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Finnish belongs to the Finno-Ugrian branch of the Uralic languages. The closest relatives of Finnish are the Baltic-Finnic languages, i.e. Karelian, Estonian, Lude, Veps, Votj, and Livonian. There are about five million speakers of Finnish in the world, most of whom live in Finland, though there are also Finnish communities in other parts of the world, including Russia, Sweden, Norway, the United States, Canada, and Australia.

One good reason for publishing this volume of articles about Finnish syntax is that the literature on Finnish syntax which is accessible to the international linguistic community is as yet relatively scarce. Another good reason is that Finnish has certain properties which are particularly relevant to current grammatical theory, where the role of functional categories in syntax has recently become one of the major topics of research. Being an agglutinating language with very rich morphology, Finnish has a system of functional categories which differs in many respects from that of the well-known Indo-European languages. Thus the study of Finnish syntax can provide many new, interesting facts, hypotheses and problems pertaining to the theory of functional categories in grammar.

The volume is not intended to be homogeneous from a theoretical point of view, but rather can be said to present an overview of the different approaches that are currently used in research on Finnish theoretical syntax.

Section 1 of this introduction discusses some basic syntactic and morphological properties of Finnish and in section 2, there will be a summary and some discussion of the contents of the articles.

1. SOME PROPERTIES OF FINNISH

1.1. On the Morphological Structure of Finnish

The following is condensed overview of Finnish grammar, with special attention given to inflectional morphology. This overview serves several purposes: First, it will give the reader a general idea of the form of Finnish. Second, it may help readers with no previous knowledge of Finnish to decipher morphologically complex example sentences throughout the volume. Third, in recent years the role of inflectional morphology in the syntax of various languages has become a major topic of research (following works such as Baker (1988) and Pollock (1989), among others). We hope that the following survey of some of the most salient properties of Finnish inflectional
morphology can be useful in comparative syntactic research on the properties of inflectional morphology and its role in syntax. Readers who are looking for a more detailed introduction to Finnish grammar, especially morphology (including morphophonology), should consult, for instance, Karlsson (1983).

The following is a list of the most important inflectional suffixes in Finnish (capital letters indicate morpho-phonological alternation, V stands for an empty V(owel)-template and C stands for an empty C(onsonant)-template):

A. Nominal suffixes:
- Case endings (given in section 1.2.)
- plural marker i, t (in PL-NOM, note: tPL-NOM -> Ø / __POSS.SUFF.)
- Possessive suffixes ni (1SG), si (2SG), nsA/Vn (3SG, 3PL), mme (1PL), nne (2PL)
- Comparative and superlative suffixes:
  comparative mPA
  superlative imPA

The following examples are some forms of the noun talo 'house' and the adjective huono 'bad':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARATIVE</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
<th>CASE (ESSIVE)</th>
<th>POSS.SUFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>talo</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>= 'the house'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talo</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>= 'houses'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talo</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>= 'as houses'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talo</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>= 'as my houses'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talo</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>= 'as my house'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talo</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>= 'my house(s)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huono</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>= 'bad'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huono</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>= 'bad (PL)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huono</td>
<td>mma</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>= 'as bad (PL)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huono</td>
<td>mpi</td>
<td></td>
<td>= 'worse (PL)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huono</td>
<td>mpa</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>= 'as worse'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huono</td>
<td>mpa</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>= 'as worse (PL)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huono</td>
<td>mpa</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>= 'worse (PL/SG) than me'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huono</td>
<td>mpa</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>= 'as worse than me'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huono</td>
<td>mpa</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>= 'as worse (PL) than me'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Verb suffixes:
- Passive marker TTA
- Past tense marker i
- Mood markers:
  potential Ne
  conditional isi
  imperative C (2SG), kOOn (3SG, PASS.), kAAmme (1PL), kAA (2PL), kOOt (3PL) [The endings include the Agr-element. IPL form is archaic, and PASS is used instead.]
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- Agreement endings:
  n (1SG), t (2SG), V (3SG), mme (1PL), tte (2PL), vAt (3PL), Vn (PASS)
- infinitive suffixes TA, mA, Te, [only Te-infinitives have passive forms]
- participle suffixes:
  present participle νA
  past participle νUt
  [Both participles have both active and passive forms.]

Consider first the inflection of a finite verb. A more detailed discussion is in Holmberg and al. in this volume. The affirmative present and simple past tense forms work as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>TNS/MOOD</th>
<th>AGR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nouse</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>'I get up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nous</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>'I got up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nous</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>'(some) people get up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nous</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>'some people got up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nous</td>
<td>isi</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>'I would get up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nous</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>isi</td>
<td>'some people would get up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nous</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>'some people probably get up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nous</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>'I probably get up'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The imperative, however, is different because the agreement suffix cannot be separated from the mood suffix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>IMP+AGR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nouse</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>'get up!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nous</td>
<td>koon</td>
<td>'let it/he/she get up!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nous</td>
<td>kaamme</td>
<td>'let's get up!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nous</td>
<td>kaa</td>
<td>'you (PL) get up!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nous</td>
<td>koot</td>
<td>'let they get up!'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| nous | ta      | koon  | 'let's get up (in general)'

In the perfect and pluperfect of the active, the auxiliary ole 'be' carries the tense, mood, and the agreement suffixes, and the lexical verb is in the past participle. In the passive the lexical verb takes the passive marker while the auxiliary is in the neutral 3rd person singular form.
The negation word *e* in Finnish is traditionally called a "negation verb." The negation word indeed carries the agreement suffix but not the other suffixes of a finite verb. It should be noted that in negated verbs in Finnish the past tense is expressed using the perfect participle form (ending *NUI*) of the verb under negation. The verb can, however, carry a mood suffix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>AGR</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>MOOD</th>
<th>PTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ei</td>
<td>mme</td>
<td>nousC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRES, 3SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>tte</td>
<td>nousC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRES, 2PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>nous</td>
<td>isi</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRES, COND, 1SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ei</td>
<td>nous</td>
<td>isi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRES, COND, 3SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>mme</td>
<td>nous</td>
<td>isi</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRES, COND, 1PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>tte</td>
<td>nous</td>
<td>isi</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRES, COND, 2PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ei</td>
<td>nous</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>isi</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRES, PASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ei</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>nous</td>
<td>sut</td>
<td></td>
<td>PST, 3SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>mme</td>
<td>nous</td>
<td>seet</td>
<td></td>
<td>PST, 1PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>tte</td>
<td>nous</td>
<td>seet</td>
<td></td>
<td>PST, 2PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ei</td>
<td>nous</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
<td>PST, PASS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pluperfect is formed by using the perfect participle form *ol+leut / ol+leet* (be+PRF-PTC) of the auxiliary.
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Again, the imperative is exceptional: the negation word is diitä, to which the imperative mood-agreement suffix is attached. However, there is another imperative marker ko attached to the verb in simple tenses and to the auxiliary in the compound tenses.

Infinitives do not have negated forms, nor do they have tenses. They can, however, be case-marked with a semantic case.
The participles do not tolerate negation but, on the other hand, they do have two tenses. In Finnish — as in languages in general — participles are adjective-like verb forms. Thus they can take comparative and superlative suffixes.

In addition to the inflectional suffixes, there is a vast number of derivative suffixes; some of them modify the meaning of the root, e.g. the reflexive, causative, frequentative, momentative, and diminutive, others change the syntactic category of the root. The role of verbal-sentential inflection morphology in the syntax of Finnish is discussed in the paper by Holmberg and af. in this volume.

1.2. Cases

There are fifteen or so cases in Finnish — the number depends on the scholar’s attitude towards the prolative and some other marginal cases. The following list, however, is rather widely accepted:
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- Grammatical cases:
  NOMinative \( \emptyset, t \) (in PL)
  GENitive \( n, Ten \) (in PL)
  PARTitive \( TA \)
  ACCusative \( n, t \) (in PL and in personal pronouns)

- General locative cases:
  TRANslative \( kse \) change of state
  ESSive \( nA \) 'as'

- Internal locative cases:
  INEssive \( ssA \) 'in'
  ELAitive \( stA \) 'from (in)'
  ILLative \( hvn, svvn \) (in some PL forms) '(in)to'

- External locative cases:
  ADEssive \( lla \) 'at / on' or Instrument
  ABLative \( lta \) 'from (on)'
  ALLative \( lle \) '(on)to'

- Marginal cases:
  ABEssive \( tta \) 'without'
  COMitive \( ne \) 'together with' [always in PL; oblig.]
      POSS.SUFF.]
  INStructive \( n \) Instrument [usually in PL]
  PROLative \( tse \) 'via' [always in PL]

The instructive and the prolate normally require the word to be in the plural form, even when the meaning is singular. The locative cases and the marginal cases are usually referred to as semantic cases because, like prepositions in English, for example, they are associated with specific meanings. Of course, the meanings given in the table above are nothing more than approximations, and the use of semantic cases in Finnish is as difficult to describe and understand as the use of prepositions in English.

The following is an example of case inflection:

talo (NOM) 'house'
taloo (PAR)
talon (GEN)
talotatalo (ACC)
talona (ESS) 'as a/the house'
taloksi (TRA) (change) 'into a house' [Note: \( e -> i \leftarrow # \)]
talossa (INE) 'in a/the house'
talosta (ELA) 'from in a/the house'
taloon (ILL) 'into a/the house'
taltoa (ADE) 'at a/the house'
taltoa (ABL) 'from a/the house'
Not only do nouns and adjectives have case forms in Finnish, but adpositions and infinitive verbs can also appear in a semantic case form. For instance:

sisi + il (in+ADE) / sisää + ssä (in+INE) 'in'
sisi + it (in+ABL) / sisää + sti (in+ELA) 'from in'
sisi + il (in+ALL) / sisää + An (in+ILL) 'into'

juokse + ma + ssä (run+INF+INE) e.g. 'he is running'
juokse + ma + sta (run+INF+ELA) e.g. 'he stopped running'
juokse + ma + stan (run+INF+ILL) e.g. 'he started running'
juokse + ma + il (run+INF+ADE) e.g. 'he can make it by running' or 'he came (by) running'
juokse + ma + tta (run+INF+ABE) e.g. 'he cannot make it without running'
juos + te + ssä (run+INF+INE) 'while running'
juos + te + An (run+INF+INS) e.g. 'he can make it by runnig' or 'he came running'

Various aspects of the grammatical case system are discussed in several papers in this volume, namely Malling's, Laitinen & Vilkuna's, Reime's, Toivainen's and Vainikka's papers. Syntactic properties of the locative cases are discussed in Nikanne's paper.

1.3. Subject-Verb Agreement Suffixes

The agreement elements in Finnish are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 PERSON</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>2 PERSON</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
<th>3 PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>mme</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>tte</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.g. the verb sano 'say':

(1)  minä sano + n  'I say'
sinä sano + t    'you say'
hän sano + o     'he/she says'
me sano + mme    'we say'
te sano + tte    'you (PL) say'
he sano + vat     'they say'
Finnish is a partial pro-drop language. One can drop the overt subject in the 1st and 2nd person but not in 3rd.

In many colloquial forms of Finnish, the agreement system is a little different. For instance in the Helsinki dialect, the 3rd person plural suffix is the same as in the 3rd person singular and the passive form is used instead of the first person plural (see Reime (this volume)). As Vainikka (1989) has noted, colloquial Finnish — at least in Helsinki — is not pro-drop in the sense described above.

1.4. Possessive Suffixes (Px's)

Finnish has suffixes traditionally called possessive suffixes. The categorial status of these suffixes is controversial: are they inflectional agreement elements, clitics, or arguments? See Trosterud (this volume) for discussion. The possessive suffixes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 PERSON</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>mme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 PERSON</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>nne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PERSON</td>
<td>nsa / Vn</td>
<td>nsa / Vn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For instance talo 'house':

(2) minun talo+ni 'my house'
    sinun talo+si 'your house'
    hän nalo+nns 'her/his house'
    meidän talo+nme 'our house'
    teidän talo+nne 'your (PL) house'
    heidän talo+nsa 'their house'

In standard Finnish, a possessive suffix is necessarily attached to the head of an NP when it has a personal pronoun as a specifier. Standard Finnish has similar pro drop in NPs as in finite sentences: one can drop an overt personal pronoun from the specifier position in the 1st and 2nd but not in the 3rd person. However, the colloquial forms of Finnish differ from standard Finnish with respect to the use of possessive suffixes. In Helsinki dialect, for instance, the possessive suffixes are seldom used in NPs but they are used in participle constructions.

1.5. Different Kinds of Agreement

Finnish has the following kinds of agreement:

(i) Subject-verb agreement
(ii) Possessive agreement
(iii) Case and number agreement in NP
(iv) Number agreement in nominal predicate clauses
Cases (i) and (ii) have already been discussed. An example of (iii) is given in (3): [AP, NP] and [DET, NP] and, in most cases, [QP, NP] must agree in case and number with the head noun.

(3) (nominative) iso talo 'big house'
    (inessive) iso+i sa talo+i sa : (partitive) iso+a talo+a :
    (plural nominative) iso+i talo+i : (plural inessive) iso+i+i sa talo+i+i sa :
    (plural partitive) iso+j+a talo+j+a

An example of (iv) is given in (4): A predicative adjective or noun agrees in number with the subject of the clause.

(4) a. talo on kummallinen
    house(NOM) be(3SG) strange(NOM)
    'the house is strange'

b. talo+t o+vat kummallis+i+a /*kummallinen
    house+PL-NOM be+3PL strange+PL+PAR
    'the houses are strange'

c. mies on politiisi
    man(NOM) be(3SG) police(NOM)
    'the man is a policeman'

d. miehe+t o+vat politiise+i+a/*politiisi
    man+PL-NOM be+3PL police+PL+PAR
    'the men are policemen'

1.6. No Article

There is no article included in a Finnish NP. The definiteness/indefiniteness distinction is expressed by means of word order or by using demonstrative pronouns. An example of the former is in (5):

(5) a. Pöydällä on kirja
    book+ADE be(3SG) book
    'There is a book on the table'

b. Kirja on pöydällä
    book be(3SG) table+ADE
    'The book is on the table'

(For more details, see Vilkuna 1989). Most often, however, an NP is interpreted as (in)definite on the basis of discourse context.

1.7. Relatively Free Word Order

Finnish is often referred to as a free word order language, and Finnish does indeed have considerable freedom of word order compared with, say, English or the neighboring Scandinavian languages. Thus, for instance, all permutations of S, V, and O are in principle permitted under appropriate conditions in terms of information structure. This is exemplified in (6). The characterizations of
the information-structural conditions are only rough approximations. See Vilkuna (1989) for a theory of Finnish word order and information structure.

(6) 
   a. SVO: Pekka osti kirjan. (Unmarked.)
      Pekka buy+PST(3SG) book+ACC
   b. SOV: Pekka kirjan osti. (Focus on the subject.)
   c. OSV: Kirjan Pekka osti. (Focus on the object.)
   d. OVS: Kirjan osti Pekka. (Focus on the subject and the object.)
   d. VSO: Ostiko/Ostihan/Ostikohan Pekka kirjan (Focus on V)
      buy+Q-CL/FOC-CL/Q-CL+FOC-CL
   e. VOS: Ostiko/Ostihan/Ostikohan kirjan Pekka (Focus on V,
      object known.)

Sentence (66d) is not natural and (6e) is not grammatical without a question or a focus clitic.

Certain aspects of Finnish "free word order" are discussed in Holmberg and al. (this volume).

2. THE PAPERS

We shall now give a short summary of each paper in this volume, with comments and a comparison of some of the ideas presented in them.

2.1. Nominative and accusative: Maling, Reime, and Toivainen

Probably the most controversial issue in Finnish case theory, if not in Finnish grammar as a whole, is the proper characterization of the variation in the form of the "accusative" object. This is reflected in the papers in this volume; three papers specifically address this topic, namely, Maling's, Reime's and Toivainen's papers. The variation can be exemplified by (7):

(7) 
      Jussi bought book+n/book+Ø
   b. Ostettiin kirja/*kirjan.
      bought-PASS book+Ø/book+n
      "A book was bought."
   c. Jussin täytyy ostaa kirja/*kirjan.
      Jussi+GEN must buy book+Ø/book+n

When the sentence is "personal" in the sense of showing subject-verb agreement the object takes the -n form, usually called accusative.

1 This pertains to the singular. In the plural there is only one non-partitive object form, marked by a suffix -t. The -n form is phonologically identical to the genitive. According to one school of thought in Finnish linguistics (represented in this volume by Vainikka's paper) the object -n form is the genitive.
gets the unmarked form = nominative. (This generalization is put forth and discussed in Timberlake (1975).) There is a classic controversy regarding the classification of the unmarked object form: is it nominative or is it a kind of accusative? The classic argument in favour of the second hypothesis is that pronominal objects bear a morphologically distinct non-nominative form in all object positions: Compare (7) and (8):

(8) a. Jussi näki sinut/*sinä
   Jussi saw you+/you+Ø

b. Sinut/*sinä nähtiin.
   you++/you+Ø saw+PASS
   "You were seen."

c. Justin täyttyy nähädä sinut/*sinä.
   Justin+GEN must see you++/you+Ø

If the unmarked object form in (1b,c) is ACC, then we can generalize over all object arguments: An object which does not take PAR(titive) or a lexically assigned semantic case takes ACC. It should be noted that the standard analysis of the pronominal object form as ACC may be called into question: in fact, Toivainen argues in his paper that it is a form of NOM.

In her paper 'Of nominative and accusative: the hierarchical assignment of grammatical case in Finnish' Joan Maling takes the position that the unmarked object form in (1b,c) is NOM. She notes that pronouns and lexical NPs are subject to different case-marking systems in many languages, and makes it clear that her theory specifically concerns the case-marking system for lexical NPs in Finnish. Applying the "Case in Tiers" theory of Yip & al. (1987) to Finnish, Maling shows that the distribution of NOM and ACC in Finnish is neatly accounted for by the following principle:

(9) Assign NOM to the highest available GF. All other GFS get ACC.

A GF (grammatical function, i.e. subject, object, etc.) is "available" if it is not assigned case by any other means, e.g. semantically. The above principle presupposes a hierarchy of GFs: SUBJ > OBJ > ADV. Thus, in (7a) the subject gets NOM and the object ACC. In (1b) the object, being the only GF, gets NOM. In (1c), finally, the subject is assigned its GEN case "by other means" and is therefore not available, hence the object gets NOM.

One interesting property of Finnish is that not only arguments, but adverbials as well can carry grammatical cases. Maling shows that the principle (9) accounts also for the distribution of NOM and ACC among adverbials. One of her conclusions is that case-marking facts require further articulation of the GF hierarchy into several adverbial functions.

Hannu Reime, in his paper 'Accusative marking in Finnish' takes the position that the unmarked object form is a realization of ACC. He proposes an explanation of "Timberlake's generalization" in terms of a theory of syntactic features and verb movement. The basic idea is that the unmarked form ("abstract accusative") is used when the object is governed by a "pure verbal form". Correspondingly, the morphologically marked -n form is used when the
object is not governed by a pure verbal form. One such case is the participle, a "semi-adjectival" verb form:

(10) Jussin ostettua kirjan*kirja me palasimme kotiin.
    Jussi+GEN bought+PTC book+u/book+Ø we returned home
    "Jussi having bought the book, we returned home."

Another case would be that of verbs with agreement. The idea is that in Finnish the nominal feature of the agreement marks the verb as "nonverbal", calling for the -n form. Cf. the fact that objects of nouns and adjectives require "overt case" in the form of a preposition in for instance English: destruction of the city, proud of John, etc. According to Reime, the contrast between the marked and the unmarked accusative in Finnish would be a reflex of the same principle which requires insertion of the preposition in these constructions.

Jorma Toivainen's paper 'The nature of the accusative in Finnish' presents a positional theory of the distribution of cases in Finnish clauses, which has certain affinities to Maling's theory, except that in Toivainen's version there is a mapping between cases, GFs, and positions in a sentence template: each sentential head (= finite verb or participle) has a case pattern in which there are three case positions for its NP arguments, a subject position and two object positions. For each position there is a set of cases which can be assigned in that position. Toivainen's theory is also intended to account, at least in part, for the distribution of the paritive (PAR) and some uses of the genitive (GEN). GEN is discussed in more detail in two other papers in the volume, namely Vainikka's and Laitinen & Vilkuna's papers.

2.2. Genitive: Vainikka and Laitinen & Vilkuna

In her paper 'The three structural cases in Finnish' Anne Vainikka argues that Finnish makes extensive use of "structural default case", that is case assigned by default to certain configurationally defined positions (unlike Toivainen's theory, where the positions are theoretically primitive). She proposes the following:

(11) a. GEN is the default case for the Spec-of-XP position (X° lexical);
b. PAR is the default case for an obligatory complement of X°;
c. ELA(tive) is the default case for a non-obligatory complement of X° (= an adjunct).

The GEN rule accounts for the occurrence of GEN in Spec(NP), Spec(PP), Spec(AP) and Spec(VP), examples of which are given in (12):

(12) Jussin kirja: Jussin kanssa: valtavan kylmä
    Jussi+GEN book Jussi+GEN with enormous+GEN cold
    "Jussi's book" "with Jussi" "enormously cold"
Käskin [Jussin mennä],
told+1sg Jussi+GEN leave
"I told Jussi to leave."

Vainikka does not mention neccessive constructions such as (7c). We may infer, however, that they would be derived by raising of an argument from Spec(VP), marked GEN by default, to the subject position of the neccessive verb (that is to say, neccessive verbs would be raising verbs; this is the analysis espoused by Laitinen and Vilkuna as well).

Vainikka assumes that the form traditionally called NOM is a caseless form. This hypothesis forms part of a rather bold theory of object and subject case-marking, which, however, is only discussed cursorily in the paper in this volume (see also the discussion in Maling's paper). An alternative, if one is unwilling to accept this part of Vainikka's theory, is to assume that NOM is assigned by AGR (the subject-verb agreement element), as is assumed for many other languages in standard GB theory. If so, GEN could be the default case of Spec(IP) as well, applying when there is no AGR, as in neccessive constructions, neccessive verbs of the tättyä type being incompatible with agreement.

Laitinen and Vilkuna discuss a particular complication pertaining to the neccessive construction, namely, alternation between GEN and NOM in the subject, common in certain dialects of Finnish (in standard Finnish GEN is the only accepted form).

(13) a. Lehmiin tättyy mennä kotiin.  
cows+GEN must go home
b. Lehmiä tättyy mennä kotiin.  
cows+NOM must go home

Laitinen and Vilkuna discuss the properties of the neccessive NOM construction, trying to determine the conditions on its occurrence, which does not turn out to be a simple matter. Transitivity appears to be one of the factors involved: neccessive constructions with NOM are typically headed by an unaccusative verb. Other important conditions concern the grammatical properties of the NOM subject: it must be a 3rd person singular or plural, and preferably non-human NP. Pronouns are excluded (except the 3rd person non-human se/me). Agreement is involved as well: in all the dialects where the construction occurs the 3pl has a form identical with 3sg, which is to say that the verb always has the neutral 3sg form in this construction, just as in the GEN construction.\(^2\)

2.3. Paritive: Vainikka

The extensive use of the paritive case (PAR) is another characteristic of the Finnish case system. PAR is used with objects affected only partially, objects

\(^2\) Given Reime's theory, the case of the subject in the non-GEN neccessive construction may in fact be ACC: this is consistent with the observation that the construction never shows (overt) agreement with the subject.
of unfinished actions, objects of failed actions, and objects in the scope of negation, just to mention some typical contexts which require PAR. Furthermore there are many idiosyncratic, lexically determined uses. As mentioned, some uses of PAR are discussed in Toivainen's paper, and a hypothesis concerning PAR forms one of the cornerstones in Anne Vainikka's paper: according to her PAR is the default object case in Finnish (see 5b, above), while ACC is assigned to an object NP in the scope of an abstract feature [+COMPLETED] associated with VP (perhaps a feature of INFL). This contrasts sharply with the standard assumption according to which ACC is the unmarked object case, while the use of PAR is regulated by a complex set of rules and lexical stipulations. There is little doubt that Vainikka's theory is simpler in the sense of demanding fewer rules and exceptions. One of Vainikka's arguments is that while PAR occurs with objects of verbs, prepositions, adjectives, numerals, and certain quantifiers, ACC is restricted to objects of verbs.

2.4. Semantic cases: Nikanne

The bulk of the 16 or so Finnish cases are adverbial, "semantic" cases, corresponding to prepositions in English and other more "analytic" languages (see above section 1.2). Nikanne discusses the proper analysis of NPs marked with such cases. Their syntactic distribution corresponds, by and large, to the distribution of PPs in English, for instance, and they behave like PPs with respect to various syntactic tests. Yet, as Nikanne shows, the cases are regular case-affixes, not incorporated adpositions. This shows in that the case is marked not only on the head noun but on adjectival and numeral specifiers of the noun as well (see above section 1.5). Nikanne proposes an analysis where the case is assigned by an abstract preposition, the structure of "NP" marked with one of these cases being (roughly) as shown in (14):

\[(\text{pp } [\text{p INE}]) [\text{np talo+ssa}]\]

'in a/the house'

---


4 One of the editors, who has been taught Finnish as a second language at school, recalls spending a good part of a year of being taught Finnish grammar going through all the various uses of PAR, including learning by heart a long list of lexical exceptions. He has no doubt that Vainikka's theory offers pedagogical advantages over the traditional theory.

Nikanne (1990) notes that the hypothesis that PAR is a default object case appears somehow counter-intuitive. He suggests the reason is that we are cognitively wired to regard completed actions as the unmarked case. The expression of such actions typically involve ACC objects in Finnish. Thus the intuition that there is something marked about PAR would not be because PAR case as such is marked, but because the actions which VPs with PAR objects denote often have a marked character.

5 Another interesting fact consistent with Vainikka's hypothesis is that the expletive subject pronoun which is common in colloquial Finnish in certain impersonal constructions is the PAR form of the 3sg non-human pronoun *siitä*.

6 And, for that matter, to PPs in Finnish: in addition to having adposition-like cases, Finnish has pre- as well as postpositions. Cf. Vainikka's paper.
2.5. Comparing the theories of grammatical case

There is some interesting tension between the various theories of grammatical case in Finnish presented in this volume. According to Maling, NOM and ACC have the character of default cases, being assigned to any "available" argument, i.e. any argument which is not already assigned case by some case-assigning lexical head or other case-assigning category. This presupposes that the GEN subject in for instance the neccessive construction (7c) is assigned its case by a case-assigning category, presumably the neccessive verb.

According to Vainikka, ACC belong to the cases which are assigned by a case-assigning category, namely the feature COMPLETED. As mentioned earlier she regards NOM as a caseless form. If , instead, we adopt the alternative suggested above according to which NOM is assigned by AGR, NOM also belongs to the cases assigned by a case-assigning category. The default grammatical cases, according to Vainikka, are GEN and PAR. One advantage of this approach is that it explains the generalization that subject-verb agreement is always with a NOM argument, which in Maling's theory must simply be stipulated. On the other hand this theory does not account for the occurrence of a NOM-like form in object position, or more generally, for the variation in the form of non-partitive objects. It is interesting to consider combining Vainikka's and Reime's theory: according to Reime the variation in question is not between NOM and ACC, but between two forms of ACC. Thus NOM could be strictly reserved for the subject position of finite clauses, a position governed by AGR.

At this point, it is worthwhile to reconsider Laitinen & Vilku's neccessive construction with NOM instead of GEN on the subject, repeated here:

(13) a. Lehmien täytyy mennä kotiin.
cows+GEN must go home
     b. Lehmat täytyy mennä kotiin.
cows+NOM must go home

There are several possible accounts of this variation within the space provided by the case theories in this volume, none of them entirely satisfactory. For instance, we could postulate that the neccessive verb *täytyy* assigns GEN optionally to the subject, in the relevant dialects. When it does not assign GEN, the subject is assigned NOM, according to Maling's principle (9). Furthermore, since the neccessive verb is incompatible with AGR (i.e. cannot show overt agreement), the NOM subject must have a neutral, personless form (= 3sg.). All of this would be in keeping with Maling's theory. On the other hand this does not help to explain why the non GEN neccessive construction only occurs with intransitive, and more specifically unaccusative verbs. It is as if the case of the subject were assigned downstairs, in object position, and brought along under movement to the surface subject position.

---

7 As mentioned, Vainikka does present the outline of a theory intended to account for the variation in the form of non-partitive objects; Maling presents a critique of this theory in her contribution.
This is more clearly the case in the necessive construction (15), an instance of the so-called "missing person construction", where the Agent is not overtly expressed, but understood as an unspecified person (see Laitinen & Vilkuna for discussion).

(15) Lehmät täytty viedä kotiin.
cows-NOM must bring home
"The cows must be brought home"

In this construction the surface subject is clearly the thematic object of the embedded verb, the thematic subject being implicit, possibly syntactically represented as small pro (cf. Holmberg & al. (this volume), section 1.6). The NOM case would seem to be assigned to the thematic object while in object position, and brought along under movement to the surface subject position (GEN is not possible in this construction). This might be the case with (13b) as well.

Another possible account of the facts in (13a,b), which would be in line with Vainikka's case theory, is that the necessive verb does not assign GEN to its subject position, but instead that position would be open with respect to case. Thus it may accommodate a case assigned downstairs, as in the case of (14) and arguably in (13b). When the argument raised to the subject position does not bring along a case, it gets GEN by default, according to Vainikka's rule. On the other hand this theory does not predict that the case of the (derived) non-GEN subject should be NOM, in particular since one of the conditions on the construction is that there should not be any (overt) agreement between the subject and the necessive verb. Note, however, a possibility allowed by Reime's theory: the case of the subject in (13b) and (14b) is not NOM but the unmarked ACC, which is incompatible with agreement. The "pronoun test" indicates that the case of the surface subject in (14) is indeed ACC (but note again the objections of Toivainen and Maling to the standard pronoun test):

(15) Sinut */sinä täytty viedä kotiin.
you+ACC/you+NOM must bring home
"You must be brought home."

The test cannot be applied to the construction (13b), since, as mentioned above, it does not tolerate any pronominal subject (except the 3rd person non-human se (sg) and ne (pl)). Hence there is no direct evidence to help us determine whether the subject in (13b) carries NOM or ACC.

None of the theories discussed offers any obvious explanation of the (very strong) prohibition against a human pronominal non-GEN subject, NOM as well as ACC, in constructions like (13b): Compare (15) and (16):

---

8 These are the only personal pronouns which do not have the pronominal ACC -n form, but instead pattern with lexical NP in showing variation between an -m form and an unmarked form in object position. This correlation of form and distribution in the necessive construction holding for lexical NP and the pronouns seine can hardly be a coincidence.
Laitinen & Vilkuna discuss this issue in great detail, and suggest that that a "semantic dimension that could be called personhood" is crucial. Still, as far as we can see, the sharp contrast between (15) and (16) remains to be explained.

2.6. Other categories: Helasvuoto, Holmberg & al., Schot-Saikku, Trosterud

The remaining four papers deal mainly with issues other than case theory, although case plays an important role in at least two of them. The issues are: relative clauses (Helasvuoto), sentential-verbal inflection and word order (Holmberg & al.), sentence types and "sentence type theory" (Schot-Saikku), and anaphora and binding (Trosterud).

Marja-Liisa Helasvuoto's paper is called 'Are relative clauses either restrictive or non-restrictive: a study of the relative clause in Finnish pear stories'. On the basis of spoken language data Helasvuoto questions the traditional syntactic distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive relatives for spoken Finnish. Relative clauses can be used restrictively or non-restrictively, among other uses (for instance they are also used as means of stringing clauses together, much like coordination). Helasvuoto does not, however, find evidence of syntactic, structural correlates for these semantic/pragmatic distinctions in her material, and concludes that they have not been grammaticalized in Finnish.

Holmberg, Nikanne, Oravita, Reine, and Trosterud's paper 'The structure of INFL and the finite clause in Finnish' is an application to Finnish of the hypothesis that syntactic structure is a projection of lexical and functional heads, where the latter include inflectional heads such as tense, agreement, mood, etc., following Pollock (1989). Finnish is a synthetic language of the agglutinating type, so inflections are numerous and in most cases morphologically distinct. Thus Finnish offers more evidence of the interplay of syntax and inflectional morphology than more analytic and fusional languages such as English and French. Of special interest in this connection is the Finnish negation, an auxiliary-like category which is inflected for subject agreement. According to Holmberg & al. a maximal expansion of the Finnish sentence has six sentential heads between C(omplementizer) and V, namely F (= AGR), NEG, TM (tense-mood), AUX, T(ense), PASS(ive). The paper presents a theory of verbal-sentential inflection, and discusses various sentential constructions involving negation, auxiliaries, adverbs, quantifiers, the passive, various moods, etc.

Päivi Schot-Saikku's paper 'What makes Finnish different: remarks on a sentence type theory of Finnish' discusses a type of syntactic theory which has been extremely influential within Finnish linguistics. According to this theory the syntax of a language can be adequately described as a set of sentence types (STs) or sentence templates, such as NP+V+NP, NP+Cop+Loc, Loc+V+NP, etc. Schot-Saikku scrutinizes some existing versions of ST theory of Finnish, noting their various shortcomings, and finally presents her own version of ST theory, which she refers to as a "case-frame theory". (Indeed, her paper might
have been included in the first part of this volume, since case theory plays an important role in it.) In this version the STs/case frames are pared down to basically two, called a Nominative Frame and an Oblique Frame, respectively, with subtypes defined by choice of case and agreement. According to Schot-Saikkula cross-linguistic variation can be aptly described in terms of this theory: For instance, what makes Finnish syntactically different from English is, above all, the existence of the Oblique Frame.

Trond Trostrud's paper is called 'Anaphors and binding domains in Finnish'. On the basis of the binding theory developed in Hellan (1988), Trostrud discusses the distribution of the Finnish anaphors *lise "self" and the possessive suffixes. With regard to the latter, Trostrud disagrees with certain other current proposals according to which the possessive suffixes are agreement markers. Instead he claims that the possessive suffix is itself an argument, which requires theta-role and case. This accounts for the complementary distribution between genitive specifier and possessive suffix in a case like (17):

(17) a. Maijan kirja
    Maija's book
b. kirja+s
   book+3sg POSS
   "his/her book"
c. *Maijan kirja+s

(17c) violates the Case Filter, since only one of the two nominals, the genitive specifier and the possessive suffix, can be assigned case by the noun kirja. The possessive suffix is moreover an anaphor, as it has to be bound within a specific domain (thus e.g. (17b) cannot be the subject of a sentence). Since possessive suffixes may co-occur with pronominal possessive pronouns in Finnish (e.g. hänens kirjansa "his/her book"), Trostrud is forced to adopt the same strategy as Joan Maling: his theory of possessive constructions is explicitly restricted to lexical NPs.
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