Merlijn de Smit

On Some Problems of Old Finnish Syntax

The problem

As Kaisa Häkkinen has repeatedly pointed out (Häkkinen 1997; 2003, 45), Finnish-Swedish linguistic contacts are an under-researched area, despite the extensive and profound traces that centuries of language contact have left on all of the subsystems of Finnish – lexicon, phonology, and also morphosyntax (Laitinen 1992, 58). The purpose of this article is to problematize the study of Finnish-Swedish morphosyntactic contacts in Old Finnish. Old Finnish, at first glance, has great potential as an area of such study: Old Finnish has generally been seen as especially marked by Swedish influence, occasionally unjustifiedly so (Lindén 1963). Moreover, much of the Old Finnish material consists of translated texts, and in some cases, the relationship between source text and translation is fairly clear. A problem, however, arises in defining what precisely Old Finnish morphosyntax is: if we analyze this or that phenomenon in Old Finnish syntax as the result of contact-induced change, what is its point of departure? Though largely based on Southwest dialects, Old Finnish has a diverse dialectal background, with a significant influence of East Finnish dialects in the early years and an impulse from Ostrobothnian writers from the 17th century onwards. Those dialects themselves remain largely an unknown: fieldwork on Finnish dialects started in the 19th century and largely focused on supposedly pristine local dialects, which may have little relevance to the speech of urban centres such as Turku and Viborg three centuries earlier (Häkkinen 1994, 441–442). And, needless to say, the notion of Old Finnish morphosyntax as a more or less describable, discreet set of rules may itself be called into question: there was no normative, prescriptive Finnish grammar, with instead the classical languages and their grammatical systems having great normative force, a situation well-known in other European languages of the same period as well (Fehling 1979).

Moreover, as opposed to loanword studies, contact-induced change in morphosyntax directly involve presuppositions on the nature of grammar on which there is as yet no consensus. Put simply, we can conceive of contact-induced morphosyntactic change as occurring between more or less definable systems, with syntactic patterns and rules transferred from one system to another. Proposed mechanisms for that transfer vary: Harris and Campbell (1995, 122) argue for the borrowing of syntactic rules as a mechanism in its own right, whereas

Sanoista kirjakieliin. Juhlakirja Kaisa Häkkiselle 17. marraskuuta 2010.
Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia = Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 259.
Helsinki 2010. 113–128.

Anttila (1989, 170) and Aikhenvald (2003) stress the applicability of reanalysis and analogy to contact-induced change as well. Alternatively, one can conceive of contact-induced morphosyntactic change as having its roots in 'speech' rather than 'language'; what is transferred, then, are not syntactic rules or patterns but very specific lexical items and combinations of lexical items, with patterns potentially being abstracted from them and applied more widely (Thompson and Hopper 2001, 50). The latter, however, is an 'internal' process of change. Such proposals have been made on the basis of generativist theory (King 2000, 82–83), but may also be based on constructionalist views of grammar. According to the latter, morphosyntax itself is not describable as a distinct and autonomous subsystem of grammar, but is an emergent dimension of specific constructions; these may vary from individual lexical items and idiomatic constructions to more abstract (yet ultimately lexically dependent) patterns. In construction grammar and related approaches, frequency plays a key role in the entrenchment and potential for abstraction and wider applicability of individual syntactic patterns as well as in the persistence of irregularities (Bybee 2007 [1995]: 165).

The latter view seems especially relevant with regards to what might be called the systemic irregularity of Old Finnish morphosyntax. Old Finnish texts are full of constructions which are clearly foreign calques and are also rare. An example is the occurrence of particle-like negation in Ljungo's 1609 City Law translation:

(1)   *Sukumies, sano, sen cartanon **ej oluen** hänellens laillisesti tarittu*
       (Land Chapter 3)
       Magnus Eriksson's City Law: *sighia byrdhamen then sama gardh*
       *eller tompt **eig wara** laghlika heembudnan*
       'The relative says that the plot was not offered lawfully to him.'

Similarly, passives have occasionally person and number markers in Agricola and to some extent in later religious texts based on Agricola's translations. Features such as these tend to be rare, and, as far as Old Finnish morphosyntax is concerned, marginal.

Systemic irregularity, in contrast, is the resistance to analysis offered by a number of very central morphosyntactic variations in Old Finnish. Thus passives in Old Finnish may behave promotionally (i.e. take a subject) or non-promotionally (take an object) in virtually identical contexts. Compare the following examples from Martti's Land Law translation:

(2)   *ios hän mös sihen ei sidhota* (Building 34)
       'If he isn't found guilty of that either'
(3)   *ioldei händä laillisesti sidhota* (Building 44)
       'If he isn't found legally guilty'

Similarly, the variation in the subject-marking of the necessive verb *pitää* 'must' between nominative and genitive seems to obey some very general tendencies, but a significant amount of unexplainable variation remains (De Smit 2006, 116–151). Inaba and Blokland (2001) argue that the variation between the three dative-like case markers in Old Finnish (the allative, the partitive and the dative-genitive) is to some extent random, and go on to conclude that

> Old Finnish's text material emphasizes the coexistence of different cases with same functions and arising from that, disordered case-marking of grammatical functions. This could be partly due to the fact that these texts are translations, but possibly Old Finnish gives us a true picture of the dialects that make up the base of its material. (Inaba and Blokland 2001, 430.)

In earlier research (De Smit 2005; 2006, 116–151), I have analyzed the variation in the subject of necessive *pitää* in accordance with the first, 'structuralist' viewpoint below. I argued that the distribution of case-markers strongly resembled that of the Finnish object (with a genitive-like *-n* with singular nouns and a nominative-like *-t* with plural nouns), and that the main impetus for this distribution was the ambiguous status of the subject of *pitää* with passive infinitival clauses. This ambiguous status itself might have resulted from Swedish model patterns. This explanation was not wholly satisfactory. First, as indicated above, such supposed redistribution could explain part of the variation, but by no means all of it. Second, the supposed redistribution of case-markers appears to have occurred without any underlying syntactic reanalysis: though the subject of *pitää* in passive necessive clauses is ambiguous in terms of its status as subject or object, there are no indications that the subject of *pitää* in active necessive clauses is in any way an object. Thus, while the distribution of case-markers resembled that of the Finnish object, the underlying syntactic relationships did not.

In the following, I re-examine the subject of Finnish *pitää* 'must' on the basis of a different set of Old Finnish texts, with an eye on problematizing precisely the underlying syntactic relationships that remained elusive in earlier research. In other words, I want to take my point of departure from the second viewpoint mentioned above, and see if the distribution of case-markers can be explained by frequency-based generalization on the basis of individual lexical items.

Necessive constructions in the corpus

The three texts under examination here are Mikael Agricola's 1548 New Testament, *Se Wsi Testamenti*, henceforth A; an excerpt from Eric Sorolainen's 1621–1625 two-part collection of sermons *Postilla* (specifically, the first 700 pages of the second part), henceforth S; and the New Testament portion of the first complete Finnish Bible translation (1642), the *Biblia*, henceforth B. These

texts are not independent; Sorolainen's *Postilla* – which contains mostly original material, in addition to translated excerpts from the gospels – was heavily influenced by Agricola's New Testament (Häkkinen 1994, 86). Sorolainen, in turn, was a member of the first Finnish Bible translation committee. Whether the work of this committee resulted in any draft translation is unclear (Häkkinen 1994, 86–87).

Necessitive *pitää* is by far the most frequent of the necessitive verbs occurring in the corpus. Necessitive *tulee* occurs to some extent – 53 in A, 56 in S and 42 in B. Other necessitive verbs (*sopii, täytyy, ei tarvitse*) occur sporadically. There are significant differences between *pitää* and *tulee*. First, unlike *pitää*, *tulee* appears not to occur with passive infinitive complements (aside from perhaps two or so cases in A) and does not show the variation between nominative and genitive case-marking which marks *pitää*. Aside from one case in S, necessitive *tulee* occurs exclusively with genitive case-marking. A third difference between the two is, of course, the shape of the infinitival complement: necessitive *pitää* occurs with a 3rd infinitive instructive, *tulee* with a short 1st infinitive. These differences suggest that there is no such thing as a necessitive construction in Old Finnish; rather, a number of impersonal modal verbs may take genitive subjects, but the usage of the genitive subject may be governed by different regularities and may have arisen in different historical circumstances in each individual case.

Tabular data for the subject and object case-marking of necessitive constructions involving *pitää* are presented in Appendix A. The total numbers are: 1317 constructions for A (1127 active, 190 passive), 1591 for S (1478 active, 113 passive) and 1112 for B (901 active, 211 passive).

Necessitive constructions and the agentivity parameter

While in Standard Finnish, nominative subject-marking with necessitive verbs is restricted to existential clauses (Setälä 1966, 108), in dialectal Finnish subject-marking is based on both the agentivity of the subject and on word class: personal pronouns, especially in the 1st and 2nd person, occur exclusively with the genitive case, with variation between genitive and nominative case-marking occurring only with 3rd person subjects (Latvala 1894, 61; Laitinen 1992, 265). With those subjects, prototypically more agentive subjects (animate subjects, subjects of transitive clauses) tend to be more frequently marked with the genitive (Setälä 1883, 138–139; Laitinen 1992, 11, 271; Ikola, Palomäki and Koitto 1989, 358). Thus, according to Laitinen, the genitive marker *-n* is the marker of a speech act person, explicitly mentioned in the clause or not, to whom deontic or dynamic necessity is directed (Laitinen 1992, 184, 205, 212). Aside from this, however, tendencies towards the generalization of nominative subject-marking are found in some peripheral Finnish dialects, mainly spoken in the vicinity of Swedish-speaking communities. Language contact has been proposed as an explanation

for this generalization (Saukkonen 1965, 123; Wande 1982, 62; Laitinen 1992, 42, 50), raising the question whether tendencies towards such a generalization can also be found in Old Finnish.

As shown in Appendix A, this does not appear to be the case as far as the sheer frequency of nominative and genitive subject-marking is concerned. Genitive subject-marking is about twice as common as nominative subject-marking in A and S, and slightly more so in B. With passive subject-marking, unmarked subjects outnumber marked genitive subjects in all three texts. The latter occur slightly more often with B. These percentages may be contrasted with Laitinen's (1992, 69, 78) results, which show approx. 40 % of the subjects in her material to be marked with the nominative when partitive and zero subjects (and passive objects) are excluded. The difference in frequency between unmarked subjects of active and passive necessive clauses, however, is deceptive: as the following table shows, most of the genitive-marked NPs in passive necessive clauses are personal pronouns. With A and S, most personal pronouns are marked when occurring in passive necessive clauses. With B, nominative case-marking is more common with these as well:

	A	-*n*	-0	S	-*n*	-0	B	-*n*	-0
personal pron.		20	11		13	3		9	10
se (3rd p. dem. pron. sing.)		6	14		2	-		1	9
ne (3rd p. dem. pron. pl.)		-	10		-	8		-	2
other pronouns		-	13		-	1		-	10
kaikki 'all'		-	3		-	2		-	6
numerals		-	1		-	-		-	-
singular nouns		9	57		3	27		1	48
plural nouns		-	17		-	15		-	22

Table 1. Argument case-marking with *pitää* and passive infinitive complements.

Partitive case-marking in negated passive necessive clauses is easily found, as the following examples show. In contrast, partitive case-marking in active necessive clauses seems by and large restricted to existential infinitive complements.

(4) **hänen** *pitä mös hwtaman ia eij pidä* **händä** *cuultaman*. (S, p 49)
     'He will also shout, and will not be heard.'
(5) *Sillä jocainen joca paha teke / hän wiha Walkeutta eikä tule Walkeuten / ettei* **hänen töitäns** *pidäis laitettaman*. (B, John 3:20)
     'Everyone who practices wickedness hates the light and does not come to the light, so that his actions may not be exposed.'

Nominative and genitive case-marking in negated passive necessive clauses occurs sporadically (2 cases in A and B, 1 in S):

(6) *Telle Hembeylle pite heitetemen se swri Caupungi Babilon ia ei* **hen**
    pidhe nyt enembe leuttemen. (A, Rev. 18:21)
    'So will Babylon, the great city, be thrown down with violence, and
    will not be found any longer.'

(7) *Sillä ei ole mitän peitetty /* **joca** *ei pidä ilmoitettaman* (B, Matt. 10:26)
    'Because there is nothing hidden that will not be revealed.'

This is all consistent with the view that, with some vacillations, the argument
of a passive necessitive clause is analyzed as an object in all three texts. The
vacillations mostly concern genitive case-marking on full nouns, which occurs
to some extent in A, and zero marking on personal pronouns, an example of
which is shown in (6) above. Zero marking of personal pronouns with passives is
known in West Finnish dialects, and is likely to be based on an analogical exten-
sion from the zero marking of full nouns as objects of passive clauses: note that
in West Finnish dialects, the object form of personal pronouns is *-n*, identical to
the marked object form of full nouns, rather than the distinctive, East Finnish *-t*
(Lehtinen 1985, 275).

    The following table shows case-marking broken down according to transi-
tivity (disregarding the presence vs. absence of an overt object).

	A nom.	gen.	S nom.	gen.	B nom.	gen.
transitive	128	396	185	559	60	320
intransitive	160	258	185	187	113	237
existential	26	4	33	-	26	1
chi sq.	68.1		130		96.4	
sign.	Yes		yes		yes	

Table 2. Subject case-marking of necessitive *pitää* and transitivity.

The correlations are compelling, but are statistical in nature except for the sub-
group of existential and possessive clauses, where genitive case-marking is
found only sporadically. In Laitinen's (1992, 78) material, 43.4 % of genitive
subjects of *pitää* occur in transitive clauses, compared to only 8.4 % of nomina-
tive subjects. Excluding existential clauses, the comparable percentages are, for
A, 44.4 % of nominative subjects and 60.5 % of genitive subjects; for S, 50 % of
nominative subjects and 73.9 % of genitive subjects; and for B, 34.7 % of nomi-
native subjects and 57.5 % of genitive subjects. The correlation between case-
marking and transitivity thus seems to be somewhat weaker in the Old Finnish
texts examined here than in Laitinen's dialectal material.

    The following table shows the numbers and percentages of inanimate refer-
ents among nominative and genitive subjects:

	A	S	B
genitive	33 (5 %)	16 (2.1 %)	23 (4.1 %)
nominative	119 (37.7 %)	104 (25.8 %)	90 (44.6 %)

Table 3. Inanimate referents as subjects of necessitive *pitää*.

Animacy seems to be associated as a positive feature with genitive case-marking: inanimate referents with genitive case-marking are very rare, while nominative case-marking occurs with both animate and inanimate referents. Laitinen (1992, 268) reports a similar situation in Finnish dialects, meshing of course well with the notion of the genitive *-n* as the marker of a speech act person.

Thus the correlations between animacy and transitivity that we would expect on the basis of Finnish dialects are found in the corpus. This said, the correlations are tendential in nature, and it is easy to find nominative subject-marking with transitive clauses and genitive subject-marking with intransitive clauses:

(8) *Cuingasta sen sijs pitä oleman? Nimittäin näin* (B, 1 Cor. 14:15)
     (lit.) 'So how must this be? Namely, like this.'
(9) *Sillä jocainen ylimmäinen Pappi pitä uhraman lahjoja ja uhreja*
     (B, Hebrews 8:3)
     'For every high priest is to offer both gifts and sacrifices'

This brings us back to the problem outlined at the beginning of this paper: although there is a strong tendency for animate transitive clause subjects to be marked with the genitive, this tendency does not take the shape of an absolute rule, such as the one which assigns nominative subject-marking to existential clause subjects in Standard Finnish. In Finnish dialects, the agentivity of the subject is only one of the factors involved in the assignment of subject case-marking: the other is lexical class, in that variation between nominative and genitive case-marking is restricted to 3rd person noun subjects, with personal pronouns being generally marked with the genitive.

Animacy and lexical class are not independent factors. Personal pronouns, which occur very frequently as subjects of *pitää*, virtually always have animate referents. Looking at those lexical categories which may refer to both animates and inanimates, we find that the association between nominative case-marking and inanimacy is not absolute, a small number of inanimate referents are marked with the genitive case:

number of inanimate referents	A	S	B
se (singular demonstrative pron.)	genitive: 8 of 20 nominative: 4 of 10	genitive: 4 of 8 nominative: 10 of 10	genitive: 3 of 11 nominative: 1 of 2
ne (plural demonstrative pron.)	genitive: 0 of 1 nominative: 2 of 17	genitive: 0 of 0 nominative: 1 of 10	genitive: 1 of 8 nominative: 3 of 16
singular full noun	genitive: 22 of 81 nominative: 64 of 95	genitive: 9 of 33 nominative: 55 of 121	genitive: 14 of 68 nominative: 47 of 60
plural full noun.	genitive: 0 of 2 nominative: 24 of 68	genitive: 1 of 3 nominative: 12 of 107	genitive: 0 of 13 nominative: 24 of 71

Table 4. Inanimate referents with four subgroups of subjects.

What Table 4 shows, especially for A and S, although somewhat less so for B, is that the plural demonstrative pronoun *ne* and plural full nouns tend to prefer nominative case-marking despite a relatively low number of inanimate referents (which are more common with singular full nouns). A closer examination of the relationship between case-marking and lexical categories will be the subject of the next section.

Case-marking and lexical categories

As there is a tendency in the corpus for agentive subjects to take case-marking, even though this does not amount to a morphosyntactic rule, it may be useful to consider the possibility that the distribution of case-markers along the transitivity/agentivity parameter is a secondary effect of a primary lexical principle: namely, a tendency for case-marking to freeze in accordance with lexical category and number (personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, singular full noun NPs, plural full noun NPs, etc.). It is not unlikely that the case-marking system of dialectal Finnish is based in part on a generalization of genitive case-marking with personal pronouns, as suggested by the frequent occurrence of these as animate transitive clause subjects; also, in the Old Finnish legal texts I examined in earlier research, there did in fact appear a strong correlation between case-marking and lexical category/number, which I explained by positing a redistribution of case-markers in accordance with Finnish object case-marking.

A breakdown of case-marking according to lexical category, subdivided further into transitive, intransitive and existential clause subjects, is presented in Appendix B. What is apparent is that all the texts studies show, as expected, a strong preference for personal pronouns to be marked with the genitive, while demonstrative *se* occurs with both markings and plural demonstrative *ne* strongly prefers nominative case-marking in all texts. Singular full noun NPs likewise show variation (with a tendency towards nominative case-marking in S) while plural full noun NPs tend to nominative case-marking in all three texts. The distribution is, by and large, similar to that found in the Old Finnish legal texts (De Smit 2005; 2006, 116–151).

The tables also show that the greater token frequency of genitive-marked subjects in all three texts does not imply paradigmatic dominance. In S, genitive subject-marking tends to restrict itself to personal pronouns, with nominative subject-marking more common in all other categories – but personal pronouns have great token frequency in S.

Can the distribution of case-markers be explained by positing a frequency-based generalization in various lexical categories on the basis of an underlying, dialectal, division according to agentivity? The answer is negative. Nominative case-marking appears to be generalized in plural categories – with plural nouns and plural demonstrative pronouns strongly preferring the nominative. This would be the opposite of what we would expect from a frequency-based

generalization: overtly plural marked nouns and pronouns tend to be fairly in-dividualized in Finnish, and, as Table 4 above shows, tend to represent ani-mate referents more often than singular nouns and pronouns. If the distribution of case-markers in the three texts were based on a generalization towards the genitive in those lexical and number categories where agentive subjects were strongly represented, we would expect plural nouns and plural demonstrative pronouns to tend strongly to genitive case-marking.

The correlation between lexical category and number and case-marking itself seems, however, pretty strong and calls for an explanation. With passive necessitive clauses (see Table 1), case-marking is different in A and B, where personal pronouns may occur to some extent with nominative case-marking and singular nouns tend strongly to nominative case-marking. In S, on the other hand, there appears to be no distinction between the arguments of active and passive necessitive clauses: in both cases, personal pronouns tend to be marked with the genitive, and singular nouns with the nominative (a feature already remarked by Petander (1894, 23)). Thus there appears to be a merger in case-marking systems of active and passive necessitive clauses. The same may be found in some Old Finnish legal texts, the difference being that in Martti's and Ljungo's legal translations singular nouns tend to be marked by the genitive in both active and passive necessitive clauses, while in S they tend to be unmarked (De Smit 2006, 141–142). In the case of the legal texts, I argued that the distinc-tion between subject and object with active and passive infinitive complements was neutralized (De Smit 2006, 146) and drew attention to coreferential subject/object ellipsis, which could be found in all legal translations. Some examples can be found in the texts under examination here as well:

(10) *Ette Inhimisen Poian piti ylenannettaman Synneisten Inhimisten*
käsijn / ia Ristinnaulitta / ia colmandena peiuen ylesnousema
(A, Luke 24:7)
'the Son of Man must be handed over to sinful men, be crucified,
and rise on the third day.'

(11) *että hänen piti Tornin pohian heitettämän ia sielä caiken eli aicans*
istuman (S, p. 594)
'That he had to be thrown to the bottom of the tower, and sit there
for all of his life'

Coreferential ellipsis, as in (10) and (11), probably arose under the pressure of literal translation (though the example from S is not a translated one) and do not in themselves suggest a syntactic reanalysis of the passive necessitive clause object as a subject – though it does lay the groundwork for such a reanalysis to occur. Coreferential deletion of subjects and passive objects may occur in Modern Finnish with intransitive subjects as well (Itkonen 1974, 380–381), and the argument of passive clauses in Old Finnish in general appears to vacillate between subjecthood and objecthood (De Smit 2006, 109). As already noted, the

presence of partitive case-marking in negated passive necessitive clauses would suggest an analysis of the argument as object. In S, it seems that, rather than an underlying syntactic reanalysis leading to a redistribution of case-markers, a surface redistribution of case-markers has lead to identical marking on the arguments of both passive and active necessitive clauses, with the underlying syntactic analysis remaining ambiguous. This depends on the assumption that the original usage in passive necessitive clauses involved unmarked arguments with all lexical categories (unlike standard Finnish, Old Finnish and dialectal West Finnish passives tend to have unmarked personal pronoun objects). In the other two texts, such a merger of active and passive necessitive clauses may be ongoing, with personal pronouns vacillating between nominative and genitive case-marking. This merger itself may well have been conditioned by contact with Swedish, where *ska*, often a source or model construction for *pitää* (Laitinen 1992, 139–140, 218) can combine with both active and passive infinitives.

The troublesome subject

The upshot of all this is that there does appear to be some syntactic process going on: the distribution of case-markers does appear to obey a general principle, and cannot be explained on the basis of frequency-based generalization in terms of specific lexical items. This does not imply that such generalizations play no role at all – the correlation between lexical categories and case-marking does appear to be stronger than that between transitivity and case-marking. However, the strong correlation between marked plurality and nominative case-marking suggests some other process. As with earlier legal texts, I believe a merger between the arguments of active and passive necessitive clauses to have been the main driver in the development of a composite case-marking sharing features of both Finnish subject and object case-marking. However, this merger cannot be regarded as the structural consequence of an earlier, completed reanalysis of the passive infinitival object to subject – rather, it co-occurs with such a reanalysis, which seems to be ongoing in the texts at hand (De Smit 2006, 146). The arguments of passive necessitive clauses show both features of subjecthood and objecthood.

This is not entirely surprising in view of the problems surrounding subject case-marking in Finnish as a whole. Existential clause subjects notably exhibit object-like features such as partitive case-marking under negation, and as already mentioned, passive objects in Old Finnish show both subject- and object-like features in case-marking. I believe the case-marking patterns observed here do vindicate some notion of autonomous structure in Old Finnish syntax: Old Finnish syntactic patterns cannot be reduced to frequency-based generalizations of more or less specific constructions. However, Old Finnish structure is partially indeterminate, showing features of varying, competing structures with

lots of neutral ground in between. Ambiguity in terms of structure may be typical of reanalysis in progress, as Harris and Campbell (1995, 59) point out:

> "After reanalysis, typically extension alters one aspect of the surface manifestation before others. At this point, a surface structure has some of the structurally ambiguous aspects that it had before reanalysis, but also one (newly extended to it) that is unambiguously characteristic of the new analysis, and often at least one that is characteristic of the old. For this reason, speakers must be able to see both analyses at once."

But where I believe a 'structuralist' view of Old Finnish, in accordance with the first alternative outlined at the beginning of this paper, is warranted by the overall pattern of case-marker distribution encountered in the texts, a 'constructionalist' one may be more appropriate in another area, namely that of Swedish influence. As noted, the texts do not show signs of overall generalization of nominative case-marking such as occurs in some Finnish dialects adjacent to Swedish-speaking areas, though the generalization of nominative case-marking in S in all areas except personal pronouns may be seen as constituting a possible step in this direction. Influence from Swedish, however, may have been crucial in the occurrence of coreferential subject/object ellipsis in composite active and passive necessitive clauses, which in itself is an important factor in the merger of active and passive necessitive clauses in S. I do not believe the emergence of coreferential subject/object ellipsis with Old Finnish necessitive clauses on the basis of Swedish model patterns to have involved the transfer or contact-induced restructuring of any syntactic rules. The distinction between the active subject and the passive object is a vague one in Old Finnish, and coreferential subject/object ellipsis exploits this vagueness. They seem to me to have arisen under the pressure of translation, and to have survived on their own in a largely non-translated text such as S; that is, they have arisen in 'speech' rather than 'language', in an area of speech underdetermined by linguistic structure. This notion – that contact-induced change in Old Finnish involves the transfer of specific lexical items and associated grammatical patterns, i.e. of constructions, rather than of more abstract grammatical rules – may be of wider applicability in the study of Old Finnish.

References

Corpus

A = Agricola, M. 1548: Se Wsi Testamenti. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tut-
      kimuskeskus. Electronic material. 14.2.2007. [http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/
      vks/meta/agricola/agri2ut1_rdf.xml 01.2.2009.]
B = Biblia eli vuoden 1642 Raamattu. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimus-
      keskus. Electronic material. 5.12.2006. [http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/vks/
      meta/biblia/biblia_coll_rdf.xml 01.2.2009.]
S = Parvio, M. (ed.) 1990: Ericus Erici. Postilla II. Näköispainos. Suomalaisen
      Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.

Other references

Aikhenvald, Alexandra 2003: Mechanisms of change in areal diffusion: new
      morphology and language contact. – *Journal of Linguistics* 39, 1–29.
Anttila, Raimo 1989: *Historical and comparative linguistics*. Current issues in
      linguistic theory 6. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
Bybee, Joan 2007 [1995]: Regular Morphology and the Lexicon – *Frequency of
      Use and the Organization of Language*, 167–193. Oxford University Press,
      Oxford.
De Smit, Merlijn 2005: Nesessiivirakenteiden subjektimerkinnästä vanhimpien
      lainsuomennosten kielessä. – *Sananjalka*, 64–90.
——2006: *Language contact and structural change. An Old Finnish case study.*
      Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Studia Fennica Stockholmiensia 9,
      Stockholm.
Fehling, Detlev 1979: The origins of European syntax. – *Folia Linguistica His-
      torica* I:2, 353–387.
Harris, Alice C. – Campbell, Lyle 1995: *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic
      perspective*. Cambridge studies in linguistics 74. Cambridge University
      Press. Cambridge.
Häkkinen, Kaisa 1994: *Agricolasta nykykieleen. Suomen kirjakielen historia*.
      Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö, Porvoo.
——1997: Kuinka ruotsin kieli on vaikuttanut suomeen? – *Sananjalka*, 31–53.
——2003: Suomen kielen ruotsalaiset lainat: tuloksia, ongelmia, mahdollisuuk-
      sia. – Pörn, M. – Åstrand, A. (toim.): *Kieli tienhaarassa. Juhlakirja Maija
      Grönholmin 60-vuotispäivän kunniaksi 23.9.2003*, 44–57. Åbo Akademis
      Förlag, Åbo.
Ikola, Osmo – Palomäki, Ulla – Koitto, Anna-Kaisa 1989: *Suomen murteiden
      lauseoppia ja tekstikielioppia*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.
Inaba, Nobufumi – Blokland, Rogier 2001: Allative, genitive and partitive: On
      the dative in Old Finnish. – *CIFU 9 Pars IV*, 421–431. Tartu.
Itkonen, Terho 1974: Ergatiivisuutta suomessa (1). – *Virittäjä*, 379–398.

King, Ruth 2000: *The lexical basis of grammatical borrowing. A Prince Edward Island French case study.* John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Laitinen, Lea 1992: *Välttämättömyys ja persoona. Suomen murteiden nesessiivisten rakenteiden semantiikkaa ja kielioppia.* Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.

Latvala, Salu 1894: *Lauseopillisia havaintoja Luoteis-Satakunnan kansankielestä.* Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.

Lehtinen, Tapani 1985: Vanhan persoonallisen passiivin jatkajiako? – *Virittäjä*, 270–289.

Lindén, Eeva 1963: Kieltolauseen sanajärjestyksestä suomen kirjakielessä. – *Virittäjä*, 214–226.

Petander, F. L. 1894: Esitys Piispa Eerikki Sorolaisen Postillan kielestä. – *Suomi* 3:6, 1–49.

Saukkonen, Pauli 1965: *Itämerensuomalaisten kielten tulosijainfinitiivirakenteiden historiaa I.* Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 137. Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, Helsinki.

Setälä, E. N. 1883: Lauseopillinen tutkimus Koillis-Satakunnan kansankielestä. – *Suomi* 2:16, 1–235.

——1966: *Suomen kielen lauseoppi.* Viidestoista painos. Tarkistanut Matti Sadeniemi. Otava, Helsinki.

Thompson, Sandra – Hopper, Paul 2001: Transitivity, clause structure and argument structure: Evidence from conversation. – Hopper, P. J. – Bybee, J. (eds): *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*, 27–60. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Wande, Erling 1982: Ruotsin Tornionlaakson suomi ja sen ominaispiirteet. – Klockare, Sigurd – Wande, Erling (eds) *Suomen kieli Ruotsissa*, 39–71. Föreningen Norden – Kulturfonden för Sverige och Finland – Finn-Kirja, Stockholm.

Merlijn de Smit
Department of Baltic languages, Finnish and German
Division of Finnish
Stockholm university
SE-10691 Stockholm
merlijn.de.smit[a]finska.su.se

Appendix A. Subject and object case-marking of necessitive *pitää*

A

pitää, active	subj. nom.	subj. gen.	subj. part.	no subject	ellipsis	?
object nom.	-	-	-	-	-	-
object acc.	44	118	-	4	28	5
object part.	38	138	-	3	20	2
no object	216	359	11	33	19	18
?	17	47	-	2	5	-

pitää, passive	NP nom.	NP gen.	NP part.	no NP	ellipsis
no subject	127	35	7	16	5

S

pitää, active	subj. nom.	subj. gen.	subj. part.	no subject	ellipsis	?
object nom.	-	-	-	-	2	-
object acc.	42	116	-	2	34	-
object part.	66	230	1	5	82	2
no object	265	319	13	25	114	18
?	30	81	-	2	29	

pitää, passive	NP nom.	NP gen.	NP part.	no NP	ellipsis	?
no subject	56	18	11	16	3	9

B

pitää, active	subj. nom.	subj. gen.	subj. part.	no subject	ellipsis	?
object nom.	-	-	-	1	-	-
object acc.	11	60	-	1	16	3
object part.	19	147	-	7	20	2
no object	156	303	12	39	15	22
?	16	44	-	-	7	-

pitää, passive	NP nom.	NP gen.	NP part.	no NP	ellipsis
no subject	108	11	46	46	-

Appendix B. Case-marking of the subject of necessitive *pitää* and lexical categories

A

	genitive subject	tr	it	ex	nominative subject	tr	it	ex
minä	68	49	19	-	1	1	-	-
sinä	41	31	10	-	-	-	-	-
hän	176	100	76	-	15	10	4	1
me	59	37	22	-	8	2	6	-
te	92	63	29	-	4	3	1	-
he	94	52	42	-	14	6	8	-
se	20	6	14	-	10	3	7	-
ne	1	-	1	-	17	10	7	-
other pronoun, sing.	18	13	5	-	42	25	17	-
other pronoun, pl.	1	1	-	-	31	17	14	-
numeral	-							
kaikki, quantor	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-
noun, sing.	81	39	39	4	95	22	53	20
noun, pl.	2	1	2	-	68	27	36	4

S

	genitive subject	tr	it	ex	nominative subject	tr	it	ex
minä	13	11	2	-	-	-	-	-
sinä	57	48	9	-	3	3	-	-
hän	136	89	47	-	9	5	4	-
me	293	248	45	-	4	3	1	-
te	39	30	9	-	1	-	1	-
he	151	103	48	-	3	-	3	-
se	8	3	5	-	10	-	10	-
ne	-	-	-	-	21	12	9	-
other pronoun, sing.	9	5	4	-	68	33	35	-
other pronoun, pl.	1	-	1	-	21	13	8	-
numeral	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-
kaikki	1	-	1	-	30	7	23	-
noun, sing.	33	17	16	-	121	46	45	30
noun, pl.	3	3	-	-	107	61	44	2

B

	genitive subject	tr	it	ex	nominative subject	tr	it	ex
minä	51	34	17	-		-	-	-
sinä	38	27	11	-		-	-	-
hän	98	49	49	-	3	2	1	-
me	69	44	25	-		-	-	-
te	73	41	32	-		-	-	-
he	96	56	40	-	1	-	1	-
se	11	4	7	-	2	1	1	-
ne	8	4	4	-	16	3	13	-
other pronoun, sing.	30	22	8	-	24	12	12	-
other pronoun, pl.	3	2	1	-	20	8	12	-
numeral		-	-	-		-	-	-
kaikki, quantor					5	2	3	-
noun, sing.	68	29	38	1	60	7	33	20
noun, pl.	13	9	4	-	71	27	38	6