

- Seržant, Ilja. 2015. Dative experiencer constructions as a Circum-Baltic isogloss. In: P. Arkadiev, A. Holvoet, B. Wiemer (eds.), *Contemporary Approaches to Baltic Linguistics*. De Gruyter. 325-348.
- Zimmerling, A. 2016. Predikativy parametricheskogo priznaka v russkom jazyke. [Predicatives of parametric features in Russian]. In: *Proceedings of the Vinogradov Institute of Russian language [Trudy IRJa RAN]* 10: 358-369.
- Zimmerling A. 2018. Impersonal'nye konstrukcii i dativno-predikativnye struktury v russkom jazyke. [Impersonal constructions and dative-predicative structures in Russian]. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 5: 7–33.

Külli Habicht (University of Tartu), Helen Plado (University of Tartu, Võro Institute)

Indicative or infinitive? Exploring verb form changes in Estonian purpose clauses (17th–20th century)⁹

Complex sentence with purpose clause delivers two verbal situations: the situation of the matrix clause (going to the shop in ex. 1) is performed with the intention of bringing about the situation of the purpose clause (buying milk in ex. 1), i.e., purpose clause expresses the desired result of intentional action.

- (1) *Lähe-n poodi, et piima ost-a.*
go-1SG shop.ILL that milk.PRT buy-INF
'I will go to the shop, in order to buy milk.'
- (2) *Mart laena-s mu-lle raamatu, et ma saa-ks se-da bussi-s luge-da.*
Mart lend-PST.3SG I-ALL book.GEN that I get-CND this-PRT bus-IN read-INF
'Mart lent me a book so that I could read something on the bus.'

In contemporary Estonian, the main verb of the purpose clause introduced by a subordinate conjunction is typically in either the infinitive form (as in ex. 1) or the conditional mood (2) (e.g., Plado 2013, Metslang et al. 2023: 892-893). However, in the Old Literary Estonian, the main verb could appear in the indicative mood (as in 3) or the conditional mood. A similar system exists in contemporary Finnish (Hakulinen et al. 2004: 1079). Additionally, in Võro, a Finnic language spoken in southeastern Estonia, the indicative mood is used in purpose clauses (4). Hence, we argue that the use of the infinitive in Estonian purpose clauses represents a relatively recent development.

- (3) *[--] sa pea-d meite wahhele keskel seis-ma, et sa meite kaebamise-d kuule-d.*
you must-2SG we.GEN between middle stand-SUP that you we.GEN complaining-PL hear-2SG
'you have to stand between us so that you can hear our complaints' (1782)
- (4) *Alomanõ puul oll' kinniq, et külm sisse tulõ-õiq.*
bottom side be.PST.3SG closed that cold inside come.CNG-NEG
'The bottom side was closed, so that cold couldn't come inside'

The presentation will examine the shift from indicative/conditional to infinitive/conditional forms. We will answer the following research questions: 1) when did the change occur? 2) in which constructions was infinitive first introduced, and how did it's usage spread? 3) what were the reasons for this change?

The data is drawn from the Old Literary Estonian corpus, which contains texts dating from the 15th to the 19th century.

⁹ This work is supported by Haridus- ja Teadusministeerium: grant number EKKD-TA2 (*Morphosyntactic variation in Estonian*).

We hypothesize that the use of infinitives in purpose clauses originated as a case of PAT-borrowing (Sakel 2007) from German, the primary contact language of Old Literary Estonian. In German, the verb in a purpose clause can appear in the infinitive, indicative, or conjunctive mood (Heidolph et al. 1984: 85). However, whereas in German, indicative mood remains in use in purpose clauses, in Estonian, it is not possible anymore.

References

- Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen, Irja Alho 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Heidolph, Karl Erich, Walter Flämig, Wolfgang Motsch 1984. *Grundzüge einer deutschen Grammatik*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Metslang, Helle, Mati Ereht, Külli Habicht, Tiit Hennoste, Reet Kasik, Pire Teras, Annika Viht, Eva Liina Asu, Liina Lindström, Pärtel Lippus, Renate Pajusalu, Helen Plado, Andriela Rääbis, Ann Veismann. *Eesti grammatika*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli kirjastus.
- Plado, Helen 2013. Eesti keele otstarbelausest. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 4, 269–284.
- Sakel, Jeanette 2007. Types of loan: Matter and Pattern. Yaron Matras, Jeanette Sakel (eds.) *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 15–30.

Michael Rießler & Idaliia Fedotova (University of Eastern Finland)

Noun phrase types in Uralic and beyond

The description of adjective attribution marking by Rießler (2016) includes a universal ontological classification for morphosyntactic types of NPs. Central typological parameters for the morphosyntactic description of NPs with adjectival modifiers are *syntactic source* (i.e. the central syntactic operation which licenses attribution and belongs primarily either to agreement marking or to government), *syntactic pattern* (i.e. devices projecting embedded NPs, devices projecting simple adjective phrases, or incorporation) and *syntactic locus* of the respective formatives (on-head, on-dependent, floating).

The main goal of our paper is to generalize this typology of adjective attribution to all NPs, incl. different kinds of adnominal modifying constituents (adjectivals, determiners, nominals, clauses, etc.). Based on selected example data from the whole Uralic family as well as non-Uralic languages of the Northern Asian area, we will show that a three dimensional cross-classification of variables based on *source*, *pattern* and *locus* provides sufficient definitions for all NP types attested in these languages.

In addition to well-known types such as NPs where constituents occur in *Juxtaposition* or where dependent constituents show *Head-Driven Agreement*, we will specifically discuss types which have not been described and typologized systematically for Uralic so far. Examples for such types are a) the special marking of attributive adjectives in Saami (*Construct State* in our ontology), b) adnominal numerals governing case marking on the head noun (*Modifier-Headed Case*), c) the so-called “definite adjectives” marked by means of possessive suffixes in Permic (*Attributive Nominalization*) and d) head-marking of possessor nouns by means of possessive suffixes (*Dependent-Driven Agreement*) which occurs in languages from several branches of Uralic.

Whereas the existence of the mentioned NP types in Northern Asian languages is not at all controversial, their description has most typically been language particular (see, for instance, the recent studies by Shluinsky 2020; Däbritz and Budzisch 2022; Däbritz 2023). The ultimate aim of our paper, which is informed by functionally oriented general linguistic theory about NP structure and morphosyntactic categories (e.g. Kibort 2010; Rijkhoff 2002; Nichols 1986), is to increase the level of comparability across