

## **Alignment in Old Finnish**

- Alignment in Modern Finnish
- Coreferential deletion and the Old Finnish passive
- Argument marking with the Old Finnish passive
- Argument marking with possessive and existential clauses in Old Finnish

## Alignment in Modern Finnish

Subject case-marking: nominative with "normal" transitive and intransitive clauses:

***Petri** juo kahvia*

*Petri nukkuu*

nominative, partitive or *t*-accusative in existential and possessive clauses

*Talossa on **koira***

*Petrillä ei ole **koiraa***

*Valokuvassa näkyy **sinutkin***

Object case-marking: genitive/accusative *-n*, *t*-accusative, nominative or partitive

*Vien lapsen kouluun*

*Vien hänet kouluun*

*En vie lasta kouluun*

*Lapsi viedään kouluun*

- Nominative, partitive and *t*-accusative are the basic object cases, genitive/accusative *-n* occurs only in constructions where a nominative subject may occur (so, not: passives, neccessive clauses, imperative clauses).
- So: a subset of intransitive subjects behave like objects in terms of case-marking. Terho Itkonen: "inverted ergativity", Helena Metslang: "fluid intransitivity".

## Passive

In modern Finnish: typologically non-promotional passive:

- Argument retains object-marking
- Agent suppressed, no adverbial agents (*the soup was eaten by the child*)
- Limited possibilities for coreferential deletion:

If the argument is non-agentive, OK:

*Erik johta-a nuorisojengi-ä ja erote-taan koulu-sta*  
Erik lead-3Sg youth gang-PART and dismiss-PASS school-ELAT

"Erik leads a youth gang and is dismissed from school"

But not if the active argument is agentive:

*Erik ryöst-i pankki-n ja erote-ttiin koulu-sta*  
Erik rob-IPF.3SF bank-GEN and dismiss-PASS.IPF school-ELAT

"Erik robbed a bank and was dismissed from school"

In Old Finnish: some promotional properties

- Polypersonal passives occur in Old Finnish
- Adverbial agents (a promotional feature) occur very widely.

What about coreferential deletion?

- With syntactically identical arguments in e.g. English, but in other languages, a deleted argument can refer to an earlier subject but also to other arguments. Pragmatic conditions.

## Coreferential deletion

Material: Agricola's works and Biblia, coordinate constructions with an active verb and a passive verb. These are not large in number (437 in the Biblia and 218 in Agricola's works), furthermore, there is only a small number of constructions where both active arguments and passive arguments are overt (60 in Bible, 28 in Agricola).  
Difficult to generalize!

Note: occasionally a deleted passive argument is coreferential with an object or another syntactic argument:

Agricola, Rucouskiria p. 373

Hen	taas	le'dhett-i	Caijphaxe-lle	sinu-n	sidhottu-na /
he[NOM]	again	send-IPF.3SG	Caiaphas-ALL	you-GEN	tied-ESS
ia	sielle	mone-lla	mooto	naure-ttin /	
and	there	many-AD	way.PART	laugh-PASS.IPF	

'He again sent you back to Caiaphas, and there (you) were ridiculed in many ways.'

Also elsewhere in Old Finnish, e.g. Sorolainen, Postilla II: 329:

Herodexe-n	HErra-n	Engeli	lö-ij	ia
Herod-GEN	Lord-GEN	Angel[NOM]	strike.PST.3SG	and
Mado-i-lda	ylös	syö-tin		
worm-PL-ABL	up	eat-PASS.PST		

'An angel of the Lord struck Herod, and he was eaten by worms.' (Sorolainen, 1629, Postilla II p. 329)

Occasionally, the deleted argument is coreferential with another argument, not the subject or object:

Bible, 1 Sm. 31:3

Ja	sota	ol-i	angara	Sauli	wastan /
and	war[NOM]	be-PST.3SG	grim[NOM]	Saul.PART	against
ja	joudzimiehe-t	käw-i-t	häne-n	päällens	jous-t-en
and	bowman-NOM.PL	go-PST-3PL	him-GEN	upon	bow-PL-GEN
cansa /	ja	haawoite-ttin	pahoin	joudzimieh-i-ldä	
with	and	wound-PASS.PST	badly	bowman-PL-ABL	

'And the war was hard against Saul, and bowmen came upon him with their bows, and (he) was wounded badly by the bowmen' (Bible, 1 Sm. 31:3)

Cases like these are few - but too many to be explained away as contaminations or slips of the pen. They were apparently a genuine feature of Old Finnish grammar!

There are cases where the active argument is overt but the passive argument is deleted:

Bible, Judges 12:7

ja Jephthah se Gileadita cuol-i /  
and Jephthah[NOM] that[NOM] Gileadite[NOM] die-PST.3SG  
ja hauda-ttin Gileadi-n Caupunge-i-hjn  
and bury-PASS.PST Gilead-GEN city-PL-ILL  
'And Jephthah the Gileadite died, and was buried in the cities of Gilead.'

But also cases where the passive argument is overt and the active argument is deleted:

Bible, Luke 1:67

Ja häne-n Isä-ns Zacharias täyte-ttin  
and he-GEN father[NOM]-3SG Zachary[NOM] fill-PASS.PST  
Pyhä-llä Henge-llä / ja ennust-i sanoden  
holy-AD spirit-AD and foretell-PST.3SG saying  
'And his father Zachary was filled with the holy spirit, and prophesied, saying...'

And cases where both arguments are overt:

Bible, 2 Chron. 33, Margin note

Manasse wie-dän sidottu-na Babeli-jn /  
Manasse[NOM] bring-PASS tied-ESS Babel-ILL  
ja hän paranda idze-ns  
and he[NOM] cure.3SG self.ACC-his  
'Manasse is taken to Babylon in chains, and he cures himself.'

In general: coreferential deletion is the "normal case" in the material. Where coreferential deletion can occur, it usually occurs. The appearance of two overt arguments is more rare.

There are cases where the overt argument is partitive:

Bible, 1 Cor. 7, margin note

Sillä heitä	cowin	silloin	ahdistettin	ja
for they-PART	strongly	then	threaten-PASS.PST	and
täydyi	usein	paeta	yhdestä Caupungista	toiseen
must-IPF.3SG	often	flee	one-EL city-EL	other-ILL

'For they were gravely persecuted then, and often had to flee from one city to the other'

Mismatch between various levels of syntactic marking: coreferential deletion suggests the arguments are "the same", but the overt argument is marked as an object!

Note: we would furthermore expect a genitive subject with the active verb (*täydyi*).

Case above adds weight to the suggestion that the conditions for coreferential deletion are pragmatically rather than syntactically determined, meaning it does not signify identity of arguments in Old Finnish.

Hypothesis: negation forces partitive on the object in Finnish. One could therefore expect negated clauses to be rarer in the coordinate constructions with coreferential deletion examined here, to avoid the mismatch mentioned above.

- This does not appear to be the case! Negated clauses do occur, and overt passive arguments in the constructions under examination here may be marked with the nominative or the partitive:

Agricola, *Ne Prophetat*, Jeremiah 13:40

Nin	ett-ei	se	ikenens	serie-te /	eli
so	that-NEG	that[NOM]	ever	break-PASS	or
poisricotu-xi		tule			
destroyed-TRANS		become(-3SG)			

'So that it may never be broken, or become destroyed' (Agricola, *Ne Prophetat*, Jeremiah 13:40)

Hypothesis: periphrastic passive arguments are more subject-like in Old Finnish (I'll explain later) and one could therefore expect periphrastic forms to be overrepresented among those in coordinate constructions with coreferential deletion.

- Not the case either!



In modern Finnish, coreferential deletion with passive arguments occurs mainly with intransitive or non-agentive active subjects. This is not the case in Old Finnish, there appear to be no restrictions on transitivity:

Bible, 1 Chron. 12:24

Tämä-n	tek-i	BenaJa	Jojada-n	poica /
this-GEN	do-PST.3SG	Benaja[NOM]	Jojada-GEN	son[NOM]
ja	yliste-ttin	nij-den	colmen	Uljasten
and	elevate-PASS.PST	those-GEN.PL	three-GEN	courageous-PL-GEN
seas				
among				

"This Benaja the son of Jojada did, and he was elevated among those three courageous men."

Note that the deleted passive argument may be coreferential with a possessor adverbial as well:

Agricola, NT, Matt. 18:8

quin	sinu-lla	ol-is	caxi	kät-te	ia	caxi
than	you-AD	be-CND.3SG	two[NOM]	hand-PART	and	two[NOM]
ialca /	ia	heite-teisin	si-hen	ijancaikise-en	Tule-en	
foot.PART	and	throw-PASS.CND	that-ILL	eternal-ILL	fire-ILL	

'than if you had two hands and two feet, and were thrown into that eternal fire'

One factor that does appear to be effective: semantic coherence between the verbs.

Mechanical/causal connection: the two events are causally linked.

Logical connection: one event is the logical consequence of the other.

Conventional connection: the two events are usually linked because of a given cultural connection.

Mechanical/causal connection: coreferential deletion is common.

Bible, Luke 9:17

Ja he sö-i-t ja rawi-ttin caicki  
and they[NOM] eat-PST-3PL and fed-PASS.PST all[NOM]

'And they ate and were all fed.'

Logical connection: coreferential deletion is common.

Bible, Jos. 5:7

sillä hei-llä ol-i esinahca / ja ei  
for they-AD be-PST.3SG foreskin[NOM] and NEG  
ollet ymbärinsleica-tu-t matca-lla  
been circumcise-PTCP.PST.PASS-PL journey-AD

'For they had foreskins, and had not been circumcised on the way,' (Bible, Jos. 5:7)

Conventional connection: coreferential deletion is common.

Bible, Genesis 21:8

Ja lapsi caswo-i ja wieroite-ttin  
and child[NOM] grow-PST.3SG and wean-PASS.PST

'And the child grew and was weaned'

But if the two events are not linked in any such fashion at all, coreferential deletion is more rare! Though it still occurs:

Agricola, Psalmtari 48:6

He                    ihmectel-i-t /                    coska                    he                    tä-te                    nä-i-t /  
they[NOM]           wonder-PST-PL                    when                    they[NOM]           this-PART see-PST-3PL  
ia   hemmestu-i-t /                    ia   alaskukiste-ttijn  
and   be amazed-PST-3PL   and   crush-PASS.PST

"They wondered, when they saw this, and were amazed, and were crushed"

In addition: coreferential deletion appears to be more common with the conjunction *ja* than with *mutta* 'but'.

Conclusion: coreferential deletion with passives in Old Finnish occurs primarily when the identity of the arguments can be inferred pragmatically/semantically, e.g. 'died and was buried', 'grew up and was weaned'.

Compare the following clause:

Bible, Amos 5:19

ja	nijn	cuin	jocu		tul-is	
and	just	like	someone	[NOM]	come-COND.3SG	
jo-n-gu-n		huone-sen	/	ja	noja-is	käte-ns
someone-GEN		room-ILL	and	lean-COND.3SG		hand-3SG
seinä-lle	/	ja	kärme-ltä		piste-täisin	
wall-ALL	and	snake-ABL		sting-PASS.COND		

'And just like someone would enter into someone's room, and lean his hand against the wall, and be bitten by a snake'

Who/what is bitten by the snake here? The person coming in, the owner of the room, or the hand?

Probably: the person who is coming in - but strictly the Bible is ambiguous here. The identity of the arguments is not at all as clear as in "died and was buried"-type cases!

## **Conclusions about coreferential deletion:**

- The occurrence of this does not really say anything about whether the Old Finnish passive is promotional (has a subject) or non-promotional (has an object). Deleted arguments may be coreferential with entirely different types of arguments as well (e.g. adverbial clauses).
- The conditions for coreferential deletion with the Old Finnish passive appear to be pragmatic rather than syntactic (in contrast to Modern Finnish!).

## The Old Finnish passive: more general

Consider Martti's 1580 Land Law:

Building, 34

ios	hän	myös	si-hen	ei	sidho-ta
if	he.NOM	also	that-to	NEG	bind-PASS

'If he is not found guilty of that either'

Building, 44

iold-ei	hän-dä	laillisesti	sidho-ta
if-NEG	he-PART	legally	bind-PASS

'If he is not found legally guilty'

Promotional (subject) passives and non-promotional (object) passives co-occur in virtually identical contexts!

## Preliminary remarks:

- Periphrastic passives (perfect and pluperfect tense) usually show agreement markers in Old Finnish, suggesting the argument is a subject:

Bible, Jos. 5:7

sillä	hei-llä	ol-i	esinahca /	ja	ei
for	they-AD	be-PST.3SG	foreskin[NOM]	and	NEG
ollet			ymbärinsleica-tu-t		matca-lla
been			circumcise-PTCP.PST.PASS-PL	journey-AD	

'For they had foreskins, and had not been circumcised on the way,' (Bible, Jos. 5:7)

I only found one example of an explicitly non-agreeing periphrastic passive in Old Finnish religious texts:

Sorolainen, Postilla I p. 1071:

<i>io-tca</i>	<i>eij</i>	<i>ole</i>	<i>kirioite-ttu</i>
which-NOM.PL	NEG.SG	be	written-PASS.PST.PTCP.SG
<i>tä-sä</i>	<i>kiria-sa</i>		
this-INESS	book-INESS		

'which are not written in this book.'

# Case-marking of passives in Sorolainen's Postilla, the 1642 Biblia, and Agricola's New Testament:

		Nominative	Partitive	Zero	Unknown
A n=1784	non-periphrastic	700	38	136	3
	periphrastic	716	36	153	2
S n=3058	non-periphrastic	1225	95	384	6
	periphrastic	1088	75	184	1
B n=2292	non-periphrastic	913	155	275	2
	periphrastic	718	37	192	0

Note: partitive occurs relatively rarely (about 5% in Agricola, a bit more in the Bible) even though it is the most common object case in Modern Finnish!



Objects in Modern Finnish are marked with the partitive if a) negated or b) of divisible, indefinite quantity, also with passives:

- a)   Tä-tä       kirja-a       e-i       lue-ta  
      that-PART book-PART   NEG-3SG   read-PASS

"This book is not read, no-one reads this book."

- b)   Kirjasto-ssa   lue-taan       kirjo-j-a  
      library-INESS read-PASS   book-PL-PART

"In the library, books are read, people read books in the library."

Negation and case-marking in the material:

Negated clauses	non-periphrastic, nominative	non-periphrastic, partitive	periphrastic, nominative	periphrastic, partitive
A	51	8	50	13
S	49	16	68	43
B	29	54	53	16

In other words, partitive with negated passives is rare in Agricola, no difference between non-periphrastic and periphrastic forms. In Sorolainen and particularly the Bible, it becomes more common, though mainly with non-periphrastic forms.

Agricola, Mark 13:2

Ei	iäte-te	kiui	kiue-n	päle ioca
NEG	leave-PASS	stone.NOM.SG	stone-GEN	upon which.NOM.SG
ei	särije-tä			
NEG	break-PASS			

Biblia, Mark 13:2

Ei	näi-stä	jäte-tä	kiwe	kiwe-n	päälle /	jo-ta
NEG	these-from	leave-PASS	stone-PART.SG	stone-GEN	upon	which-PART.SG
ei	särje-tä					
NEG	break-PASS					

'Not one stone here will be left on another; every one will be thrown down'

Two other examples:

Agricola, Jh. 12:5

Mix-ei	teme	Woidhe	myy-ty
why-NEG	this.NOM	ointment.NOM.SG	sell-PASS.PST.PTCP
colme-n sata-n		pe'ningi-n	
three hundred-into		penny-into	

Biblia, Jh. 12:5

Mix-ei	tä-tä	woidet-ta	myy-ty
why-NEG	this-PART	ointment-PART.SG	sell-PASS.pst.PTCP.PF
colme-en sata-an		penningi-hin	
three hundred-into		penny-into	

'Why wasn't this perfume sold for three hundred pence?'

- In Sorolainen, a strikingly large number of periphrastic passive arguments are marked with the partitive. This is unexpected. However, a large number of cases are indefinite pronouns *ei yhtään* and *ei mitään*, which may be to some extent lexicalized.

Divisibility:

		non- periphrastic, nominative	non-periphrastic, partitive	periphrastic, nominative	periphrastic, partitive
A Indefinites	Indivisible	26	3	24	4
	Divisible	31	5	21	8
S Indefinites	Indivisible	79	3	30	19
	Divisible	27	26	20	20
B Indefinites	Indivisible	32	5	25	3
	Divisible	33	28	18	8

From this, it is apparent that:

- It is hardly a factor for case-marking in Agricola's NT
- It is a factor in Sorolainen and the Biblia: indefinite divisibles ("indefinite quantity") are marked with the partitive in about half of the cases.
- Factor interacts with negation: in Biblia and Sorolainen, indefinite arguments tend to be marked with the partitive in negated clauses (both divisibles and indivisibles):

Sorolainen, Postilla I, p. 618

eij	sij-hen	enä	todistox-i-a	tarwit-ta
NEG	that-to	more	proof-PL-PART	need-PASS

'No more proof is needed for that'

Biblia, James 2, comment

waan	ett-ei	ricka-i-ta	ja	woimallis-i-a	mailma-s
but	that-NEG	rich-PL-PART	and	powerful-PL-PART	world-in
cunnioite-tais	ja	suur-na	pide-täis		
honour-PASS.COND	and	great-as	hold-PASS.COND		

'But that the rich and mighty of the world would not be honoured and held great'

Verbal telicity: atelic verbs take partitive arguments in Modern Finnish:

*minu-a odote-taan*

I-PART wait-PASS

"They are waiting for me"

*minu-t tape-taan*

I-ACC kill-PASS

"They are killing me"

Seems to be a weak factor in the Old Finnish material. There are cases where an atelic verb governs a partitive argument:

Agricola, 1 Cor. 4:12

*Coska mei-te waino-ta' /*

when we-PART persecute-PASS

*nin me kerssi-me*

then we.NOM suffer-1 PL

'When we are persecuted, we endure it'

But counterexamples can be easily found:

Sorolainen, Postilla I p. 79

*että cosca saarnamiehe-t totude-n tähden wiha-tan ia*  
that when preacher-NOM.PL truth-GEN for hate-PASS and  
waino-tan

persecute-PASS

'That, when preachers are hated and persecuted for the sake of the truth...'

## In conclusion

- In Agricola, partitive case-marking is marginal with passives, and a large part of occurrences are furthermore instances of the (lexicalized) pronoun *mitä*. As far as case-marking is concerned, the passive in Agricola is promotional.
- In Sorolainen, partitive case-marking is more common, but it is restricted to indefinite arguments (negated indefinite arguments in general, and divisible indefinite arguments in non-negated clauses).
- In the Biblia, partitive case-marking is still more common, and extended to definite arguments in negated clauses. There is a clear split between non-periphrastic and periphrastic passives, with the latter remaining promotional.

The passive in Old Finnish thus shows a stepwise change from a promotional (subject) passive to a non-promotional (object) passive, proceeding through the categories that are the least marked from the viewpoint of objecthood (e.g. first indefinite arguments, then definite).

But does Agricola's promotional passive represent the original state of affairs in Finnish, or is it itself based on foreign models?

## Fluid intransitivity in Modern Finnish

In modern Finnish, the subjects of existential and possessive clauses exhibit object-like case-marking:

a) Partitive under negation:

*jääkaapi-ssa ei ole pitsa-a*  
fridge-INESS NEG be pizza-PART

"There is no pizza in the fridge"

b) Partitive with indefinite, divisible arguments ("indefinite quantity"):

*puu-ssa istu-u lintu-j-a*  
tree-INESS sit-3SG bird-PL-PART

"There are birds sitting in the tree"

c) Marginally, *t*-accusative with personal pronoun arguments:

*onne-ksi minu-lla o-n sinu-t*  
luck-TRANS I-ADESS be-3SG you-ACC

"Fortunately I have you"

- Existential clause subjects are (largely) restricted to indefinite subjects, but this constraint does not occur with possessive clauses
- Verbal telicity is not a factor as the verbs of existential and possessive clauses are necessarily atelic



## Fluid intransitivity in Old Finnish

It is not easy to collect a corpus of existential and possessive clauses, because:

- These do not have specific lexical or morphological markers, and the traits that occur in them are precisely the ones in question - do Finnish existential clauses have partitive subjects?

Instead: corpus of intransitive clauses with indefinite subjects. Not always easy to determine! See:

Agricola, NT Matt 15:1

Silloin	edheskeu-i-t	Jesuse-n	tyge /	kirianoppenuua-t	ia
then	come forth-PST-3PL	Jesus-GEN	to	scribe[NOM]-PL	and
Phariseuse-t	io-t-ca		Jerosolima-st	tullu-ua-t	
pharisee[NOM]-PL	which[NOM]-PL-CLT		Jerusalem-ELA	come-PTCP-PL	
ol-i-t					
be-PST-3PL					

‘Then came to Jesus scribes and Pharisees, which came from Jerusalem...’

Indefinite interpretation is reasonable here (the scribes and pharisees have not been mentioned before, and it is not the case that the ones from Jerusalem are contrasted with any others) and it was taken into account.

In contrast:

Agricola, Acts 5:9

Catzo	ni-nen	ialco-ij-a /	io-t-ca
Behold.IMP	those-GEN.PL	foot-PL-PART	which[NOM]-PL-CLT
sinu-n	Miehe-s	hautas-i-t /	Oue-n
your-GEN	man-GEN.2SG	bury-PST-3PL	be-3PL
edes			door-GEN
in front of			

‘Look! The feet of those who buried your husband are in front of the door.’ (A, Acts 5:9)

Was not taken into account, because it clearly appears to be definite - despite the very interesting (and rare) occurrence of a plural partitive subject agreeing with a main verb! But consider the following:

Agricola, Matt. 2:1

<i>Catzo / silloin tul-i-t</i>	<i>Tieteije-t</i>
Look.IMP then come-PST-3PL	wise man[NOM]-PL
<i>idhe-ste Jerusalemi-jn</i>	
east-ELA Jerusalem-ILL	

‘And look, then wise men came from the east to Jerusalem’

Indefinite interpretation is reasonable, and explicit in the 1938 Finnish translation (*tietäjiä tuli...* with partitive plural), but in Luther's Bible, we have a definite subject: *da kamen die Weisen vom Morgenland nach Jerusalem und sprachen*

## General data

Material: indefinite intransitive subjects in Agricola's NT and the NT portion of the 1642 Biblia

A	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
n=899	397	116	156	9	117	104
B	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
n=959	449	97	148	32	109	124

Example of 'unknown':

Biblia, Revelations 17:18

jo-lla	o-n	walda	maa-n	Cuningas-t-en	pää-lle
which-ADE	be-3SG	power-?	land-GEN	king-PL-GEN	upon-ALL

‘Which has power over the kings of the land’

Agreement patterns:

A	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
n=899	711	117	71
B	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
n=959	752	86	121

Material shows that:

- Object-like marking of indefinite subjects is somewhat more common in the Biblia than in Agricola's NT, both in terms of case-marking and in terms of agreement.
- Plural partitive subjects particularly are strikingly rare in Agricola, with just a handful of occurrences:

Agricola, Luke 7:8

ia	minu-n	alla-ni	o-n	sotamieh-i
and	I-GEN	under-1SG	be-3SG	soldier-PL(-PART)

‘And I have soldiers serving under me’

Instead, plural nominative often occurs where plural partitive could be expected on the basis of Modern Finnish:

Agricola, Luke 21:11

ia	mös	Cauhistoxe-t	ia	swre-t	Ihme-t
and	also	terror[NOM]-PL	and	great[NOM]-PL	wonder[NOM]-PL

Taiuaha-st      tapacta-uat  
heaven-ELA      happen-3PL

‘And great terrors will happen, and great wonders from the heavens.’ (A, Lk. 21:11)

Compare the modern Bible translation (1992) with plural partitives: *Kauhistuttavia asioita tapahtuu, ja taivaalla näkyy suuria ennusmerkkejä.*

## Negation

A	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
non-negated	368	113	58	6	84	97
negated	29	3	98	3	33	7
B	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
non-negated	423	94	47	26	75	118
negated	26	3	101	6	34	6

- Partitive is the most common case-marker for negated indefinite subjects, with little difference between Agricola and the Biblia. Note that partitive in this context is much more common than with passive arguments!

Agreement with negated clauses is very rare:

A	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
non-negated	546	115	65
negated	165	2	6
B	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
non-negated	586	86	111
negated	166	0	10

An example of agreement in a negated clause:

Agricola, Romans, Preface

Ett-e-i	wiele	paha	himo	ia	syndi
that-NEG-3SG	still	evil[NOM]	desire[NOM]	and	sin[NOM]
ie-uet	mei-hin	ala-le-ns			
remain-3PL	we-ILL	under-ALL-3PL			

‘That no evil desires and sin remain among us’

This construction (with agreement markers on the main verb instead of the negative auxiliary) is unknown in Standard Finnish, but it occurs rarely in Old Finnish (as well as rarely in some dialects).

## Divisibility

A	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
indivisible	313	26	42	0	13	8
divisible	84	90	114	9	104	96
B	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
indivisible	313	22	34	1	7	8
divisible	136	75	114	31	102	116

- Partitives occur mostly with divisible subjects, but nominative is more common with divisible subjects as well. There is no clear relation between divisibility and the occurrence of agreement markers. Overall, this factor seems to be much weaker than negation.

The subject of the following clause would be marked with the partitive (and non-agreement) in Standard Finnish (1992 Bible: *Jeesuksen luo temppeliin tuli sokeita ja rampoja...*):

Agricola, Matt. 21:14

*Ja edheskeu-i-t hene-n tyge-ns*

and walk forth-PST-3PL him-GEN toward-3PL

*sockia-t ia onduua-t Templi-s*

blind[NOM]-PL and cripple[NOM]-PL temple-INE

‘And blind men and cripples walked forth towards him in the Temple’

## Clause type

A	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
existential	224	78	63	2	30	55
possessive	173	38	93	7	87	49
B	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
existential	235	67	66	20	35	67
possessive	214	30	82	12	74	57

- Partitive marking appears to be much more common in possessive constructions than in non-possessive clauses with indefinite intransitive subjects! The same can be said with agreement: it is rarer among possessive clauses than non-possessive clauses:

A	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
existential	338	101	14
possessive	373	16	57
B	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
existential	369	71	50
possessive	383	15	71



## Explaining this?

- *have-drift*: a diachronic tendency for (non-*have*) possessive constructions to exhibit features of a *have*-construction, including a possessee with object-like marking. There are plenty of foreign language models that could have stimulated this development in Old Finnish.
- With indefinite intransitive subjects, there is a clear variation between S-like and O-like subjects (and both are in principle possible in Standard Finnish as well: *puussa istuu lintuja* / *jotkut linnut istuvat puussa*):

Biblia, Acts 2:5

<i>Nijn Jerusalemi-s</i>	<i>asu-i</i>	<i>Judalais-i-a</i> /	<i>Jumala-ta</i>
thus Jerusalem-INESS	dwell-PST.3SG	jew-PL-PART	God-PART
<i>pelkääwäis-i-ä</i>	<i>mieh-i-ä</i> /	<i>caickinaise-sta</i>	<i>Canssa-sta</i>
fearing-PL-PART	man-PL-PART	all kind-ELA	nation-ELA

‘Thus there were Jews living in Jerusalem, and god-fearing people of all nations’

Biblia, 1 Tim. 6:4

<i>jo-i-sta</i>	<i>cateus</i> /	<i>rijta</i> /	<i>häwäistys</i>
which-PL-ELA	envy[NOM]	quarrel[NOM]	shame[NOM]
<i>ja paha-t</i>	<i>luulo-t</i>	<i>tule-wat</i>	
and evil[NOM]-PL	thought[NOM]-PL	come-3PL	

‘From which envy, strife, shame and evil thoughts spring.’

The same possibility for variation with possessive clause subjects does not appear in Finnish.

Lexical quantification:

Compare:

pöydä-llä	o-n	mitale-j-a
table-ADESS	be-3SG	medal-PL-PART

"There are medals on the table"

muutama-t	mitali-t	o-vat	pöydä-llä
several-PL	medal-PL	be-3PL	table-ADESS

"Several medals are on the table"

- It is possible to express an indefinite subject in a "normal" clause with subject-like case-marking, but this usually requires an explicit indefiniteness marker!

Hypothesis: lexical quantification (the presence of a lexical indefiniteness marker such as *joku* 'some', *muutammat* 'several') correlates with subject-like case-marking, as here:

Agricola, Mark 9:1

O-uat	mutama-t	nei-sse /	io-t-ca	te-sse	seiso-uat
be-3PL	several[NOM]-PL	those-INE	which[NOM]-PL-CLT	this-INESS	stand-3PL

‘There are several among those which stand here.’

A	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
lexical	137	36	79	0	2	53
not lexical	260	80	77	9	115	51
B	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
lexical	98	25	69	9	3	71
not lexical	351	72	79	23	106	53

A	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
lexical	242	51	14
not lexical	469	66	57
B	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
lexical	216	28	31
not lexical	536	58	90

- Result: lexical quantification favours object-like case-marking (surprisingly!) and in Agricola (but not Biblia), lexical quantification also favours agreement (e.g. the tendencies are in conflict).

Explanation of lexical quantification favouring agreement in Agricola:

- *muutama* 'several' often occurs with the nominative plural:

Agricola, Mark 9:1

O-uat	mutama-t	nei-sse /	io-t-ca	te-sse	seiso-uat
be-3PL	several[NOM]-PL	those-INE	which[NOM]-PL-CLT	this-INESS	stand-3PL

‘There are several among those which stand here.’

- *paljo(n)* 'many' tends to occur with plural agreement on the main verb in Old Finnish (not in St. Finnish):

Agricola, Luke 7:11

ia	hene-n	cansa-ns	men-i-t	palio	hene-'
and	he-GEN	with-3SG	go-PST-3PL	many	he-GEN

opetuslaps-i-a-ns  
disciple-PL-PART-3SG

‘And many of his disciples went with him.’

Explaining overrepresentation of partitive with lexical quantification: lexicalized partitives such as *ei yhtään* 'none'.

In general:

- Negation the strongest factor favouring partitive case-marking in Agricola and Biblia, followed by divisibility.
- Clause type is a stronger factor in Agricola than Biblia, meaning that possessive clauses with typically object-like subject marking "stand out" more in Agricola than in the Biblia.
- Generally, constructions with object-like subject marking are more rare in Old Finnish than in Standard Finnish. Some of this could be explained by language contact, but:
- Plural partitive subjects are very rare in Agricola. Divisibility-based partitive subject marking occurs more restrictedly in east Finnic languages (e.g. Karelian) than in Standard Finnish. The rarity of plural partitive S in Agricola could be an eastern feature - but we would need a clearer picture of plural partitive marking on objects to support this hypothesis.



