Finnic languages where the converb in **-ten* has lost ground to the all-Finnic simultaneous converb in **-tesna/-tesnä* on the one hand and the newer converb of means in *-malla/-mällä* on the other. Now, in turning to the historical background of the modern North Saami converb in *-miin*, it is quite possible to assume that this verb form gained its independence somewhat recently, and it is especially the Finnic (Finnish-Karelian) verb form in *-malla* that seems to have triggered or at least accelerated the emergence of a nearly identical converb form in the Saami languages.

To return to the language of the dialect samples introduced in the previous Section 3.1.2.1, the essence and status of the non-finites in *-miin* in these registers can be illustrated by the following examples:

- (78) *Iskamiinhan dan boahdá diehtit. Iskkakeahtá ii dieđe maidege, muđui go iská meara.*

(MSFOu 117: 218, Unjárga, Robert Persen Marjavaara 1920)

Iska-m-iin=han dan boahdá diehti-t. Iskka-keahtá
 probe-VN-COM=to.be.sure it.GA come.3SG know-INF probe-VABE
ii dieđe ma-i-d-ege, muđui go
 NEG.3SG know.CONNEG anything-PL-GA-STEM otherwise COMP
iská meara.
 probe.3SG sea.GA

‘To be sure, one comes to know it by probing. One will not know anything without probing, only the way that one investigates the sea.’

- (79) *De leai muhtun dálubuoigi, guhte elii eanan-bargguin ja šibit-geassimiin.* (LES 1: 190, Unjárga, Martin Wik 1888)

De lea-i muhtun dálubuoigi, guhte eli-i
 PRT be-PST.3SG some peasant who live-PST.3SG
eanan-bargg-u-in ja šibit-geassi-m-iin.
 land-work-NMLZ-COM and domestic.animal-conduct-VN-COM

‘Now, there was a peasant who lived by crop and animal husbandry.’

- (80) *Ja dainna noaidđastallamiin dahke sii ollu bahás guhtet guimmiidasaset, nu ahte godde sin guimmiideaset dainna noaidđastallamiin.*

(MSFOu 115: 179, Gárasavvon/Ráneš, Henrik Rasthe 1920)

Ja da-inna noaidđastalla-m-iin dahke sii ollu bahás guhte-t
 and it-COM bewitch-VN-COM do.PST.3PL 3PL.much badly REC-PL
guimmi-i-dasa-set, nu ahte godde sin guimmi-i-d-easet
 companion-PL-ILL-3PL SO COMP kill.PST.3PL 3PL.GA companion-PL-GA-3PL
da-inna noaidđastalla-m-iin.
 it-COM bewitch-VN-COM

‘And with this witchcraft they did much evil to each other, so that they killed their companions with the witchcraft.’

As can be predicted, the dialect texts include dozens of comitative forms of the verbal noun, and such constructions almost always express the means of the actions denoted by the main verbs. However, even though these instrumental modifiers may be semantically comparable with indisputable verb forms such as the verb abessive (cf. *iskamiin* ‘by probing’ ~ *iskkkakeahtá* ‘without probing’ in 78), none of the *-miin* constructions of North Saami dialects seem to have clearly verbal features such as objects or even adverbial modifiers like *viššal-it* [diligent-ADV] ‘diligently’ in (75) and those in the examples mentioned in Ylikoski

(2002: 91, 100, 106–107) and in Section 2.2 above (22, 26). Instead, many of the *-miin* constructions such as those in (78–80) exhibit syntactic features of nouns: the patients may have the appearance of the nominative modifier of a compound noun (*šibit-geassi-n* [domestic.animal-conduct-VN] ‘animal husbandry’ : *šibit-geassimiin* ‘by animal husbandry’ just as in *eanan-barg-u* [land-work-NMLZ] : *eanan-bargguin* ‘by crop husbandry’ in 79), or the verbal noun may have pronominal attributes such as *dainna* in (80).

Even though the independent instrumental converb of contemporary literary North Saami seems to lack predecessors in North Saami dialects, this verb form has a very close parallel in Inari Saami where the non-finite in *-má(á)in*, also still formally identical to the comitative form of the verbal noun in *-m*, is used not only in the literary language where it may be followed by unambiguous accusative objects such as *irättäsâid* in (81), but it also occurs in the older dialect samples wherein the accusative object *vahečoolmijd* (82) precedes the converb form. Note also *nyetti-pootâ-n moonna-m-ááin* [seine-bottom-ILL go-VN-COM] ‘by going to the bottom of the seine’ in Example (67) above, although directional modifiers such as the illative *nyettipootân* may possibly be regarded as a modifier of the verbal noun as well.

- (81) *Sivned taid, kiäh huksejeh taan eennâm rähtimáin já hoittámáin irättäsâid já uárnejeh maangásân pargo.* (Kirkkokietâkirje, p. 34)

Sivned ta-i-d, kiä-h hukse-jeh taan eennâm
 bless.IMP.2SG it-PL-ACC who-PL build-3PL this.GEN country.ACC
rähti-máin já hoittámáin irättäsâ-i-d já uárne-jeh
 build-CONV and take.care-CONV company-PL-ACC and provide-3PL
maangásâ-n parg-o.
 many-ILL work-NMLZ.ACC

‘Bless those who are building this nation by establishing and running businesses and providing jobs for many people.’

- (82) *Mun jođám tuoddârân vahečoolmijd puárádâlmááin.*

(MSFOu 167: 177, Aanaar, Mikko Aikio, late 19th century)

Mun jođá-m tuoddârâ-n vahe-čoolmi-j-d puárá-dâl-mááin.
 1SG wander-1SG fell-ILL defect-eye-PL-ACC cure-FREQ-CONV

‘I am going to the fells, curing my diseased eyes.’

Note, however, that unlike the converb in *-miin* in North Saami, *puárádâlmááin* in (82) does not refer to the means of the main action, the journey, but it rather expresses another state of affairs that is only concomitant with the traveling denoted by the main clause. — Needless to say, it is not the purpose of this study

to provide detailed descriptions of the non-finite systems in these other Saami languages.

In comparison to the absence of the *-miin* form in North Saami grammars, it is enlightening to see that even though the standard descriptions of the Inari Saami morphology do not mention an independent verb form in *-má(á)in* either (see e.g. IW 4: 34ff.; Sammallahti & Morottaja 1993: 134ff.; Olthuis 2000: 174ff.), such a form was given an independent status in the first scholarly accounts of the language by Lönnrot (1854: 161ff.) and Andelin (1861: 398ff.), although without any information concerning its semantic functions. Lönnrot (1854: 161) also compares the Inari Saami verb form to the corresponding North Saami formation, but the latter is presented only in brackets as if to indicate its different or unsure status within North Saami morphology. Curiously, when presenting the non-finite in *-má(á)in* or *<-main>*, for example *<toohamain>* pro *tohámáin ~ tohámááin* in the modern orthography, Andelin (1861: 398ff.) also mentions a non-finite verb form in *<-dæppen>* as if such a formation were a sort of variant of the former. Moreover, Lönnrot and Andelin label this category as the “adessive” (*Adessiv[us]*; cf. the Finnish adessive case *-lla/-llä*, also present in the converb of means in *-malla*) even though the *comitative* case (*-in*) of nouns and pronouns is labeled as such. — See also Korhonen (1974: 16) on Lönnrot’s description of Inari Saami non-finites.

To return to North Saami, it deserves mention that even though the converb in *-miin* is not unknown on the northern side of the Finnish-Scandinavian language border³⁰ as evidenced by the Examples (14, 40–42) of Ylikoski (2002: 91, 104–107) and the Example (75) above, it is quite clear to me that most of the unambiguous occurrences of this verb form stem from the idiolects of Finnish-Saami bilinguals. Furthermore, the converb in *-miin* is remarkably frequent in texts translated from Finnish,³¹ whereupon the source construction is usually a non-finite clause containing the converb in *-malla* which, in turn, is a part of the system of non-finites that has much in common with that of Saami and many other Uralic languages, including many non-finites that go back to the various case forms of the Uralic verbal noun in **-mV*. The fact that the present-day North Saami converb in *-miin* has a fully analogous counterpart even in the earliest

³⁰ In other words, the border that roughly divides most of the modern North Saami into those communities who live under the constant influence of the Scandinavian majority languages Norwegian (in the north and west) and Swedish (in the west) and those who live under the influence of the Finnish language (in the south and east) which belongs to the same Uralic language family as the Saami languages.

³¹ This appears to be the case for the Example (39) in Ylikoski (2002: 106) as well, since the Saami translation (1990) of Tove Jansson’s *Pappan och havet* (1965) also has other features that point to the earlier (1965) Finnish translation of the Swedish original. Note also that the Inari Saami *rähtimáin já hoittámáin irättásáid* (81) corresponds to the Finnish original *perusta-malla ja hoita-malla yrityks-i-ä* [establish-CONV and take.care-CONV company-PL-PART] ‘by establishing and running businesses’ (<http://www.evl.fi/kkh/to/kjmk/jp-kirja/tela1.pdf> 29.1.2008).

records of Inari Saami also suggests that the Inari Saami *-má(á)in* may in fact have emerged first and then served as the primary model for the North Saami *-miin* whose use has certainly been continually reinforced, if not initiated, by the Finnish *-malla*.

As for the varieties of North Saami in Sweden, I have not observed any unambiguously verbal *-miin* clauses there (i.e., in the territory of the Torne Saami dialect), not to speak of Lule Saami further to the southwest.

Further support for the hypothesis concerning the Finnish influence on the emergence of the North and Inari Saami non-finites in *-miin* and *-má(á)in* can be found in Skolt Saami and the other easternmost Saami languages, Kildin and Ter Saami, that possess another type of probable calque of the Finnic *-malla*, namely a non-finite in *-eel* that has been considered to have originated in the instrumental case form of the deverbal noun in **-nde*.³² The “instrumental case” marker (*-l*) as such has been regarded as a loan from Northern Finnic in which one of the core functions of the adessive (*-lla/-llä*) is to denote an instrument or means of an action (see e.g. Ravila 1935: 45; Korhonen 1981a: 233). However, the sporadic nature of the actual occurrences of the claimed case suffix suggests that it would be more appropriate to speak of a rather unproductive way of forming adverbs (e.g. Skolt Saami *kuõ’htt* ‘two’ → *kuõi’tee’l* ‘together (two of us/you/them)’, *čâ’lmm* ‘eye’ → *čââ’lme’l* ‘with an eye’) and there seems to be little evidence for assuming that this category was more productive in the earlier stages of these languages. The non-finite in *-eel*, however, is a quite productive verb form at least in Skolt Saami, as exemplified by Examples (83–84) that, not unlike the North and Inari Saami non-finites in *-miin* and *-má(á)in*, are quite straightforward equivalents of the Finnic converb in *-malla*:

- (83) *Nâ de kaav vuõ’lji oocâd, vuejee’l, ääldin.*
 (MSFOu 60: 94, Paaččjokk, Mikko Fedotov, 1920s)
Nâ de kaav vuõ’lji oocâ-d, vuej-ee’l, ääld-in.
 well PRT wife leave.PST.3SG seek-INF ride-CONV reindeer.doe-COM
 ‘Well, the wife went to search [for her husband and son], riding (in a sleigh), with a reindeer doe.’
- (84) *Nâiddooumaž leäi Sââ’rvesvuu’dest, pâi paalveel šee’li.*
 (MSFOu 60: 223, Njuõ’ttjäu’rr, Trifon Gerasimov 1914)
Nâidd-oumaž leä-i Sââ’rvesvuu’de-st, pâi
 shaman-man be-PST.3SG Sââ’rvesvu’vdd-LOC only

³² According to the received view, the gerund in *-dettiin* originated in the locative plural of this deverbal noun (see e.g. Korhonen 1974: 145–157; 1981a: 291–293; Sammallahti 1998b: 86).

paalv-eel *šee'li.*
sacrifice-CONV hunt.PST.3SG

‘In Sää’rvesvu’vdd, there was a shaman who used to hunt only by making offerings.’

Once again, it must be said that non-North Saami verb forms like these need further research, as the non-finite in *-eel* is also occasionally used to express concomitant and simultaneous events and not just the means of the event denoted by the main clause (e.g. *tuâst-eel* [catch-CONV] ‘when catching’, MSFOu 60: 144). However, all these more or less recently emerged instrumental converbs occur in those Saami languages that have had the closest contacts with Northern Finnic, whose converb in *-malla* seems to have offered a formally and functionally useful model for new Saami non-finites to evolve and replace the declining verb genitive, that is, the non-finite that is assumed to date back to the Proto-Saami (*-*n*) in spite of its absence from the easternmost Saami languages which use converb in *-eel* instead (see Korhonen 1974: 155–157, 191–196).

To sum up, the above-described situation is conveniently illustrated in Examples (85a–d) with the Finnish sentence (85a) and its translations into the three Saami languages spoken in Finland. The converb *jakamalla* ‘by dividing’ has been translated using the various converbs discussed above, while the nominal adessive of the instrument *5,94573:lla* ‘by 5.94573’ is always translated using comitative forms:

(<http://www.vm.fi> 18.1.2002)

- (85) a. *Markat muunnetaan euroiksi jakamalla ne 5,94573:lla.*
Marka-t muunne-taan euro-i-ksi jaka-malla ne 5,94573-lla.
mark-PL convert-PASS euro-PL-TRA divide-CONV it.PL 5.94573-ADE
- b. *Márkkít nuppástuhttojit euron juohkimiin daid 5,94573:in.*
Márkki-t nuppástuhtt-o-jit euro-n juohki-miin da-i-d
mark-PL convert-PASS-3PL euro-ESS divide-CONV it-PL-GA
5,94573-in.
5.94573-COM
- c. *Määrkih nubásmittojuh euron jyehimáin taid 5,94573:in.*
Määrki-h nubásmitt-o-juh euro-n jyehi-máin ta-i-d
mark-PL convert-PASS-3PL euro-ESS divide-CONV it-PL-ACC
5,94573-in.
5.94573-COM

- d. *Maa'rk'id mu'tteet eurrân jue'jje'1 tōid 5,94573:in.*
Maa'rk-i-d mu'ttee-t eurrâ-n jue'jj-ee'1 tō-i-d
 mark-PL-ACC convert-IMPR euro-ESS divide-CONV it-PL-ACC
 5,94573-in.
 5.94573-COM
 'Marks are converted to euros by dividing them by 5.94573.'

Finally, it must be added that rather than the converb in *-miin*, earlier literary North Saami possessed another type of non-finite construction in the apparently identical semantic function of expressing the means of the action denoted by the main predicate in the sentence; the construction in *<-m bokte>*, etymologically reminiscent of the non-finite in *-ndihte*, will be discussed below in Section 3.1.3.

3.1.2.3. The non-finite in *-nláhkai* and related phenomena in North Saami and its nearest relatives

As regards the historical background of the somewhat abstruse non-finite in *-nláhkai*, not much can be added to the remarks presented in Ylikoski (2006a) and repeated in Section 2.3 above. Like Ylikoski (2002, 2004a), the original paper was intended to describe the use of this non-finite in the contemporary literary language. However, at the time of writing the paper I was already acquainted with the above-mentioned dialect material as well, for which reason I was also able to make the remark that the participial attributive use of *-nláhkai* is apparently a quite recent phenomenon that is absent in the language of the published dialect samples (Ylikoski 2006a: 32). Otherwise, the dialectal use of this verb form does not differ remarkably from that of the contemporary literary language (86–87); it has been used in optional adverbial modifying functions (88–90) as well as in more “predicative” functions (91–94) as described in Ylikoski (2006a) and Section 2.3 above:

- (86) ...*Gulletgo? garihii Ivvar-Lemet ja fakjalahtii Lemet oalgečalbmai ja girddaldahtii šlivggastan láhkai, jorrahtii moatte geardde birra ja luoitilii.* (Ylikoski 2006a: 27 < E. Guttorm 1981: 202)
Gulle-t=go? garih-ii Ivvar-Lemet ja
 hear-PST.2SG=Q swear.suddenly-PST.3SG Ivvar-Lemet and
fakjalahti-i Lemet oalge-čalbma-i ja girddaldahti-i
 reach.out-PST.3SG Lemet(.GA) shoulder-lobe-ILL and toss-PST.3SG
šlivggast-an láhkai, jorrahtii moatte geardde
 hurl-nláhkai swing-PST.3SG couple.GA times

birra ja luoitil-ii.
 around and let.off-PST.3SG

‘‘Did you hear me?’’ swore Ivvar-Lemet suddenly, grabbed Lemet by the shoulder and tossed him as if by hurling, swung him around a couple of times and let go.’

- (87) *Govvadáidda oahpahunvvo stoahkanláhkai.*

(Ylikoski 2006a: 27 < http://opspro.peda.net/utsjoki/viewer.php3?DB=saame&mode=2&document_id=60 6.4.2005)

Govva-dáidda oahpah-uvvo stoahka-nláhkai.

picture-arts teach-PASS.3SG play-nláhkai

‘The visual arts are taught (as if) through playing.’

- (88) *Čáhci boahotá vancca nala borranládje ja doadjá mannjestávnni duohkáii, muhto ii vancii.* (LES 4: 348, Gáivuotna, Erik Bakkemo 1923)

Čáhci boahotá vancca nala borra-nládje ja doadjá
 water come.3SG boat.GA onto eat-nláhkai and surge.3SG

mannje-stávnni duohká-i, muhto ii vanci-i.

back-post.GA back-ILL but NEG.3SG boat-ILL

‘The water comes over the boat as if devouring it and surges to the back of the sternpost, but not into the boat.’

- (89) *De oáčču son vástádusa buot čeavlámus láchkai, ja velá čudje muhtun sánit bilkidanládje su, earenoamážit dan dáfus go eγγελas gonagasnieida čálii sutnje, ahte su áhči riikkas leat ollu dakkár soalddáhat, go dánska gonagasbárdni lei.* (LES 2: 186, Guovdageaidnu, Lars Gaino 1878)

De oáčču-i son vástádusa buot čeavla-mus láchkai,
 PRT get-PST.3SG 3SG answer.GA all arrogant-SUPERL in.the.manner

ja velá čudje muhtun sáni-t bilkid-anládjesu,
 and yet sound.PST.3PL some word-PL mock-nláhkai 3SG.GA

earenoamáž-it dan dáfus go eγγελas gonagas-nieida
 special-ADV it.GA as.for COMP English king-daughter

čáli-i sutnje, ahte su áhči riikka-s lea-t
 write-PST.3SG 3SG.ILL COMP 3SG.GA father.GA kingdom-LOC be-3PL

ollu dakkár soalddáhat, go dánska gonagas-bárdni le-i.

many such soldier-PL as Danish king-son be-PST.3SG

‘Then he got an answer in the most arrogant manner, and in addition, certain words sounded like mocking him, especially as the English princess wrote him that in her father’s kingdom, there are many soldiers such as was the Danish prince.’

- (90) *De son spižain gáivvastii dohko spáikkastanláhkai gusa guvlui, vai ballá eret su suinniid borramis.*

(LES 2: 398, Kárášjohka, G. Balke < Mattis Isaksen, 1880s)

De son spiža-in gáivvast-ii dohko spáikkast-anláhkai gusa
 PRT 3SG whip-COM swing-PST.3SG thither lash-nláhkai COW.GA
guvlu-i, vai ballá eret su suinni-i-d borra-mis.
 direction-ILL in.order.that fear.3SG away 3SG.GA hay-PL-GA eat-2INF
 ‘Then he swung towards the cow as if by lashing, to scare it away from eating his hay.’

- (91) “*Dego son riepmá hállet gohpu njálbmái jugistanládje, de galggat njoammut guvttiin giedain gohporávdii.*”

(LES 4: 436, Gáivuotna, Erik Persen 1880; cf. Example 32 above)

Dego son riepmá hálle-t gohpu njálbmá-i jugist-anládje,
 as 3SG begin.3SG tip.up-INF cup.GA mouth-ILL drink-nláhkai
de galgga-t njoammu-t guvtti-in gieda-in gohppo-rávdii.
 PRT must-2SG adhere-INF two-COM hand-COM cup-rim-ILL
 ‘As I begin [i.e., “he begins”] to tip up the cup to my mouth in order to take a gulp, then you must grab the rim of the cup with both hands.’

- (92) “*Dat ii leat imaš, jos dakkár albmás golli ja silba mihtidanláhkai fire-giid mielde, go gárdinge lea gollehuvvon olggul.*”

(LES 1: 82, Unjárga [< Anár], Johan Johnsen Aikio 1891)

Dat ii lea-t imaš, jos dakkár albmá-s golli
 it NEG.3SG be-CONNeg wonder if such man-LOC gold
ja silba mihtid-anláhkai fireg-ii-d mielde, go
 and silver measure-nláhkai firkin-PL-GA with as
gárdin=ge lea golleh-uvvo-n olggul.
 mansion=also be.3SG gild-PASS-PTC.PST from.outside
 ‘No wonder, if such a man has gold and silver to the extent that it can be measured in firkins, as even the mansion has been covered with gold.’

- (93) *Ja soai durddideigga dan vuoras bártni stevveliid ja bijaiga soai muoraid ala veallut goikanláhkai.*

(MSFOu 117: 141–142, Unjárga, Nils Mosessen 1920)

Ja soai durddid-ei-gga dan vuoras bártni stevvel-ii-d ja
 and 3DU stain-PST-3DU it.GA aged son.GA boot-PL-GA and
bija-i-ga soai muora-i-d ala veallut goika-nláhkai.
 put-PST-3DU 3DU wood-PL-GA onto on.one’s.side dry-nláhkai
 ‘And they stained the old bachelor’s boots and put them on the woods to dry.’

- (94) *Ihkku bijai son dan liikki jáffu-pakklusii čuožžut, ja stuorra ákšu orui gieđas čuolastanláhkai, ja dahpai uvssa gitta,...*

(LES 1: 200, Unjárga [< Anár], Johan Johnsen Aikio 1891)

Ihkku *bija-i* *son* *dan* *liikki* *jáffu-pakklus-i*
 by.night put-PST.3SG 3SG it.GA corpse.GA flour-warehouse-ILL
čuožžut, ja *stuorra* *ákšu oru-i* *gieđa-s*
 standing and large.ATTR ax be.located-PST.3SG hand-LOC
čuolast-anláhkai, ja *dahpa-i* *uvssa* *gitta,*
 strike-nláhkai and block-PST.3SG door.GA shut

‘By night he took the corpse into the flour warehouse in a standing position, with a big ax in its hands to strike with, and he locked the door,...’

Most of the converbal *-nláhkai* forms both in the literary language as well as in the dialect texts appear to have irrealis, simulative meanings (see the translations of Examples 86 ‘as if by hurling’, 87 ‘as if through playing’, 88 ‘as if devouring’, 89 ‘like mocking’ and 90 ‘as if by lashing’; cf. also Examples 36–37 above). In uses of this kind, the meaning of the non-finite in *-nláhkai* apparently stems from the original semantic function of the postposition *láhkai* ‘in the manner of’, and most of the *-nláhkai* forms in Examples (86–91) could rather easily be conceived as answers to the question *man láhkai?* [INT.GA in.the.manner] ‘in what manner?’.

As regards the so-called predicative use of *-nláhkai*, the inner semantics of the verb form is oriented towards many kinds of participants, for example, patients (92), themes (93) and instruments (94), in dialects as well, although it appears that there are certain quantitative differences between the traditional, dialectal use and the current literary use of this verb form; most significantly, the role of the optional adverbial functions of *-nláhkai* clauses has decreased at the expense of predicative, especially patient-oriented functions of the verb form (see Examples 30–32, 35). However, due to the continuum-like nature of the phenomena in question, it would be impossible to present exact calculations on the various functions of *-nláhkai*. For example, the *-nláhkai* constructions in Examples (32) and (92) may be analyzed as having not only predicative but also somewhat adverbial functions.

Not unlike the development of the converb in *-miin* under the influence of Finnish non-finites, the changes in the use of *-nláhkai* appear to reflect the influence of Finnish passive participial constructions, since patient-oriented predicative, and attributive (see Section 3.2.2), functions of this verb form are increasingly common in texts written by the bilingual Finnish Saami and most notably in texts that are translated from Finnish (see Ylikoski 2006a: 31–33). On the other hand, as Examples (88–94) from the dialect material show, the non-finite in *-nláhkai* has clearly existed in the language for more than a century, and this

is also manifested in the earlier stages of written North Saami (95–96); Example (97) is apparently the first scholarly account of this construction:

- (95) *Go mi leimmet geargan rátkimis ja leimmet ráhkadan guvttiide **vuodje-***
lan ládje, de mon rohttejin viidneláskku, mi mus leai ozas, ja...

(Hætta & Bær 1982: 78)

Go mi le-i-mmet gearga-n rátki-mis ja
when 1PL be-PST-1PL have.time-PTC.PST detach-2INF and
le-i-mmet ráhkad-an guvtti-i-de vuodjel-an ládje, de
be-PST-1PL prepare-PTC.PST two-PL-ILL ride-nláhkai PRT
mon rohtte-ji-n viidne-láskku, mi mu-s lea-i
1SG pull-PST-1SG liquor-bottle.GA REL 1SG-LOC be-PST.3SG
oza-s, ja
jacket.pouch-LOC and

‘As we were done with separating the reindeer and had prepared ourselves to ride off in two directions, I pulled out of my jacket pouch a bottle of liquor, and...’

- (96) *De vulgi Sodoma gonagas olgus ja Gomorra gonagas ja Adma gonagas ja Seboim gonagas ja Bela, dat læ Soar, gonagas ja divvu ječaidæsek **soattam-lagje** sin vuostai Siddim vuomest, (Bibal: Genesis 14:8)*

De vulgi Sodoma gonagas olgus ja Gomorra gonagas ja
PRT leave.PST.3SG Sodom king out and Gomorrah king and
Adma gonagas ja Seboim gonagas ja Bela, dat læ
Admah king and Zeboiim king and Bela it be.3SG
Soar, gonagas ja divvu ječa-i-d-æsek soatta-mlagje
Zoar king and fix.PST.3PL REFL-PL-GA-3PL fight-nláhkai
sin vuostai Siddim vuome-st,
3PL.GA against Siddim valley-LOC

‘Then the king of Sodom, the king of Gomorrah, the king of Admah, the king of Zeboiim and the king of Bela (that is, Zoar) marched out and made themselves ready to fight them in the Valley of Siddim.’

- (97) *Várjal mu, (dasgo) **gahččanláhkai** mun lean!* (Stockfleth 1832: 268)

Várjal mu, (dasgo) gahčča-nláhkai mun lea-n!
protect.IMP.2SG 1SG.GA (because) fall-nláhkai 1SG be-1SG
‘Take care of me, as I am about to fall!’

As regards the independence of the formation that I have labeled as “the non-finite verb form in *-nláhkai*”, I wish to substantiate my claim (Ylikoski 2006a:

33–35) that the formation in question has for long had a number of morphological and semantic features that distinguish it from the virtually non-existent true postpositional phrases with a genitive-accusative (*V-ma/-mi*) dependent and a meaning confined to the expression of manner or resemblance. As for the syntax of *-nláhkai*, it was already explained in Section 2.3 (and Ylikoski 2006a: 34) that its mainly patient-oriented character makes it difficult to come across sentences in which the idea of the independent verbal nature of *-nláhkai* would be confirmed by verbal syntax, most unambiguously manifested in post-verbal objects (see Example 34' and the discussion there), but the internal syntax of clauses such as *bilkidanládje su* 'like mocking him' (89) and *soattam-lagje sin vuostai Siddim vuomest* 'ready to fight them in the Valley of Siddim' (96) affirm that *-nláhkai* possessed verb-like features as early as the 19th century, at least (see also Lagercrantz 1929: 51; Ylikoski 2006a: 20, 34).

To conclude my description of North Saami *-nláhkai* ~ *-nládje*, I should add that the same formation appears to be in use not only throughout the North Saami area but also in Lule Saami to the southwest.³³ Grundström (1946–1954 s.v. *lādji, lāhkē*) provides a number of examples from the dialects of Lule Saami and the border zone between Lule and North Saami, but since a large number of the examples are presented without a full sentence context, most of the *-mláhkáj* constructions appear in a predicative function (98), not unlike their contemporary counterparts in the modern literary language (99):

- (98) *Väddja le vátsemláhkáj.*
 (Grundström 1946–1954 s.v. *lāhkē* [Jáhkámáhkke])
Väddja le vátse-mláhkáj.
 road be.3SG walk-*mláhkáj*
 'The road is ready to walk on (= fit for walking).'

- (99) *Ladnja galggá árrumláhkáj dāhkkít.*
 (<http://www.infonorra.no/category.php?categoryID=345> 14.12.2007)
Ladnja galggá árro-mláhkáj dāhkkít.
 room must.3SG live-*mláhkáj* fit-INF
 'The room must be fit for living.'

Interestingly, there seem to be no material traces of *-nláhkai* in the eastern sister languages of North Saami, but instead a very similar type of non-finite construction in which the verbal noun is followed by a clitic-like postposition *náál* (Inari

³³ As this study is mainly a synchronic description of North Saami, I have not expanded my research to the Saami languages further to the west and thus will not attempt to describe the use of these formations in the Saami area as a whole.

Saami), *nalla* (Skolt Saami) that derives from the noun *nääli* resp. *nää'll* ‘manner’ just like *láhkai* (← *láhki* ‘manner’) in North Saami. They, too, are quite often used in predicative functions and the influence of Finnish participial clauses is quite evident especially in the literary use of these languages (for *-mnáál* and *-mnalla* in traditional language, see e.g. IW s.v. *nääli*; KKS s.v. *nääll̥*):

- (100) a. *Sämmiliist, kiäst lii Suomâst päikkikieldâlaavâst (201/1994)*
uáivildum päikkikieldâ, lii vuoigâdvuotâ almottið viehâdâh-
*tiätuvuáhâdâhân **vuorkkinnáál** eenikiellân sämikielâ.*
 (<http://www.samediggi.fi/vanha/psaame/laki/esitys2.htm> 19.1.2008)
Sämmilii-st, kiä-st lii Suomâ-st
 Saami-LOC who-LOC be.3SG Finland-LOC
päikki-kieldâ-laavâ-st (201/1994) uáivild-um
 home-municipality-law-LOC (201/1994) mean-PTC.PASS.PST
päikki-kieldâ, lii vuoigâdvuotâ almottið
 home-municipality be.3SG right report-INF
viehâdâh-tiätu-vuáhâdâh-n vuorkki-mnáál
 population-data-system-ILL save-mnáál
eeni-kiellâ-n sämi-kielâ.
 mother.GEN-language-ESS Saami-language.GA
- b. *Sápmelaččas, geas lea Suomas ruovttugiieldalágas (201/1994)*
oaivilduvvon ruovttugiielda, lea vuoigatvuohta almmuhit veahkadat-
*diehtovuogâdahkii **vuorkknláhkái** eatnigiellanis sámegiela.*
 (<http://www.samediggi.fi/vanha/psaame/laki/esitys1.htm> 19.1.2008)
Sápmelačča-s, geas lea Suoma-s
 Saami-LOC who-LOC be.3SG Finland-LOC
ruovttu-giielda-lága-s (201/1994) oaivild-uvvo-n
 home-municipality-law-LOC (201/1994) mean-PASS-PTC.PST
ruovttu-giielda, lea vuoigatvuohta almmuh-it
 home-municipality be.3SG right report-INF
veahkadat-diehto-vuogâdahk-ii vuorkk-nláhkái
 population-data-system-ILL save-nláhkái
eatni-giella-n-is sáme-giela.
 mother.GA-language-ESS-3SG Saami-language.GA
- c. *Saamelaisella, jolla on Suomessa kotikuntalaisa (201/1994) tarkoi-*
*tettu kotikunta, on oikeus ilmoittaa väestötietojärjestelmään **tallen-***
nettavaksi äidinkielekseen saame.
 (<http://www.samediggi.fi/vanha/suomi/laki/esitys.htm> 19.1.2008)

<i>Saamelaise-lla, jo-lla</i>	<i>on</i>	<i>Suome-ssa</i>
Saami-ADE	who-ADE	be.3SG Finland-INE
<i>koti-kunta-lai-ssa</i>	<i>(201/1994)</i>	<i>tarkoite-ttu</i>
home-municipality-law-INE	(201/1994)	mean-PTC.PASS.PST
<i>koti-kunta, on</i>	<i>oikeus</i>	<i>ilmoitta-a</i>
home-municipality	be.3SG	right report-1INF
<i>väestö-tieto-järjestelmä-än</i>	<i>tallenne-ttava-ksi</i>	
population-data-system-ILL	save-PTC.PASS.PRS-TRA	
<i>äidi-n-kiele-kse-en</i>	<i>saame.</i>	
mother-GEN-language-TRA-3	Saami.language	

‘A Saami person residing in a municipality in Finland as defined in the Municipality of Residence Act (201/1994) has the right to report the Saami language as that person’s mother tongue for entry into the Population Information System.’

In conclusion, it appears safe to say that the “novelty” of the non-finite in *-nláhkai* is not so very different from that of *-ndihte*: both of them are “new” verb forms mainly in terms of the history of the grammatical description of the Saami languages. They may have possessed many if not all of their specific features even at the time of the first Saami grammars (e.g. Leem 1748; Rask 1832), but these features have simply been neglected or misunderstood until the present study; the misunderstandings are most visible in the former attempts to describe the otherwise quite unproblematic verbal noun by providing additional remarks on its morphologically and syntactically untypical, verb-like use with “some” or “certain” postpositions whose identities have been left unspecified. The converb in *-miin*, in contrast, can plausibly be considered a new verb form not only in terms of the history of Saami grammars, but also in terms of the history of the language itself: the North Saami *-miin* form seems to be absent from earlier descriptions, and quite correctly, as the clear signs of its independence seem not to have been found until the literary language of the 1980s and 1990s. — Note, however, the verb form in *-má(á)in* in Example (82) in the spoken Inari Saami of the first half of the 20th century.

3.1.3. More marginal verb-like formations based on adverbial verbal noun constructions

The non-finites in *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai* must, of course, have developed originally through many gradual changes and areal expansion, and the distinction between adpositional phrases with the verbal noun genitive-accusative in *-ma/-mi* and independent verb forms in *-n-* + suffixed postposition is not absolute. For instance, it is not uncommon to hear postpositional phrases such as *juhkama maŋŋá* ‘after drinking’ (cf. Example 10) pronounced as *juhkam maŋŋá*, that is, in a form that might just as well consist of the word forms *juhkan* and *maŋŋá*; in general, the North Saami genitive-accusative marker *-a* in nouns such as *juhkan* can often be omitted, but the details of the phenomena remain in need of further study.³⁴ However, the verbal noun genitive-accusative of three-syllable verbs such as *muitalit* ‘tell’ is nearly always *muitallemi* (e.g. *muitallemi maŋŋá*) and not *muitalan*.

One instance of the *juhkan maŋŋá* type of expression has been earlier mentioned by Nielsen (1926: 390) and Nickel (1994: 313) who presented the phrase *rohkadalla-n bokte (oažžu-t)* [pray-*n* through (get-*INF*)] ‘(to get) by praying’ instead of the more predictable *rohkadalla-m-a bokte*, [pray-*VN-GA* through] but—as already stated in Ylikoski (2002: 110; 2004a: 90, 156 n. 30)—phrases such as *<V-n bokte>* ‘by V-ing’ do not actually exist in contemporary literary Saami. Nevertheless, it appears that Nielsen’s mention of *rohkadalla-n bokte* (*<rokkadallam bokte>*) may have been influenced by his knowledge of the old literary language in which such formations are in fact used even in constructions with postverbal objects:

- (101) *Ik don galga æppebasotet du nieidat diktem bokte su dakkat fuorravuodaid, amas ænam dakkat fuorravuodaid, ja ænam šaddat dievva hæpadlašvuodain. (Bibal: Leviticus 19:29)*
- | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| <i>I-k</i> | <i>don</i> | <i>galga</i> | <i>æppe-basot-et</i> | <i>du</i> | <i>nieida-d</i> | |
| NEG-2SG | 2SG | MUST.CONNEG | NEG-sanctify- <i>INF</i> | 2SG.GA | daughter.GA-2SG | |
| <i>dikte-m</i> | <i>bokte</i> | <i>su</i> | <i>dakka-t</i> | <i>fuorravuoda-i-d,</i> | <i>ama-s</i> | <i>ænam</i> |
| let- <i>nbokte</i> | 3SG.GA | do- <i>INF</i> | adultery-PL-ACC | NEGSUP-3SG | land | |
| <i>dakka-t</i> | <i>fuorravuoda-i-d,</i> | <i>ja</i> | <i>ænam šadda-t</i> | <i>dievva</i> | | |
| do- <i>INF</i> | adultery-PL-ACC | and | earth | become- <i>INF</i> | full | |
| | <i>hæpadlašvuoda-in.</i> | | | | | |
| | disgrace-COM | | | | | |
- ‘Do not degrade your daughter by letting her commit adultery, lest the land commit adultery and be filled with wickedness.’

³⁴ For example, the omission of *-a* seems impossible when the noun is in object position, as in Example (8).

- (102) *Go don birrastattak ovta gavpuga gukkes aige ja læk soattamen dam vuostai dam valddem varas, de ik don galga hævatet dam muoraid čuoppam bokte daid akšoin, dastgo don galgak dain borrat, ja...*

(Bibal: Deuteronomy 20:19)

Go don birrastatta-k ovta gavpug-a gukkes aige ja
 as 2SG surround-2SG one.GA city-GA long.ATTR time.GA and
læ-k soatta-men dam vuostai dam valdde-m varas, de
 be-2SG fight-ACTESS it.GA against it.GA take-nvárás PRT
i-k don galga hævat-et dam muora-i-d
 NEG-2SG 2SG must.CONNEG destroy-INF it.GA tree-PL-ACC
čuoppa-m bokte da-i-d akšo-in, dastgo don galga-k
 fell-nbokte it-PL-ACC ax-COM because 2SG shall-2SG
da-i-n borra-t, ja
 it-PL-LOC eat-INF and

‘When you lay siege to a city for a long time, fighting against it to capture it, do not destroy its trees by putting an ax to them, because you shall eat their fruit, and...’

- (103) *..., ja manne aigok don dalle suddodet vigetes varai vuostai goddem bokte Davida ansaškættai? (Bibal: 1 Samuel 19:5)*

ja manne aigo-k don dalle suddod-et vige-tes
 and why plan-2SG 2SG then sin-INF fault-less.ATTR
vara-i vuostai godde-m bokte David-a ansaš-kættai?
 blood-PL.GEN against kill-nbokte David-GA deserve-VABE
 ‘... and why then are you going to sin against innocent blood by killing David for no reason?’

The existence of the formations in *-m bokte* (101–103) clearly contradict the claims made repeatedly in the original papers and Sections 2.2 and 2.3 above that *dihte* ~ *dihtii*, *várás* and *láhkai* ~ *ládje* (and marginally *váste* and *nammii*) are the only adpositions that may be attached to the “shortened verbal noun” in *-n* (old literary language <-m>) and followed by an object. However, it appears that such formations can be found only in the oldest literary language, but neither in any of the spoken language samples of any period nor in the contemporary literary language. Furthermore, sporadic glances at documents other than the Bible translation of 1895 suggest that *-m bokte* constructions flourish almost exclusively as a kind of loan translation from Scandinavian infinitival constructions with the preposition *ved* ‘by’: Compare the above-mentioned *-m bokte* constructions with the corresponding infinitival clauses in the Danish *Bibelen* (1871) that most likely served as a central source text for the Saami *Bibal* (1895): *diktem bokte su dakkat fuorruvuodaid* (101) ~ Danish *ved at lade hende bedrive Horeri* ‘by

letting her commit adultery’, *čuoppam bokte daid akšoin* (102) ~ *ved at hugge ned på dem med Øksen* ‘by putting an ax to them’ and *goddem bokte Davida ansaškættai* (103) ~ *ved at ihjelslå David uforskyldt* ‘by killing David for no reason’. In other words, it appears that this construction must be seen mainly as a curiosity of the old literary North Saami; whatever its ultimate origin may be, there are no traces of a “non-finite verb form in *-nbokte*” (101–103) either in the modern language or the traditional dialects behind it.

As regards the functional role of *-m bokte* in the language of the *Bibal* and other contemporary texts, every instance of *-m bokte* that I am aware of seems to occur consistently as an adverbial of means, that is, in the semantic function that may nowadays be expressed by the newly emerged converb in *-miin* or the use of *bokte* in finite or infinitival clauses with the dummy pronoun (*dat*) and the complementizer *ahte*. The modern-day representative of *<-m bokte>* (101–103) would be a converb in *??/*-nbokte*, formally analogous to verb forms such as *juhka-ndiht* (23) and functionally equivalent to non-finite clauses like *juhka-miin* (22) and *dan (~ dakko) bokte ahte juhkat* (49):

- (22') *??/*Piera dagai rihkkosa juhkanbokte vuola.*
*??/*Piera daga-i rihkkos-a juhka-nbokte vuola.*
 Piera make-PST.3SG crime-GA drink-nbokte beer.GA
 ‘Piera committed a crime by drinking beer.’

Despite the absence of non-finites such as *??/*juhkanbokte* (22'), there are some other quite interesting formations in contemporary North Saami, too:

- (104) *Mii fertet bargat dan ala ahte nissonat galget oadjebasvuodas feasttas bállet ruoktot mannat almmá háhkanhaga čáhp[p]esboahkána karates.*
 (*Min Áigi* 23.8.2006, p. 14)
Mii ferte-t bargat dan ala ahte nisson-at galge-t
 1PL must-1PL work-INF it.GA onto COMP woman-PL will-3PL
oadjebasvuoda-s feastta-s bálle-t ruoktot manna-t
 safety-LOC party-LOC have.peace.to-INF to.home go-INF
almmá háhka-nhaga čáhpes-boahkán-a karate-s.
 without acquire-nhaga black.ATTR-belt-GA karate-LOC
 ‘We must work toward a situation in which women will be able to return home safely from a party, without acquiring a black belt in karate.’
- (105) *47 me[a]rr[á]dusa guovtti diimmus ja goase vis[o]t stivrra evttohusaid jelgii, nurridanhaga unnitlogus.* (<http://www.samiradio.org/article.php?articleID=13404> 26.8.2006 [5.6.2003])

47 mearrádus-a guovtti diimmu-s ja goase visot stivrra
 47 resolution-GA two.GA hour-LOC and nearly all board.GA
 evttohusa-i-d jelgii, nurrid-anhaga unni-t-logu-s.
 proposal-PL-GA in.compliance grumble-nhaga small-CMPR-number-LOC
 ‘47 proposals [were adopted] within two hours and nearly everything
 according to the proposals of the board, without grumbling from the
 minority.’

The word forms *háhkkanhaga* ‘without acquiring’ and *nurridanhaga* ‘without grumbling’ are the only two instances of their kind that I have encountered in the vast number of texts in the Saami languages. They appear to be made up of a verb root followed by an *-n* resembling a verbal noun and the postposition *haga* ‘without’. This sentence (104) appears to be a translation of a Norwegian sentence (106):

- (106) *Vi må sørge for at kvinner kan gå trygt hjem fra fest uten* [without]
å [COMP] *ha* [have.INF] *svart belte i karate*.
 (Finnmark Dagblad 23.8.2006, p. 8)
 ‘We must work toward a situation in which women will be able to return
 home safely from a party, without acquiring a black belt in karate.’

In Example (104), *háhkkanhaga* ‘without acquiring’ is followed by the object *čáhppesboahkána* ‘a black belt’, and the non-finite clause seems to correspond to a fully predictable use of the so-called verb abessive (see Examples 12 and 78). In other words, it would be most natural to end the sentence with the clause (*almmá*)³⁵ *hágabeahtta čáhppesboahkána karates* instead, while *háhkkanhaga* ought to be regarded as a fully unpredictable hapax legomenon unless we are aware of the formally similar *nurridanhaga* in Example (105). However, it appears that the latter does not fit the general picture of Saami non-finites any better than *háhkkanhaga*. The semantic function of *nurridanhaga unnitlogus* ‘without grumbling from the minority’ is understandable as such, but the construction does not correspond to the use of the verb abessive (**nurritkeahtta unnitlogus*), but rather brings to mind the verbal noun that could be followed by a locative modifier such as *unnitlogus*, that is, *nurrideapmi unnitlogus* ‘grumbling (that can be heard) from the minority’. In fact, *nurridanhaga unnitlogus* is the only known instance of a non-finite formation in which a postposition, in this case originating in an abessive suffix case, is quite clearly suffixed to the preceding verbal noun

³⁵ The preposition-like word *almmá* may optionally precede verb abessives as well as their nominal counterparts, postpositional phrases with *haga*.

(*V-n*) which nevertheless retains the ability to take modifiers typical of nouns rather than verbs.

It would be tempting to regard the two above-mentioned “*nhaga*-forms” as marginal, near hapax legomena that are hardly worth much pondering. However, I have also come across as many as seven functionally similar formations in which the *V-n* is followed by *keahttá*:

- (107) *Taxibiila bođii muhto vujii dušše meaddel, bis[á]nankeahttá.*
 (<http://www.samiradio.org/article.php?articleID=12616> 26.8.2006 [18.3.2003])
Taxi-biila bođi-i muhto vuji-i dušše meaddel,
 Taxi-car come-PST.3SG but drive-PST.3SG only by
bisán-ankeahttá.
stop-nkeahttá
 ‘A taxi came but went by without stopping.’
- (108) *Muhto dán ládje geavahit guohtuneatnamiid buorebut ja de sáhttá doallat bierg[o]buvttadeami luondd[u] billistankeahttá.*
 (<http://www.samiradio.org/article.php?articleID=12665> 26.8.2006 [20.3.2003])
Muhto dán ládje geavah-it guohtu-n-eatnam-ii-d
 but this.GA in.the.manner use-1PL graze-VN-land-PL-GA
buore-bu-t ja de sáhttá doalla-t biergo-buvttad-eami
 good-CMPR-ADV and PRT can.3SG maintain-INF meat-produce-VN.GA
luonddu billist-ankeahttá.
nature.GA taint-nkeahttá
 ‘But in this manner we are using the grazing lands better, and it is possible to produce meat without harming nature.’
- (109) *Bargoaddi sáhttá nu ládje bargat iežas vuogi mielde soabadankeahttá fágalih[t]uin.* (<http://www.samiradio.org/article.php?articleID=13461> 26.8.2006 [11.6.2003])
Bargo-add-i sáhttá nu ládje bargat ieža-s
 work-give-PTC.PRS can.3SG so in.the.manner act-INF REFL.GA-3SG
vuogi mielde soabad-ankeahttá fága-lihtu-in.
 manner.GA according agree-nkeahttá trade-union-COM
 ‘The employer can thus make his/her own way without having to agree with the trade union.’

- (110) *Dokumentáras bođii ovdan ahte Guovdageainnu politiijakantuvrras lea[t] guođđá[n] rohčošanáššiid dutkankeahtá 80-logus.*

(*Min Áigi* 8.12.2006, p. 6)

Dokumentára-s bođi-i ovdan ahte Guovdageainnu
documentary-LOC come-PST.3SG to.the.fore COMP Guovdageaidnu.GA
politiiija-kantuvrra-s lea-t guođđá-n rohčoš-an-ášši-i-d
police-office-LOC be-3PL leave-PTC.PST debauch-VN-case-PL-GA
dutka-nkeahtá 80-logu-s.
inspect-nkeahtá 80-number-LOC

‘It was brought out in the documentary that the Guovdageaidnu police department left some sexual offences uninvestigated in the 1980s.’

At first sight, forms such as *bisanankeahhtá*, *billistankeahtá*, *soabadankeahhtá* and *dutkankeahtá* look like contaminations of the verb abessive (-*keahtá*) and various formations of the type *V-n* + postposition—here, too, the most unmarked verb forms would be the verb abessives *bisánkeahtá*, *billiskeahhtá*, *soabatkeahtá* and *dutkkakeahhtá*. However, certain western dialects of North Saami use *keahtá* as a postposition as well (see Korhonen 1974: 181–182), and even though the literary language favors the use of *haga* (111), *keahtá* (112) is also sometimes used instead:

- (111) *Aboneanttat geat leat čatnon Suovvejoga/Unjárgga čáhcerusttegii šaddet čázi haga mañnebárgga 20.12.2005 gaskal tii. 08:00 ja 16:00.*

(<http://www.nesseby.kommune.no/index.php?id=290903> 12.6.2007)

Aboneantta-t gea-t lea-t čatn-o-n
customer-PL who-PL be-3PL connect-PASS-PTC.PST
Suovvejoga/Unjárgga čáhce-rustteg-ii šadde-t čázi
Suovvejohka.GA/Unjárga.GA water-works-ILL become-3PL water.GA
haga mañnebárgga 20.12.2005 gaskal tii. 08:00
without Tuesday.GA 20.12.2005 between h[ours] 08:00
ja 16:00.

and 16:00

‘Customers connected to the Suovvejohka/Unjárga waterworks will be without water on Tuesday 20th of December 2005 between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m.’

- (112) *Dálošvákki čáhcerusttega doallit báhcet čázi keahtá mánnodaga 14.08. ...* (<http://www.kafjord.kommune.no/index.php?language=se&cat=4253> 12.6.2007)

Dálošvákki čáhce-rustteg-a doall-i-t báhce-t čázi
Dálošvággi.GA water-works-GA hold-PTC.PRS-PL remain-3PL water.GA

keahttá *mánnodaga* 14.08.

without Monday.GA 14.8.

‘The customers of the Dálošvággi waterworks will remain without water on Monday 14th of August...’

Although I have encountered as many as nine instances of formations in *-nhaga* (104–105) ~ *-nkeahttá* (107–110), their credibility is partly weakened by the fact that six of them were found on a single web site among news stories written during 2003 and 2004, and the remaining three occurrences were found in the newspaper *Min Áigi* (104, 110) and its successor *Ávvir* in 2006 and 2008, so that it is in principle possible that all of these nine instances are based on a single idiolect. However, almost the same could be said of the quite marginal formations in *-nnammii* and *-nváste*. It has been proposed (Ylikoski 2004a: 141–142 and Section 2.2) that they, as well as the more frequent *-nvárás*, could be regarded as some kind of allomorphs of the purposive converb that is usually realized as *-ndihtte* or *-ndihtti*, and in the same vein it might be possible to regard *-nhaga* and *-nkeahttá* as highly exceptional deviations from the general use of the verb abessive in *-keahttá*.

Even though it is legitimate to question the naturalness of the *-nhaga* and *-nkeahttá* clauses, it is nevertheless intriguing to see how well their common features fit into a general view of the system of non-finites in the language. With the exception of Example (105), these formations have as many as three different features that separate them from verbal noun constructions in exactly the same way as the purposive converb in *-ndihtte*: 1) syntactically, they may be followed by objects (104) and adverbial modifiers (104, 109) **and** 2) morphologically, the postpositions are suffixed to the compound-like stem in *-n* **and** 3) orthographically, the writers have treated the formations as undivided word forms. Constructions such as *almmá háhkanhaga čáhppesboahkána karates* (104) are thus much nearer to the verb abessive (cf. *almmá hágakehttá čáhppesboahkána karates*) than to regular verbal noun constructions of the type *almmá čáhppes-boahkán-a háhka-m-a haga* [without black.ATTR-belt-GA acquire-VN-GA without]³⁶ (cf. Ylikoski 2004a: 121).

In regard to the claims made in the original papers (Ylikoski 2002, 2004a, 2006a) and Sections 2.2 and 2.3 above, it can be maintained and redefined that the existence of the verb-like formations “*V-n* + postposition” in North Saami seems to be confined to purposive non-finites (*-ndihtte* and its various, but quite marginal “allomorphs”) and the non-finite in *-nláhkai*, despite some sporadic

³⁶ In verbal noun constructions, the role of genitival attributes (e.g. *čáhppesboahkána*) and adverbial modifiers (e.g. *karates*) is more limited than in more verbal non-finite clauses, so that phrases as complex as *??almmá čáhppesboahkána karates háhkama haga* scarcely occur in actual language usage.

occurrences of *-nhaga* and *-nkeahttä* in the modern literary language and the use of *-m bokte* in older literary texts. It still seems safe to repeat that there are no verb forms like **juhkanmañjá* ‘after drinking’ or **juhkanovdal* ‘before drinking’ (29) in North Saami although such anterior and posterior converbs are otherwise quite common in other Uralic languages (e.g. Ylikoski 2003a: 202–205). The existence of such formations would mean the rise of entirely new morpho-semantic categories in the language, whereas the occurrences of *-nhaga* and *-nkeahttä* are obviously related to the well-established category of the verb abessive. When it comes to the reasons for coining formations such as *háhkanhaga* (104) and *billistankeahttä* (108) instead of *hágakeahttä* and *billiskeahttä*, it is difficult to think that this would have happened without the analogy offered by the converb in *-ndihte* that consists, after all, quite transparently of the stem *V-n* and a postposition attached to it. Furthermore, it is even possible to see these, albeit sporadic, forms as part of an ongoing drift towards a new, more uniform system of non-finites wherein nearly all forms are based on the strong grade variant (e.g. *háhka-* instead of the weak grade *hága-*) of the verb stem; a possible drift of this kind will be discussed in more detail in Section 4.2.1 below.

3.1.4. Other related phenomena: the rare instances of deverbals with objects

There is still one aspect of Saami verbal noun constructions that needs to be discussed in order to gain a fuller view of the above-mentioned non-finites (*-ndihte* ~ *-nvárás* etc., *-nhaga* ~ *-nkeahttä* and the old literary Saami *-m bokte*) in the language. To begin with, it may be restated that the verbal noun is, by definition, a category whose relation to the word-class of verbs vacillates between derivation and the kind of inflection that might be characterized as “word-class-changing inflection” (Haspelmath 1996; see Section 2.1 above). This means that there may be various continua of variation in the productivity and regularity of such formations as well as in respect to their “verbal” vs. “nominal” internal syntax.

Due to the special characteristics of the North Saami verbal noun and its relations to other, more verb-like non-finites in the language, the preceding discussion has largely centered on the internal syntax of non-finites as an indicator of the “verbal” resp. “nominal” nature of diverse formations. Even though it may be viewed as a matter of taste whether we should consider the unmarked use of the verbal noun as part of verbal morphosyntax or as belonging to ordinary noun phrases, it has proved useful to use the internal word order of such constructions as a criterion for differentiating between the verbal noun proper and formations

that have gained independence from the original verbal noun constructions. With respect to such a criterion, however, the history of Saami linguistics also includes some curious specimens of verb-like constructions such as the following examples adopted from Sammallahti's (2005) recent monograph on North Saami syntax:

- (113) *Mus lea rádjanmiella dan šibiha.*

(Sammallahti 2005: 95 < Nielsen 1926: 389)

Mu-s lea rádja-nmiella dan šibih-a.
 1SG-LOC be.3SG slaughter-nmiella it.GA animal-GA
 'I wish to slaughter the animal.'

- (114) *Mus lea vuolginmiella meahccái.* (Sammallahti 2005: 109)

Mu-s lea vuolgi-nmiella meahccá-i.
 1SG-LOC be.3SG leave-nmiella wilderness-ILL
 'I wish to go to the wilderness.'

- (115) *Biera lei mus báhčinskihpárin guovžža.*

(Sammallahti 2005: 95 < Nickel 1994: 313, 407, 474)

Biera le-i mu-s báhči-n-skihpár-in guovžža.
 Biera be-PST.3SG 1SG-LOC shoot-VN-companion-ESS bear.GA
 'I had Biera as a companion to shoot the bear.'

- (116) *Dalle nogai dat heastavuodjin boastta.* (Sammallahti 2005: 95)

Dalle noga-i dat heasta-vuodji-n boastta.
 at.the.time cease-PST.3SG it horse-ride-VN mail.GA
 'At that time, (the practice of) delivering mail by horse came to an end.'

In these sentences, the verbal noun occurs as the first (113–115) or second (116) part of a compound noun that is followed by an object (113, 115–116) or an adverbial modifier (114). The most famous formation of this type is *-nmiella* (113–114), consisting of *V-n* to which the noun *miella* 'desire' is attached: the same or at least syntactically very similar examples have already been presented by many scholars such as Nielsen (1926: 389; 1932–1962 s.v. *miellâ*), Korhonen (1974: 28; 1981a: 212), H.-H. Bartens (1989: 343) and Nickel (1994: 313, 474). However, as I earlier (Ylikoski 2002: 109; 2004a: 95–96, 154 n. 13) remarked, the occurrence of such formations as these in North Saami seems, in fact, to have been limited to those studies. Now, after searching for such constructions for more than five years, I am able once more to corroborate the fact that although the various compounds of the type *V-nmiella* are quite common as ordinary

nouns (e.g. *borra-n-miella* [eat-VN-desire] ‘appetite’; see also Ylikoski 2004a: 154 n. 13), the actual occurrences of a verb-like *-nmiella* (113–114) can hardly be found in any readily available material outside the above-mentioned descriptions (!) of the language. In other words, I have not been able to locate a single such construction either in the literary language of any period or in any of the spoken language samples published since the 19th century. Furthermore, the absence of such constructions has also earlier been mentioned by Koskinen (1998: 186). However, a single but important exception to this general state of affairs has been kindly provided by Johanna Ijäs whose personal research material includes the following sentence uttered by a five-year old child to her father:

- (117) *Dus lea álo borranmiella báhpiriid.*
 (Johanna Ijäs [personal communication], Guovdageaidnu, 2007)
Du-s lea álo borra-nmiella báhpír-ii-d.
 2SG-LOC be.3SG always eat-nmiella paper-PL-GA
 ‘You always have the desire to eat (bits of) paper.’

As regards the verb-like use of *báhčinskihpár(in)* ‘(as a) hunting companion’ (115) and *heastavuodjin* ‘hauling with horses, “horse-hauling”’ (116), such constructions as these were first mentioned by Raija Bartens (1972: 36) and Kemi (1991: 73–74; 1992: 33), respectively. Unlike the examples of *-nmiella*, it is possible to trace the actual sources of these constructions: Example (115) appears to be a North Saami construct based on an Inari Saami sentence (118), whereas Example (116) is a modification of Turi’s (1982) original sentence (119).³⁷

- (118) *Mut kuobža ij lámáž ohtkin ovdil pááččám eereeb ko ohta Matti-nomalaž
 almai lai lámáž uba kuohtii pääččimskipárin koadist oadđee kuobža,
 maid sun jieč taaidij lám karvam-uv.*
 (Morottaja 1957; cited by Bartens 1972: 36)
Mut kuobža ij lámáž ohtkin ovdil pááččá-m
 but bear.ACC NEG.3SG be-PTC.PST anyone before shoot-PTC.PST
eereeb ko ohta Matti-noma-laž almai lai lámáž
 besides COMP one Matti-name-ADJ man be.PST.3SG be-PTC.PST
uba kuohtii pääčči-m-skipári-n koadi-st oadđ-ee
 even twice shoot-VN-companion-ESS bear’s.den-LOC sleep-PTC.PRS
kuobža, ma-i-d sun jieč taaidi-j lám
 bear(.ACC) REL-PL-ACC 3SG REFL seem-PST.3SG be-PTC.PST

³⁷ I wish to thank Pekka Sammallahti for helping me locate Example (119).

karva-m=uv.

ring.in-PTC.PST=also

‘But none of them had shot a bear before, except for a man by the name of Matti who had even been twice a companion to shoot bears, and it may be that he also had encircled them by himself.’

- (119) *Ja dan rájes go luodda bodii Mázi, de nogai dat heastavuodjin poastta.*
(Turi 1982: 30)

Ja dan rájes go luodda bodi-i Mázi-i, de
and it.GA since as road come-PST.3SG Máze-ILL PRT
noga-i dat heasta-vuodji-n poastta.
cease-PST.3SG it horse-ride-VN mail.GA

‘And from the time the road was built to Máze, (the practice of) delivering mail by horse had come to an end.’

Despite the originality of Examples (118–119), they are, to my knowledge, hapax legomena that do not seem to have parallels in other Saami languages. However, their position in descriptions of the Saami languages must be examined in relation to other constructions in which the verbal noun is used to form morphologically compounded word forms with verb-like internal syntax. In fact, Sammallahti (2005: 95) puts all the constructions in Examples (113–116) on a par with formations in *-ndihte* and *-nvárás* by presenting them as examples of the phenomenon of the “deverbal action noun” (*deverbála dahkunomen*) or a complex predicate including such, which may have an accusative object when it functions as a part of a compound word or a complement to a postposition (Sammallahti’s example in this context is *oaidni-n várás* [see *-nvárás*] ‘in order to see’ which could be *oaidnin dihte* or *<oaidnindihte>* ‘id.’ as well). However, this is only one of those rare occasions when Sammallahti (2005: 95, 161) does not clearly distinguish these formations otherwise (*ibid.*, pp. 119, 122, 127, 175, 243) labeled as “action genitives” (occurring with the postpositions *dihte* and *láhkai*) from various “deverbal action nouns” (*deverbála dahkunomenat*) including not only the verbal noun in *-n/-pmi*, but also even less verbal and less productive formations such as *vuolgga* ‘departure’ (← *vuolgit* ‘leave’; cf. *vuolgi-n* [leave-VN] ‘departure’ also mentioned on p. 109), all of which are also occasionally characterized as deverbal nouns (*deverbála substantiivvat*; pp. 95, 102, 171, 222). More recently, Sammallahti (2007: 6) has emphasized that the “action genitive” in *-n* (*čállin*, *muitalan* ← *čállit* ‘write’, *muitalit* ‘tell’) is historically identical to—but now formally distinct from—the genitive-accusative singular of the “deverbal action noun” (*-ma/-mi* in *čállima*, *muitaleami*).

Terminological puzzles aside, it remains a fact that thousands and thousands of non-finites in *-ndihte* and *-nvárás* greatly if not infinitely outnumber the use of the curiosities of (113–116), of which only (116) is clearly based on an authentic North Saami sentence (119). Therefore, it seems that the latter should rather be mentioned on a par with an equally unique sentence (120), in which the plain verbal noun *boahtin* ‘arrival’ appears simultaneously as a genitive-accusative attribute of *áigi* ‘time’ and also as the head of a discontinuous phrase with adverbial modifiers expressing direction (*ruoktot* ‘(to) home’) and source (*meahcis* ‘from the wilderness’):

- (120) *Nieida gohčui dan olbmá: “Čiega eret,” go stálu boahtima áigi lei ruoktot meahcis.* (LES 2: 648, Guovdageaidnu [< Gárasavvon], Johan Johansen Sikko 1882)

Nieida gohču-i dan olbmá: “Čiega eret,”
 girl command-PST.3SG it.GA man.GA hide.IMP.2SG away
go stálu boahti-m-a áigi le-i ruoktot meahci-s.
 when ogre.GA come-VN-GA time be-PST.3SG to.home wilderness-LOC
 ‘The girl ordered the man: “Hide yourself”, when the time had come for
 the ogre to arrive home from the wilderness.’

As interesting as the syntactically unique phrase *stálu boahtima áigi ... ruoktot meahcis* ‘the time of ogre’s arrival home from the wilderness’ may be, it ought to be clear that such a lone and odd construction does not merit attention to the degree that it would serve as an “example” of a special type of verbal noun construction in the language. In my opinion, the same should hold for the verbal compound nouns of Examples (113–116) that have been repeatedly used to illustrate the characteristics of the North Saami verbal noun. In light of their “frequency” in actual language usage, even the formations in *-m bokte* (101–103), *-nhaga* (104–105) and *-nkeahttä* (107–110) deserve much more attention, as such formations can nevertheless be attested to a degree that allows us to make some kind of generalizations about their nature. Furthermore, it may be added that the few native speakers of North Saami I have consulted tend to be somewhat uncertain about the grammaticality or acceptability of sentences such as (113–116)³⁸, but they all agree on the unacceptability of freshly created Examples such as (121–123) in spite of the fact that they differ from Examples (113–116) only in their lexical content and overall complexity:

³⁸ All of my informants have had education in linguistics and they may already have seen the examples in the previous linguistic literature.

- (121) ??/**Piera logai olgoriikkalaš fitnodagain leat bohkanmiella oljo- ja gássariggodagaid Bolivias.*
 ??/**Piera loga-i olgo-riikka-laš fitnodaga-i-n lea-t*
 Piera tell-PST.3SG outer-country-ADJ company-PL-LOC be-INF
bohka-nmiella oljo- ja gássa-riggodaga-i-d Bolivia-s.
 drill-nmiella oil- and gas-wealth-PL-GA Bolivia-LOC
 ‘Piera said that foreign companies wish to drill oil and gas in Bolivia.’
- (122) ??/**Mu mánát lávejit leat mus viežžanskihpárin borramušaid dien ođđa gávpeguovddážiis.*
 ??/**Mu máná-t láve-jit lea-t mu-s*
 1SG.GA child-PL be.in.the.habit.of-3PL be-INF 1SG-LOC
viežža-n-skihpár-in borramuša-i-d dien ođđa
 fetch-VN-companion-ESS nourishment-PL-GA it.GA new
gávpe-guovddážiis.
 store-center-LOC
 ‘I use to have my children as companions to fetch groceries from the new shopping center.’
- (123) ??/**De viimmat orru nohkagoahhtimin dát giehtabassan oppa bearraša lihtiid, go boahhte vahku oažžut lihttebassanmašiinna.*
 ??/**De viimmat orru nohka-goahhti-min dát*
 PRT finally seem.3SG cease-INCH-ACCESS this
giehta-bassa-n oppa bearraš-a lihti-i-d, go boahhte
 hand-wash-VN whole family-GA dish-PL-GA as next
vahku oažžu-t lihtte-bassa-n-mašiinna.
 week.GA get-1PL dish-wash-VN-machine.GA
 ‘Now, it seems that there will finally be an end to this manual washing of all the family’s dishes, as we will get a dishwasher next week.’

All in all, it appears that verbal compound nouns like these are so haphazard that they belong to the same collection of rarities as the deverbal noun *fáktemuš* and the adjective *suoládahkis* in Examples (124–125):

- (124) *Dain lea fáktemuš juohke balvva.* (Sammallahti 2005: 95 < Nielsen 1926: 319; Korhonen 1974: 11–12; Nickel 1994: 408)
Da-i-n lea fákte-muš juohke balvva.
 it-PL-LOC be.3SG keep.an.eye.on-NMLZ every cloud.GA
 ‘They must keep an eye on every cloud.’

(125) *Dat lea nu suoládahkis olbmuid bohccuid.*

(Nielsen 1926: 319; Korhonen 1974: 12; Nickel 1994: 408)

Dat lea nu suolád-ahkis olbmui-i-d bohccu-i-d.

it be.3SG so steal-ADJ human-PL-GA reindeer-PL-GA

‘He was so inclined as to steal people’s reindeer.’

Examples (124–125) were presented by Nielsen (1926: 319) as instances showing that “certain” deverbals and adjectives (*visse substantiver og adjektiver*) may have objects. Korhonen (1974: 11–12) cites them to illustrate the difference between regularly inflected verb forms and sporadic instances (*nur einige Einzelfälle*) of derived words having features otherwise typical of verbs, whereas Nickel (1994: 407–408) and Sammallahti (2005: 95) mention *fáktemuš* in Example (124) as being a “(deverbal) action noun” (*handlingsnomen, deverbála dahkunomen*) on the same level as *rádjanmiella* (113) and *báhčinskihpár* (115), and purposive non-finites in *-nvárás* and *-ndihte*.

In light of actual language usage, the verb-like usage of *fáktemuš* (124) and *suoládahkis* (125) seem as isolated as that of *rádjanmiella* (113) which can hardly be attested outside Nielsen’s (1926) *Lærebok* and the literature based on it. This means that newly formed sentences such as (126) must be considered as eccentric as those seen in Examples (121–123) above:

(126) *??/*Gullen, ahte 1700-logus professoriin lei čállimuš ovtta nákkosgirjji juohke jagi.*

*??/*Gulle-n, ahte 1700-logu-s professor-ii-n le-i*

hear-PST.1SG COMP 1700-number-LOC professor-PL-LOC be-PST.3SG

čállimuš ovtta nákkos-girjji juohke jagi.

write-NMLZ one.GA claim-book.GA every year.GA

‘I heard that in the 18th century, the professors had to write a dissertation every year.’

Nielsen (1926: 319) also mentions Examples (127–128), cited and partly modified by O. H. Magga (1980: 67, 76) and Nickel (1994: 407). The productivity of these deverbals seems as minimal as that of those mentioned above, although Ante Aikio has kindly pointed out to me that the latter is paralleled by Example (129) in Nielsen’s dictionary:

(127) *Dat lea hui oažžul guliid.* (Nielsen 1926: 319)

Dat lea hui oažžu-l guli-i-d.

it be.3SG very get-ADJ fish-PL-GA

‘S/he is very good at catching fish.’

- (128) *Olbmuidd bealjit leat nu gullalaset diekkár áššiid.* (Nielsen 1926: 319)
Olbmu-i-d bealji-t lea-t nu gulla-las-at diekkár ášši-i-d.
 human-PL-GA ear-PL be-3PL SO hear-ADJ-PL such matter-PL-GA
 ‘People’s ears are eager to hear such things.’
- (129) *Gáljasiivu lea hui cábmálas heastta.* (Nielsen 1932–1962 s.v. *cab¹malás*)
Gálja-siivu lea hui cábmá-las heastta.
 slippery.ice-road.conditions be.3SG very exhaust-ADJ horse.GA
 ‘An ice-glaced road is very exhausting for a horse.’

When speaking of verb-like word forms as unique as those verbal noun compounds mentioned above (113–116) and other syntactically similar constructions (124–129), it must be stated that there is actually one type of deverbal derivation—deverbal nouns in *-u*—that appears to have a “productive” verbal syntax and is exemplified by a total of three authentic occurrences in the dialect material available; the fourth instance (133) of the same phenomenon occurred in a recent newspaper announcement:

- (130) *Beaivi go lei šaddan, šattai ohcu máná.*
 (MSFOu 61: 128, Kaakkuri, Matti Skore 1930)
Beaivi go le-i šadda-n, šatta-i ohc-u
 day as be-PST.3SG become-PTC.PST become-PST.3SG seek-NMLZ
máná.
 child.GA
 ‘As the day had come, the search for the child began.’
- (131) *Ja jos gádaš olbmo čalbmi daid oaidná, de dat álgá gádaštit ja iige
 lihkostuva bivdu šat dan olmui guhte lea bivddus dakkáraš ealliid, mat
 leat ruđa veara.* (JSFOu 71: 37, Vuovdaguoika, Aslak Guttorm 1955)
Ja jos gádaš olbmo čalbmi da-i-d oaidná, de dat álgá
 and if jealous human.GA eye it-PL-GA see.3SG PRT it begin.3SG
gádaštit ja ii=ge lihkostuva bivd-u šat dan
 envy-INF and NEG.3SG=also succeed.CONNEG hunt-NMLZ anymore it.GA
olbmu-i guhte lea bivdd-u-s dakkáraš ealli-i-d,
 human-ILL who be.3SG hunt-NMLZ-LOC such animal-PL-GA
ma-t lea-t ruđa veara.
 REL-PL be-3PL money.GA worth
 ‘And if a jealous eye sees them, he or she will begin to envy them, and
 hunting for a person who hunts animals that are worth money will not
 succeed.’

(132) *Ja son muitái, ahte son lei sáhtus muhtun amas hearrá.*

(MSFOu 124: 106–107, Njávđán, Anders Olsen Rauna 1920)

Ja son muitái-i, ahte son le-i
 and 3SG remember.INCH-PST.3SG COMP 3SG be-PST.3SG
sáht-u-s muhtun amas hearrá.
 escort-NMLZ-LOC some foreign gentleman.GA

‘And he began to remember that he was escorting a foreign gentleman.’

(133) *Leat go ozus ovtta dahje eambbo mátkeguimmiid[?]*

(Ávvir 5.6.2008, p. 15)

Lea-t=go oz-u-s ovtta dahje eambbo mátkeguimmi-i-d?
 be-2SG=Q seek-NMLZ-LOC one.GA or more travel-companion-PL-GA
 ‘Are you seeking one or more travel companions?’

Nouns like *ohcu* ‘search’, *bivdu* ‘hunt’ and *sáhttu* ‘escorting’ and are semantically very close to the fully productive verbal noun in *-n* (*ohcan*, *bivdin*, *sáhtašepmi*). In practice, however, the locative forms *bivddus*, *sáhtus* and *ozus* are best paraphrased with the so-called action essive in *-min* ~ *-me(n)*. As already illustrated by Examples (17–21), the action essive is used in various progressive functions, whereas certain functions of the locative form of the verbal noun have resulted in the so-called action locative or second infinitive which has somewhat different functions (see Examples 5–6). — Speaking of the action locative in this connection, it must be pointed out that this non-finite is also occasionally used as a stative, locative-like adverbial modifier (for similar, likewise rather occasional usage of the infinitive in *-t*, see Ylikoski 2005: 207 n. 11; Vuolab-Lohi 2007: 426):

(134) *Moai ean birge dušše vuovdimis t-báiddiid, danne fertejetne diinet viesso-láiguid eará s[a]jjs, dadjá Ragnhild.* (Áššu 21.7.2006, p. 13)

Moai ean birge dušše vuovdi-mis t-báiddi-i-d,
 1DU NEG.1DU get.along.CONNEG only sell-2INF T-shirt-PL-GA
danne ferte-jetne diine-t viesso-láigu-i-d eará saji-s,
 therefore must-1DU earn-INF house-rent-PL-GA other place-LOC
dadjá Ragnhild.
 say.3SG Ragnhild

‘We don’t get along only by selling T-shirts, therefore we must get money for rent elsewhere, says Ragnhild.’

- (135) *Buohkat geat dorjot leat mielde veahkeheames olbmuid geaid máilbmi ii oainne.* (Áššu 2.3.2007, p. 24)

Buohkat *gea-t* *dorjo-t* *lea-t* *mielde* *veahkeh-eames*
 everyone who-PL support-3PL be-3PL with help-2INF
olbmui-d *gea-i-d* *máilbmi* *ii* *oainne.*
 human-PL-GA who-PL-GA world NEG.3SG see.CONNEG
 ‘All who give their support are involved in helping those who are not
 seen by the world.’

However, to return to the more common functional similarity of the action essive and the locative *bivddus*, *sáhtus* and *ozus*, their mutual proximity may also be seen in Example (136):

- (136) *Mii lávet maid fitnat guollebivddus dahje murjeme.*
 (Áššu 28.11.2006, p. 13)

Mii *láve-t* *maid* *fitna-t*
 1PL be.in.the.habit.of-1PL also go.and.come.back-INF
guolle-bivdd-u-s *dahje* *murje-me.*
 fish-try.to.catch-NMLZ-LOC or pick.berries-ACTESS
 ‘It is our custom to go fishing or berrying.’

The word form *guollebivddus* above also illustrates that derivations like *bivdu* are quite typical deverbal nouns in that they do not have objects, but the “patient”, or some other participant, in the action (*bivdu*) may be rather expressed as the first part of a compound noun (*guolle-* ‘fish’). However, in Examples (131–133) the patients are expressed as objects just as they would be in the corresponding action essive constructions *lea bivdimin dakkáraš ealliid* ‘id.’, *lei sáhtašeamen muhtun amas hearrá* ‘id.’ and *ohcamin ovttá dahje eambo mátkeguimmiid* ‘id.’. The nominative phrase *ohcu máná* ‘the search for the child’ (130), however, seems to lack clear parallels, as the corresponding **ohcan máná* (instead of *máná ohcan*) would be just as ungrammatical as would **juhkan vuola* ‘drinking of beer’ discussed in Section 2.2.

It is also of interest to note that in addition to forming an extraordinarily well “established” type sporadic verb-like derivations,³⁹ the four occurrences of *ohcu*, *bivdu* and *sáhttu* represent the only category of deverbal nouns that has parallel morphosyntactic features in other Saami languages and even in the more remote Finnic languages. In (137), the illative form of the Inari Saami *sáttu*

³⁹ The “sporadically verb-like derivations” here may be interpreted as including the two instances of a verb genitive with an object, presented in Examples (76–77).

(~ North Saami *sáhttu*) takes the object *taid*, and *sáátun taid* seems to correspond to the use of the infinitive (*vuolgi-j ... sátti-đ ta-i-d* [leave-PST.3SG escort-INF it-PL-ACC] ‘went to escort them’). In Finnic, the best, and even etymologically identical, parallels to (130) and (133) are expressions such as (138–139) from Finno-Karelian folk poetry, and functionally similar constructions (140–141; cf. 132, 137) are also known in idiomatic expressions in the everyday language, although these are a bit more remote:

- (137) *Na nuuvthan tot, uázui oppeet täid čuudijd, tiädustuv oskođ tom já, nuuvthan tot vuolgi-j oppeet, ovttáain stuárráamuzzáain kárbáain, sáátun taid já, ja suuvái toho, miätä Aanaar, já, já...*

(MSFOu 213: 17–19, Aanaar, Iisakki Paadar 1952)

Na nuuvt=han tot, uázu-i oppeet tä-i-d čuudi-j-d,
 well so=to.be.sure it get-PST.3SG again this-PL-ACC Chud-PL-ACC
tiädustuv osko-đ to-m já, nuuvt=han tot vuolgi-j
 of.course believe-INF it-ACC and so=to.be.sure it leave-PST.3SG
oppeet, ovttáa-in stuárráa-muzzáa-in kárbáa-in, sáát-u-n
 again one-COM large-SUPERL-COM boat-COM escort-NMLZ-ILL
ta-i-d já, ja suuvá-i toho, miätä Aanaar,
 it-PL-ACC and and row-PST.3SG thither along (Lake.)Inari.GEN
já, já
 and and

‘Well, in that manner he got these Chudes (villains) to believe it once again, and well, he went again, with one of the largest boats, to escort them, and he rowed thither, along Lake Inari, and...’

- (138) “...*Et ollut ve’en etsossa, / olit sulhasen etsossa, / punapaulan puujelos-sa, kautokengän katselossa.*” (Kanteletar III: 23: 141–144)

E-t ol-lut ve’e-n ets-o-ssa,
 NEG-2SG be-PTC.ACT.PST water-GEN seek-NMLZ-INE
ol-i-t sulhase-n ets-o-ssa,
 be-PST-2SG fiancé-GEN seek-NMLZ-INE
puna-paula-n puujel-o-ssa,
 red-lace-GEN be.busy.with-NMLZ-INE
kauto-kengä-n katsel-o-ssa.
 upper.leather-shoe-GEN look-NMLZ-INE

‘You were not looking for water, you were looking for a fiancé, busy making red lace, looking for closed-toed shoes.’

- (139) *Mielikki, metsän emäntä, / Tapiolan tarkka vaimo, / läksi hammasta
hakahun, / kynsiä kyselemähän / ... (Kalevala 46: 419–422)*
Mielikki, metsä-n emäntä, / Tapiola-n tarkka vaimo, /
 Mielikki forest-GEN hostess Tapiola-GEN punctual wife
läksi hammas-ta hak-u-hun, / kyns-i-ä
 go.PST.3SG tooth-PART seek-NMLZ-ILL nail-PL-PART
kys-ele-mähän
 ask-FREQ-3INFILL
 ‘Then Mielikki, woodland hostess, / Wisest maid of Tapiola, / Sought for
 teeth and claws to give him, / ...’ (*The Kalevala* 1891: 672)
- (140) *Rami oli tyttöä saatilla.* ([http://www.msccrossroads.org/cgi-bin/
YaBB.cgi?num=1136303583/20](http://www.msccrossroads.org/cgi-bin/YaBB.cgi?num=1136303583/20) 14.12.2007)
Rami ol-i tyttö-ä saat-i-lla.
 Rami be-PST.3SG girl-PART escort-NMLZ-ADE
 ‘Rami was escorting a girl.’
- (141) *Isäntä on pappia kyydissä.*
Isäntä on pappi-a kyydi-ssä.
 master be.3SG pastor-PART give.ride.NMLZ-INE
 ‘The master of the house is giving the pastor a ride.’

The Finnish Examples (138–141) are also relevant in the sense that the role of such marginalia in the general structure of the language was debated as early as the 19th century (cf. Paunonen 1976: 342–343); since then, they have remained outside the basic descriptions of the non-finite verb forms. Now, it appears that the same should be the case for the various Saami expressions presented in this section: As captivating as these phenomena may be, they still remain in the outer margins by being highly irregular and unproductive, and many of them even seem unattestable in the authentic material on Saami languages. Even though the existence and general acceptability of constructions like *rádjanmiella dan šibiha* (113) or *fáktemuš juohke balvva* (124) are surely worth further research, our current knowledge of them hardly gives reason to describe them on a par with formations as regular as the non-finites in *-ndihte ~ -nvárás*, or *-nláhkai*, for that matter. Such practice, begun by Nielsen (1926: 389–390), has nevertheless continued down to our time, as even the most extensive descriptions of North Saami still present both *-ndihte ~ -nvárás* and *-nmiella* (113), and *-nskihpárin* (115) vaguely as “certain occurrences” of the verbal noun that may be considered non-finite verb forms (Nickel 1994: 313, 474) or otherwise belonging to a unitary group of “deverbal action noun” (*deverbála dahkunomen*) constructions with objects (Sammallahti 2005: 95).

To further emphasize the full productivity of *-ndihte*, its frequency can be illustrated by affirming that on June 16th, 2007, random Google searches for such expressions gave the following results: <*oažžun dihte*> ‘in order to get’ 134 instances, <*oažžundihte*> 55, <*oažžun dihtii*> 87 and <*oažžundihtii*> 6 (in total 282 instances); and <*gávdnan dihte*> ‘in order to find’ 41, <*gávdnandihte*> 2, <*gávdnan dihtii*> 6 and <*gávdnandihtii*> 2 (total 51). A clear majority of these were followed by objects and other modifiers typical of verb forms. Corresponding purposive expressions with (*oažžun/gávdnan*) *várás*, *váste* and *nam-mii*, or compound nouns such as *oažžunmiella* and *gávdnanmiella*, were not found, but each search for the formally analogous formations <*oažžun láhkai*>, <*oažžunláhkai*>, <*gávdnan láhkai*> and <*gávdnanláhkai*> gave two results (total 8). Due to the technical limitations of Google and other web search engines, it is not possible to perform combined searches for innumerable potential word forms such as those ending with *-miella* or *-nskihpárin*, but it is nevertheless to be presumed that none of such constructions are followed by objects in the internet either.

The absence of a certain phenomenon in a corpus does not inevitably lead to the conclusion that a given phenomenon does not exist in the language, however. Even though a construction of the type *borranmiella báhpiriid* ‘the desire to eat’ (117) seems to be missing from nearly all the authentic research material at our disposal, future corpora could help us locate more such formations. The current situation can be compared to a study of the so-called 5th infinitive in Finnish: With the lone exception of Dubrovina (1972: 203), this verb form has for more than a century been unanimously described as occurring only in connection with the verb *olla* ‘be’, resulting in proximative predicates often characterized as “periphrastic types of constructions”. It was not until the internet and the 180-million-word electronic corpus of Finnish were available that it became easy to discern (Ylikoski 2003a) that only about one in over three million Finnish word forms is an instance of a 5th infinitive that is used as an optional modifier to a verb other than *olla*.⁴⁰ Yet, it ought to be clear that before such concrete evidence can be found, the relevance of the Examples (113–116) to basic descriptions of North Saami can hardly be underestimated, not to speak of their being presented as in any way equal to the non-finite in *-ndihte*.

⁴⁰ E.g., *Vene keikku-i irtautu-maisilla-an* [boat toss-PST.3SG get.loose-5INF-3] ‘the boat was tossing, about to get loose’ (Ylikoski 2003b: 13, 43; cf. Ylikoski 2004a: 128–129, 152 for a parallel expression with the action essive in North Saami).

3.1.5. On the morphological independence of the non-finites in *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai*: the role of conjunction reduction in North Saami inflection and derivation

Much of the discussion in the preceding sections has centered on syntactic and semantic features of various non-finite constructions that imply that the formations in *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai* are best analyzed as verb forms of their own, independent of the normal use of the verbal noun. As regards their morphology, it was mentioned in Section 3.1.2.1 that nearly all of the thousands of syntactically verbal constructions with *dihte* are based on the shorter *-n* form of the verbal nouns—otherwise used only as the first part of compound words—even though there are some very sporadic occurrences of “*-madihte/-midihte* forms” as well (see Examples 60–63). However, earlier scholars have not been too concerned over the fact that *-ndihte* is formally different from the predictable use of the verbal noun genitive-accusative forms. This view has also been partly expressed by Sammallahti (2005: 95) who characterizes constructions such as *oidnin várás bártniid* ‘in order to see the boys’, comparable to *gullan dihte Ipmil sáni* ‘in order to hear the word of God’ (ibid., p. 175; see Example 57 in Ylikoski 2004a: 95) as postpositional phrases in which postpositions are complemented by the “deverbal action noun” (*deverbála dahkunomen*). However, Sammallahti (2005: 119, 122, 127, 175, 243; 2007: 6) has more consistently characterized the same phenomena as instances of the “action genitive” (*aktio genetiiva*), a verb form apparently used only as a syntactically noun-like complement of the postpositions *dihte*, *várás* and *láhkai*.⁴¹

As far as I can see, there is hardly any reason to cling to the tradition of viewing the *-n* formative in *-ndihte* as an unaccountable variant of the verbal noun genitive-accusative form (cf. the remoteness of forms like *muital-eami* [tell-VN.GA] ‘of telling’ and *čalmmusteami* [indicate-VN.GA] ‘of indicating’ vs. *muitalan-* and *čalmmustan-* mentioned in Sections 2.2 and 3.1.2). Similar problems remain concerning Sammallahti’s (2005, 2007) postulation of a totally novel verb form, the above-mentioned “action genitive” with no inherent meaning of its own, used only to complement the few postpositions *dihte*, *várás* and *láhkai* in the correspondingly peculiar type of postpositional phrases that so starkly differ from the morphologically, syntactically and semantically predictable verbal noun constructions of the type *-ma/-mi dihte/várás/láhkai*. Moreover, the idea of an inflectional word form such as the North Saami “action genitive” seems to lack any typological parallels whatsoever, whereas the view that the outcome of

⁴¹ As pointed out in Sammallahti (2007: 6), the “action genitive” is formally identical to the “action nominative” (*aktio nominatiiva*) or the so-called agentive passive participle that will be described in more detail in Section 3.2.1 below.

the undisputable grammaticalization of postpositions such as *dihte* and *várás* can be seen as the genesis of new converb forms is perfectly in accord with our typological knowledge of adverbial inflectional forms and their development; compare, for example, the analogical development of the Eastern Mansi non-finite in *-msyöt* ‘while V-ing’ from the so-called past participle (here: verbal noun) in *-m* followed by *syüwt* ‘during’ (= *syüw-t* [time-LOC]) and other similar non-finites described in Kulonen (2007: 204–205; see also Tauli 1966: 94).⁴²

Nevertheless, there is one morphological feature of *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai* that needs to be discussed in more detail, namely the occasional occurrence of compounded formations such as *nannen- ja ovddidandihte vuosehangiela* ‘in order to strengthen and develop the sign language’ (Ylikoski 2004a: 112–113, 136–141) and *oaidnin ja dutkan láhkái* ‘visible and “studyable”’ (Ylikoski 2006a: 33–34). (For more examples, see 71–72 above.) Even though one cannot deny the material transparency of ordinary simple constructions in which the formally uneroded postposition-like element has been traditionally and certainly quite consciously written as a separate word,⁴³ the origins of these formations become even more obvious in expressions such as *nannen- ja ovddidandihte vuosehangiela*, although they are still quite different from true postpositional phrases with a different morphology, word order and semantics (cf. *vuoseh-angiela nanne-m-a ja ovddid-eami dihte* [show-VN-language.GA strengthen-VN-GA and develop-VN.GA because] meaning primarily ‘due to the strengthening and development of the sign language’).

However, I wish to argue in what follows that the kind of conjunction reduction manifested in expressions such as *nannen- ja ovddidandihte* must not be seen as an obstacle to considering the formations *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai* fundamentally different from other suffixes of North Saami, as the same kind of conjunction reduction can in fact be observed in many other inflectional and derivational categories as well. To my knowledge, however, such phenomena have remained unnoticed apart from the use of the plural comitative suffix *-(i)guin* that originates in the postposition **guoimmi* (< Proto-Saami **kuojmē(-n)*). In Ylikoski (2004a: 141; 2006a: 33–34), constructions of the type *V-n- ja V-ndihte*

⁴² Pekka Sammallahti (personal communication) has also put forward a suggestion that “action genitive” constructions such as *<juhkan dihte>* ‘in order to drink’ can be regarded as not only semantically but also syntactically equal to analytical infinitival constructions such as the English *in order to drink* or the corresponding *for å drikke* in Norwegian. In principle, an analysis of this kind is certainly possible as well, but it does not alleviate the problem of postulating a typologically unusual inflectional item that is some kind of verb (and expressly not a noun) form used exclusively, that is, unlike the above-mentioned infinitives, as a complement to only three or so postpositions to form an abstruse subtype of adpositional phrases that differs from the ordinary usage of adpositions in many respects.

⁴³ In other words, the development of the formations *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai* has apparently not yet reached the possible further stages of grammaticalization that could also include phonological or orthographical reduction comparable to the fate of *dihte* in the lexicalized adverbs *datte(t)*, *dette* ‘yet, however’ < *dandihte* < *dan dihte* [it.GA because] ‘because of it’ or the analogous development of its etymological equivalents in Finnish (*sentään* ‘yet, however’ < *sentähän* < *se-n tähden* [it-GEN because] ‘because of it’).

and *V-n- ja V-nláhkai* were compared to the use of the comitative suffix in the phrases *áhká-i(-d) ja máná-i-guin* [wife-PL(-GA) and child-PL-COM] and the more common *áhká-i-guin ja máná-i-guin* [wife-PL-COM and child-PL-COM] ‘with wives and children’. O. H. Magga (2002: 62) has recently focused attention on the same phenomenon in Example (142) that may be supplemented by Example (143) from Saami folklore:

(142) *Seahkka leai devdojuvvon silbbai ja golliguin.* (O. H. Magga 2002: 62)

Seahkka lea-i devd-ojuvvo-n silbba-i ja goll-i-guin.
sack be-PST.3SG fill-PASS-PTC.PST silver-PL.(OBL) and gold-PL-COM
‘The sack was filled with silver and gold.’

(143) *De čuorvugodii: «Rivttes olbmot, boahttet bissui- ja sáittiiguin! Guovža baiká din čáhcerudnái.»* (Gaski et al. 2004: 232 << LES 2: 2, Báhcca-vuotna, Anders Nilsen 1888)

*De čuorvu-godii: «Rivttes olbmo-t, boahte-t bissu-i-
PRT yell-INCH-PST.3SG real.ATTR human-PL come-IMP.2PL gun-PL.(OBL)
ja sáitti-i-guin! Guovža baiká din čáhce-rudná-i.»*
and spear-PL-COM bear defecate.3SG 2PL.GA water-hole.in.the.ice-ILL
‘Now, [the fox] began to yell: “Hey, people, come here with your guns and spears! The bear is shitting in your water-hole!”’

According to O. H. Magga (2002: 62), phrases such as *silbbai ja golliguin* can be compared with phrases such as *silba- ja golle-ruda-i-guin* [silver- and gold-money-PL-COM] ‘with silver and gold coins’, and this has led him to the conclusion that *-guin* is not a suffix, but formations such as *golliguin* should rather be seen as compound words as well. On the other hand, Nevis (1988: 45, 48–49) characterizes such constructions as instances of “clitic postpositions”.

Even though a characterization such as “clitic postpositions” should in principle also suit non-finites in *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai* (Ylikoski 2002: 140–141), such a wording carries with it a diachronic analysis that may be regarded as unnecessary and even unjustified in any synchronic description of the language. It is true that the split of the formatives *-(i)guin* and *-(n)dihte* into *N-i- ja N-i-guin* and *V-n- ja V-n-dihte* takes place at the syllable boundary that correlates with the earlier word boundary, but in a synchronic perspective, it might be more appropriate to regard such elements as mere “clitics” in the wide sense of having some of the properties of independent words and some more typical of bound morphemes. (For the past and present of the comitative in *-guin*, see also A. Aikio & Ylikoski 2007: 35, 40–41 and Antonsen 2007: 101–105, 122.) However, before relying on such ad hoc characterizations, we must note that such an approach would challenge the established view regard-

ing a great number of other more or less bound morphemes. Consider first the following examples:

- (144) *Sáhtte vássit guhtta jagi ovdal go irgi lei čohkken dan meare ollu gihliid ahte vuoni- ja vuohppasássa leigga duhtavaččat.* (A. Solbakk 2005a: 39)

Sáhtte vássi-t guhtta jagi ovdal go irgi le-i
 can.PST.3PL pass-INF six year.GA before COMP fiancé be-PST.3SG
čohkke-n dan meare ollu gihli-i-d ahte
 gather-PTC.PST it.GA amount.GA much betrothal.gift-PL-GA COMP
vuoni- ja vuohppa-sássa le-i-gga
 mother.in.law and father.in.law-future.relative be-PST-3DU
duhtavačča-t.
 content-PL

‘It could be that it took six years for the fiancé to gather enough betrothal gifts to satisfy his future parents-in-law.’

- (145) *Son leai Boasta-Lemet, gii ovddeš áigge, nuorra- ja olmmáivuoda beivviid siste lávii boastta fievrredit Iešnjárggas Hemmojohkii.*

(H. A. Guttorm 1986: 81)

Son lea-i Boasta-Lemet, gii ovddešáigge, nuorra- ja
 3SG be-PST.3SG mail-Lemet who earlier time.GA young- and
olmmái-vuoda beivvi-i-d siste lávi-i boastta
 man-hood.GA day-PL-GA in be.in.the.habit.of-PST.3SG mail.GA
fievrred-it Iešnjárgga-s Hemmojohk-ii.
 transport-INF Iešnjárga-LOC Hemmojohka-ILL

‘He was Lemet the postman, who used to deliver mail from Iešnjárga to Hemmojohka in olden times, in the days of his youth and manhood.’

Examples beginning from (144–145) show that phenomena similar to the conjunction reduction seen in constructions such as *nannen- ja ovddidandihte* and *silbbai ja golliiguin* can be found on many levels in Saami morphology. The morphemes *sássa* (144) and *vuohhta* (genitive-accusative *vuodá*) (145) are in fact sometimes regarded as more or less independent words meaning ‘a future relative’ and ‘-hood’, respectively: As for *sássa*, it is listed as an independent word in dictionaries such as those of Nielsen (1932–1962 s.v. *sässá*) and Sammallahti & Nickel (2006 s.v. *sássa*), although the former specifies that *sássa* is most often used as the last part of a compound.⁴⁴ On the other hand, Nielsen (1926: 208) described the same morpheme as a derivational suffix in his North Saami gram-

⁴⁴ Sammallahti and Nickel (2006 s.v. *sássa*) describe the morpheme as follows: *sássa* ‘der/die künftige Verwandte’; *-sássa* ‘künftig, angehend’.

mar, remarking that such formations lie on the border between derivations and compounds. Korhonen (1981a: 320) presents the formative as a derivational suffix (-*sássa*) only.

The morpheme *vuohhta* (145), in turn, has been described as a derivational deadjectival and denominal suffix by not only Nielsen (1926: 212–213) and Korhonen (1981a: 322), but also by Nickel (1994: 333–334) and Sammallahti (1998b: 90). Again, Nielsen (*ibid.*) remarks on the compound-like nature of *-vuohhta* forms, especially visible in deadjectival forms such as *lihkohisvuohhta* ‘accident; unhappiness’ that are based on the attributive (*lihkohis*) and not predicative (*lihkoheapmi* ~ *lihkoheapme*) forms of the adjectives, as if *lihkohis* were an adnominal modifier of *-vuohhta*. Somewhat strangely, Nickel (*ibid.*) adds that even though he describes the words with *-vuohhta* “for practical reasons”—although not specifying any such reasons—among derivations, they are in fact compound words. Neither Nickel nor other scholars have mentioned any examples of conjunction reduction (144–145) as evidence in favor of interpreting these formations as compound words; it appears that the only explicit reason for such an interpretation has been a phonological one. As Nielsen (1926: 56–57) remarked, there are only a few bound morphemes with the vowel *á* (-*sássa*) or one of the diphthongs *ie*, *oa* and *uo* such as *-vuohhta* or the inchoative formative *-goahhti-* seen in Example (153) below (see also Korhonen 1974: 101).

As regards the morphosyntactic independence of these morphemes, Nielsen (1932–1962 s.v. *sāssá*) presents a lone Example (146) in which *sássa* occurs as a word form of its own:

- (146) *Gosa dus dat sássa manai?* (Nielsen 1932–1962 s.v. *sāssá*)
Gosa du-s dat sássa mana-i?
 whither 2SG-LOC it future.relative go-PST.3SG
 ‘Where did that future relative of yours go?’

As for *vuohhta*, Nielsen (1932–1962 s.v. **vuottá : vūttii*) and also Sammallahti and Nickel (2006 s.v. *vuohhta*) mention the use of the plain **vuohhta* in idiomatic expressions such as *váldi-t vuhti-i* [take-INF **vuohhta*-ILL] ‘take into consideration’, whereas the derived or compounded nouns in *-vuohhta* are left unmentioned on these occasions.

Even if *sássa* and *vuohhta* may be considered to be more or less independent nouns, it seems far more difficult to suggest analogous explanations for the following occurrences of the adjectival derivatives in Examples (147–149):

- (147) *Don áhče- ja eatneheapme, du ráhkis unna oarbbes mánáš, atte munnje gápmagiid bohcconáhkis, atte munnje skeaŋkka, dakkár bivdoealli mii addá njálgga varramáli, bivdoealli meara čiekŋalastas ii ge eatnanguolbaniin.* (Kristiansen 2004: 31)

Don áhče- ja eatne-heapme, du ráhkis unna
 2SG father- and mother-less 2SG.GA dear little.ATTR
oarbbes máná-š, atte munnje gápmag-ii-d
 orphan.ATTR child-DIM, give.IMP.2SG 1SG.ILL shoe-PL-GA
bohcco-náhki-s, atte munnje skeanjka, dakkár
 reindeer.GA-leather-LOC give.IMP.2SG 1SG.ILL present.GA such
bivd-o-ealli mii addá njálgga varra-máli,
 hunt-NMLZ-animal.GA REL give.3SG delicious.ATTR blood-soup.GA
bivd-o-ealli meara čiekŋallas ii=ge
 hunt-NMLZ-animal(.GA) sea.GA depth.LOC NEG.3SG=and
eatnan-guolban-ii-n.
 land-dry.(peaty.)terrain-PL-LOC

‘You father- and motherless one, dear little orphan child, give me reindeer-leather shoes, give me a present, game that makes a delicious blood soup, a game animal from the depths of the sea instead of the dry land.’

- (148) *Ahk[e]rádjá lea 18 jagi fievrridit riikii tuollo- ja divathis duhpátgálvvuid.* (Min Áigi 7.3.1997, p. 2)

Ahke-rádjá lea 18 jagi fievrrid-it riiki-i tuollo-
 age-limit be.3SG 18 year.GA transport-INF country-ILL duty-
ja divat-his duhpát-gálvvu-i-d.
 and fee-less.ATTR tobacco-product-PL-GA

‘There is an age limit of 18 years for importing duty-free (“duty- and fee-free”) tobacco products in the country.’

- (149) *Finnmárkkku fylkkagielddas lea doarjjaortnet, man mielde fylkkagielda addá doarjaga, reanto- ja divatkeahtes loana, priváhta viessohukse-jeaddjiide, geat huksejit lanjaid/ásodagaid joatkaskuvlla oahppiide.* (Min Áigi 18.1.1995, p. 3)

Finnmárkkku fylkkagieldda-s lea doarjja-ortnet, man
 Finnmark.GA county-LOC be.3SG support-system REL.GA
mielde fylkkagielda addá doarjag-a, reanto- ja
 according county give.3SG support-GA interest- and
divat-keahtes loana, priváhta viesso-hukse-jeaddji-i-de, geat
 fee-keahtes loan.GA private house-build-PTC.PRS-PL-ILL who-PL
hukse-jit lanja-i-d/ásodaga-i-d joatka-skuvlla
 build-3PL room-PL-GA/dormitory-PL-GA continuation-school.GA
oahppi-i-de.
 student-PL-ILL

‘Finnmark/Finnmark county has a subvention system according to which the county provides subsidies, an interest- and fee-free loan, to private builders who build rooms or dormitories for high-school students.’

Constructions such as *áhče- ja eatneheapme* (147) do not simply consist of coordinated noun pairs such as *áhčči ja eadni* followed by the so-called caritive adjective suffix *-heapmi* (*-heapme*), but also the first part of the construction is in the weak gradation *áhče-* required by *-heapmi* in words like *áhčeheapme* ‘fatherless’. Viewed from syntactic and semantic perspectives, *áhče- ja eatneheapme* (147) correspond to the somewhat infrequent English expression *father- and motherless*. It appears that this feature of *-less* may be considered a remnant of the formerly free Old English word *léas* (cf. *firena léas* ‘free from crimes’; OED s.v. *-less*), quite like the use of *free* in the translations of *tuollo- ja divathis* ‘duty- and fee-free’ (148) and *reanto- ja divatkeahtes* ‘interest- and fee-free’ (149). However, the North Saami morphemes *-heapme/-his* (147–148) and *-keahtes* (149) are not considered to have been derived from free words but from combinations of bound morphemes including the Uralic abessive or caritive suffix **-pta/-ptä*, so that it would be quite difficult to explain the constructions in Examples (147–149) as being compound words consisting of nouns such as *áhčči* ‘father’ and *eadni* ‘mother’ followed by the “adjectives” *heapme/his* and *keahtes*. Such explanations would be even more defective for the following constructions wherein the attributive *-keahtes* (150) and its predicative and adverbial counterpart *-keahtá* (151) are attached to coordinated verb stems:

- (150) *Jagiin manjil 1850 ledjege olu čujut- ja mávssekeahtes sierradivadiid murrenrágg[á]štusáššit, belohakkii stáhta ja belohakkii priváhta eatnamiin gos vuovdi gulai almmolašvuhtii.*
 (<http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/kilde/000/nou/1993/0034/ddd/pdts/nou199319930034000dddpdts.pdf> 14.12.2007)
Jagi-i-n manjil 1850 le-dje=ge olu čujut- ja
 year-PL-LOC after 1850(.GA) be-PST.3PL=indeed many plead- and
mávsse-keahtes sierra-divad-ii-d murre-n-rággáš-tus-ášši-t,
 pay-keahtes separate-fee-PL-GA chop.wood-VN-punish-NMLZ-issue-PL
belohakkii stáhta ja belohakkii priváhta eatnam-ii-n
 half state.GA and half private land-PL-LOC
gos vuovdi gula-i almmolaš-vuhti-i.
 where forest belong-PST.3SG public-hood-ILL
 ‘In the years after 1850, there were indeed many lawsuits concerning special fees (on felling trees and chopping wood) that had not been paid or argued against [i.e., no pleas were offered in defense], both on state land and on private land where the forest belonged to the public.’

- (151) *Fástu, borakeahtáiivuohta lea oskku vierru ahte eallit veahá bottu bora- ja jugakeahtá.* (OT, p. 669)

Fástu, bora-keahtáiivuohta lea oskku vierru ahte
 fasting eat-VABE-hood be.3SG faith.GA practice COMP
ealli-t veahá bottu bora- ja jugakeahtá.
 live-INF little while eat- and drink-VABE

‘Fasting, abstaining from food [i.e., “uneatenness”] is a religious practice of going a little while without eating and drinking.’

If the instances of conjunction reduction seen in Examples (147–149) are to be regarded as something very different from the more prototypical realization of derivation or inflection, the morphology of *čujut- ja mávssekeahtes* and *bora- ja jugakeahtá* challenge the traditional morphological description of Saami and other Uralic languages in two ways: In addition to having to explain the essence of *-keahtes* and *-keahtá* anew (i.e., if they are not regarded as suffixes anymore), we would have to postulate a new inflectional verb form, formally identical to the connegative form discussed in Section 1.1, with which the elements *-keahtes* and *-keahtá* would be compounded.⁴⁵ Furthermore, Example (152) shows that a similar phenomenon of conjunction reduction is also possible with another non-finite, the gerund in *-dettiin*:

- (152) *SFS doarju sámegiela geavaheami, muhto ii eis[e]ge vuostálastte eará gielaid geavaheami ge sámi áššiid ja beroštumiid ovddideames – min lahtut áinnas dahket dange, sihke máilmmielaid bokte ja smávit giellafoavkkuid bokte dego skandináviagielaideid hála- ja čáledettiin.*

(Gaski & J. T. Solbakk 2002: 4)

SFS doarju sámegiela geavah-eami, muhto ii
 SFS support.3SG Saami-language.GA use-VN.GA but NEG.3SG
eisege vuostálastte eará giela-i-d geavah-eami=ge sámi
 at.all oppose.CONNEG other language-PL-GA use-VN.GA=also Saami.GA
ášši-i-d ja beroštumi-i-d ovddid-eame-s – min
 issue-PL-GA and concern-PL-GA promote-VN-LOC 1PL.GA
lahtu-t áinnas dahke-t dan=ge, sihke máilmmi-giela-i-d
 member-PL certainly do-3PL it.GA=also both world.GA-language-PL-GA

⁴⁵ In fact, the Mordvin languages do possess a somewhat similar “construction of negative gerunds and participles” as characterized by Hamari (2007: 119), that is, a construction in which the etymologically obscure negation particle *apak* is followed, although not preceded as in the cases of *-keahtá* and *-keahtes*, by the lexical verb in the connegative form. For example, the functional equivalent of *jugakeahtá* ‘without drinking’ as well as the corresponding attributive expression *jugakeahtes* ‘undrunk’ is *apak šime (anak cume)* [*apak* drink.CONNEG] in Erzya Mordvin (see also Csepregi 2001: 185).

bokte ja smávi-t giella-joavkku-i-d bokte dego
 through and small-CMPR language-group-PL-GA through such.as
skandinávia-giela-i-d hála- ja čále-dettiin.
 Scandinavia-language-PL-GA speak- and write-GER
 ‘SFS [= *Sámi fágagirjjálaš čálliid- ja jorgaleaddjiidsearvi*, i.e. *the Sami Non-fiction Writers and Translators Association*] supports the use of the Saami language, but does not by any means oppose using other languages in promoting Saami issues and concerns—our members certainly do that as well, both in using the world’s major languages and in using languages of smaller language groups, for example, when speaking and writing Scandinavian languages.’

In addition to the considerable challenges of re-explaining various nominal and adjectival derivatives as well as a couple of non-finite verb forms, parallel occurrences of unprecedented conjunction reduction can also be found in the field of verbal derivation as exemplified by the following sentences:

- (153) *De neavvui válddi dulka daid nieiddaid movt galget čohkkat geresis, goppos geres hállaniš- ja šleangasišgoahta, doppil galget eret hállet geres, amaset si eai eret ravgga dahje fierral geresis.* (Hætta & Bær 1982: 88)
De neavvu-i válddi dulka da-i-d nieidda-i-d
 PRT advice-PST.3SG bailiff.GA interpreter it-PL-GA girl-PL-GA
movt galge-t čohkka-t geres-is, goppos geres
 how must-3PL sit-INF sledge-LOC to.which.direction sledge
hállan-iš- ja šleangas-išgoahta, doppil galge-t eret
 lean-iš- and rock-INCH.3SG in.that.direction must-3PL away
hálle-t geres-a, ama-set si eai eret ravgga
 bend-INF sledge-GA NEGSUP-3PL 3PL NEG.3PL away fall.CONNEG
dahje fierral geres-is.
 or roll.CONNEG sledge-LOC
 ‘The bailiff’s interpreter gave those girls advice on how to sit in the sledge, that when the sledge begins to lean and rock in one direction, they must bend the sledge away from that direction, lest they fall or roll away from the sledge.’
- (154) *Dát leat sánit mat vaikko vel oanehaččat, de dattege bastilit ja bahč[č]agit govvejit olu sápmelaččaid eallinvásáhusaid nuorravuoda rájis gitta bures rávis- ja eallilanolbmo rádjái go deaividit ovddeš áiggiid, ja gitta otná[ž]ii seilon almmolašvuoda garra suomai-, dárui-, ruotai- ja ruoššaiduhttimiin.* (J. T. Solbakk 2005: 20)

Dát lea-t sáni-t ma-t vaikko vel oanehačča-t, de
 this.PL be-3PL word-PL REL-PL though yet brief-PL PRT
datte=ge bastil-it ja bahččag-it govve-jit olu
 however=also pungent-ADV and bitter-ADV describe-3PL many
sápmelačča-i-d ealli-n-vásáhusa-i-d nuorra-vuođa rájis
 Saami-PL-GA live-VN-experience-PL-GA young-hood.GA since
gitta bures rávis- ja eallilan-olbmo rádjái go deaivid-it
 up.to well grown.up and aged-human.GA until when meet-3PL
ovddeš áiggi-i-d, ja gitta otnáž-ii seilo-n
 earlier time-PL-GA and up.to today-ILL remain-PTC.PST
almmolaš-vuođa garra suoma-i-, dárui-, ruota-i- ja
 general-hood.GA hard.ATTR Finnish-i- Norwegian-i- Swedish-i- and
ruošša-iduhtti-m-iin.

Russian-TRANSF-VN-COM

‘These are words that—even though they are small words—nevertheless pointedly and bitterly describe the life experiences of many Saami from their youth up to their adulthood and old age, when they are faced with the old times and the general Finnicization, Norwegianization, Swedification and Russification that has remained to our days.’

A more common way of expressing the semantic contents of *hállaniš- ja šleangasišgoahtá* ‘begins to lean and rock’ in Example (153) would be through a coordination of full verb forms (*hállanišgoahtá ja šleangasišgoahtá*), formed with the inchoative suffix *-(i)šgoahti-*. Correspondingly, *suomai-, dárui-, ruotai- ja ruoššaiduhttimiin* in (154) is equal to a more normal way of coordinating full *-iduhtti-* verbs in the form *suomaiduhttimiin, dáruiduhttimiin, ruotaiduhttimiin ja ruoššaiduhttimiin*. Now, it would hardly be reasonable to postulate verb lexemes such as *(-)goahtit* ‘begin’ or *(-)duhttit* ‘transform, convert’, not to speak of new bound morphemes (*-iš, -i*) and corresponding inflectional or derivational verb forms such as *hállaniš* (← *hállan-it* [lean-INF]) or to ponder whether *suomai, dárui* and *ruotai* (← *suoma-* ‘Finnish’, *dáru-* ‘Norwegian’ and *ruota-* ‘Swedish’) are noun, adjective or verb forms.

Even though all the above-mentioned examples of conjunction reduction are quite rare in North Saami, they are by no means entirely unique. As for the *-guin* comitative (142–143) and *-vuohta* nouns (145), more examples can be found quite easily, and I am also aware of as many as four similar occurrences of the *-keahtes/-keahtá* seen in Examples (149–151). The allomorphs *-heapme* (147) and *-his* (148) are used in complementary distribution according to their syntactic (predicative resp. attributive) functions, and the conjunction reduction seen in (147–148) is paralleled also in the Lule Saami expression *bielje- ja giela-*

dipme [ear- and language-less] ‘deaf-mute’ (O. Korhonen 2007 s.v. *bielje-*).⁴⁶ The analogous behaviour of *-dettiin* (152), *-(iš)goahti-* (153) and *-iduhtti-* (154) must be regarded as hapax legomena, however, but even as such they remind us of the continuous nature of the phenomena in question. It is also good to note that in a similar manner to the claimed compound nouns with *-sássa* (144) and *-vuohta* (145), the inchoative *-(iš)goahti-* verbs have also been characterized as compound verbs (Nickel 1994: 263, 389; Korhonen 1981a: 106), though without explanations for such interpretations.⁴⁷

Of course, it is not possible to determine the most appropriate ways analyzing every instance of conjunction reduction seen in Examples (142–154) within the confines of this study. Instead, the diversity of the above examples is intended to provide evidence that even though diachronic and quantitative approaches to *-(n)dihte*, *-(n)láhkai* or *-(i)guin* may tempt us to regard them as clitic postpositions of some kind, a strictly synchronic and purely qualitative point of view must not automatically lead us to the same conclusion. However, it is quite interesting to observe these phenomena from a diachronic perspective as well, since many of the above examples open whole new vistas on the historical morphology of North Saami.

In the light of the so-called grammaticalization theory, constructions such as *V-n- ja V-n-dihte* and *N-i- ja N-i-guin* may be seen as quite natural by-products of processes wherein postpositional phrases develop into adverbial verb forms or adverbial cases (i.e., “adverbial noun forms”; cf. Example 1 in Section 2.1), respectively. Also, the bound morpheme *-vuohta* (145) is supposed to have originated in the free noun **vōte* ‘year’ (Korhonen 1981a: 322; Sammallahti 1998b: 90). The origin of *-sássa* (144) is apparently unknown to date, but the origins of the other constructions are quite well known: It was already mentioned above that the morphemes *-heapme/-his* (147–148) and *-keahtes/-keahtá* (149–151) go back to combinations of bound morphemes that include the Uralic abessive suffix **-pta/-ptä* (for details, see e.g. Korhonen 1974: 172–181; 1981a: 226–227, 295, 328; Sammallahti 1998b: 87, 91). In the same vein, the received view on the origins of *-dettiin* (152), *-(iš)goahti-* (153) and *-iduhtti-* (154) is that they, too, are composed of smaller pieces of ancient derivational suffixes (Korhonen 1981a: 291–293; 329–331; 339–340; Sammallahti 1977; 1998b: 86, 92–93). If these views hold true, it appears that Examples (147–154) may be seen in some way as preliminary steps on the paths to degrammaticalization that may turn unambiguous derivational suffixes into more ambiguous clitic-like morphemes and

⁴⁶ I wish to thank Pekka Sammallahti for pointing out this example.

⁴⁷ Similar vacillation can be found in Erkki Itkonen’s Inari Saami dictionary (IW); compare the definition found under *-gyettid ~ -goattid* and that of the allomorphs *-škyettid ~ -škittid ~ -škattad* (s.v.) used with three-syllable verb stems: the former is characterized as a “momentanes bzw. inchoatives, einem Ableitungssuffix ähnliches Verb”, whereas the latter is a “Suffix der inchoativen Verben”.

ultimately into free words.⁴⁸ It is especially fascinating to observe that the most prominent examples of such a development involve the morphemes *-heapme/-his* and *-keahtá/-keahtes* (147–151) that are closely, both historically and functionally, connected with the postposition *haga* (< the abessive case suffix **-ptākeḱ* or **-ptākeḱen*) that is already one of the best-known counterexamples to the so-called unidirectionality hypothesis.⁴⁹

Generally speaking, the examples presented in this section include formations as various as those that have traditionally been regarded as 1) denominal nouns, 2) deadjectival nouns, 3) denominal adjectives, 4) denominal verbs and 5) deverbal verbs as well as formations that otherwise fulfill the established criteria for 6) nominal and 7) verbal inflection. Therefore, it would appear that if we seek a common denominator for all or at least a majority of these phenomena, the explanation must be a morpho(phono)logical one rather than one related to syntax or semantics. Since this study is based almost entirely on written material, the quest for such an explanation cannot be the major concern of this study either. Nevertheless, all but one (*-guin*) of the morphemes in question normally consist of two syllables, and according to Antonsen (2007: 102–105, 122), even the comitative plural has preserved its disyllabic allomorphs *-guoimi* and *-gu(o)ime* in the Gáivuotna dialect. The morpheme *-his* in Example (148) can be regarded as an attributive allomorph of the predicative *-heapme* (147). What is more, the first syllable usually contains either a long vowel (e.g. *-ndihte /-ntihte/, -nláhkai /-nlaahkaj/, -sássa /-saassa/, -(d)ettiin /-(ḱ)eettijn/*) or a diphthong (e.g. *-vuohta, -keahtá, -heapme, -(iṣ)goahti-*), although such comparatively heavy affixes are otherwise quite uncommon in North Saami that is, after all, a rather fusional language in which the great majority of inflectional words are formed with monosyllabic suffixes only or no segmentable suffix at all (cf. Table 8 in Section 4.2.1). In other words, all of the above-mentioned morphemes may possibly be perceived as not really possessing the characteristic features of suffixes proper,

⁴⁸ In spite of the thorough and quite credible explanation for the origin of *-(iṣ)goahti-*, being compared to the functionally corresponding Veps inchoative suffix *-škande-* (Sammallahti 1977), I wish to point out an alternative explanation based on the notable formal and functional similarity of *-(iṣ)goahti-* (infinitive *-(iṣ)goahtit*) and the Saami verb *boahhtit* ‘come’: It might not be impossible to think that verb forms such as *hállan-iṣ- ja šleangas-iṣgoahtá* [lean-iṣ- and rock-INCH.3SG] ‘begins to lean and rock’ (141) could have originated in analytic constructions of the type “*hállan-it ja šleangas-it boahtá*” [lean-INF and rock-INF come.3SG] ‘comes to lean and rock’ instead. (In present-day North Saami, expressions such as *boahhtá hállanit ja šleangasit* may be used as a periphrastic future, i.e. ‘will lean and rock’.) However, confirmation of this hypothesis awaits further research.

⁴⁹ The degrammaticalization of *haga*, understood and described originally by Wiklund (1902: 57–59), is discussed by, inter alia, Nevis (1986), Campbell (2001: 127), Joseph (2003: 485), Haspelmath (2004: 29) and Norde (forthcoming).

and such an anomaly may also be reflected in their morphosyntactic behaviour, irrespective of whether these morphemes originate in free words or not.⁵⁰

To end this digression into the morphosyntactic peculiarities of a variety of other bound disyllabic morphemes in North Saami, it can be concluded that especially when viewed from a synchronic and qualitative perspective, the instances of conjunction reduction in clauses such as *nannen- ja ovddidandihte vuosehangiela* ‘in order to strengthen and develop the sign language’ need not be regarded as fundamentally different from more complete expressions of the type *nannendihte ja ovddidandihte vuosehangiela* in which *-ndihte* has all the essential features needed in order to be regarded as a verb form on its own, fully independent of the verbal noun from which it has originated. The various examples seen in this section have shed light not only on non-finites in *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai* but also on the analogous but more marginal formations in *-nhaga* (104–105) and *-nkeahtá* (107–110) as well as the *-m bokte* constructions (101–102) in earlier written North Saami. Furthermore, in spite of the transparency of their origins, these formations are not the only non-finites that can undergo conjunction reduction: the same may happen to the gerund in *-dettiin* (152) and the verb abessive in *-keahtá* (151) as well as to its adnominal counterpart in *-keahtes* (150), whose position and role in the North Saami system of non-finite verb forms will be discussed in more detail in the following section on the subsystem of participles in the language.

3.2. The subsystem of participles revisited

This study on the non-finite verb forms in North Saami will be complemented by an examination of those non-finites that can be characterized as participles. Such verb forms did not play any substantial role in the original papers that centered mainly on various, mostly optional adverbial non-finites and their relationship to those infinitival verb forms most typically used as obligatory complements. However, as seen in Ylikoski (2003a) and Section 2.1 in which its key points were summarized, a deeper understanding of the interplay between infinitives, converbs and verbal nouns demands for the role of participles in the system of non-finites not to be overlooked either. It was also argued that it is reasonable to

⁵⁰ Another way of looking at these phenomena is to note that these formatives fit quite well into the shape of ordinary, prototypical disyllabic lexemes belonging to open word classes; compare, for example, nouns such as *muohta* ‘snow’ ~ **vuohta* or *eapmi* ‘carpel, pistol’ ~ **heapmi* and verbs such as *boahtit* ‘come’ ~ **goahtit* or *muhttit* ‘change’ ~ **duhttit*; however, **duhttit*, phonologically identical to the <*-duhttit*> of verbs such as *ruošsaiduhttit* ‘Russify’ would be phonologically unacceptable due to the word-initial voiced dental fricative /ð/ (<*d̥*>). I wish to thank Ante Aikio for this remark.

try to approach all subcategories (i.e., infinitives, converbs, verbal nouns and participles) from a unified point of view, if possible. Nevertheless, it was seen that the most appropriate definitions of these notions are not fully commensurable: the infinitives and converbs are best defined by their functions, whereas the verbal nouns, functionally overlapping with both converbs and infinitives, must by definition be regarded as “nominal” verb forms that may in principle have all the characteristic features of underived nouns, which naturally makes them appear less verbal than the non-finites that do not have morphosyntactic features similar to other word classes.

As regards the notion of *participle*, however, it was stated in Ylikoski (2003a: 228–229) that “participles, by comparison, seem definable both by their (predominantly) attributive functions and by their (not completely) adjectival morphosyntax.” This means that such verb forms can be seen as being on a par with infinitives and converbs on the one hand, as well as with verbal nouns on the other, even though it seems that the latter are left outside the non-finites proper more often than participles that are, in turn, considered a part of the verb conjugation in many European grammatical traditions, in spite of the fact that many of the so-called participles may have features that bring them close to deverbal adjectives and even deverbal nouns denoting agents or patients. In the subsections that follow, the theoretical basis of the description of North Saami participles and the internal structure of the participial subsystem within the entire system of non-finite verb forms is mainly based on the conceptual frameworks presented in Haspelmath (1994) and Ylikoski (2003a).

3.2.1. The received view: two or three participles

The North Saami participles as such were largely left untouched in the original papers. To begin with, the two non-finites that are usually the only formations called participles, mainly the present participle in *-i/(j)eaddji* and the past participle in *-n*, were passed over quite nonchalantly by stating that these verb forms appear quite unproblematic and their functions are quite similar to identically labeled verb forms in other European languages (see e.g. Ylikoski 2002: 74–75, 85–86; 2004a: 63; Section 2.3 of this overview). They occur in both attributive and predicative functions, and in the latter function the past participle may often be interpreted as the main verb in a periphrastic perfect tense. As to the interrelations between these participles and other non-finites, further observations in Ylikoski (2002, 2004a) were limited to the partial functional similarity of the past participle and the formation in *-miin*, originally the comitative

case form of the verbal noun.⁵¹ However (as already seen in Section 2.3), the attributive functions of the non-finite in *-nláhkai* called for more attention to be given to the corresponding use of the participles, as constructions such as *jahkásačča-t juohki-nláhkai Máná-i-d-beaivvi báلكkášupmi* [yearly-ADV give.away-nláhkai child-PL-GA-day.GA prize] ‘the Children’s Day prize that is awarded every year’ (Example 167 below) seem to be used in functions of the logically predictable, yet virtually unattested, passive verb participles of the type **juhk-kojeaddji ~ *juhkkojuvvojeaddji*.

In addition to the above-mentioned present and past participles, a third well-observed type of non-finite that fulfills the normal criteria for participles is the attributive use of verb forms such as *čállin* and *goddin* in such phrases as *áhči čállin-girji* [father.GA write-PTC.PASS.AG book] ‘the book written by the father’ (Sammallahti 1998b: 86; Ylikoski 2002: 82) or *gumppe goddi-n boazu* [wolf.GA kill-PTC.PASS.AG reindeer] ‘a reindeer killed by the wolf’ (Nickel 1994: 314; Ylikoski 2004a: 90). Quite misleadingly, this verb form has not been clearly labeled as a participle, but it has often been described as one of the functions of the so-called “action”, that is, the form otherwise regarded as a verbal noun. On the other hand, Sammallahti (1998b: 86, 89) distinguishes between the verbal noun (*-n, -pmi*) belonging to the sphere of nominal derivation rather than non-finite inflection of verbs and the so-called action forms including the action essive, the action locative (or the second infinitive) and the “action nominative” of the above-mentioned *áhči čállin-girji*, rightfully remarking that the latter are in fact only “lumped together on the basis of their historical morphology”.⁵²

Despite the even more unfortunate lumping of verbal nouns and the various other “action forms” by other scholars, some have characterized the functions of the “action nominative” as participial, though: According to Nielsen (1926: 389) and Korhonen (1974: 31; 1981a: 291), the above-mentioned “actions” are used as the “agent participle”, an allusion to the traditional characterization of the Finnish participle with identical morphosyntactic surroundings (e.g. *isä-n kirjoitta-ma kirja* [father-GEN write-PTC.PASS.AG book] ‘the book written by the father’). These phrases consist of a head noun and a participial non-finite that

⁵¹ Compare, for example, *son geahča-i ... stuorra geahpehe-m-iin* [3SG look-PST.3SG ... large.ATTR be.relieved-VN-COM] ‘he looked [at her] with great relief’ and *son daja-i issorasa-t geahpih-an* [3SG say-PST.3SG enormous-ADV be.relieved-PTC.PST] ‘having been enormously relieved, he said:...’ (Ylikoski 2002: 99). Otherwise, perhaps the most interesting feature of the North Saami past participle in a cross-linguistic setting that has been left outside the scope of the present study, is its infinitive-like use as a partly elliptical non-finite complement in certain modal and epistemic constructions with past time reference, for example, *Piera galgá (lea-t) juhka-n vuola* [Piera must.3SG (be-INF) drink-PTC.PST beer.GA] ‘Piera must have drunk beer’ as opposed to the infinitival *Piera galgá juhka-t vuola* ‘Piera must drink beer’ (cf. Example 2). For more discussion, see O. H. Magga (1986: 25–26, 32, 50 *et passim*), Nickel (1994: 473) and Sammallahti (2005: 139–143).

⁵² As already mentioned in Sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.5 above, Sammallahti (2005, 2007) recently proposed two more “action forms”, the converbial “action comitative” in *-miin* and the “action genitive”, by which he refers to the *-n* element that occurs as the complement of the postpositions *dihte*, *várás* and *láhkai* and is formally identical to the “action nominative” discussed in this section.

is obligatorily preceded by a genitive-accusative noun or pronoun denoting the agent of the action (e.g. writing) in question. As the head noun of the participle always refers to the patient of the action (e.g. a book that is written or a reindeer that is killed), it would be more accurate to characterize such “agent participles” as *agentive passive participles*, for example. Adopting the terminology of Lehmann (1984: 152) and Haspelmath (1994: 152–154) already used in connection with the *-nláhkai* constructions discussed in Sections 2.3 and 3.1.2.3, these non-finites can arguably be considered passive participles in the sense that they are *oriented* toward the verb’s patient. — Sammallahti (1998b: 86), too, states that the “action nominative” is “functionally a participial”, although other scholars (e.g. H.-H. Bartens 1989: 343; Nickel 1994: 314) only vaguely distinguish such phrases from verbal noun constructions.

In order to understand the true nature of the “agent participle”, it is important to note that the verb form here is not even formally identical to the verbal noun proper (*-n* with disyllabic verbs, *-pmi* with trisyllabic verbs) but only to shorter forms (always *-n*) that are always used as the first elements of compound words and as the basis for formations such as *-ndihte*. On the other hand, these verb forms are also partly identical to the past participle, though only in certain verb classes, that is, the trisyllabic verbs (e.g. *čálest-it* [scribble-INF] : *čálest-an* [scribble-PTC.PST/PTC.PST.AG]) and disyllabic *a-*, *á-*, *e-* and *o-*stem verbs (e.g. *lohka-t* [read-INF] : *lohka-n* [read-PTC.PST/PTC.PST.AG]) but not the disyllabic *i-* and *u-*stem verbs (e.g. *čállit-t* [write-INF] : *čállin* [write-PTC.PASS.AG] vs. *čállá-n* [write-PTC.PST]). The partial homonymy of the verbal noun, the past participle and the agentive passive participle is summarized in Table 3:

	<i>a-</i> , <i>á-</i> , <i>e-</i> and <i>o-</i> stems (<i>lohkat</i> ‘read’)	<i>i-</i> and <i>u-</i> stems (<i>čállit</i> ‘write’)	trisyllabic stems (<i>čálestit</i> ‘scribble’)
verbal noun (<i>-n</i> , <i>-pmi</i>)	<i>lohkan</i>	<i>čállin</i>	<i>čálestapmi</i>
past participle (<i>-n</i>)	<i>lohkan</i>	<i>čállán</i>	<i>čálestan</i>
agentive passive participle (<i>-n</i>) ⁵³	<i>lohkan</i>	<i>čállin</i>	<i>čálestan</i>

Table 3. The formation of the three North Saami non-finite verb forms ending with *-n*.

Examples (155–157) illustrate the syntactic functions of the above-mentioned *-n* forms and are accompanied by an example demonstrating a corresponding use of the present participle in *-i/(j)eaddji* (158):

⁵³ Cf. the formation of the compounds such as *čállin-boddu* [write-VN-moment] ‘a moment for writing’, *lohka-n-boddu* [read-VN-moment] ‘a moment for reading’ and *čálest-an-boddu* [scribble-VN-moment] ‘a moment for scribbling’, and the converb forms *čállindihte*, *lohkandihte* and *čálestandihte* (*reivve*) ‘in order to write/read/scribble (a letter)’.

verbal noun

- (155) *áhč̄i reivve lohka-n ~ čálli-n ~ čálest-eapmi*
 father.GA letter.GA read-VN ~ write-VN ~ scribble-VN
 ‘reading ~ writing ~ scribbling of a letter by the father’

past participle

- (156) *reivve lohka-n ~ čállá-n ~ čálest-an áhč̄i*
 letter.GA read-PTC.PST ~ write-PTC.PST ~ scribble-PTC.PST father
 ‘the father who read ~ wrote ~ scribbled a letter’

agentive passive participle

- (157) *áhč̄i lohka-n ~ čálli-n ~ čálest-an*
 father.GA read-PTC.PASS.AG ~ write-PTC.PASS.AG ~ scribble-PTC.PASS.AG
reive
 letter
 ‘a letter read ~ written ~ scribbled by the father’

present participle

- (158) *reivve lohkk-i ~ čáll-i ~ čálest-eaddji áhč̄i*
 letter.GA read-PTC.PRS ~ write-PTC.PRS ~ scribble-PTC.PRS father
 ‘the father reading ~ writing ~ scribbling a letter’

In concluding this introductory summary of the more or less received knowledge concerning the North Saami participles, it must be emphasized that Examples (155–158) should be regarded as idealized rather than typical examples of the verb forms in question. In fact, it is not all that common to come across actual sentences in which an ordinary past or present participle modifies a noun (e.g. *áhč̄i* ‘father’) and simultaneously has arguments of its own (e.g. the object *reivve* ‘a letter’). Authentic examples of adverbially modified adnominal participles include expressions such as *čábbá-t gárvod-an olmmái* [beautiful-ADV dress-PTC.PST man] ‘a man dressed in fine clothes’, *muhtin alla árvvu-s adn-ojuvvo-n kristtalaš almmái* [certain high.ATTR value-LOC consider-PASS-PTC.PST Christian man] ‘a certain highly esteemed Christian man’ and *garra-dálkki-s dáistal-eaddji suolu* [hard-weather-LOC battle-PTC.PRS island] ‘the island battling in the storm’ in Examples (41), (62) and (66) presented in Ylikoski (2004a: 82, 100, 102), but corresponding phrases with objects are less common.

When examining the verbal features of the above-mentioned participles, it must be noted that, despite the characterization “so-called agent participle” (*sogenanntes Agenspartizip*), Korhonen (1974: 30–31) explicitly denies the pos-

sibility of regarding the form in question (as well as the verbal noun in *-n/-pmi*) as a verb form, as it does not usually have adverbial modifiers typical of verbs. However, phrases such as *áhči lohkan ~ čállin ~ čálestán reive* (157) are fully productive in terms of their morphology, syntax and semantics, and as their use is strongly determined by external syntactic factors, it is difficult to find justification for thinking that the agentive passive participle belonged to the sphere of derivation rather than inflection. Furthermore, despite attempts by prescriptive grammarians to keep the functions of the agentive passive participle and the past participles of passive verbs separate, it is not uncommon to find the latter in the function “reserved” for the special verb form to be used with the genitive-accusative modifier denoting the agent of the action. According to O. H. Magga (1987: 133), phrases such as (159) are common but “wrong” and should be replaced by the appropriate construction with the agentive passive participle as exemplified by (160); further authentic examples of participial phrases of the former type are also seen in Examples (161–163) where the general passive participles have—to use the terminology of prescriptive grammarians—replaced the more proper use of the agentive passive participles *ráhkadan* (161), *dahkan* (162) and *friddjan-dahkan* (163):

- (159) *álmog-a vállje-juvvo-n orgána* (O. H. Magga 1987: 133)
 people-GA elect-PASS-PTC.PST body
 ‘a body elected by the people’

- (160) *Norgga sámi álmoga válljen orgánan Sámedikki ulbmil lea bargat dan badjelii, ahte sámiid vuoigatvuodát dohkkehuvvojit vuodđun seailuhit sámi kultuvrra, giela ja servodateallima.*
 (<http://www.samediggi.no/artikkel.asp?MIId=1&AId=1424&Back=1>
 18.7.2007)

Norgga sámi álmog-a vállje-n orgána-n
 Norway.GA Saami.GA people.GA elect-PTC.PASS.AG body-ESS
Sáme-dikki ulbmil lea bargat dan badjelii, ahte
 Saami-parliament.GA aim be.3SG work-INF it.GA upon COMP
sámi-i-d vuoigatvuoda-t dohkkeh-uvvo-jit vuodđu-n seailuh-it
 Saami-PL-GA right-PL accept-PASS-3PL basis-ESS preserve-INF
sámi kultuvrra, giela ja servodat-ealli-m-a.
 Saami.GA culture.GA language.GA and society-live-VN-GA
 ‘As a body elected by the Norwegian Saami people, the Saami Parliament aims to work on the acceptance of Saami rights as the basis for preserving Saami culture, language and social life.’

- (161) *Praktihkalaš oasis galggat sáddet musihkkabátti, mas ieš leat čuojahan iežat ráhkaduvvon musih[k]a.* (*Min Áigi* 15.9.1995, p. 11)
Praktihka-laš oasi-s galgga-t sádde-t musihkka-bátti, ma-s
 practice-ADJ part-LOC must-2SG send-INF music-tape.GA REL-LOC
ieš lea-t čuojah-an ieža-t ráhkad-uvvo-n musihka.
 REFL be-2SG play-PTC.PST REFL.GA-2SG make-PASS-PTC.PST music.GA
 ‘In the practical part, you must send a tape on which you yourself play music that you have made yourself.’
- (162) *Son áigu juoigat sihke iežas dahkkon luđiid ja maddái luđiid mat leat dovdosat Sámis.* (*Áššu* 28.7.2006, p. 3)
Son áigu juoiga-t sihke ieža-s dahkk-o-n
 3SG plan.3SG chant.yoiks-INF both REFL.GA-3SG make-PASS-PTC.PST
luđi-i-d ja maddái luđi-i-d ma-t lea-t dovdos-at
 yoik-PL-GA and also yoik-PL-GA REL-PL be-3PL known-PL
Sámi-s.
 Saami.land-LOC
 ‘She is going to present yoiks composed by herself as well as those that are well known in Saami land.’
- (163) *Dasgo dat guhte lei šlávva go Hearrá rávkka-i su, lea Hearrá friddjan-dahkkuojvvon olmmoš.* (OT: 1 Corinthians 7:22)
Dasgo dat guhte le-i šlávva go Hearrá rávkka-i
 for it who be-PST.3SG slave when Lord call-PST.3SG
su, lea Hearrá friddja-n-dahkk-ujvvo-n olmmoš.
 3SG.GA be.3SG Lord.GA free-ESS-make-PASS-PTC.PST human
 ‘For he who was a slave when the Lord called him, is the Lord’s freed man.’

However, the majority of ordinary past participles are used in predicative, rather than attributive (156), functions, most notably with the verb *leat* ‘be’ to form a periphrastic perfect tense in which the participle has invariably all those features that are typical of verbs (see e.g. Examples 53, 110, 111, 142 and 161 above). As regards the present participle, it is normally used quite differently: an overwhelming majority of the formations in *-i/(j)eaddji* are actually deverbal agent nouns with few unambiguously verb-like properties, for example, (*girjji*) *čáll* ‘writer (of the book)’, (*girjji*) *lohkki* ‘reader (of the book)’; cf. also the occupational label *girje-čáll-i* [book-write-PTC.PRS] ‘writer’ as well as *viessohuksejeadjiide* ‘to housebuilders’ in Example (149). On the other hand, the verbal status of the active participle is clearly evidenced by the occasional

but by no means extraordinary constructions (structurally similar to Example 158) wherein adnominal participles have objects of their own; for the naturalness of such phrases, cf. Korhonen (1974: 31–33, 216–217):

- (164) *Vuosttas fatnasiin suhkaba Áilu ja Ánde[,] nupp[ii]n fas sudno doarred-eaddji dážat.* (Marastat 1992: 46)

Vuosttas fatnas-iin suhka-ba Áilu ja Ánde, nuppi-in
 first boat-COM row-3DU Áilu and Ánde second-COM
fas sudno doarred-eaddji dáža-t.
 whereas 3DU.GA chase-PTC.PRS Norwegian-PL
 ‘Áilu and Ánde are rowing in the first boat, whereas in the second, there are Norwegians who are chasing them.’

- (165) *Danin evangeliuma cealki ja bassi sakrameanttaid juohkki kirku lea karismáhtalaš servodat.*

(http://www.evl.fi/arkkipiispa/Helluntaikirje_saame.pdf 14.12.2007)
Danin evangelium-a cealk-i ja bassi sakrameantta-i-d
 therefore Gospel-GA proclaim-PTC.PRS and holy sacrament-PL-GA
juohkk-i kirku lea karismáhtalaš servodat.
 deliver-PTC.PRS church be.3SG charismatic community
 ‘Therefore, the church that preaches the Gospel and administers the holy sacraments is a charismatic community.’

With the exception of the unfortunate ambiguity with which the agentive passive participle has been presented in earlier descriptions of North Saami, not much need be added to the accounts of these three participles as such. Their morphology and basic syntactic properties throughout the Saami language area have earlier been studied and described by scholars such as Erkki Itkonen (1950), Korhonen (1974: 27–38, 66–105, 158–170) and R. Bartens (1978a). Even though it is possible to provide amendments to the descriptions of these well-established non-finite verb forms, the main concern of the following sections will be to examine certain other, previously less-known or even totally unknown participial constructions that shed light not only on the three above-mentioned participles but on the nature of the North Saami non-finite verb forms as a whole.

Section 3.2.2 offers a re-evaluation of the status of the participle-like *-nláhkai* forms in the language. As it turns out, the occasional attributive use of this verb form seems, surprisingly, to be one of the many “patches” that may be used to fill in gaps caused by the absence of the passive equivalent of the (active) present participle in *-i/-(j)eaddji*. Such patching seems to be realized by various analogical developments, and some analogical explanations are strengthened

by additional evidence regarding the untypical attributive use of certain other non-finites. In Section 3.2.3, the subsystem of North Saami participles is complemented by the introduction, or at least rehabilitation, of the negative participle in *-keahtes*, the largely ignored adnominal counterpart of the adverbial verb abessive in *-keahttá*.

3.2.2. Passive participles

With regard to the participles in North Saami, the most notable original paper is Ylikoski (2006a) on the non-finite in *-nláhkai*. As mentioned above and illustrated earlier with Examples (38–39), which are repeated here, the so-called present (38) and past participles (39) of the language are inherently active participles:

- (38) *Vuola juhkki olbmot máhttet návddašit eallimis.*
Vuola juhkk-i olbmo-t máhte-t návddaš-it eallim-is.
 beer.GA drink-PTC.PRS human-PL be.able-3PL enjoy-INF life-LOC
 ‘People who drink beer know how to enjoy life.’

- (39) *Vuola juhkan olbmot sáhttet gal dahkat rihkkosiid.*
Vuola juhka-n olbmo-t sáhte-t gal dahka-t
 beer.GA drink-PTC.PST human-PL may-3PL to.be.sure make-INF
rihkkos-ii-d.
 crime-PL-GA
 ‘People who have drunk beer may commit crimes, though.’

Likewise, it was seen that the passive counterpart of the past participle is formed in compliance with the ordinary inflection of passive *-o(juvvo)-* verbs:

- (40) *Piera feasttas juhkko(juvvo)n vuollagat ledje hui divrasat.*
Piera feastta-s juhkk-o(juvvo)-n vuollag-at le-dje hui
 Piera.GA party-LOC drink-PASS-PTC.PST beer-PL be-PST.3PL very
divrasa-t.
 expensive-PL
 ‘The beers that were drunk at Piera’s party were very expensive.’

The formation and use of the Saami passive verbs has been described quite extensively by scholars such as Schlachter (1953–1960, 1966) and Sammallahti (2005: 60–71), and it suffices to state here that *-o(juvvo)-* verbs such as *juhkko(juvvo)t* (← either *juhkát* ‘drink’ or ← *juohkit* ‘divide, distribute’) belong

to one of the most productive derivational patterns in the language. For example, Korhonen (1967: 15) states that possible constraints in the formation and use of the passive verbs are not due to morphological but only to semantic factors, and Sammallahti (1998b: 84–85) even describes them as belonging to the domain of inflection—thus constituting the passive voice—rather than derivation (but cf. *ibid.*, pp. 115–116).

The formation and use of the passive past participle throughout the Saami languages has been described in detail by Schlachter (1954: 156–161), Korhonen (1974: 91–93), R. Bartens (1978a: 75–82) and Sammallahti (2005: 61). However, as seen in Example (41), it appears that passive verbs are inflected somewhat defectively:

- (41) ??/**Piera feasttas juhkk(juvvo)jeaddji vuollagat leat hui divrasat.*
 ??/**Piera feastta-s juhkk-o(juvvo)-jeaddji vuollag-at lea-t hui*
 Piera.GA party-LOC drink-PASS-PTC.PRS beer-PL be-3PL very
divrasa-t.
 expensive-PL
 ‘The beers that are (or: will be) drunk at Piera’s party are very expensive.’

The above example has been labeled ungrammatical due to the fact that the present participles of *-o(juvvo)-* verbs simply cannot be attested anywhere in North Saami. Somewhat puzzlingly, Nielsen (1926: 165) hints that present participles cannot be formed from long stems such as *juhkk(juvvo)-* but only from shorter stems such as *juhkk-*. However, he does not give any examples of such forms either, and they are equally absent even in R. Bartens’ (1978a) study of the passive participles in Finnish and the Saami languages. Instead, in Schlachter’s (1954: 150–152) study of *-o(juvvo)-* verbs, the only passive non-finites he is aware of are the infinitive, past participle, verbal noun and action essive. It is, however, interesting to note that in one of the earliest Saami grammars, Friis (1856: 88, 96) presents a complete, but apparently fabricated paradigm of passive verbs such as *rávvejuvvot* ‘be advised’ (← *rávvet* ‘advise’); in the list of non-finite verb forms, he presents a participial form *rávvejuvvi* <*ravvijuvve*>, a formation that will be discussed in more detail below (see Examples 180–184).⁵⁴

⁵⁴ For actual functions of the passive non-finites, see also the use of the past participles and infinitives occurring in many of the examples of Ylikoski (2004a): *huksejuvvon* ‘built’ (Example 56, p. 92), *dárkkuhuvvon* ‘meant’ (Ex. 7, p. 62), *addojuvvon* ‘given’ (Ex. 54, p. 91) and *adnojuvvon* ‘esteemed’ (Ex. 66, p. 102); *čádjidahttojuvvot* ‘be misled’ (Ex. 43, p. 84) and *čielggaduvvot* ‘be clarified’ (Ex. 83, p. 113). The action essive forms of passive verbs, endorsed by language planners such as O. H. Magga (1987: 130–131), are also quite common in the modern literary language; their use will be discussed further below (see Examples 185–186).

For the sake of completeness, it can be added that the only “passive present participles” that Nielsen (1926: 165) may have had in mind might be those rare instances of individual word forms such as *gávdnojeaddji* ‘existing’ and *haksojeaddji* ‘smelly’ that are formally identical to the predictable passive participles of the transitive verbs *gávdnat* ‘find’ and *haksit* ‘smell (an odor or scent)’, but in practice, they must be seen as unmarked present participles of the originally passive, but now lexicalized intransitive verbs *gávdnot* ‘exist’ and *haksot* ‘have an odor or scent’ that are not semantically compatible with the true passive derivations *gávdnojuvvot* ‘be found’ and *haksojuvvot* ‘be smelled’. In the same vein, *čoggojeaddji* in (166) cannot be interpreted as the passive participle of the verb *čoaggit* ‘gather’ but rather, as the plain present participle of *čoggot* ‘accumulate’ (\neq *čoggo(juvvo)t* ‘be gathered’):

- (166) *Turismmas čoggojeaddji bázahusain badjel 90 % čoggo geasse- ja čakčamánu áigge.* (http://teno.poyry.com/luonnos/Karigasniemi/Karigas_saami_1.6.pdf 19.1.2008)
- Turismma-s čoggo-jeaddji bázahusa-i-n badjel 90 %*
 tourism-LOC accumulate-PTC.PRS waste-PL-LOC over 90 %
čoggo geasse- ja čakča-mánu
 accumulate.3SG summer[=June] and fall[=September]-month.GA
áigge.
 during
 ‘Over 90 percent of the waste accumulated from [i.e., generated by] tourism accumulates during the June–September period.’

Before turning to the alternative participial expressions described by Bartens (1978a), I repeat Example (42) whose participle-like *-nláhkai* is based on participial phrases such as those of Examples (167–169) presented in Ylikoski (2006a: 30) and additional Examples (170–172):

- (42) (?)*Piera feasttas juhkanláhkai vuollagat leat hui divrasat.*
 (?)*Piera feastta-s juhka-nláhkai vuollag-at lea-t hui*
 Piera.GA party-LOC drink-nláhkai beer-PL be-3PL very
divrasa-t.
 expensive-PL
 ‘The beers that will be drunk at Piera’s party are very expensive.’
- (167) *Jahkásaččat juohkinláhkai Mánáidbeaivvi bálkk[a]šupmi lea oaiv-vilduvvon arvvosmahttit mánáidkultuvrra buđaldusd[o]ibmii ja dáiddabajásgeassimii laktáseaddji dáhpáhusa dahje organisašuvnna.* (< Ylikoski 2006a: 30 < http://www.minedu.fi/opm/uutiset/lastenpaivanpalkinto2004_pohjsaame.rtf 16.2.2005)

Jahkásačča-t juohki-nláhkai Máná-i-d-beaivvi bálkkašupmi
 yearly-ADV give.away-nláhkai child-PL-GA-day.GA prize
lea oaivvild-uvvo-n arvosmahtti-t máná-i-d-kultuvrra
 be.3SG mean-PASS-PTC.PST encourage-INF child-PL-GA-culture.GA
buđaldus-doibmi-i ja dáidda-bajásgeassi-m-ii laktás-eaddji
 hobby-activity-ILL and art-educate-VN-ILL relate-PTC.PRS
dáhpáhus-a dahje organisašuvnna.
 event-GA or organization.GA
 ‘The Children’s Day prize that is awarded every year is meant to en-
 courage an event or an organization related to leisure activities and art
 education.’

- (168) *Duodaštusat ja daidda merkenláhkai dieđut*
 (< Ylikoski 2006a: 30 < http://opspro.peda.net/utsjoki/viewer.php3?DB=saame&mode=2&document_id=125 6.4.2005)
Duodaštusa-t ja da-i-dda merke-nláhkai dieđu-t
 certificate-PL and it-PL-ILL record-nláhkai piece.of.information-PL
 ‘the certificates and the information to be recorded therein’
- (169) *Ulbmil áigodahkii: ... Sihkkarastit suohkana ássiide*
einnostanládje ja buori bálvalusfálaldaga... (< Ylikoski 2006a: 30
 < [http://www.kautokeino.kommune.no/Finnmark/Kautokeino/kautokeinok2.nsf/Attachments/6F4C223D184671CD4125700500473210/\\$FILE/pland2005-2008kst_sa.pdf](http://www.kautokeino.kommune.no/Finnmark/Kautokeino/kautokeinok2.nsf/Attachments/6F4C223D184671CD4125700500473210/$FILE/pland2005-2008kst_sa.pdf) 6.4.2005)
Ulbmil áigodahk-ii: Sihkkarasti-t suohkan-a ássi-i-de
 aim period-ILL secure-INF municipality-GA inhabitant-PL-ILL
einnost-anládje ja buori bálvalus-fálaldaga
 predict-nláhkai and good.GA service-supply.GA
 ‘The objective for the period: to guarantee a predictable and good supply
 of public services for the inhabitants of the municipality.’
- (170) *NSR sámediggejoavku lea duhtavaš go sámediggeráđdi evttoha*
rievdadit Sámedikki ohcanláhkái doarjjaortnegiid njuolggadusaid
vai njuolggadusat heivejit Brønnøysund registara ja Stáhta
ekonomiijastivrejumi njuolggadusaide. (Min Áigi 26.9.2007, p. 14)
NSR sáme-digge-joavku lea duhtavaš go
 NSR.GA Saami-parliament-group be.3SG satisfied as
sáme-digge-ráđdi evttoh-a rievdad-it Sáme-dikki
 Saami-parliament-board propose-3SG change-INF Saami-parliament.GA
ohca-nláhkái doarjja-ortneg-ii-d njuolggadusa-i-d vai
 apply-nláhkai support-system-PL-GA regulation-PL-GA in.order.that

njuolggadusa-t heive-jit Brønnøysund registrar-a ja Stáhta
 regulation-PL fit-3PL Brønnøysund.GA register-GA and state.GA
ekonomiija-stivrejumi njuolggadusa-i-de.
 economy-administration.GA regulation-PL-ILL

‘The NSR Saami Parliamentary Group is satisfied with the Saami Parliamentary Board’s proposal to change the regulations for the petitioned support system of the Saami Parliament in order for the the regulations to agree with the those of the Brønnøysund Register Centre and the Government Agency for Financial Management.’

- (171) *Doaibma lea devdon mearreáigái, go dikšunláhkai mánáid meari*
lea váigat ovddalgihtii diehtit. (http://www.plappi.fi/files/orig/6047_Vdlg_12.5.05_BG.pdf 14.12.2007)

Doaibma lea devd-o-n mearreáigái, go
 appointment be.3SG fill-PASS-PTC.PST time.limit-ILL as
dikšu-nláhkai máná-i-d meari lea váigat
 care-nláhkai child-PL-GA number.GA be.3SG difficult
ovddalgihtii diehti-t.

beforehand know-INF

‘The appointment has been made for a fixed period, since it is difficult to know in advance how many children must be taken care of.’

- (172) *Sáme guovllus ollašuhhtinláhkái guovddáš EU:a doarjjaprográmmat*
 (<http://www.samediggi.fi/vanha/psaame/kertomus/Maakuntaohj03.doc>
 14.12.2007)

Sáme-guovllu-s ollašuhhti-nláhkái guovddáš EU-a
 Saami-area-LOC execute-nláhkai central EU-GA
doarjja-prográmma-t
 support-program-PL

‘the principal EU support programs to be executed in the Saami area’

As already remarked in Ylikoski (2006a: 30–31, 34), *-nláhkai* constructions such as these can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as non-finite verb forms that function as attributive modifiers of nouns and therefore deserve to be characterized as participles. Furthermore, all these formations are “passive participles” as they are oriented towards the patients of the actions denoted by the non-finite: the beer to be drunk (42), the prize to be awarded (167), the information to be recorded (168), a public service that can be “predicted” or expected (169), support that can be solicited (170), the children to be taken care of (171) and the EU support programmes to be executed (172). Consequently, the verbal nature of such

formations cannot be proved by the objects that active verb forms may possess (55, 89), but the above sentences do include examples of adverbial modifiers that the non-finite in *-nláhkai* may have.

It was emphasized in (Ylikoski 2006a: 34) that the adnominal functions of *-nláhkai* serve as convincing proof of the independence of this verb form, as such formations can hardly be related to the original adpositional phrases *V-ma/-mi láhkai* meaning ‘in the manner of V-ing’. In other words, it is not natural to think of Examples (42, 167–172) as answers to the question *man láhkai?* [INT.GA in.the.manner] ‘in which manner? in which way?’. On the contrary, the triggering question could be the etymologically related *man lágan ~ manlágan?* [INT.GA like] ‘what kind of?’.⁵⁵ Therefore, it should be somewhat more likely for us to encounter sentences such as (173–175) in which the outward appearance of the “passive present participle” can be seen as a kind of compound adjective based on the verb stem plus *-n* and *lágan*:

- (173) *Ulbmil 1-prográmma dievasmahttinoasis lea sámekultuvrii laktaseaddji ovdiddandoaibma máinnašuvvon doarjunlágán doaibman viđa doaibmabidjoollisvuođa oktavuodas (1.2., 2.5., 2.6., 2.7. ja 3.2.).*
(<http://www.samediggi.fi/vanha/psaame/kertomus/Maakuntaohj03.doc>
14.12.2007)

Ulbmil 1-prográmma dievasmahti-n-oasi-s lea
objective 1-program.GA supplement-VN-part-LOC be.3SG
sáme-kultuvri-i laktas-eaddji ovdidd-an-doaibma
Saami-culture-ILL relate-PTC.PRS promote-VN-activity
máinnaš-uvvo-n doarju-nlágán doaibma-n viđa
mention-PASS-PTC.PST endorse-nlágan activity-ESS five.GA
doaibmabidjo-ollisvuođa oktavuodas-s (1.2., 2.5., 2.6., 2.7. ja 3.2.).
action-wholeness.GA connection-LOC (1.2., 2.5., 2.6., 2.7. and 3.2.).
‘In the supplementary section of the Objective 1 Program, supporting activities related to Saami culture are labeled as “activities to be endorsed” under five different measures (1.2., 2.5., 2.6., 2.7. and 3.2.).’

- (174) *Maiddái sadjásažžan doaibmama loahpaheapmi ii leat virgegaskavuođa loahpaheapmái buhtastahttinlágán doaibmabidju.*
(http://www.plappi.fi/files/orig/5107_Kh 14.3.2005.pdf 17.6.2006)
Maiddái sadjásažža-n doaibma-m-a loahpah-eapmi ii
also substitute-ESS act-VN-GA end-VN NEG.3SG

⁵⁵ The words *láhkai ~ láhkái* ‘in the manner of’ and *lágan ~ lágán ~ lágas ~ lágás* ‘-like’ all derive from the noun *láhki* ‘mode, manner’ (← Scandinavian *slag*) (cf. Nielsen 1932–1962 s.v. *lágan, lágas, lakke*).

lea-t *virge-gaskavuođa* *loahpah-eapmá-i*
 be-CONNeg office-relation.GA end-VN-ILL
buohtastahttin-lágan *doaibmabidju*.
 compare-nlágan action

‘The termination of a temporary post is not an action comparable to the termination of an official position either.’

(175) *Savvona mánggadoaimmadálu vuodđogálvvuide gulle sirdinlágan geahččiid sajít.*

(http://www.plappi.fi/files/orig/5107_Kh_14.3.2005.pdf 17.6.2006)

Savvon-a mángga-doaimma-dálu *vuoddo-gálvvu-i-de*
 Savu-GA multi-action.GA-house.GA base-ware-PL-ILL
gulle *sirdi-nlágan* *geahčč-i-i-d-saji-t*.

belong.PST.3PL remove-nlágan view-PTC.PRS-PL-GA-place-PL

‘The permanent fittings of the Savu community center included movable spectator seats.’

To be sure, however, formations such as these are in no way a predictable or commonly accepted means of expressing the semantic function of passive present participles: instead, such formations are more naturally used in expressions such as *stoahka-n-lágan doaimma-t* [play-VN-like activity-PL] ‘game-like (literally: playing-like) activities’ or, in a formally more analytical construction such as that occurring in Ylikoski (2006b: 49), *suhitta-m-a lágan dovdamuš* [get.angry-VN-GA like feeling] ‘anger-like (literally: resenting-like) feeling’. The three examples above are in fact the only instances of the “-nlágan participle” I am aware of, which is much less than the twenty or so occurrences of participial -nláhkai forms that represent only a small fraction of the various functions of -nláhkai. Against this view, it seems to me that the use of -nlágan in (173–175) is probably best understood as some kind of adnominal ad-hoc counterpart of the predominantly adverbial, patient-oriented non-finite in -nláhkai. However, such adjectival deverbal derivations are, in contrast to the formations like -nláhkai, typologically the most natural source constructions for participles in general, that is, verb forms that may quite safely be described as verbal adjectives (see Haspelmath 1994: 167–170; Ylikoski 2006a: 32–33), and this brings us back to R. Bartens’ (1978a) remarks on other participle-like formations in the Saami languages.

Bartens (1978a) examines historical-morphological parallels to the Finnish (Finnic) passive participles throughout the Saami language area. Due to the nature of the phenomena in question, the main focus of her paper is not on the contemporary functional equivalents between Finnish and North Saami, but rather on the history of the passive past participle in -(o)juvvon ~ -on and, to a lesser extent, the occurrence of certain deverbal adjectives based on verbs containing

the causative element *-h-* (< Proto-Saami **-htē-* < Finno-Saami **-tta-/-ttä-* [Sammallahti 1998b: 91]), possibly related to the *-tt-* element of Finnic passive participles in *-ttava/-ttävä*. As for North Saami, her examples consist of short references to words like *borahahtti* ‘edible’, Buolbmát dialect *boraheaddji* (Nielsen 1926: 394) or Unjárga dialect *manaheaddji* ‘passable, accessible’ (LW, p. 459), corresponding to *manahahtti* in most other dialects of North Saami.

Formations of the *-headdji* type are in fact (active) present participles of verbs such as *borahit* ‘be eatable; cause to eat’ (← *borrat* ‘eat’) and *manahit* ‘be possible to go; cause to go’ (← *mannat* ‘go’), in which the causative *-h-* is used to form verbs that Sammallahti (2005: 67–69) characterizes as unintentional and dynamic “permissive passive verbs”. However, it appears that the use of North Saami “permissive passive” *-headdji* forms is largely limited to certain word forms only such as *aniheaddji* ‘usable’ in Example (176) used in certain Sea Saami and neighboring (i.e. Buolbmát) dialects. I am not aware of any examples of *-headdji* that could be analyzed otherwise than as lexicalized adjectives with specifically permissive meanings.⁵⁶

(176) *Ii son viššan, go ii leat náhkki aniheaddji, go eai leat čábbát.*

(MSFOu 117: 211, Unjárga, Nils Mosessen 1920)

<i>Ii</i>	<i>son</i>	<i>višša-n,</i>	<i>go ii</i>	<i>lea-t</i>	<i>náhkki</i>
NEG.3SG	3SG	bother-PTC.PST	as NEG.3SG	be-CONNeg	leather
<i>ani-h-eaddji,</i>	<i>go eai</i>	<i>lea-t</i>	<i>čábbát.</i>		
USE-CAUS-PTC.PRS	as NEG.3PL	be-CONNeg	pretty-PL		

‘He did not bother, as the leather is not usable, because they are not pretty.’

In modern standard North Saami, *aniheaddji* of (176) would instead be *anihahtti*. As for formations such as *anihahtti* ‘usable, useful’, *borahahtti* ‘edible’ and *manaheaddji* ‘passable, accessible’, they have in fact been considered as passive participles of some kind by Lagercrantz (1929: 198, 208, 211 *et passim*) who characterizes Návuotna word forms such as *anihahtti* ‘usable’ and *borjjastahtti* ‘sailable’ as “positive factitive verbal adjectives” (*positive faktitive Verbal-Eigenschaftswörter*) that belong to the non-finite paradigm of the verbs *atnit* ‘use’ and *borjjastat* (= *borjjastit*) ‘sail’; this means that Lagercrantz does not regard *anihahtti* and *borjjastahtti* as belonging to the inflectional paradigm of the permissive passive verbs *anihit* ‘be usable’ or *?borjjastahttit* ‘be sailable’.

⁵⁶ However, participles and agent nouns in *-headdji* are very common among ordinary causative verbs such as *oahpahit* ‘teach’: *oahpaheaddji* ‘teacher, the one who teaches’ (← *oahppat* ‘learn’), *jodihit* ‘lead’: *jodiheaddji* ‘leader, the one who leads’ (← *johtit* ‘travel’) and *vuolggahit* ‘send’: *vuolgaheaddji* ‘sender, the one who sends’ (← *vuolgit* ‘leave, go’).

Indeed, it appears that in light of the virtual absence of logically predictable forms such as *boraheddji*, *manaheddji* and *aniheddji* in contemporary literary North Saami, it may be plausible to consider word forms such as *borahahti* ‘edible’, *manahahti* ‘passable, accessible’ and *anihahti* ‘usable, useful’ as exceptional manifestations of the present participles of permissive passive verbs. On the other hand, there are also formations such as Lagercrantz’s *borjjastahti* and those of Examples (177a–c) that should probably be regarded as passive-like adjectival derivations of trisyllabic verbs rather than as participles of permissive passive verbs that do not otherwise seem to be actively used in the language. At best, such instances as *beroštahttit* and *eahpidahttit* may be used as causative emotive verbs with the meanings ‘make someone care’ and ‘make someone suspicious’, respectively. Such formations differ from presens participles proper (178a–c), both in terms of morphology and semantics:

- (177) a. *beroštahti gažaldagat*
berošt-ahti gažaldaga-t (← *beroštahttit* ‘make care’)
 care-*ahti* question-PL
 ‘noteworthy questions’
- b. *eahpidahti vuogit*
eahpid-ahti vuogi-t (← *eahpidahttit* ‘make suspicious’)
 doubt-*ahti* habit-PL
 ‘dubious habits’
- c. *ipmirdahti čilgehus*
ipmird-ahti čilgehus (← ?*ipmirdahttit* ‘make understand’)
 understand-*ahti* explanation
 ‘an understandable explanation’
- (178) a. *berošteaddji olbmot*
berošt-eaddji olbmo-t
 care-PTC.PRS human-PL
 ‘concerned people’
- b. *eahpideaddji jienat*
eahpid-eaddji jiena-t
 doubt-PTC.PRS voice-PL
 ‘doubting voices’

- c. *ipmirdeaddji hoavda*
ipmird-eaddji hoavda
 understand-PTC.PRS boss
 ‘an understanding boss’

On some occasions, *-(h)ahtti* may take adverbial modifiers such as *bures* ‘well’ in *álkkes ja bures ádde-hahtti giella* [easy.ATTR and well understand-*hahtti* language] ‘easy and well understandable language’, mentioned in (Ylikoski 2006a: 32 n. 3). In Example (179), the form *manahahtti* has an adverbial modifier *vuolás* but simultaneously also a “subject” in the illative form, reminding us of the normal syntax of adjective phrases such as *olbmui-de várálaš* [human-PL-ILL dangerous] ‘dangerous for people’:

- (179) *Go geinnodat šattai nu ceakkus, ahte ii šat lean olbmuide manahahtti vuolás, de badjeolmmái fáhkkestaga rohttestii iežas doaresbeallái muhtun báktelatniji, maid son didii, ja...*
 (LES 2: 532, Čuđegieddi [< Ivgubahta], O. Thomassen 1889)
Go geinnodat šatta-i nu ceakkus, ahte ii šat
 when route become-PST.3SG so steep COMP NEG.3SG anymore
lea-n olbmui-de mana-hahtti vuolás, de badje-olmmái
 be-PTC.PST human-PL-ILL go-*hahtti* downward PRT upper-man
fáhkkestaga rohttest-ii ieža-s doares-beallá-i muhtun
 suddenly wrench-PST.3SG REFL.GA-3SG fringe-side-ILL some
bákte-latnji-i, ma-i(-d) son didi-i, ja
 rock-cleft-ILL REL-(PL-)GA 3SG know-PST.3SG and
 ‘As the route became so steep that it was no longer treadable for men,
 the Mountain Saami suddenly drew himself aside to a cleft in the rock he
 knew, and...’

It is also as well to note that *manahahtti* is ultimately based on the verb *mannat* ‘go’ and therefore it is not actually a “passive” formation in the sense of being oriented toward a patient of the (intransitive) act of going; instead, it must be characterized as having a location-oriented function. Analogous extensions of otherwise patient-oriented verbal adjectives are quite common in other languages as well; see R. Bartens (1978a: 78) for Saami and Ylikoski (2004b: 256–259, 272 n. 7) for Finnic.

It is true that deverbal adjectives of the type *-(h)ahtti* are quite productive in contemporary language, but as already remarked in Ylikoski (2006a: 32) they cannot be regarded as passive participles either: in spite of their productivity, their semantic functions are clearly restricted to a permissive function and they

do not generally possess the syntactic properties of verbs.⁵⁷ Therefore, it is easy to agree with Korhonen (1974: 45–46) and state that there are no convincing reasons to regard any of the above-mentioned *-(h)ahtti* formations as anything other than deverbal adjectives. To put it concretely, the morphosyntactic status and semantic function of the suffix *-(h)ahtti* are ultimately quite similar to those of the English *-able* as seen in the translations above; this is also in line with Nielsen's (1926: 269) remark concerning the similarity of *-(h)ahtti* and the Norwegian *-lig* (e.g. *spise-lig* [eat-ADJ] 'eatable').

To return from the above-mentioned deverbal adjectives to the inflection of passive *-o(juvvo)-* verbs and the absence of logically anticipatable present participles in **-o(juvvo)jeaddji*, there is one more formation in modern written North Saami that comes quite close to the hypothetical **-o(juvvo)jeaddji*. It was mentioned earlier at the beginning of this section that Friis (1856: 88, 96) has presented a passive present participle formation *rávvejuvvi* <*ravvijuvve*> of the verb *rávvet* <*ravvit*> 'advise'. Even though the authenticity of this verb form may be called into question, it does have real parallels in the modern-day North Saami literary language:

- (180) *Muhto jus hálida einnostuvvi rehkegiid oažžut, de lea fástahaddi čoavddus, dadjá Eikset, ja lohká iežas dál smiehttame galgá go fástahaddái čatn[a]t iežas.* (Áššu 28.7.2006, p. 5)
- Muhto jus hálid-a einnost-uvvi rehkeg-ii-d oažžu-t, de lea*
 but if want-3SG predict-uvvi invoice-PL-GA get-INF PRT be.3SG
fásta-haddi čoavddus, dadjá Eikset, ja lohká ieža-s dál
 fixed-price solution say.3SG Eikset and tell.3SG REFL.GA-3SG now
smiehta-me galgá=go fásta-haddá-i čatna-t ieža-s.
 think-ACTESS must.3SG=Q fixed-price-ILL bind-INF REFL.GA-3SG
 'But if one wants to receive predictable bills, a fixed price is the solution, says Eiksen and says that he is now considering whether to bind himself to a fixed price.'
- (181) *Dá lea čiegus mávssaheaddji! Dulbmojuvviid bealušteaddji! Leaskkaid ja oarbásiid dorvu!* (Min Áigi 21.2.1997, p. 10)
- Dá lea čiegus mávssah-eaddji! Dulbm-ojuvvi-i-d*
 here be.3SG secret avenge-PTC.PRS trample-ojuvvi-PL-GA

⁵⁷ It seems that it would be syntactically and semantically odd if not impossible to transform the *-nláhkai* participial phrases in Examples (155) and (156) into the form *??jáhkásaččat juogehahtti Mánáidbeaivvi báikkášupmi* '??the Children's Day prize that is awardable every year' and *??duodaštusat ja dáidda merkehahtti dieđut* '??the certificates and the information that is recordable therein'. On the other hand, if a "participle" in *-nláhkai* or *-nlágan* has a permissive reading and no modifiers of its own, expressions such as *sirdinlágan geahččüdsajit* 'movable spectator seats' (175) could, and probably according to many even should, be replaced with *sirdihahtti geahččüdsajit*.

bealušt-eaddji! Leaskka-i-d ja oarbás-ii-d dorvu!
 defend-PTC.PRS widow-PL-GA and orphan-PL-GA refuge
 ‘Here is the mysterious avenger! The defender of the oppressed! The
 refuge for widows and orphans!’

- (182) *Guovddášliggemin dollo čáhcebáhtteriin liggejuvvi guovddášliggen, várrejeaddji šleadgaliggen ja johttiáibmoliggen.*
 (<http://www.vero.fi/nc/doc/download.asp?id=3847;49332> 18.6.2006)
Guovddáš-ligge-m-in doll-o čáhce-báhtter-iin ligge-juvvi
 central-heat-VN-ESS regard-PASS.3SG water-radiator-COM heat-juvvi
guovddáš-ligge-n, várre-jeaddji šleadga-ligge-n ja
 central-heat-VN reserve-PTC.PRS electricity-heat-VN and
johtt-i-áibmo-ligge-n.
 circulate-PTC.PRS-air-heat-VN
 ‘By central heating is meant a heating system that is based on hot-water circulation in radiators [i.e., “a heating system that is heated with hot-water radiators”], electric radiators with heat storage, and hot-air circulation.’

- (183) *Skuvlladási árvvoštallama guovddáš áššegirji lea lohkanjagi loahpas ráhkaduuvvi doaibmamuitalus, mas čilgejuvvo, mo ásahuvvon ulbmilat leat ollašuvvan ja árvvoštallama guovddáš bohtosat sihke daid vuodul dahkkon doaimmat.* (http://opspro.peda.net/utsjoki/viewer.php3?DB=saame&mode=2&document_id=160 5.8.2006)
Skuvlla-dási árvvoštalla-m-a guovddáš ášše-girji lea
 school.GA-level.GA evaluate-VN-GA central issue-book be.3SG
lohka-n-jagi loahpa-s ráhkad-uvvi doaibma-muitalus, ma-s
 read-VN-year.GA end-LOC compile-uvvi action-report REL-LOC
čilge-juvvo, mo ásah-uvvo-n ulbmil-at lea-t
 explain-PASS.3SG how set-PASS-PTC.PST objective-PL be-3PL
ollašuvva-n ja árvvoštalla-m-a guovddáš bohtos-at sihke
 materialize-PTC.PST and evaluate-VN-GA central result-PL as.well.as
da-i-d vuodul dahkk-o-n doaimma-t.
 it-PL-GA on.the.grounds make-PASS-PTC.PST action-PL
 ‘At the school level, the principal document for the evaluation is the annual report that is compiled at the end of the school year, containing information on how the defined objectives have been met, the principal results of the evaluation as well as the consequent actions taken.’

The syntax, semantics and, rather importantly, frequency (or degree of productivity and reliability) of the above formations is quite comparable to those of the

attributive non-finites in *-nláhkai* (167–172) and *-nlágan* (173–175). At the same time, the very same features distinguish *-uvvi* formations from the adjectival formations in *-(h)ahhti* and *-(h)eaddji* seen in Examples (176–177). As shown in Examples (182–183), *-uvvi* formations can have adverbial modifiers of their own (*čáhcebáhhtteriin* ‘with hot-water radiators’, *lohkanjagi loahpas* ‘at the end of the school year’), and they seem to have purely passive semantics without any modal restrictions comparable to the use of the “permissive passive” formations in Examples (176–177). On the other hand, formations such as *einnostuvvi* (180)—and *einnostanládje* (169)—could easily be replaced with the more predictable *einnostahtti* ‘predictable’.

As regards the productivity of the formation in question, I am aware of six different *-uvvi* forms.⁵⁸ The form *einnostuvvi* (180) seems to have a rather established, that is, lexicalized, status in the language, as evidenced by a total of 18 additional instances found on various web pages during 2006–2008. Furthermore, I also came across four instances of the negated counterpart *eahpeinnostuvvi* ‘unpredictable’ (184) which, like two of the *einnostuvvi* forms, may also occur in a predicative position:

- (184) *Go dál geahčastat ruovttoluotta, de várra dát optimisttalaš ja eahpe-realisttalaš áigemeroštallan čájeha buorebut go miige eará man uhccán presideansa áššis lea ja man eahpeinnostuvvi dat duodai lea.* (http://www.galdu.org/govat/doc/saugestad_overs_sa.pdf 30.6.2007)
- Go dál geahčast-at ruovttoluotta, de várra dát optimistta-laš ja eahpe-realistta-laš áige-meroštalla-n čájeh-a buore-bu-t go un-realist-ADJ time-calculate-VN show-3SG good-CMPR-ADV than mii=ge eará man uhccán presideansa ášši-s lea ja man REL=also else REL.GA little precedence issue-LOC be.3SG and REL.GA eahpe-einnost-uvvi dat duodai lea.*
 un-predict-uvvi it really be.3SG
 ‘If you now take a glance back, maybe it is the optimistic and unrealistic time estimates that best show how little precedence there is for this issue and how unpredictable it really is.’

As regards the inner structure of formations such as *einnostuvvi* ‘predictable’, *dulbmojuvvi* ‘oppressed’, *liggejuvvi* ‘heated’ and *ráhkaduvvi* ‘compiled’, their

⁵⁸ In addition to the forms seen in Examples (180–183), at the final stage of the present study I also observed the expressions *sáme-guovllu-s čadah-uvvi ... skuvle-n-prográmma* [Saami-area-LOC implement-uvvi educate-VN-program] ‘a training program to be implemented in the Saami area’ and *klassifisere-m-ii dárbbáš-uvvi dieđu* [classify-VN-ILL need-uvvi information.GA] ‘the information needed for classification’ in the internet (<http://lotta.yle.fi/srwebanar.nsf/sivut/oddsat?opendocument&pageid=Content7E067> 15.4.2008 and <http://www.ymparisto.fi/download.asp?contentid=93537> 30.12.2008, respectively).

morphological composition is somewhat anomalous. On the one hand, it is quite understandable that such a form as *dulbmojuvvi* may be based on the analogy *duolbma-n* [trample-PTC.PST] : *duolbm-i* [trample-PTC.PRS] = *dulbm-ojuvvo-n* [trample-PASS-PTC.PST] : X; X = *dulbm-ojuvv-i* [trample-PASS-PTC.PRS] (pro otherwise expectable **dulbmo(juvvo)jeaddji*). On the other hand, a corresponding formula would yield formations such as **einnostuvvojeaddji*, **liggejuvvojeaddji* and **ráhkaduvvojeaddji* (cf. ordinary present participles *einnosteaddji*, *liggejeaddji* and *ráhkadeaddji*), that is, the very forms that would be the most anticipatable passive participles in any case. However, it is possible that the *-uvvi* forms in Examples (180–184) should be regarded as quite harmless quirks of language, as their appearance suggests that we are dealing with (active) present participles of the virtually non-existent verbs **einnostuvvat*, **dulbmojuvvat*, **liggejuvvat* and **ráhkaduvvat* instead of the ordinary passive verbs *einnostuvvot* ‘be predicted’, *dulbmojuvvot* ‘be trampled (oppressed)’, *liggejuvvot* ‘be heated’ and *ráhkaduvvot* ‘be done (compiled)’. The non-finites in Examples (180–184) cannot be easily misunderstood either, even though the verb **einnostuvvat* could in principle be morphologically regarded as another kind of passive derivation, that is, an instance of verbs that Sammallahti (2005: 63–67) characterizes as automative passive verbs. Due to the semantic and pragmatic restrictions of verbs of this type, such a verb (**einnostuvvat* ‘be predictable’) would not seem to exist in the language, though.⁵⁹ — Incidentally, the morphological irregularity of these apparently participial (*-uvvi*) suffixes resembles the *-hahtti* formations that are not necessarily based on genuine verb lexemes either (see Examples 177a–c).

Having become acquainted with the participially used formations in *-nláhkai*, *-nlágan* and *-uvvi*, it is appropriate to seek reasons for the complete absence of the passive past participle in **-o(juvvo)jeaddji*, creating an apparent “gap” in the somewhat asymmetric system of North Saami participles. To be sure, such a gap can be bridged by alternative expressions such as finite relative clauses (see e.g. V. Guttorm 1994; Nickel 1994: 439, 442, 514; Sammallahti 2005: 159–161, 164) or in some cases by creating compound nouns with the verbal noun, for example, *guoddi-n-seanga* [carry-VN-bed] ‘stretcher’, literally ‘carrying-bed’, that is, ‘bed that is carried’ (see Examples [12a–b] in Ylikoski 2006b: 44). However, the examples presented in this section provide evidence that, at least in the modern literary use of the language, the absence of the passive present participle has led writers, and especially translators of official documents with extraordinarily complex sentence structure, to resort to formations

⁵⁹ The other corresponding derivatives are *duolbmašuvvat* ‘be trampled (oppressed) by itself’ and apparently nonexistent **lieggašuvvat* ‘be heated by itself’ and **ráhkaduvvat* ‘be done (compiled) by itself’. According to Erkki Itkonen (1939: 366–367) and R. Bartens (1978a: 76), there are signs of fusion between the suffixes *-(j)uvvo-* and *-uvva-* (<*-uvvu-*> resp. <*-uvvá-*> in the Nielsenian Lappological tradition) in Skolt Saami.

that are obviously meant to function as such, even though their material origins may appear somewhat surprising.

As regards the reasons for the absence of logically anticipatable verb forms in **-o(juvvo)jeaddji*, one of the few possible explanations may be the relative heaviness of the longest possible variant **-ojuvvojeaddji* (e.g. **juhkkojuvvojeaddji* and **dulbmojuvvojeaddji*). However, equally logical forms such as **juhkkojeaddji* and **dulbmojeaddji* should not seem any stranger than *juohkinláhkai* ‘divided, awarded’ (167) or *dulbmojuvvi* ‘trampled, oppressed’ (181),⁶⁰ so that a more convincing explanation may lie in the fact that the suffix *-i/(j)eaddji* is very often used to create agent nouns whose semantic function, not only “active” but highly agentive, is in sharp opposition to the passive, patient-oriented function of participles such as *dulbmojuvvi*/**dulbmojeaddji*. Therefore, especially the longer variant *-jeaddji* might be experienced as having a misleadingly strong flavor of agentivity. For example, the dissimilarity of the active and passive participles in expressions such as *dulbmojuvviid bealušteaddji* ‘the defender of the oppressed’ (181) probably works better toward maintaining the agent/patient distinction in comparison to the (morpho)logically more consistent expression **dulbmo(juvvo)jeaddjiid bealušteaddji*.

In addition to formations in *-uvvi* (180–184), I have also come across another participle-like attributive and morphologically “passive” non-finite verb form in North Saami. In Example (185), such a function has been assigned to the so-called action essive form of the passive verb *ásahuvvot* ‘be founded’ (← *ásahit* ‘found’). As described in Ylikoski (2002) and Section 2.2, the action essive is often used in certain types of adverbial modifying functions and as complements to verbs of perception and cognition, but most often it occurs with the verb *leat* ‘be’ forming the periphrastic progressive seen in Examples (17), (44–47), (102) and (186):

(185) *Earret Unjárgga Sámi Duodji báikki olbmot šaddet aiddo ásahuvvomín fitnodaga oamasteaddjin.* (*Min Áigi* 10.5.1995, p. 5)

<i>Earret</i>	<i>Unjárgga</i>	<i>Sámi</i>	<i>Duodji</i>	<i>báikki</i>	<i>olbmo-t</i>
besides	Unjárga.GA	Saami.GA	handicraft	locality.GA	human-PL
<i>šadde-t</i>	<i>aiddo</i>	<i>ásah-uvvo-min</i>	<i>fitnodaga</i>		
become-3PL	right(.now)	found-PASS-ACTESS	company.GA		

oamast-eaddji-n.

OWN-PTC.PRS-ESS

‘In addition to Unjárga Saami Handicraft, local people also will be among the owners of the company being founded.’

⁶⁰ Note also the morphological complexity of the occasional use of passive inchoative verbs such as *geavah-uvvo-goahiti-t* [use-PASS-INCH-INF] ‘begin to be used’ and *ráddádall-ojuvvo-goahiti-t* [negotiate-PASS-INCH-INF] ‘begin to be negotiated’.

- (186) *All Catering as, borramušfitnodat Leavnnjas, mii lea ásahuvvomin, oažžu 67.000 ruvnnu álggahandoarjjan.* (*Min Áigi* 4.8.1995, p. 9)
All Catering as, borramuš-fitnodat Leavnnja-s, mii lea
 All Catering as nourishment-company Leavdnja-LOC REL be.3SG
ásah-uvvo-min, oažžu 67.000 ruvnnu álggah-an-doarjja-n.
 found-PASS-ACTESS get.3SG 67,000 crown.GA start-VN-support-ESS
 ‘All Catering as (Ltd.), a Leavdnja catering company that is being found-
 ed, will acquire 67,000 crowns as a start-up support.’

Even though *ásahuvvomin* in Example (185) is the only known instance of adnominal *-uvvomin* forms, it must certainly be viewed as part of a more general adnominal use of the action essive on the whole. As it turns out, the adnominal non-finites seen in Examples (187–190) force us also to re-evaluate the position of the North Saami active present participles, and the full nature of the action essive:

- (187) *Havssii njálgga gáfehája gievkkanlanjas olggos lávdame, aitto jur rávdame gáffe.* (Einejord 1986: 14)⁶¹
Havssi-i njálgga gáfe-hája gievkkan-lanja-s
 smell-PST.3SG delicious.ATTR coffee.GA-smell.GA kitchen-room-LOC
olggos lávda-me, aitto jur rávda-me gáffe.
 out spread-ACTESS exactly right(.now) settle-ACTESS coffee
 ‘He smelled the delicious smell of coffee wafting from the kitchen, coffee that was settling at that very moment.’
- (188) *Duane Smith, Inuit Circumpolar Conference jodiheaddji Kanadas, oaidná ahte dáppe leamen info-váili lea sivalaš oassái váigatvuodaide.* (<http://www.saamicouncil.net/files/20040401102722.pdf> 29.7.2006)
Duane Smith, Inuit Circumpolar Conference jodih-eaddji
 Duane Smith, Inuit Circumpolar Conference(.GA) lead-PTC.PRS
Kanada-s, oaidná ahte dáppe lea-men info-váili lea sivalaš
 Canada-LOC see.3SG COMP here be-ACTESS info-lack be.3SG guilty
oassá-i váigat-vuoda-i-de.
 part-ILL difficult-hood-PL-ILL

⁶¹ In Example (187), the verb form *lávdam* is a part of the construction *njálgga gáfehája gievkkanlanjas olggos lávdame* that functions as the complement of the perception verb *haksit* ‘smell’ (cf. Example 18 in Section 2.2), but the following words *aitto jur rávdame gáffe* may be understood as a kind of appositional (nominative *gáffe* vs. accusative *gáfehája*) noun phrase functionally equivalent to the use of a finite relative clause in ..., *gáffe, mii le-i aitto jur rávda-me* [coffee REL be-PST.3SG exactly right(.now) settle-ACTESS] ‘coffee that was settling at the very moment’. On the other hand, it could be possible to view the words *aitto jur rávdame gáffe* as an elliptical, and appositional, clause instead of the full clause *aitto lei* [be-3SG] *jur rávdame gáffe* ‘[...and] coffee was settling at the very moment’.

‘Duane Smith, Canadian President of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, sees the existing lack of information as a reason for some of the problems.’

- (189) *Liegganeamen Árttisa čuozausat: Árttalaš dálkádattuppástusa čuozašárvoštallan* (Hassol 2004a [the title of the book])
Lieggan-eamen Árttis-a čuozausa-t: Árttalaš dálkádattuppástusa
 warm-ACTESS Arctic-GA impact-PL Arctic climate-change.GA
čuozaš-árvoštalla-n
 impact-assess-VN
 ‘Impacts of a Warming Arctic: Arctic Climate Impact Assessment’
 (Hassol 2004b [the title of the book])

- (190) *Da[n s]adjái gávnnahuvvui ahte meara heakkat gárte gillát m[á]hggaid jagiid, ja ain dálge váivviduvvojit sakka, danne go vel unná[ž]iid dihttomen oljorátnu sáht[t]á eastadit ceavzima, geahpeda sahkaneemiid ja nj[oa]hcuda ahtanuššama.* (Hassol 2004a: 85)
Dan sadjái gávnnah-uvvu-i ahte meara heakka-t gárte
 it.GA instead notice-PASS-PST.3SG COMP sea.GA life-PL end.up.PST.3PL
gillá-t mángga-i-d jagi-i-d, ja ain dál=ge váivvid-uvvo-jit
 suffer-INF many-PL-GA year-PL-GA and still now=also strain-PASS-3PL
sakka, danne go vel unnážiid dihtto-men oljo-rátnu sáhttá
 much because even slightly occur-ACTESS oil-mat may.3SG
eastad-it ceavzi-m-a, geahped-a sahkaneem-ii-d ja
 hinder-INF survive-VN-GA lessen-3SG be.fertilized-VN-PL-GA and
njoahcud-a ahtanušša-m-a.
 stunt-3SG advance-VN-GA
 ‘Instead, they found that marine life suffered for many years, and continues to suffer, because even tiny [i.e., “slightly occurring”] patches of remnant oil reduced survival, slowed reproduction, and stunted growth.’
 (Hassol 2004b: 85)

Not unlike many other non-finite constructions presented in this and the preceding section, the adnominal use of the action essive is a quite marginal phenomenon in the language. In addition to Examples (185, 187–190), other occurrences such as this only seem to be found easily in the book entitled “*Liegganeamen Árttisa čuozausat*” (189), a translation of “Impacts of a Warming Arctic”.⁶²

⁶² For example, the book includes subheadings such as *Badján-eamen temperatuvrra-t* [rise-ACTESS temperature-PL] ← *Rising Temperatures* (p. 12), *Lassán-eamen arvvi-t ja muohitti* [increase-ACTESS rain-PL and snowing] ← *Increasing precipitation* (p. 12) and *Hedjon-eamen girse* [degrade-ACTESS permafrost] ← *Degrading permafrost* (p. 87).

In fact, the overall quality of the translation has been publicly reprobated by the Saami linguist Nils Øivind Helander (see Johnskareng 2006 writing in the newspaper *Min Áigi*; see also Rasmussen 2006), and another reader (Kangasniemi 2006) has also explicitly remarked that a more correct translation of the title would have been *Lieggan-eaddji Arktis-a čuozažusa-t* (or ...*váikkuhusa-t*) [warm-PTC.PRS Arctic-GA impact-PL/impact-PL] ‘Impacts of a Warming Arctic’. However, as evidenced both by the fact that such a book has nevertheless been published and the existence of corresponding constructions in Examples (185, 187–188), this phenomenon must not be overlooked either. — Even though constructions such as these cannot be found in the published dialect texts at our disposal, an apparently colloquial expression of this kind has been incidentally cited by Erkki Itkonen (1966: 309) who mentions the phrase *mieska-n, aitto fier-ral-eamen stohpo-ráđu-t* [rot-PTC.PST just tumble.over-ACTESS shack-carcass-PL] ‘decayed, collapsing ramshackle shacks’ as an example of adverbial word forms occasionally occurring in attributive positions.

It appears quite obvious that the adnominal use of both the *-nláhkai* (42, 167–172) and *-min* (185, 187–190) forms is based on an analogy offered by one of the most frequent non-finite verb forms in the language, that is, the past participle which is, in accordance with the typologically common properties of participles and non-verbal adjectives (191a–b), used both in predicative (192a) and adnominal positions (192b), the former function being often considered a periphrastic perfect tense. As the copula verb *leat* ‘be’ is also the most common finite verb in sentences with *-nláhkai* and *-min*, it is perfectly understandable that they, too, may have been reanalyzed as verbal adjectives of some kind with inherently active (*-min*) and passive (*-nláhkai*, *-o(juvvo)min*) voices:⁶³

- (191) a. *Báikki olbmot leat geafit.*
Báikki olbmo-t lea-t geafi-t
 locality.GA human-PL be-3PL POOF-PL
 ‘The local people are poor.’
- b. *báikki geafes olbmot*
báikki geafes olbmo-t
 locality.GA POOF.ATTR human-PL
 ‘the local poor’

⁶³ The functional resemblance between *-nláhkai* and *-uvvomin* in sentences such as *eall-i-govva-guovddáš lea vuodđud-anláhkái ~ vuodđud-uvvo-min* [live-PTC.PRS-picture-center be.3SG establish-*nláhkai* ~ establish-PASS-ACTESS] ‘the movie center is being established’ has been observed earlier in Ylikoski (2006a: 26).

- (192) a. *Báikki olbmot leat ásahan fitnodaga.*
Báikki olbmo-t lea-t ásah-an fitnodaga.
 locality.GA human-PL be-3PL found-PTC.PST company.GA
 ‘The local people have founded a company.’
- b. *fitnodaga ásahan olbmot*
fitnodaga ásah-an olbmo-t
 company.GA found-PTC.PST human-PL
 ‘the people who have founded a company’
- (193) a. *Báikki olbmot leat ásaheamen fitnodaga.*
Báikki olbmo-t lea-t ásah-eamen fitnodaga.
 locality.GA human-PL be-3PL found-ACTESS company.GA
 ‘The local people are founding a company.’
- b. *fitnodaga ásaheamen olbmot* (cf. Examples 187–190)
fitnodaga ásah-eamen olbmo-t
 company.GA found-ACTESS human-PL
 ‘the people who are founding a company’
- (194) a. *Fitnodat lea ásahanláhkai ~ ásahuvvomin.*
Fitnodat lea ásah-anláhkai ~ ásah-uvvo-min.
 company be.3SG found-nláhkai ~ found-PASS-ACTESS
 ‘The company is being founded.’
- b. *ásahanláhkai ~ ásahuvvomin fitnodat* (cf. Examples 42, 167–172, 185)
ásah-anláhkai ~ ásah-uvvo-min fitnodat
 found-nláhkai ~ found-PASS-ACTESS company
 ‘the company (that is) being founded’

Neither the meaning of the active *-min* (187–190) nor the passive *-o(juvvo)min* (185) necessarily equates with that of the participles in *-il-(j)eaddji* or **-o(juvvo)jeaddji* (or the various non-finites seen in Examples 167–175, 180–184), but the verb form in *-(o(juvvo))min* is inherently progressive in meaning, also when used adnominally. Therefore, its use in Examples (185, 187–190) could be characterized as “progressive participle” that may be perceived as a kind of subtype of the present participle, but not all instances of the aspectually neutral present participle can be transformed into explicitly progressive expressions. In other words, the action essives in (185, 187–190, 193b, 194b) can be seen as adnominal counterparts of the periphrastic predicative *leat V-min*, but phrases with adnominal *-nláhkai*, *-nlágan* or *-uvvi* cannot necessarily be transformed

into progressive finite clauses, and therefore we are not likely to come across progressive participial phrases like **jáhkásaččat juhkkovuvvomin Mánáidbeaivvi báلكkášupmi* ‘*the Children’s Day prize that is being awarded every year’ or *??lohkanjagi loahpas ráhkaduvvomin doaibmamuitalus* ‘??the annual report that is being compiled at the end of the school year’.

It has already been seen in connection with the individual “passive present participles” presented in this section that practically all of them, *-nláhkai*, *-nlágan*, *-uvvi* and *-uvvomin*, are quite marginal, though not fully isolated occurrences of phenomena that are possibly accepted by only a small minority of the speakers of North Saami. Therefore, it would be very unrealistic to suggest that from now on, the number of participles presented in all basic descriptions and school grammars should be elevated not only to three (including the agentive passive participle in addition to the traditional present and past participles) but to seven or so, of which as many as four could be characterized as passive present participles.

In their entirety, the formations seen above are nonetheless intended to demonstrate that the passive present participle in **-o(juvvo)jeaddji* really seems to be absent in the language, whereas there would seem to be a number of more or less professional writers and translators who have repeatedly resorted to as many as four unforeseen morphosyntactic innovations to fill the gap in an otherwise asymmetric system of participles. However, as pointed out by Haspelmath (1994: 154–157), asymmetries of this kind are quite common and even functionally motivated in the languages of the world, so that the phenomena observable in contemporary North Saami may be related to the influence of the Finnish language, especially as it seems that at least those formations in Examples (155–156, 159–163, 169–170) are based on passive present participles in the Finnish source text. A Finnish influence on Saami participles has been also suggested by R. Bartens (1978a: 81–82), and parallel development was already discussed in connection with the emergence of the converb in *-miin* and the corresponding forms in Inari and Skolt Saami. On the other hand, Examples (169–170, 180–181, 184–185) demonstrate that corresponding constructions have also gained a toehold in texts written and published on the Norwegian side of the border where the dominating language possesses only two voice-neutral participles (past and present) and in the absence of passive present participles, various other expressions such as deverbal adjectives are used instead (cf. Faarlund et al. 1997: 117–119, 470–474; see also Teleman et al. 1999: 179, 183, 530–531, 581ff. and Malmgren 2001 for an almost identical situation in Swedish).⁶⁴ Therefore, it ap-

⁶⁴ In Ylikoski (2006a: 31), it was maintained that *einnostanládje* ‘predictable’ in Example (169) seems to be a translation of the deverbal adjective *forutsig-bar(t)* [predict-ADJ], and the noun phrase *sullii 3200 geavah-anláhkai saji* [about 3200 use-*nláhkai* place.GA] ‘about 3200 usable [salmon-fishing] places’ originates in the Norwegian *om lag 3200 dispon-ible plass-er* [around 3200 utilize-ADJ place-PL] ‘id.’. In the same vein, *eahpeeinnostuvvi* ‘unpredictable’ in (184) appears to be a translation of *u-forutsig-bar* [un-predict-ADJ] (http://www.galdu.org/govat/doc/saugestad_bente_fin.pdf 30.6.2007).

pears that the existence of the formations seen above and the possible reasons behind their emergence should not be completely ignored, but rather taken into account even in future language planning. — I will return to these issues in Section 4.2.2.

As regards the actual number of participles in a language, this must naturally depend on the criteria used for determining what a participle is and what it is not. In this study (Section 2.1 and Ylikoski 2003a) I have emphasized that the verb forms traditionally labeled as participles are actually the only type of non-finites that can be quite adequately defined both in terms of 1) their word-class and 2) their syntactic functions. This is due to the fact that as verbal adjectives, the syntactic functions of participles are in practice mostly limited to the adnominal and predicative functions, which also happen to be among the decisive features of adjectives in general. However, it is far more common, and usually more economical, to be confined to the former perspective and define participles as verbal adjectives, even in spite of the fact that at least the participles of the major western European languages usually lack adjectival features as central as the formation of the comparative and superlative degree (see Ylikoski 2003a: 227–228).

On the other hand, the view of participles as “verbal adjectives” often seems to carry the assumption that they are mainly used as adnominal modifiers inside the noun phrase rather than in predicative positions. For example, virtually every example in Haspelmath’s (1994) study on the typology of passive participles depicts them as attributives, and the Saami participles discussed in this section have been described in the same vein. Also, R. Bartens (1978a: 80), when discussing the predominantly predicative use of the Saami past participle, makes the comment that it feels strange to think of a participle that could not be used as an attribute.

However, a glance at the early history of Saami grammars shows that the concept of a participle or a verbal adjective has not always required such attributive usage: As earlier noted by Korhonen (1974: 15), Leem (1748: 145, 155 *et passim*) differentiates between two present participles: “Participium Præsens prius” and “Participium Præsens posterius” that refer to the non-finites nowadays known as the present participle (*-i/(j)eaddji*) and the so-called action essive (*-min*). In other words, the action essive has been also considered a participle in spite of its “posterior”, that is, non-attributive syntactic functions. Furthermore, Rask (1832: 114–115) regards the latter as the only present participle in the language, whereas the formation in *-i/(j)eaddji* is characterized as the agent noun (*Handlersformen*, *nomen agentis*) only. This tradition was continued by Friis (1856: 82ff.) who labels the “participles” in *-min* <-me> and *-n* <-m> as the “present adjective” (*Adjektivus, Præsens*) and “past adjective” (*Adjektivus,*

Præteritum), respectively, adding that this kind of “adjective mood” corresponds to participles in other languages; however, the *-i/-j)eaddji* form is labeled as the “actor” or agent noun (*Aktor- eller Handlersform*). — The contemporary view of the two participles in *-i/-j)eaddji* and *-n* was apparently introduced by Nielsen (1926: 151ff., 393–397).

It seems that the view that the action essive could be labeled as a participle is based solely on the “posterior” or predicative use of this verb form. With the exception of Itkonen’s (1966: 309) brief reference to *mieskan, aitto fierraleamen stohporáđut* ‘decayed, collapsing ramshackle shacks’ mentioned above, its attributive use (185, 187–190) has not been described earlier, but explicitly denied instead, since Kemi (1991: 66) has described the differences between the past participle and the action essive by referring to the ungrammaticality of phrases such as **vázzi-min olmmoš* [walk-ACTESS human] ‘a person walking’ (cf. *vázzá-n olmmoš* [walk-ACTESS human] ‘a person who has walked’). — In the light of Examples (185–190), the ungrammaticality of the attributive use of *vázzimin* does not appear to be that obvious, however.

As a side note, it can be mentioned that in Kert’s (1971) grammar of the two easternmost Saami languages, Kildin and Ter Saami of the Kola Peninsula, the corresponding form is labeled as the participle in *-men·* (*нручастие на -men·*), and the author also presents two Ter Saami examples in which this verb form is used as an adnominal modifier. According to the translations he has provided, these peculiar participles should apparently be analyzed as past—active (195) and passive (196)—participles of a kind:

(195) *kahk-men· olmji* (Kert 1971: 204)
 fall-ACTESS man
 ‘a fallen man’ (Kert: ‘упавший человек’)

(196) *logg-men· kñiga* (Kert 1971: 204)
 read-ACTESS book
 ‘a book that has been read’ (Kert: ‘прочинная книга’)

To conclude this survey of the formations that can be regarded as bridging and filling the gap created by the absence of the passive counterpart of the present participle in North Saami, it should be briefly noted that corresponding non-finite verb forms are not readily found in the neighboring Saami languages either. As for Lule Saami in the southwest, Spiik’s (1989: 88–89) account of the passive morphology consists of a paradigm for the verb *tjábmeduvvat* ‘be beaten’ (← *tjábmet* ‘beat’), and this paradigm also includes the present participle *tjábmeduv¹ve* with the note that this form has been fabricated (*konstruerat*),

which means that such a form must be regarded as a theoretical construct, comparable to the corresponding **cábmo(juvvo)jeaddji* (← *cábmit* ‘beat’) in North Saami. On the other hand, Spiik (1989: 110) describes the present participle as being mainly an agent noun rather than a verbal adjective, and corresponding passive formations, semantically patient rather than agent nouns, can indeed occasionally be found. Olavi Korhonen’s (2007 s.v.) dictionary includes the noun *gástaduvve* ‘baptizee’ (← *gástaduvvat* ‘be baptized’ ← *gástadit* ‘baptize’), and in the authentic texts, I have encountered a passive participle *áskelduvve* ‘trusted (person), trustee’ which occurs in Example (197). The Lule Saami translation of the New Testament includes the participle-like noun *bálkkiduvve* ‘hired man’ (← *bálkkidit* ‘hire’; Example 198a), whereas the corresponding North Saami translation uses the underived noun *reanga* ‘hired man’ (198b) instead:

- (197) *Ráddidus ájggu aj tjavtjan 2003 ja gidán 2004 virggealmatjijda ja áskelduvve ulmutjijda komuvnan ja lánndadikken konferensajt almasjlasj riektáj gávttuj fállat.* (http://www.manskligarattigheter.gov.se/dynamaster/file_archive/031011/a571fe0d521bff6acb9c37aa1d5326be/Faktablad_NationellhandplanMR_lulesamiska.pdf 19.12.2007)
- Ráddidus ájggu aj tjavtja-n 2003 ja gidá-n 2004*
 government plan.3SG also fall-INE 2003 and spring-INE 2004
virgge-almatj-ij-da ja áskeld-uvv-e ulmutj-ij-da komuvna-n
 office-human-PL-ILL and trust-PASS-PTC.PRS human-PL-ILL municipality-INE
ja lánndadikke-n konferensa-j-t almasjlasj riektáj
 and county.council-INE conference-PL-ACC human right-PL.GEN
gávttuj fálla-t.
 concerning offer-INF
 ‘The government is also planning to arrange conferences on human rights for the civil servants and trusted representatives in the municipalities and county councils in the fall of 2003 and the spring of 2004.’

- (198) a. *Bálkkiduvve ham sávtsajs ij berusta.* (ÅT: John 10:13)
Bálkki-duvv-e=ham sávtsa-j-s ij berust-a.
 hire-PASS-PTC.PRS=to.be.sure sheep-PL-ELA NEG.3SG care-CONNeg
 ‘To be sure, a hired man does not care about the sheep.’
- b. *Dasgo son lea dušše reanga ii ge ane fuola sávzzain.* (OT: John 10:13)
Dasgo son lea dušše reanga ii=ge
 because 3SG be.3SG only hired.man NEG.3SG=and
ane fuola sávzza-i-n.
 hold(up).CONNeg care.GA sheep-PL-LOC
 ‘Because he is only a hired man and does not care about the sheep.’

R. Bartens (1978a: 82–85) has paid attention to Inari Saami formations that correspond to the deverbal adjectives of the types *boraheadji* and *borahahti* (176–178) in North Saami. However, it seems that the unambiguously verbal passive present participles are almost non-existent in Inari Saami, too. In a footnote in Ylikoski (2006a: 31 n. 2), I referred to the participle *juáhhojeijee* in the phrase *ihásá-vt juáh-h-o-jeijee Párná-i-peeivi palhâšume* [yearly-ADV give.away-PASS-PTC. PRS child-PL.GEN-day.GA prize] ‘the Children’s Day prize that is awarded every year’ which, like *jahkásaččat juohkinláhkai Mánáidbeaivvi báلكkášupmi* in (167), is obviously a translation from the Finnish participial phrase *vuosittain jae-ttava Lastenpäivä-n palkinto* [yearly give.away-PTC.PASS.PRS child.PL.GEN-day-GEN prize].

However, even though *juáhhojeijee* (← *juohhud* ‘be given away, be divided’ ← *jyehid* ‘give away, divide’) is actually the most predictable equivalent to the North Saami **juhkko(juvvo)jeaddji*, forms like these cannot be easily found elsewhere in the language. On the other hand, alternative expressions analogous to the participial *-nláhkai*, *-nlágan*, *-uvvi* or *-uvvomin* seen above seem not to exist in the most conservative language, yet it does not appear impossible that such formations could gain a foothold in Inari Saami as well. In fact, in the light of the adnominal *-nláhkai* constructions in Examples (167–172) and the Finnish participial construction in (100c), the North and Inari Saami non-finites in Examples (100a–b) could in principle be interpreted not only as having so-called predicative functions (described in Ylikoski 2006a and Section 2.3) but alternatively as attributive modifiers of the nouns *eatnigiella* ‘mother language’ and *eenikielâ* ‘id.’, and such reanalyses may in turn give rise to unambiguously attributive extensions of the type *jahkásaččat juohkinláhkai Mánáidbeaivvi báلكkášupmi* (167) or analogous *?ihásávt jyehimnáál Párnáipeeivi palhâšume*. In concrete terms, the sentences (101a, 101b) above need not mean ‘...to report [the Saami language as one’s mother tongue] for entry into the Population Information System’ but alternatively, Inari Saami *vuorkkimnáál* and North Saami *vrkenláhkái* may be interpreted as adnominal modifiers of *eenikiellâ* and *eatnigiella* ‘the mother tongue’:

- (101) a. ...*almottiđ viehâdáhtiätuvuáhádâhân vuorkkimnáál eenikiellân sâmi-kielâ.*
almott-iđ [*viehâdâh-tiätu-vuáhádâhâ-n vuorkki-mnáál*
 report-INF [population-data-system-ILL save-mnáál
eeni-kiellâ-n] *sâmi-kielâ.*
 mother.GEN-language-ESS] Saami-language.GA

- b. ...*almmuhit veahkadatdiehtovuogádahkii vrkenláhkái eatnigiellanis sâmegiela.*
almmuh-it [*veahkadat-diehto-vuogádahk-ii vrke-nláhkái*
 report-INF [population-data-system-ILL save-nláhkai

eatni-giella-n-is] *sáme-giela.*
 mother.GA-language-ESS-3SG] Saami-language.GA
 ‘...to report the Saami language as [one’s mother tongue to be entered
 into the Population Information System]_{NP}.’

It is the syntactic-semantic ambiguity of sentences like these that often makes it impossible to present exact numbers of phenomena such as the “about twenty” instances of attributive *-nláhkai* forms in my research material. However, I have encountered another sentence in which the Inari Saami *-mnáál* seems to occur in an unambiguously attributive, that is, participial function:

- (199) *Tuđhos tuálá sistees oovtâ págulii uási já nelji valjimmáál uási, moin kalga valjid kyehti, ovdil ko čoodât tutkos.* (Kieräs 12/2007)
Tuđhos tuálá sistee-s oovtâ págulii uási já
 exam hold.3SG in-3SG one.ACC obligatory.ATTR part.ACC and
nelji valji-mnáál uási, mo-i-n kalga valji-đ
 four.ACC choose-mnáál part.ACC REL-PL-LOC must.3SG choose-INF
kyehti, ovdil ko čoodât tutkos.
 two.ACC before COMP pass.3SG exam.ACC
 ‘The exam consists of one obligatory part and four parts to choose from,
 of which two must be chosen in order to pass the exam.’

As for the third immediately neighboring Saami language, Skolt Saami, I am not aware of any corresponding passive present participles.

In this section on the dynamics of passive participial constructions, particular emphasis has been laid on the attributive functions of non-finite formations and the interplay between attributive and predicative functions of non-finites that can be characterized as participles which, in turn, have been generally characterized as verbal adjectives. Similar issues will be discussed in the following section where the traditional view of the participial subsystem of North Saami non-finite verb forms is supplemented by evaluating the role of the non-finite in *-keahtes*—in many respects the attributive counterpart of the adverbial-predicative verb abessive in *-keahttä*—as the general (present and past, active and passive) negative participle in the language.

3.2.3. The negative participle

At the very beginning of Section 1, it was stated that one of the largely unnoticed and undescribed non-finites in North Saami is the negative participle exemplified by the word form *logakeahtes* ‘unread’. The formative *-keahtes* was also discussed in Section 3.1.5 in which the constructions *reanto- ja divatkeahtes loatna* ‘interest- and fee-free loan’ (149) and *čujut- ja mávssekeahtes sierra-divadat* ‘special fee that has not been paid or argued against’ (150) were presented as examples of conjunction reduction that was shown to affect a number of inflectional and derivational suffixes in the language. Furthermore, in spite of the formal and functional similarities between denominal and (de)verbal adjectives such as *divat-keahtes* [fee-*keahtes*] ‘fee-free’ and *mávsse-keahtes* [pay-*keahtes*] ‘unpaid’, the latter were characterized as the adnominal counterpart of a so-called verb abessive, the negative converb in *-keahtá*, which is also subject to conjunction reduction as seen in *bora- ja juga-keahtá* [eat- and drink-VABE] ‘without eating and drinking’ (151).

In the following, I wish to argue that even though it is not impossible to regard such formations as *logakeahtes* ‘unread’ and *mávssekeahtes* ‘unpaid’ as deverbal adjectives, there are many reasons to explore an alternative explanation, namely, the view that we are indeed dealing with the adnominal counterpart of the adverbial verb form, and the most appropriate characterization for such a verb form is *negative participle*. Consider first the non-finites in Examples (200–207):

- (200) *Vuosttažettiin namahuvvojit nissoniid **bassalkeahtes** buksahiitamat dahje oapmebuvssat.* (Gaski et al. 2004: 99 < LES 1: 462, Unjárga, Henrik Olsen Reppen 1903)

<i>Vuosttažettiin</i>	<i>namah-uvvo-jit</i>	<i>nisson-ii-d</i>	<i>bassal-keahtes</i>
first	mention-PASS-3PL	woman-PL-GA	wash- <i>keahtes</i>
<i>buksa-hiitam-at</i>	<i>dahje</i>	<i>oapme-buvssa-t.</i>	
pant-seat-PL	or	worn.out-pant-PL	

‘The first things to be mentioned are the unwashed seats of women’s pants or worn-out pants.’

- (201) *Muhtumin gal šaddá, go **náitalkeahtes** nieida máná vuostái lea, ahte meahccái manná čihkosis riegádahttit ja mánás doppe sorbmet.*

(Gaski et al. 2004: 142 < LES 2: 332, Kárášjohka, G. Balke, 1880s)

<i>Muhtumin</i>	<i>gal</i>	<i>šaddá,</i>	<i>go</i>	<i>náital-keahtes</i>	<i>nieida</i>	<i>máná</i>
sometimes	to.be.sure	happen.3SG	as	marry- <i>keahtes</i>	girl	child.GA

vuostái lea, ahte meahccá-i manná čihkos-is riegádahtti-t
 against be.3SG COMP wilderness-ILL go.3SG secret-LOC bear-INF
ja máná-s doppe sorbme-t.
 and child.GA-3SG there kill-INF

‘To be sure, it sometimes happens that an unmarried girl is pregnant and she goes into the wilderness to give birth to her child and kill it there.’

- (202) *Ja de dan láhkai moriidahttojuvvojit vela olbmot moritkeahtes*

oahpaheaddjis, ja... (Hætta & Bær 1982: 206)

Ja de dan láhkai moriid-ahtt-ojuvvo-jit vela olbmo-t
 and PRT it.GA in.the.manner awaken-CAUS-PASS-3PL too human-PL
morit-keahtes oahpah-eaddji-s, ja
 awaken-keahtes teach-PTC.PRS-LOC and

‘And in that way, it also occurs that people get (spiritually) awakened by an unawakened teacher, and...’

- (203) *Oasusgoddi ii badjelgeahča Lauri Syrjäsa eallinbarggu dolgevuogga-bivddus, muhto gávnnaha muiorávttu giddema Deatnogáddái leat čállojuvvon ja čálekeahtes njuolggadusaid ja báikkálaš kultuvrra vuostá.* (Min Áigi 19.10.2007, p. 5)

Oasusgoddi ii badjel-geahča Lauri Syrjäs-a
 cooperative NEG.3SG over-look.CONNEG Lauri Syrjänen-GA
ealli-n-barggu dolge-vuogga-bivdd-u-s,
 live-VN-work-NMLZ.GA feather-hook.and.line-try.to.catch-NMLZ-LOC

muhto gávnna-h-a mui-to-rávttu gidde-m-a
 but regard-3SG commemorative-plaque.GA attach-VN-GA

Deatno-gáddá-i lea-t čáll-ojuvvo-n ja čále-keahtes
 Deatnu-shore-ILL be-INF write-PASS-PTC.PST and write-keahtes
njuolggadusa-i-d ja báikkálaš kultuvrra vuostá.
 rule-PL-GA and local culture.GA against

‘The cooperative does not overlook Lauri Syrjänen’s life work in fly fishing, but thinks that placing a commemorative plaque on the Deatnu shore would contravene the written and unwritten rules as well as the local culture.’

- (204) *Visti lea eanaš liggekeahtes vuork[á]visti, gos eai leat sosiál- dahje [d]oaimmahatlanjat.*

(<http://www.vero.fi/nc/doc/download.asp?id=3847;49332> 18.6.2006)

Visti lea eanaš ligge-keahtes vuorká-visti, gos
 building be.3SG mostly heat-keahtes warehouse-building where

eai lea-t sosiál-dahje doaimmahat-lanja-t.

NEG.3PL be-CONNeg social-or office-room-PL

‘The building functions mostly as an unheated warehouse and there are no social or office rooms.’

- (205) *presupposišuvdna Cealkaga implisihtta dahjege sániiguin almmut-keahtes navddus das, ahte juoga lea duohta dahje lea máilmmis.*

(Sammallahti 2007: 112; the first emphasis in the original)

presupposišuvdna Cealkag-a implisihtta dahjege sáni-i-guin

presupposition sentence-GA implicate alias word-PL-COM

almmut-keahtes navddus da-s, ahte juoga lea duohta

express-keahtes assumption it-LOC COMP something be.3SG true

dahje lea máilmmi-s.

or be.3SG world-LOC

‘Presupposition [an entry in the glossary of linguistic terms, explained as follows]: The implicit, that is, something not expressed with words, assumption that something is true or exists in the world.’

- (206) *Giedahallat dárbbasettiin čoahkkínbovdehusas máinnaškeahtes eará áššiid.* (http://www.plappi.fi/files/orig/6660_Dárkkistanlg.27.9.06.BG.pdf 2.1.2008)

Giedahalla-t dárbbas-ettiin čoahkkín-bovdehusa-s máinnaš-keahtes

consider-1PL need-GER meeting-notice-LOC mention-keahtes

eará ášši-i-d.

other matter-PL-GA

‘When needed, other issues not mentioned in the notice of meeting will be discussed.’

- (207) *Gielda sáhtta maiddái oastit bálvalusaid priváhta gávppašan-vuođđojurdagiin doaibmi fitnodatdoalli[i]n, vuoittu buvttekeahtes ovtastumis, stáhtas dahje eará gielddain ja gielddaovttastumiin.*

(Laiti 2003a: 13)

Gielda sáhtta maiddái oasti-t bálvalusa-i-d priváhta

municipality may.3SG also buy-INF service-PL-GA private

gávppaš-an-vuođđo-jurdag-ii-n doaibm-i

trade-VN-basic-thought-PL-COM function-PTC.PRS

fitnodat-doall-i-i-n, vuoittu buvtte-keahtes ovtastumi-s,

company-hold-PTC.PRS-PL-LOC profit.GA fetch-keahtes community-LOC

stáhta-s dahje eará gieldda-i-n ja

state-LOC or other municipality-PL-LOC and

gieldda-ovttastumi-i-n.

municipality-federation-PL-LOC

‘The municipality may also buy services from entrepreneurs observing commercial principles, from communities that do not make a profit, from the state or from other municipalities and federations of municipalities.’

The main reason for providing so many examples of the non-finite in *-keahtes* is that the above sentences seem to be the first full sentences ever presented in Saami linguistics to exemplify the use of this verb form. The above collection of examples is intended as evidence, inter alia, that the verb form is by no means a recent innovation but has been in use in the spoken and written varieties of North Saami since the 19th century (200–202).

The phrase *čállojuvvon ja čálekeahtes njuolggadusaid* ‘written and unwritten rules’ (203) nicely captures the functional similarity of the passive past participle *čállojuvvon* ‘written’ and its negative counterpart *čálekeahtes* ‘unwritten’. Not unlike many other negative categories in Saami and other languages, the negative participle is semantically somewhat indifferent respecting the semantic distinctions manifested in corresponding affirmative formations. For example, even though *čálekeahtes* in (203) is most naturally seen in opposition to the passive past participle *čállojuvvon*, it appears that *liggekeahtes* in (204) can be viewed as the negative counterpart of the passive present “participle” *liggejuvvi* ‘heated, heatable’ in (182) rather than the passive past participle *liggejuvvon* ‘(having been) heated’. Due to the neutralization of the present/past distinction, it is not uncommon to come across instances of *-keahtes* where it is altogether irrelevant to make a such distinction (cf. Examples 200, 205). On the other hand, Examples (201–202) show that the active/passive distinction is absent as well; the affirmative counterparts of phrases such as *náitalkeahtes nieida* ‘unmarried girl’ and *moritkeahtes oahpaheaddji* ‘unawakened teacher’ include active participles; cf. *náitalan nieida* ‘married girl’ and *morihan oahpaheaddji* ‘awakened teacher’.

As regards the proposed participial (i.e. verbal) status of *-keahtes*, the above examples show that this form may be accompanied by adverbial modifiers describing the instrument (*sániiguin* ‘with words’ in 205) and location (*čoahkkinbovdehusas* ‘in the notice of meeting’ in 206) of the action denoted by the non-finite verb form, and the genitive-accusative *vuottu* in Example (207) even refers to the object argument of the verb *buktit*. — Although it might seem clear that formations like those above may be regarded as participles, it is instructive to pay attention to an analogous formation in *-meahttun* before going on to consider in greater depth the question of the status of the formation in *-keahtes*:

- (208) *Lea áibbas dohkketmeahtun dahku sus buohcanluomus johtit miehtá Suoma ja iežas márkanastit.* (Min Áigi 1.11.1995, p. 1)

Lea áibbas dohkket-meahtun dahk-u su-s
 be.3SG totally accept-meahtun do-NMLZ 3SG-LOC
buohca-n-luomu-s johti-t miehtá Suoma ja
 be.sick-VN-leave-LOC wander-INF along Finland.GA and
ieža-s márkanasti-t.
 REFL.GA-3SG market-INF

‘It is totally unacceptable for him to travel around Finland promoting himself while on sick leave.’

- (209) *Go girjerádjosis ii gávna daid, de lea oalle veadjemeahtun dien láhkai.* (<http://www.samiradio.org/article.php?articleID=25404> 12.7.2007 [21.6.2006])

Go girje-rádjos-is ii gávna da-i-d, de lea oalle
 as book-depot-LOC NEG.3SG find.CONNEG it-PL-GA PRT be.3SG quite
veadje-meahtun dien láhkai.
 be.capable-meahtun it.GA in.the.manner

‘As they cannot be found in the library, the situation is quite impossible.’

- (210) *Doppe lei son okto gi oinnolažžan oidnui, muhto lohkameahtun oaidne-meahtumat verdestalle suinna, gi makkar jienain ja lihkadusain.* (E. Guttorm 1981: 196)

Doppe le-i son okto gi oinnolažža-n oidnu-i, muhto
 there be.3SG 3SG alone who devil-ESS seem-PST.3SG but
lohka-meahtun oaidne-meahtum-at verdestalle su-inna, gi
 count-meahtun see-meahtun-PL pal.PST.3SG 3SG-COM who
makkar jiena-in ja lihkadusa-in.
 what.kind sound-COM and gesture-COM

‘There she was alone, as if like a devil, but innumerable ghosts acted like friends to her, making various sounds and gestures.’

In Examples (208–210), the formations in *-meahtun* are used to express the impossibility of the action denoted by the verb stem: *dohkketmeahtun* (← *dohkkehit* ‘accept’), *veadjemeahtun* (← *veadjit* ‘manage’), *lohkameahtun* (← *lohkat* ‘read, count’) and *oaidnemeahtumat* (← *oaidnit* ‘see’) refer to things that cannot be accepted, managed, counted or seen. These formations are reminiscent of the deverbial adjectives in *-hahtti* seen in the previous section (Examples 177a–c), as they look rather like passive participles, but have a more restricted meaning of impossibility. Furthermore, often the exact meaning of such a formation can-

not be deduced from its parts: *lohkameahttun* (210) does not mean ‘unreadable’ but only ‘uncountable, innumerable’, and *oaidnemeahttun* in the same sentence is not an adjective meaning ‘invisible’ but a noun with the meaning ‘ghost, phantom’.⁶⁵

As regards the internal and external morphosyntax of the formations in *-meahttun*, these constructions do not have the typical features of verbs but rather those of unambiguous adjectives. For example, they are not preceded by adverbial modifiers or objects as are the *-keahtes* forms seen in Examples (205–207), but are quite often modified by intensifiers or degree adverbs such as *áibbas* ‘totally’ (208) and *oalle* ‘quite’ (209), which otherwise seem to occur with “verb forms” only in cases in which a participle can be considered a lexicalization, that is, a deverbal adjective rather than a verb form proper (e.g. *áibbas dolka-n* [totally get.tired-PTC.PST] ‘totally fed up’, *oalle juhka-n* [quite drink-PTC.PST] ‘quite drunk, intoxicated’; cf. Ylikoski 2003a: 227).

Formations in *-meahttun* also seem to be relatively less productive in general. For example, one of the most common ways of importing international loan verbs into North Saami is through the use of the formative *-ere-* in such words as *identifiseret* ‘identify’, *kontrolleret* ‘control’, *organiseret* ‘organize’ and *siviliseret* ‘civilize’, and it is not surprising to come across non-finite verb forms such as the participles *identifiserejuvvon* ‘identified’ or *identifiserekeahtes* ‘unidentified’, or *kontrollerejuvvon*, *kontrollerekeahtes*, *organiserekeahtes* and *siviliserekeahtes* in Examples (211–213), but I have not found a single instance of an analogous formation in *-(ere)meahttun* (i.e., forms such as *?identifiseremeahttun* ‘unidentifiable’, *?kontrolleremeahttun* ‘uncontrollable’, *?organiseremeahttun* ‘unorganizable’ or *?siviliseremeahttun* ‘uncivilizable’):

- (211) ...; *passiivavearbbat ovdanbuktet dihto eavttuid mielde guovttelágan dilálašvuodaid, namalassii diđolaččat kontrollerejuvvon doaimmaid ja kontrollerekeahtes dáhpáhusaid* (vrd. 2.1.5.). (Sammallahti 2005: 60)
- | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| <i>passiiva-vearbba-t</i> | <i>ovdan-bukte-t</i> | <i>dihto</i> | <i>eavttu-i-d</i> | <i>mielde</i> |
| passive-verb-PL | forth-bring-3PL | certain | provision-PL-GA | according |
| <i>guovtte-lágan</i> | <i>dilálašvuoda-i-d,</i> | <i>namalassii</i> | <i>diđolačča-t</i> | |
| two.GA-kind | situation-PL-GA | namely | conscious-ADV | |
| <i>kontrollere-juvvo-n</i> | <i>doaimma-i-d ja</i> | <i>kontrollere-keahtes</i> | | |
| control-PASS-PTC.PST | action-PL-GA and | control- <i>keahtes</i> | | |

⁶⁵ The morpheme *-meahttun* is a loan suffix from Finnic (Korhonen 1981a: 326–327). Some of the deverbal formations in *-meahttun* have even been taken from Finnish as such: *oaidnemeahttun* in (210) could be replaced with *neahkameahttun* (← Finnish *näky-mätön* [be.visible-PTC.NEG] ‘invisible’) although there is no corresponding verb **neahkat* in Saami. In Saami, the same suffix is also used to create denominal adjectives such as *ipmilmeahttun* ‘godless’ and negated adjectives such as *buhtismeahttun* ‘unclean’ (see also e.g. Korhonen 1981a: 326–327; Nickel 1994: 309–310, 356; Sammallahti 1998b: 90–91).

dáhpáhusa-i-d (vrd. 2.1.5.).

event-PL-GA (cf. 2.1.5.)

‘...; passive verbs express, with certain provisions, situations of two types, namely, actions that are consciously controlled as well as events that are not controlled (cf. 2.1.5.).’

- (212) **Organiserekeahtes** boazoeaiggádat livčče nagodan NBR jođiheaddji mearridit jus livčče searvan miellahtun, oaivvilda NBR-jođiheaddji Nils Henrik Sara. (Reindriftsnytt/Boazodoallo-odđasat 3/2006, p. 28)
- Organisere-keahtes boazo-eaiggád-at li-včče nagod-an*
 organize-keahtes reindeer-owner-PL be-COND.3PL manage-PTC.PST
NBR jođih-eaddji mearrid-it jus li-včče searva-n
 NBR(.GA) lead-PTC.PRS.GA command-INF if be-COND.3PL join-PTC.PST
miellahttu-n, oaivvild-a NBR-jođih-eaddji Nils Henrik Sara.
 member-ESS intend-3SG NBR-lead-PTC.PRS Nils Henrik Sara
 ‘Unorganized reindeer owners would have been able to direct the leader of the NBR [= *Norgga Boazosápmelaččaid Riikkasearvi*, i.e. *the Saami Reindeer Herders’ Association of Norway*], if they had joined to become members, says NBR leader Nils Henrik Sara.’

- (213) *Muhtumat oidne dáid «siviliserekeahtes» olbmuid buorre gávpegálvun.*

(A. Solbakk 2005b: 46)

Muhtum-at oidne dá-i-d «sivilisere-keahtes» olbmu-i-d

some-PL see.PST.3PL this-PL-GA civilize-keahtes human-PL-GA

buorre gávpe-gálvu-n.

good trade-product-ESS

‘Some people regarded these “uncivilized” people as good commodities.’

All in all, it seems quite clear that formations in *-meahtun* belong to the sphere of derivation rather than verbal conjugation. The main reason for making this assertion here is the somewhat surprising fact that the question of its status as a non-finite verb form has gained more attention than the corresponding status of the form in *-keahtes*: It was stated earlier in Section 3.2.2 that even though Lagercrantz (1929: 198, 208, 211 *et passim*) presents deverbal adjectives of the type *anihahtti* ‘usable, useful’ as “positive factitive verbal adjectives” belonging to the non-finite paradigm of the verbs, it is easier to agree with Korhonen (1974: 45–46) and regard such formations as deverbal adjectives. Much the same goes for the formation in *-meahtun*: in a sense, Lagercrantz (*ibid.*) quite rightly describes it as the negative counterpart of the *-hahtti* form by characterizing the former as the “negative factitive verbal adjective” (*karitive faktitive Verbal-Eigen-*

schaftswörter), but here, too, it appears more appropriate to endorse Korhonen's (ibid., pp. 46–47) and Nielsen's (1926: 269) view that there is no reason to regard these formations as verb forms either.

As to the status of formations in *-keahtes*, it is quite interesting to note that although Korhonen (1974: 14–49) has cautiously assessed the statuses of possibly every other formation that has ever been characterized as a non-finite verb form in any of the Saami languages, it seems to have partly escaped his attention that Lagercrantz (1929: 198, 208, 211 *et passim*)—apparently the only scholar ever—also described *-keahtes* among the non-finite verb forms. It must be admitted, though, that Lagercrantz seems to regard forms in *-keahtes* and the so-called verb abessive as a single whole that is labeled as the “negative causative verbal adjective” (*karitives kausatives Verbal-Eigenschaftswort*): *-keahtes* is further characterized as the attributive form, whereas *-keahtá(i)* and *-haga* represent the predicative form of the verbal adjective, and this has been incidentally also acknowledged by Korhonen (ibid., p. 19) who merely notes that the predicative form corresponds to the verb abessive in the Nielsenian tradition. However, it is quite surprising that Korhonen does not at all commit himself on the role of the suffix *-keahtes* in relation to *-keahtá*, while he diligently describes (ibid., pp. 171–190) the morphology and the origins of the latter as well as its more marginal equivalents throughout the Saami language area.

In addition to the non-finite verb formations in *-keahtes* mentioned in Lagercrantz's disconnected examples such as *boare-keahtes* (literary standard *boadekeahtes*) [come-*keahtes*] ‘not coming, not having come’ and *borjjas-keahtes* [sail-*keahtes*] ‘not sailing, not having sailed’ (Lagercrantz 1929: 208, 211), their existence has also been briefly noted by Nielsen (1926: 91) and Korhonen (1981a: 245), although not among any of the non-finites that are regarded as verb forms. In descriptions of the formation of attributive and predicative forms of adjectives, the attributive form of the “negative adjective” (not “verb abessive” here) such as *logakeahtes* : *logakeahtá(i)* ‘unread’ is said to be formed according to the same pattern as the attributive *muorrás* derived from *muorrái* ‘rich in trees’ (← *muorra* ‘tree; wood’).⁶⁶

Nielsen (1926: 388) also briefly refers to the existence of the attributive forms of *-keahtá(i)* when asserting, in connection with verbs such as *leat* ‘be’ and *orrut* ‘be, dwell’, that verb abessive forms are used as “adjectives”. The use of such periphrastic negatives is also described in Ylikoski (2002: 134; 2004a: 84–85), and it is indeed instructive to take a fresh look at these in the light of the predicative **and** attributive functions of the non-finites discussed in the previous section on passive participles. It was suggested that the attributive functions of the non-finites in *-nláhkai* and *-(uvvo)min* are based on an analogy offered by the

⁶⁶ Incidentally, the actual process of forming attributive forms such as *logakeahtes* and *čálekeahtes* from “adjectives (!) with the suffix *-keahtá* in the basic form” is also described in Pope and Sára's (2004: 119) school grammar of North Saami (see also Helander 1987: 75).

past participle in *-n* that is, not unlike adjectives in general, used in both major positions. Bearing this in mind, it is quite natural to regard the use of *-keahtes* and *-keahtá* as representing a single category consisting of a negative non-finite with two suffixes in complementary distribution according to the general rules of the adjectival morphosyntax of the language. As already shown in the previous examples, formations in *-keahtes/-keahtá* are most often oriented toward the patients of transitive verbs such as *ásahit* ‘found’ (214a–b) and toward agents of intransitive verbs such as *náitalit* ‘marry’ (215a–b):

- (214) a. *Fitnodat lea ásatkeahtá.* (cf. Example 194a)

Fitnodat lea ásat-keahtá.
 company be.3SG found-VABE
 ‘The company has not been founded.’

- b. *ásatkeahtes fitnodat* (cf. Example 194b)

ásat-keahtes fitnodat
 found-keahtes company
 ‘an unfounded company’

- (215) a. *Nieida lea náitalkeahtá.*

Nieida lea náital-keahtá.
 girl be.3SG marry-VABE
 ‘The girl has not been married.’

- b. *náitalkeahtes nieida* (cf. Example 201)

náital-keahtes nieida
 marry-keahtes girl
 ‘an unmarried girl’

The complementary and participial nature of *-keahtes* and *-keahtá* can be further evidenced by the fact that the phrase *čállojuvvon ja čálekeahtes njuolggadusaid* ‘written and unwritten rules’ (203) can be transformed into a sentence such as (216):

- (216) *Muhtumat njuolggadusain leat čállojuvvon ja muhtumat leat čálekeahtá.*

Muhtum-at njuolggadusa-i-n lea-t čáll-ojuvvo-n ja muhtum-at
 some-PL rule-PL-LOC be-3PL write-PASS-PTC.PST and some-PL
lea-t čále-keahtá.
 be-3PL write-VABE
 ‘Some of the rules have been written, and some of them have not been written.’

In the absence of electronic corpora for North Saami, it is not possible to present “official” quantitative comparisons between *-keahtes* and *-keahttá*, but in my private corpus of 796 PDF documents (see Section 1.3) including 1,882 occurrences of *<-keahttá>*, there are as many as 1,310 attributive formations in *<-keahtes>*. This calculation is meant to illustrate how surprising it is that although the verb abessive in *-keahttá* has been well known and described ever since the mid-19th century (Friis 1856: 82, 86, 88 *et passim*; cf. Korhonen 1974: 15), the use of *-keahtes* has been left almost entirely undescribed throughout the history of Saami linguistics. — However, the one exception is Csepregi’s (2001) pan-Uralic review of the so-called abessive or caritive suffixes that will be discussed in more detail at the end of this section.

It has already been seen that Nielsen (1926: 91), Lagercrantz (1929: 198, 208, 211) and Korhonen (1981a: 245) confine themselves merely to remarks concerning the existence of *-keahtes* formations. These remarks and the established use of *-keahtes* show that the constructions in question were by no means unknown, but only ignored by earlier scholars. Whatever the reasons may have been, it seems quite clear that the formation in *-keahtes* must be regarded as much of a verb form as the adverbial-predicative *-keahttá* that has hardly ever been characterized as anything other than a non-finite verb form. Furthermore, in light of the attributive and predicative functions of these verb forms, our understanding of the North Saami participles would remain quite incomplete if a description of such forms is restricted to the mutual relations between affirmative participles without any reference to corresponding negative forms that nevertheless seem to cover virtually all the main functions of the various (active and passive, present and past) participles.

However, it is another question whether the suffixes *-keahtes* and *-keahttá* should be analyzed as allomorphs of a single category that has traditionally been labeled as the verb abessive or, alternatively, whether they should be regarded as two distinct verb forms. Given previous scholars’ evident lack of concern with regard to the existence of attributive *-keahtes* constructions, they would seem to have been regarded merely as allomorphs that do not merit any special attention. There are indeed many signs pointing in the same direction; besides the complementary distribution of *-keahtes* and *-keahttá* crystallized in Examples (203, 214–215), a corresponding dichotomy seems to be altogether absent among the corresponding non-finites in other Saami languages such as neighboring Lule Saami (*-k*) in the southwest and Inari Saami (*-hánnáá*) in the east. In Lule Saami, verb abessives such as *diedek* (217a) and *suvrrodik* (218a) correspond to the North Saami *diedēkeahttá* (217b) and *suvvrokeahtes* (218b) regardless of whether they occur in a predicative, adverbial (*diedek*) or adnominal (*suvrrodik*) position. The same also applies to the Inari Saami verb forms *huámmášhánnáá* (217c) and *suvrodhánnáá* (218c):

- (217) a. *Gå bassebiejve lidjin vássám ja sijddaj lidjin máhtsatjit, de Jesus äjgádij **diedek** Jerusalemij bátsij.* (ÅT: Luke 2:43)
Gå basse-biejve lidjin vássá-m ja sijdda-j
 when holy-day.PL be.PST.3PL pass-PTC.PST and home-ILL
lidjin máhtsa-tjit, de Jesus äjgádi-j diede-k
 be.PST.3PL return-SUP PRT Jesus parent-PL.GEN know-VABE
Jerusalemi-j bátsi-j.
 Jerusalem-ILL stay(.behind)-PST.3SG
- b. *Muhto go bassebeaivvit ledje vássán, ja sii vulge fas ruoktot, de bárdni bázi Jerusalemii, almmá vanhemiiddis **diedekeahttä.***
 (OT: Luke 2:43)
Muhto go basse-beaivvi-t ledje vássá-n, ja
 but when holy-day-PL be.PST.3PL pass-PTC.PST and
sii vulge fas ruoktot, de bárdni bázi-i
 3PL leave.PST.3PL again to.home PRT son stay(.behind)-PST.3SG
Jerusalem-ii, almmá vanhemi-ii-dd-is diede-keahttä.
 Jerusalem-ILL without parent-PL-GA-3SG know-VABE
- c. *Ko juhlepeeivih nuhhi, sij vuolgii maassád, mut kandâ paasij vanhimij **huámmášhánnáá** Jerusalemân.* (Kirkkokietâkirje, p. 64)
Ko juhle-peeivi-h nuhhi, sij vuolgii maassád,
 when feast-day-PL end.PST.3PL 3PL leave.PST.3PL (back.)home
mut kandâ paasi-j vanhim-i-j huámmáš-hánnáá
 but boy stay(.behind)-PST.3SG parent-PL-GEN notice-VABE
Jerusalemâ-n.
 Jerusalem-ILL
 ‘After the feast was over and they were to return home, Jesus stayed behind in Jerusalem without his parents knowing it.’
- (218) a. ***Suvrrodik** lájbe basij vuostasj biejve åhpadisálmma Jesusa lusi báhtin ja gahtjin:...* (ÅT: Matthew 26:17)
Suvrrod-ik lájbe basi-j vuostasj biejve
 sour-VABE bread.GEN holy.day-PL.GEN first day.GEN
åhpad-is-álmma Jesus-a lusi báhti-n ja gahtji-n:
 teach-NMLZ-man.PL Jesus-GEN up.to come-PST.3PL and ask-PST.3PL
- b. ***Suvrokeahtes** láibbiid basiid vuosttaš beaivvi máhttájeaddjit bohte Jesusa lusa ja jerre:...* (OT: Matthew 26:17)
Suvro-keahtes láibbi-i-d basi-i-d vuosttaš beaivvi
 sour-keahtes bread-PL-GA holy.day-PL-GA first day.GA

máhtta-jeaddji-t bohte Jesus-a lusa ja jerre:
 learn-PTC.PRS-PL come.PST.3PL JESUS-GA up.to and ask.PST.3PL

- c. **Suvrodhánnaá** *leeibi juhle vuossmuu peeivi máttááttáspárnááh pottii*
Jeesus kuuvl já kojáádi:... (EMM: Matthew 26:17)
Suvrod-hánnaá leeibi juhle vuossmuu peeivi
 SOUR-VABE bread.GEN feast.GEN first day.GEN
máttáátt-ás-párnááh-pottii Jeesus kuuvl já
 teach-NMLZ-child-PL come.PST.3PL JESUS.GEN up.to and
kojáádi:
 ask-PST.3PL
 ‘On the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread the disciples came
 to Jesus and asked:...’

It would not seem reasonable to claim that the predicative verb abessives in *-k* and *-hánnaá* should be categorically distinguished from the attributive verb forms in *-k* and *-hánnaá*. As for North Saami, the idea of complementary allomorphy between *-keahtes* and *-keahttä* is also strengthened by Examples (219–220) wherein the predicative *-keahttä* form exhibits the clear adjectival feature of being capable of taking an essive case suffix, thus giving the plain verb abessives *náitalkeahttä(i)* ‘unmarried’ and *ráhkkankeahttä(i)* ‘unprepared’ the slightly more transitory meanings of ‘as unmarried’ and ‘as unprepared’:

- (219) *Dan heahteáiggi dihtii mas mii dál eallit, mun oaivvildan ahte olbmui lea buorre bissut náitalkeahttäjin.* (OT: 1 Corinthians 7:26)

Dan heahte-áiggi dihtii ma-s mii dál ealli-t, mun
 it.GA trouble-time.GA because REL-LOC 1PL.NOW live-1PL 1SG
oaivvild-an ahte olbmui lea buorre bissu-t
 think-1SG COMP human-ILL be.3SG good remain-INF
náital-keahttäjin.
 marry-VABE-ESS

‘Because of the present crisis, I think that it is good for people to remain
 (in an) unmarried (state).’

- (220) *Dasgo jos muhtun makedonialaččat boadášedje mu fárus ja gávnnašedje din ráhkkankeahttäjin, de dat šattašii midjiide heahpadin, ja velá didjiide ge, go mii leat luohtán didjiide.* (OT: 2 Corinthians 9:4)

Dasgo jos muhtun makedonia-lačča-t boadáš-edje mu fárus
 for if some Macedonia-ADJ-PL come-COND-3PL 1SG.GA with
ja gávnna-š-edje din ráhkkan-keahttäjin, de dat
 and find-COND-3PL 2PL.GA prepare-VABE-ESS PRT it

šatta-š-ii midjiide heahpad-in, ja velá didjiide=ge,
 become-COND-3SG 1PL.ILL shame-ESS and even 2PL.ILL=too
 go mii lea-t luohttä-n didjiide.
 as 1PL be-1PL trust-PTC.PST 2PL.ILL
 ‘For if any Macedonians come with me and find you (in an) unprepared
 (state), that would be a shame for us, and for you too, because we trusted
 you.’

However, in spite of the nearly perfect complementary distribution of *-keahtes* and *-keahttä* there are occasional signs suggesting that these formations are not identical in meaning, and thus they cannot be in merely allomorphic relation to each other. Consider Examples (221–222) whose *juogekeahtes* and *eahpitkeahtes* do not occur in attributive but predicative positions analogous to the *-keahttä* forms in Examples (214a, 215a and 216) above:

(221) *Suoma viidodat lea juogekeahtes.* (*Suoma vuoddoláhka*, p. 8 [§ 4])

Suoma viidodat lea juoge-keahtes.
 Finland.GA territory be.3SG divide-keahtes
 ‘The territory of Finland is indivisible.’

(221') *Suoma viidodat lea juogekeahttä.*

Suoma viidodat lea juoge-keahttä.
 Finland.GA territory be.3SG divide-VABE
 ‘The territory of Finland is undivided.’

(222) *Go doaba dasa lassin lea eahpečielggas, de dan ávki ii leat gal áibbas eahpitkeahtes.* (O. H. Magga 2007: 290)

Go doaba dasa lassi-n lea eahpe-čielggas, de dan
 as concept it.ILL addition-ESS be.3SG un-clear PRT it.GA
ávki ii lea-t gal áibbas eahpit-keahtes.
 advantage NEG.3SG be-CONNeg to.be.sure fully doubt-keahtes
 ‘To be sure, as the concept is also unclear, its advantages are not entirely
 unquestionable.’

The *-keahtes* forms (221–222) are not actually used to replace *-keahttä*. In contrast to *juogekeahtes* in (221), the most unmarked interpretation of *juogekeahttä* in such a sentence as (221') would be that of a periphrastic negative predicate meaning ‘the territory of Finland is (so far) undivided’. In fact, verb abessives such as (*lea*) *juogekeahttä* in (221') must indeed be characterized as “periphrastic negative predicates” rather than as predicatives. In the same vein, *dan ávki ii leat ... eahpitkeahtes* in (222) is not equivalent to a sentence such as *?dan ávki ii leat*

... *eahpitkeahtá* that, pragmatically odd though it may seem, would mean something like ‘its advantages are not (at the time being) undoubted’, but the clause with *eahpitkeahtes* tends to convey the impression that ‘its advantages are not unquestionable’.⁶⁷

The non-finites *juogekaehtes* ‘indivisible’ in (221) and *eahpitkeahtes* ‘unquestionable’ in (222) do not refer to something that has been left undone only thus far, but to the indivisibility or “unquestionability” that exists now and will also in the future. It was earlier seen in connection with Example (204) that participial forms such as *liggekaehtes* ‘unheated’ may also function as the negative counterparts of present such participials as *liggejuvvi* ‘heated, heatable’ (182), although it could equally well be used to negate the past participle *liggejuvvon* ‘(having been) heated’. However, Examples (221–222) inform us of the semantic limits and the grammaticalized nature of the periphrastic negative *leat V-keahtá* and, consequently, the fact that predicative and adverbial uses of *-keahtá* and attributive use of *-kaehtes* cannot simply be described as two or three facets of a single negative non-finite verb form in the language: when following the auxiliary-like *leat* ‘be’, predicative uses of *-keahtá* and *-kaehtes* may have different functions and interpretations.

In addition to the specialized semantics of the periphrastic negative *leat V-keahtá*, the occurrence of the “attributive” forms *juogekaehtes* and *eahpitkaehtes* in predicative positions may be related to some type of lexicalization of these word forms. Instead of having a function identical to the predicative constructions *leat juogekaehtá/eahpitkaehtá* ‘be undivided/undoubted’, the overall semantics of the sentences in (221–222) makes it possible to replace these forms with clearly deverbal adjectives in *-meahttun*. This can be nicely illustrated by comparing *juogekaehtes* in (220) with Example (223) referring to a corresponding sentence in the Norwegian Constitution. Adjectives in *-meahttun* do not have distinct variants depending on the attributive vs. predicative position of the adjective:

- (223) ...*Vuodđolága § 1* (“*Norgga Gonagasriika lea...juohkemeahttun*”)...
 (<http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/kilde/rap/2006/0004/ddd/pdfv/273785-samialbomot.pdf> 17.12.2007)
Vuodđo-lága § 1 (“*Norgga Gonagas-riika lea ... juohke-meahttun*”)
 base-law.GA § 1 Norway.GA king-state be.3SG divide-meahttun
 ‘...the first article of the Constitution (“The Kingdom of Norway is... indivisible”)...’

⁶⁷ The non-attributive use of *-kaehtes* seems to be limited to sentences in which *leat* ‘be’ is the finite verb; I am unaware of instances wherein *-kaehtes* has been used in functions comparable to the adverbial use of *-keahtá* (cf. Examples 12, 78, 217b, 225). Therefore, it appears that *-kaehtes* is used only in the two main functions of prototypical participles, that is, as adnominal modifiers and predicatives.

Furthermore, *eahpitkeahtes* in Example (222) is preceded by the intensifying adverb *áibbas* typical of adjectives rather than verb forms (cf. Example 208 above).

The non-finites in *-keahtá* and *-keahtes* also seem to differ from each other with respect to their diathetic orientation. Even though both of them, when formed from transitive verbs, most often tend to have a patient-oriented meaning, this tendency is more salient in the case of *-keahtes* constructions. The phrase *vuoittu buvttekeahtes ovtastumis* in Example (207) must be regarded as something of an exception in this respect. This means that those rare occurrences of explicitly passive negative participles such as *áidojuvvokeahtes* in Example (224) must be regarded as redundant exceptions to the regular use of the plain *áiddokeahtes* (225):

- (224) *Dat árvalii ee. ahte boazosápmelaččat besset buhtadusovddasvástádusas vahágiin áidojuvvokeahtes eatnamiin ja gittiin guhkkelis go 1 km fástaássi dálus.* (http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/kilde/000/nou/1994/0021/se_/pdts/nou199419940021000se_pdts.pdf 14.12.2007)

Dat árval-ii ee. ahte boazo-sápmelačča-t besse-t
 it propose-PST.3SG inter.alia COMP reindeer-Saami-PL escape-3PL
buhtadus-ovddasvástádusa-s vahág-ii-n áido-juvvo-keahtes
 compensation-responsibility-LOC damage-PL-LOC fence-PASS-keahtes
eatnam-ii-n ja gitti-i-n guhkkelis go 1 km
 land-PL-LOC and field-PL-LOC further than 1 km
fásta-ássi dálus.
 permanent-inhabitant.GA house-LOC

‘It was proposed there [= in the draft of a proposed law] inter alia that the Reindeer Saami would be excused liability for damage in unfenced lands and fields further away than one kilometer from permanent dwellings.’

- (225) *...buhtadasovddasvástádus doppe gos áiddokeahtes eanaopmodat lea vahágahttojuvvon.* (<http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/jd/dok/NOUer/2001/NOU-2001-34/66.html?id=380050> 2.1.2008)

buhtadas-ovddasvástádus doppe gos áiddo-keahtes eana-opmodat lea vahágahtto-juvvo-n.
 be.3SG damage-PASS-PTC.PST

‘...liability for damage in places where unfenced land property has been damaged.’

As regards corresponding formations in *-(ojuvvo)keahtá*, however, there are at least adverbial (if not predicative) contexts in which it seems necessary to explicitly specify whether the verb abessive is oriented toward the agent or the patient of an action such as mentioning in Example (226) wherein *namahuvvokeahtá* indicates that Isak Saba, one of the collectors and writers, has been left without sufficient recognition, rather than that he himself has omitted to mention something; in the latter case the verb abessive *namatkeahtá* would have been used:

- (226) *Omd. lea Isak Saba čohkken ja čállán eanaš máidnasiid Qvigstada Várjjat-guovllu girjjis almmá namahuvvokeahtá manin ge eanebun go diehtogáldun.* (Gaski et al. 2004: 12)
- Omd. lea Isak Saba čohkke-n ja čállá-n eanaš*
 E.g. be.3SG Isak Saba gather-PTC.PST and write-PTC.PST most
máidnas-ii-d Qvigstad-a Várjjat-guovllu girjji-s almmá
 story-PL-GA Qvigstad-GA Várjjat-area.GA book-LOC without
namah-uvvo-keahtá manin=ge eanebu-n go diehto-gáldu-n.
 mention-PASS-VABE REL.ESS=also more-ESS than information-source-ESS
 ‘For example, Isak Saba has collected and written most of the stories in Qvigstad’s book from the Várjjat area, without being mentioned as anything other than an informant.’

All in all, it seems that whereas the neighboring Saami languages have only one negative non-finite, in North Saami there are two suffixes that in general fulfil the same functions as the unitary verb abessives in *-k* (Lule Saami) or *-hánnáá* (Inari Saami) seen in Examples (217–218). Regardless of the above-mentioned problems of deciding whether the formation in *-keahtá* and *-keahtes* should be regarded as one or two at least partially independent verb forms, it is necessary to recognize the established attributive functions of *-keahtes* that, along with the predicative functions of *-keahtá* and even *-keahtes*, are best understood in the light of the many affirmative participles in the language, and this would also seem a good reason to characterize the form *-keahtes* as possessing participial functions, and consequently to label this whole form as the negative participle per se. — Needless to say, much remains to be done in future research on this topic.

When describing the forgotten participial functions of the non-finite in *-keahtes/-keahtá* and situating them in a more visible place in the description of the North Saami verb forms, we must also briefly examine other functions of the same elements in the language as well as at corresponding phenomena in other Uralic languages. To begin with, the denominal use of *-keahtes*—as already seen in the construction *reanto- ja divatkeahtes* ‘interest- and fee-free’ (149) above—has not received much attention either. It is somewhat surprising that within the descriptions of Saami languages as such, these forms have never

been discussed in connection with those verbal formations which are formally and semantically identical: it seems to me that only Nickel (1994: 355) and Sammallahti (2007: 71) have paid any attention to the existence of the forms *jeagel-keahtes* [reindeer.lichen-*keahtes*] ‘lichenless’ and *gahper-(ke)ahtes* [hat-*keahtes*] ‘hatless’ even though it is quite common to encounter such forms as *divatkeahtes* ‘fee-free’ or *eaiggátkeahtes* ‘ownerless’ (227):

(227) *Hamsun čilge guovllu ávdin eaiggátkeahtes guovlun gos dušše soames sápmelaš ain oidnostallá duollet dálle.* (Falch 2002: 198)

Hamsun čilge guovllu ávdin eaiggát-keahtes
 Hamsun explain.3SG area.GA uninhabited owner-*keahtes*
guovlu-n gos dušše soames sápmelaš ain oidn-o-st-allá
 area-ESS where only some Saami still see-PASS-MOM-FREQ.3SG
duollet dálle.

once.in.a.while

‘Hamsun describes the area as an uninhabited, unowned territory wherein only some Saami can be seen sporadically.’

In the light of the above examples, it may not be that surprising to note that the suffix *-keahtes* can in fact be attached to the verbal noun as well, leading to the formations such as *organiserenkeahtes* (228) and *jápminkeahates* (229) that could therefore be regarded as true denominal adjectives.⁶⁸ However, the semantic function of *organiserenkeahtes* (228) suggests that it would be equally appropriate to use the participial form *organiserekeahtes* (cf. Example 212) instead, and it might also be a matter of taste whether love is characterized as “deathless” (*jápminkeahates*) or “undying” (*jámekeahtes*) which is comparable to “unstoppable” (*bissetkeahtes*) in Example (229):

(228) *Gávdnojit oalle buori fálaldagat. Organiserenkeahtes nuoraide lasihit fálaldagaid.* (Min Áigi 1.9.1995, p. 5)

Gávdno-jit oalle buori fálaldaga-t.
 exist-3PL quite good.GA facility-PL

Organisere-n-keahtes nuora-i-de lasih-it fálaldaga-i-d.
 organize-n-*keahtes* young-PL-ILL add-3PL facility-PL-GA

‘There are quite good facilities. The facilities for unorganized youths will be increased.’

⁶⁸ In fact, I am quite uncertain of the grammaticality of logically predictable yet virtually unattested adjectives of the type *??/*organiserenhis* : *??/*organiserenheapmi*, *??/*jápminhis* : *??/*jápminheapmi*. However, the formations in *-nkeahtes* (228–229) differ from the apparently analogous formations in *-nkeahttá* (108–111) whose morphological and syntactic properties cannot be regarded as adjectival or nominal, but as typical of adverbial verb forms.

- (229) *Jápminkeahtes ráhkisvuohta áiggi ja almmiviidodaga čađa.*
Bissetkeahtes ráhkisvuohta. Ja maid dahká olmmoš go ii oidno dahje
gullo, na go ii oppage fuomášuvvo? (Min Áigi 7.3.1997, p. 10)
Jápmi-n-keahtes ráhkisvuohta áiggi ja almmi-viidodaga čađa.
 die-n-keahtes love time.GA and sky.GA-vastness.GA through
Bisset-keahtes ráhkisvuohta. Ja ma-i(-)d dahká olmmoš go
 stop-keahtes love and INT-(PL-)GA do.3SG human as
ii oidn-o dahje gull-o, na go ii
 NEG.3SG see-PASS.CONNEG or hear-PASS.CONNEG well as NEG.3SG
oppa=ge fuomáš-uvvo?
 even=also notice-PASS.CONNEG
 ‘Undying love through time and space. Unstoppable love. And what does
 a man do when he is not seen or heard, well, not even noticed?’

Apparently the only scholar who has simultaneously paid attention to (de)nominal and (de)verbal formations in *-keahtes* as well as *-keahttä* (cf. *čázi keahttä* ‘without water’ in 112) is Csepregi (2001) who presents a concise review of corresponding constructions throughout the Finno-Ugric languages of the Uralic language family. Even though her argumentation is partly blurred by a somewhat careless presentation of Saami data,⁶⁹ she correctly clarifies that Saami word forms such as *vuoššakeahtes* ‘uncooked’ (230a) and *sohkarkeahtes* ‘sugarless’ (231a) are quite similar to the use of *-đâmo* and *-tẽm* in Mari and Komi, respectively. As Csepregi is not disturbed by various grammatical traditions which consider formations such as *vuoššakeahtes* (230a), *šoltâđâmo* (230b) and *putẽm* (230c) as either deverbal adjectives or participles belonging to the verbal conjugation, she fruitfully succeeds in showing that in the Finno-Ugric languages, it is quite normal for one and the same suffix to attach to verbs (230a–c) and nouns (231a–c) alike:

- (Csepregi 2001: 184)
- (230) a. *vuoššakeahtes guolli* (North Saami)
vuošša-keahtes guolli
 cook-keahtes fish
- b. *šoltâđâmo kol* (Mari)
šoltâ-đâmo kol
 cook-PTC.NEG fish

⁶⁹ For example, Csepregi (2001: 182–183) describes the postposition *haga* as an unproductive case suffix as seen from the word forms *mánáhaga* ‘without a child’ and *sohkarhaga* ‘without sugar’ pro *mána haga* [child.GA without] and *sohkar-(a) haga* [sugar-GA without]. She also infers a distinction between *-keahtes* and *-keahttä* as representative of the Saami language branch in general.

c. *putem* *ćeri* (Komi)

pu-tem *ćeri*
 cook-PTC.NEG fish
 ‘uncooked fish’

(Csepregi 2001: 183)

(231) a. *In liiko sohkarkeahtes dedjii.* (North Saami)

I-n *liiko* *sohkar-keahtes* *dedji-i.*
 NEG-1SG like.CONNEG sugar-keahtes tea-ILL

b. *Sakârðâme čajâm om jörate.* (Mari)

Sakâr-ðâme *čajâm* *o-m* *jörate-e.*
 sugar-less tea-ACC NEG-1SG like-CONNEG

c. *(Me) og rad'ejt sakartem čaj.* (Komi)

(Me) *o-g* *rad'ejt* *sakar-tem* *čaj.*
 1SG NEG-1SG like.CONNEG sugar-less tea
 ‘I do not like sugarless tea.’

In traditional grammatical descriptions of Finno-Ugric as well as other European languages, the whole problem of determining whether the use of suffixes such as *-keahtes*, *-ðâme* and *-tem* belong to the realm of inflection or derivation is limited to those adjectival formations that are based on verb stems. If the same or similar suffix is attached to a noun stem, grammarians apparently never ask themselves whether such a process should be regarded as declining nouns in an “adjective case” instead of deriving **denominal** adjectives. As regards analogous “adverbial” formations, these questions were earlier touched upon in connection with Example (1) and in Ylikoski (2003a: 203–205): Even though the so-called converbs are sometimes characterized as verbal adverbs, they are actually “adverbial verb forms” that are often functionally interchangeable with other types of adverbial modifiers, such as adverbial cases of nominal inflection.

In principle, it would be only logical to characterize adverbial case forms as “adverbial noun forms”. A case in point is the adverbial equivalent of the Komi participial/adjectival suffix *-tem* (230c, 231c), since the corresponding adverbial suffix *-teg* is used both as a converb marker corresponding to the Saami *-keahttä* ‘without V-ing’ and an abessive case suffix corresponding to the Saami *haga* ‘without’, a former cognate suffix that has been degrammaticalized into a postposition (see Section 3.1.5). For example, Komi *pu-teg* [cook-CONV] ‘without cooking’ (cf. *putem* in Example 230c) corresponds to the Saami *vuošša-keahttä* ‘id.’, and *sakar-teg* [sugar-ABE] corresponds to *sohkkar-a haga* [sugar-GA

without] ‘without sugar’.⁷⁰ — It should go without saying that the abessive case suffix *-teg* in the inflectional word form *sakarteg* or the postposition in *sohkkara haga* have not turned the nouns into adverbs any more than such verb forms as *puteg* and *vuoššakeahtá* should be regarded as verbal adverbs.

As the traditional idea of noun declination does not include “case forms” that would turn otherwise prototypical nouns into inflectional noun forms having the syntactic properties of prototypical adjectives, it is quite understandable that if adjectival suffixes such as *-keahtes* and *-tem* can be attached to both nouns and verbs, this may easily lead grammarians to regard the resulting word forms as non-nouns (denominal adjectives) and non-verbs (deverbal adjectives), that is, regardless of possible reasons for considering the latter as verb forms, namely, participles.

To spell out once more the unfortunate disparity between the labels and characterizations discussed above, Table 4 is intended to demonstrate that in spite of seemingly unproblematic definitions such as “converb = adverbial verb form” and “participle = adjectival verb form”, the corresponding phenomena in nominal word formation belong to completely different spheres of traditional grammar or “basic linguistic theory”. When attached to a noun stem, an adjectival affix is always regarded as turning a noun into a denominal adjective rather than creating an inflectional noun form:

	affix attached to a verb stem	affix attached to a noun stem
“adverbial”	converb (adverbial verb form)	(adverbial) case (“adverbial noun form”)
“adjectival”	1) participle (adjectival verb form) or 2) deverbal adjective	denominal adjective (*“adjectival noun form”)

Table 4. Traditional designations of inflectional and derivational formations based on attaching productive “adverbial” or “adjectival” affixes to a verb or noun stem.

Exact demarcation between participles and deverbal adjectives is, of course, impossible: Even though formations such as those in *-meahttun* (Examples 208–210) or their affirmative counterparts in *-hahtti* (Examples 177a–c in Section 3.2.2) are clearly less productive and possess less verbal features than *-keahtes*, the latter also may be seen as less verbal than, for example, past participles in *-n* and *-o(juvvo)n* that explicitly express whether a verb form has an active or passive orientation and whether the event belongs to the past rather than present or future. However, as suggested by Hakulinen et al. (2004: 520) concerning the Finnish negative participle in *-maton/-mätön*, it would seem intrinsic in negation for there to be less need to provide detailed information about non-existent events and actions, an understandable fact that also offers a feasible explanation for the

⁷⁰ Note the possibility of non-standard dialectal expressions such as *vuoššahaga* ‘without cooking’ and *sohkkara keahtá* ‘without sugar’ (see Sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.5 and Example 112 above).

comparative rareness of adverbial modifiers (Examples 205–206) and objects (Example 207) when considering the actual use of the negative participle.⁷¹

In conclusion, the hazy borderline between participles and deverbal adjectives must never be forgotten. Even though it is appropriate to recognize the role of the non-finite(s) in *-keahtes* and *-keahttä* as the negative counterparts of two well-established affirmative participles, the present participle in *-i/- (j)eaddji* and the past participle *-n*, as well as various formations that could be characterized as passive participles (Section 3.2.2), their adjectival nature cannot be entirely overlooked, as the suffix *-keahtes* is also used to create denominal adjectives as seen in Examples (149, 227–229 and 231a), and it is only natural that individual occurrences of participial verb forms may be lexicalized in the direction of less verb-like adjectives (222). However, it seems to me that the non-finites in *-keahtes* do not have more explicitly non-verbal properties than those explicit verbal properties seen in Examples (205–207), even though the latter are quite rare in the most informal genres, and many of the heaviest *-keahtes* phrases are translations from Finnish. For example, the locative modifier *čoahkkinbovdehusas* ‘in the notice of meeting’ and the direct object *vuoittu* ‘profit’ of the negative participle in Examples (206–207) seem to stem from Finnish originals (232–233):

- (232) *Käsitellään tarvittaessa kokouskutsussa mainitsemattomat muut asiat.*
 (http://www.plappi.fi/files/orig/6659_Tark.ltk.27092006.pdf 2.1.2008)
Käsitellä-än tarvi-tta-essa kokous-kutsu-ssa
 consider-PASS need-PASS-2INFINE meeting-notice-INE
mainitse-mattoma-t muu-t asia-t.
 mention-PTC.NEG-PL other-PL matter-PL
 ‘When needed, other issues not mentioned in the notice of meeting will be discussed.’

⁷¹ To be sure, there are also many kinds of “adverbial verb forms” and “adverbial (noun) case forms” with respect to the degree of the regularity, productivity and extent to which they preserve the morphosyntactic properties of the original word-class. For example, the so-called verb genitive described in Sections 2.2 and 3.1.2.2 (and Ylikoski 2002: 88–89) has quite rightly been labeled as a “verbal adverb” (Erkki Itkonen 1960: 72), although it seems even more appropriate to characterize such formations as **deverbal** adverbs. In the same vein, it is quite customary to view less clear cases of nominal inflection as adverbs that may, from a diachronic point of view, be in the process of either acquiring or losing features that would give them a more prominent status as case forms proper.

However, it seems that there are not many alternative characterizations for adjectival word forms based on noun stems. Although it appears that at least in most languages spoken in Europe, the denominal adjectives in the lower right-hand slot in Table 4 are denominal indeed (i.e. void of explicitly nominal features typical of their stem nouns), there are phenomena such as the possessive adjectives in Sorbian, in which “denominal” (!) adjectives such as *mužowa* in the phrase *moj-eho muž-ow-a sotra* [1SG.POSS-GEN.M husband-PA-F sister] ‘my husband’s sister’ (Corbett 1987: 303) may retain not only the attributive modifiers (*mojeho*) of the stem noun (*muž*) but also relative pronouns and other unambiguously nominal features described in more detail by Corbett (1987), Haspelmath (1996) and Choi (2004). It is worth noting that even though the internal syntax of such formations has been regarded as so exceptionally “noun-like” that Haspelmath (ibid.) regards them as an instance of the so-called “word-class-changing inflection” comparable to the participles (= inflectional verbal adjectives), they are not described as belonging to the realm of nominal declination but are simply characterized as adjectives.

- (233) *Kunta voi myös ostaa palveluita yksityisiltä liikeperiaatteella toimivilta yrittäjiltä, voittoa tuottamattomilta yhteisöiltä, valtiolta tai muilta kunnilta ja kuntayhtymiltä.* (Laiti 2003b: 12)

Kunta voi myös osta-a palvelu-i-ta yksityis-i-ltä
 municipality may.3SG also buy-1INF service-PL-PART private-PL-ABL
liike-periaattee-lla toimi-v-i-lta yrittäj-i-ltä,
 business-principle-ADE function-PTC.PRS-PL-ABL entrepreneur-PL-ABL
voitto-a tuotta-mattom-i-lta yhteisö-i-ltä, valtio-lta tai
 profit-PART fetch-PTC.NEG-PL-ABL community-PL-ABL state-ABL OR
mu-i-lta kunn-i-lta ja kunta-yhtym-i-ltä.
 other-PL-ABL municipality-PL-ABL and municipality-federation-PL-ABL
 ‘The municipality may also buy services from entrepreneurs observing commercial principles, from communities that do not make a profit, from the state or from other municipalities and federations of municipalities.’

In addition to the obvious Finnish influence in sentences such as (206–207), the Finnish negative participle in *-maton*(/*-mätön*) also deserves attention through consideration of the history of the description of these verb forms, as it seems that the neglect of the role of *-keahtes* may partly stem from the earlier Finnish grammatical tradition (well known and often imitated by many generations of scholars of the Saami languages) of regarding *-maton* forms as deverbal adjectives that were not characterized as participles until quite recently, either (compare, e.g., Karlsson 1999: 194–200, 236 and Hakulinen et al. 2004: 515, 520). Even though the most contemporary ways of looking at phenomena such as these are not by definition better than the former, Finnish grammatical tradition suggests that formations such as *-maton* or *-keahtes* may certainly be viewed from more than one perspective.⁷²

3.2.4. Summary of participles

To pull the threads together, it seems evident that the traditional view of only two participles in North Saami is based on a gross simplification of the system of non-finites in the language. As illustrated in Table 4 and Examples (157, 160), the agentive passive participle in *-n* must be considered a verb form in its own right, independent of the verbal noun in *-n/-pmi*. While it is true that formally identical elements (e.g. *čállin-*, *lohkan-* and *čálestan-*) also represent the verbal noun in compound words, it remains a fact that the formations constituting the

⁷² The corresponding forms in such languages as Mari, Komi and Udmurt were regarded as participles somewhat earlier; see, for example, R. Bartens (1979: 95, 42, 175, 196, 205, 215), Cypanov (1997: 157–176) and the literature mentioned therein.

“agentive participle” (157, 160) occur as free word forms in these undeniably participial functions only. As regards the temporal interpretation of the form in question, virtually all instances of its use seem to refer to past events (see Section 3.2.1), although certain contexts such as *Norgga sámi álbmoga válljen orgána* ‘a body elected by the Norwegian Saami people’ in (160) also imply a more continuous meaning that would comprise a past, present and future for the body that continues to be elected by the people.

The role of the other passive participial formations (Section 3.2.2) within the whole system of non-finite verb forms in North Saami is quite interesting. While the “passive past participle” in *-o(juvvo)n* fits perfectly into the general pattern of the formation and use of passive verbs, it is remarkable that a corresponding present participle is totally absent from the language but, at the same time, formations such as *-nláhkai*, *-nlágan* and *-uvvi* and even the “passive progressive participle” in *-uvvomin* evidence the functional needs for a passive present participle that would be able to override the morphological expectations set out by the regular paradigms of the North Saami verb. Although all of these apparently new solutions occur so infrequently that it would not seem appropriate to regard them as participles proper, they can nevertheless be viewed as concrete symptoms substantiating the fact that the existence and the frequent use of the other participles has created a kind of gap that becomes even more visible when texts are translated from languages such as Finnish in which the corresponding participle is part of a system that is otherwise quite similar to that of North Saami; see, for example, Karlsson (1999: 194–200, 236) for a concise account of the Finnish participles in English. However, the existence of participle-like expressions such as *einnostanládje* ‘predictable’ (169), *einnostuvvi* ‘id.’ (180), *dulbmojuvvi* ‘trampled, oppressed’ (181) and *ásahuvvomin* ‘being founded’ (185), outside the direct influence of Finnish, not to speak of the “active progressive participle” (187–190) which is without obvious correlates in any of the neighboring languages, shows that we are dealing with phenomena that cannot be readily explained away by referring to foreign influence.

While the attributive use of the progressive action essive seen in Examples (187–190) may be regarded as just as sporadic as the above-mentioned attempts to fill in the gap created by the absence of the passive present participle, the predicative use of the so-called verb abessive in *-keahtta* and especially its attributive counterpart in *-keahtes* must definitely be taken into account when revising the traditional picture of North Saami participles. Even though the attributive *-keahtes* form has been almost entirely forgotten in previous descriptions, it is quite difficult to find any reason for not including a formation that is as regular, frequent and verbal as this in the description of North Saami participles.

In conclusion, Table 5 below presents a revision of the set of North Saami participles. Instead of only two participles—*juohkki* and *juohkán*—seen in Table 2 (Section 2.2) describing the traditional view of the non-finites in the language, there are as many as five or potentially even six participles in Table 5:

participle	marker	‘divide’	rough translation
present participle	<i>-i</i>	<i>juohkki</i>	‘dividing (one)’
past participle	<i>-n</i>	<i>juohkán</i>	‘(having) divided’
agentive passive (past) participle	<i>-n</i>	<i>juohkin</i>	‘(one that has been) divided by’
passive past participle	<i>-o(ju(vvo))n</i>	<i>juhkk-o(ju(vvo))n</i>	‘(one that has been) divided’
negative participle	<i>-keahtes</i> (<i>-keahtá</i>)	<i>juogekeahtes</i> (<i>juogekeahtá</i>)	‘undivided’ (‘one that has not been divided’, ‘one that is not being divided’)
“passive present participle”	<i>-nláhkai</i> , <i>-nlágan</i> , <i>-uvvi</i> ; <i>*-o(juvvo)jeaddji</i>	<i>“juohkinláhkai”</i> , <i>“juohkinlágan”</i> , <i>“juhkk-juvvi”</i> ; <i>*juhkk-juvvojeaddji</i>	‘(one) being divided’

Table 5. The participles in contemporary written North Saami. (The new formations below the broken line are very marginal and probably cannot be considered as representing true verb forms in the language.)

In summarizing the above-mentioned remarks on the influence of the Finnish participial system on that of North Saami, it is instructive to provide a tabular overview of the similarities between the participles in the two languages:

	active	passive	active and passive
present participles	<i>jaka-va</i> <i>juohkk-i</i>	<i>jae-ttava</i> <i>“juohkinláhkai”</i> , <i>“juohkinlágan”</i> , <i>“juhkk-juvvi”</i>	
past participles	<i>jaka-nut</i> <i>juohká-n</i>	<i>jae-ttu</i> <i>juhkk-o(ju(vvo))n</i>	
agentive participles		<i>jaka-ma</i> <i>juohki-n</i>	
past and present negative participles			<i>jaka-maton</i> <i>juoge-keahtes</i>

Table 6. The participial systems in Finnish and North Saami as exemplified by the verbs *jakaa* ‘divide’ and *juohkit* ‘id.’.

Of course, it could be argued that the passive participle in *-o(ju(vvo))n* should not be regarded as a verb form of its own but, in accord with the received view of Saami grammars until now, only as the past participle of passive verbs. Somewhat unexpectedly, however, it is precisely this absence of a corresponding present form that seems to give the *-o(ju(vvo))n* forms an extra impetus, that is, the reinforcement of an independent status for this verb form, as it is revealed that the existence and the outward appearance of the passive participles may not be so obvious after all. Moreover, the existence of the allomorph *-ojun* alongside the more regular variants *-ojuvvon* and *-on* can be interpreted as a sign of the independence of this non-finite verb form; the corresponding forms in the neighboring Inari and Skolt Saami have also been considered passive participles in their own right (cf. Inari Saami *uáivildum* in Example 100a; see also Korhonen 1974: 91–93; R. Bartens 1978a: 77ff.; Sammallahti & Morottaja 1993: 134ff.; Sammallahti & Mosnikoff 1991: 175).

Even though it is relatively straightforward matter to afford a synchronic description of as many as five established participles in North Saami, the category of “passive present participle” raises many questions that cannot be answered through a purely synchronic and descriptive account of the language. Instead, these questions belong to the domain of diachronic linguistics and even to the practical issues of language planning: a comprehensive synchronic description (Section 3.2.2) can provide interesting insight into the present anomalous situation of the various participle-like formations used to fill the gap caused by the absence of **-o(juvvo)jeaddji*, but it can only be assumed that the present anomaly will be rectified in the future somehow, either as a result of unconscious changes in the language or through authoritative actions of conscious language planning. The same holds true for the use of the action essive as active and passive “progressive participles” (185, 187–190) whose attributive functions are still so marginal that they are not even considered worth mentioning in Table 5. These and other questions concerning the future of the Saami non-finites will be discussed more comprehensively in the concluding Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 below.

4. Concluding remarks and further perspectives

4.1. Summary of the synchronic description

In the concluding sections of the majority of the original papers on which this study is based (Ylikoski 2002, 2004a, 2006a), it was repeatedly emphasized that even though I have predominantly focused on a synchronic description of the non-finite verb forms in modern written North Saami, many of my findings and conclusions differ from the established view of the non-finite verb forms in a way that also challenges the general views of the diachronic paths of North Saami and invites further research in this area as well. Partial answers to these expectations have now been presented especially in Section 3.1 where the main focus is on the various non-finite forms that have previously been described as more or less exceptional functions of the verbal noun.

In the light of a substantial amount of additional data from various registers of literary North Saami, including glimpses into the earlier stages of the written language, and especially that data provided by practically all published samples of dialect texts, it has been possible to discern the regular, unmarked use of the verbal noun proper from a number of formations that have been traditionally viewed as abnormalities of a sort within the morphosyntax of the North Saami verbal noun. Moreover, the revision and the re-evaluation of the North Saami non-finite system has benefited from the additional insights provided by dialect and literary language data from the bordering Lule, Inari and Skolt Saami languages. As a result, it has been possible to substantiate many of the somewhat provisional conclusions made in the original papers and maintain, for example, that formations in *-miin* (when having the syntactic properties of verbs), *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai*, must be considered verb forms of their own. Furthermore, it has been possible to conclude that forms such as *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai* gained their independence even during earlier stages of North Saami (and partly in the neighboring Saami languages as well), whereas the *-miin* form may be regarded as a relatively recent innovation, apparently influenced by the corresponding non-finites in Inari Saami and the more remote but all the more influential Finnish.

Since a detailed scrutiny of the verbal noun, various adverbial non-finite verb forms and their mutual relations would not have been possible without many references to the infinitives in *-t* and *-mis*—the latter, the “action locative” or second infinitive, also originating from the adverbial functions of the verbal noun—and to prototypical attributive functions of participles, it proved appropriate to provide a detailed description of the participial subsystem of the

language as well (Section 3.2). As regards the infinitives, it was stated in Section 2.2 that the syntactic and semantic functions of various infinitival complements have already been carefully described by scholars such as Saukkonen (1965, 1966), O. H. Magga (1984, 1986), Koskinen (1998), Sammallahti (2005) and Jomppanen (2005, 2006, forthcoming). These views are further complemented in Ylikoski (2006b) in which the use of the *-t* infinitive in those adverbial constructions wherein the semantic functions of the plain infinitive are modified by various adpositions is introduced and described. However, it suffices here to repeat that the use of the two infinitives is largely analogous to the use of their namesakes in other, better-known languages in western and northern Europe. The division of labor between the two infinitives largely corresponds to that of the (etymologically) (il)lative Finnic infinitives in *-tal/-tä* and *-maan/-mään* resp. the elative *-masta/-mästä* described in Ylikoski (2003a: 212–214). (See also Korhonen 1974: 103–105; Jomppanen, forthcoming.)

In condensing the main results of the original papers of this study and those of the preceding Section 3, it is possible to present a thoroughly revised version of Table 2 (in Section 2.2; repeated here for convenience) illustrating the received view of the non-finite verb forms in North Saami. Based on the idea of four cross-linguistically valid subtypes of non-finite verb forms (Ylikoski 2003a), Table 7 depicts the North Saami non-finite system as consisting of two infinitives, one verbal noun, six converbs and five participles:

non-finite verb form (the label in Norwegian)	marker	‘divide’	rough translation
infinitive (<i>infinitiv</i>)	<i>-t</i>	<i>juohkit</i>	‘(to) divide’
action locative (<i>aktio lokativ</i>)	<i>-mis/-mes</i>	<i>juohkimis</i>	‘from dividing’
action (<i>aktio</i>)	<i>-n/-pmi</i>	<i>juohkin</i>	‘(act of) dividing’
present participle (<i>presens partisipp</i>)	<i>-i</i>	<i>juohkki</i>	‘dividing (one)’
past participle (<i>perfektum partisipp</i>)	<i>-n</i>	<i>juohkán</i>	‘(having) divided’
gerund (<i>gerundium</i>)	<i>-(d)ettiin</i>	<i>juogedettiin</i>	‘while/in dividing’
verb abessive (<i>verbabessiv</i>)	<i>-keahtá</i>	<i>juogekeahtá</i>	‘without dividing’
verb genitive (<i>verbgentiv</i>)	<i>-Ø</i>	<i>juogi</i>	‘(by way of) dividing’
positive supine (<i>positive supinum</i>)	<i>-žit/-žžat</i>	<i>juogážit</i>	‘in order to divide’
negative supine (<i>nektende supinum</i>)	<i>ama-Px</i> (+ <i>V-t_{int.}</i>)	<i>amas juohkit</i>	‘in order not to divide; lest s/he divide’
action essive (<i>aktio essiv</i>)	<i>-min/-me(n)</i>	<i>juohkimin</i>	‘in the act of dividing’

Table 2. The North Saami non-finite verb forms according to Nickel (1994: 63–68).

non-finite verb form	marker	‘divide’	rough translation
INFINITIVES			
infinitive	<i>-t</i>	<i>juohkit</i>	‘(to) divide’
second infinitive (action locative)	<i>-mis/-mes</i>	<i>juohkimis</i>	‘from dividing’
VERBAL NOUN			
verbal noun	<i>-n/-pmi</i>	<i>juohkin</i> (cf. <i>juogadeapmi</i>)	‘(act of) dividing’ ‘(act of) sharing’
CONVERBS (ADVERBIAL VERB FORMS)			
gerund (simultaneous converb)	<i>-(d)ettiin</i>	<i>juogedettiin</i>	‘while/in dividing’
verb abessive (negative converb)	<i>-keahtta</i>	<i>juogekeahtta</i>	‘without dividing’
action essive (progressive converb)	<i>-min/-me(n)</i>	<i>juohkimin</i>	‘in the act of dividing’
non-finite in <i>-miin</i> (instrumental converb)	<i>-miin</i>	<i>juohkimiin</i>	‘by dividing’
non-finite in <i>-ndihte</i> (purposive converb)	<i>-ndihte</i> (~ <i>-nváras</i> , <i>-nváste</i> , <i>-nnammi</i>)	<i>juohkindihte</i>	‘in order to divide’
non-finite in <i>-nláhkai</i>	<i>-nláhkai</i> (~ <i>-nládje</i>)	<i>juohkinláhkai</i>	‘ready to divide / to be divided’, ‘like dividing’
PARTICIPLES			
present participle	<i>-i</i>	<i>juohkki</i>	‘dividing (one)’
past participle	<i>-n</i>	<i>juohkán</i>	‘(having) divided’
passive past participle	<i>-o(ju(vvo))n</i>	<i>juhkkko(ju(vvo))n</i>	‘(one that has been) divided’
agentive passive (past) participle	<i>-n</i>	<i>juohkin</i> (cf. <i>juogadan</i>)	‘(one that has been) divided by’ ‘shared by’)
negative participle	<i>-keahtes</i> (<i>-keahtta</i>)	<i>juogekeahtes</i> (<i>juogekeahtta</i>)	‘undivided’ (‘one that has not been divided’, ‘one that is not being divided’; in principle also: ‘one that has not divided’, ‘one that is not dividing’)

Table 7. The non-finite verb forms in contemporary written North Saami.

It goes without saying that the highly compressed format of Table 7 can offer only a superficial description of the morphology, syntax and semantics of North Saami non-finite verb forms. For example, as mentioned in connection with Examples (5–6, 18), the action essive may also be used in functions in which the non-finite in question could well be characterized as a kind of infinitive.⁷³ However, it is possible to see that from the total of eleven non-finites presented in Table 2, three claimed forms (*verb genitive*, *positive supine*, *negative supine*) have been completely abolished and as many as six new verb forms have been introduced. Two of the new non-finites can be viewed as some kind of substitutes for two of the rejected non-finites, as the non-finites in *-miin* and *-ndihte* seem to have taken the place of the verb genitive and the (positive) supine as productive and regular converbs denoting means or manner and purpose, respectively.

As for the so-called negative supine, this construction in itself is a fully productive means for expressing negative purpose, but there is no reason to regard it as a verb form of its own but only as one of the functions of the infinitive in *-t*, not unlike the analogous use of *lest* + infinitive in English. Furthermore, it can be further stated that neither the purposive converb in *-ndihte*, the etymologically analogous non-finite in *-nláhkai* or any of the three “new” participles—the agentive passive participle, passive past participle and negative participle—introduced in this study have gained their independence very recently in the North Saami language as such. In other words, the only truly new non-finite verb form in the language seems to be the converb in *-miin*; the so far more sporadic and questionable formations such as *-nkeahtá* (107–110) or the “participles” in *-nlágan* (173–175) and *-uvvi* (180–184) are not regarded as having similarly stable roles in the language.

In addition to the coarse nature of the translations given for individual verb forms, not to speak of the loose description of their morphological composition,⁷⁴ in Tables 2 and 7, the subgroup consisting of the six converbs is quite heterogeneous in that even though some of these can be informatively characterized as simultaneous, instrumental and purposive converbs, the negative converb in *-keahtá* and the progressive converb in *-min* are in fact not only converbs proper, that is, verb forms used mainly as optional adverbial modifiers, but also verb

⁷³ I also wish to restate that the so-called connegative verb forms have not been regarded as non-finite verb forms proper in this study (cf. Sections 1.1, 2.2 and 3.1.1). In principle, it would certainly be possible to generalize the concept of non-finiteness to connegatives as well.

⁷⁴ Even though this study aims to present a detailed description of the syntax and semantics of many of the non-finite forms in North Saami, a corresponding description of the details of their morphological composition (e.g., the description of the allomorphy depending on various types of verb stems) has not been the subject matter of this study, since such information has already been exhaustively provided in the standard descriptions of Saami morphology (e.g. Nielsen 1926; Nickel 1994; Sammallahti 1998b). As for the present additions to the non-finite paradigm, the rules of their composition can be directly inferred from those of their nearest etymological equivalents (i.e., *-miin*, *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai* in relation to the other “action” forms, the passive past participle in relation to the passive verb formation and the non-finite in *-keahtes* in relation to *-keahtá*).

forms with other functions, most notably as the lexical verb in periphrastic negative and progressive constructions. Together with the multifaceted and not easily characterizable *-nláhkai* form, the non-finites in *-keahtá* and *-min* could in fact be characterized as adverbial-predicative non-finites, which—as concretized in the mutual relations of *-keahtá* and *-keahtes* and the more marginal attributive occurrences of *-nláhkai* and *-min*—also amalgamates them with the participles that can generally be described as (attributive-predicative) adjectival verb forms.

4.2. Diachronic perspectives

The main aim of this study has been to provide a comprehensive synchronic description of the non-finites in North Saami. However, this has not been possible, or at least meaningful, without occasionally resorting to more diachronic perspectives while searching for a more profound understanding of the phenomena in question. Even though it has transpired that many of the seemingly new phenomena are new only in respect of the ways in which they have been analyzed in this study, it would not have been possible to arrive at these conclusions without actually comparing the non-finite verb forms of the present-day literary language to their predecessors in spoken and earlier written varieties of the language.

More often than not, however, the outward appearance of all these “new” verb forms is so transparent that it would have been quite impossible not to see that suffixes such as *-miin*, *-ndihte*, *-nláhkai* originate in formally identical (*-miin*) or nearly identical (*-ma/-mi dihte*, *-ma/-mi láhkai*) verbal noun constructions, even though the non-finites in *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai* seem to have functioned independently of their original constructions as early as the 19th century, at least. The same goes for the agentive passive participle in *-n* and the negative participle in *-keahtes*. On the other hand, it has also become evident that some of the non-finites really are quite recent innovations or at least some of their functions do not appear to have obvious counterparts outside contemporary North Saami.

In other words, many of the most significant conclusions presented in this study are not based on strikingly novel observations of unprecedented phenomena but on new ways of analyzing some of the well-established non-finite formations in the language. As far as I can see, opening these new vistas has been worthwhile, as the formerly disparate bunch of morphologically, syntactically and semantically exceptional subtypes of the so-called “action” can now be regarded as unambiguous verb forms of their own right, and the remaining functions can consequently be regarded as somewhat uniform uses of the unambiguously noun-like verbal noun.

At the end of this predominantly synchronic study, it is useful to cast a deliberately diachronic look at the whole system of non-finite verb forms in

North Saami. For present purposes, a multitude of possible perspectives concerning the diachronic dimensions of the topic can be broadly divided into two approaches. In Section 4.2.1, ongoing development within the North Saami non-finite paradigm is reviewed from the standpoint of general theoretical and Uralic or Finno-Ugric linguistics. As it turns out, a revised inventory of the non-finite verb forms seems to point to a new, more agglutinative direction for the so-called drifts that earlier made the once agglutinative predecessors of the Saami languages outstandingly fusional in comparison to the other Uralic languages. After that, Section 4.2.2 will focus on more practical issues concerning the sociolinguistic status of the North Saami language and its users. The changes within the language system are evaluated with reference to concrete factors behind the modern literary use of North Saami; furthermore, in addition to looking at the past and present of the language, it is suggested that it may be possible to pay attention to the future of North Saami as well as other Saami languages, as it seems that future language planners could consciously take into consideration the various tendencies scrutinized in the descriptions of the present-day language.

4.2.1. The emergence of new non-finites—rehabilitating the agglutinative technique in North Saami?

In the original papers (Ylikoski 2002: 84, 157; 2004a: 151; 2006a: 35) it was remarked that the emergence of new non-finites such as the converbs in *-miin*, *-ndihte* and *-nláhkai* may be seen as partial counter-evidence in favor of the received view that the Saami languages belong to the most “Indo-Europeanized” Uralic languages; characterizations such as these refer to the comparatively high degree of fusionality within the morphology and the predominantly analytic syntax that, for example, usually makes use of conjunctions and finite subordinate clauses rather than corresponding non-finite constructions otherwise typical of the Uralic languages (see e.g. Tauli 1966: 87–91; M. Korhonen 1979: 18; 1980: 97–98; Comrie 1981: 13–14; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993: 39).

It certainly holds true that the Saami languages can be regarded as exceptionally fusional Uralic languages. As already seen in the glosses of Saami examples, there is a considerable amount of stem variation in the Saami languages, and it is often quite difficult, even impossible to distinguish between the word stems and inflectional suffixes, not to speak of one-to-one correspondence between the morphology and semantics of inflectional word forms. An illustrative example of the situation is seen in Table 8, partly based on remarks presented by Korhonen (1967: 17):

	<i>juohkk-</i>	<i>juohk-</i>	<i>juog-</i>	<i>juhk-</i>
-á		<i>juohká</i> PRS.3SG		
-e			<i>juoge</i> 1) PRS.CONNEG 2) IMP.2SG	<i>juhke</i> 1) PRS.1DU 2) PST.3PL
-i	<i>juohkki</i> 1) IMP.2DU 2) PTC.PRS		? <i>juogi</i> VGEN	
-o				<i>juhko</i> IMP.CONNEG
-u	<i>juohkku</i> IMP.1DU			
-án		<i>juohkán</i> PTC.PST	<i>juogán</i> PRS.1SG	
-en				<i>juhken</i> PST.1SG
-in		<i>juohkin</i> 1) VN 2) PTC.PASS.AG		
-on				<i>juhkon</i> IMP.1SG
-át			<i>juogát</i> PRS.2SG	
-et	<i>juohkket</i> IMP.2PL			<i>juhket</i> 1) PRS.3PL 2) PST.2SG 3) IMP.2PL
-it	<i>juohkkit</i> IMP.2PL	<i>juohkit</i> 1) INF 2) PRS.1PL		
-ot	<i>juohkkot</i> IMP.1PL			<i>juhkot</i> IMP.1PL
-ut	<i>juohkkut</i> IMP.1PL			

Table 8. Fusionalty of North Saami morphology illustrated by some of the inflectional forms of the verb *juohkit* 'divide'.

The morphological structure and development of inflectional morphology in the Saami languages has been examined most extensively by Korhonen (1969) who describes the emergence of the present-day fusionalty, most prevalent in the easternmost Saami languages, through multiple sound changes that have led to

a rich allomorphy of lexical word stems as well as to a merging and loss of the former diversity of inflectional and derivational affixes. Furthermore, there is a wealth of suffixal allomorphy in the Saami languages due to the rise of pleonastic morphemes maintaining uniform rhythmic structures within individual inflectional categories (cf. Korhonen 1967: 22–23); for example, compare the third person dual and plural forms of the disyllabic stem *juohki-* (*juohki-beahhti* [divide-3DU], *juohki-behtet* [divide-3PL]) and those of the trisyllabic stem *juogad-* (*juogad-eahppi* [share-3DU], *juogad-ehpet* [share-3PL]). Even though our picture of the largely agglutinative Pre-Saami protolanguages may have been oversimplified by the limitations of the comparative method, the overall fusional nature of the Saami languages is obviously so recent that it is quite understandable that Korhonen (1980, 1981b) also characterized such drastic developments as a kind of *drift*⁷⁵ from an agglutinative to fusional language.

As mentioned by Korhonen (1969: 304–305), one of the most concrete syntactic consequences of these changes in Saami morphology is the loss of ambiguous dual marking in possessive suffixes and verb inflection in the easternmost Saami languages, after which the dual number must have been specified analytically with a plural expression including the due numeral. As a corresponding phenomenon in the domain of non-finite morphology, one recalls the fate of the so-called verb genitive that is assumed to have existed in the Saami protolanguage (Korhonen 1974: 191–196; 1981a: 297; Sammallahti 1998b: 87–88) but has gradually lost ground, possibly due to a development in which the “genitive(-instructive)” marker **-n* was lost in nearly all of the easternmost Saami languages so that the verb form has contracted into a plain verb stem in the weak grade. It is easy to understand why language users have begun to favor more expressive analytical formulations such as the verbal noun in the comitative case.

However, it was repeatedly argued in the synchronic parts of this study that non-finite formations such as *juohkimiin* ‘by dividing’ (85b) possess features suggesting that they are no longer analytical in the sense of being composed of separate elements denoting verbal noun (*-ma/-mi*) and the comitative (*-in*), but they can be analyzed as synthetic, indivisible wholes instead. Now, as the converb in *-miin* is by no means a lone example of a non-finite verb form that has a relatively recent and transparent origin in formerly analytic verbal noun constructions, it seems that we are in a position to witness a new, agglutinative tendency in at least one of the Saami languages. It is only natural that recent inflectional—not to speak of derivational—forms in any language are agglutinative and not fusional, as new forms most often develop through agglutination, which

⁷⁵ In the words of Sapir (1921: 166), a *drift* can be characterized as a developmental tendency in a language “constituted by the unconscious selection on the part of its speakers of those individual variations that are cumulative in some special direction”.

turns formerly free morphemes into bound affixes. Normally, the morphological make-up of these new affixes is sufficient to support the semantic function of the new inflectional category, and the fresh bound morphemes do not (yet) show allomorphy resulting from historical sound changes or analogical mechanisms.

On the other hand, it is also quite common that new, more or less agglutinative word forms do not originate from the concrete processes of the agglutination of free morphemes but in analogy. Of the non-finite formations described in this study, at least the “passive present participle” in *-uvvi* (180–184) must be considered as such. It does not seem impossible to conceive a similar explanation for the “verb abessive” in *-nkeahtá* instead of *-keahtá* (e.g., *soabadankeahhtá* in Example 109 and *dutkankeahtá* in 110 pro *soabatkeahtá*, *dutkkakeahhtá*) either. Even though the morpheme *keahtá* is also occasionally used as a postposition making the formation *V-nkeahtá* look similar to *V-ndihte*, logical source constructions of the type *V-ma/-mi keahhtá* [V-VN.GA without] are, though not impossible, at least diminishingly rare in comparison to the frequency of corresponding *V-ma/-mi dihte* constructions.⁷⁶ Furthermore, also formations in *-nhaga* (*háhkahaga* ‘without acquiring’ instead of *hágahaga* in 104) and *-nkeahtes* (e.g. *organiserenkeahtes* ‘unorganized’ in Example 228 rather than *organiserekeahtes* in Example 212) can be viewed as the result of analogy made possible by the considerable number of functionally analogous non-finite verb forms that are historically based on the element *-n* of the verbal noun.

Viewed synchronically, it would seem more appropriate to consider the element *-n-* as an indivisible part of the suffixes, and it is important to note that the fourteen-member inventory of North Saami non-finite verb forms (as summarized in Table 7) includes as many as seven verb forms in which the marker contains either an *-n(-)* or *-m-*, and the suffix is attached to the verb stem in the strong grade (e.g. *juohki-* ‘divide’).⁷⁷ Furthermore, at least the converbs in *-miin* and *-ndihte* appear to have largely replaced the verb genitive (*?juogi*) and the supine (*juogázit*) that are based on the weak grade instead. As a result, the only remaining non-finites based on the weak grade are the gerund (*juogedettiin*), the negative converb (*juogekeahtá*) and its participial counterpart (*juogekeahtes*), and it is precisely this type of asymmetry that brings to mind that the sporadic occurrence of the formations in *-nhaga* (104–105), *-nkeahtá* (107–110), *-nkeahtes* (228–229) and even *-nlágan* (173–175) may well stem from an analogical model

⁷⁶ For actual instances of *V-ma/-mi dihte* constructions, see Example (52) in Ylikoski (2002: 111) and Examples (55, 64–65, 67–68) in Ylikoski (2004a: 91, 101–102).

⁷⁷ Non-finite groups of this kind with the elements *-n/-m-* bring to mind the various etymologically comparable Finnic non-finites containing the element *-ma/-mä-*. As discussed in Ylikoski (2003a: 203–204, 211–213, 216–217), the Finnish grammatical tradition has marked these verb forms with historicizing labels such as inessive, elative, illative, adessive, abessive and instructive forms of the so-called third or *-ma* infinitive in Finnish. In fact, this is somewhat parallel to the practice of labeling many of the Saami formatives as “action nominative, genitive, essive, locative and comitative”, that is, “lumping them together on the basis of their historical morphology” (Sammallahti 1998b: 86) only.

that is provided by not only established non-finites originating in verbal noun constructions, but also by non-finites such as the infinitive (-*t*), the past participle (-*n*) and the agentive passive (-*n*) participle that are also based on the strong grade of the verb stem.

Leaving aside the gerund without attested strong grade challengers in *-*ndettiin* as well as the present and passive past participles based on the extra-strong grade (*juohkk-i*, *juhkk-o(ju(vvo))n*), it is possible to present a visual comparison of the dominant type of North Saami non-finite verb forms and the apparently recessive type of non-finites as shown in Table 9:

non-finite verb form	dominant type (strong grade)		recessive type (weak grade)
infinitive	<i>juohki-t</i>		‘(to) divide’
past participle	<i>juohká-n</i>		‘(having) divided’
verbal noun	<i>juohki-n</i>		‘(act of) dividing’
agentive passive participle	<i>juohki-n</i>		‘(one that has been) divided by’
action essive	<i>juohki-min</i>		‘in the act of dividing’
second infinitive (action locative)	<i>juohki-mis</i>		‘from dividing’
instrumental converb	<i>juohki-miin</i>	← ? <i>juogi</i> (< * <i>juogi-n</i>)	‘by dividing’
purposive converb	<i>juohki-ndihte</i>	← <i>juogá-žit</i> (Torne Saami)	‘in order to divide’
non-finite in - <i>nláhkai</i>	<i>juohki-nláhkai</i>		‘ready to divide / be divided’, ‘like dividing’
negative converb	“ <i>juohki-nkeahtá</i> ” (~“ <i>juohki-nhaga</i> ”)	← <i>juoge-keahtá</i>	‘without dividing’
negative participle “passive present participle”	“ <i>juohki-nkeahtes</i> ” “ <i>juohki-nlágan</i> ”	← <i>juoge-keahtes</i>	‘undivided’ ‘(one) being divided’

Table 9. A sketch of the re-patterning of the non-finite paradigm in North Saami. (The new formations below the broken line are very marginal and probably cannot be considered representative of the true generally accepted development in the language, not to speak of their being characterized as “dominant” types in themselves.)

It cannot be overemphasized that the re-patterning of the non-finite paradigm as depicted in Table 9 is quite speculative in nature. As for the purposive and instrumental converbs, the view of those in -*miin* and -*ndihte* which replace the verb genitive and supine is based on the received view that the latter verb forms were productive even in Proto-Saami (Korhonen 1974: 191–203; 1981a: 297–298;

Sammallahti 1998b: 87–88), but the view of the negative formations in *-nhaga*, *-nkeahttä*, *-nkeahtes* as being challengers of a kind to the ever-productive non-finites in *-keahttä*, *-keahtes* must be taken with a grain of salt. However, it seems obvious that the introduction of these sporadic non-finites is supported by the fact that the majority of the non-finite markers, and all of the most recent ones, in the language are nowadays attached to the verb stem in the strong grade (e.g., *juohki-* instead of *juogá-*, *juohká-*, *juhke-*, *juhko-*, *juohkke-*, *juohkki-*, *juohkko-* or *juohkku-* seen in Table 8 above).⁷⁸

In any case, the existence of the non-finites listed in the “dominant type” column in Table 9 do not fit well into the traditional view, supported in Table 8 above, that the inflectional patterns in the Saami languages display an exceptionally high degree of fusionality in contrast to agglutination. Instead, they emphasize that the non-finite paradigm is currently undergoing a process of restructuring that can, to take a familiar example, be compared to development of modal constructions such as *wanna*, *gonna*, *gotta*, *shoulda*, *coulda* and *woulda* in English. As described by Krug (2000, 2001), this “wholesale reorganization” (Bolinger 1980: 6) of the English auxiliary system has led to the emergence of a new subset of modal expressions, labeled as *emerging modals* by Krug. Krug’s arguments focus on the role of iconicity in the process of such reorganization, and his main theoretical arguments are condensed into a notion labeled as the “Iconicity of Grammatical Categories Principle”:

Other things being equal, the more a form refers to what is crosslinguistically realized as a grammatical morpheme, the more distinct will be its linguistic form from neighboring forms and from its source construction syntagmatically, and the more similar will it be to related forms paradigmatically. (Krug 2001: 322)

⁷⁸ The existence of the *-nhaga* formations also offers an interesting perspective concerning the development of the corresponding Finnic non-finite in *-mattal-mättä* ‘without V-ing’: Given the very marginal status of the nominal abessive case *-ttal-ttä* in the Finnic languages, it may appear rather strange at first sight that *-matta* is a part of a set of so-called third infinitive forms (see Note 77) that seems to be a fairly recent morphological innovation in Finnic (cf. Saukkonen 1965, 1966; Korhonen 1974: 104; Laanest 1982: 245–248). As can be inferred by the data presented by Csepregi (2001; cf. also Korhonen 1974: 173–174, 181–182; R. Bartens 1979: 95, 178; 2000: 84, 257–258), the nature of many Uralic negative non-finites, such as the Saami verb abessives (e.g. North Saami variant *-haga*) and the corresponding Mari *-de* and Komi *-teg*, makes it seem probable that the earliest negative converb in the Uralic languages consisted merely of the suffix **-ptal-ptä*. Therefore, in the light of the development of syntactically verb-like formations in *-nhaga*—according to the model provided by other verbal-noun based non-finites—it is tempting to think that the Pre-Finnic formations of the type **V-ptal-ptä* (>> Finnish **juo-tta*, Estonian **joo-ta* [drink-ABE]; cf. Saami *jugahaga*, Mari *jüde* and Komi *juteg* ‘without drinking’) may have been replaced by a formation (Finnish *juomatta*, Estonian *joomata* ‘without drinking’) coined through analogy with novel verb forms in *-ma-/mä-*, such as the “third infinitive” inessive, illative and elative. In other words, both Saami *-nhaga* and Finnic *-matta* may possibly be seen as resulting from analogical pressure to replace the negative non-finite of the type “verb stem + abessive” with innovations that are only seemingly derived from the abessive case forms of the ancient verbal noun.

Krug refers to the loss of syntagmatic iconicity in constructions such as *want to* (>> *wanna*), *is/am/are going to* (>> *gonna*), *have/has got to* (>> *gotta*), but the loss of syntagmatic iconicity is not only a matter of morphological but also syntactic and semantic iconicity (cf. *I have got to* (~ **gotta*) *the end*). Of course, the wording “loss of syntagmatic iconicity” also applies to the phenomena discussed in connection with the various new non-finites in North Saami: formations such as *juhkamiin vuola* ‘by drinking beer’ (22), *juhkandihte vuola* ‘in order to drink beer’ (23) or *juohkinláhkai bálkkašupmi* ‘the prize that is awarded’ (167) differ from the verbal noun constructions in that they cannot be considered the sums of their parts anymore (cf. *vuola juhkama dihte* ‘because of beer-drinking’ in Example 28).

Just as non-finites such as *-ndihte*, *-nkeahtes* and *-nkeahttá* are possibly built on quite different models (postpositional phrases, denominal adjectives and sheer analogy, respectively), the various English modals like *wanna*, *gonna*, *gotta*, *shoulda* and even *betta* (<< *had better*) are of a rather heterogeneous origin, although it can now be seen that they have a uniform structure /CVCə/ (/ˈwɒnə, ˈɡɒnə, ˈɡɒtə, ˈʃʊdə, ˈbetə/). In Krug’s terminology, such uniformity can be characterized as a gain in paradigmatic iconicity as opposed to a loss in the syntagmatic iconicity mentioned above (see Krug 2001: 314–315).

Even though formulations such as Krug’s “Iconicity of Grammatical Categories Principle” may not be groundbreaking news with regard to the nature of language change and the power of analogy (cf. Anttila 1989: 88–108; Esa Itkonen 2005: 105–113), it does seem that if the above modal formations can be seen as belonging to a more or less uniform set of “emerging modals”, we could also view the increasing number of non-finites in the left-hand column of Table 9 as “emerging non-finites”. However, a decisive morphological difference between the English modals and Saami non-finites is that the former belong to the domain of inflection. More specifically, the morphological paradigmatic iconicity of Saami verb forms is not based on a common morphophonological structure such as /CVCə/ but on the attachment of a set of inflectional suffixes which can be considered a text-book example of agglutination.

As for the historical make-up of the North Saami non-finite verb forms, it may come as something of a surprise that postpositions such as *dihte* and *láhkai*, along with their allomorphs and semantically similar postpositions such as *várás* ‘for (the purpose of)’ and *ládje* ‘in the manner of’, respectively, have not grammaticalized into adverbial case suffixes but only into adverbial verb forms instead. However, such phenomena may be seen as fortifying the view (presented in Ylikoski 2003a: 205; see also Sections 2.2 and 3.1 above) that the “adverbiality” of so-called converbs or adverbial verb forms is in fact very similar to that of “adverbial noun forms”, that is, adverbial cases: the syntactic and semantic functions of temporal, instrumental, purposive verb forms in the sen-

tence are by and large the same as those of adverbial cases such as the locative and comitative in North Saami, and therefore it should be no wonder that such adpositional phrases as *V-ma/-mi dihte* have grammaticalized into an adverbial suffix *-ndihte* very much in the same way that the adpositional phrase **N-i(d) guoimmi* [N-PL(.GA) with] ‘with Ns’ has turned into an adverbial comitative suffix *-(i)guin* (see Section 3.1.5).

When comparing adverbial verb forms and corresponding noun forms in North Saami, it is somewhat curious to note that there are actually many more adverbial verb forms than adverbial noun forms in the language. The number of adverbial cases is four (locative, illative, comitative, essive), whereas the number of converbs in Table 7 is six. Of course, as three of these four case markers are materially also in use in non-finite verb forms (“action locative, comitative and essive”), it is clear that a language like North Saami has to resort to alternative source constructions, for example, adpositional ones, if the language is to increase the number of adverbial verb forms.⁷⁹

In the light of the increasing number of adverbial verb forms and the related agglutination of postpositions such as *dihte*, *láhkai* and even *bokte* (101–103) and *haga* (104–105), it is reasonable to ask whether there are similar processes at work in the domain of noun inflection in North Saami. Except for the comitative plural suffix *-(i)guin*, the answer to this question seems to be largely negative, however. Although it has been noted (R. Bartens 1978b: 191–195; A. Aikio & Ylikoski 2007: 43) that the outward appearance of certain postpositions such as *al(de)* ‘on’ and *ala* ‘onto’ has acquired clitic-like features (cf. *<bálgá alde>/pálk al/ ~ /pálk ál/* [path.GA on] ‘on the path’) in Saami languages, such cliticizations do not seem to have any syntactic or semantic concomitants that would give us further reason to regard them as case-like suffixes in North Saami. However, see Bartens’ (1978b: 194–195) syntactic remarks on some of the corresponding constructions in other Saami languages southwest of North Saami.

Interestingly, there is a better candidate for a new case suffix that does not originate from a postposition proper but a morpheme *(-)ráigge ~ rái* ‘through’ going back to the genitive-accusative form of the noun *ráigi* ‘hole, slot’. The morpheme is used as the last part of formations such as *láseráigge* ‘through the window’ (← *láse* ‘window’) and *vuovderáigge* ‘through the forest’ (← *vuovdi* ‘forest’)—note that their use does not presuppose any kind of “holes” in the win-

⁷⁹ Even though the illative form of the verbal noun (*-miil-pmái*, see e.g. *dáidda-bajásgeassi-m-ii* [art-educate-VN-ILL] in Example 155 and *loahpah-eapmá-i* [end-VN-ILL] in 174) does not show any sign of independence from verbal noun constructions, the corresponding formation seems to have acquired an independent verb form status in South and Ume Saami, where the non-finite in *-mman/-men* could probably be regarded as a kind of infinitive (cf. the verbal nature of the examples presented by Saukkonen [1965: 39–40], Korhonen [1974: 27], Bergsland [1982: 47] and H.-H. Bartens [1986: 19–20]), quite like the etymologically analogous non-finite in the Finnic languages (e.g., the Finnish infinitive in *-maan/-mään* discussed in Ylikoski 2003a: 212–217, 225).

dow or woods. These formations have earlier been described as compound words (e.g. Nielsen 1932–1962 s.v. *rai'ge*; R. Bartens 1978b: 15, 18–20), but later on, the bound morpheme has been characterized as an adverb (e.g. Sammallahti & Nickel 2006 s.v. *-ráigge*, *-rái*). Although further research on this topic has to be left outside the scope of the present study, Examples (234–235) illustrate that the *-rái(gge)* forms have many syntactic and semantic properties that indeed make them look like case suffixes:

(234) *Go idit šattai, de lei ieš jápmán, ja varra lei golgan, sihke njunneráigge*

ja njálb[m]eráigge, dasgo su iežas joavku borre su. (Gaski et al. 2004:

88 < LES 1: 436, Unjárga [< Anár], Johan Johnsen Aikio 1890)

<i>Go</i>	<i>idit</i>	<i>šatta-i,</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>le-i</i>	<i>ieš</i>
when	morning	become-PST.3SG	PRT	be-PST.3SG	REFL
<i>jápmá-n,</i>	<i>ja</i>	<i>varra</i>	<i>le-i</i>	<i>golga-n,</i>	<i>sihke</i>
die-PTC.PST	and	blood	be-PST.3SG	flow-PTC.PST	both
<i>njunne-ráigge</i>	<i>ja</i>	<i>njálbme-ráigge,</i>	<i>dasgo</i>	<i>su</i>	
nose-ráigge	and	mouth-ráigge	because	3SG.GA	
<i>ieža-s</i>	<i>joavku</i>	<i>borre</i>	<i>su.</i>		
REFL.GA-3SG	crew	eat.PST.3PL	3SG.GA		

‘When the morning came, he himself was dead, with blood having run both through his nose and his mouth, as his own crew had “eaten” him.’

(235) *Cokka báddegeaži uhca ráigeráigge.*

(<http://www.peda.net/veraja/saame/kasityokurssi/maggai> 19.7.2007)

<i>Cokka</i>	<i>bádde-geaži</i>	<i>uhca</i>	<i>ráige-ráigge.</i>
thrust.IMP.2SG	string-end.GA	small.ATTR	hole-ráigge

‘Thrust the end of the string through the small hole.’

In addition to the semantic distance between the genitive-accusative *ráiggi* ~ *ráigge* ‘of a hole’ and *-rái(gge)* ‘through’, Example (234) shows that the coordinated phrase *sihke njunneráigge ja njálbmeráigge* rather than *?sihke njunne- ja njálbmeráigge* implies a relatively high degree of boundedness in the case of *-ráigge*. Furthermore, the word form *ráigeráigge* ‘through the hole’ (235) may be regarded as a prima facie example of a grammaticalization that has proceeded so far that the grammaticalized element can be attached to the morpheme in which it has its material origin; note also the adjectival attribute *uhca* that modifies the noun *ráigi* in “the *-ráigge* case”.

All in all, it appears that the inflectional paradigm of nouns has remained much more fusional than the non-finite paradigm in North Saami. It must also be remembered that one of the adverbial cases, the abessive, has in fact drifted in

a diametrically opposite direction in the process of degrammaticalizing into the postposition *haga* (see Section 3.1.5). Of course, it is not unusual to witness such a quantitative difference between the inflection of different parts of speech; for example, most of the Romance languages do not have nominal cases at all, but at the same time they do possess rich verbal morphology which includes various tenses, moods and non-finite forms.

When pondering over the “agglutinative drift” within the North Saami non-finite paradigm, it is important to recognize the fact that non-finite verb forms are not prototypical but expressly non-prototypical verb forms that are generally not marked for categories characteristic of verbs and do not have the prototypical predicative functions of verbs (see Section 3.1.1 and Ylikoski 2003a: 186). Therefore, it seems appropriate to consider nominal case inflection as being on a par with finite rather than non-finite verb forms, and from such a perspective, the degrees of fusional or agglutination among the inflectional paradigms of verbs and nouns do not significantly diverge.

As for the non-finite verb forms, they can be regarded as at the outskirts of verb inflection; let us remember the fact that verbal nouns, participles and participle-like formations vacillate between derivation and “word-class-changing” inflection, and the fact that the notion of the converb has often been described by characterizing such verb forms as “verbal adverbs”. These views also fit into the general picture of the morphological processes of derivation, namely, the possibly universal tendency that the role of agglutination is more central in the domain of derivation than in inflection; cf. the *richness* of agglutinative derivational morphology in the otherwise fusional-isolating English language. As explicitly noted by Korhonen (1969: 300–302) and Pajunen (1998: 68), this is clearly the case in the Saami languages as well, so that the agglutinative nature of North Saami non-finites can also be explained by their resemblance to unambiguously derivational word formation.

In addition to the dichotomy between the prototypical manifestations of agglutination and fusional, it is also useful to bear in mind the various semi-bound morphemes discussed in detail in Section 3.1.5 above. It was seen that in addition to the relatively newly developed inflectional suffixes *-ndihte*, *-nláhkai* and *-(i)guin* that may undergo conjunction reduction (e.g. *nanne-n- ja ovddid-andihte* [strengthen-*n-* and develop-*ndihte*], *silbba-i ja golli-i-guin* [silver-PL(OBL) and gold-PL-COM]), analogous reduction can be observed among many other inflectional—and derivational—categories as well. Viewed from a diachronic perspective, the majority of the examples presented in Section 3.1.5 are rather interesting because such non-finite constructions as *bora- ja jugakeahtá* ‘without eating and drinking’ (151) and *hála- ja čáledettiin* ‘when speaking and writing’ (152) as well as denominal adjectival expressions such as *áhče- ja eatneheapme* ‘father-

and motherless’ (147) and *reanto- ja divatkeahtes* ‘interest- and fee-free’ (149) or the derivative verb phrase *suomai-, dárui-, ruotai- ja ruoššaiduhttimiin* ‘with the Finnicization, Norwegianization, Swedification and Russification’ (154) could in principle be regarded as tentative symptoms of a wholesale degrammaticalization of inflectional and derivational suffixes in the language. It was suggested in Section 3.1.5 that this may have to do with the somewhat untypical morphophonological structure of these morphemes that sets them apart from the more typical bound morphemes consisting of single syllables, single consonants or no segmentable suffix at all. If such a “degrammaticalization drift” were to take place on a large scale in the language, the present restructuring of the system of non-finites, many of which have disyllabic markers that can be omitted in conjunction reduction, depicted in Table 9 could then be viewed another way, as an intermediate stage on the way to a more clitic-like status for many of the present-day inflectional and derivational suffixes, that is, those that do not quite fit into the otherwise predominantly fusional morphology of the language.

Admittedly, many of the remarks and considerations presented in this section are quite theoretical, and the questions concerning the ongoing development of non-finite verb forms in North Saami are certainly in need of more rigorous research in a wider perspective. In the concluding section, the synchrony and diachrony of these verb forms are approached from a more pragmatic, user-based perspective on contemporary written North Saami, in which the manifestations of various morphological, syntactic and semantic categories are seen as something serving to fulfill the communicative needs of language users.

4.2.2. Conclusion: user-based approaches to the dynamics of the North Saami non-finites

The preceding sections as well as the original papers of this study have viewed North Saami and the other Saami languages mainly as autonomous language systems, that is, without many remarks on the extralinguistic world in which the languages and their speakers and writers live. At the conclusion of this study, it is also worth paying attention to the social reality of the language and its users, as such perspectives can certainly widen our understanding of the past, present and even the future of the North Saami non-finite verb forms.

It was seen in the preceding sections and the original papers that some of the relatively recent changes and innovations in the Saami non-finite morpho-syntax can be explained through the influence of the neighboring major languages. Not surprisingly, these major languages can be seen to be pulling the North

Saami language in two quite opposite directions: that of the agglutinative Uralic languages such as Finnish and that of the fusional Indo-European languages such as the Scandinavian languages (in fact, this situation gives North Saami a rather unique position on the linguistic map of Europe). For example, it is possible to assign the emergence of the converb in *-miin*, along with its Inari Saami counterpart in *-má(á)in*, to the influence of the Finnic converb in *-malla/-mällä* (Section 3.1.2.2). In the same vein, it can be observed that the participle-like attributive use of the non-finite in *-nláhkai* and other curious formations with the same function is most visible in texts translated from Finnish whose passive present participle has not apparently had a functional equivalent in the earlier stages North Saami. As for the Scandinavian languages Norwegian and Swedish with only a handful of non-finite verb forms, they were mentioned with reference to the similarity of Saami and Scandinavian infinitival constructions with adpositions (e.g. *dan ala ahte čielggadit* in Example 44 ~ *med (~for) å oppklare* ‘(working) on solving (the crime)’), but otherwise they have been touched upon only in connection with such matters as the fact that the Finnish-like use of *-miin* and *-nláhkai* can apparently also be found in texts that have not been written under the direct influence of Finnish.⁸⁰ Namely, present-day North Saami, and especially its literary use, is always under the influence of at least one of the major languages of the Saami language area.

Of course, the influence of other languages has been a regular topic of discussion in many papers on the present-day situation of Saami languages. Initiated by the “practical advice for translators” as an appendix to Nielsen’s (1926: 424–428) North Saami grammar, dangers of cross-linguistic interference have been concretely displayed by many scholars since then (most recently S. Aikio 1999, 2005; T. Magga 1998, 2002; Čállinrávagirji 2003; O. H. Magga 2004a; Vuolab-Lohi 2007). However, much of the discussion has consisted of presenting somewhat isolated examples of undesirable language use and proposals for more correct alternatives. As noted by S. Aikio (2005: 55), it is not unusual for the argumentation to have been based on personal preferences that are often related to corresponding phenomena in Scandinavian or Finnish, depending on which side of the Saami language area the writer happens to be located.

⁸⁰ In addition to the infinitive (e.g. Norwegian *oppklare*, Swedish *uppklara* ‘solve’), the non-finite verb forms in Norwegian and Swedish include the present participle (*oppklarende*, *uppklarande*) and the past participle (*oppklart*, *uppklarad*). The so-called supine (*uppklarat*) in Swedish is used—in a similar way to the past participle in Norwegian—with the auxiliary verb *ha* to create the analytic perfect and pluperfect tenses.

When viewed from a purely functional perspective, the emergence of the Saami converbs in *-miin* and *-má(á)in* could certainly also be explained by Scandinavian infinitival constructions such as the Norwegian *ved å* + infinitive, but as was seen in Section 3.1.3 the overall morphosyntactic structure of such constructions seems to have led early translators to use the verbal-noun based formation in *<-m bokte>* instead. However, the most transparent translational equivalent of “*ved å* + infinitive” is *dan (~dakko) bokte ahte V-t* seen in Example (49). Unlike *<-m bokte>*, the latter is in use in the contemporary language as well, most notably on the Norwegian side of the North Saami area.

When speaking of the foreign influence on the Saami languages, the discussion has centered mainly on neologisms, idioms, certain aspects of case syntax and word order, but not on the inflectional morphology of the language. In the comparatively few studies of morphological variation in present-day Saami languages (Turi 1996 and Palismaa 2005 on North Saami, Toivonen 2007 on Inari Saami), on the other hand, much of the focus has been on the incomplete acquisition and attrition of finite verb morphology. Much of the argumentation in the above-mentioned literature is based on the fact that the Saami languages have a minority status nearly everywhere. For example, Toivonen (2007: 389–390, 398–399) considers that the variation among dual and plural verb forms in Inari Saami represents a universal phenomenon, viz, that endangered minority languages generally exhibit a high degree of variation often related to loss of morphology as a typical side-effect of language attrition. As regards the phenomena discussed in this study, some expressions, most notably the conjunction reduction seen in various negative formations such as the former abessive case marker, present-day postposition *haga* (e.g. *áhčči ja eatni haga* [father.GA and mother.GA without] ‘without father and mother’) and the corresponding verb form *-keahttá* (*bora- ja juga-keahttá* [eat- and drink-VABE] of Example 151), could possibly be ascribed to the influence of Scandinavian analytic expressions such as *uten far og mor* and *uten å spise og drikke* [without COMP eat.INF and drink.INF], respectively. — However, there are apparently no studies in which the major languages have been considered to play an active role in triggering morphological innovations, such as the non-finite in *-miin*, in the Saami languages.

It is certainly true that a large part of the most controversial usage of written North Saami is related to writers’ inexperience in using a minority language as a literary language. Furthermore, it is quite obvious that from the perspective of prescriptive grammar and grammarians, many of the marginal non-finite constructions presented in this study can, or perhaps even must, be regarded as similar unwanted corruption of the language. A case in point are the many sporadic formations that seem to be used in order to fill the gap caused by the absence of a passive equivalent to the active present participle (Section 3.2.2). As it seems, this gap becomes particularly obvious when translating texts from Finnish whose morphosyntactic structure is otherwise quite close to that of North Saami. However, it is quite predictable that it may not be easy to straightforwardly accept a variety of morphological innovations that seem to differ so starkly from the traditional use of the language and that up to the present are to be observed mainly in translations of official documents. In comparison to a lexicon that by its very nature abounds with neologisms and novel ways of combining these, inflectional morphemes constitute very closed systems wherein new items are only rarely introduced.

While it is not the aim of this study to contribute to the prescriptive grammar of North Saami, it must be noted that when speaking of the present and future literary use of the language the role of the major languages cannot be overly exaggerated. Moreover, the importance of prescriptive action concerning language use and education cannot be overstated either. However, this is certainly not saying that North Saami is any different than other languages, endangered and non-endangered alike. In respect to the demographic situation of the language community, North Saami is quite an ordinary language viewed in a global perspective: the approximate number of native speakers (15,000–25,000) is two or three times that of a median of 7,000 speakers for the total of 6,912 known living languages listed in the Ethnologue data base (Ethnologue), and a very high degree of multilingualism among speakers of North Saami is only a natural consequence of a situation in which such a language is surrounded by official state languages with millions of speakers.

As regards the literary use of the language, it must be recognized that even in the core areas of North Saami, most notably the municipalities of Guovdageaidnu and Kárášjohka with their surroundings in the Norwegian county of Finnmark, as well as on the Finnish side of the border, where the language is used widely as the language of education, administration and the media, it can hardly be the only or even the primary literary language in Saami society wherein many members of the older generations are, in fact, literate only in the majority language, and not in their mother tongue. It is particularly in the most official domains of the language that the increasing literary use of the Saami languages is being inevitably subordinated to the established use of the dominant language of the country. However, it is only normal for the use of a literary language to depend on the other literary languages. For example, nearly all European literary languages still retain visible origins of the more or less slavish translations of religious and legislative texts that have led to such concepts as *kanslisvenska*, that is, corrupted literary Swedish strongly influenced by German, or the analogous *Kanzleideutsch* and *Chancery English* with Latin and French as their models. It is true that most of these older literary languages have also been consciously “guarded”, “protected”, “preserved” and “purified” from foreign influence throughout the centuries, but it still remains a fact that the literary languages of Europe are remarkably homogeneous because of their common origins (see e.g. van der Auwera 1998a; Haspelmath 2001).

As for Saami and the other minority languages of the world, it appears evident that the past, present and future influence of the majority languages could scarcely be avoided at any level; as depicted by O. H. Magga (2004a: 36), even the most language-conscious professionals in the Saami media are quite often influenced by the major languages to the extent that their language may be

characterized as “Norwegian with Saami words” (*dárogiella sámegiell sániiguin*). Furthermore, it can be predicted that the role of translation in the literary use of North Saami will not diminish, as a large part of the translations are, and will be, carried out by administrative and legislative institutions that are even obligated to do so by the language laws. Even if the prescriptive grammarians and language planners of North Saami rightly feel somewhat awkward when facing the high degree of internal variation and competing foreign influences on this minority language of three nation-states, it is to be hoped that the results and the remaining questions of the present study may help encourage action toward maintaining and rebuilding a more unified North Saami literary language.

Even though the historical development of the North Saami inflectional morphology was above (in Section 4.2.1) ascribed to language-internal factors such as analogy and the somewhat vague notion of “drift” that may be leading the language in a more agglutinative direction, it is also possible to imagine concrete, conscious actions that could regulate or promote the use of various non-finites described in this study. In addition to the diversity of the rather sporadic non-finite formations discussed especially in Sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4, the preceding sections and the original papers have introduced five or six “new”, but quite established verb forms that were not regarded as independent verb forms earlier. Four of them stem from a revised view of the verbal noun that has traditionally been labeled as the “action”: it was asserted that formations such as the converbs *juohkimiin* ‘by dividing’, *juohkin dihte ~ juohkindihte* ‘in order to divide’ and *juohkin láhkai ~ juohkinláhkai* ‘ready to divide, to be divided; like dividing’ as well as the agentive passive participle *juohkin* must be distinguished from the verbal noun *juohkin*. The fifth “new” verb form is the negative participle such as *juogekeahtes* ‘undivided’ that for some reason has been omitted from nearly all descriptions of North Saami even though the adverbial-predicative verb abessive (*juogekeahttä* ‘without dividing’) is always given its due place among the non-finite verb forms in the language. Finally, the passive past participle in *-o(ju(vvo))n* is the sixth verb form that must be given a somewhat independent status in the system of non-finites, mainly because of the fact that the absence of a corresponding passive present participle makes the former seem less obvious among the North Saami non-finites.

In the current absence of a precise description of these verb forms in the more or less prescriptive grammars (e.g. Nickel 1994; Pope & Sára 2004; Sammallahhti 2005), it is quite possible that many language users and learners will remain unnecessarily uncertain about the use of these and other, functionally related verb forms. One example of such ambivalence is the overlapping use of the passive past participle and the agentive passive participle seen in Examples (157, 159–163) and already admonished by O. H. Magga (1987: 133); he also

refers (*ibid.*, pp. 133–134) to an analogous mistake of extending the use of the non-finite in *-ndihte*, the purposive converb, to constructions such as *áigumuša-t dulvad-an dihte joga* [plan-PL dam-*ndihte* river.GA] ‘the plans to dam the river’ where the adnominal infinitive *áigumušat dulvadiit joga* ‘id.’ should be used instead. It would appear that the need for corrections such as these could probably be reduced by giving every non-finite verb form an appropriate place in standard descriptions of the language. Furthermore, it might prove useful to consider whether the independent nature of the non-finites in *<-ndihte ~ -n dihte>* and *<-nláhkai ~ -n láhkai>* are reason enough to make recommendations concerning the orthography of these formations, that is, whether they should be written consistently as two or—and I consider this a more logical solution—as single word forms.

As regards more marginal formations such as the various candidates for present passive participles (Section 3.2.2), it could well be possible for language planners and other linguists to consciously look for the most appropriate strategies that would help translators and other writers find natural expressions that correspond to the passive present participle of Finnish or similar languages—the present diversity of the competing translational solutions suggests that there really is a “gap” in North Saami that creates difficulties in actual language use, even among professional writers and translators. In considering a course of action for the future, I wish to propose that it could be worthwhile to use advantageously those judgments that may be elicited from language users themselves.

While this study of North Saami non-finites has been deliberately limited to empirical observations of authentic, though not always that natural and indisputable, linguistic material, I wish to conclude the whole discussion by offering a new perspective for further research based on a pilot experiment to test the acceptability of the various “passive present participles” among first-year Saami students at the University of Oulu, Finland.⁸¹ This experiment was conducted with seven informants on September 18th, 2006, and it consisted of grammaticality judgments regarding the formations *juohkinláhkai* ‘(to be) given away, awarded’, *einnostanládje* ‘predictable, (to be) predicted’ and *ollašuhhtinláhkái* ‘(to be) executed’ in the sentences seen in (167, 169 and 172) as well as a number of hypothetical formations of the type “*juohkinládje*”, “*juohkinlágan*”, “*juhkkojuvvi*”, “*juhkkojeaddji*” and “*juhkkojuvvojeaddji*” in identical contexts (cf. Section 3.2.2). The results of this highly preliminary and partly incomplete survey showed that formations such as “*juhkkojuvvi*”, “*einnostuvvi*” and “*ollašuhhttojuvvi*” were regarded as by far the most acceptable alternative. All of these were accepted by at least five informants, whereas the formations in *-nláhkai*, *-nládje*

⁸¹ I would like to thank Outi Länsman for the opportunity to carry out this experiment.

and *-nlágan* were accepted only by one or two informants each, and the logically most expectable formations “*juhkkojuvvojeaddji*”, “*einnostuvvojeaddji*” and “*ollašuhthtojuvvojeaddji*” were rejected as ungrammatical by all informants. The shorter variant “*juhkkojeaddji*” was likewise rejected, but “*ollašuhthtojeaddji*” was considered possible by three informants.

The results of the survey must be interpreted with some caution, however, as it later turned out that not all of my informants were fully bilingual in North Saami and Finnish as I had presumed, and that for some of them, North Saami was clearly a secondary language. On the other hand, it must be acknowledged that a significant proportion of the speakers and writers of the Saami languages consists, and most probably will continue to consist, of those who do not master the language at the highest level. — Incidentally, the most widely accepted formations in *-(oj)uvvi* are etymologically comparable to the Lule Saami passive participles *áskelduvve* ‘trusted’ and *bálkkiduvve* ‘hired (man)’ seen in Examples (197–198), which also makes the North Saami *-(oj)uvvi* seem the most natural alternative for the apparently non-existent passive present participle in **-o(juvvo)jeaddji*.

All in all, many of the above thoughts on the future development of the non-finite verb forms in North Saami may be best regarded as preliminary suggestions only. At the conclusion of this present study on the inventory of non-finite verb forms in contemporary North Saami I wish to state that the main aim of this and the preceding section (Section 4.2.1) has been to offer some impressions and new insights into the dynamic nature of the synchronic system of non-finites in the North Saami literary language at the turn of the twenty-first century. More rigorous studies of the diachronic issues touched upon here must be left to the future investigators and language planners of North Saami and the other Saami languages.

References

Data sources

Data sources: North Saami literary language

- Áššu*. [Newspaper. Guovdageaidnu, Norway.]
- Ávvir*. [Newspaper. Kárášjohka and Guovdageaidnu, Norway.]
- Bibal* = *Bibal daihe Basse čala mi sistes doalla Boares ja Ođđa Testamenta kanonalaš girjid*. Kristiania: Grøndahl & Søn 1895.
- Einejord, Magne 1986: *Ráimmahallan*. [Deatnu:] Jár'galæd'dji Á/s.
- Falch, Torvald 2002: *Árvvut, suodjalus, hálddašeapmi*. [Abstract.] – Svanhild Andersen (ed.), *Samiske landskap og Agenda 21: kultur, næring, miljøvern og demokrati. Rapport 2 fra prosjektet "Miljø, kultur og kunnskap. Bruk og forvaltning av kulturmiljø og naturressurser i samiske områder."* Dieđut 1/2002. Guovdageaidnu/Kautokeino: Sámi Instituhtta. 198.
- Gaski, Harald & John T. Solbakk (eds.) 2002: *Čállet Sámi Verddet. SFS 1992–2002 10 jagi sámi fágateavsttaid ovddideamen. Sámi fágagirijálaš čálliid- ja jorgaleaddjiidsearvvi 10-jagi ávvučála*. Kárášjohka: ČálliidLágáduš.
- Gaski, Harald & John T. Solbakk & Aage Solbakk (eds.) 2004: *Min njálmmálaš árbevierru. Máidnasat, myhtat ja muitalusat*. [Kárášjohka:] Davvi Girji.
- Guttorm, Eino 1981: *Árbeetan luohhti*. Deatnu: Jár'galæd'dji Á/s.
- Guttorm, Hans Aslak 1986: *Iešnjárgga šiljut*. Deatnu: Jár'galæd'dji Á/s.
- Hassol, Susan Joy 2004a: *Liegganeamen Árktisa čuožahusat. Árktalaš dálkádatnuppástusa čuožahárvoštallan*. Jorgalii sámás: Nils Ole Gaup. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hætta, Lars & Bær, Anders 1982 [1958]: *Muitalusat*. Čáliiga Lars Hætta ja Anders Bær. Olggos attii Thor Frette. Tromsø – Oslo – Bergen: Universitetsforlaget.
- Kristiansen, Roald E. 2004: *Davviguovlluid eamiálbmogiid oskkut ja sámi dološ osku. Oahppogirji nuoraidskuvlla 8.-10. luohkáide*. Sámás: Berit Margrethe Oskal. Kárášjohka: ČálliidLágáduš.
- Laiti, Mirja 2003a: *Lámisolbmuid ja mielladearvvasvuodaveajuiduvviid ássanbálvalusaid dárbbu čielggadeapmi Enodaga ja Ohcejoga gielddas. Ássanbálvalusvuoddudus ÁSBA*.
- Magga, Ole Henrik 2007: *Cealkkavástta – čielga ja anolaš doaba sámi cealkkaoahpa čilgemis?* – Jussi Ylikoski & Ante Aikio (eds.), *Sámit, sánit, sátnehámit. Riepmočála Pekka Sammallahtii miessemánu 21. beaivve 2007*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 253. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 279–291.

- Marastat, Mihkkal 1992: *Darjeskáiddi čiehká*. Guovdageaidnu: DAT.
Min Áigi. [Newspaper. Kárášjohka, Norway.]
- OT = *Ođđa Testamenta*. Oslo: Norgga Biibbalsearvi 1998.
- Reindriftsnytt/Boazodoallo-ođđasat*. [The quarterly magazine of *Reindriftsforvaltningen/Boazodoallohállddahus*, the Norwegian Reindeer Husbandry Administration. Áltá, Norway.]
- Sammallahti, Pekka 2005: *Láidehus sámegiela cealkkaoahpa dutkamii*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.
- Sammallahti, Pekka 2007: *Gielladutkama terminologijja*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.
- Solbakk, Aage 2005a: Eloštanvierut ja soagŋu dološ Sámis. – *Sámis* 1: 34–40.
- Solbakk, Aage 2005b: Govvamuiittut. – *Sámis* 2: 46–53.
- Solbakk, John T. 2005: Parisas gal riegiádit sámii teavsttat! – *Sámis* 1: 19–24.
- Suoma vuodđoláhka*. Helsinki: Riikkabeaivvit 2000.
- Turi, Klemet Nilsen 1982: *Áiggit rivdet*. [Deatnu:] Jár’galæd’dji Á/s.

Data sources: North Saami dialects

- Gaski, Harald & John T. Solbakk & Aage Solbakk (eds.) 2004: *Min njálmálaš árbevierru. Máidnasat, myhtat ja muitalusat*. [Kárášjohka:] Davvi Girji.
- JSFOu 71 = Itkonen, Terho (ed.) 1971: Uskomus-, tarina- ja satuaineistoa Tenon varresta. Muistiinpannut ja julkaissut Terho Itkonen. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 71,5: 1–84.
- Krohn, J. (ed.) 1885: *Lappalaisia tekstejä. Sanakirjan kanssa*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- LES 1 = Qvigstad, J. (ed.) 1927: *Lappiske eventyr og sagn. I. Lappiske eventyr og sagn fra Varanger*. Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Serie B: Skrifter III. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & co. (W. Nygaard).
- LES 2 = Qvigstad, J. (ed.) 1928: *Lappiske eventyr og sagn. II. Lappiske eventyr og sagn fra Troms og Finnmark*. Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Serie B: Skrifter X. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & co. (W. Nygaard).
- LES 3 = Qvigstad, J. (ed.) 1929a: *Lappiske eventyr og sagn. III. Lappiske eventyr og sagn fra Lyngen I*. Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Serie B: Skrifter XII. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & co. (W. Nygaard).
- LES 4 = Qvigstad, J. (ed.) 1929b: *Lappiske eventyr og sagn. IV. Lappiske eventyr og sagn fra Lyngen II og fra Nordland*. Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Serie B: Skrifter XV. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & co. (W. Nygaard).
- MSFOu 61 = Ravila, Paavo (ed.) 1931: *Ruijanlappalaisia kielennäytteitä Petsamosta ja Etelä-Varangista*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne LXI. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

- MSFOu 68 = Ravila, Paavo (ed.) 1934: *Reste lappischen Volksglaubens*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne LXVIII. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- MSFOu 115 = Lagercrantz, Eliel (ed.) 1958: *Lappische Volksdichtung. II. Lyngenlappische, nordwestlappische und westfjordlappische Texte*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 115. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- MSFOu 117 = Lagercrantz, Eliel (ed.) 1959: *Lappische Volksdichtung. III. Seelappische Texte des Varangergebiets*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 117. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- MSFOu 124 = Lagercrantz, Eliel (ed.) 1961: *Lappische Volksdichtung. V. See- und Skolte-lappische Texte des südlichen Varangergebiets*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 124. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- MSFOu 126 = Lagercrantz, Eliel (ed.) 1963: *Lappische Volksdichtung. VI. Texte aus den see-, nord-, west- und südlappischen Dialekten*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 126. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Qvigstad, J. (ed.) 1925: *Lappische Texte aus Kalfjord und Helgöy. Reste eines ausgestorbenen Seelappendialekts*. – *Oslo Etnografiske Museums skrifter* 1: 1. Oslo. 21–40.
- Sammallahti, Pekka (ed.) 1975: *Sodankylän saamelaisten entistä elämää Elsa-Marja Aikion kertomana*. Castrenianumin toimitteita 14. Helsinki.

Data sources: Inari Saami

- EMM = *Evangelium Matteus mielä*. [Helsinki:] Suomen Piipiliseura 1995.
- Kieräš. [Weekly online newsletter in Inari Saami. Accessed at <http://anaraskielaservi.net/kieras/archives/2007/kieras2007-nr.12.rtf> 8.2.2008.]
- Kirkkokietâkirje* = *Suomâ evangelâš-luteerlâš kirho Kirkkokietâkirje anarâš-kielân. Tuhhiittum kirholaščuâkkimist skammâmáánu 10. peivi 2000*. Pieksämäki: Kirjapaino Raamattutalo Oy. [Accessed at <http://www.ev1.fi/kkh/to/kjmk/saame/inarijpkirja.pdf> 26.1.2008.]
- Morottaja, Uula 1957: *Nellimlij kuobžapivdem-maainas*. – *Sabmelaš* 7.10.1957, p. 4.
- MSFOu 167 = Koskimies, A. V. & T. I. Itkonen (eds.) 1978: *Inarinlappalaista kansantietoutta*. [Second, revised edition.] Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 167. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- MSFOu 213 = Itkonen, Erkki & Lea Laitinen (eds.) 1992: *Inarinsaamelaisia kielennäytteitä. Aanaarkiela čäjtuzeh*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 213. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Data sources: Lule Saami

ÅT = *Ådå Testamennta*. Uppsala: Svieriga Rámátsiebrre 2000.

LES 2 = Qvigstad, J. (ed.) 1928: *Lappiske eventyr og sagn. II. Lappiske eventyr og sagn fra Troms og Finnmark*. Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Serie B: Skrifter X. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & co. (W. Nygaard).

Data sources: Skolt Saami

EE = *Evvan evanġe'lium*. Mikkeli: Suomen Pipliaseura 1988.

MSFOu 60 = Itkonen, T. I. (ed.) 1931: *Koltan- ja kuolanlappalaisia satuja*. I–II. Kolttalaisia ja kildiniläisiä satuja. Koonnut T. I. Itkonen. III. Jokongalaisia satuja. Koonnut D. E. D. Europaeus. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne LX. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Data sources: other languages

Bibelen = *Bibelen eller Den Hellige Skrift, indeholdende det Gamle og Nye Testamentes kanoniske Bøger*. Christiania 1871. [Accessed at <http://www.detnyetestamente.dk/resourcer/bibel-oversaettelser/gt1871.txt> 26.1.2008.]

Finnmark Dagblad. [Newspaper. Hammerfest, Norway.]

Hassol, Susan Joy 2004b: *Impacts of a warming Arctic. Arctic climate impact assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kalevala. (Uuden Kalevalan kahdeskymmeneskolmas painos.) Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 14. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura 1951 [1849].

The Kalevala 1891 = *The Kalevala. The epic poem of Finland. Into English by John Martin Crawford. In two volumes. Vol. II*. New York: The Columbian Publishing Co. 1891.

Kanteletar = *Kanteletar elikkä Suomen kansan vanhoja lauluja ja virsiä*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 3. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura 1966 [1840].

Laiti, Mirja 2003b: *Vammaisten ihmisten ja mielenterveyskuntoutujien asumispalveluiden tarve Enontekiön ja Utsjoen kunnissa*. Asumispalvelusäätiö ASPA.

Other references

- Aikio, Ante & Ylikoski, Jussi 2007: Suomelaš gielaid *l*-kásusiid álgovuoddu sáme- ja eará fuolkegielaid čuovggas. – Jussi Ylikoski & Ante Aikio (eds.), *Sámit, sánit, sátnehámit. Riepmočála Pekka Sammallahtii miessemánu 21. beaivve 2007*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 253. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 11–71.
- Aikio, Samuli 1999: Saamelaiskielistä ja niiden huollosta. – *Kielikello* 2/1999: 26–30.
- Aikio, Samuli 2005: Interferenssejä ja jokapäiväisyyksiä. – Paula Kokkonen (ed.), *Sukukansaohjelman arki. Suomalais-ugrilainen perintö ja arkipäivä. Studia Fenno-Ugrica* 21.9.–16.11.2004. Castrenianumin toimitteita 64. Helsinki: M. A. Castrénin seura – Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura – Helsingin yliopiston suomalais-ugrilainen laitos. 48–58.
- Andelin, A. 1861: Enare-lappska språkprof med ordregister. (Föredragen d. 17 Sept. 1860.). – *Acta Societatis scientiarum Fennicæ* 6. Helsingfors: Societas scientiarum Fennicæ. 385–508.
- Antonsen, Lene 2007: Giella buolvvas bulvii. Gáivuona sáme giela morfologiija guorahallan. [MA Thesis.] Tromsø: University of Tromsø, Faculty of Humanities. [Accessed at http://www.ub.uit.no/munin/bitstream/10037/1210/1/Giella_buolvvas_bulvii.pdf 18.10.2008.]
- Anttila, Raimo 1989: *Historical and comparative linguistics*. Second revised edition. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 6. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bartens, Hans-Hermann 1986: Die Stellung der Supinumformen im lappischen Sprachsystem. – Wolfgang Veenker (ed.), *Festschrift für István Futaky. Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 10. Hamburg. 17–40.
- Bartens, Hans-Hermann 1989: *Lehrbuch der saamischen (lappischen) Sprache*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Bartens, Raija 1972: *Inarinlapin, merilapin ja luulajanlapin kaasussyntaksi*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 148. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Bartens, Raija 1978a: Suomen ja lapin passiiviset partisiipit. – Alho Alhoniemi (ed.), *Rakenteita. Juhlakirja Osmo Ikolan 60-vuotispäiväksi 6.2.1978*. Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 6. Turku: Turun yliopisto. 75–85.
- Bartens, Raija 1978b: *Synteettiset ja analyttiset rakenteet lapin paikanilmauksissa*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 166. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

- Bartens, Raija 1979: *Mordvan, tšeremissin ja votjakin konjugaation infiniitisten muotojen syntaksi*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 170. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Bartens, Raija 2000: *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 238. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Bergsland, Knut 1961: *Samisk grammatikk med øvelsesstykker*. Oslo: Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet.
- Bergsland, Knut 1982: *Sydsamisk grammatikk*. Tromsø – Oslo – Bergen: Universitetsforlaget.
- Bolinger, Dwight 1980: *Language – the loaded weapon. The use and abuse of language today*. London – New York: Longman.
- Booij, Geert E. 2005: *The grammar of words. An introduction to linguistic morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Čállinrávagirji 2003. [A North Saami writing guide published by Sámediggi – The Sámi Parliament in Norway. Accessed at http://www.skolenettet.no/nyUpload/Samisk_læringsnett/Dokumenter/callinravvagat.pdf 18.10.2008.]
- Campbell, Lyle 2001: What’s wrong with grammaticalization? – *Language Sciences* 23: 113–161.
- Choi, Sung-Ho 2004: “Possessive adjectives” in Upper Sorbian: Their syntax and morphology. – *언어학* 39: 3–25.
- Comrie, Bernard 1981: *The languages of the Soviet Union*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Corbett, Greville G. 1987: The morphology/syntax interface: Evidence from possessive adjectives in Slavonic. – *Language* 63: 299–345.
- Csepregi, Márta 2001: Abessivi, karitiivi – suffiksi yli sanaluokkarajojen. – Tõnu Seilenthal (ed.), *Congressus Nonus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum. 7.–13.8.2000 Tartu. Pars IV. Dissertationes sectionum: Linguistica I*. Tartu. 181–189.
- Сурапов = Цыпанов, Евгений Александрович 1997: *Причастие в коми языке: история, семантика, дистрибуция*. Екатеринбург: Российская академия наук, Уральское отделение.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1996: [A review of Francesca C. Merlan, *A grammar of Wardaman: A language of the Northern Territory of Australia*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter 1994.] – *Language* 72: 839–842.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1997: *The rise and fall of languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1989: Prototypical differences between inflection and derivation. – *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 42: 3–10.

- Dressler, Wolfgang U. & Kastovsky, Dieter & Pfeiffer, Oskar E. & Rainer, Franz 2005: *Morphology and its demarcations. Selected papers from the 11th Morphology meeting, Vienna, February 2004*. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 264. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2006: Descriptive theories, explanatory theories, and Basic Linguistic Theory. – Felix K. Ameka, Alan Dench & Nicholas Evans (eds.), *Catching language. The standing challenge of grammar writing*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 207–234.
- Dubrovina = Дубровина, Зинаида Михайловна 1972: *Инфинитивы в финском языке*. Ленинград: Издательство Ленинградского университета.
- Eira, Inger Marie Gaup 2004: *Sámegiella davviriikkain. Stáhtus- ja domenačielggadepmi. Sami language in Nordic countries. Status- and domain clarification. Samisk språk i Norden. Status- og domeneutredning*. Dieđut 4/2004. Guovdageaidnu: Sámi Instituhtta.
- Erelt, Mati & Erelt, Tiiu & Ross, Kristiina 1997: *Eesti keele käsiraamat*. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- Ethnologue = Ethnologue. Languages of the World. An encyclopedic reference work cataloging all of the world's 6,912 known living languages. Statistical summaries. [Accessed at http://www.ethnologue.com/ethno_docs/distribution.asp?by=area 29.7.2007.]
- Faarlund, Jan Terje & Lie, Svein & Vannebo, Kjell Ivar 1997: *Norsk referansegrammatikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Friis, J. A. 1856: *Lappisk Grammatik. Udarbeidet efter den finmarkiske Hoveddialekt eller Sproget, saaledes som det almindeligst tales i norsk Finmarken*. Christiania: J. W. Cappelen.
- Grundström, Harald 1946–1954: *Lulelappsk ordbok. Lulelappisches Wörterbuch. I–IV*. Skrifter utgivna genom Landsmåls- och folkminnesarkivet i Uppsala. Ser. C:1. Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln.
- Guttorm, Vesa 1994: Sáhkavuorru relatiivacealkagiin. – Vuokko Hirvonen (ed.), *Sámegiela ja sámii girjjálašvuoda praktihkalaš ja teorehtalaš symposia Guovdageainnus 13.–15.9.1993. Loahpparaporta*. Guovdageaidnu: Sámi Allaskuvla. 9–14.
- Hakulinen, Auli 1993: Kielitieteen suomalaisuus. – Pekka Laaksonen & Sirkka-Liisa Mettomäki (eds.), *Kauas on pitkä matka. Kirjoituksia kahdesta kotiseudusta*. Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja 72. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 18–26.
- Hakulinen, Auli & Vilkuna, Maria & Korhonen, Riitta & Koivisto, Vesa & Heinonen, Tarja Riitta & Alho, Irja 2004: *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 950. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

-
- Hamari, Arja 2007: *The negation of stative relation clauses in the Mordvin languages*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 254. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Haspelmath, Martin 1989: From purposive to infinitive – a universal path of grammaticalization. – *Folia Linguistica Historica* 10: 287–310.
- Haspelmath, Martin 1994: Passive participles across languages. – Barbara Fox & Paul Hopper (eds.), *Voice: Form and function*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 151–177.
- Haspelmath, Martin 1995: The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category. – Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König (eds.), *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective. Structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms – adverbial participles, gerunds*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 13. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 1–56.
- Haspelmath, Martin 1996: Word-class-changing inflection and morphological theory. – Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1995*. 43–66.
- Haspelmath, Martin 1998: How young is Standard Average European? – *Language Sciences* 20: 271–287.
- Haspelmath, Martin 1999: Converb. – Keith Brown & Jim Miller (eds.), *Concise encyclopedia of grammatical categories*. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 110–115.
- Haspelmath, Martin 2001: The European linguistic area: Standard Average European. – Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language typology and language universals. An international handbook. Volume 2*. Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 20.2. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter. 1492–1510.
- Haspelmath, Martin 2004: On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization. – Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde & Harry Perridon (eds.), *Up and down the cline: The nature of grammaticalization*. Typological Studies in Language 59. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 17–44.
- Haspelmath, Martin 2007: Pre-established categories don't exist: consequences for language description and typology. – *Linguistic Typology* 11: 119–132.
- Haspelmath, Martin & Ekkehard König (eds.) 1995: *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective. Structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms – adverbial participles, gerunds*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 13. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Helander, Elina 1987: Gielladikšun. – Samuli Aikio et al. (eds.), *Sámás 3. Et morsmålkurs i nordsamisk. En modersmålskurs i nordsamiska*. Oslo: Tiden Norsk Forlag. 72–76.

- Itkonen, Erkki 1939: *Der ostlappische Vokalismus vom qualitativen Standpunkt aus. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Inari- und Skoltlappischen. Lautgeschichtliche Untersuchung.* Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne LXXIX. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Itkonen, Erkki 1950: Das Perfekt des Partizips im Lappischen. – *Commentationes Fenno-Ugricae in honorem Y. H. Toivonen.* Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne XCVIII. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 271–304.
- Itkonen, Erkki 1960: *Lappische Chrestomathie mit grammatikalischem Abriss und Wörterverzeichnis.* Hilfsmittel für das Studium der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen VII. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Itkonen, Erkki 1966: *Kieli ja sen tutkimus.* Helsinki: Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö.
- Itkonen, Esa 1999: Myytti Suomen kielitieteen ‘suuresta murroksesta’. – Esa Itkonen, *Kielitieteen kääntöpuoli. Kirjoituksia vuosilta 1963–1999.* Yleisen kielitieteen julkaisuja 2. Turku: Turun yliopisto. 47–61.
- Itkonen, Esa 2004: Paavo Ravila yleisen kielitieteen edustajana. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 90: 319–329.
- Itkonen, Esa 2005: *Analogy as structure and process. Approaches in linguistics, cognitive psychology and philosophy of science.* Human Cognitive Processing 14. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- IW = *Inarilappisches Wörterbuch.* Herausgegeben von Erkki Itkonen unter Mitarbeit von Raija Bartens und Lea Laitinen. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XX. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura 1986–1991.
- Johnskareng, Ámmun 2006: Gielalaš fuollameahtunvuolta. – *Min Áigi* 7.4.2006, pp. 6–7.
- Jomppanen, Marjatta 2005: Davvisámegiela *lei gahččat-* ja suomagiela *oli kaatua -ráhkadusaid veardádallan.* – *Sámi dieđalaš áigečála* 1/2005: 88–108.
- Jomppanen, Marjatta 2006: Relatiivainfinitiiva davvisámegielas ja suomagielas – *Sámi dieđalaš áigečála* 1/2006: 62–87.
- Jomppanen, Marjatta (forthcoming): Pohjoissaamen ja suomen perusinfinitiivi vertailussa *leat-* ja *olla-*verbien yhteydessä sekä lauseen verbikeskuksena. PhD dissertation.
- Joseph, Brian D. 2003: Morphologization from syntax. – Brian D. Joseph & Richard D. Janda (eds.), *Handbook of historical linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. 472–492.
- Kangasniemi, Hannu 2006: Liegganeamen Arktisa čuozausat. – *Min Áigi* 5.4.2006, p. 18.
- Karlsson, Fred 1997: *Yleinen kielitiede Suomessa kautta aikojen.* Helsingin yliopiston yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 28. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.

- Karlsson, Fred 1999: *Finnish: An essential grammar*. London – New York: Routledge.
- Kemi, Kjell 1991: Infinihttahámiid syntákša. – Vesa Guttorm, Nils Ø. Helander & Kjell Kemi (eds.), *Muhtun giellagažaldagat*. Guovdageaidnu: Sámi oahpahusráddi. 55–77.
- Kemi, Kjell 1992: Aktio vai n-dahkonomen? – Vesa Guttorm (ed.), *Giellačállosat*. Dieđut 4/1992. Guovdageaidnu: Sámi Instituhtta. 26–48.
- Kert = Керт, Георгий Мартынович 1971: *Саамский язык (кильдинский диалект). Фонетика. Морфология. Синтаксис*. Ленинград: Наука.
- KKS = Itkonen, T. I. 1958: *Koltan- ja kuolanlapin sanakirja. Wörterbuch des Kolta- und Kotalappischen. I–II*. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XV. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria 1993: *Nominalizations*. London – New York: Routledge.
- Korhonen, Mikko 1962: Zum syntaktischen Gebrauch des lappischen Verbs *gâl'gât* 'sollen, müssen'. – *Commentationes Fenno-Ugricae in honorem Paavo Ravila*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 125. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 233–251.
- Korhonen, Mikko 1967: *Die Konjugation im Lappischen. Morphologisch-historische Untersuchung. I. Die finiten Formkategorien*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 143. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Korhonen, Mikko 1969: Die Entwicklung der morphologischen Methode im Lappischen. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 37: 203–362.
- Korhonen, Mikko 1974: *Die Konjugation im Lappischen. Morphologisch-historische Untersuchung. II. Die nominalen Formkategorien*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 155. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Korhonen, Mikko 1979: Entwicklungstendenzen des finnisch-ugrischen Kasussystems. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 43: 1–21. [Reprinted: Salminen, Tapani (ed.) 1996: *Typological and historical studies in language by Mikko Korhonen. A memorial volume published on the 60th anniversary of his birth*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 223. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 165–178.]
- Korhonen, Mikko 1980: Über die struktural-typologischen Strömungen (Drifts) in den uralischen Sprachen. – Osmo Ikola (ed.), *Congressus Quintus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum. Turku 20.–27. VIII 1980. Pars I. Sessiones plenares*. Turku. 87–110. [Reprinted: Salminen, Tapani (ed.) 1996: *Typological and historical studies in language by Mikko Korhonen. A memorial volume published on the 60th anniversary of his birth*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 223. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 179–194.]

- Korhonen, Mikko 1981a: *Johdatus lapin kielen historiaan*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 370. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Korhonen, Mikko 1981b: Typological drift in the Finno-Ugrian languages with special reference to the case system. – 한글 173–174: 687–710. [Reprinted: Salminen, Tapani (ed.) 1996: *Typological and historical studies in language by Mikko Korhonen. A memorial volume published on the 60th anniversary of his birth*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 223. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 195–206.]
- Korhonen, Mikko 1988: The Lapp language. – Denis Sinor (ed.), *The Uralic languages. Description, history and foreign influences*. Leiden – New York – København – Köln: E. J. Brill. 41–57.
- Korhonen, Olavi 2007: Lulesamisk ordbok. (Manuskript under utvidgning.) Baklängesversion för forskningsändamål redigerad med författarens tillåtelse av Pekka Sammallahti. Oulu. [Manuscript.]
- Kortmann, Bernd 1997: *Adverbial subordination. A typology and history of adverbial subordinators based on European languages*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 18. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kortmann, Bernd 1998: Adverbial subordinators in the languages of Europe. – Johan van der Auwera & Dónall P. Ó Baoill (eds.), *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 20. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 457–561.
- Koskinen, Arja 1998: *Toiminnan välttämättömyys ja mahdollisuus. Pohjois-saamen modaalisten ilmausten semantiikkaa ja syntaksia*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 231. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Krug, Manfred G. 2000: *Emerging English modals. A corpus-based study of grammaticalization*. Topics in English Linguistics 32. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Krug, Manfred G. 2001: Frequency, iconicity, categorization: Evidence from emerging modals. – Joan L. Bybee & Paul J. Hopper (eds.), *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure. Proceedings from the Symposium on Frequency Effects and Emergent Grammar, Carnegie-Mellon University, May 28–30, 1999*. Typological Studies in Language 45. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 309–335.
- Kulonen, Ulla-Maija 2007: *Itämansin kielioppi ja tekstejä*. Hilfsmittel für das Studium der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen XV. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Laanest, Arvo 1982: *Einführung in die ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Autorisierte Übertragung aus dem Estnischen von Hans-Hermann Bartens. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

- Lagercrantz, Eliel 1929: *Sprachlehre des Nordlappischen nach den seelappischen Mundarten*. Oslo Etnografiske Museum. Bulletin 3. Oslo.
- Leem, Knud 1748: *En lappisk Grammatica efter den Dialect, som bruges af Field-Lapperne udi Porsanger-Fiorden*. Kiøbenhavn: Gottman Friderich Kisel.
- Lehmann, Christian 1984: *Der Relativsatz. Typologie seiner Strukturen. Theorie seiner Funktionen. Kompendium seiner Grammatik*. Language Universals Series 3. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Lehmann, Christian 1988: Towards a typology of clause linkage. – John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Typological Studies in Language 18. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 181–225.
- Lönnrot, Elias 1854: Ueber den Enare-lappischen dialekt. (Vorgetr. d. 23 Oktob. 1854.). – *Acta Societatis scientiarum Fennicæ 4:1*. Helsingfors: Societas scientiarum Fennicæ. 133–279.
- LW = Lagercrantz, Eliel 1939: *Lappischer Wortschatz*. Lexica Societatis Fennougricæ VI. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Magga, Ole Henrik 1980: *Giellaoahppa. Jietna-, hápmme- ja cealkkaoahppa oanehaččat čilgejuvvon*. Dieđut 3/1980. Guovdageaidnu: Sámi Instituhtta.
- Magga, Ole Henrik 1984: Infinitives within the VP in Northern Sami: the accusative with infinitive. – Bernt Brendemoen, Even Hovdhaugen & Ole Henrik Magga (eds.), *Riepmočála. Essays in honour of Knut Bergsland presented on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*. Oslo: Novus Forlag.
- Magga, Ole Henrik 1986: *Studier i samisk infinitivsyntaks. Del I: Infinitivsetning. Akkusativ og infinitiv*. Guovdageaidnu: Sámi Instituhtta.
- Magga, Ole Henrik 1987: Gielladikšun. – Samuli Aikio et al. (eds.), *Sámás 3. Et morsmålkurs i nordsamisk. En modersmålskurs i nordsamiska*. Oslo: Tiden Norsk Forlag. 125–135.
- Magga, Ole Henrik 2002: Muhtun čuolmmat sámi cealkkaoahpas. – Johanna Ijäs (ed.), *Hástalusat. Sámegiela ja sámi girjjálašvuoda njealját dutkan- ja bagadansymposia raporta. Sámi dieđalaš áigečála 1/2002*: 59–69.
- Magga, Ole Henrik 2004a: Leatgo Norgga giellalágat ja hálddahusvuogit duohta dorvun sámegillii? – Tuomas Magga & Veli-Pekka Lehtola (eds.), *Sámiid rievttit gillii ja historjái. Saamelaisten oikeudet kieleen ja historiaan*. Publications of the Giellagas Institute 3. Oulu: Oulu universitehta. 28–37.
- Magga, Ole Henrik 2004b: Veahkkevearbbaid guossis fas. – Inger Marie Gaup Eira, Johanna Ijäs & Ole Henrik Magga (eds.), *Juho-Niillasa 70-jagi beaivái. Sámi dieđalaš áigečála 1/2004*: 54–67.

- Magga, Ole Henrik 2007: Cealkkavástta – čielga ja anolaš doaba sámi cealkkaoahpa čilgemis? – Jussi Ylikoski & Ante Aikio (eds.), *Sámit, sánit, sátnehámit. Riepmočála Pekka Sammallahtii miessemánu 21. beaivve 2007*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 253. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 279–291.
- Magga, Tuomas 1998: Adnogo giellagáhtten? – Vesa Guttorm (ed.), *Giellačállosat III. Diedut 1/1998*. Guovdageaidnu: Sámi Instituhtta. 68–74.
- Magga, Tuomas 2002: North Saami and majority languages. – Endre Mørck & Tuomas Magga (eds.), *Samiska i ett nytt årtusende*. ANP 2002:717. Köpenhamn: Nordiska ministerrådet. 117–134.
- Malmgren, Sven-Göran 2001: *Förnybart, reliabelt och tvásamt föräldraskap*. Om subjektiv och objektiv produktivitet hos några suffix. – Sture Allén et al. (eds.), *Gäller stam, suffix och ord. Festskrift till Martin Gellerstam den 15 oktober 2001*. Meijerbergs arkiv för svensk ordforskning 29. Göteborg: Elanders Novum. 302–311.
- Mørck, Endre & Tuomas Magga (eds.) 2002: *Samiska i ett nytt årtusende*. ANP 2002:717. Köpenhamn: Nordiska ministerrådet.
- Nedjalkov, Igor' V. 1998: Converbs in the languages of Europe. – Johan van der Auwera & Dónall P. Ó Baoill (eds.), *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 20. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 421–455.
- Nevis, Joel A. 1986: Decliticization and deaffixation in Saame: Abessive *taga*. – Brian D. Joseph (ed.), *Studies on language change*. Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics 34. Columbus: The Ohio State University Department of Linguistics. 1–9.
- Nevis, Joel A. 1988: A morphotactic paradox in Northern Saame: comitative *-guim*. – *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher. Neue Folge* 8: 38–50.
- Nichols, Johanna 2007: What, if anything, is typology? – *Linguistic Typology* 11: 231–238.
- Nickel, Klaus Peter 1994: *Samisk grammatikk*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.
- Nielsen, Konrad 1926: *Lærebok i lappisk. I. Grammatikk. Lydlære, formlære, orddannelselære og syntaks samt tillegg*. Oslo: A.W. Brøgers boktrykkeris forlag.
- Nielsen, Konrad 1932–1962: *Lappisk ordbok. Grunnet på dialektene i Polmak, Karasjok og Kautokeino*. Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Serie B: Skrifter XVII: 1–5. Oslo. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & co. (W. Nygaard).
- Nikanne, Urpo 1997: Suomen infiniittisten adjunktien temporaalinen tulkinta. – *Virittäjä* 101: 338–357.
- Nikolaeva, Irina (ed.) 2007: *Finiteness. Theoretical and empirical foundations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Noonan, Michael 2006: Grammar writing for a grammar-reading audience. – *Studies in Language* 30: 351–365.
- Norde, Muriel (forthcoming): *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- OED = Oxford English Dictionary Online. The definitive record of the English language. [Accessed at <http://dictionary.oed.com/entrance.dtl> 23.1.2008.]
- Olthuis, Marja-Liisa 2000: *Kielâoppâ. Inarinsaamen kielen kielioppi*. [Aanaar:] Sämitigge.
- Pajunen, Anneli 1998: Pääsanaluokkien eriytymättömyydestä uralilaiskielissä. – Anneli Pajunen (ed.), *Kieliopillistumisesta, analogiasta ja typologiasta*. Suomi 185. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 59–109.
- Palismaa, Maaren 2005: Sámmánáid giellahálddašcapmi. Kontrastiiva dutka- muš 6. luohká sámmánáid giellageavaheamis. [Unpublished MA Thesis.] Oulu: University of Oulu, Giellagas Institute for Saami Studies.
- Paunonen, Heikki 1976: Kotikielen Seura 1876–1976. – *Virittäjä* 80: 310–432.
- Pope, Kirsten & Sára, Máret 2004: *Eatnigiella. Giellaoahpu váldogirji*. [Second, revised edition.] Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.
- Ramstedt, G. J. 1903: *Über die Konjugation des Khalkha-Mongolischen*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne XIX. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Ramstedt, G. J. 1939: *A Korean grammar*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne LXXXII. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Rask, Rasmus 1832: *Ræsonneret lappisk Sproglære efter den Sprogart, som bruges af Fjældlapperne i Porsangerfjorden i Finmarken. En Omarbejdelse af Prof. Knud Leems Lappiske grammatica*. København: J. H. Schubothes Boghandling.
- Rasmussen, Torkel 2006: *Suorggatlaš dieđut liegganeami váikkuhusain. Gielalaš bealledahku gullá ruskalihttái*. [A review of Susan Joy Hassol, *Liegganeamen Árttisa čuozausat. Árttalaš dálkádatnuppástusa čuozašárvoštallan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2004.] – *Min Áigi* 31.3.2006, pp. 10–11.
- Ravila, Paavo 1932: *Das Quantitätssystem des seelappischen Dialektes von Maattivuono*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne LXII. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Ravila, Paavo 1935: Die stellung des lappischen innerhalb der finnisch-ugrischen sprachfamilie. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 23: 20–65.
- Ravila, Paavo 1941 [1967]: Kielentutkimus ja positivismi. – *Länsi* 1941: 57–70. [Reprinted: Ravila, Paavo 1967: *Totuus ja metodi. Kielitieteellisiä esseitä*. Porvoo – Helsinki: WSOY. 9–26.]

- Ravila, Paavo 1951 [1967]: Totuus ja metodi kielitieteessä. – *Virittäjä* 55: 113–122. [Reprinted: Ravila, Paavo 1967: *Totuus ja metodi. Kielitieteellisiä esseitä*. Porvoo – Helsinki: WSOY. 27–38.]
- Sammallahti, Pekka 1977: Bridging the gap between two inchoative suffixes: *-škande-* and Lapp *-škoatte-*. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 42: 192–194.
- Sammallahti, Pekka 1998a: Saamic. – Daniel Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic languages*. London – New York: Routledge. 43–95.
- Sammallahti, Pekka 1998b: *The Saami languages. An introduction*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.
- Sammallahti, Pekka 2001: Strict morpheme dependency. An outline of North Saami structure. [Manuscript.]
- Sammallahti, Pekka 2005: *Láidehus sámegiela cealkkaoahpa dutkamii*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.
- Sammallahti, Pekka 2007: *Gielladutkama terminologijja*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.
- Sammallahti, Pekka & Morottaja, Matti 1993: *Säämi-suomâ sänikirje. Inarinsaamelais-suomalainen sanakirja*. Ohcejohka: Girjegiisá Oy.
- Sammallahti, Pekka & Mosnikoff, Jouni 1991: *Suomi-koltansaame sanakirja. Lää'dd-sää'm sää'nnke' rjj*. Ohcejohka: Girjegiisá Oy.
- Sammallahti, Pekka & Nickel, Klaus Peter 2006: *Sámi-duiskka sátnegirji. Saamisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. Karasjok: Davvi Girji.
- Sapir, Edward 1921: *Language. An introduction to the study of speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Saukkonen, Pauli 1965: *Itämerensuomalaisten kielten tulosijainfinitiivi-rakenteiden historiaa. I. Johdanto. Adverbaali infinitiivi*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 137. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Saukkonen, Pauli 1966: *Itämerensuomalaisten kielten tulosijainfinitiivi-rakenteiden historiaa II. Adverbaali infinitiivi (täydennys). Adnominaali infinitiivi. Absoluutti infinitiivi. Elliptinen infinitiivi*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 140. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Schlachter, Wolfgang 1953: Lappische Passivsyntax. – *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* 25: 179–208.
- Schlachter, Wolfgang 1954: Lappische Passivsyntax II. – *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* 26: 149–171.
- Schlachter, Wolfgang 1957: Lappische Passivsyntax III. – *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* 29: 2–32.
- Schlachter, Wolfgang 1960: Lappische Passivsyntax V. – *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* 32: 25–64.

- Schlachter, Wolfgang 1966: Der Agens-Illativ beim Passiv des Lappischen. – *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen I. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Jahrgang 1966.* 9: 395–408. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Spiik, Nils Eric 1989: *Lulesamisk grammatik*. [Second, revised edition.] Luleå: Th Blaasværs Forlag.
- Stockfleth, N. V. 1832: [A letter to Rasmus Rask, dated 17.9.1832.] – Louis Hjelmslev (ed.) 1941: *Breve fra og til Rasmus Rask. II. 1820–1832*. København: Ejnar Munksgaards Forlag. 268–269.
- Tauli, Valter 1966: *Structural tendencies in Uralic languages*. Indiana University publications. Uralic and Altaic Series 17. The Hague: Mouton.
- Teleman, Ulf & Hellberg, Staffan & Andersson, Erik 1999: *Svenska Akademiens grammatik. 2. Ord*. Stockholm: Svenska Akademien & Norstedts Ordbok.
- Tikkanen, Bertil 2001: Converbs. – Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language typology and language universals. An international handbook. Volume 2*. Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 20.2. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter. 1112–1123.
- Toivonen, Ida 2007: Microvariation in Inari Saami. – Jussi Ylikoski & Ante Aikio (eds.), *Sámit, sánit, sátnehámit. Riepmočála Pekka Sammallahtii miessemánu 21. beaivve 2007*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 253. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 389–400.
- Turi, Else R. 1996: Kárášjoga mánáid vearahámiid morfologalaš variašuvnna guorahallan. [Unpublished MA Thesis.] Tromsø: University of Tromsø, Institute of Language and Literature.
- van der Auwera, Johan 1998a: Conclusion. – Johan van der Auwera & Dónall P. Ó Baoill (eds.), *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 20. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 813–836.
- van der Auwera, Johan 1998b: Defining converbs. – Leonid Kulikov & Heinz Vater (eds.), *Typology of verbal categories. Papers presented to Vladimir Nedjalkov on the occasion of his 70th birthday*. Linguistische Arbeiten 382. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. 273–282.
- Vuolab-Lohi, Káre 2007: “Máilmmi alladeamos olmmoš” – Sámegiela giellagáhttema máŋggalágan hástalusat. – Jussi Ylikoski & Ante Aikio (eds.), *Sámit, sánit, sátnehámit. Riepmočála Pekka Sammallahtii miessemánu 21. beaivve 2007*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 253. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 423–429.

- Wiklund, K. B. 1902: Zur geschichte des urlappischen \bar{a} und \bar{u} in unbetonter silbe. II. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 2: 41–71
- Ylikoski, Jussi 2002: Zu den adverbialen Nominalkonstruktionen im Nordlappischen. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 57: 68–166.
- Ylikoski, Jussi 2003a: Defining non-finites: action nominals, converbs and infinitives. – *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 16: 185–237.
- Ylikoski, Jussi 2003b: Havaintoja suomen ns. viidennen infinitiivin käytöstä. – *Sananjalka* 45: 7–44.
- Ylikoski, Jussi 2004a: Zu den adverbialen Nominalkonstruktionen im Nordsaamischen II. Finale Konstruktionen. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 58: 57–161.
- Ylikoski, Jussi 2004b: Remarks on Veps purposive non-finites. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 90: 231–276.
- Ylikoski, Jussi 2005: Puhekielen morfologisten ja semanttisten innovaatioiden tutkimusnäkömiä – esimerkkinä suomen *tekeen-* ja *tekees-*tyyppiset verbimuodot. – *Puhe ja kieli* 25: 187–210.
- Ylikoski, Jussi 2006a: Davvisámegiela *-nláhkai* ~ *-nládje* -suffiksála ii-finihtta vearbaráhkadusat. – *Sámi dieđalaš áigečála* 1/2006: 18–38.
- Ylikoski, Jussi 2006b: Fuomášumit sámegiela adposišuvnnaid funkšuvnnain: ovdamearkan *alde-* ja *ala-*postposišuvnnaid ii-lokála geavaheapmi. – *Sámi dieđalaš áigečála* 1/2006: 39–61.