

Necessive constructions in Old Finnish

Old Finnish legal texts show a wealth of modal constructions involving (for example) *pitää*, *tulla* and *mahtaa* as auxiliaries:

Ljungo 1601, Breaching the peace 19:

Nin	pitä	sen	kihlakunnan	lautamiehet	tietämän,			
thus	must	it-GEN	parish-GEN	councillor-PL	know-INF.INSTR			
ios	hän	kästi	sen	edestä,	eli	tuli	mw	rijta
if	he	avenge-IPF.3SG	it-GEN	for	or	come-IPF.3SG	another	quarrel
heidhen		waihellens						
they-GEN		between-3SG						

"Thus the parish councillors must find out, whether the took vengeance for it or whether there was some other quarrel between them."

Breaching the peace, 32:

Sillä ei	tule	hänen	vsiammalla	maalla	rauhatoim	olla ,	
for	NEG-3SG	must	he-GEN	several-ADESS	country-ADESS	outlawed be	
eli	rauha	puuttua	mutta	sillä	yhdellä	maalla	kussa
or	peace	lack	but	that-ADESS	one-ADESS	country	where-ADESS
wahingo	tehtin						
damage	do-PASS.INF						

"For he should not be outlawed or lack peace in several countries, but only in that country where the crime was committed."

Necessive constructions in Modern Finnish:

Genitive subject, unmarked object:

Minu-n pitää viedä kirja takaisin kirjasto-on
I-GEN must take book back library-ILL
"I must take the book back to the library" (deontic modality)

Unmarked subject in existential and highly intransitive constructions:

Asunno-ssa pitää olla jääkaappi
apartment-INESS must be fridge
"There should be a fridge in the apartment" (epistemic modality)

- In some dialects, *pitää* and *täytyy* 'must' exhibit nominative subjects and sometimes also agreement with the auxiliary: these dialects tend to be close to historically Swedish-speaking areas.
- The construction with the instructive inessive (*minun pitää tietämän/ottaman/viemän*) occurs rarely in Southwestern dialects.

Necessive constructions in Old Finnish:

- *pitää* used in both necessive and future-tense constructions, occasionally difficult to tell apart, but mostly necessive in legal texts.
- *tulee* tends to describe a free choice, or a right, rather than a deontic obligation:

Ljungo, King 3:

Nei-nen	tule	hän-dä	Kuningha-xi	walita,
those-GEN.PL	must	he-PART	king-TRANSL	choose
ia domita,	maa-ta	hallitze-man		
and sentence	land-PART	rule-INF.ILL		

"They shall choose him as king, and assign him to rule the land."

- *pitää* shows almost exclusively an infinitive instructive (*pitää tietä-män*)
- The subject of *pitää* can be genitive and nominative, the (total) object is marked with the genitive:

Ljungo, Inheritance 11:

nijn	pitä	lapse-t	waimo-n	peri-män
thus	must	child-PL	woman-GEN	inherit-INF.INSTR

"Thus shall the children inherit the woman."

- Passive infinitives are common (not at all in Modern Finnish).

The "normal situation": Kircko-Laki ja Ordningi (Florinus 1686)

Case-marking of the subject of *pitää* is clearly distinct with active and passive infinitives:

Active inf.	Genitive <i>-n</i>	Nominative	Partitive <i>-ta</i>	Unknown	Total
	270	95	3	-	368
Passive inf.	Genitive <i>-n</i>	Nominative	Partitive <i>-ta</i>	Unknown	
	3	174	64	6	247

Examples:

jo-nga pitä ilman wijwytyš-tä ylösotta-man ja päättä-män
who-GEN must without delay-PART take up-INF.INSTR and decide-INF.INSTR

Asian

matter-GEN

“who must take up the matter and decide it without delay” (p. 66)

Pitkäperjantai pitä nijn hywin Maa-lla cuin

Good Friday[NOM] must just as well country-ADESS as

Caupunge-i-sa pyhite-ttä-män

city-PL-INESS sanctify-PASS-INF.INSTR

“Good Friday must be sanctified in the country as well as in the cities.” (p. 6)

In Kircko-Laki ja Ordningi, there is clear relation between case-marking and transitivity which reflects the situation in Finnish dialects:

	Transitive	Intransitive	Existential
Genitive argument	204	65	1
Nominative argument	18	51	26
Partitive argument.	0	1	2

Personal pronouns prefer genitive case-marking which is to be expected if case-marking is based on transitivity/agentivity (as in dialectal Finnish). Otherwise, no clear relationship between lexical class and case-marking:

	Singular NP	Plural NP	Sing. demonstrative <i>se</i>	Pl. demonstrative <i>ne</i>	Personal pronoun
Genitive	88	51	13	10	79
Nominative	31	18	19	7	3

The situation is the same in other later Finnish legal texts (e.g. Kollanius 1648, *Ruodzin Waldacunnan Laki* 1759).

The "abnormal situation"

Martti 1580: Arguments of passive infinitives generally marked with *-n* in the singular, *-t* in the plural (as opposed to generally nominative as in the later texts):

King, 3

Caikēin näinnen lakicundamiesten änellä,
All-GEN those-GEN lawman-GEN.PL voice-ADESS
ia nijdhen quin nämä nimittänet ouat
and those-GEN that these appointed be-3PL
pitä kuningan wlos walittaman
must king-GEN choose-PASS-INF.INSTR

"And by the votes of all those lawmen, and those that they have appointed, the King must be elected."

The same distribution of case-markers is found with arguments of active infinitives:

	Singular NP	Plural NP	Sing. demonstrative <i>se</i>	Pl. demonstrative <i>ne</i>	Personal pronoun
Genitive	81	2	18	0	75
Nominative	23	21	2	22	0

Correlation between transitivity/agentivity is weak in Martti 1580 (and absent in Ljungo's texts), could be an effect of the tendency for personal pronouns to be marked in the genitive.

In other words

The underlying system for case-marking of the argument of necessity *pitää* in Martti is something like this:

Personal pronouns:	genitive <i>-n</i>
Singular nouns and other pronouns:	genitive <i>-n</i>
Plural nouns and other pronouns:	nominative <i>-t</i>

... And this regardless of whether the infinitive is active and passive.

What does this remind you of?

Other 1500- and early 1600-texts: by and large the same pattern (possibly a stronger tendency towards nominative case-marking). Generally similar marking with active and passive infinitives (stronger but not complete tendency towards nominatives with passives).

Note Ljungo, City Law (Ships 5):

mutta	nijn	että	Kuningas	ia	Caupungi	oikeude-ns	pitä-uät	sa-man
but	so	that	king	and	city	right-3SG	must-3PL	get-INF.INSTR

"But so that the king and the city will get their rights"

The plot thickens...

In the earliest Finnish texts (Westh, Uppsala Gospel Book fragment) and once in Agricola, necessary *pitää* shows an accusative personal pronoun argument:

Agricola, *Weisut ia ennustoxet*, Jeremiah 8:12

Senteden	heide-t	pite ycte-n	coco-n	catu-man
for that reason	they-ACC	must one-ILL	heap-ILL	fall-INF.INSTR

“So they will fall among the fallen”

Westh, p. 93

Silloin	pitä	meidhä-t	tule-man	heidhe-n	cansa-ns	ychten
then	must	we-ACC	come.INF.INSTR	them-GEN	with-3SG	together

“Then we will unite with them” (p. 93)

UGB, p. 105

Lwta	e-ij	teiidhä-t	pidhä	rickijlö-män	häne-stä
bone-PART	NEG-3SG	you-ACC	must	break-INF.INSTR	him-from

“You will not break any of his bones.”

Explaining this?

"The usage of personal pronoun accusative *-t* in the earliest texts is a case of hypercorrection: an eastern Finnish writer or copyists corrected the West Finnish personal pronoun genitive/accusative *-n* to *-t*, also in inappropriate positions"

- Then we would expect also personal pronoun genitives to be changed to *t*-accusatives in other functions, e.g. possessor or modifier of a postposition. But we only encounter this once, in Westh (p. 83):

ia me sama heidhä-t iälle-nssä
and we[NOM] the same they-ACC after-3SG
“And similarly we, after them.”

"The main argument of *pitää* in earlier Old Finnish is (for some weird reason) really an object and marked like a Finnish object"

- But then, wouldn't we expect to see partitive-marked subjects of *pitää* in negated contexts? We're not seeing those.

"The main argument of *pitää* is really a modifier of the infinitive, not the grammatical subject of the auxiliary. For some reason, it behaves like an accusative-and-infinitive construction."

- Bingo.

Note dialectal Finnish:

pit-i mene-mä-ni kirko-lle (Kuru)
must-IPF.3SG go-INF.INSTR-1SG church-ALL

“I had to go to church.” (Saukkonen 1965: 125)

Accusative and infinitive?

Participial construction in Modern Finnish:

näe-n häne-n tule-va-n
see-1SG he-GEN come-PARTIC-GEN

"I see him coming."

- Originally, the (genitive) "subject" of the participle was the object of the main verb. The construction emerged from something like: "I see him, the coming one."

In Old Finnish, participial constructions still occur with object-like arguments:

Biblia 1642, Mark 1:10

näk-i hän taiwa-t aukene-wa-n ja
see-IPF-3SG he[NOM] heaven[NOM]-PL open-PTCP-GEN and
Hengen tule-wa-n alas
spirit-GEN come-PTCP-GEN down

"he saw heaven being torn open and the Spirit descending on him"

See: Pirkko Forsman-Svensson, *Satsmotsvarigheter i finsk prosa under 1600-talet...* SKS, Helsinki 1983

Might the case-marking pattern of *pitää*-constructions be influenced by the participial construction?

- *pitää* does in fact occur as a matrix verb of participial constructions as well (with the meaning, "it is said that...")
- Contamination/interference between infinitive instructive *-mAñ* and participial genitive *-wAñ* not implausible, and does occasionally occur:

Kircko-Laki p. 58

Täsä	pitä	sij-tä	waari	ote-tta-wa-n	ettei
Here	must	that-ELAT	take care-PASS-PTCP-GEN	that	not

“Care must be taken here, lest...”

But how are participial constructions and necessary constructions linked?

- Foreign model patterns that employ accusative-and-infinitive constructions.

The most obvious candidate: Latin *oportet* 'it is proper, one ought' which occurs with AcI constructions:

Vulgate, Matt 16:21

Exinde	cœpit	Iesus	ostendere	discipulis	suis,
then	begins	Jesus	to point out	disciple-to	his-to
quia	oporteret	eum	ire	Hierosolymam	
because	must-SUBJ.IPF	he-ACC	go	Jerusalem-ACC	

“From that time on Jesus began to explain to his disciples that he must go to Jerusalem”

Pitää and oportet

- In the Biblia, the overwhelming majority of *pitää*-constructions correspond to future constructions in the Latin source text.
- But the usage of *pitää* as a future auxiliary mostly influenced by Swedish (*ska*) and German (*sollen*)
- Among necessary occurrences of *pitää*, source constructions with *oportet* are the most frequent (more so than *debeo* or *necesse est*)

Mark 9:11

mikä		se	o-n	cuin	Kirjanoppene-t	
what[NOM]		it[NOM]	be-3SG	as	scribe-NOM.PL	
sano-wat :	Elia-n	pitä	ensin	tuleman ?		
say-3PL		Elia-GEN	must first	come		
Quid	ergo	dicunt		Pharisæi,	et	scribæ,
what	thus	say-3PL		pharisee-NOM.PL	and	scribe-NOM.PL
quia		Heliam	oporteat	venire		primum?
because		Elia-ACC	must-SUBJ.3SG	come		first

“And they asked him, “Why do the teachers of the law say that Elijah must come first?”

But...

If I am correct about the argument of *pitää* in early Old Finnish exhibiting an accusative-and-infinitive construction on the model of Latin *oportet*, this is likely an archaic feature in Old Finnish, perhaps going back to medieval religious language:

- The feature in Old Finnish is old, it occurs in 16th and early 17th century texts, including the very earliest ones (e.g. Westh).
- The influence of precisely Latin on Finnish is most plausible in pre-reformation Finnish. Post-reformation, source texts in German (e.g. Luther's Bible) become more prominent (as well as the use of *pitää* as a future auxiliary in accordance with Swedish and German models).