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Abstract

In this thesis we investigate various issues related to the Finnish noun phrase with the main goal of describing the observed phenomenon in the framework of generative grammar. Hence, we assume, as often proposed in the literature (Abney 1987, Cinque 1994, Giusti 1993, 1996 and 2006, and many others), that the noun phrase has three main “layers”, represented in the projection in (1):

\[
\text{(1)} \quad \text{DP} \quad 3) \text{Complementation Area} \\
\quad \text{Spec} \quad \text{D}' \quad 2) \text{Inflectional Area} \\
\quad \text{D}^0 \quad \text{AgrP} \\
\quad \text{Spec} \quad \text{Agr}' \quad 1) \text{NP-shell Lexical Area} \\
\quad \text{Agr}^0 \quad \text{NP} \\
\]

In the Lexical Area the thematic relations are established and theta-roles assigned, in the Inflectional Area modifiers are merged in a hierarchical order and finally, the referential features of the noun phrase are evaluated in the Complementation Area (cf. Giusti 2007).

The paper is organized as follows: in the first chapter we present the linear order of the noun and its modifiers and we make some parallelisms with the order found in clause. Starting from the evident observation that all nominal modifiers are in adnominal position, we will observe that both the adjectival hierarchy proposed by Cinque (1994) and the hierarchy for nominal modifiers of Greenberg’s Universal 20 (discussed in Cinque 2005) are respected in Finnish.

The second chapter concerns the thematic relations in nominal expressions. Finnish, being an agglutinative language with a rich inflectional morphology, is an intriguing ground for some observations on case-assignment and theta-
roles, among others, the (im)possibility of two prenominal genitives and elative case.

In the third chapter we concentrate on the lexical items that can modify a nominal expression. After the Finnish case system, we present, on the lines of Laury (1991) and Juvonen (2000), the possible process of grammaticalization that the demonstrative se ‘it/this/that’ is undergoing. Then, we go through demonstratives, case alternation, word order, pronouns, and of course proper names all of which provide the noun phrase with referential features.

The fourth chapter is devoted to the possessive system. The possessive constructions poses several intriguing questions on their structure and we will analyze data of both standard and colloquial Finnish, assuming that the two “register” have different and independent possessive constructions and applying Cardinaletti’s (1998) bipartition into weak and strong pronouns.

In the fifth chapter we deal with quantifiers and we apply the classification proposed by Giusti & Leko (2001, 2005) to Finnish, which provides further evidence for the classification in Quantity Nouns, Quantity Adjectives and Quantifiers.

Throughout the thesis, we will observe that partitive case occurs under various circumstances (as related to indefiniteness, in quantified expressions, assigned by a set of verbs) and the sixth and last chapter presents some data provided by a test on object case alternation in Finnish/Italian bilinguals with particular reference to the (un)boundedness features of the predicate.
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>partitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>essive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INE</td>
<td>inessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>elative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL</td>
<td>illative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADE</td>
<td>adessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE</td>
<td>abessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>comitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td>instructive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3,etc.</td>
<td>1st, 2nd, 3rd person, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1POSSsg/pl</td>
<td>1st person singular/plural possessive pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2POSSsg/pl</td>
<td>2nd person singular/plural possessive pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3POSS</td>
<td>3rd person singular/plural possessive pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRTC</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG.PRTC</td>
<td>agentive participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRTC.PASS</td>
<td>passive participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRTC.II</td>
<td>second participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3INF</td>
<td>third infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Word order in Finnish

Finnish is a language belonging to the Ural-Altaic family, a language group that has approximately 23 million speakers. The Ural-Altaic family can in turn be divided into two subfamilies: the Finno-Ugric and the Samoyedic. The most important Finno-Ugric languages, for number of speakers, are Hungarian, which belongs to the Ugric languages, Finnish and Estonian, which belong to the Balto-Finnic languages.

Finnish is an agglutinating language and has a case system of 15 cases which can be divided into structural and semantic cases. Nominals and some verbal forms, such as infinitives and participles have case inflection. Finnish nominals show agreement with their modifiers for all nominal features, namely number and case (gender is never realized as a morpho-syntactic feature in this language).

Finnish is partially a pro-drop language because it allows pro-drop for all persons except for third person singular and plural. There are, however, exceptions to this general rule, as third person subjects can be dropped with verbs that have an arbitrary subject and a generic meaning, in addition to verbs denoting weather, emotional states, distance and time.

Finnish is basically an SVO language and shows quite a free constituent movement (as noted among others by Vilkuna 1995, Helasvuo 2001) probably due to its rich inflectional grammar. Generally, new information is given at the end of the sentence (sentential focus), while background information can be moved to the sentence-initial position (topicalization).

1.1 The order of constituents in the clause

In this section we present the word order in the Finnish clause and the restricted movements found in the noun phrase. Since the focus of this thesis
is on the noun phrase, the evidence about clausal structure reported in this section cannot be exhaustive, but only sufficient to highlight the difference between the noun phrase and the clause.

As hinted above, Finnish shows freedom of movement in the overt syntactic component, like German (this property may be historically related to the influence of Germanic languages to Balto-Finnic languages, as noticed, among many others, by Kiparsky 1996, Salminen 1993).

In a language with a rich inflectional morphology such as Finnish it is not surprising that the object and the subject can be moved quite freely as the case inflection expresses the grammatical function of the noun, as in (1) a-b.

(1)  
   a. Liisa rakastaa Jussia  
      S  V  O  
      Liisa-NOM love-PRES3sg Jussi-PART  
      ‘Liisa loves Jussi’  
   b. Jussia rakastaa Liisa  
      O  V  S  
      Jussi-PART love-PRES3sg Liisa-NOM  
      ‘Liisa loves Jussi’

Hence, in addition to the standard word order which is felt as the most neutral and natural, non-neutral word-orders are given by constituent movement in order to assign markedness or emphasis to the moved element¹, as exemplified in (2) where we give the neutral order, (2)a, and all the possible non-neutral orders for a transitive sentence, (2)b-f:

(2)  
   a. SVO Maija osti kirjan  
      Maija-NOM bought book-ACC  
   b. SOV Maija kirjan osti  
      Maija-NOM book-ACC bought

¹ See also Vilkuna 1995 on focus, intended as “new information”, in Finnish sentences. She also claims that Finnish does not have a particular focus position.
c. OVS kirjan osti Maija
book-ACC bought Maija-NOM

d. OSV kirjan Maija osti
book-ACC Maija-NOM bought

e. VOS osti kirjan Maija
bought book-ACC Maija-NOM

f. VSO osti Maija kirjan
bought Maija-NOM book-ACC

From the interpretation of the SVO order as neutral it is evident that new information is generally given at the end of the sentence, whereas background information is provided sentence initially.

Following Holmberg & Nikanne (2002), Finnish is a topic-prominent language (as closely-related Hungarian), which means that the argument which is externalized in the Spec,IP position need not be the subject but can be any category capable of functioning as a topic. In this sense Finnish differs from subject-prominent languages (i.e. English) which have the subject that is externalized.

A different analysis is that there are clause types with a word order different from the standard SVO order (Sulkala & Karjalainen 1992, Vilkuna 1995): the existential clause (3)a, the possessive clause (3)b, and the relative clause (3)c have an AdvVS order, the experiential clause has an OV order (3)d, the state clause (in Sulkala & Karjalainen’s term, i.e. with weather verbs) can be V-initial or have a AdvV order (3)e.

(3)  a. ulkona on autoja
outside olla-PRES3sg car-PARTpl

b. minulla on kirjoja
me-ALL olla-PRES3sg book-PARTpl

c. sanoin, että huomenna tulee Kaisa
say-PAST1sg that tomorrow arrive-PRES3sg Kaisa
Holmberg and Nikanne (2002) have pointed out that a V-initial sentence is possible only when there are no potential topics, which can move to sentence initial position, as exemplified in (4) (from Holmberg & Nikanne 2002) and in (5):

(4) a. ilmeni ongelmia
   appeared problem-PARTpl
   ‘problems appeared/there appeared problems’

b. *?ongelmia ilmeni
   problem-PARTpl appeared

(5) a. Maija huutaa
   Maija-NOM shouts/is shouting

b. *huutaa Maija
   shouts/is shouting Maija-NOM

From (4) it emerges that the subject cannot move to sentence-initial position, hence the sentence is grammatical only if V-initial, whereas in (5) the sentence is grammatical and has a neutral interpretation only when the subject, which is a potential topic in Holmberg & Nikanne’s terms, is moved to sentence-initial position (we remark that (5)b is marginal and is marked with *? because it strongly contrasts with (5)a).

Let us consider again a transitive clause, as in (6):

(6) a. Matti näki Maijan
   Matti-NOM see-PAST3sg Maija-ACC

b. Maijan Matti näki
   Maija-ACC Matti-NOM see-PAST3sg
Notice that (6)c is more natural if a clitic particle –hän/-päl, otherwise it may sound a bit odd because of the presence of other constituents that can function as topics. The preference for the presence of a clitic particle –hän/-päl hints to the assumption that in (6) the V-initial is not, however, the most neutral order and the insertion of the particle hints to a sort of verbal focalization. On the lines of Vilkuna (1989) and Holmberg & Nikanne (2002, 2008) the Finnish clause has the structure in (7), where C hosts a Wh-element or a category with contrastive information, as evident from the occurrence of the interpretation of the particles –hän/-päl that occur only on the first element of the clause.

(7) \[
\text{CP} \text{ C [FP Fin [NegP Neg [TP T [AuxP Aux [PtcP Participle [VP V [NP N]]]]]]]}
\]

Observe also the contrast in (8)a-b. In (8)a the verb is conjugated in a simple form and can be in sentence-initial position, where the clitic particle signals that the verb has moved through head-movement to C. In (8)b only the auxiliary can be moved to sentence-initial position, as exemplified in the ungrammatical (8)c. Unfortunately, we are not going to analyse the particles in (6)c and (8)a here and we leave open for the moment all questions concerning their morpho-syntax.

(8) \begin{align*}
\text{a. tunnen(han) minä hänet} \\
\text{know-PRES1sg I-NOM him/her} \\
\text{‘I know him/her’}
\end{align*}

\footnote{\textit{-han/hän} is a “pragmatic particle” (Karlsson & Hakulinen 1979) as \textit{-kin, -ko/kö, -pa/päl}. Adjoined particles are the only instance of clitic morphemes in Finnish. The semantics of these particles is related to discourse features and changes also depending on the constituent they are attached to.}
b. on Pekka ennenkin käynyt siellä
aux-3sg Pekka-NOM before+kin go-PRTCPast there
‘Pekka has been there (also) other times’
c. * käynyt on Pekka ennenkin siellä
go-PRTCPast aux-3sg Pekka-NOM before+kin there

As for adverbs and their linear order in the clause we will first present their classification in the literature and then we will observe if the hierarchy proposed by Cinque’s (1999) is also evident for Finnish.

Traditional grammars starting from Ahlmann (1933) and Hakulinen & Karlsson (1979) make a distinction between adverbs and adverbials in Finnish. The first are classified in i) adverbs of intensity, which modify adjectives, quantifiers and material adverbs (erittäin ‘very’, hyvin ‘well’, melko ‘quite’, etc.), in ii) material adverbs, and finally in iii) adverbs of modality, which in turn can be divided in i’) adverbs having scope over the whole clause and that can appear either sentence-initially or after the verb (ehkä ‘may be’, epäilemättä ‘with no doubt’, tuskin ‘hardly’), in ii’) adverbs which can have scope over any constituent of the clause (edes ‘at least’, ainakin ‘at least’, myös ‘also’, vain ‘only’) and in iii’) adverbs pragmatically similar to these but that can appear in sentence-initial position or after the first constituent and have scope over the whole clause (kyllä ‘sure’, muuten ‘otherwise’) (Ahlmann 1933). It has been assumed (Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979) that the relevant position is quite free for adverbs of time like eilen ‘yesterday’ and huomenna ‘tomorrow’ and is a bit more restricted for the other “material” adverbs as auki ‘open’, kauas ‘far’, ulkona ‘outside’, yksin ‘alone’. The “intensity” adverbs such as hyvin ‘well’, melko ‘quite/rather’, erittäin ‘very’, näin ‘like this/such’ appear before the adjective, quantifier or “material” adverb they define.

This classification doesn’t handle the issue of a possible hierarchy internal to adverbs and we tentatively adopt for Finnish the classification of Cinque (1999), who observes the order of occurrence of adverbs and identifies
different classes of adverbs: the “higher adverb classes” linearly precede the “lower adverb classes”, in the order resumed in (9):

(9) higher (sentence) AdvPs > lower AdvPs > (DP subject) (V) complements > place, time, manner, etc. adverbials > (focused) lower AdvPs > de-accented material

For Finnish we propose that the sequence in (9) corresponds to the order in (10):

(10) (H Adv) avoimesti > onneksi > ilmeisesti > todennäköisesti > nyt/yhden kerran > ehkä > viisasti > (L Adv) tavallisesti > jo > ei enää > aina > kokonaan > hyvin/huonosti

This order gives the grammatical results exemplified in (11):

a. **onneksi** Liisa **nyt** toivoo **ehkä** kirjaa
   
   fortunately Liisa now wish-PRES3sg perhaps book-PARTsg
   
   ‘Fortunately Liisa wishes perhaps a book’ (?)

b. **ilmeisesti** Maija ei **tavallisesti** enää itke öisin
   
   probably Maija not usually longer cry-PRES3sg night-INSTR
   
   ‘Probably Maija no longer cries in the night’

c. **viisaasti** Matti ei halua **enää** **aina** mennä diskoon
   
   wisely Matti not want-PRES3sg longer always go-INF disco-ILLsg
   
   ‘Wisely Matti no longer always wants to go to the disco’

(12) a. *ehkä Liisa nyt toivoo onneksi kirjaa
   
   perhaps Liisa now wish-PRES3sg fortunately book-PARTsg

b. *tavallisesti Maija ei ilmeisesti enää itke öisin
   
   usually Maija-NOM not probably longer cry-PRES3sg night-INSTR

c. *aina Matti ei halua enää viisasti mennä diskoon
   
   always Matti-NOM not want-PRES3sg longer wisely go-INF disco-ILLsg
Nevertheless, in Manninen (2003) we find a different approach to Finnish adverbs and adverbials. Starting from an analysis of the different forms of Finnish adverbials (nouns, adjectives, numerals, infinitival verbs, prepositional and postpositional phrases, adverbs) she argues against Cinque’s analysis for three main reasons: 1) it does not account for circumstantial adverbs, 2) it cannot be maximally restrictive since it permits that two different adverbials can be merged, and 3) it makes wrong predictions about the co-occurrence restrictions on adverbials. In order to cross over the encountered problems, she argues that adverbials are licensed as phrases rather than heads and provides evidence for a kasus/kase phrase, which accounts for a uniform analysis of the adverbials in Finnish. As for the hierarchical order of adverbials, in order to account for the apparent free linear order in which circumstantial adverbials are found, Manninen (2003) proposes that unambiguous hierarchical orders need not to correspond to total linear orders.

We cannot go deeper through the facts observed in this paragraph but just present the linear order of the constituents in the clause in order to note its difference on movement with the nominal expression.

1.2. Word order and interpretation

Let us now observe the possible [± DEFINITE] interpretation that different word orders can give. Despite Finnish has a quite free word order, there is a “standard word order” felt by native speakers as neutral with reference to discourse. Referring to this, we can say that the [± DEFINITE] feature can also be expressed by the position of the noun in the sentence, the sentence final position being a [-DEF] position and the sentence initial position a [+DEF] position. This may support the hypothesis of a DP/KP projection, as in (13),
which is presumably empty and where the definiteness features of the noun phrase are checked (cf. Giusti 1993, 1995, 2001 and the discussion in chapter 3).

\[(KP/DP \text{ Case/Referentiality}/\pm\text{Def}[\text{ConcP} [\text{NP}]]\]

(13)

\[(14)\]

a. tyttö kävelee polulla
   
   girl-NOMsg walk-PRES3sg path-ADEsg
   
   ‘The/a girl is walking on a path’

b. polulla kävelee tyttö
   
   path-ADEsg walk-PRES3sg girl-NOMsg
   
   ‘On the path is walking a girl’

c. yksi tyttö kävelee polulla
   
   one-NOMsg girl-NOMsg walk-PRES3sg path-ADEsg
   
   ‘a girl is walking on the path’

(15)

\[(15)\]

a. työt kävelevät polulla
   
   girl-NOMpl walk-PRES3pl path-ADEsg
b. */polulla kävelevät työt
   
   path-ADEsg walk-PRES3pl girl-NOMpl
c. tyttöjä kävelee polulla
   
   girl-PARTpl walk-PRES3sg path-ADEsg
d. polulla kävelee tyttöjä
   
   path-ADEsg walk-PRES3sg girl-PARTpl

The different possible orders can be related to what Belletti (1988) observed for the Definiteness Effect in her discussion on partitive case. Following the Definiteness Effect, a preverbal subject can be either definite or indefinite, differently from a postverbal subject NP that can only be indefinite. In the singular, the numeral *yksi ‘a/one’ needs to be inserted in order to have a clear [-DEF] interpretation of the preverbal subject, (14)c. If the subject NP is plural then partitive case is required in order to have the [-DEF] feature on it, (15)a-d.\(^3\) In the plural, partitive is related to [-DEF] features in both preverbal and

\(^3\) (15)b is ungrammatical only with a [-DEF] interpretation of the subject *työt ‘girls’ but grammatical if *polulla ‘on the path’ is contrastively localized.
postverbal position whereas nominative can appear only on the preverbal subject since it is related to [+DEF]. It seems that the singular postverbal subject NP even if marked with nominative case has a [-DEF] feature parallel to the partitive plural subject, either preverbal or postverbal. The [-DEF] feature of a postverbal subject is evident also by the counterparts of English existential sentences, as we can observe in (16):

(16)a. there is a man in the room / *there is the man in the room  
   huoneessa on mies  
   room-IN€sg is man-NOMs$g  
b. the man is in the room  
   mies on huoneessa  
   man-NOMs$g is room-IN€sg

Another piece of evidence for the definiteness of preverbal positions is given by impersonal passive constructions such as (17):

(17)a. mies tapettiin  
   man-NOMs$g kill-PAST.PASS  
   ‘the man was killed’  
b. tapettiin mies  
   kill-PAST.PASS man-NOMs$g  
   ‘a man was killed’  

(18)a. miehet tapettiin  
   man-NOMpl kill-PAST.PASS  
b. ?*tapettiin miehet  
   kill-PAST.PASS man-NOMpl  
c. miehiä tapettiin  
   man-PARTpl kill-PAST.PASS  
d. tapettiin miehiä  
   kill-PAST.PASS man-PARTpl

Strong evidence for the [+ DEF] feature on preverbal subjects is that only (17)a but not (17)b can be used in contexts where we refer to a man previously
introduced in the discourse, as also confirmed by the plural counterparts in (18)a-d, where the postverbal nominative [+DEF] subject in (18)b is marginal and cannot have a [-DEF]. We can conclude with two remarks: first, the preverbal position in Finnish can be [± DEF] whereas postverbal is [-DEF], and second, in line with Belletti, the Definiteness Effect concerns the nature of indefinite subjects in sentences involving unaccusative verbs, as we exclude the Definiteness Effect appearing with transitive and intransitive verbs, the patterning of Finnish being the same as for French (19), and English (20).

(19) a. trois filles ont parlé à Pierre
    b. * il a parlé à Pierre trois filles

(20) a. Mary ate an apple
    b. * there ate an apple Mary

The aim of this overview on the mobility of constituents internally to the clause was to give a better understanding on the missed parallelism with nominal expressions, which has a more rigid word order, as we will describe in the next paragraph.

1.3 The order of constituents in the Nominal Expression

It seems that while it is possible to move elements in the clause with a relative freedom, the movement possibilities in the noun phrase are very restricted. This asymmetry between the clause and the noun phrase is evident with regard to nominal modifiers. In general, all the modifiers of the noun appear prenominally, as in (21). This is not the case for the adverbs in the clause (22), where the adverb can appear in different structural positions, in (22)c the adverb is contrastively focused:

(21) a. Maijan tarkka kuvaus rakennuksista
     Maija-GEN accurate-NOM description-NOM buildings-ELAp1
     ‘Maija’s accurate description of the buildings’
b. *Maijan kuvaus tarkka rakennuksista
   Maija-GEN description-NOM accurate-NOM buildings-ELApl

(22)a. Maija kuvasi tarkasti rakennukset
   Maija-NOM described accurately buildings-ACCpl
b. Maija kuvasi rakennukset tarkasti
   Maija-NOM described buildings-ACCpl accurately
c. Maija tarkasti kuvasi rakennukset
   Maija-NOM accurately described buildings-ACCpl

We assume that in Finnish the noun does not move from its low base-position, where it is generated. It carries number and case $\phi$-features which are copied on its prenominal modifiers and and on its complements on the basis of the general assumption (cf. Giusti 2002) that all the functional heads of an extended nominal projection share the same $\phi$-features, as in (23):

(23) kaikille mukaville ja rehellisille ystävilleni
   all-ALLpl  nice-ALLpl  and  honest-ALLpl  friend-ALLpl+POSS1sg
   ‘to all my nice and honest friends’

1.3.1 Determiners and possessors

In the nominal possessive construction (on the Finnish possessive system see also ch. 4), the possessum can never precede the possessor, even if this is stressed and irrespectively of whether it is expressed by a full DP in genitive case, as in (24)a, or by a pronominal form, as in (24)b:

(24) a. *koira Pekan / PEKAN
   dog-NOMsg Pekka-GENsg
b. *koirani minun /MINUN
   dog-POSS1sg my
c. Pekan koira
   Pekka-GENsg dog-NOMsg
d. minun koirani
my dog-POSS1sg

As for the order of nominal modifiers we refer to the predicted order in Greenberg’s Universal 20 (see also Cinque 2005) and reported in (25) and (26). In (27) we find that this linear order is maintained in the Finnish nominal construction.

(25) “When any or all the items demonstrative, numeral, and descriptive adjective, precede the noun, they are always found in this order. If they follow, the order is either the same or its exact opposite” (Greenberg 1978)

(26) Dem > Num > A > N
(27) tämä yksi kaunis kukka
‘this one beautiful flower’

The occurrence of one or more of these lexical items in postnominal position would lead to an ungrammatical result:

(28)a. *tämä kaunis kukka yksi
this beautiful flower one
b. *tämä yksi kukka kaunis
this one flower beautiful

From this we conclude that no leftward movement of the noun is allowed. A different case is that of the demonstrative that can exceptionally appear in postnominal position, when occurring with an ostension (indicated by the arrow), as exemplified in (29):

(29) yksi kaunis kukka, tämä→
‘one beautiful flower, this’

However, the underlying structure of (29) is different from the structure in (27). The required pause and ostension hint to an appositive structure instead
of indicating the demonstrative’s base-position. However, the low base-position of the demonstrative can be inferred from the position of the locative reinforcer as in (30)a-b, under the assumption of Brugé (2002) that the demonstrative and the locative form one constituent because they can move together, as is visible from languages such as Bosnian (30)a, non-standard English, (30)b, and Norwegian, (30)c, but not from Finnish, as in (31)c, for which at Spell-Out level the demonstrative has obligatorily moved to sentence-initial position in order to check its features whereas the locative stays in its postnominal position.

(30) a. ona tamo (nova) kniga (Bosnian)
    that there (new) book
b. this here (nice) book (nonstandard English)
c. denne herre (flotte) bilen (Norwegian)
    this here (nice) car-the

(31) a. hänen kaunis kirjansa, tämä tässä
    his beautiful book-POSS3sg, this here
b. tämä hänen kaunis kirjansa [ e ] tässä
    this his beautiful book-POSS3sg here

c. *tämä tässä hänen kirjansa
    this here his book-POSS3sg

Following this assumption, the relevant structure is:

(32)
Across languages demonstratives can move to [Spec,DP] before Spell-Out, and this movement can be obligatory, optional or null. The final position is crosslinguistically the same and it is assumed to be the specifier position. This is also suggested by crosslinguistic evidence (i.e. Giusti 1997 for Rumanian) as the demonstrative allows N-to-D movement and it follows that it cannot occupy D°. Brugé and Giusti (1996) claim that the demonstrative is in the specifier of a functional projection that belongs to the extended nominal projection. The demonstrative should not only be prenominal but also in the higher position, as we see from (33)c.

(33) a. tämä kaunis kukka
   ‘this beautiful flower’

b.*kaunis kukka tämä
   ‘beautiful flower this’

c.*kaunis tämä kukka
   ‘beautiful this flower’

Brugé and Giusti also claim that raising of the demonstrative takes place in order to check the Referential and Deictic features of the demonstrative in Spec,DP. From the empirical evidence in (30) and (33), and for the referential reading of a noun modified by a demonstrative, we can conclude that for Finnish this movement is obligatory, and that the base position is signalled by the locative tässä/tuolla ‘here/there’. The pattern is parallel to Italian, French, German, and Albanian, and according to the parameterized principle on when checking [+ referential] feature happens (cf. Brugé 2002), Finnish is assumed to have a strong [+ referential] feature because checking is before Spell-Out and the demonstrative appears in the prenominal position, whereas for languages in which checking occurs after Spell-Out and before Logical Form, the [+ referential] feature is weak.
We can also conclude that in Finnish the noun moves one step to the lowest functional head in the inflectional layer to cross over the low demonstrative position and appear to the left of the standard locative. Finnish is coherent with the argument in favour of the XP status of the demonstrative, which blocks wh-movement of a genitive out of the nominal projection, as we see from the contrast in (34):

(34) a. tämä Liisan taulu on myyty
   this-NOMsg Liisa-GENsg paintingNOMsg has been sold
   ‘This Liisa’s painting has been sold’
   b. kenen (*tämä) taulu on myyty?
   who-GENsg (this) painting has been sold
   ‘Whose painting has been sold?’

Finally, as observed by Grimshaw (1990) for other languages, demonstratives and locative reinforcers are only marginally accepted with abstract and event nouns, (35)a-c, and when they are accepted, they cannot be reinforced. This is evident in (35)a-b, with the demonstrative se ‘it, this, that’ and the corresponding locative siellä ‘there’ the sentence is grammatical only in a pure locative sense (the interpretation being something like “that time that we were there”). (35)a-b contrasts with (36)c which is fine for the occurrence of an object denoting nominal:

(35) a. tämä kerta (?*tässä)
   ‘this time here’
   b.* tuo kerta tuolla / *se kerta siellä
   ‘that time there’
   c. tuo tuho (*tuolla)
   ‘that destruction there’ (grammatical only in the result interpretation)

(36) a.tämä heidän typerä ajatuksensa (*tässä) ei vakuuta ketään
   ‘this their stupid thought here does not convince anybody’
   b. tämä vanha kirja tässä ei ole myynnissä
   ‘this old book here is not on sale’
From (35) and (36) we have empirical evidence to conclude that the locative reinforcer is grammatical only when associated with object denoting nominals, which are concrete entities opposed to abstract ones, as exemplified in (35)a-b and (36)a.

In this section, we have observed the position of possessives and demonstratives. In Finnish, parallel to English, all the complements and modifiers of the noun are prenominal and the locative reinforcer follows the noun. In the next section we will deal with the prenominal order of adjectives and other modifiers, such as quantifiers.

1.3.2 Adjectives and other modifiers

In the literature (cf. Hakulinen et al. 2004) Finnish adjectives have been classified into:

- Relative APs, including “subject-oriented” and “object-oriented” adjectives that denote shape, character or state of mind;

- Absolutes APs, denoting qualities such as material, origin, colour, age, or other qualities like sosioekonominen ‘socio-economical’; contrary to relatives, they generally cannot be intensified nor compared;

- Compound APs formed by a relative adjective + a “specifying” adjective (sikahuono-litt. ‘pig bad’>’very bad’, pienikokoinen-litt.’small sized’>’small’, jääkylmä-litt.’ice cold’, pienenpieni-litt. ‘little little’), and cannot be compared;

- Individuality denoting APs such as ainoa ‘sole/only’, paras ‘best’, that cannot be intensified nor compared;

- Proportion APs formed by the –inen ending adjectives and are preceded by a genitival qualifier (as metrin-GEN pituinen ‘long (as) a metre’). They make
a proportion between a quality of the entities X and Y, and in general cannot take comparative reading.

- Indeclinable APs consisting of adjectives such as *pikku* ‘small’, *aimo* ‘huge’, *ensi* ‘first’, *viime* ‘last’, that are strictly related to the noun they modify, cannot be compared, and not surprisingly they often form compound nouns.

- “pro-adjectives”, a subset of adjectives with a pronominal stem that refer to a quality previously introduced in the discourse (*sellainen* ‘such’, *eräänlainen* ‘a kind of’, *sikälainen* ‘local’, *millainen* ‘what kind of/any kind’).

Adjectives should precede the noun they modify and postnominal adjectives are not allowed, with the exception that will be observed in (40)- (46).

It is possible to detect a set of adjectives that cannot be used predicatively. Using the labels above, we can say that the set of adjectives that cannot be used predicatively consists of indeclinable adjectives, (37)a. As expected in Cinque’s (2005) proposal, these adjectives cannot be used in postnominal appositive reading or even in “full” relative clauses (37)b-c:

(37) a. *tämä vuosi on viime

a’. tämä vuosi on viimeinen

    This year is last

b. *tämä kerta, viime ja eri, on ikimuistoinen

b’. tämä kerta, viimeinen ja erilainen, on ikimuistoinen

    This time, last and different, is unforgettable

c. *tämä kerta, joka on viime, on ikimuistoinen.

    c’. tämä kerta, joka on viimeinen, on ikimuistoinen.

    This time, that is last, is unforgettable.

In order to use these indeclinable adjectives in predicative sentences or with a postnominal appositive interpretation, they should be transformed in –*inen* ending adjectives, as in (37)a’-b’-c’. This sort of alternation resembles the short and long adjectival forms found for example in Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian
(cf. Leko 1996, Trenkic 2004), where only one form is allowed in predicate position (the “short” one). We give in (38) the “long” –inen form derived from the indeclinable adjectives that cannot be used predicatively.

(38) eri > erilainen ‘different’,
ensi > ensimmäinen ‘first’
kello > kelloinen ‘good/acceptable’
kunnon > kunnollinen ‘proper’
melko > melkoinen ‘fairly/pretty’
pikku > pikkulainen ‘little/small’
tosi > todellinen ‘real’
viime > viimeinen ‘last’

Moreover, there are indeclinable adjectives, such as pelkkä ‘mere’ and silkka ‘pure/simple’, which do not have a possible –inen long form and hence can be only in adnominal position.

As for adjectives, there are two exceptions to the general rule about the obligatory prenominal position of nominal modifiers.

Let us first observe their main characteristics in Finnish. Adjectives are base-generated at the left of the noun (cf. Cinque 1994) and the noun does not move across them. Another main property of adjectives is the agreement for case and number with the noun they modify. We exemplify these observations in (39):

(39) a. kauniille nuorelle kiltille prinsessalle annettiin ruusu
   beautiful-ALLsg young-ALLsg good-ALLsg princess-ALLsg was given
   rose-NOMsg
   ‘a rose was given to the beautiful young good princess’
b. presidentti nousi isoon valkoiseen lentokoneeseen
   president-NOMsg boarded big-ILLsg white-ILLsg airplane-ILLsg
   ‘the president boarded on a big white airplane’
The first exception consists of postnominal adjectival modifiers that appear in exclamations (40)a of vocative expressions in imperative sentences (40)b, and are delimited by context and discourse. The second one consists of adjectives that are parallel to “reduced” relative clauses, as we will observe in (46).

(40) a. tyttö parka!
   girl-NOM poor-NOM

b. lapsi kiltti, tuo minulle kynä
   child-NOM good-NOM, bring-IMPER.pres me-ALL pen-ACC

In Finnish there is no vocative case (as i.g. in Latin) and in (40) the only possible case in these constructions is nominative, the case which has no real case-marking and which therefore has been proposed as a non-case (Vainikka 1989, 1993). We assume, in line with Longobardi (1994), Szabolcsi (1984), and Abney (1987) that in (40) the noun raises across the adjective, the linear order being (41)b rather than (41)a.

(41) a. [ν NP [ν N]]
   b. [ν [ν D NP ]]}

The context for the occurrence of postnominal adjectives is limited to “affective” ones and presumes discourse-external factors such as a confidential relationship between the speaker and the hearer (i.e. formal letters are indeed excluded). These occurrences recall the Italian vocative expressions with the adjective in postnominal position (cf. Longobardi 1994):

(42) Gianni mio caro, vieni qui!
   Gianni my dear come here

These nominal constructions are allowed both in standard and in colloquial Finnish. In the former postnominal adjectives consist of the heading of letters and e-mails, whereas in the latter postnominal adjectives are used in vocative exclamations within family and relatives, and domestic animals. The adjectives used are in general “positive” and loving ones, such as rakas ‘dear’,
kiltti ‘good’, raukka ‘poor’ and parka ‘poor’ (the last two in the benevolent sense). We remark that among these, only the adjectives rakas ‘dear’ and kiltti ‘good’ can appear either prenominally or postnominally, (43) a-b.

(43) a. kiltti poika
good boy
b. poika kiltti
boy good

On the other hand, raukka ‘poor’ and parka ‘poor’ are grammatical only in postnominal position. In this respect they represent a very particular subset of adjectives, given, as we have observed, that adjectival modifiers are always prenominal. Also notice that the nouns that can occur before those adjectives constitute a closed class which includes kinship terms, such as äiti ‘mother’, isä ‘father’, tätä ‘aunt’, poika ‘boy’, tyttö ‘girl’, sisko ‘sister’, veli ‘brother’, and pets, such as koira ‘dog’, kissa ‘cat’, and the diminutives derived from those nouns that obviously belong to colloquial Finnish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinship N</th>
<th>“affective” APs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pet N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the number feature, singular is the most common even if plurals such as those in (44), are not excluded.

(44) a. äiti ja isä rakkaat
mother and father dear-PL
b. pojat kiltit
boys good-PL

In these constructions the possessive suffix, which usually attaches to the head noun, can occur on the adjective and this suggests that the noun and the
adjective form a compound noun, as also confirmed by the spelling in (45), in which there is no internal case agreement between the head and the modifier:

(45) a. voi tyttöparkani!
    oh girl-poor-POSS1sg
    ‘Oh, my poor girl!’

As hinted above, the second exception to the generalization that adjectives appear prenominally is represented in (46)a, where the adjectives are parallel to “reduced” relative clauses (in the sense of Cinque 2005), as we see from the “full” relative clause in (46)b:

(46) a. hänen vastauksensa, viisas ja tarkka, hämmästytti opiskelijoita.
    ‘his/her answer, wise and precise, surprised the students’

b. hänen vastauksensa, joka oli viisas ja tarkka, hämmästytti opiskelijoita.
    ‘his/her answer that was wise and precise, surprised the students’

In sentences such as (46)a the adjectives should be put after a pause and have appositive interpretation. The adjective can refer to either the head or to the complement, as is shown in (47)a-b, and it needs not be necessarily adjacent to the modified noun but must agree for case and number with it, as is evident from (47)c:

(47) a. varkaan salaperäinen katoaminen
    thief-GENsg mysterious-NOMsg disappearance-NOMsg
    ‘the thief’s mysterious disappearance’

b. salaperäisen varkaan katoaminen
    mysterious-GENsg thief-GENsg disappearance-NOMsg
    ‘the disappearance of the mysterious thief’

c. salaperäinen varkaan katoaminen
    mysterious-NOMsg thief-GENsg disappearance-NOMsg
    ‘the thief’s mysterious disappearance’
We observe that the genitival modifier can either precede the adjective (59)a or be located between the adjective and the noun (59)c. We will focus on the position of the Genitive in chapter 2. For the moment we leave the issue open.

1.3.2.1 Adjectival hierarchy

Also for Finnish, as noted for other languages such as English and Italian, (cf. Cinque 1994), it is possible to observe a hierarchy in the order of the adjectives. Adjectives are assumed to be in the Specifier position of intermediate functional projections between a higher FP and NP. Following Giusti (1993) we assume that the FP projection hosts the case features projected on the adjectives and the noun. The morphological agreement on adjectives is explained by assuming the presence of a functional head for each specifier. The AP is left-branched with respect to the N it refers to. In the following representation we give the proposed hierarchy of adjectives for object denoting nominals (48) and event nominals (50):

(48) \[ FP \text{ [AP SIZE [AP AGE [AP COLOUR [AP ORIGIN [AP MATERIAL [NP N]]]]]]} \]

(49) \[ FP \text{ [AP pienessä [AP vanhassa [AP valkoisessa [AP suomalaisessa [AP puisessa [NP talossa]]]]]] on paljon kukkia} \]
small-INE old-INE white-INE Finnish-INE wooden-INE house-INE is a lot flowers-PARTpl
’In the small old white Finnish wooden house there are a lot of flowers’

(50) \[ FP \text{ [AP CARD,[AP ORDINAL,[AP SPEAKER-OR,[AP SUB], \ OR,[AP MANNER/THEMATIC]]]]} \]

(51) \[ FP \text{ [AP kaksi [AP ensimmäistä [AP mahdollista [AP tyhmää [AP suoraa [NP vastavaikutusta]]]]]]} \]
Two first-PART possible-PART- stupid-PART direct-PART reaction-PART
Let us briefly go back to indeclinable adjectives and in particular to the adjective *pikku* ‘little/small’. On the lines of Cinque (2006), we observe that this adjective, despite the ‘size’ reading, can also have an endearing interpretation. Its co-occurrence with a SIZE adjective gives the possibilities in (52), opposite to the behaviour of an apparently synonym adjective as *pieni* ‘small’, suggests that it could be in a lower position with respect to the SIZE category, showing a similar behaviour to the English *little* which has also a connotative interpretation, differently from *small*, which has only a denotative reading (cf. Cinque 2006). Indeed, in (53) *little* cannot precede the potential synonyms *tiny*.

(52) a. iso pikkuauto
    big little-car
b. *iso pieni auto
    big small car

(53) a. a tiny little girl
    b. *a little tiny girl

As happens for other languages, the same adjective can be generated in different structural positions, in other words, for example *vihreä* ‘green’ can denote either AGE or COLOUR (and it is used also in idiomatic expressions with different meanings).

(54) a. vihreässä nuoruudessani olin haaveilija
    green-INEsg youth-INEsg+POSS1sg be-PAST1sg dreamer-NOM
    ‘in my early youth I was a dreamer’
b. vihreä maljakko on kaapissa
    green-NOMsg vase-NOMsg be-PRES3sg cupboard-INEsg
    ‘the green vase is in the cupboard’

In Finnish, the material denoting adjective, being the nearest to *N*, may optionally form a compound noun with it, in which case of course it is not marked with either case or number features. Generally, the material-denoting
adjective is the most likely to form a compound with the head noun, the
others are excluded even if they happen to be in the nearest AP to N
(exception consist of lexicalised uses).  

(55) a. pyöreä uusi vihreä suomalainen lasikulho
   ‘round new green Finnish glass-bowl’
   b. *uusikulho
   new-bowl

Referring to thematic adjectives in (51), these, and others such as entinen
‘former’ in (56)a, differ from pure “descriptive” adjectives such as kaunis
‘beautiful’, (56)b, in the sense that they seem to be parallel to adverbs in
relative clauses (cf. Cinque 2005):

(56) a. entinen presidentti
   former president (the X that was formerly president)
   b. kaunis tyttö
   beautiful girl (*? the X that was beautifully a girl)

It has been suggested with evidence from Finnish (Scott 1994) that the labels in
(48) and (50) are not fine-grained enough and the adjectival hierarchy can be
further decomposed, in order to account, for example, for utterances such as
(57) where the “size” category, can further split into categories denoting
height, weight, length, and width.

---

4 A+N compound nouns have in common a different semantics from A N order. They can be
roughly classified in the following groups: (i) toponyms, like Uusimaa, both A and N are
marked by case; (ii) more recent compounds, that have only N marked for case; (iii) particular
uses of indeclinable adjectives, which are normally “separate” (tosiasia ‘real matter’, isoäiti
‘grandmother’); (iv) A+A-inen (runnasalumien ‘snowy’, samannäköinen ‘similar’); (v) A marked
with Gen. +N (byväintähtoinen ‘benevolent’). If either A or N is rare or long it is possible to write
them separately. Finally, N+ A compound nouns are common for colours (helmentharmaa ‘pearly
grey’, lumivalkea ‘snow-white’). Moreover, there are some lexicalised cases of N + A (hallanarka
‘sensitive to frost’, uuniämmin litt.’oven warm’, sanavalais ‘ready wit’, virkavapaa ‘leave of
absence’, taulukkama litt.’fire hot’ > ‘red-hot’).  

3 Scott (Scott 1994) refers to the category cline of Kingsbury & Wellman 1986:
DET-SUBJ.COMMENT-SIZE-AGE-SHAPE-COLOR-NATIONALITY/ORIGIN-MATERIAL-COMPOUNDED ELEMENT-N
From evidence on adjective order in Finnish, Scott agrees with Cinque for the existence of a universal hierarchy, but he also suggests that in a more fine-grained classification some languages may allow parametrization in the adjectival hierarchy. In (58) the correct order for English would be the opposite one (‘the ugly long road’):

(58) pitkä ruma tie
    long ugly road

1.3.2.2 Predicative structures and complements
Comparing structures in which on one side we find adjectives in adnominal position and on the other side the predicative construction, we remark that while adnominal adjectives must always agree in case with the noun they modify, in predicative position case agreement is not necessary. This is exemplified in (59), where the adnominal adjective agree with the noun, (59)a-b, in contrast with the predicative sentence in (59)c, which admits nominative/accusative case alternation. The fact has some parallelism with German, where adjectives in prenominal position agree for case, number and gender, contrary to adjectives in predicate position that are always invariant, (60)a-b. In Finnish the observed alternation is possible only for plural forms.
(59) a. uudet kirjat / *kirjoja
   new-NOM books-NOMpl / books-PARTpl
b. uusia kirjoja / * kirjat
   new-PARTpl books-PARTpl / books-NOMpl
c. kirjat ovat uusia / uudet
   books-NOMpl are new-PARTpl / new-NOM pl
(60) a. die neue Büchern
   the new-NOM.NEUpl books-NOM.NEUpl
b. die Büchern sind neu
   the books-NOM.NEUpl are new

As expected (Cinque 2005), adjectives that can appear in both adnominal position and in predicative constructions can have different interpretations depending of their position. (61)b differs from (61)a in that the characteristic of being true does not concern the poet but the person (that happens to be a poet)

(61) a. aito runoilija
   true poet
b. runoilija on aito
   (the) poet is true

Finnish prenominal adjectives can take complements to their left and reduced relative clauses have the same properties, as in (63), in a parallel way to Germanic languages other than English, as in (64)a-d for German.

(62) a. lapsistaan ylpeä äiti
   children.ELApI+POSS3sg proud mother
   ‘a mother proud of her children’
b. vaaleihin tyytyväinen presidentti
   elections-ILLsg satisfied president
   ‘a president satisfied with the elections’
(63) a. äskettäin huolella silitetyt paidat
   recently care-ADE ironed shirts
   ‘the shirts recently ironed with care’
1.3.3 Relative clauses

We observe that Finnish has two constructions: the first one is a participle of the second type and can only be prenominal, (65). The second one is a postnominal finite clause that is introduced by the relative pronoun joka ‘which/who/that’, (66).

(65) töissä olevat miehet ovat lumoavia
work-INE be-PRTC.IIpl men-NOMpl are fascinating
(66) miehet, jotka ovat töissä, ovat lumoavia
men-NOMpl that be-PRES3pl work-INEsg are fascinating

Hence, we observe that the English (67)a have two possible Finnish counterparts, in (67)b-c:

(67) a. the men that are working
b. töissä olevat miehet
work-INE be-PRTC.IIpl men-NOMpl
c. miehet, jotka ovat töissä
men-NOMpl that be-PRES3pl work-INE
We observe that in (67)b the participle behaves as the modifier of the noun and appears necessarily before it. Differently, in (67)c the relative clause is introduced by a pronoun and is necessarily after the modified noun phrase.

Relative clauses of the second type (with the pronoun *joka* ‘which/who/that’) can be divided into restrictives, (68)a, and appositives, (68)b:

(68) a. tuo on se veljeni, joka on lääkäri.
   he is the brother of mine, who is a doctor

   b. vanhin veljeni, joka on lääkäri, asuu Kemissä.
   the eldest brother of mine, who is a doctor, lives in Kemi

In Finnish, when an adjective is inserted it appears either after the numeral and before the relative clause or after the relative clause and before the noun giving the order in (69) and exemplified in (70):

(69) Dem Num (A) Rel.Clause (A) N

(70) nämä kolme (komeaa) toimistossaan työskentelevää (komeaa) miestä
   these three (fascinating) office working-PRTC (fascinating) men

The position of the relative clause seems to be the same as in German, that is to the left of the noun and after the numeral:

(71) diese drei [in ihren Büro arbeitenden] Männer
   nämä kolme [toimistossaan työskentelevää] miestä

Finally, as noted by Matsumura (1982), to whom we refer for a deeper analysis, the two types of relative clauses are in many ways different, as is resumed in Table 1 and exemplified in (72)-(73):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prenominal RCs</th>
<th>Postnominal RCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted to subject and (direct) object NPs</td>
<td>Any NP can be relativized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relativized NP is deleted</td>
<td>The relativized NP is replaced by a pronoun (which inherits case and number) that is moved to sentence-initial position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-finite or participial verb form</td>
<td>Finite verb form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Constituents have an OV order | Constituents have a VO order (as in non-embedded simple sentences)
---|---

(72) a. [kirjastosta sanakirjan lainannut] opiskelija
   library-ELA dictionary-ACC borrowed-PRTC.PASS student-NOM
b. [opiskelijan kirjastosta Ø lainama] sanakirja
   student-GEN library-ELA borrowed-AG.PRTC

(73) a. kirjasto, josta opiskelija lainasi kirjan __
   library-NOM, which-ELA student-NOM borrow-PAST3sg book-ACC

1.4 Conclusions

In this chapter we first observed the possible word order in the clause, with respect to the position of adverbs and to the [± definite] interpretation of the constituents depending on their pre- or postverbal position. Then we moved to the noun phrase. On the basis of our examples we noted that movement is possible only in the leftmost periphery of the noun phrase. As for adjectives, we noted that a set of adjectives, those that do not show inflection, cannot be used predicatively. Afterwards, we described the position of adjectives and gave some evidence for the proposed hierarchy internal to adjectives, reported in (48) and (50). APs are always prenominal and the A-N order can be explained assuming that the noun does not move across APs. Exception to this general rule consists of those cases exemplified in (40).

The last paragraph presents the position of relative clauses in the noun phrase. It may be plausible to assume, as suggested by Matsumura (1982) that Finnish is a sort of typological hybrid between the typical word orders of a VO language and those of a OV language (Greenberg 1963), as exemplified in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VO Language</th>
<th>OV Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Verb-Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Finnish both the orders of VO and OV languages are possible as for orders a)-b)-c). On the contrary, as for the orders in d)-e) only those of an OV language are possible.

Finally, we recall that we consider the noun phrase with a “three-layers” structure and after having observed the distribution of prenominal modifiers in the complementation and inflectional area, the next chapter is devoted to the thematic relations in the lexical area.
2. Thematic relations in nominal expressions

2.1 Observations on argument structure

In this overview on argument structure in Finnish nominals we consider event and result nouns, transitive nouns, passive nouns, and finally psych nouns. We will also give evidence for some parallelisms or differences with the verbal counterpart of these nominals. Our observations intend to provide a background for the following chapters and a basis for future research. Due to space limits they cannot be exhaustive at the moment.

We will consider the Noun Phrase as a structure parallel to the clause comparing data from English and Finnish. As the noun phrase (DP) shares both structural and transformational properties with the clause (CP) it is expected to display arguments such as subject and one or more complements. However, following Grimshaw (1990), nouns are defective theta-markers and they can only take PPs as complements. As a consequence, many nouns do not project a genuine argument structure.

If noun phrases are parallel to clauses, they also have a subject and presumably case is assigned to the object by a functional head, or by a preposition. We assume that event nominals project their argument structure hierarchically and we will see how the thematic hierarchy presented in Grimshaw and repeated here in (a) emerges in Finnish noun phrases.

(a) Agent > Experiencer > Goal/Source/Location > Theme

The hierarchy in (a) claims that Agent is the most prominent argument and therefore it is expected to c-command the Experiencer or the Theme. This relation is asymmetric, in the sense that the Experiencer or the Theme cannot c-command the Agent.
According to Grimshaw (1990), nouns can be roughly divided into complex event nominals, or process nominals, and result nominals. The main points we are considering are:

(b) complex event (or process) nominals (like *announcement, examination*) are nouns that have “an internal aspectual analysis” (Grimshaw 1990). They have an argument structure and take obligatory arguments.

(c) result nouns do not have an argument structure but only imply the existence of participants to the event (like *gift, exam*), which is expressed by a telic predicate.

Some nouns can be ambiguous between the complex event and the result reading. An important test (that also works for Finnish, to disambiguate between the two readings) is the insertion of frequency modifiers such as *frequent* and *constant*, which can appear, similarly to English (cf. Grimshaw 1990), only with complex event nouns, that are atelic predicates.

(1) a. jatkuva taulujen lahjoitus
   constant-NOMsg paintings-GENpl donation-NOMsg
   ‘the constant donation of the paintings’

   b. *jatkuva lahjoitus
   constant-NOMsg donation-NOMsg
   ‘the constant donation’

   c. *jatkuva lahja
   constant-NOMsg gift-NOMsg
   (the) constant gift

(2) a. jatkuva papereitten tarkastus
   constant-NOMsg documents-GENpl examination-NOMsg
   ‘the constant examination of the documents’
b. *jatkuva tarkastus
constant-NOMsg examination-NOMsg
‘the constant examination’
c. *jatkuva tentti
constant-NOMsg exam-NOMsg
‘the constant exam’

In (1)a and (2)a the noun lahjoitus ‘donation and tarkastus ‘examination’ are complex event nominals and express an atelic event. Therefore, they can be associated with a frequency modifier such as jatkuva ‘constant’ and they need their arguments to be expressed, as evident from the ungrammaticality in (1)b and (2)b. In (1)c and (2)c a result noun and an object referring noun are associated with such a modifier and as expected the result is ungrammatical. Moreover, we remark that the case of the Theme in (1)a and (2)a is genitive, the structural case expected to be found in nominals.

It seems that Finnish marks process nominals with the typical -inen affix. This also is the ending of the IV infinitival form. Many nouns show the alternation between the result and the process interpretation and as predicted can alternatively occur with frequency modifiers, as exemplified in (3) where the relevant noun is boldfaced:

(3) a. tehtävän ratkaiseminen kesti tunnin PROCESS
problem-GENsg solving-NOMsg last-PAST3sg hour-ACC
‘the solving of the problem took an hour’
b. tehtävän ratkaisu on kirjan lopussa RESULT
problem-GENsg solution-NOMsg be-PRES3sg book-GENsg end-INE
‘the solution to the problem is at the end of the book’

As predicted by Grimshaw (1990) result nominals but not process nominals can be used predicatively (4)a, and they can appear in contexts that correspond to English existential sentences (4)b:
(4) a. tämä on vaikea ratkaisu/*ratkaiseminen  
   this is a difficult solution/*solving  
   b. on olemassa ongelman ratkaisu /*ratkaiseminen  
   there exists the solution/*solving to the problem

Finally, the generalization in (d) is true for Finnish, (5)a-b, in a parallel way to Hungarian (cf. Szabolcsi 1994), as in (6)a-b:

(d) complex event nouns must project their internal argument

(5)   a. sodan loppu vuoden kuluessa  
   ‘the end of the war within one year’  
   b. *loppu vuoden kuluessa  
   ‘the end within one year’  
   c. sota loppui vuoden kuluessa  
   ‘the war ended within one year’

(6) a. a háború egy év-en belül való befejez-és-e  
   the war-NOM one year-LOC within being end-DEV-POSS3sg  
   ‘the ending of the war within one year’  
   b. *az egy év-en belül való befejez-és  
   the one year-LOC within being end-DEV  
   ‘the ending within one year’  
   c. a háború egy év-en belül befejeződött  
   the war-NOM one year-LOC within end-PAST3sg

In both the examples in (5) and (6) the aspectual modifier forces the event reading. If the internal argument is omitted, as in (5)b and (6)b, the ungrammaticality follows only in the event interpretation forced by the presence of the time adverbial. However, the result reading is available if the time adverbial is omitted.
2.1.1 Result and Event nouns

Nominals such as end and examination can denote either the event, and therefore have an event reading, or can refer to a concrete ‘object’ in the world, and therefore have a result reading. As claimed on empirical evidence, among others, from English (Grimshaw 1990) and Hebrew (Siloni 1997) and related to the generalization in 2.1 point (c), we assume that:

(d) a noun with no arguments cannot have an event reading

This claim is exemplified for Finnish in (7):

(7) a. vihollinen tuhosi kaupungit / *vihollinen tuhosi
   enemy-NOM destroy-PAST3sg city-ACCpl
   the enemy destroyed the city / * the enemy destroyed

b. vihollisen kaupunkien tuho
   enemy-GEN city-GENpl destruction-NOM
   ‘enemy’s destruction of the city’

We observe that (7)b is the nominal counterpart of (7)a. The event noun tuho ‘destruction’ is derived from the verb tuhota ‘to destroy’, and in the noun phrase the same argument structure is maintained with the difference that both the arguments are, and indeed must be, prenominal. The event is telic and the subject is agentive in both (7)a and (7)b. We remark that the object is marked with accusative in the clause while it is in genitive in the corresponding noun phrase. As expected, the Agent theta-role is the most prominent and corresponds to the external argument, to which genitive is assigned. The only possible order in the noun phrase is that in (7)b, where the noun does not move from its low position. The noun phrase in (7)b may raise some ambiguities because of the double genitive, and an expression with the agentive participle would be preferred, as in (8).

(8) vihollisten tuhoama kaupunki
    enemy-GENpl destroy-AG.PRTC city
    ‘the city destroyed by the enemies’
In addition to the ‘test’ of aspectual PPs, it is possible to verify the event reading of a noun by inserting agent-oriented adjectives and rationale clauses. In (9)a the noun has one argument and receives an event interpretation, for the occurrence of the aspectual modifier *jatkuva* ‘continuous’. The ungrammaticality of (9)b follows from the absence of arguments, as predicted in (d), and the presence of the modifier, which would give an (impossible) event reading, whereas (9)c is the grammatical result reading of the noun, where neither argument or modifier inducing an event reading are present.

(9) a. papereitten jatkuva tarkastus oli tarpeeton
   documents-GEN continuous examination-NOM was unnecessary
b. *jatkuva tarkastus oli tarpeeton
   (the) continuous examination was unnecessary
c. tarkastus oli tarpeeton
   (the) examination was unnecessary

Agent-oriented adjectives require an understood Agent, which can only be conceived with an event reading and hence ensures the event interpretation even if the Agent is not inserted. This is exemplified in (10)a. In (10)b the argument is not expressed and this leads to ungrammaticality:

(10)a. papereitten tahallinen tarkastus kesti koko päivän
   (the) documents intentional examination lasted (the) whole day
b. *tahallinen tarkastus kesti koko päivän
   (the) intentional examination lasted (the) whole day

A rationale clause, which also entails an Agent, is ungrammatical if the noun has no arguments. The absence of arguments would force a result reading which is incompatible with the rationale clause:

(11) a. papereitten tarkastus rajalla estäämään rikollisten maahantuloa
    documents examination on the border in order to avoid criminals entering in the country
b. *tarkastus rajalla estäämään rikollisten maahantuloa
examination at the border in order to avoid criminals entering in the country

As for result nouns, it seems plausible to assume that the presence of two genitives, as in (12), may render the constituent ambiguous. This is reinforced by the contrasting judgements given by native speakers. It is not even clear if the first genitive is the possessor or the agent. It may be possible for result nouns that just one prenominal specifier position for genitive arguments is available.

(12) *Liisan Pekan taulu
Liisa-GEN Pekka-GEN painting

2.2 Transitive nouns
Let us introduce here transitive nouns with respect to their thematic hierarchy. When two arguments are present the assignment of two genitive cases is avoided. Instead the Theme can be expressed by a postnominal argument in elative case (a locative case indicating cause and origin), as in as in (13)b and (14)b. As genitive is the case of adnominal arguments and is also related to possession, we refer to § 4.1 for possessor hierarchy and theta-roles.

(13) a. *Liisan Pariisin kuvaus
Liisa-GEN Paris-GEN description
AGENT THEME
b. Liisan kuvaus Pariisista
Liisa-GEN description Paris-ELA
AGENT THEME

(14) a. *Liisan tentin ajatus
Liisa-GEN exam-GEN thought
b. Liisan ajatus tentistä
Liisa-GEN thought exam-ELA
The set of nominals that can have a complement in elative case includes nominals such as: *haave* ‘dream’, *havainto* ‘observation’, *huoli* ‘worry’, *kertomus* ‘story’, *keskustelu* ‘conversation’, *kyse* ‘question’, *käsitys* ‘conception’, *pakina* ‘humorous article’, *pula* ‘shortage’, *riita* ‘quarrel’, *syyte* ‘accusation’, *tarina* ‘story’, *tutuus* ‘truth’, *unelma* ‘dream’, *vastuu* ‘responsibility’.

When an argument is expressed by genitive case, the interpretation may be ambiguous between a Theme and an Agent/Exp reading, in a sense they are ambiguous between the passive and the intransitive class.

(15)a. Liisan kuvaus
   Liisa-GEN description
   AGENT/THEME

b. miesten pula
   men-GENpl shortage
   EXP/THEME

Vainikka (1993) proposes that elative is the default case for the adjunct position. Elative productively occurs on the complement of a set of nominals. The complement is postnominal and is considered as an adjunct because it is optional and, following Vainikka (1993) receives case from its syntactic position. We remain agnostic as whether this really means that elative is not structural here. However, differently from Vainikka (1993) we analyse elative with quantity expressions as an instance of Quantity Nouns that assign elative case (cf. 5.1). A unification of the two instances would be welcome but cannot be entertained in this work.

For some transitive nouns derived from transitive verbs we observe that the agent can be expressed by a prenominal genitive, as in (16)b derived from (16)a. In these cases, when two genitives are present, it is always the first one to be interpreted as the subject and Agent and the second one as the object and Theme, coherently with the thematic hierarchy.

(16)a. Liisa söi omenan
This set of deverbalized nouns such as *syönti* ‘eating’, *juonti* ‘drinking’, *oppiminen* ‘learning’, *kehittäminen* ‘development’, *kohtelu* ‘treatment’.

With complex event nominals the pattern is different in the sense that the occurrence of Agent and Theme both expressed by genitive is marginal.

(17) a. kaupunki tuhottiin
   city-NOMsg destroy-PAST.PASS
   ‘the city was destroyed’

b. kaupungin tuho
   city-GENsg destruction
   ‘the city’s destruction’

c. vihollisen kaupungin tuho
   enemy-GENsg city-GEN sg destruction-NOMsg

The noun phrase in (17)b is parallel to passive verb phrase in (17)a and no agent can be expressed even if the idea of a [+ human] agent is implicit. (17)c is grammatical but *vihollisen* ‘enemy-GENsg’ can only be interpreted as a possessor.

2.2.1 Compound nouns

In Finnish compound nouns are very productive and they are formed in order to identify in a unique way a concept in a specific context. Also compound nouns appear to have an internal argument structure where the Theme θ-role is assigned to the first noun by the second noun. The main characteristic of
compound nouns is to constitute semantically one ‘unit’, as the compound noun *lumenluonti* (litt. ‘snow shovelling’) does in (18):

(18) asukkaiden lumenluonti
    inhabitant-GENpl snow-GEN shovelling-NOM
    ‘the snow shovelling by the inhabitants’

As for the morphology, in Finnish we observe different types of compound nouns: the first nominal can appear in nominative case, (19)a, the base form of the noun, or in genitive case, (19)b. Other cases are quite rare.

(19) a. muistomerkki
    memory symbol > ‘memorial’
    b. viikonloppu
    week-GEN end

The fact of having genitive (or any other) case on the first element of a compound noun can be explained if we postulate for Finnish a tripartite analysis of compounds: i) compounds such as *muistomerkki* ‘memorial’ are lexicalised and formed in the morphology, ii) compounds such as *viikonloppu* ‘weekend’ are formed in the syntax and have undergone a lexicalisation, and iii) newborn compounds such as *maidonjuonti* ‘milk-GEN drinking’ are formed in the syntax but have not yet undergone lexicalisation.

### 2.2.2 Intransitive nouns derived from transitive verbs

In (20) we have an example for intransitive nouns derived from transitive verbs, like nouns derived from verbs related to natural forces. Observing (20)a-b-c we infer that the Patient is obligatory with the verb but not in the corresponding nominal construction, where the genitival argument can be interpreted either as an Agent or as a Patient.

(20) a. ampiainen pisti Liisaa
    ‘the bee stung Liisa’
b. Liisan pistos
AGENT/PATIENT
Liisa-GEN stinging-NOM

c. Liisa pisti jotakuta
‘Liisa stung someone’

The prenominal argument can be either the Agent or the Patient depending on the discourse context. Hence, it can correspond to (20)b or (20)c, differently from e.g. Hungarian (Szabolcsi 1994) (21), where the Agent should be expressed:

(21) *Péter megsípése
    Péter-NOM sting-DEV-POSS3sg
    ‘the stinging of Péter [by some animal]’

Finally, with nouns derived from ergative verbs, as tulo ‘arrival’, we observe that the subject cannot be expressed by a nationality adjective, parallel to Italian (cf. Giorgi & Longobardi 1991):

(22)a. Maijan tulo
    Maija-GEN arrival

b. Ranskalaisten tulo
    French(noun)-GENpl arrival

c. ?*Ranskalainen tulo
    French(adj.)-GEN arrival

2.3 Passive Nouns

In the literature, the Finnish passive has been considered different from languages such as English and Italian in that, for example, there are no real agentive constructions with by-phrases, either in the nominal or in the verbal construction. Moreover, passivization is possible only with understood human, or, at least highly personified, animate Agent. Crucially, no Cause can
be understood in a passive construction, as evident from (23), where (23)a is entailed by (23)b and it is not entailed by (23)c.

(23) a. puut kaadettiin
   tree-NOMpl cut/fell-PAST.PASS
   ‘the trees were cut’

b. metsurit kaatoivat puut
   forest worker-NOMpl cut-PAST3pl tree-ACCpl

c. myrsky kaatoi puut
   storm-NOMsg toppled-PAST3sg trees-ACCpl
   ‘the storm toppled the trees’

However, Manninen & Nelson (2004) have recently claimed that in Finnish the postposition toimesta ‘on the part of’ may be analysed as the agentive adjunct in both verbal and nominal passive constructions, in a similar way to the Italian da parte di ‘on the part of’:

(24) a. kaupungin tuho vihollisen toimesta
   THEME                AGENT
   city-GEN destruction-NOM/ACC  enemy-GEN ‘by’
   ‘the city’s destruction by the enemy’

b. kaupunki tuhottiin vihollisen toimesta
   THEME                AGENT
   city-NOM destroy-PASSpast enemy-GEN ‘by’
   ‘the city was destroyed by the enemy’

In (24) the agent is expressed and is assigned genitive case by toimesta. It is worth pointing out that toimesta ‘on the part of’ cannot be used as productively as English by, (25)a-b. It occurs generally with verbs and nouns of creation and destruction, (26)a-b-, but has not a very wide use and is marginal in all other cases, e.g. the agentive adjunct toimesta ‘on the part of’ is not allowed with psych verbs, (26)c.

(25) a. the letter has been written by Peter
b. kirje on kirjoitettu Pekan toimesta
   letter-NOMsg write-PAST.PASS Pekka-GENsg 'by'

(26)a. tutkimusohjelmat perustettiin hallinnon toimesta
   research-program-NOMpl create-PAST.PASS administration-GENsg 'by'
   'the research programs were created by the administration'
b. tutkimusohjelmien perustaminen hallinnon toimesta
   research-program-GENpl creation administration-GENsg 'by'
   'the creation of the research programs by the administration'
c. *Kaisan rakastettiin Pekan toimesta
   Kaisa-PARTsg love-PAST.PASS Pekka-GENsg 'by'

Parallel to other languages such as Italian, we observe that in Finnish there exists a set of “inherently passive nouns” (such as murha ‘murder, pidätys ‘arrest’, riisto ‘exploitation’) that can have one prenominal genitival argument which is always the Theme, (27)a-b. Example (28) gives further evidence for the impossibility of an Agent θ-role when the noun phrase is parallel to a passive verbal construction:

   (27)a. opiskelijoitten pidätys
      students-GENpl arrest
      THEME/*AGENT
   b. omaisuuden riisto
      property-GEN exploitation
      THEME

   (28)a. Ari murhasi presidentin
      AGENT    THEME
      Ari-NOM murder-PAST3Psing president-ACC
      'Ari murdered the president'
b. Presidentti murhattiin
      THEME
      president-NOM murder-PASSIVE
      'The president was murdered'
Inherently passive nominals correspond to a passive verbal construction and are in clear contrast with nouns such as *kuvaus* ‘description’ that have an ambiguous interpretation of the genitive argument between a [± agentive] interpretation.

(29) a. Liisan kuvaus matkastaan kuulosti jännittävältä
   Liisa-GEN description-NOM trip-ELA+POSS3sg sounded exciting
b. Liisan kuvaus oli tarkka ja löysin hänet helposti
   Liisa-GEN description-NOM was accurate and I found her easily
c. Liisan kuvaus oli tarkka ja löysin paikan helposti
   Liisa-GEN description-NOM was accurate and I found the place easily

A strategy to avoid the marginality of two genitives might be the productive formation of compound nouns, as in (30)b. The genitive prenominal complement is preferably interpreted as the possessor with nouns that are not inherently passive, as in (30)a, whereas it is interpreted as the theme with inherently passive nouns, as was the case in (28).

(30) a. Liisan lääkärin pelko
   Liisa-GEN doctor-GEN fear-NOM
   ‘The doctor of Liisa fears (something)’
b. Liisan lääkärinpelko
   Liisa-GEN [doctor-GEN fear-NOM]
   ‘Liisa’s fear of the doctor’

Moreover, we have suggested that some nominal constructions are ambiguous because of the different relation of the prenominal genitive to the noun it
modifies: the agentive interpretation is given by an agentive participle that can be non-overt, otherwise genitive is related to possession.

As observed, the adnominal complement is in genitive case. This case is strictly related to possession as the possessor (expressed by a full DP or a possessive pronoun) is always in genitive case. We will face the thematic hierarchy with regard to possessive constructions in chapter 4.

2.4 Psychological predicates

This section is divided into psych verbs (2.4.1) and psych nouns (2.4.2). First we resume some observations on psych verbs, which have roused the interest of many scholars, and on these basis, afterwards we will observe the pattern of psych nouns.

2.4.1 Psych verbs

Psych verbs generally assign partitive to their object and are atelic and unbounded (in the sense of Kiparsky 1998). Pylkkänen (1997) divides them into two classes: the first one (i) includes morphologically simple verbs which have an argument structure in which the subject is the Experiencer and the object is the Theme. The subject is marked with nominative case and the object with partitive case. It has been suggested (Kiparsky 1998) that with psychverbs we find no case alternation for lexico-semantic reasons because the situation of, for example, *love or hate is not an achievement and hence is not bounded.

(31) a. Liisa rakastaa hevosia /*hevoset
    (EXP (THEME))
    Liisa-NOM loves horses-PARTpl /*ACC
b. Liisa pelkää ukkosta /*ukkosen
    (EXP (THEME))
    Liisa-NOM fears the thunder-PARTsg /*ACC
The second one (ii) class of Pylkkänen’s classes consists of morphologically causative verbs which realize the Experiencer as the object, and are derived from group (i) with the causative inflectional morphology –ttA. Case assignment is the same as in (i). This type of derivation is common to morphological rich languages (e.g. Japanese, cf. Nelson 1999).

pelätä > pelottaa (‘to fear > to frighten’), nauraa > naurattaa (‘to laugh > to make s.o. laugh’), suuttua > suututttaa (‘to get anry’ > to make s.o. angry’)

(32)a. ukkonen pelottaa lapsia
   (THEME) (EXP)
   (The) thunder-NOM frightens the children-PARTpl
b. minä nauran / minua naurattaa
   (AGENT) (EXP)
   I laugh / I-PARTsg makes laugh (’someone/something makes me laugh’)

A more fine-grained classification is that of Belletti and Rizzi (1988) who identify three classes of psych-verbs for Italian, represented by the verbs ‘temere’ (fear), ‘preoccupare’ (worry) and ‘piacere’ (appeal), with the following pattern:

Class 1: Gianni teme il temporale
   John fears the thunder
   Janne-NOM pelkää ukkosta-PART
   SUBJ OBJ EXP THEME
Class 2: Il temporale preoccupa Gianni
   The thunder worries John
   Ukkonen-NOM huolestuttaa Jannea-PART
   SUBJ OBJ THEME EXP
Class 3: A Gianni piace il temporale / Il temporale piace a Gianni
   The thunder appeals to John
   Janne-NOM pitää ukkosesta-ELA

The parallelism with the classification of Pylkkänen (1997) is in the sense that her class 1 is very much like the temere-class (Class 1, fear-class for English)
and her class 2 is like *preoccupare*-class (Class 2, *frighten*-class for English). However, Class 3 is missing in Pylkkänen’s classification.

It has been suggested, by Grimshaw (1990) for English, that for verbs belonging to Class 2, with the Experiencer role assigned to the object, an aspectual “causer” role is licensed, and it is represented in a causal hierarchy parallel to the thematic hierarchy. According to this proposal, the characteristic of this verb class is the asymmetry between the two hierarchies because the subject is assigned a Theme theta-role and is most prominent in the causal hierarchy but not in the thematic hierarchy. The asymmetry is evident in Finnish, too:

(33) a. *minä pelkään ukkosta*  
   ‘I fear the thunder’

b. *ukkonen pelottaa minua*  
   ‘The thunder frightens me’

\[\text{(EXP)} \rightarrow \text{(THEME)} \rightarrow \text{CAUSE}\]

In Pesetsky’s (1995) terms, when Theme appears in subject position it has a “causer” of emotion reading, whereas when it is in object position it has a “target” of emotion interpretation.

A slightly contrasting approach comes from Nelson (1999). Her starting point is that Finnish derived causatives do not show a uniform pattern and in order to explain the differences, Nelson (1999) gives a more detailed classification of four classes of psych verbs for Finnish:

(i) root statives (i.e. vendlerian states): *pelätä* ‘to fear’, *surra* ‘to grief’, *epäillä* ‘to doubt’ :

(34) a. *Hanna pelkää koulun loppua*  
   Hanna-NOMsg fear-PRES3sg school-GENsg end-PARTsg  
   ‘Hanna fears the end of the school’

b. *Hanna suree (koulun loppua)*
Hanna-NOMsg grief-PRES3sg (school-GENsg end-PARTsg)

‘Hanna grieves (the end of the school)’

c. Hanna epäilee häntä syylliseksi

Hanna-NOMsg doubt-PRES3sg (s)he-PARTsg guilty-TRANSsg

‘Hanna doubts him to be guilty’

(ii) root inchoatives (i.e. achievements): pelästyä ‘to get frightened by’, raivostua ‘to become furious’, suuttua ‘to get angry’:

(35)a. Liisa pelästyi koiraa

Liisa-NOMsg get frightened-PAST3sg dog-PARTsg

‘Liisa got frightened by the dog’

b. Liisa raivostui (Maijalle tästä asiasta)

Liisa-NOM become furious-PAST3sg (Maija-ALL this-ELAsg thing-ELAsg)

‘Liisa became furious (with Maija about this question)’

c. Liisa suuttui (Maijalle tästä asiasta)

Liisa-NOM get angry-PAST3sg Maija-ALL this-ELAsg question-ELAsg

‘Liisa got angry with Maija about this matter’

(iii) causative statives: pelottaa ‘to frighten’, surettaa ‘to grief’, epäilyttää ‘to make suspicious’, see example (32)a-b.

(iv) causative inchoatives: pelästyttää ‘to make frightened’, raivostuttaa ‘to infuriate’, suututtaa ‘to anger’. We remark a transitive and aspectually bounded use of these verbs with accusative case marking the object, as evident in (36)c.

(36)a. Liisaa raivostutti (ongelman ilmentyminen)

(EXP (THEME))

problem-GEN emergence-NOM make furious-PAST3sg Liisa-PART

‘Liisa was furious because of…’

b. myöhästyminen raivostutti Maijaa

THEME EXP

being late-NOM make furious-PAST3sg Maija-PART

‘(the fact of) being in late made Maija furious’
c. Liisa raivostutti Maijan (*jatkuvasti)

THEME EXP
Liisa-NOM make furious-PAST3sg Maija-ACC (*continuously)
‘Liisa made Maija furious’

All the verbs in the groups above have an optional argument that may be projected or not (some verbs have two optional arguments).
In root statives and inchoatives the Experiencer is linked to the subject and these verbs behave like Class 1, the fear-class, in other languages. In root statives, the external argument is assigned the Experiencer-role and nominative case, whereas, in a parallel way, the object is assigned a Theme theta-role and partitive case.

As for root inchoatives a further subdivision should be noticed, because of the differences between raivostua ‘to get furious’, suuttua ‘to get angry’ and pelästyä ‘to get scared’. The first two can have different case assignment depending on the[± human] feature of the object, whereas pelästyä ‘to get scared’ verb type makes no differences whether the object, to which is assigned a Cause theta-role, is [± human].

(37) a. suutuin häneen
    I got angry him/her-ILL
    ‘I got angry because of him/her’

b. suutuin asiasta
    I got angry thing-ELA
    ‘I got angry because of this thing’

c. pelästyin asiaa/häntä
    I got scared thing-PART/(s)he-PART
    ‘I got scared of the thing/of him/her’

Causative statives fail to project an obligatory external argument, as we see from the contrast in (32)a-b, and can have either the Experiencer or the Theme sentence-initially, similarly to Belletti & Rizzi’s Class 3 verbs. The Experiencer
is marked with partitive and Theme with nominative, independently of the
animacy feature. These verbs would be expected to pattern as Class 2 verbs
but are actually similar to Class 3, because they are stative, disallow an
agentive reading and display unaccusative features (Nelson 2003). Nelson
(2003) also points out that “[...] causative morphology does not license a
particular thematic role. Instead, the availability of an agentive interpretation
appears to be linked to event structure and the assignment of Accusative case
[...]”.
Causative inchoative verbs do optionally project an external argument, as we
see from the alternation in (36)a and b, and pattern similarly to Class 2. The
Cause-role, when overt, is assigned to the subject and bears nominative case.
The Experiencer-role corresponds to the object and it can be marked either
with accusative or with partitive case. When the Cause is overt and [+human]
then the Experiencer is assigned accusative, whereas when the external
argument is not licensed or is inanimate the Experiencer is assigned partitive
case.
Causative inchoatives with a [+human] Cause subject can be interpreted as
bounded or unbounded predicates, showing accusative/partitive case
alternation. Let us introduce here that accusative case marks the object of
bounded predicates whereas partitive case is assigned to the object of
unbounded predicates (cf. also chapter 3 and chapter 6). Finally, in line with
Nelson, we observe that all causatives that are not delimited, or bounded,
pattern similarly to Belletti & Rizzi’s Class 3, allowing either the Experiencer
or the Theme to appear sentence-initially.
A common feature to both classes of stative psych verbs is that they are
intrinsically unbounded and hence can assign partitive but not accusative to
the Experiencer, and as expected are compatible with aspectual modifiers
such as ‘for an hour’, but not with ‘in an hour’. On the other hand, inchoative
verbs have in common the possible achievement interpretation, even if root
inchoatives may have the Theme in partitive, they allow a resultative reading.
Causative inchoatives are compatible with delimiting aspectual modifiers such as ‘for an hour’ and ‘in an hour’. With ‘for an hour’ only partitive case can be assigned to the Experiencer, whereas with ‘in an hour’ they can, but not necessarily do, show the accusative/partitive case alternation related to the aspectual features of the predicate.

2.4.2 Psych nouns

Let us now turn to the nominal counterparts of these verbs and observe their argument structure and case assignment. It should be noted that causative psych nominals, either stative (pelottaa ‘to frighten’ > pelotus; pelottaminen ‘intimidation’) or inchoative (suututtaa ‘to anger’ > suututtaminen ‘exasperation, aggravation’), are formed with a nominal affix like –minen, an affix which can form the nominalized counterpart of a verb and hence can be marked for all cases.

The nominal counterparts of root stative psych verbs in class (i) pattern as follows:

pelätä ‘to fear’ > pelko ‘fear’

(38) a. Pekka pelkää Liisaa
    EXP THEME
    Pekka-NOM fears Liisa-PART

b. (Pekan) epäonnistumisen / pimeän pelko
   (EXP) THEME
   (Pekka-GEN) failure-GEN / darkness-GEN fear-NOM
   (Pekka’s) failure’s/darkness’ fear

c. Pekan pelko Liisaa kohtaan
    EXP THEME
    Pekka-GEN fear-NOM Liisaa-PART towards
    ‘Pekka’s fear of Liisa’

1 It should not be confused with the IV infinitive, which also have a –minen form but can only be marked for nominative and partitive case.
d. *Pekan Liisan pelko

EXP THEME

Pekka-GEN Liisa-GEN fear

In (38) the root stative psychological verb *pelätä* ‘to fear’ assigns the Theme theta-role to its internal argument and has a semantic causative aspect, i.e. it is *Liisa* which is the ‘causer’ of the feeling of fear. The partitive case on the internal argument is required by the verb, (38)a. Accusative case on the Theme would lead to an ungrammaticality. In the argument structure of the corresponding noun the subject is marked with genitive case and is the experiencer of the feeling, (38)b-c. When non-overt it takes an arbitrary reference. Two consecutive genitive cases, on the Experiencer and on the Theme are marginally accepted, as we also observed in §2.1. The insertion of the postposition *kohtaan* ‘towards’, which assigns partitive case, is necessary when the two are proper names, as from the contrast in (38)c-d.

With regard to nouns derived from root inchoative verbs as *raivo* ‘rage’ and *suuttumus* ‘anger’, we observe the alternation in (39). If the theme is an event, the postposition *johdosta* ‘because of’ is needed, whereas if the theme is the target of the psych noun the postposition *kohtaan* ‘towards’ is needed and it assigns partitive case to the complement. This however cannot be considered a general assumption for nouns derived from root inchoative verbs as e.g. *pelästyminen* ‘fright’ shows a different pattern.

(39) a. Liisan suuttumus hintojen nousun johdosta

Liisa-GEN anger-NOM prices-GENpl rise-GENsg ‘because of’

b. Liisan suuttumus Maijaa kohtaan

Liisa-GEN anger Maija-PARTsg towards

The Causative verbs, both statives (in group (iii) as *pelottaa* ‘to frighten’) and inchoative (in group (iv) as *pelästytää* ‘to make frightened’) are derived with the morphological causative suffix –*ttA* and do not generally have a nominal counterpart, with some exceptions as *pelottaa* ‘to frighten’ > *pelotus*
‘intimidation’, which seems to be a result noun as it does not necessarily need an argument to be expressed:

(40) a. rangaistuksen pelotus jatkui vuosia
    punishment-GEN intimidation lasted for years
    b. pelotus jatkui vuosia
    (the) intimidation lasted for years

Finally, also some nominals derived from psych predicates have Theme expressed by elative case (cf. 2.2), for example toivo ‘hope’, onnittelut(t) (‘congratulations’).

(41) a. potilaan toivo paranemisesta
    patient-GENsg hope-NOMsg recovery-ELAsg
    ‘patient’s hope of recovering’
    b. onnittelut saavutuksesta
    congratulation-NOMpl achievement-ELAsg
    ‘congratulations for the achievement’

In conclusion, the class of psych-nouns is characterized by having a subject Experiencer and an object Theme, that can be optionally projected. Generally, verbs denoting psychological states have a corresponding nominal construction with the insertion of the postposition kohtaan ‘towards’, which requires partitive case on the Theme.

Finally, we can summarize the observed facts as follows:

- Exp (Gen) > Theme (Gen) > N
  (42) Liisan pimeänpelko
      Liisa-GEN darkness-GEN fear
- Theme > N
  (43) jäätelön himo
      ice-cream craving
- Exp (Gen) > N > Theme (Part) > postposition
  (44) Liisan rakkaus lapsia kohtaan
      Liisa-GEN love children-PARTpl towards
2.5 Conclusions

In this chapter we observed the thematic relations in nominal expressions. In particular, we observed that, as expected, the thematic hierarchy proposed by Grimshaw (1990) is respected. As for the adnominal genitival arguments, we observed that Finnish marginally admit two consecutive genitives (see also Chapter 4). Interestingly, with transitive nouns the Theme can be in elative case. As for passive nouns we observed the presence of a set of “inherently passive nouns” that exclude an Agent. Finnish passive, contrary to e.g. English and Italian, lacks real agentive constructions, and nouns that are not “inherently passive” have an ambiguous interpretation of the adnominal genitive argument. Finally, we observed the thematic relations of psych nouns derived from psychological verbs, which show a rather complex classification. In (42)-(45) we exemplified the distribution of theta-roles. Also the Theme of certain psych nouns can be in elative case and it would be interesting to deepen the morpho-syntax of this case, which also corresponds to English “of” and Italian “di”.

‘Liisa’s love for children’

- Exp (Gen) > N > Theme (Ela)

(45) Liisan toivo paremmasta elämästä
Liisa-GEN hope better-ELA life-ELA
3. The highest layer of the noun phrase

In this chapter we will approach the morpho-syntax of the highest projection of the noun phrase, where we assume that the referential features of the noun phrase are checked.

In Finnish we find neither gender features nor definite/indefinite articles. Moreover, being an agglutinative language (as Turkish (Enç 1991) in (2)a and Hungarian (Szabolcsi 1994) in (2)b ), we find all the relevant morphemes separately attached to the stem of the noun. The order of the inflectional elements is exemplified in (1):

(1)  a. talo-Ø-lle-ni
    N – sg – ALL– POSS1sg
    to my house
  b. talo-i-lle-ni
    N – pl – ALL – POSS1sg
    to my houses

(2)  a. kiz-lar-dan
    girl– pl –ABL
  b. kalap-ja-i-m
    hat-POSS-PL-1sg

The plural is the most internal morpheme, it is followed by the case suffix and finally by the possessive suffix, when necessary.

The structure proposed by Reime (1992, 1993) on the lines of Baker (1988) and represented in (3), correctly presents the hierarchy of the inflectional elements.
We assume in the framework of the Minimalist program that the noun is taken form the lexicon already inflected and its features are checked against the syntactic structure. We take (4) (cf. 1.2) as the structure of the noun phrase (Abney 1987, Cinque 1990 and 1994, Giusti 1993 and 2006, and many others).

The three main areas correspond to three layers, the second of which is labelled Concord Phrase (Giusti 2007) in order to differentiate it from Reime’s AgrP in (3), in which the possessor must be checked.

Considering DP as the highest projection in the noun phrase, we assume, as proposed by Giusti (1993, 1995, 2001) that it can form a new projection with Case, called DP/KP, where also the referential and definiteness features of the
noun phrase are checked. We will observe that Finnish data, and in particular the emergence of a definite article, supports this analysis. In fact, it seems plausible to assume that if D/K somehow undergoes to weakening, the specifier position of this projection can be filled by a pronoun or a demonstrative that start a process of grammaticalization and take on a different function.

The noun always has a case suffix (taking nominative as a Ø morpheme) and is marked for number with Ø as singular and –i as plural. To be more precise, it is either the plural suffix or a numeral that gives the plural feature, as numerals require partitive singular on the noun and hence the plural marker is not expressed (also cf. ch.5).

As Finnish displays a rich case morphology, first of all we will present the Finnish case system (3.1) and afterwards we will present the emergence of a definite article and other means, such as case-marking, the use of different elements that can function as referential operators, and word-order (see also chapter 1) through which the referential and definite features of the noun phrase can be expressed (3.2).

### 3.1 The Finnish case system

Finnish shows a case system with fifteen cases that can be divided into structural (nominative, genitive, accusative, and partitive) and semantic cases that are further divided into locative (classified in internal, external, and general) and marginal cases (abessive, comitative, and instructive). These two latter groups of cases correspond to prepositions in languages that display a poorer nominal inflection.

An example of a lexicalised case is that of prolative case which nowadays is no more productive. Prolative was used to express “means of transport” and it is still visible in expressions such as in (5):
In the summary table below (Table 1) we present the Finnish case system. The different phonological realizations are given for both singular and plural and the use(s) of each case is(are) summarized in the rightmost column. Examples for the different use of cases are presented in Table 2, where each number used to signal the case in the Table 1 corresponds to the relevant example for that case in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE FINNISH CASE SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURAL Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Ø, -n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Partitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMANTIC CASES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) Locative cases</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Essive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Translative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Inessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Elative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Illative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Adessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Allative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Marginal cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Abessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Comitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Instructive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(12c) with verbs of perception (as 11)

Table 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td><strong>Talo</strong> on iso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The house is big.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td><strong>Talon</strong> ovi on vihreä.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The house's door is green.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>Liisa näki <strong>talon</strong> / <strong>hänet</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liisa saw a/the house. / Liisa saw him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitive</td>
<td>a. Liisa syö <strong>mansikoita</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liisa eats strawberries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Liisa rakastaa <strong>Matti</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liisa loves Matti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Liisa ompeli <strong>sukkaa</strong>, kun puhelin soi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liisa was sewing a sock when the phone rang.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. <strong>Lapsia</strong> saapui pihalle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children arrived in the courtyard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Liisa ei juo <strong>maitoa</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liisa doesn’t drink milk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f'. <strong>Viisi</strong> <strong>koira</strong> juoksi kadulla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five dogs ran in the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f''. Menen Suomeen ennen <strong>kesää</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will go to Finland before summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essive</td>
<td>a’. Liisa on aina esiintynyt <strong>rellisenä ihmisenä</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liisa has always behaved like an honest person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a’’. Pienenä <strong>lapsena</strong> Liisa oli suloinen tyttö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As a little child (when she was) Liisa was a pretty girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. <strong>Jouluna</strong> on mukava olla perheen seurassa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Christmas it feels good to stay with the family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translative</td>
<td>a. Viime vuonna Maija pukeutui <strong>pelleksi</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last year Maija dressed up as a clown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Pekka toivoo lähtevänsä ulkomaille koko <strong>kesäksi</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pekka hopes to go abroad for the whole summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inessive</td>
<td>Hän leipoi suklaakakun yhdessä <strong>tunnissa</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S)he made the chocolate cake in one hour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8) Elative | a. Otin avaimet **laukusta**.  
I took the keys out of the bag.  
b. Huolehdin **sinusta**.  
I take care of you  
c. Neljäsosa opiskelijoista on ulkomaalaisia.  
The fourth part of students is foreigner.  |
| --- | --- |
| 9) Illative | a. Maija meni **kotiin** ja Pekka **elokviin**.  
Maija went home and Pekka to the cinema.  
b. En ole nähnyt häntä monen **viikkoon**.  
I haven’t seen him/her for many weeks.  |
| 10) Adessive | a. Liisa istuu **tuolilla**.  
Liisa is sitting on the chair.  
b. Tuletko **illalla** meille?  
Are you coming to our place this evening?  
c. Roni piirtää aurinkoa **lyijykynällä**.  
Roni is drawing the sun with a pencil.  
d. **Minulla** on paljon haaveita.  
I have a lot of dreams.  |
Listen! I’m going to tell you a secret.  
b. Leipä tuoksuu **hyvälle**.  
Bread smells good.  |
| 12) Ablative | a. Kissa hyppäsi **katolta**.  
The cat jumped from the roof.  
b. Eilen illalla menin nukkumaan **yhdeksältä**.  
Last night I went to sleep/bed at nine o’clock.  
c. Täällä haisee **pahalta**!  
It smells bad here!  |
| 13) Abessive | Hän käveli sisään **sanomatta** mitään.  
He entered the room without saying a word  |
| 14) Comitative | Kaisa tuli illalliselle **lapsineen**.  
Kaisa came to the dinner with her children.  |
Table 2

The presence of a variety of possible outputs for almost all the cases is due to vowel shift and rules of vocalic harmony. In plural nouns case the suffix is preceded by the plural marker –i. Structural Cases inspired different analyses and much debate among linguists. As for nominative case, it has been suggested among others by Vainikka (1989, 1993) in the Government and Binding theoretical framework that nominative is no case but rather absence of case as it has no overt morphology. It has been suggested that Finnish can have nominative objects, assigned by impersonal verbs (Toivainen 1993 on the lines of Timberlake 1974). A different proposal comes from Reime (1992) who claims that the Ø-ending of nominative and the Ø-ending for accusative singular are present on the noun although not spelled out. Reime’s proposal is based on observations on phonological facts of consonantal gradation with possessive suffix. The presence of a Ø-ending accounts for the difference of [t] in (6)a-b:

(6) a. hattu-Ø-mme on punainen
   hat-NOM+POSS1pl
   ‘our hat is red’

b. hatu-ssa-mme on marjoja
   hat-INE+POSS1pl
   ‘in our hat there are berries’

Reime claims that in (6)a, following the general rule of consonantal gradation, one can observe that the possessive suffix does not cause a weakening of the

2 For sake of convenience we give one example for all:
   (i) pelle-nä
       clown-ESSsing
   (ii) pelle-i-nä
        clown-ESSpl
grade in nominative with Ø-ending and this may account for the presence of a phonologically empty segment between the stem and the possessive.

Vainikka (1993) has suggested that genitive case is assigned by any lexical head to the specifier of its projection. Vainikka also proposed the existence of three structural cases in Finnish, always assigned by default: in addition to genitive assigned to [Spec,XP], partitive is assigned to an obligatory complement of X° and elative is assigned to an adjunct of X°. So, partitive is suggested to be the structural default case for objects. Traditionally, it has been stated that the existence of accusative case is clearly visible only because of the output of personal pronouns, the other possible outputs being the same as for nominative or genitive. In (7) the object pronoun marked with accusative in (7)a has a different output from the genitive in (7)b, whereas there is no visible difference in case-ending in the pairs in (8).

(7)  a. Maija näki hänet eilen
    Maija-NOM saw him-ACC yesterday

    b. hänänen vaimonsa on tulossa
    his wife-POSS3sg is coming

(8)  a. Maija näki ministerin eilen
    Maija-NOM saw (the) minister-ACC yesterday

    b. ministerin vaimo on tulossa
    minister-GEN wife is coming

However, many linguists (among those Maling 1993, Toivainen 1993, Vilkuna 1995, Nelson 1998) despite differences in their approaches, agree on the assumption that accusative on objects is a form of nominative, even in the case of personal pronouns (since it is possible to find crosslinguistically different case markings for pronouns and lexical items). Hence, the –n ending is considered as a genitive and allomorphic case-endings are avoided. A different point of view is that of Reime’s (1993) who labels the -Ø ending of

3 Geminated stops /kk/, /pp/, and /tt/ are weakened into simple stops and simple stops into some weaker (more sonorant) consonant if followed by a closed syllable (Reime 1992)
the accusative as “abstract accusative” and considers the endings alternation as an alternation between two different phonetic outputs of the same case. Finally, Kiparsky (2001) suggested that the ending alternation for accusative objects “mark distinct morphological cases which are contextually conditioned realizations of abstract accusative case”. Moreover, he brings good evidence to adopt the following case table rather than the previous one where accusative is suggested to exist only for personal pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>talo /hän (‘house/he’)</td>
<td>talot/he (‘houses/they’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>— / häne (‘— / him’)</td>
<td>— /heidä (‘— / them’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>talon/hänen (‘house-GEN/ his’)</td>
<td>talojen/heidän (‘houses-GEN/ their’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

In particular, Kiparsky (2001) proposes this analysis of the Finnish case system in order to permit case agreement between two coordinated NPs and between modifiers and their heads.

A universal tendency for locative elements to develop more grammatical meanings has been noted, inter alia by Helasvuo (2001). On these lines, we remark elative case which originally is a locative case, and it is still productively used in this sense, but it has also developed a more complex semantics. This case seems to correspond to both the English *from*, in its base interpretation, and the preposition *of*. Vainikka (1993) has proposed that it is the default case assigned to adjuncts as it occurs with certain quantifiers, superlative adjectives, on complements of adjectives and nouns, and finally it occurs with, for example, *ulos* ‘out’ and *sisään* ‘in’.

Marginal cases are sometimes replaced by other expressions (especially in colloquial Finnish), this is the case of abessive and comitative cases, the former may be substituted by the preposition *ilman* ‘without’ followed by partitive
case, as in (9), and the latter may be substituted by the genitive followed by the postposition *kanssa* ‘with’, as in (10).

(9) a. Maija istui penkillä hanskatta
   Maija-NOM sit-PAST3sg bench-ALLsg glove-ABEs
   ‘Maija was sitting on the bench without glove’

   b. Maija istui penkillä ilman hanskoja
   Maija was sitting on the bench without glove-PARTpl

(10) a. Maija saapui koirineen
   Maija-NOM come-PAST3sg dogs-COM+POSS3sg/pl
   Maija came with her dog/dogs

   b. Maija saapui koirien kanssa
   Maija come-PAST3sg dogs-GEN with
   ‘Maija came with her dogs’

The only case which is identical for singular and plural, and therefore ambiguous, is comitative:

(11) lapsineen
   child-COMsg/pl+POSS3sg/pl
   ‘with his/her child/children’

Moreover, the stem of this case should be followed by the possessive suffix for nouns but not for adjectives.

The instructive case is mostly used only in plural forms and in expressions that are deeply settled in the language. Singular occurs only in some almost idiomatic expressions and the stem of the case is hardly considerable as part of the nominal paradigm.

(12) a. hän kalastaa paljain käsin
   he fishes bare-INSTR hands-INSTR

   b. Maija lähti kotiin pettynein mielin
   Maija went home deceived-INSTR mind-INSTR
The Finnish cases have undergone several morphological transformations. It has been assumed (Häkkinen 1985 among others) that also the number of cases has increased in the history of Finnish language. Nowadays, the case system results as enriched with respect to the proto-Finnic language but it is undergoing further changes. Such changes, as the lexicalised use of some marginal cases, may be part of a wider transformation including the presence of a possessive systems for colloquial Finnish (ch. 4), the shortened pronominal and verbal forms, and the grammaticalization of the demonstrative se ‘it/this’ into a definite article (3.2).

3.2 Lack of articles?

A controversial issue is the function of the demonstrative se ‘it/this/that’, as a marker of identifiabilty, and hence the emergence of a definite article in spoken Finnish (Laury 1991)⁴. Se has also the behaviour of a personal pronoun with [-human] features in standard Finnish and [+human] features in colloquial Finnish. Given that se (ne in the plural) has wide and differentiated usages, we sum up in Table 4 below the main circumstances under which se can be found (adapted from Suomen kielen perussanakirja ‘The basic dictionary of the Finnish language’ 2001):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCURRENCES OF SE/NE</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) in colloquial Finnish with [-human] referent</td>
<td>Mikä se on? What se is?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) with [+human] referent only in relative joka-sentence or when talking about newborns or a group of persons</td>
<td>Se voittaa, joka tekee maalin. Se wins, who scores a goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) with [+human] in colloquial Finnish instead of the 3rd pers. pronouns</td>
<td>Kutsutaan ne kylään. Let’s invite ne to our place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) head of relative clauses</td>
<td>Se mitä sanoit, ei ole totta.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ We will use the term “colloquial Finnish” as opposed to “standard Finnish” denoting with the former the spoken variety of the language, which is often extended to informal contexts, while “standard Finnish” will be used to denote the formal variety of the language, both spoken and written.

⁵ The following English translations are ours.
Se what you said, is not true.

(e) referring to something generally known (as a definite article)

Tuo on se kuuluissa muusikko.
That is se famous musician.
Olisko se isäntä kotona?
Is se farmer at home?

(f) anticipating the subject

Se on jo vanha tämä meidän koira.
Se is already old this our dog.
Niin se vain kävi, ettei hän tullutkaan.
So se only was, that (s)he didn’t come.

(g) strengthening the preceding noun or personal pronoun

Sinä se vain nuorrut.
You se only look younger.

(h) as an expletive in idiomatic expressions

Se on sen ajan murhe.
Se is that-GEN time-GEN grief.

Table 4

Se can be used as a pronoun (Table 4 (a)-(b)-(c)) and as a determiner with a noun (like that and this in English), the former consists of its use as [thuman] (anaphoric) 3rd person pronoun. Its occurrence with a [+human] reference is limited to restricted contexts (cf. Table 4 (b)-(c)). Two “new” uses, reported in Table 4 (h) and (i), which are presumed to have entered and set up in the language mainly by the language contact with Swedish or English.

Laury (1991) analyses the change in status of the pronoun se during the last hundred years, and gives substantial evidence for a growing use of se in light of its identificational capacities that are very similar to pure definiteness markers, as reported in (13) from a recorded conversation (Laury 1991):

(13) Ja se pappi .. tuli justiinsa niitte...sen ...sen .. ehtoillisen kanssa ja,
and se-NOM priest-NOM came right in that moment, those...
se-GEN...se-GEN...Holy Communion-GEN with and,...se-GEN bread-GEN with
‘and the priest .... came right in that moment with the...the... Holy Communion and ...with the bread’

In Laury’s scale empirical evidence is given to highlight the shift of the pronoun se from a discourse prominent marker to a marker of ‘discourse identifiability’. Laury proposes that se should be reanalyzed as a marker of
identifiability in general and in support of this proposal, one piece of evidence also comes from the emergence of the demonstrative tämä as a major marker of discourse prominence instead of se, which is losing this function.

Laury’s (1991) proposal is further supported by two basic facts: (i) that se has clearly taken on functions not peculiar to pronominal demonstratives, and (ii) that this phenomenon is parallel to what we can observe for the closely-related Estonian demonstrative pronoun see. Besides the uses of see as a demonstrative, in Estonian too it can occur in contexts typical to definite articles to express indirect or anticipatory familiarity or uniqueness (Hiietam & Börjars 2003), as exemplified in (14):

(14) otsin just uue arvuti. Tegelikult mulle see klaviatuur väga ei meeldi.
    buy-PAST1sg just new-GEN computer-GEN actually I-ALL see keyboard-NOM very not like
    ‘I’ve just bought a new computer. I’m not happy with the keyboard actually’

It is plausible to say that both Finnish se and Estonian see, have started a process of grammaticalization, in Greenberg’s terms6 (1978), towards the status of a definite marker.

Juvonen (2000), apparently rejects this hypothesis and states that in Finnish “none of the adnominal determiners (i.e. se and tämä ‘this’) had grammaticalized into an obligatory definite article (at the level of genre, nor at the level of predefined groups)” (Juvonen 2000:194). Juvonen reports that she has found no evidence in the data collected among Finnish/Swedish bilinguals that se is a better candidate than tämä as a possible definite article and that both demonstratives represent an equally good alternative. This is supported by great individual

---

6 According to Greenberg, the cycle of definite articles consists of a development from adnominal demonstratives used anaphorically to a noun marker, in which Stage 0 represents the adnominal use of a demonstrative pronoun with a deictic function; Stage I is the level at which this element has come to mean “identified” in general and it is compulsory, like definite articles in Indo-European languages; Stage II represents a situation where the normal form of the noun is referred to by the non-generic article, that has definite and non-definite uses, and finally at Stage III it has developed in an empty noun-marker or a set of gender marking showing agreement with the noun.
variation in the use of *se* or *tämä*. Juvonen argues instead for the emergence of an optional grammatical category, whose use varies according to sociolinguistic and pragmatic factors.

However, we do not believe that Juvonen’s observations provide strong evidence against an analysis in terms of grammaticalization. It is not implausible to maintain that during the grammaticalization process the demonstrative can preserve for some time its function. Moreover, it doesn’t matter which is the lexical item undergoing the grammaticalization process but it matters that such a process is going on.

Analysing the shift from the Latin demonstrative article *ille* to the definite article, Giusti (2001) classifies the three categories of demonstratives, pronouns and articles on the basis of the features listed in Table 5 (a slightly revised version of the original):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMONSTRATIVE</th>
<th>PRONOUN</th>
<th>ARTICLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definite</td>
<td>definite</td>
<td>definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deictic/anaphoric/ostensive</td>
<td>anaphoric/ostensive</td>
<td>anaphoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/VI person</td>
<td>I/II/III/IV/V/VI person</td>
<td>Øperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(it projects an extended projection and it is inserted in Spec,DP)</td>
<td>(it projects an extended projection and it is an argument or it is in Spec,DP)</td>
<td>(it is inserted in a functional head)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Demonstratives, pronouns and articles are definite in nature and share the ‘anaphoric’ feature. The changing status of *se* fits within the demonstrative-to-article development described by Greenberg’s stage-model and the recent analysis made by Giusti (2001).

At the moment, it seems that *se* has maintained the common definiteness feature and those generally related to it, that are identifiability, uniqueness, and specificity features but is also developing a Ø person feature.
Se/ne is normally used in colloquial Finnish as the 3rd personal pronoun instead of hän/he '(s)he/they', the latter being reserved to standard Finnish (cf. also Holmberg & Nikanne 2002, 2008). As we have seen in the table above, the category of demonstratives has in common with pronouns also the person features for a 3rd person, hence it may be assumed that se is also developing into a 3rd person pronoun, parallel and independent from the development of a definite article.

In the following example we exemplify the uses of se as a personal pronoun(15)a, as a demonstrative (15)b, and as a definite article (15)c :

(15) a. Maija astui huoneeseen. Se tajusi katseestani ajatukseni. (pers.pron)
   Maija-NOM walked room-ILL. se-NOM understood eyes
   ‘Maija entered in the room. She understood my thoughts by my eyes’

b. Maija antoi lahjaksi kirjan sille punahiuksiselle pojalle. (dem)
   Maija-NOM gave present-TRANS book-ACC se-ALL redhaired-ALL boy-ALL
   ‘Maija gave a book to that boy as a present’

c. ja tää miun kaveri, ni. Me oltiin siihen alttarille mänössä (def.art)
   and this-NOM/ACC my friend-NOM/ACC, so. We were se-ILL altar-ALL go-PROG.
   ‘and this my friend, so. We were going to the altar’ (from Laury 1991)

In (15)a the register is colloquial and the pronoun se is used as a personal pronoun instead of hän ‘(s)he’. In (15)b the language level is that of standard Finnish and se is used in its demonstrative function, as we can infer from the deictic reading of the sentence. In (15)c, in a variety of eastern Finnish, se is not used as a demonstrative but rather as a definite article because the pronoun marks a new but identifiable NP. The ‘altar’ in question has not been mentioned in the discourse and it is assumed to be familiar just because of our encyclopaedic knowledge. Hence, it can be preceded by a definite article but
not by a demonstrative, which cannot be used in such a ‘familiarity’ reference context.

A counterpart of *se* in its definite article interpretation is found in the numeral *yksi* ‘one’ that has some characteristics of an indefinite article and it can be used in this sense in order to give a [- DEF] reading to the singular form of the noun, both in object position, as in example (19)a, and in subject position, as we see in (19)b. *Yksi* one’ is parallel to the Italian *un/*uno, which can be used as an indefinite article (meaning *a/an*) or a numeral (meaning *one*), as we see in (16):

(16) a. ho visto un ragazzo
    saw-PAST1sg a/one boy
    ‘I saw a/one boy’
 b. un ragazzo cammina per strada
    a/one boy walk-PRES3sg on the road
    ‘a/one boy is walking on the road’

For (16)a the interpretation can be both (17)a or b, and (16)b can be interpreted as (18)a or b:

(17) a. I saw one boy (not two)
    b. I saw a boy (indefinite)
(18) a. One boy is walking on the road (not two)
    b. A boy is walking on the road (indefinite)

In the corresponding Finnish sentence we have the same interpretation possibilities, (17) for (19)a, and (18) for (19)b.

(19) a. näin yhden pojan kadulla
    saw-PAST1sg one-ACC boy-ACC street-ADE
    ‘I saw a/one boy in the street’
 b. yksi poika kävelee kadulla
    a/one boy-NOM walk-PRES3sg street-ADE
‘a/one boy on the street’

In conclusion, a new category of [+ definite] marker is emerging in Finnish. It is represented by *se* as a definite marker and *yksi* as an indefinite marker.

### 3.2.1 Demonstratives as referential operators

Finnish demonstrative pronouns are listed in Table 6, they can be inflected in all cases and agree in case with the noun that they determine:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tämä</td>
<td>(this)</td>
<td>nämä (these)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se</td>
<td>(this/it)</td>
<td>ne (these/they)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuo</td>
<td>(that)</td>
<td>nuo (those)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 6 |

When the demonstrative modifies a noun, this is interpreted as bearing referential features and cannot have an indefinite or generic reading, as we see from (20), where the noun is provided with semantic referential features by the prenominal modifier.

(20) tämä kissa

‘this cat’

The demonstrative pronoun *tämä* ‘this’ can be used to refer to the nearest, or last-mentioned, noun. Traditionally, it has been assumed that when a demonstrative (deictic or referential) has the [+human] feature, the 3rd person pronoun *hän/he ‘he/they’ can be used in standard Finnish instead of *tämä ‘this’* (among others Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979), as exemplified in (21):

---
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However, a recent comparative research on Finnish and Estonian suggests that *tämä* ‘this’ can be used in addition to non-human antecedents also for non-salient human antecedents (objects or subjects in the OVS order) in contrast with *hän/he* ‘he/they’ that is preferred with more accessible referents, as subjects (Kaiser & Hiitetam 2003).

The demonstrative *tuo* ‘that’ has a distal reference and, in Laury’s (1991) terms, it is used to point out a referent rather than presenting it in the way *tämä* ‘this’ does, with the referent outside the speaker’s sphere. *Se* ‘it/this’ differs from both *tämä* and *tuo* because it has no referent based on proximity to the speaker but rather on proximity to the hearer and internal to his/her sphere.

With reference to case alternation (cf. 3.2.2), let us anticipate a consideration related to demonstratives. Observe that when a demonstrative is the modifier of a partitive object, the object is referential. Hence, the available features related to partitive are the aspect (unbounded) and the interpretation of partitive as a part of:

(22) a. Maija söi tämän omenan [+DEFINITE] [+BOUNDED]
    Maija eat-PAST3sg this-ACCsg apple-ACCsg

b. Maija söi tätä omenaa [-DEFINITE] [-BOUNDED]
    Maija eat-PAST3sg this-PARTsg apple-PARTsg

In (22)a the object is marked for accusative and case features are somehow copied to the prenominal modifier, the object noun phrase is definite because of the referential features of demonstratives, and the event is concluded, hence the predicate is bounded. In (22)b the object NP and the prenominal demonstrative are marked with partitive case but the object noun phrase cannot be indefinite. Hence, licensing of partitive case happens in order to
express the partiality of the event (Maija ate a part of the apple) or it figures out the unboundedness aspect of the predicate (the action is not achieved).

3.2.2 Case alternation as the expression of definiteness

Besides the particular use of *se* ‘it/that’ as a determiner and the definiteness features of demonstratives, the feature of the noun can be determined by case alternation. As for subjects, under certain circumstances we can find a nominative/partitive alternation. However, the [± definite] feature remains ambiguous and context-dependent in other cases. As for objects, we will observe that in many cases the object is ambiguously interpreted for the [± definite] feature, even if partitive is generally related to indefiniteness in contrast with accusative that is generally assumed to mark definite objects. The Finnish accusative/partitive case alternation on object, when not involving aspect but only the referential properties of the NP, appears with verbs that allow for this alternation as a sort of compensating mechanism for the missing definiteness feature. These facts are parallel to the observations on Estonian total/partitive case alternation (Tamm 2005).

Let us now observe in (23)-(24) case alternation as a marker of definiteness for subjects, (23), and objects, (27), respectively:

(23)   a.lapset saapuivat pihalle
       children-NOMpl come-PAST3pl courtyard-ALL
       ‘(The) children arrived in the courtyard’

---

7 We refer to verbs denoting an action that enables the realization of a boundary, not to negative predicates, which obligatorily take partitive or to verbs that cannot have case alternation and hence have a “morphological” partitive. Kiparsky has noted three different types of verbs, on the basis of the “boundedness” concept. The first one is formed by verbs such as *ostaa* (to buy), *ottaa* (to take), *tappaa* (to kill) which are bounded and assign accusative to their object except if these are quantitatively indeterminate, in which case partitive occurs. The second one is formed by verbs denoting psychological states, intensions, continuous motion, which always assign partitive case; the third one includes verbs which can assign either partitive and accusative depending on the boundedness of the predicate (see section 4 for a more accurate description of these verb classes).
As is evident in (23), partitive subjects do not agree for number with the predicate which has the default third person features. Moreover, partitive case on the subject has no implications on the aspect of the verb, differently from partitive on the object. If partitive case can appear on the subject of unaccusatives verbs in existential sentences, as in (23), it cannot appear on the subject of transitive verbs, as in (24), neither on the subject of intransitive verbs, as in (26), even if with the insertion of a locative the result becomes marginal:

(24) a. poika antoi ruusun tytölle
   boy-NOM give-PAST3sing rose-ACC girl-ALL
   ‘A/the boy gave a/the rose to a/the girl’

b. *poikia antoi ruusun tytölle
   boys-PARTpl give-PAST3sg rose-ACCsg girl-ALLsg
   ‘(some) boys gave a/the rose to a/the girl’

(25) a. pojat antoivat ruusun tytölle
   boy-NOMpl give-PAST3pl rose-ACCsg girl-ALLsg
b. *poikia antoivat ruusun tytölle
   boy-PARTpl give-PAST3pl rose-ACCsg girl-ALLsg

(26) a. *poikia itkee
   boy-PARTpl cry-PRES3sg
b. ?poikia itkee huoneessa
   boy-PARTpl cry-PRES3sg room-INEsg
   ‘(some) boys cry in the room’

As for accusative/partitive object case alternation, we observe in (27)a that partitive has three possible interpretations:
On the other hand, accusative is generally related to determinate quantities, to the “whole” of the object and to bounded predicates, as in (27)b.

(27) a. söin omenoita
   ate-PAST1sing apple-PARTpl
   ‘I was eating the/some apples’

b. söin omenat
   ate-PAST1sing apple-ACCpl
   ‘I ate the apples’

Accusative can be opposed to partitive for the definite/indefinite interpretation of the noun phrase, accusative indicating a definite entity or quantity, even of mass nouns, and partitive referring to indefinite quantities, being called inter alia by Kiparsky (1998) the NP-related partitive. This opposition may represent the basic difference in the use of these two cases, and the occurrence of partitive case under these circumstances represents, in the development of the language, the basic semantic value of this case. However, the occurring alternation is a bit more complicated, as we have seen above in example (27)a-b where it can also be the aspect of the verb to be involved and not only the definiteness of the noun bearing accusative or partitive case. For sake of completeness, let us briefly introduce partitive/accusative alternation as related to boundedness.

3.2.2.1 Partitive/accusative case alternation and boundedness

We observed in (27) that the case alternation may also be related to the boundedness features of the predicate. A bounded predicate has a boundary point (temporal and spatial), and the action can terminate in reaching it, while
an unbounded predicate lacks such a temporal or spatial boundary point and expresses an activity or an on-going state. Observe example (28):

(28) Avasin jääkäpin, siellä oli omenoita. Otin yhden omenan.

I opened the fridge, there were apples(PARTpl). I took one(ACCsg) apple(ACCsg).

a. Söin omenaa kun ovikello soi.
I was eating the apple(PARTsg) when the doorbell rang.
b. Söin omenan ja ovikello soi.
I ate the apple(ACCsg.) and the doorbell rang.

In both cases of (28), the apple is a definite entity, it is the one that has been taken from the fridge. Nonetheless, it bears partitive case in (28)a and accusative in (28)b. The action expressed by the predicate in (28)a is unbounded or atelic. As a consequence, it requires partitive case on its internal argument. While in English and Italian it would be misleading to refer to a known apple by means of an indefinite article, in Finnish the aspect of the predicate is predominant on the [±DEF] feature of the noun. On the contrary, in (28)b, the event of eating the apple is bounded and is not overlapping with the following event. For this reason the object is in accusative case.

The [±DEF] feature of the noun and the [±BOUNDED] feature of the predicate has been resumed under the distinction between a ‘total direct object’ and a ‘partial direct object’ by Thomas (2003). According to Thomas, the object is marked with partitive or accusative according to the degree of affectedness of the action denoted by the predicate. Hence, we have accusative with a totally affected object and partitive with a partially affected object.

The observed case alternation (both in its NP-related function and related to the [±BOUNDED] features of the predicate) may hint to an external position where partitivity features are checked. Partitive case is relevant for many aspects. We will also deal with partitive/accusative alternation in chapter 5,
relation to quantification and in the scope of negation. In chapter 6, we will observe case alternation in Finnish/Italian bilingual teenagers on the object as also related to the (un)boundedness feature of the predicate.

3.2.3 Proper names

Proper names denote an entity in a direct way, and, as it is often claimed, with a function somehow parallel to demonstratives. Hence, we are going to check whether they can occupy the specifier position of the KP/DP projection (cf. (4) p.54), being related to the definiteness feature of the noun phrase.

When either the first name or the family name are present, they are marked by case like nouns, (29).

(29) a. annoin kirjan Maijalle
    give-PAST1sg book-ACC Maija-ALL
b. annoin kirjan Niemiselle
    give-PAST1sg book-ACC Nieminen-ALL

When both the first name and the family name are present we find a complement/specification relation between the two names, as we see from (30)a-b. In (30)a, we have the base form whereas in (30)b the name and the surname are inverted, and the surname in genitive case seems to have a determiner-like function.

    Maija-NOM Nieminen-NOM buy-PAST3sg car-ACC
b. [Niemisen Maija] osti auton.
    Nieminen-GEN Maija-NOM buy-PAST3sg car-ACC

As expected, with the occurrence of an oblique case it is only the head of the noun phrase that is inflected.

(31) a. annoin kirjan [Maija Niemiselle]
    give-PAST1sg book-ACC Maija-NOM Nieminen-ALL
b. annoin kirjan [Niemisen Maijalle]

give-PAST1sg book-ACC Nieminen-GEN Maija-ALL

In (31)a allative case is required by the verb and it marks only the surname, whereas the name is marked for nominative. The full name seems to behave like a compound noun, that displays case and number features only on the second element. The surname in the prenominal position behaves like a possessive or a genitival attribute and allative case is assigned only to the proper name Maija. This phenomenon is reminiscent of what we find in Italian, in cases such as Cosimo de’ Medici, where the genitive specifies the family or the origins, with the expected difference that the genitive precedes the head noun in Finnish and follows it in Italian, as is also the case with common nouns.

We observe that the structure in (31)a may plausibly correspond to a relation parallel to (32). Differently, when the surname is marked for genitive case and precedes the name it seems that the two nouns bear an R-relation as in (31)(32)b.

(32) annoin kirjan Maija-ompelijalle

give-PAST1sg book-ACC Maija- dressmaker-ALL

‘I gave the book to the dressmaker Maija’

In Finnish, proper names can be modified by an adjective, can appear in possessive constructions, can have the possessive clitic, and can be marked by case, (33)a. Finnish lacks a kind of postnominal modification possible for example in Italian (Gianni mio litt.’John my’), (33)b.

(33) a. hänen hauskalle Matillensa tapahtui jännittävä seikkailu.

his/her funny-ALL Matti-ALL+POSS3sg. exciting adventure(?)

‘an exciting adventure happened to his funny Matti’

b. *Matti minun

‘Matti my’
Finally, for Finnish we observe another instance of nominal modification, which consists of the formation of a sort of compound noun where the proper name always precedes the common name, as exemplified in (34):

(34)  a. Emmi-kissa
     Emmi cat
     ‘the cat Emmi’

     b. Julle-poika
     Julle boy
     ‘the boy Julle’

The relation between the proper name and the noun seems to have some parallelisms with the relation between the noun and the adjective that we observed in 1.2.2 and repeated in (34), which exemplifies the only case for Finnish in which we assume that the noun raises across its adjectival modifier and that consists of vocatives, exclamations(35), and letter headings.

(35) lapsi rakas
     child dear

In conclusion, as expected, proper names are complex structures and it may be plausible to assume that the first element is in the specifier position, as can be inferred from the parallelism between (31) and (32).

3.3 Conclusions

Summarizing, in this chapter we dealt with the elements that can occupy the specifier position of a DP/KP projection, in order to provide the noun phrase with referential features. The referential features of the noun phrase are given by pragmatic inference, demonstratives, case alternation, word order, pronouns, and of course proper names. The observed facts supports the hypothesis for an external DP/KP projection.
We have noted that the absence of the definite/indefinite article category in Finnish is not so clear-cut as we observed the emergence of a new category of definite markers. The demonstrative *se* is presumably undergoing a process of grammaticalization and the possible development of the definite article from the demonstrative pronoun *se* ‘that/it’ is an ongoing process at its initial stage. The assumption of the development of a definite article from the demonstrative *se*, and not from other demonstratives, may be related also to the impossibility of *se* to be used as indicator of proximity or distance from the speaker. Demonstratives are assumed to carry definiteness features, to identify uniquely the noun they modify, and their use overrides other means of expressing definiteness (as also noted by Juvonen 2000). Also case alternation can be used as a definiteness marker (nominative/partitive for subject and accusative/partitive for object). However, case does not always mark unambiguously nouns for the [±DEF] feature. Besides the indefinite interpretation, partitive case also relates to the aspect of the verb or is required in the scope of negation. Afterwards, we exemplified how also pronouns and proper names are used in order to give a definite and referential interpretation to the noun phrase. Finally, also possessive pronouns are related to uniqueness and identifiability features, that in turn are part of the concept of definiteness. To this and related issues we devote the following section.
4. The Possessive System

This chapter is dedicated to the Finnish possessive system which presents a rather complex syntax. The possessive relation in Finnish can be expressed either by a full genitive DP, (1)a, or by a possessive pronoun (Finnish has not possessive adjectives). In the latter case a possessive suffix can be inserted with interesting restrictions, (1)b. On the basis of the distribution of the possessive suffix, we distinguish possessive pronouns in standard and colloquial Finnish and observe that the latter behave like full DPs in that they do not cooccur with the possessive suffix, (1)c.

(1) a. Tuulan kirja.
    Tuula-GEN book
    ‘Tuula’s book’

b. hänen kirjansa.
    (s)he-GEN book-NOM+POSS3

c. sen kirja
    his/her/its book
    ‘his/her book’

4.1 About Possessors hierarchy and theta-role

The main aim of this section is to try to complete the discussion started in chapter 2 on thematic relations in nominal expressions.

Finnish displays the pattern exemplified in (1), where we find an object denoting noun kirja as the possessum. The genitive case on the possessor is clearly assigned DP-internally and it is independent of the case assigned by an external predicate to the possessum, as exemplified in (2):

(2) a. annoin luun Liisan koiralle.
    give-PAST1sg bone-ACCsg Liisa-GENsg dog-ADEsg
    ‘I gave a bone to Liisa’s dog’
b. presidentti tutustui ministerin vaimoon.

president-GEN meet-PASS3sg ministry-GENsg wife-ILLsg

‘The President met the ministry’s wife’

In (2)a the transitive verb *antaa* ‘give’ has three arguments and assigns accusative and adessive case to its internal arguments. In (2)b the transitive verb *tutustua* ‘meet/know’ assigns illative case to its internal argument. In both (2)a and (2)b the genitive case is assigned internally to the object DP.

With object-referring nouns such as *muotokuva* ‘portrait’ the genitive DP can bear various thematic roles as exemplified in (3):

(3)  a. Liisan muotokuva POSSESSOR
    Liisa-GENsg portrait-NOMsg
    ‘Liisa’s portrait’

b. Picasson muotokuva AGENT
    Picasso-GENsg portrait-NOMsg
    ‘A/the portrait by Picasso’

c. naisen muotokuva THEME
    woman-GENsg portrait-NOMsg
    ‘A/the portrait of a woman’

In (3) the interpretation of the Θ-roles is only due to our encyclopaedic knowledge of the world, as for example in (3)a *Liisa* can potentially be Agent or Theme.

As also observed in chapter 2, Finnish appears to respect the DP-internal thematic hierarchy discussed for Italian by Cinque (1980) and further developed by Giorgi and Longobardi (1991). The possessed noun and the possessor form a morphological unit and a thematic role assigning unit, and as for other languages (among others Italian and Bulgarian) we observe in (3) that various Θ-roles can be realized in the possessive construction. In general in Finnish two prenominal genitives are marginal, as signalled by the question mark in (4)a.
As observed from the examples in (4), we can confirm the generally assumed thematic hierarchy in (5) also for Finnish. A possessor θ-role can only be assigned to the highest genitive DP, as is evident from (4)e where it is expressed by a possessive pronoun, and Theme can never precede Agent.

(5) POSSESSOR - AGENT - THEME

The impossibility for a Theme to precede an Agent theta-role is also clear when the Theme is expressed by a postnominal DP in elative case. The theta-role hierarchy is maintained and the prenominal genitive DP can be assigned either the Possessor (6)a or the Agent theta-role (6)b.

(6) a. Liisan muotokuva Runebergista

   Liisa-GENsg portrait-NOMsg Runeberg-ELAsg

   ‘Liisa’s portrait of a woman’
b. Picasso muotokuva naistesta
   Picasso-GENsg portrait-NOMsg woman-ELAsg
   ‘Picasso’s portrait of a woman’

In nominal constructions genitive case can only be prenominal whatever theta-role it is assigned (7)a, whereas elative case is always postnominal as in (6)b vs. (7)b, and it cannot be prenominal either stressed or unstressed, as in (7)b-c:

(7)  a. *muotokuva Picasso
    portrait-NOM Picasso-GEN
    ‘The portrait of Picasso’
  
b. *naisesta muotokuva
    woman-ELA portrait-NOM
    ‘The portrait of woman’
  
c. *NAISESTA muotokuva
    woman-ELA portrait-NOM
    ‘The portrait of woman’

With a higher genitive possessor DP, we observe two possible constructions instead of the double genitive: the formation of a compound noun (8)a-b and a construction with elative case (8)c. The first part of the compound noun can be either an Agent or a Theme, whereas the postnominal DP in elative case can only be a Theme.

(8)  a. Liisan Picasso-muotokuva
    POSS. AGENT N
    Liisa-GENsg Picasso-portrait-NOM
    ‘Liisa’s portrait of Picasso’
  
b. Liisan kapteeni-muotokuva
    POSS. THEME N
    Liisa-GENsg captain-portrait-NOM
    ‘Liisa’s portrait of the captain’
c. Liisan muotokuva kapteenista

POSS. N THEME

Liisa-GEN sg portrait-NOM sg captain-ELA sg

‘Liisa’s portrait of the captain’

Considering nouns such as *tarkastus* ‘examination’ and *tilaus* ‘order’ that can have a result or an event interpretation, we observe that the predicted thematic hierarchy presented in (5) is respected. However, this class of nouns crucially differs in that the Theme cannot be expressed by elative (or other) case (in postnominal position) as in (9)d.

(9) a. Liisan opettajan kokeiden tarkastus

POSS. AGENT THEME N
teacher-GEN sg paper-GEN pl examination-NOM sg

‘The teacher’s examination of the papers’

b. meidän kirjojen tilaus

AGENT THEME N
we-GEN book-GEN pl order-NOM sg

‘our order of books’

c. meidän kirjatilaus

AGENT THEME N
we-GEN book-order-NOM

‘our book-order’

d. *meidän tilaus kirjoista

AGENT N THEME
we-GEN order-NOM book-ELA

‘our book-order’

For the sake of completeness, we observe that also for (9)b, as was the case in (8)a, the formation of a compound noun is possible, as in (9)c.

In conclusion, on the basis of these observations we can formulate the following generalizations: a) when a full DP is the possessor, it is generally assigned genitive case and is always prenominal, and b) elative case is limited
to themes of certain object-referring nouns (as observed for *muotokuva* ‘portrait’ in example (4)b, (6)a-b, (8)c). Furthermore c) the well-known possessivization hierarchy in (5) is respected. Finally, d) different thematic roles can be expressed by genitival DPs but it is generally preferable not to have more than one prenominal genitive DP.

### 4.2 Possessive pronouns in Standard Finnish

Finnish does not display possessive adjectives and only personal pronouns can express possession with anaphoric pronominal reference. As a consequence, pronominal possessives never agree for case or number with the possessum head noun.

Parallel to full DPs, Possessive pronouns are always prenominal:

(10) a. hänen talonsa
    his/her house-NOM+POSS3sg

b. talonsa hänen
    house-NOM+POSS3sg  his/her

The possessive pronouns are personal pronouns in genitive case (as we will see in the boldfaced column in table 6) and possession is expressed by the pronoun cooccurring with the possessive suffix, the latter represented in the third column. The possessive suffix agrees for number and person with the possessor, gender is not present in Finnish. The suffix of the third person possessive is syncretic. It presents a number of allomorphs: *-nsA*\(^1\) appears attached to nominative, genitive, accusative, and illative case endings on the possessum (all of which end in a consonant) as exemplified in (11)a, while *-Vn* (lengthening of the last vowel + n) attaches to all the other cases, as in (11)b.

(11) a. hänen talonsa
    his/her house-NOM+POSS3sg

\(^1\) The capital letter *A* indicates that the vowel can surface as [a] or [ä] due to vowel harmony rules.
In table 7, we observe two different classes of personal pronouns. The first column represents the personal pronouns in nominative case, the basic form. In the second column there are the possessive pronouns that are formed by the personal pronouns in genitive case. Finally, the third column represents the possessive suffixes corresponding to each person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERS. PRON.(Nom)</th>
<th>POSS.PRON.(Gen)</th>
<th>POSS. SUFFIXES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg. minä</td>
<td>minun</td>
<td>-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg. sinä</td>
<td>sinun</td>
<td>-si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg. hän [+hum]</td>
<td>hänent [+hum]</td>
<td>-nsA, -Vn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se[-hum]</td>
<td>sen [-hum]</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl. me</td>
<td>meidän</td>
<td>mme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl. te</td>
<td>teidän</td>
<td>-tte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl. he [+hum]</td>
<td>heidän [+hum]</td>
<td>-nsA, -Vn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne[-hum]</td>
<td>niitten[-hum]</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

Observe the occurrence of *sen* ‘its’ as a third person singular possessive pronoun. In standard Finnish it has [-human] reference and it does not present doubling with the possessive suffix on the possessum. It is monosyllabic and it patterns as the “weak” pronouns in colloquial Finnish (cf. section 4.3).

In (12)a, we observe the distribution of the possessive morpheme. The possessive morpheme always follows the number and case suffixes and it cliticizes only on the possessum and not on the modifiers preceding it. Furthermore, in (12)b the lack of the possessive suffix in standard Finnish is exemplified for the third person [-human] pronoun:
In standard Finnish, it is possible to have non-overt possessive pronouns for first and second person (13)a, on the other hand third person does not admit such a possibility, as it is apparent in (13)b. It is always necessary to have either an overt pronoun or referent, i.e. the subject of the clause, as exemplified in (14)a-b.

(13) a. hattuni lensi kauas.
    hat-POSS1sg fly-PAST3sg far away
    ‘My hat flew far away’

   b. *hattunsa lensi kauas.
    hat-POSS3sg fly-PAST3sg far away
    ‘his/her hat flew far away’

(14) a. Mari näki [[hattunsan] lentävän]
    Mari-NOM see-PAST3sg fly-1PRTC hat-POSS3p
    ‘Mari saw her hat flying (away)’

   b. Mari näki [hänen/hän hattunsan] lentävän
    Mari see-PAST3sg his/her hat-POSS3p fly-1PRTC
    ‘(s)he saw his/her hat flying (away)’

In (14)a the possessive suffix and the subject of the clause are coindexed whereas in (14)b the possessive suffix is coindexed with the third person possessive pronoun which in turn can refer either to an external entity or to the subject of the clause.
According to the classification of Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) and Cardinaletti (1998) it seems that possessive pronouns in standard Finnish are strong pronouns because they can be focalized (15)a, coordinated (15)b and they can appear in predicative (15)c and isolation structures (15)d.

(15) a. tämä on MINUN kirjani
   ‘this is MY book’

b. tämä kirja on minun ja sinun
   ‘this book is mine and yours’

c. tämä kirja on minun
   ‘this book is mine’

d. –“Kenen kirja tämä on?” – “Minun”.
   ‘-Whose book is this?’ – ‘It’s mine’

Obviously, the possessive suffix cannot be stressed:

(16) *sinun kirjA
    you-GEN book-POSS2sg
    ‘your book’

Moreover, possessive pronouns in standard Finnish crucially require obligatory doubling with the agreeing possessive suffix. This may suggest that they are strong pronouns doubled by a clitic. This first hypothesis is corroborated by the observation that the possessive suffix clearly has a different status with respect to case and number morphemes because (i) it is the last morpheme on the noun and (ii) contrary to case and number does not need to be overt.

A possible alternative is to analyse the possessive morpheme as an agreement on the possessum with person, number and case features of the pronominal possessor.

Since in both cases the presence of the possessive morpheme is required by the pronominal nature of the possessor, the two analyses clearly make different empirical predictions as regards parallel behaviour of Finnish pronouns in the
clause and parallel phenomena in cross-linguistic perspective. The first hypothesis predicts that strong pronouns need to be doubled, while the second hypothesis predicts that subject pronouns need to agree with their predicate. We will argue in the following that there are good reasons to favour the second hypothesis.

### 4.2.1 Parallelisms with the clause

Finnish is a partially pro-drop language and subject pronouns can be dropped for all persons, but not for third person singular and plural, as exemplified in (17).

(17) a. (minä) tulen  
(I) come  
b. *(hän) tulee  
(s)he comes  
c. *(he) tulevat  
they come

Parallel to the verbal construction in (17), we have the possessive construction in (18), where the possessive pronoun is obligatorily overt for third person, as evident from (18)b and (18)c. Moreover, we remark that the third person possessive suffix is morphologically the same for singular and plural and the insertion of the possessive pronoun avoids ambiguities in semantic interpretation.

(18) a. (minun) koirani  
(my) dog-POSS1sg  
b. *(hänen) koiransa  
his/her dog-POSS3sg  
c. *(heidän) koiransa  
their dog-POSS3pl
Reconsider also example (14) here repeated in (19) compared to a parallel clausal construction.

(19)  

a. Mari näki [[hattunsä] lentävän]  
Mari-NOM see-PAST3sg fly-1PRTC hat-ACC+POSS3p  
‘Mari saw her hat flying (away)’

b. Mari sanoi, että tulee myöhemmin  
Mari-NOM say-PAST3sg that come-PRES3sg later  
‘Mari said that will come later’

c. Mari näki [hänän hattunsä] lentävän  
Mari see-PAST3sg his/her hat-ACC+POSS3p fly-1PRTC  
‘(s)he saw his/her hat flying (away)’

d. Mari sanoi, että hän ja tulee myöhemmin  
Mari-NOM say-PAST3sg that she come-PRES3sg later  
‘Mari said that she will come later’

In (19), we observe a perfect parallelism with the clause in the distribution of the pronouns. In (19)a-b the pronoun is non-overt and the referent can only be the subject of the clause. On the contrary, when the pronoun is overt, the referentiality of the pronouns in the possessive construction and in the clause differ. In (19)c the possessor can only be picked elsewhere in the discourse whereas in (19)d the referent can be either the subject of the clause or refer to somebody else.

The obligatoriness of an overt referent for the third person therefore contrasts with the freedom of dropping pronouns for the first and second person. However, the poorer inflectional morphology of third person singular is not sufficient to explain this asymmetry given that third person plural inflection is richer but still unable to licence pro, as we observe in (20):

(20)  

a. *(Liisa) tule-e cf (17)b  
‘Liisa comes’

b. *(Liisa ja Pekka) tule-vat cf (17)c  
‘Liisa and Pekka come’
Finnish is a topic-prominent language (cf. Holmberg & Nikanne 2002), i.e. any argument that can function as a topic can move to preverbal position. Hence, following Holmberg’s analysis, in Finnish verb-initial sentences are possible only when there is no ‘potential topic’ that can be externalized. Here, we tentatively suggest that the different dropping possibilities can be explained in terms of topic-drop effect. In fact, while the first or second person is always present in the discourse, being necessarily the participant of a speech or writing act, and can be intended as “overt referent”, the referent for the third person needs to be explicit because not directly involved as a participant in the speech or writing act.

(21)  a. kerroin Maijalle uudesta projektistamme.
    tell-PAST1sg Maija-ALL new-ELA project-ELA+POSS1pl
    ‘I told Maija about our new project’

b. kerroitko Maijalle uudesta projektistamme?
    tell-PAST+INT Maija-ALL new-ELA project-ELA+POSS1pl
    ‘Did you tell Maija about our new project’

c. *kertoko Maijalle uudesta projektistamme?
    tell-PAST3sg Maija-ALL new-ELA project-ELA+POSS1pl
    ‘Did (s)he tell Maija about our new project?’

In (21)a-b the participants in the discourse are clearly identified, as the first and second persons represent always the speaker and the interlocutor, whereas in (21)c the third person subject cannot be directly involved in the discourse and needs an overt referent.

The assumption that the possessive construction undergoes the same topic-drop effect to be found in the clause is coherent with Szabolcsi (1994) who suggests for Hungarian that the possessor bears the same agreement relation to the possessum that the subjects bears to the verb: as [+tense] licenses agreement between the subject and the verb, so does [+poss] between the possessor and the possessum, the result being a functional similarity in the two relations, as it will be exemplified in section 4.4. Furthermore, the
possessive suffix morpheme on the possessum is the last morpheme on the
noun, as the person inflection is the last morpheme on the verb. Finally, in
Finnish the parallelism with the clause is reinforced if we consider that pro-
drop is limited to first and second person and can hold for third person only
under discourse-pragmatic conditions.

The parallelism between the possessive morpheme and agreement on the verb
for person features of the subject is confirmed by the fact that the third person
possessive pronoun must be dropped if the possessive suffix is coindexed
with the subject of the clause. In this respect the overt subject of the noun
phrase can and by economy must be null if it refers to a topic referent, as in
example (19)a and (19)c. In a parallel way, the third person subject pronoun
must be overt or have an overt referent, as correctly predicted by examples
(19)b and (19)d, and by the ungrammatical (21)c. Finnish does not allow true
pro-drop for third person singular and plural, with the exception of a set of
verbs which includes verbs with an arbitrary subject NP and with a generic
meaning, and verbs denoting weather, emotional states, distance and time,
which have an expletive subject.

4.2.2 Crosslinguistic observations

In a crosslinguistic perspective, the facts observed for Finnish may suggest a
parallelism with Greek and Bulgarian that are known as clitic-doubling
languages (cf. Giusti & Stavrou 2005). In particular, it could appear that
Finnish differs from Bulgarian and is similar to Greek in that in Bulgarian the
possessive clitic can co-occur with a full possessive DP, whereas this is not
possible for Greek and Finnish (except when the referent of the possessive
suffix is the subject of the sentence, as previously noticed), as exemplified in
(22)a for Bulgarian, (22)b for Greek and (22)c for Finnish (the Bulgarian and
Greek data are from Giusti & Stavrou 2005):
Furthermore, Finnish appears similar to Greek in that in both languages doubling of the possessor appears to be obligatory only when the possessor is a strong pronoun, as in (23)a for Greek and (23)b for Finnish:

(23)  a. to pedhi mu emena dhen ithele na spudhasi sto eksoteriko
the child 1CL me-GEN not wanted to study abroad
b. minun lapseni ei halunnut opiskella ulkomailla
me-GEN child-NOM+POSS1sg not wanted to study abroad

With respect to the distribution of the clitic morpheme we observe that in Greek (24)a and in Finnish (24)b it can occur with either a definite or an indefinite NPs, whereas in Bulgarian (24)c definite NPs are excluded:

(24)  a. ena/to oreo tu vivlio
a/the nice 3CL book
b. minun uusi kirjani
me-GEN nice book-NOM+POSS1sg
c. *nova mi kniga
new me-CL book

The hypothesis that the possessive suffix could be a doubling clitic, however, is incompatible with the previous proposal that it is in fact an agreement morpheme. As a matter of fact, it is excluded on independent grounds. First of all, (24)a we remark that in Greek the possessive morpheme can encliticize on the noun as well as on any agreeing prenominal modifier that is not possible for Finnish, as evident from the contrast in (25):
More crucially, this hypothesis predicts the same behaviour of pronouns in the clause. But while both Bulgarian and Greek display clitic doubling with pronouns (and also with DPs in given contexts) in the clause, Finnish does not even have clitic pronouns in the clause, as exemplified in (26):

(26) a. včera (ja) kupix knigata (Greek)
yesterday CL.FEM.sg buy-PAST1sg-I the-book
b. (to-)aghorasa to vivlio (Greek)
(CL-) buy-PAST1sg the book
c. eilen ostin kirjan (Finnish)
yesterday buy-PAST1sg book-ACCsg
‘Yesterday, I bought the book’

Thus, we can exclude that the Finnish possessive suffix is a clitic pronoun parallel to the Greek clitic morpheme, simply because it would be the only clitic pronoun in the language. We therefore conclude that the Finnish pronominal possessive construction patterns apparently in a similar way to the Hungarian one since in both we observe the presence of a possessive morpheme on the possessor, as exemplified in (27), where we notice the parallelism between Hungarian (27)a-b and Finnish (27)a’-b’. However, Hungarian, presents a further agreement morpheme, that appears on the head noun and reflects the person and number of the possessor. The Hungarian agreement morpheme is non-overt only for the third person singular pronoun (the following Hungarian counterparts are from Kiss 2002).
It seems that the Finnish possessive suffix is similar to the Hungarian agreement morpheme as both are the last morpheme on the noun they attach to, rather than to the possessive suffix which has, on the contrary, a different distribution in the two languages under discussion. In (28) we notice the contrast for full noun phrases, (28)a for Hungarian and (28)b for Finnish:

\begin{align*}
    (28) & \quad \text{(Hu)} \\
    & \text{a. a Péter diák –ja –i} \\
    & \text{the Peter student-POSS-PL} \\
    & \text{‘Peter’s students’} \\
    & \text{b. Pekan oppilaita} \\
    & \text{Pekka-GEN student-PL-PART} \\
    & \text{‘Pekka’s students’}
\end{align*}

The Hungarian possessive suffix is adjacent to the noun and it is followed by number and case, while the agreement morpheme follows the case suffix exactly as the possessive morpheme does in Finnish. Curiously, both Hungarian and Finnish show a peculiar behaviour for third person agreement morpheme and possessive suffix respectively, even if for Hungarian it is limited to third person singular. A last remark that does not contradict the suggested parallelism between the Hungarian agreement morpheme and the
Finnish possessive suffix, is that in Hungarian the possessive suffix always attaches to the possessed noun, with no difference between a pronoun and a full DP possessor differently from what we observed for Finnish. For the moment I do not have an interesting explanation for this contrast a part from the generic observation that inflectional paradigms are the place for the widest crosslinguistic variation.

4.3 Possessive pronouns in colloquial Finnish

It appears necessary to distinguish possessive pronouns in standard and colloquial Finnish as it seems that the colloquial forms show a different syntactic pattern, rather than just being a phonological reduced variant of the strong form due to the informal register.

In colloquial Finnish, there is a general tendency towards more analytic than synthetic forms. In order to have a more comprehensive understanding of colloquial Finnish let us briefly review its main characteristics, that are: (i) a visible shortening of pronominal forms and abbreviated verbal forms, due to deletion of a consonant and/or a vowel, as in (29)a with respect to standard (29)b, (ii) the use of the impersonal passive form –AAn (cf. fnt. 1) in the first person plural (30)a instead of the standard suffix –mme (30)b, and finally, (iii) with respect to third person pronouns only the [-human] pronouns (cf. table 7) are used and the verb does not agree with the subject for number being always singular, as exemplified by the contrast in (31)a and b:

(29)  a. mä oon
     b. minä olen
     ‘I am’

(30)  a. me mennään
     b. me menemme
     ‘We go/we are going’
(31)  a. ne tulee huomenna
    b. he tulevat huomenna

‘They will come tomorrow’

Also possessive pronouns have a shortened form derived from standard Finnish possessives (cf. table 8), in the same way as colloquial personal pronouns are derived from standard ones. It is worth remarking, as already noticed by Vainikka (1989) that while the first and second person possessives can be omitted in their standard form (since possession is expressed by the possessive suffix), they cannot be dropped in their colloquial form, where possessor is not expressed by any suffix. In table 8, we report the shortened form of personal pronouns in colloquial Finnish and of possessive pronouns in standard and colloquial Finnish:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLL. PERSONAL PRONOUNS</th>
<th>STANDARD POSS. PRON.</th>
<th>COLLOQUIAL POSS. PRON.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 sg. mä</td>
<td>minun</td>
<td>mun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 sg. sä</td>
<td>sinun</td>
<td>sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 sg. se</td>
<td>hänen [+human]</td>
<td>sen [-human]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sen [± human]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pl. me</td>
<td>meidän</td>
<td>meiän</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pl. te</td>
<td>teidän</td>
<td>teiän</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pl. ne</td>
<td>heidän [+human]</td>
<td>niitten [-human]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

For the 1st and 2nd person, the colloquial forms consist of abbreviated forms (m(in)un > mun) with no agreeing possessive suffix on the possessum as in (32)a, and for the 3rd person there is only one pronominal form independently

---

3 Recall that the variety in issue here is the colloquial variety of the Southern part of Finland and in particular of the Eastern area in the proximity of Helsinki.
of the [± human] referential features of the possessor, as in (32)b. This pronoun, as mentioned above, does not require a possessive morpheme on the possessed, in a parallel way to full DPs.

(32) a. mun kirja
   me-GEN book-NOM
   ‘my book’

b. sen kirja
   it-GEN book-NOM
   ‘his/her/its book’

Therefore, it appears that the possessive pronouns in colloquial Finnish are on the way to form an autonomous system with its own characteristics, which are in particular the shortened form of possessive pronouns and the dropping of possessive suffix on the possessum and the consequent lack of possessor-possessum agreement.

Colloquial possessives do not require a possessive suffix on the possessed noun, similarly to full DPs and to the third person [-human] standard possessive *sen* ‘it’.

At this point, a couple of observations are needed with respect to the pronoun *se* ‘it/that’. First, we remark that the same lexical item is used as a demonstrative pronoun and as a [-human] personal pronoun in standard Finnish. Second, it has extended to [±human] referents in colloquial Finnish.

We can therefore assume a shift of *se* ‘it/that’ from a demonstrative use to a pronominal one and a general levelling of colloquial possessive pronouns on the model of less agglutinating and morphologically less rich languages. Moreover, it seems plausible to assume that the Finnish nominal system is undergoing a general remodelling supported also by the formation of a definite article as *se* ‘it/that’ shows to have not only a demonstrative-related but also a definite article-related use and it is taking on functions not peculiar to demonstrative pronouns, i.e. its referential properties are very similar to pure definiteness markers (cf. Laury 1991).
The possibility to find in colloquial Finnish hybrid forms such as in (33) possibly demonstrates the ongoing process in the formation of a parallel possessive system to the standard Finnish one. In (33) we observe the presence of the agreeing possessive suffix preceded by the first person singular colloquial possessive pronoun, this kind of utterances may be analysed as code-mixing between standard and colloquial Finnish.

(33) mun kirjani
    me-GEN(COLL) book-NOM+POSS1sg
    'my book'

The lack of possessive suffixes, as exemplified in (32), could at a first sight suggest that possessive pronouns have a weak status in colloquial Finnish, as weak pronouns typically do not occur in doubling constructions (cf. Cardinaletti 1998 and Cardinaletti & Starke 1999). The weak status of possessive pronouns in colloquial Finnish could also be suggested by evidence from personal pronouns. Let us recall that also in other cases pronouns can be divided into two classes: the “long” form of standard Finnish and the “short” form of colloquial Finnish. The reduced form cannot replace the long form in all contexts. In the typical context in which a strong form is required, the short form is marginal even in colloquial register:

(34) Context: the doorbell rings.
    - Kuka siellä?  - ?*Mä / Minä.
    ‘Who is there?’  ‘(It’s) me’.

And even if it is not totally excluded, the use of the colloquial form in (35)a is marginal, in contrast with the standard form in (35)b and the mixed form in (35)c.

(35) a. ?* se oon mä
    b. se olen mina
    c. se oon minä
    ‘It’s me’
However, if the long form of possessives in standard Finnish seems very much to be strong pronouns, the classification of the reduced possessive as weak pronouns is controversial as they can also appear in contexts typical of strong pronouns, such as focalization (36)a, predicative (36)b, and isolation (36)c structures. Furthermore, they can also be coordinated (36)d, as strong pronouns.

(36)  

a. tämä on MUN kirja
   ‘this is MY book’

b. tämä kirja on mun
   ‘this book is mine’

c. "Kenen tämä kirja on?” - “Mun”
   - “Whose book is this?” – “It’s mine”

d. mun ja sun tilanne
   ‘my and your situation’

Given that we have excluded the clitic nature of the possessive suffix, the last evidence on a weak status of the short forms disappears and we can safely suggest that both classes of pronouns in Finnish are strong, at least at the present stage of the language.

4.4 Inalienable possession and kinship relations

It would be interesting to have a brief parallel comparison between English and Finnish for what concerns permanent possessive relations, as body parts and kinship relations, as they differ meaningfully from alienable possessive constructions. Referring to Cooper’s (2002) study on inalienable possession in Finnish\(^3\) we remark that a more flexible behaviour is admitted in the omission of the possessor if compared to English, Finnish patterning similarly to Italian:

---

\(^3\) The examples are from the novel represented in the Tampere Bilingual Corpus and adapted from Cooper 2002
“You’re hurt” he said. “It’s nothing. My arm. It’ll be all right in a second”.

“Loukkauduitteko?” hän kysyi. “Ei se mitään… Ø käsivarsi Ø vain.

   Kohta se taas on hyvä”.

(38) The girl’s shoulder, and her arm right down to the elbow, were pressed on his.

   Tytön olkapää ja Øoikea olkavarsiØ painautuvat tiukasti häneen.

   (vs […] hänen oikea olkavarten saa […]).

In (37) it is the discourse that makes the possessive relation clear (it is the arm of the speaker, being the arm of someone else a possessive would be obligatory). In (38) the use of the possessive construction would lead to ambiguity in the interpretation and, as suggested by Cooper (2002), it seems that a zero possessor has even more anaphoric force than a pronoun. Also sentences like (39) provide evidence for the anaphoric force of a zero possessor, when one possessive construction is present, all the following ones are omitted as in (39)a (if explicit they could refer to another possessor and the sentence would be ambiguous as in (39)b):

(39) Her lips were deeply reddened, her cheeks rouged, her nose powdered.

   a. Hänen huulensa olivat syvän punaiset, ØposketØ oli punattu ja nenäØ puuteroitu.

   b. Hänen huulensa olivat syvän punaiset, hän poskensa va oli punattu ja hänen nenänsä va puuteroitu.

   c. Hänen huulensa olivat syvän punaiset, poskensa oli punattu ja nenänsä puuteroitu.

(39)c is certainly grammatical and the possessive morphemes correctly refer to the subject pronoun hänen (‘his/her’). However, the presence of the possessive morpheme is unnecessary and stylistically heavy. This must be related to the alienable nature of the possessum.
In Finnish a zero possessor is possible and preferred when the reference is that of a generic possessor, differently from English, where it is necessary to use the pronoun one’s.

(40) jos katsotaan liikaa televisiota, silmät väsyvät
    if look-PRESpass too much television-PART eyes-NOM get tired
    ‘If one looks too much television, one’s eyes get tired’

With what Cooper (2002) calls “whole-part structures” neither Finnish, (41)a, nor English, (41)b, require a possessive construction:

(41)  a. […] ja katsoin häntä suoraan silmiinØ
  b. […] and looked her in the eyes

However, Cooper points out that the when possession omission is possible in Finnish, but not in English, this is not related to syntactic constraints but to the discourse level, and ambiguity, depersonalization, generic meaning are involved. The omission of the possessive suffix is possible in colloquial language, as we have previously seen, and usually ambiguity is disambiguated by the discourse context, which may not be so clear in the written standard language, where possessive suffixes should always be present.

For what concerns kinship relations, in Finnish it seems that a possessive pronoun or a suffix can be non-overt only in some cases, in particular when the reference is disambiguated by the context:

(42)  a. [pMari jää kotiin [p kun Ø äitiØ,kävi kaupassa]]
    Mari-NOM stayed home-ILL when mother-NOM went shop-INE
    ‘Mari stayed home while X’s mother went to the shop’
    where X = Mari/ mine
  b. [hän ja siskoØ[ØX]] tulivat
    (S)he-NOM and sister-NOM come-PAST3pl
    ‘(S)he and his/her/my sister came’
In (42)a there is no possessive construction and the sentence is grammatical. The kinship relation can be IP internal between the two nouns or the second noun, äiti (mother) can have an external reference, the alternation depending on whether the sentence belongs to standard or colloquial register. Example (42)b contrary to (42)a is accepted by my informants only in colloquial Finnish being ungrammatical in the formal register. Also here we see that the absence of the possessive suffix (and of the antecedent pronoun) assumes the kinship relation to be inferred only from the discourse context, more precisely, the possessor refers to the preceding pronoun, except in the oral form, when it can also refer to the speaker. In colloquial speech the dropping of the clitic possessive suffix is generally preferred to that of the possessive pronoun in (42)c and (42)d. The pattern of possession in (42)a and (42)b may seem parallel to what was observed with inalienable possession but it is interesting to note that while in the examples concerning inalienable possession the co-reference between possessor and possessor was unambiguous (see example (39)a) here we notice a “discourse-topic effect”. This means that in the spoken register, the antecedent for the possessor äiti (‘mother’) would be the speaker itself, while in a written text the discourse-topic would be Mari, the subject of the main clause. This observation explains the double co-reference index on äiti (‘mother’) in (42)a.
4.5 Possessive copular construction

For the sake of completeness we now introduce the construction with a predicate, i.e. the “have-sentence”, which is formed in Finnish in the following way according to the feature [±animate] of the possessor:

(43)  a.  [sillä mukavalla pojalla] on [paljon hevosia]
        that-ADE nice-ADE boy-ADE on a lot horse-PARTpl
     ‘That nice boy has a lot of horses’

b.  [minun kissalla] on [pitkä häntä]
        I-GEN cat-ADE on long-NOM/ACCsg tail-NOM/ACCsg
     ‘My cat has a long tail’

c.  talossa on isot ikkunat/isoja ikkunoita
        house- INE on big-NOM/ACC/PARTpl windows-NOM/ACC/PARTpl
     ‘The house has big windows’

d.  *talolla on isot ikkunat
        house- ADE on big-ACCpl windows-ACCpl
     ‘The house has big windows’

In (43)a-b an animate possessor has adessive case, while in (43)c an inanimate possessor must have inessive case as the ungrammaticality of (43)d shows. Inessive case (an internal locative case used for spatial relations involving containment) is also possible under specific circumstances on animate nouns to express an intrinsic relation to the possessed element, as shown by (44):

(44)  a.  tuossa pojassa on vikaa
        that-INEsg boy-INEsg cop-3sg problem-PARTsg
     ‘That boy has some problems’

b.  minun hevosessani on kilpailijan taidot
        I-GEN horse-INEsg+POSS1sg on champion-GEN ability-NOM/ACC
     ‘My horse has the abilities of a champion’

It is difficult to pin down the relevant features that are involved in the choice of adessive or inessive on animate possessors. It is not a matter of stage-level vs individual-level properties, in fact both stage-level properties such as
having horses (as in (43)a) and individual-level properties such as having a long tail (as in (43)b) require adessive case on the possessor. Neither is it a matter of abstract vs concrete possessums since being hungry (have hunger) also requires adessive. We leave the question open and turn to discuss the case morphology on the possessum.

In the previous examples we left open the decision of whether the –t morpheme on the plural possessum was accusative or nominative. As a matter of fact, despite the rich agreement morphology on the Finnish noun, direct cases display quite a wide degree of synchretism. It is therefore very difficult to distinguish nominative from accusative. However, there are two good reasons to believe that we are dealing with accusative. First of all the copula never agrees in number with the possessum as shown in (45)a-b, contrary to the copula in the predicative constructions (46)a-b:

(45)  
\[ \text{Liisalla on punaiset kengät} \]
\[ \text{Liisa-ADE cop-PRES3sg red-NOM/ACC shoes-NOM/ACC} \]
\[ '\text{Liisa has red shoes}' \]

b. *\text{Liisalla ovat punaiset kengät} \]
\[ \text{Liisa-ADE cop-PRES3pl red-NOM/ACC shoes-NOM/ACC} \]

(46)  
a. \text{Liisa on puutarhassa} \]
\[ \text{Liisa-NOM cop-PRES3sg garden-INE} \]
\[ '\text{Liisa is in the garden}' \]

b. tytöt ovat puutarhassa \]
\[ \text{girl-NOMpl cop-PRES3pl garden-INE} \]
\[ '\text{The girls are in the garden}' \]

Furthermore, if the possessum is expressed by a personal pronoun, we have the possibility to detect accusative in (47)a and not nominative case in (47)b, as well as to confirm the lack of agreement of the copula with the possessum for person features (47)c:
(47)  a. Liisalla on sinut
    Liisa-ADE cop-PRES3sg you-ACC
    ‘Liisa has you’
b. * Liisalla on sinä
    Liisa-ADE cop-PRES3sg you-NOM
c. *Liisalla olet sinä
    Liisa-ADE cop-PRES2sg you-NOM

In copular constructions partitive case can occur and alternate with accusative case. In particular, it occurs not only with quantifiers as in (43)a, but also with indefinite interpretation of the possessum, as in (48)a, and in the scope of negation, as in (48)b:

(48)  a. sillä tytölä on hevosia.
     that-ADE girl-ADE on horse-PARTpl
     ‘that girl has (some) horses’
b. sillä tytölä ei ole punaisia kenkiä.
     that-ADE girl-ADE not on red-PARTpl shoes-PARTpl
     ‘that girl doesn’t have red shoes’

Finally, it is interesting to notice that the relative possessum-possessor order is not free and has different interpretation. The unmarked case is possessor-possessum, as in (49)a, and the inverted order given in (49)b conveys the interpretation of a temporally or locally delimited possession:

(49)  a. Liisalla on auto
     POSSESSOR - POSSESSUM
     Liisa-ADE on car-ACC
     ‘Liisa has a/the car’
b. auto on Liisalla
     POSSESSUM - POSSESSOR
     car-NOM/ACC on Liisa-ADE
     ‘the car is Liisa’s possession’
Hence, in possessive copular constructions a postnominal possessor is admitted. Finally, let us note that adessive possessor in the unmarked order (i.e. preceding the possessum) can be followed by the possessive suffix on the possessor (Nikanne 1990):

(50) a. juopoilla on pullonsa
    drunkard-ADEpl on bottle-ACC+POSS3pl
    ‘drunkards have their bottles’

b. *pullonsa on juopoilla
   bottle-ACC+POSS3pl on drunkard-ADEpl

In (50) adessive is coindexed with the possessive suffix. We observed in section 4.2.1 that the possessive suffix can refer to a full DP when the latter is the subject of the clause, hence marked with nominative case. Adessive is a semantic case and we would not expect that the possessive suffix can be coreferential with it. However, in possessive copular constructions it is allowed.

4.6 Conclusions

In this section we have seen four possible ways of expressing possession in Finnish: (a) with a possessive pronoun and an agreement on the possessed noun in the formal register, (b) with a possessive pronoun and a possessed noun without any agreement, (c) with a full possessive DP and no agreement on the possessum, (d) with a copular construction with the possessor in adessive or inessive case and no agreement either on the possessum or even on the copula.

The nominal constructions presented a number of open questions. First of all the status of the possessive morpheme on the noun: is it an agreement morpheme or is it a resumptive clitic?
Van Steenbergen (1991) in her study concerning binding in the pronominal system in Finnish considers the possessive suffix as an agreement marker that forms the head of a sort of nominal IP. She suggests that in the absence of a possessive pronoun we have a *pro* empty element, which can be bound only by the subject of the clause and this *pro* appears under circumstances of co-reference with the *c*-commanding NP. Her analysis makes a perfect parallelism of the behaviour of personal pronouns in the sentence and in the noun phrase. *Mutatis mutandis*, the syntactic and discourse conditions in which, in the presence of agreement, a null or overt pronoun occurs are the same. Furthermore, even in the clause, the colloquial register presents reductions both in the form of pronouns and in the inflection of the verb parallel to what happens with possessor pronouns. Finally, the parallelism with Hungarian further supports this hypothesis. We therefore exclude that it is a clitic resumptive pronoun, even if at first sight this could be suggested by its occurrence with a strong pronoun and its impossibility with a pronoun that apparently seems weak. This is also coherent with the consideration that the Finnish clause does not allow any resumption either as clitic doubling or as clitic left-dislocation.
5. Quantifiers

In this chapter we will deal with Finnish quantifiers. The relation of partitive case with quantification is evident but we will try to go beyond the traditional analysis of quantity expression in Finnish and we will adopt the tripartite classification of quantifiers into Quantity Nouns, Quantity Adjectives and Quantifiers proposed by Giusti & Leko (2001, 2005). Their proposal is supported by data from Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian that provides evidence for the postulation of the three lexical categories: Quantifiers have specific assigning properties whereas Quantity Nouns and Quantity Adjectives behave as nouns and adjectives, respectively.

5.1 An overview of the data

At a first sight it seems that also in Finnish quantifiers can be classified in weak and strong\(^1\) ones, as weak quantifiers appear to be strictly connected with partitive case, as exemplified in (1)a-b (Thomas 2003).

(1) a. kissa joi paljon maitoa
   cat-NOM drank a lot of milk-PARTsg
b. kissa söi useita hiiriä
   cat-NOM ate several-PART mice

According to Milsark (1977), Thomas (2003) classifies quantifiers from a semantic point of view into weak and strong. Weak determiners are: \textit{a, some, many/much(a lot of), several, few/a little, numerals, bare plural (existential), any (non assertive)}. Strong determiners are: \textit{the, demonstratives, possessive pronouns, all, every, each, any, most, both, bare plural (generic)}. Strongly quantified nominals

\(^1\) This classification is of Milsark (1977) who distinguished weak quantifiers from strong quantifiers on the basis of their occurrence in existential sentences:

(i) There are some men \textit{WEAK Q}
(ii) *There are all men \textit{STRONG Q}
are generally marked with nominative case in subject position and accusative case in object position, as exemplified in (2) for Finnish.

(2) a. kaikki oppilaat olivat luokassa
    all-NOM students-NOMpl were in the classroom

    b. haluaisin lukea kaikki kirjat
    (I) would like to read all-ACC books-ACCpl

This classification on one side correctly predicts a strict correlation between partitive and quantification, on the other, however, is insufficient to explain other facts that we observe in Finnish, for example the case alternation in (3)a-b and the occurrence of elative case in quantity expressions, as in (4). Moreover, many of the quantifiers are ambiguous between a strong and weak interpretation.

(3) a. kissa söi monta hiirtä
    cat-NOMsg eat-PAST3sg many-PARTsg mouse-PARTsg

    b. kissa söi monet hiiret
    cat-NOMsg eat-PAST3sg many-NOMpl mouse-NOMEpl

(4) a. puolet kaupungista paloi
    half city-ELAsg burn-PAST3sg

    b.*puolet kapunkia paloi
    half city-PARTsg burn-PAST3sg

Let us observe the occurrence possibilities of a quantifier with demonstratives, at a first sight one could identify three main groups of quantifiers:

(i) type of kaikki ‘all’: the noun they quantify is in nominative case (5)a or some other case depending on the syntactic content, e.g. in (5)b we find allative case. This class of Qs can co-occur with a demonstrative and can surface both before and after it, as will be shown in (10)b.

(5) a. kaikki kirjat ovat Liisan
    all-NOM book-NOM be-PRES3pl Liisa-GEN

    ‘all the books are Liisa’s’
b. Maija lahjoitti makeisia kaikille oppilaillensa

Maija-NOM give-PAST3sg sweets-PARTpl all-ALL pupils-ALL+POSS3sg

‘Maija gave (as a present) sweets to all her pupils’

(ii) type of paljon ‘a lot of’, vähän ‘little/few’, hiukan ‘a bit’, jonkin verran ‘some/somewhat’: they assign partitive case (6)a and cannot be preceded by a demonstrative, (6)b. They are (almost) indeclinable and they can take a full extended nominal projection as a complement.

Numerals seems to be problematic since they assign the partitive (7)a, except when their complement is modified by a demonstrative, in which case the only possible case is elative2, as in (7)b. The partitive case is overriden when the verb assigns a different case to its quantified complement (7)c, where it assigns inessive.

(6)  a. Ville kutsui paljon mukavia kavereita juhliin.

Ville invited a lot of nice-PARTpl friends-PARTpl to the party

b. *Ville kutsui näitä paljon kavereita juhliin.

Ville invited these-PARTpl a lot of friends-PARTpl to the party

(7)  a. kolme poikaa odottaa alakerrassa.

three boys-PART are waiting downstairs

b. kolme näistä opiskelijoista tulee huomenna.

three these-ELApl students-ELApl come tomorrow

‘three of these students (will) come tomorrow’

c. olen asunut kolmessa kaupungissa.

I have lived three-INEsg cities-INEsg

‘I have lived in three cities’

(iii) type of moni/monet ‘many’, harva/harvat ‘few’, usea/useat ‘many/several’, jokainen ‘each’, the numeral yksi ‘one, muutama/muutamat ‘some/a few’,

2We recall that elative is primarily an internal locative case. When it occurs in quantified expressions it has a parallel semantics to Italian tra/fra.
molemmat ‘both’, kumpikin ‘each’: the nominal they quantify is marked either with nominative (8)a or with elative case (8)b. Also here, if the extended nominal projection they take as a complement is modified by a demonstrative, only the elative case can be assigned and nominative is excluded, as we see from the alternation in (9)a-b:

(8) a. monet isot kaupungit ovat pääkaupunkeja
   many-NOMpl big-NOM cities-NOM are capitals
b. moni meistä haluaisi lähteä lomalle
   many-NOMsg us-ELA would like to go on a holiday
   many of us (among us) would like to go on a holiday
c. *moni me / *monet me opiskelijat
   many-NOMsg we-NOM/many-NOMpl we-NOM student
d. me monet opiskelijat
   we-NOM many-NOMpl student-NOMpl

(9) a. *monet nämä opiskelijat
   many-NOMpl these-NOMpl student-NOMpl
   ‘many these students’
b. monet näistä opiskelijoista
   many-NOM these-ELA student-ELAp1
   ‘many of these students’

Merely considering word order, quantifiers in class (i) can appear either before or after the demonstrative, as in (10), and it is the only class that shows a similar behaviour. We assume, in line with Cardinaletti and Giusti (1993, 2006) that the quantifier can be either in the higher QP projection or, when preceded by the demonstrative, in a lower AP projection, let us call it, for the moment, adjectival quantifier. In both cases, the quantifier and the demonstrative agree for case and number.

(10) a. [AP kaikki [APr nämä [APr punaiset [NP T-paidat]]]]
    all these red T-shirts
b. [DP nämä [AgrP kaikki [AgrP punaiset [NP T-paidat]]]]
    these all red T-shirts

Referring to the order predicted by Greenberg’s Universal 20 (cf. Giusti 1991) we take the order in (11) as the base-order and assume it to be common at least to Romance and Slavic languages.

(11) Q > Dem > (QAP) > A > N

(12) kaikki nämä kolme kaunista poikaa
    ‘all these three beautiful boys’

The quantifier kaikki ‘all’ would presumably be in the higher QP projection in (12) and in an AP projection when it appears lower. As expected, a possessive and a demonstrative can co-occur respecting the linear order in (13).

(13) Q > Dem > Poss > QAP > A > N

The only possible variation is allowed in the furthest left-periphery of the noun as in (14)a-c, within the quantifier, the demonstrative and the possessive:

(14) a. kaikki nämä minun kolme kaunista kukkaani
    ‘all these my three beautiful flowers+POSS1sg’

b. nämä kaikki minun kolme kaunista kukkaani
    ‘these all my three beautiful flowers+POSS1sg’

c. nämä minun kaikki kolme kaunista kukkaani
    ‘these my all three beautiful flowers+POSS1sg’

Quantifiers in class (ii) can be associated with a demonstrative only in the sense that a demonstrative, in the partitive case, can modify the DP, that the Q selects, as exemplified in (15)a, where we observe that the demonstrative and the DP agree for case. However, with numerals the demonstrative can be either in nominative (15)b or in partitive (15)c, depending on the verb and on the boundedness of the predicate, but the noun modified by the numeral maintains the partitive case when the demonstrative precedes the numeral.
The only possibility to have the numeral preceding linearly the demonstrative is for the numeral to select elative case.

(15) a. siellä oli paljon näitä kauniita tauluja
there were a lot of these-PARTpl beautiful-PARTpl paintings-PARTpl
b. luin nämä neljä sanomalehteä
read-PAST1sg these-ACCpl four newspapers-PARTsg
‘I read these four newspapers’
c. luin näitä neljää sanomalehteää
read-PAST1sg these-PARplT four-PART newspapers-PARTsg
‘I read/was reading (part of) these four newspapers’

Finally, the quantifiers in class (iii), when agreeing in number and case with the demonstrative, have in common that none of them can precede the demonstrative, as we see from the contrast in (16)a-b, neither in the singular nor in the plural form. All of them, with the exception of *kumpikin ‘each/both’ and *jokainen ‘each’, can surface after the demonstrative and hence we assume that they pattern as an adjectival quantifier, (16)b.

Quantifiers in class (iii) also show a different behaviour as they can also select a DP in elative case modified by a demonstrative, as in (16)c.

(16) a. *moni/harva/muutama/yksi tämä kirja
many/few/some-few/one-NOM this-NOM book-NOM
b. nämä monet/useat/harvat/muutamat tärkeät hetket
these-NOM many/several/few/some important-NOM moments-NOM
c. moni näistä kirjoista on lainassa
many-NOMsg these-ELAp1 book-ELAp1 is loan
‘Many of these books is out on loan’

Jokainen ‘each’ and *kumpikin ‘each/both’ can only select a DP projection in elative case, (17)a vs (17)b. The numeral *yksi ‘one’ patterns similarly as it selects a DP in elative case, (18)a, but it can also surface in a lower position and, in this case it seems to be an adjectival quantifier, (18)b, because it agrees
with the noun and does not assign case to it and because it is not the first element in the noun phrase as it is preceded by the demonstrative, (18)c.

(17)  a. *jokainen/kumpikin tämä poika  
   each/both this boy
b. jokainen/kumpikin näistä kirjoista on hauska  
   each/both these books is fun.

(18)  a. yksi näistä kirjoista on sinun
   one these books is yours
b. tämä yksi elämä on ainoa
   this one life is the only (one)
c.*yksi tämä elämä
   one this life

Class (i) and (iii) may seem very similar on the basis of pure case-marking but we remark the different distribution possibilities with a demonstrative. The quantifiers in class (i) and (iii) can also select a DP in elative case. So far, from a first observation of the data, it seems that quantifiers differ in their distribution with demonstratives. We also observed that different cases can occur in quantified expressions, i.e. partitive or elative or case percolation. However, an important issue that remains unexplained and misleading under the previous classification is case alternation in quantitative constructions, as was shown in (7) and repeated here in (19).

(19)  a. kolme poikaa odottaa alakerrassa.
   three boys are waiting downstairs
b. kolme näistä opiskelijoista tulee huomenna.
   three of these students come tomorrow
   ‘three of these students (will) come tomorrow’
c. olen asunut kolmessa kaupungissa.
   I have lived in three cities
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Two questions arise: (i) on which basis partitive, elative and agreeing case occur? And (ii) why also numerals can show a kind of “free variation” between partitive/elative and agreeing case?

We will suggest in 5.3 that these three occurrences are instances of three different structural representations. Before that, let us make some observations on partitive case.

5.2 Quantifiers and partitive case

As we have said above, partitive case is strictly related to quantification and in particular to weak quantification. Partitive case in its NP-related function can mark the subject of existential sentences or the object of transitive sentences when the noun is indefinitely specified corresponding to English *some*.

(20)

a. Suomen järvissä elää kaloja
   Finland lakes-INE live fish-PARTpl
   ‘(some) fishes live in the lakes of Finland’

b. turistit näkivät kaloja
   tourists-NOMpl saw fish-PARTpl
   ‘(the) tourists saw (some) fishes’

Quantifiers, when weak or expressing cardinality, occur under the same circumstances and in Finnish they occur with partitive case. Hence, it seems plausible to think about a “quantificational partitive” (in the sense of Thomas 2003). Under this assumption, partitive may be thought to be assigned by a weak quantifier, as exemplified in (21):

(21)
However, Giusti & Cardinaletti (1992) show that the correct structure is rather (22), where the quantifier is considered as a lexical head that selects a DP.

\[(22)\]

The position in Q° may be filled with an item of the Quantifier class or may be empty. Whether overt or non-overt a weak quantifier assigns partitive case to the selected noun phrase, hence these nominals marked with partitive case can be assumed to be “weakly quantified”. It has been argued (Kiparsky 1998) for a unification of the circumstances under which partitive case is assigned, suggesting that it is not only NP-related but more extensively unbounded. Hence, partitive would be assigned whenever the feature [-bounded] is present either on the object or on the time period of the predicate.

Weak noun phrases marked for partitive case can be coordinated with strong quantifiers marked for nominative or accusative, as exemplified in (23):

\[(23)\]

a. ostin kirjat ja vihkoja.
   bought (I) book-ACCpl and notebooks-PARTpl
   ‘I bought the books and (some) notebooks’

b. ostin kaikki kirjat ja vähän vihkoja
   bought (I) all books-ACCpl and few notebooks-PARTpl
   ‘I bought all the books and few notebooks’

In (23)a-b even if the two coordinated objects are assigned different cases (accusative the former and partitive the latter) the sentence is grammatical because the two nominals bear the same theta-role. This may suggest that in
there is a Q which assigns partitive to the second conjunct, since the [± bound] feature of the predicate is certainly unique and should assign one and the same case to both nominal expressions.

Notice that partitive case always occurs on the object of transitive verbs in negative sentences, regardless of the definiteness features of the object noun phrase, as exemplified in (24):

(24) a. ostan kirjan
    buy-PRES1sg book-ACCsg
    ‘I buy the book’
b. en osta kirjaa
    not-PRES1sg
    ‘I don’t buy the book’

Thomas (2003) proposes that also in negative sentences a QP is projected, hence the partitive case is assigned to the direct object. This is related to the more general assumption that partitive case is licensed by the QP when the object is not totally affected by the predicate or the event is unbounded. The object or event denoted by a negative sentence is obviously not totally affected and it can be unbounded, therefore partitive case occurs. Hence, it seems that the properties of what we have, until now, called “aspectual partitive” and “quantificational partitive” can be found in the “partitive of negation” in terms of “unaffectedness”.

5.3 Quantity Nouns, Quantity Adjectives and Quantifiers in Finnish

In light of the occurrence of partitive case as related to quantification and as a marker of an unbounded event, an obvious question arises in cases such as (25)a in contrast with (25)b:
In (25)a the interpretation is ambiguous and it is not evident if the partitive case on the numeral and on the noun is an agreement relation (indicating partitivity) between the prenominal modifier and its head or if it is assigned in reason of its [-bounded] features.

The observations can be better integrated by the following classification (cf. Giusti & Leko 2001, 2005), which explains the differences among quantifiers in reason of a different structural projection, mainly analysing Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian. In their analysis quantifiers are divided into three different lexical categories: Quantifiers, Quantity Nouns, and Quantity Adjectives. These classes have some similarities but the differences that characterize them give reason to assume that each class has its own projection and only Quantifiers have case assigning properties (partitive for Finnish). We suggest that also Finnish shows a similar tripartition and that the differences with Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (henceforth BCS) can be motivated for language-specific reasons.

5.3.1 Quantity Nouns
For Finnish the most evident feature that differentiates Quantifiers (Q) from Quantity Nouns (QN) and Quantity Adjectives (QA) is the case of the quantified noun. In fact, we observe that the same lexical items can belong to different categories on the basis of their case-marking properties. We have previously said that all quantifiers, with the exception of those in class (ii) in 5.1, can take a DP complement in elative case. We now propose that all such cases are instances of Quantity Nouns. In fact, besides having a DP projection
as their complement in elative case, (26)a, QNs also display a full nominal declension like all regular nouns and hence can appear in all cases, as exemplified in (26)b for allative case, whereas the elative DP retains its case. Moreover, in Finnish we find “true” quantity nouns such as enemmistö ‘majority’ and osa ‘part’ (that are nouns in nature) that cooccur with elative DPs, (26)c and, of course, they have full nominal declension, (26)d. In this case the QN shows declension, nevertheless the quantified noun maintains the elative case. These “pure” QNs can be modified by adjectives as in (26)c, however, differently from BCS, QNs in Finnish can occur with adverbs (26)e, that at least in BCS can only occur with Quantifiers. We remark that in this case it is quite common to drop the complement DP.

(26)  
(a) moni ystävistäni on ulkomaalainen.  
many-NOMsg friends-ELAp1+POSS1sg be-PRES3sg foreigner  
‘many friends of mine are foreigners’

(b) kirjoitin monelle ystävistäni.  
write-PAST1sg many-ALLsg friends-ELAp1+POSS1sg  
‘I wrote to many of my friends’

(c) suurin osa rakennuksista on remontissa  
biggest part-NOMsg building-ELAp1 be-PRES3sg renovation-INEsg  
‘the majority of the buildings are under renovation’

(d) koulupäivä on ratkaisu vain osalle lapsista  
schoolday is a solution only part-ALLsg children-ELAp1  
‘schoolday is a solution only to a part of the children’

(e) melko moni heistä lopetti opiskelun kesken  
quite many-NOMsg they-ELA quit-PAST3sg studies incomplete  
‘quite many among them dropped out from university’

Some quantifiers, such as moni ‘many’ and the plural counterpart monet ‘many’, can pattern both as an adjective and as quantity noun and the difference is visible from the case of the selected nominal. Evidence is provided in (27). When the quantifier monet ‘many’ occurs with a
demonstrative, we observe the distribution in (27), with the singular *moni* ‘many’ there would not have been any difference in the interpretation.

(27) a. monet näista opiskelijoista
   many-NOMpl these-ELApl student-ELApl
   ‘many of these students’

b. *monet nämä opiskelijat
   many-NOMpl these-NOMpl student-NOMpl

c. nämä monet opiskelijat
   these-NOMpl many-NOMpl student-NOMpl
   ‘these many students’

d. *nämä monet opiskelijoista
   these-NOMpl many-NOMpl student-ELApl

The quantifier *monet* ‘many’ select a DP in elative case in (27)a and is ungrammatical with a DP bearing nominative case (in a kind of agree relation). On the contrary, when it is the demonstrative to be higher then it can only agree in case and number with the following nominals. We assume that in (27)a *monet* ‘many’ is a quantity noun, whereas in (27)c it is an adjective, hence agreeing with the head noun as prenominal modifiers do in Finnish.

On the basis of these observations we assume that the projection in (28) represents Quantity Nouns:

(28)

```
(28)               DP/KP
      Spec      D'/K'
        D'/F°   NP
            Spec   N'
              QN   DP/KP (Elative Case)
              moni/osa
                  Spec   D'
                D°/K°   NP
          N  rakennuksista
```
Let us observe that *osa* ‘part’, in addition to elative, can also assign partitive case to the quantified nominal, (29)a. It seems to be ambiguous between a quantity noun and a “pure” noun as it can be quantified by numerals, (29)b, and it can occur with demonstratives (29)c, and adjectives (29)d, contrary to *moni* ‘many’ in (29)e-f.

(29) a. tämä on rauhallinen osa kaupunkia
   this is peaceful part city-PARTsg
   ‘this is a peaceful part of the city’

b. kolme osaa vettä
   three part-PART water-PARTsg

c. tämä osa Helsingistä
   this part Helsinki-ELAsg
   ‘this part of Helsinki’

d. kaunis osa Helsingistä
   beautiful part Helsinki-ELAsg
   ‘a/the beautiful part of Helsinki’

e. *tämä moni oppilaista
   this many students-ELApl

f. *viisas moni oppilaista
   wise many students-ELApl

Finally, there also exists a particular set of nouns that assign partitive case, such as *joukkos* ‘group’, *parvi* ‘swarm/flock’, *korillinen* ‘a basket of’, *litra* ‘litre’, *metri* ‘metre’, but, for reasons of space, we cannot deal with them in this section (see among others Vos 1999 for partitive constructions).

5.3.2 Quantity Adjectives

As for Quantity Adjectives, they show case and number agreement with the noun they modify, differently from both Quantity Nouns and Quantifiers. In
our previous classification this was noted as a difference on the selectional possibilities of a quantifier in class (i) or (iii) in 5.1. Applying the tripartition proposed by Giusti & Leko (2001,2005) to Finnish we see that these selectional properties are the result of a different structural position.

Basically, in Finnish QAs consist of the quantifiers in group (i) and (iii) when sharing the same case and number feature with the noun they modify, as happens for adjectives (except the indeclinable ones, see 1.2.2). The agreement with the head noun is the expected pattern with adjectives, with no exception for QAs.

(30) a. Kaisa kirjoitti kutsun monelle ystävälle

Kaisa-NOM wrote invitation-ACC many-ALLsg friend-ALLpl

‘Kaisa wrote the/an invitation to many friends’

As we have noticed from the contrast in (26) and (30) the basic difference between QAs and QNs lies in the relation with the following quantified DP. Therefore, we assume that QAs have the following projection, where the case is assigned by the verb to its complement and spreads by agreement to the adjective.

(31)
5.3.3 Quantifiers

Quantifiers always assign partitive to the noun they quantify and they appear to correspond to class (ii) of the previous description (cf. 5.1). The relation of this class to partitive case, supports the hypothesis of a “quantificational partitive”, in the sense of Thomas (2003) to which we have hinted at above (cf. 5.2). As predicted, partitive is the only case that can mark the quantified nominal, (32)a. Moreover, we assume that Quantifiers surface in an external position to the noun phrase to which selectional restrictions, such as case requirement, are imposed. Quantifiers cannot be preceded by a demonstrative (neither if agreeing with the quantified nominal nor in any other case (32)a-b). Furthermore, they do not show a full nominal declension, (32)c, they can be modified by adverbs (32)d, and finally they cannot be modified by adjectives, as QNs can, observe the contrast in (32)e-f.

(32) a. *paljon kirjat
   a lot of books-NOMpl

b. *nämä paljon kirjoja
   these-NOMpl a lot books-PARTpl

c. *näitä paljon kirjoja
   these-PARTpl a lot books-PARTpl

d. *paljoille kavereille
   a lot-ALLpl friends-ALLpl

e. melko paljon turisteja käy Suomessa kesäsin
   quite a lot tourists-PARTpl go Finland-INEsg summer-INSTR
   ‘quite a lot of tourists go to Finland in summer time’

f. *suurin paljon turisteja
   biggest a lot of tourist-PARTpl

g. suurin osa turisteista
   biggest part tourist-PARTpl
   ‘the biggest part of tourists’
From (32)d we remark that Quantifiers trigger the 3rd person singular agreement with the predicate, hence there is no agreement between the noun phrase and the predicate. This appears to support the assumption of an internal structure of the QP. We remark that the quantified nominal can be either plural, in which case partitive is “indefinite partitive”, as in (32)d, or singular in which case it has the semantics of “a part of”, as in (33).

(33) söin paljon kakkua
   eat-PAST1sg a lot cake-PARTsg
   ‘I ate a lot(a big part) of the cake’

In a study on the syntax of word *paljon* ‘a lot’ it has been noted (Karttunen 1970) that the occurrence of *paljon* ‘a lot’ is restricted to noun phrases that are either the subject of an “existential intransitive” sentence, (34)a, or the object of a transitive “resultative” sentence, (34)b. The latter is the typical context for partitive/accusative object alternation, i.e. verbs in a transitive “resultative” sentence take accusative or partitive objects depending on the resultative features of the predicate. It may be reasonable to assume that also the other lexical items belonging to the class of Quantifiers, such as *vähän* ‘a little/few’ and the numerals, show a similar behaviour to *paljon* ‘a lot’, as exemplified in (35).

(34)a. paljon lapsia leikkii pihalla
   a lot of children-PARTpl play in the courtyard
   b. puutarhurit istuttivat paljon kukkia
       (the) gardeners planted a lot of flowers-PARTpl

(35)a. vähän lapsia leikkii pihalla
   few children-PARTpl play in the courtyard
   b. puutarhurit istuttivat vähän kukkia
       (the) gardeners planted few flowers

(36)a. kolme lasta leikkii pihalla
   three child-PARTsg play in the courtyard
Verbs that are “inherently irresultative”, i.e. psych verbs as *rakastaa* ‘to love’, *vihata* ‘to hate’, and psych causative verbs (see 2.1) as *pelottaa* ‘to scare/frighten’, *harmittaa* ‘to annoy’ that obligatorily select a partitive object, can be modified by *paljon* ‘a lot’ only in its adverbial reading, (37).

(37) a. Maija rakastaa paljon Mattia

Maija-NOMsg loves a lot Matti-PARTsg

b. Maija rakastaa paljon kahta poikaa

Maija-NOMsg love-PRES3sg a lot two boy-PARTsg

Verbs that can have both a resultative and irresultative reading, can have their object modified by a Quantifier only in the resultative interpretation, i.e. with a partitive object. Referring to our previous labels concerning the use of partitive (cf. 3.2.2 and also 5.2), we can say that Quantifiers occur with the so-called NP-related partitive.

As the observations for *paljon* ‘a lot’ can be extended to all the components of class (ii) in 5.1, which fits with the class of Quantifiers in Giusti & Leko’s terms, it may be tentatively assumed, as a generalization for Finnish Quantifiers, that:

- Lexical items such as *paljon* ‘a lot’, *vähän* ‘little/few’, *hiukan* ‘a bit/some’, *niukasti* ‘little’, *jonkin verran* ‘some/somewhat’ are Quantifiers and assign partitive case to the noun they modify when this is the subject of intransitive existential sentences or the object of transitive resultative sentences.

On the basis of these observations and in line with Giusti & Leko (2001, 2005) we propose the following projection for Finnish Quantifiers:
5.3.4 Numerals

Numerals present an open issue because of the possible case alternation of the modified nominal. The partition in Quantity Nouns, Quantity Adjectives and Quantifiers applies also to numerals and it correctly predicts the different occurrences observed in (7). In Finnish numerals and the DP complement, whichever is the class of reference, agree in number (singular) with the predicate.

Numerals fall into the class of Quantity Nouns when selecting a DP complement in elative case, (39)a, and just as QNs they show nominal declension, as exemplified in (39)b for allative case:

(39) a. kolme näistä kilpailijoista pääsee Kiinan olympialaisiin.
   three-NOM these-ELApL competitors-ELApL get China-GENsg Olympics-ILLpl
   ‘three of these competitors can continue in the Olympics Games in China’

   b. kahdelle heistä annetaan erikoispalkinto.
   two-ALL they-ELApL give-3INFill special prize
   ‘to two of them will be given a/the special prize’
When Numerals are declinable and agree with the following noun, they pattern as Quantity Adjectives, as in (40):

(40) annoin lahjan kolmelle lapselle
   gave (I) present-ACC three-ALL child-ALLsg
   ‘I gave a/the present to three children’

Finally, the Numerals that behave as Quantifiers are uninflected and assign partitive case to the quantified noun phrase. A preceding demonstrative or personal pronoun is allowed, (41)a-b, but, as expected, they cannot be modified by an agreeing adjective, (41)c.

(41) a. Liisa näki kaksi kuumailmapalloa.
    Liisa-NOM saw two balloon-PARTsg
    ‘Liisa saw two (hot air) balloons’

b. te kaksi opiskelijaa saatte lyhyemmän työpäivän
   you-NOM two student-PARTsg get shorter working-day
   ‘you two students will be given a shorter working-day’

c. *iso kaksi kuumailmapalloa
   big two balloon-PARTsg

5.4 Conclusions

In conclusion, we can assume that Finnish gives positive evidence for the existence of three categories that realize the concept of quantity: Quantifiers, Quantity Nouns and Quantity Adjectives. This tripartition correctly predicts the observed case alternations in Finnish quantity expressions. In parallel with Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian but with some language specific differences (i.e. the different case that marks the quantified nominal in BCS and Finnish), in Finnish Quantity Nouns and Quantifiers are lexical heads that select a full noun phrase as their complement imposing plural number to it, Quantity Nouns assign elative case, whereas Quantifiers assign partitive case.
Furthermore, it appears that the set of “distributive” items such as jokainen ‘each’, kumpikin ‘each/both’, molemmat ‘both’ show the possibility to behave either as QAs or QNs. Quantity Adjectives are shown to be “homogeneous constructions” in Giusti & Leko’s terms (the quantity expression is expected “to have its case and ϕ-features valued by the nominal phrase”). With regard to agreement with the predicate, Quantifiers always agree for singular number, regardless of the number of the selected DP (as in (32)d and (33)), whereas Quantity Nouns can have singular or plural forms, such as moni (sg) / monet (pl) ‘many’, muutama (sg) / muutamat (pl) ‘some/a few’, harva (sg) / harvat (pl) ‘few’, kumpikin (sg) / kummatkin (pl) ‘each/both’, that agree in number with the predicate, and have a plural quantified nominal, (42)a-b, and without any change in the interpretation.

(42) a. monet ystävistäni ovat ulkomaalaisia
   many-pl friends-ELAp1 are foreigners-PARTpl
b. moni ystävistäni on ulkomaalainen
   many-sg friends-ELAp1 are foreigner-NOMsg
   ‘many of my friends are foreigners’

We have seen that numerals too fall into the tripartition, and they always trigger singular agreement with the predicate. As for the case of the modified nominal, we observed that partitive case is related to weak quantification. The other case that occurs in quantified constructions is elative case. We assume that the alternation between partitive and elative case in quantified expressions is not related to a indefinite/definite distinction, as also noted by Anttila & Fong (2000) within the framework of Optimality Theory. On the contrary, we tentatively suggest that it is rather a matter of Quantity Nouns vs. Quantifiers distinction and they are not in free variation as it may appear at a first sight. Partitive and elative case can mark both definite and indefinite nominals and in those cases, where partitive and elative seem to show a free variation with no obvious difference in meaning, as in (43)a and (43)b, we
presumably have two different underlying structures, as we represented in (28) and (38).

(43) a. Napoleon valloitti puolel Euroopasta
    Napoleon conquered half Europe-ELAsg
b. Napoleon valloitti puolel Eurooppaa
    Napoleon conquered half Europe-PARTsg
6. The competence of partitive/accusative object alternation in Finnish-Italian bilingual speakers

Until now we have explored and described some topics of Finnish noun phrase structure. In this final section we want to add some empirical evidence from bilingual speakers. As partitive case has provided this thesis with various observations, we have tested a group of bilingual Finnish-Italian speakers on the alternation of accusative and partitive case in object position. Our main aim was to observe whether the unboundedness feature with predicate is detected by bilinguals or not, i.e. if the participants to the test could recognize “partially affected” objects, in the sense of Thomas (2003) as presented in 5.2. Of course, due to the small number of tested speakers it is not yet possible to make overall generalizations but the obtained results may give some insights for future research.

6.1 Theoretical background and expected results

As our point of interest in this test is the competence of case alternation on direct object, let us summarize the circumstances under which partitive and accusative case occur in Finnish.

Partitive case:
- is used to denote an indefinite quantity
- is assigned to the object of unbounded predicates
- is licensed in negative sentences
- is licensed by “weak” quantifiers
- marks the subject of the equivalent of English existential sentences
- is assumed to be checked in QP

Accusative case:
- is assigned to the object of bounded predicates
- is licensed by “strong” quantifiers
- is assumed to be checked near VP in a dominating Aspect projection (where Acc is licensed in reason of [+bounded] features of the predicate)

In order to unify the checking of partitive and accusative cases within the discussion on aspectual partitive, Thomas¹ (2003) proposes, as represented in (1), that it may be the case that Aspect is a projection with [± bounded] features higher than VP. If the [-bounded] feature is present, a QP projection that licenses partitive case is selected. On the other hand, if the [± bounded] feature is present no QP needs to be selected and accusative case is licensed on the object.

(1)

However, it may plausible to assume that the ambiguity of partitive objects when case alternation is possible for both the [± definite] and the [± bounded] features is due to different structures, the [± definite] being in the NP whereas the [± bounded] being in a projection between AspP and VP, as suggested by Thomas (2003) in (1).

Following Kiparsky’s classification on the basis of the boundedness feature of a predicate and consequently in relation to object case alternation, verbs can be basically divided in three main groups:

¹ A different account assumes that Aspect and Case are independent syntactic relations and that partitive case is therefore assigned by a null XP that takes the internal argument as its complement (MacDonald 2005).
I. Telic verbs, that are bounded and that assign accusative to their object (with the exception of quantitatively indeterminate objects which would be assigned partitive case), among these: ostaa (buy), ottaa (take), pudottaa (drop), suorittaa (carry out), kadottaa (lose/destroy), menettää (lose), hukata (lose), hävitää (disappear, lose), löytää (find), and others.

II. Atelic and unbounded verbs which assign partitive case to their object and denote (a) psychological state, (b) intention and (c) continuous motion or contact. Among them rakastaa (love), suudella (kiss), toivoa (wish), onnitella (congratulate), väsyttää (tire)

III. Verbs denoting creation, destruction, events whose progress is mapped out into the parts of the object and verbs with different meanings depending on the case of the object. These verbs assign accusative or partitive depending on the boundedness of the VP and they include syödä (eat) ommella (sew), rakentaa (build), avata (open), kirjoittaa (write), tuhota (destroy).

Summarizing, the so-called “aspectual partitive” (Kiparsky 1998) is related to the boundability properties of the predicate that denotes either an activity, or state, that can terminate or not in reaching a certain ending point (“boundary”), or an activity for which such an ending point does not exist (i.e. to love).

We expect that our target group is able to determine at least partially whether the object is “partially affected” by the predicate. We imagine that a hypothetical scale exists for the competence of Finnish as a L2, for which the first stage consists of the acquisition of lexical properties of verbs with reference to case assigned to the object, and the second stage corresponds to the computational abilities about the interaction of Aspect and Case on the object. The first stage is presumably acquired quite early and it is necessary for basic communication. We assume that our target group has acquired these competences from positive evidence in the sociolinguistic context. The
competences of the second stage give the possibility to express more subtle meanings that involve a deeper knowledge of the language.

6.2 The test

The target group consisted of five bilinguals of age between 11 and 24. One of them is a “second-generation” bilingual (Finno-Italian mother and Italian father) but with a regular contact to her grandmother, who is also living in Italy. We assume that the participants are “coordinated bilinguals” (Diebold Jr. 1996 among others), the two languages are used in different situations, Italian is the dominant one and Finnish is limited to informal and family contexts. All of them show the main characteristics related to bilingualism presented in Titone (Titone 1996):

- they show awareness of belonging to two cultures and to master two languages
- they can think in the two languages and interpret messages in different codes and situations
- they can produce/understand messages in the two languages with an acceptable pronunciation and without great difficulties

Their sociolinguistic background has many common characteristics: they have grown up in Italy, where they have spoken Italian in the social context and Finnish within the family. Before the age of 4-5 their main language was Finnish, but with the beginning of school the balance between the two languages underwent a rapid shift. They haven’t received any formal education in Finnish, except four of those who have followed one year of Finnish class taught twice a month. Their language level is not homogeneous, due to possibly insufficient exposure to Finnish. A relevant factor may also be the time spent in Finland and the affective relation with the country, with relatives and friends. As a logical consequence the stronger the relation is with
the country and Finnish speaking people, the higher is the motivation to maintain the language competences and the possibilities to improve it in a natural context. Our interest falls in particular on bilinguals with no real formal education in the analysed language because of the quite obvious observation that bilinguals are expected to have a different language intuition from learners of Finnish as a foreign language, who are formally taught the language.

The students were given a test, which consists of 18 pictures with the prompts of a subject, a verb and an object. They have to build up the sentence and to choose the case on the object. The verbs we have used are those in group II and III in Kiparsky’s (1998) classification, so the students should detect whether a verb assigns morphologically partitive to its object (as rakastaa ‘love’ in group II) or if the object is partially or totally affected and hence is either in partitive or accusative. In order to make the temporal features clear, relative clauses of two types have been added. The first type is while/when-type, i.e. ‘When I entered the room Liisa was sewing a sock’. The second type is and-type, i.e. ‘Liisa ate the apple and left the room’. Moreover, in the sentences there are also adverbs that can occur only with either unbounded predicates (of the for an hour-type) or with bounded predicates (of the in an hour-type). When the event is bounded, a non-restrictive relative clause is present, and accusative case is expected on the object, while with an unbounded event a restrictive relative clause is present and partitive case is expected on the object. Verbs that allow a partitive/accusative alternation are alternated with verbs that obligatorily require partitive case (such as emotion-denoting verbs) in order to avoid possible expectations. The given prompts in the relevant sentences allow for the creation of affirmative sentences in order to avoid possible confusion due to partitive of negation.
6.4 The analysis

In those sentences where it was necessary to signal the overlapping of events and unboundedness was expected to be expressed by partitive case, the use of the progressive verbal form has been misleading. In fact, with the progressive form of the predicate, partitive case is obligatorily required and this evidently avoids the alternation with the accusative. As for the writing skills of the participants, we can safely assume that notwithstanding some orthographical mistakes, the morphological alternation of accusative and partitive is evident. Examining the given results, we can make the following observations:

1) as for the verbs of group II in Kiparsky’s classification, those that morphologically require partitive case, all the participants correctly assigned the only possible object case, without any confusion with accusative case.

2) a) as for the verbs of group III in Kiparsky’s classification when the event was unbounded and partitive case was expected to mark the object, the verb was put in a progressive form and the object, hence obligatorily requiring partitive, was incorrectly marked with accusative case. This was noted as “incorrect” in the unbounded column.

2) b) as for the verbs of group III in Kiparsky’s classification, when the predicate denoted a bounded event and accusative was expected, accusative was also correctly chosen by the participants. However, when the predicate denoted an unbounded event, partitive case was not univocally chosen as related to the unachievement of the action, as reported in Graph 1 and in Table 9:
From Graph 1 we observe that the bounded feature was widely detected and correctly expressed by means of accusative marking. The students correctly fulfilled also the constructions with obligatory partitive object. Hence, they have passed the first stage of our scale, which, we recall, consists of the acquisition of lexical properties of verbs with reference to case assigned to the object, and the second stage corresponds to the computational abilities about the interaction of Aspect and Case on the object. However, the results with unbounded predicates show that they haven’t passed the second stage at the moment.

In the following graphs we have the individual results, where B=bounded, U=unbounded, OP=obligatory Partitive:
With the exception of E., all the participants show a high level of correct answers with bounded predicates and with the exception of H. all the
participants show a poor number of correct answers with unbounded predicates. We assume that these differences in performance are due to different language levels, H. mastering Finnish better than the others. If we ignore the individual results of E., the overall use of accusative for the object of both bounded and unbounded predicates is even more evident, as in Graph 2:

![Graph 2](image)

The result does not change significantly either if we ignore the high-level performance of H., as represented in Graph 3. Accusative case that marks the object of bounded transitive predicates also marks incorrectly the object of unbounded predicates as is evident from the cylinders in the middle:

![Graph 3](image)
6.4 Conclusions

The most salient result in the test concerns the large use of accusative case. It appears to be the default object case for our target group as it is chosen as the object case where case alternation is possible and partitive is expected, also where partitive is required by the progressive form. The theoretical assumption that partitive case is the default object case (cf. Vainikka 1993, de Hoop in Kiparsky 1998) also because the wider occurrence it has as the object case with respect to accusative, does not correspond to the results of the test.

The results rather suggest that partitive case is interpreted as related to unboundedness and used in its aspectual function only at a higher level of language acquisition (as showed by the individual results of H. and K. in particular). It cannot be that partitive is somehow “unknown” as an object case because it is correctly used on the object of those verbs that morphologically require it. Moreover, the fact that the students have mostly been in contact with colloquial Finnish is not relevant.

Finally, even though this survey has involved a small group of participants and has been unassuming in dimensions, it is rather innovative in the contents and the description of the obtained results may give suggestions for future research in many ways. First, the observed preference for accusative as the object case may give hints for reconsidering the status of accusative as the object case opposed to partitive case. Second, from an acquisitional perspective, it would be interesting to verify whether the unboundedness feature is effectively a feature mastered at a superior language level even in speakers who have been exposed very early to the target language. Furthermore, if our assumptions are correct, it would be worth to find out in which measure this could be relevant for the syntactic structure of a sentence and if it is a QP projection between AspP and VP that licenses partitive case, as suggested by Thomas (2003) and represented in (1). In this case, would it be correct to assume the presence of two QP projections, one that licenses partitive case on the basis of the (un)boundedness features of the predicate.
and the other that licenses partitive in quantified constructions, and how, if in any way, they would interact? We leave these questions open for the moment.
Appendix: THE TEST

Liisa - avata - ikkuna
Liisa - open - window

1) Eilen Liisa …………………………………………………… koska hänellä oli kuuma.
Yesterday…………………………………………………………… because she was hot.

| 1) avasi ikkunan (B) | Correct: K. H. |
| open-PAST3sg window-ACC | Incorrect: M. S. E. |

2) Eilen Liisa ………………………………………………… jatkuvasti kun hänellä oli välillä kuuma ja välillä kylmä.
Yesterday Liisa ……………………………………………… continuously because she was feeling hot and cold.

| 2) avasi ikkunaa (U) | Correct: M. S. H. |
| open-PAST3sg window-PART | Incorrect: K. E. |
3) Liisa istui keittiössä ja ……………………………………………, kun puhelin soi.
Liisa was sitting in the kitchen ……………………when the phone rang.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3) luki kirjaa (U)</th>
<th>Correct: K. H. E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>read-PAST3sg</em> <em>book-PART</em></td>
<td>Incorrect: M. S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Liisa…………………………………….……….loppuun ja alkoi valmistella illallista.
Liisa ………………………………………to the end and began to prepare the supper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4) luki kirjan (B)</th>
<th>Correct: M. K. S. H. E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>read-PAST3sg</em> <em>book-ACC</em></td>
<td>Incorrect:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Liisa – syödä – omena

5) Liisa……………………………………………………………………………ja lähti lenkille.
   Liisa…………………………………………………………………………… and went for a walk.

5) sõi omenan (B)
   eat-PAST3sg apple-ACC

Correct:  K. H. E.
Incorrect: M.

Liisa – ommella – sukka

6) Liisa…………………………………………………………………..kun astuin huoneeseen.
   Liisa…………………………………………………………………..when I entered the room.

6) ompeli suukaa (U)
   mend-PAST3sg sock-PART

Correct:  K. H. E.
Incorrect: M. S.
Mikko ja Pekka – rakentaa – talo  
Mikko and Pekka – build - house

7) Kun saavuin pihalle näin Mikon ja Pekan, jotka ..............................................
When I arrived in the courtyard I saw Mikko and Pekka who..............................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7) rakensivat taloa (U)</th>
<th>Correct: K. H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>build-PAST3pl house-PART</td>
<td>Incorrect: M. S. E.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) Kahden kuukauden jälkeen kaunis Valkoinen talo oli valmis. Mikko ja Pekka ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
After two months the beautiful white house was finished. Mikko and Pekka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8) olivat rakentaneet talon (B)</th>
<th>Correct: M. K. S. H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>build-PAST3pl house-ACC</td>
<td>Incorrect: E.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9) Eilen illalla Liisa laittoi ruokaa mutta kaikki paloi pohjaan. Hän…………………………………………kokonaan, kun keittiössä haisi niin pahalle!

Yesterday evening Liisa cooked and everything was burned. She……………………………completely because the kitchen smelled bad!

9) avasi ikkunan (B) 
open-PAST3sg window-ACC
Correct: M. K. H. 
Incorrect: S. E.

Liisa – polttaa – tupakka
Liisa – smoke - cigarette

10) Liisa päätti lopettaa tupakoinnin lopullisesti. Hän .........................viimeisen ...................ja heitti loput roskikseen.

Liisa decided to stop smoking definitively. She smoked......................and threw the rest in the dustbin.

10) poltti tupakan (B) 
smoke-PAST3sg cigarette-ACC
Correct: M. K. H. E. 
Incorrect: S.
Liisa – kirjoittaa - kirje
Liisa – write - letter

11) Eilen kun tulin kotiin Liisa kirjoitti……………………………………………………..
Yesterday when I arrived at home Liisa ……………………………

11) kirjoitti kirjettä (U)
wrote letter-PART
Correct:
Incorrect: M. K. S. H. E.

12) Eilen Liisa…………………….. ja lähti kapungille kavereittensa kanssa.
Yesterday Liisa………………..and went downtown with her friends.

12) kirjoitti kirjeen (B)
write-PAST3sg letter-ACC
Correct: M. K. S. H.
Incorrect: E.
syödä – Liisa – omena
eat - Liisa - apple

13) Eilen Liisa oli keittiössä ja …………………………………….kun ovikello soi.
Yesterday Liisa was in the kitchen and …………………when the doorbell rang.

| 13) söi omenaa (U)                        | Correct: M. H. E. |
| eat-PAST3sg apple-PART                    | Incorrect: K. S. |

Liisa – polttaa – tupakka
Liisa – smoke – cigarette

14) Liisa istui olohuoneessa ja ……………………………………. kun Matti
Liisa was sitting in the sitting room and ……………… when Matti entered
astui huoneeseen ja näki hänet.
the room and saw her.

| 14) poltti tupakkaa (U)                   | Correct: K. S. H. E. |
| smoke-PAST3sg cigarette-PART             | Incorrect: M.       |
15) Brad Pitt – rakastaa – Angelina Jolie
Brad Pitt – love – Angelina Jolie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>rakastaa Angelina Jolia (OP)</th>
<th>Correct: M. K. S. H. E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>love-PRES3sg Angelina Jolie</td>
<td>Incorrect:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16) Mikko – suutelee – Maija
Mikko – kiss – Maija

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>suutelee Maijaa (OP)</th>
<th>Correct: M. K. S. H. E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kiss-PRES3sg Maija-PART</td>
<td>Incorrect:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17) Jennifer – luulee – Matti – hullu
Jennifer – believe – Matti – crazy

| 17) luulee Mattia hulluksi (OP) | Correct: K. H. |
| believe-PRES3sg Matti-PART | Incorrect: E. M. S. |
| crazy-TRANSL |

18) Viime viikolla Mikko
Last week Mikko

| 18) kiipesi vuoren yli (B) | Correct: M. K. S. H. E. |
| climb-PAST3sg over mountain-ACC | Incorrect: |
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