

Phase-obedient Agreement at A'- levels in Finnish

Walther Glödtaf (Linguistics PhD UIUC)



UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Topic of the Talk

- To show that Accusative Case form variation in singular non-pronominals and negation form variation in Finnish rationale adverbials is due to an indeterminacy of whether the adverbial is headed by a CP or not

Evidence for this Analysis

- **Relativisation**
- **Contrastive Negation**

Theoretical Consequences

- Variation in ACC and Negation form is due to variation whether a CP is posited
 - Can capture data that fell outside previous analysis by Brattico (2014)
- Agreement at A'-levels in Finnish obeys CP-phases
- Supports previous arguments that agreement in Finnish happens prior to A'-movement
- *Possessive suffixes do not participate in determining the morphological form of elements that agree with T*

What are Rationale Adverbials?

- Modify a verb with an adjunct that specifies the reason to do something
- In Finnish these are formed with the -kse- morpheme
- They do not have tense morphology
- But do have S-V agreement morphology in the form of a possessive-suffix (used commonly for S-V agreement in dependent clauses)

ACC-assignment

1) Minun täyty-**i** mennä eläinsuojaan ostaa-kse-ni
I.GEN need-**PAST** go shelter.ILL buy-RATIO-PX1S

kissa/kissa-n

cat.**ACC(0)**/ACC(N)

'I needed to go (in)to the shelter in order to buy a cat'

**Notice: The ACC-form varies between ACC(0)/ACC(n) (with a
necessive matrix clause only)**

Ex. 2: Contrastive Negation

2) Minä menin eläinsuojaan **en/ei** ostaakseni koiran
I.NOM go.PAST.1S shelter.ILL **no.1/3s** buy.RATIO.PX1S dog.ACC(N)
vaan kissan
only cat.ACC(N)

‘I went to the shelter not in order to buy a dog but a cat’ /

‘I went to the shelter in order not to buy a dog but a cat

Notice: The negation varies between a subject agreeing (1S) and default form (3S)

What needs to be explained?

- Why is there variation in the ACC-form?
- Why is there variation in the form of the negation?

Notes on ACC-Assignment I

- ACC is assigned by telic verbs and contrasts with Partitive in atelic verbs
- ACC has two forms in Finnish for singular non-pronominal objects, ACC(0) and ACC(n)
- ACC(n) is homophonous with Genitive
- ACC(0) is homophonous with Nominative
- But when one replaces either with a pronominal or plural object then these elements bears unambiguous ACC

Local ACC-assignment

3) Minä löys-i-n kissa-n
I.NOM find-past-1s cat-ACC(N)

‘I found a cat’

4) Minun täyty-i löytää kissa
I.GEN need-PAST find cat.ACC(0)

‘I needed to find a cat’

Notice: When the verb has morphology to indicate phi-agreement, ACC(n) ensues, when the verb lacks this morphology, ACC(0) ensues

Non-local ACC-assignment

5) Minun täyty-**i** mennä eläinsuojaan ostaa-kse-*ni* **kissa**/kissa-**n**
I.GEN need-**PAST** go shelter.ILL buy-RATIO-*PX1S* cat.**ACC(0)**/ACC(N)

'I needed to go (in)to shelter in order to buy a cat'

Notice: Both ACC(n) and ACC(0) are now possible! ACC(0) would look like it is assigned by the matrix *necessive* and ACC(n) by the *Px* in the adverbial

Forms of the Negation

6) Minä ost-i-n e-n koira-n vaan kissa-n
I.NOM buy-PAST-1s no-1s dog-ACC(N) only cat-ACC(N)

'I bought not a dog but a cat'

7) Minun täyty-i ostaa e-i koira vaan kissa
I.GEN need-PAST buy no-3s dog.ACC(0) only cat.ACC(0)

'I needed to buy not a dog but a cat'

Contrastive Negation

- 8) Minä menin eläinsuojaan en/ei ostaakseni koiran
I.NOM go.PAST.1s shelter.ILL no.1/3s buy.RATIO.PX1s dog.ACC(N)
vaan kissan
only cat.ACC(N)

'I went to the shelter not in order to buy a dog but a cat' /

'I went to the shelter in order not to buy a dog but a cat

Notice: The negation varies between a subject agreeing (1S) and default form (3S)

Interim Summary

Clause-type	ACC-Form	Negation-Form
Simple (with phi morphology)	ACC(n)	Agreeing
Simple (without phi morphology)	ACC(0)	Default (3S)
Complex (Matrix without and Adverbial with phi)	ACC(n)/ACC(0)	Default (3S)
Complex (only with phi morphology)	ACC(n)	Agreeing/ Default (3S)

The Role of CP

- (Finite) CP in Finnish acts as a boundary for long-distance agreement.
- Brattico (2014) analysed this to be due to (finite) CP-headed clauses having functional projections specified for tense polarity, and phi-morphology
 - No ACC case-form is assigned over a (finite) CP from the matrix clause
 - No negation form is assigned over a (finite) CP from the matrix clause
- I interpret this as evidence for (finite) CP being a phase for these types of operations

Rationale Advys with CP I

- 9) Minun täyty-**y** mennä eläinsuojaan jotta osta-**n** kissan/***kissa**
I.GEN need-**PRES** go shelter.ILL that.RATIO buy.PRES-**1s** cat-**ACC(N)**/***ACC(0)**

‘I need to go to the shelter so that I buy a cat’

Rationale Advcs with CP II

10) Minun täyty-**y** lähteä eläinsuojasta jotta en/***ei**
I.GEN need-**PRES** go shelter.ELA that.RATIO no.**1s/*3s**

osta kissa-a
buy.PRES cat.PAR

‘I need to leave the shelter so that I not buy a cat’

Argument

- Unlike Brattico (2014), I do not assume the boundaryhood of (finite) CP to be a side-effect of clauses headed by finite CP having functional projections specified for Tense, Polarity, and Phi
- **I assume that the presence of these functional projections guide the parser into positing a (finite) CP**
 - When a structure is unspecified for some of these projections, the parser might not assign a (finite) CP since all three projections are conclusive evidence for the need of a (finite) CP

Predictions

If the parser had to assign a CP for other independent reasons, then the effects from the matrix clause should disappear too

→ **No ACC(0) case-form on direct objects**

→ **No default negation form**

Examples of instances where a CP is needed to be assigned independently:

- Relativisation
- Contrastive Negation

Evidence: Relativisation

- In relative clauses the relative pronoun needs to move from its base position to a CP where it receives the –ka morpheme
- -ka morpheme must be giving to it very high in the structure as the order of morphemes is: **ANIMACY-NUMBER-CASE-RELATIVISER**
- Base position is adjunct internal since in regular relative clauses, the relative pronoun does not have the same Case as the noun it modifies

Evidence that -ka is linked to CP

- -ka (and its vowel-harmonized equivalent -kä is in wh-expressions
 - Mi-kä (What) → Note **Mi-n-kä** (What.ACC(n))
 - Ku-ka (Who)
 - Miten-(kä) / Kuin-(ka) (How)
 - Milloin-(ka) (When)
- -ka is in some Cs
 - Joten-(ka) (Therefore)
 - Kuten-(ka) (As (we can see...))

Relativisation Example

11) (Eastern Finnish dialects):

Frodo päätti tarinat joi~~ta~~(ka)₁ Bilbo ~~ei~~ ehtinyt kirjoittaa

Frodo finished stories.**ACC** ANIMATE.PL.**PAR.**(REL)₁ Bilbo ~~not~~ could write

valmiiksi _____₁

finish _____₁

‘Frodo finished the stories which Bilbo could not finish in time’

Minun täytyi löytää kissa, (I needed to find a cat...)

12) ..._{CP}[jonka/*joka ostaakseni]₁,
..._{CP}[which.ACC(N)/*ACC(0) buy.RATIO.PX1S]₁

_{CP} [minun täyty-i mennä eläinsuojaan ____₁]]

_{CP} [I.GEN needed-PAST go shelter.ILL ____₁]]

‘I needed to find a cat, which (is such that) in order to buy it I had to go to the shelter’

Result

- ACC(0) is no longer possible to be assigned on the relative pronoun!
- Inserting a CP at the head of the adverbial interrupted any possible Case-assignment from the matrix clause

Evidence: Contrastive Neg

- Contrastive negation has been argued to be in CP (Kaiser, 2006), since it preposes the clause it negates
- *However contrast need not be applied at the beginning of the clause*

Examples

13) En minä ostanut kissaa!
No.1s I.NOM bought cat.PAR!

'I did not buy a cat!'

→ Someone bought a cat

14) Minä en ostanut kissaa
I.NOM no.1s bought cat.PAR

'I did not buy a cat!'

→ #Someone bought a cat
(→ I stole/borrowed... it instead)

Contrastive Negation I

- 15) Minun täyty-**i** mennä eläinsuojaan **jotta** **en**
I.GEN need-**PAST** go shelter.ILL **that.RATIO** no.**1s**
ostaisi koiran vaan kissan
buy.COND dog.ACC(N) only cat.ACC(N)

‘I needed to go to the shelter so that I not buy a dog but a cat’

Contrastive Negation II

- 16) Minun täyty-i mennä eläinsuojaan ei jotta
I.GEN need-PAST go shelter.ILL no.3s that.RATIO
ostaisin koiran vaan kissan
buy.COND.1s dog.ACC(N) only cat.ACC(N)

'I needed to go to the shelter not so that I would buy a dog but a cat.'

Result

- Assigning the form of the negation from the matrix clause is no longer possible below the CP!
- Inserting a CP at the head of the adverbial interrupted any possible neg-form assignment from the matrix clause
- The sentence with the agreeing negation is also no longer ambiguous
- Ambiguity of the agreeing neg-form without an overt CP is due to the neg-form being able to be assigned by the matrix clause if no CP is posited by the parser

Summary of Results

When the parser has to assign a CP for other independent reasons, then the effects from the matrix clause disappear

- No ACC(0) case-form on direct objects
- No neg-forms assigned by the matrix clause

→ Whether or not the parser assigns a CP controls whether the matrix clause verb determines the form of ACC or the Negation in the lower clause

→ **Variation is a result of the parser having too little information in the adjunct itself to determine if a CP is present.** As a result, the parser sometimes assigns a CP (since the adjunct has functional projections for Phi and Polarity) and sometimes does not (since it lacks Tense)

Theoretical Consequences

- Variation in ACC and Negation form is due to variation whether a CP is posited
 - Can capture data that fell outside previous analysis by Brattico (2014)
- Agreement at A'-levels in Finnish obeys CP-phases
- Supports previous arguments that agreement in Finnish happens prior to A'-movement
- Possessive suffixes do not participate in determining the morphological form of elements that agree with T

**Thank you for listening to my
talk!**



References

Brattico, P. 2014. Long Distance Case Assignment and Intervention. *Lingua* 148, pp. 309-336

Brattico, P. 2018. *Word Order and Adjunction in Finnish*. Charleston, SC.: Aquila & Celik.

Huhmarniemi, S., & Brattico, P., 2013. The Structure of the Finnish Relative Clause. *Finno-Ugric Languages and Linguistics* 2 (1), pp. 53-88.

Kaiser, E. 2006. Negation and the left periphery in Finnish. *Lingua* 116, pp. 314-350.

Addendum I: ACC with only phi verbs

- 17) Minun men-i-**n** eläinsuojaan ostaa-kse-*ni* ***kissa**/kissa-**n**
I.GEN go-PAST-**1s** shelter.ILL buy-RATIO-*PX1s* cat.***ACC(0)**/ACC(**N**)

'I went (in)to shelter in order to buy a cat'

Addendum II: Neg with Neccessive matrix verb

- 18) Minä täyty-**i** mennä eläinsuojaan **ei/*en** ostaakseni
I.NOM need-PAST go shelter.ILL no.3/*1s buy.RATIO.*PX1S*
koiran vaan kissan
dog.ACC(N) only cat.ACC(N)

‘I needed to go to the shelter not in order to buy a dog but a cat’ /

‘I needed to go to the shelter in order not to buy a dog but a cat

Addendum II: Manner Adverbials

19) Minä ilahdut-i-n Merja-n osta-malla(*ni)
I.NOM gladden-PAST-1s Mary-ACC(N) buy-MANNER-(*PX1s)

kissan/*kissa

cat.ACC(N)/*ACC(0)

'I made Merja happy by buying a cat'

Addendum IV: Manner Adverbials

20) Minun täyty-**i** ilahaduttaa **Merja** ostamalla(*ni)
I.NOM need-**PAST** gladden Mary-**ACC(0)** buy-MANNER-(*PX1s)

kissa/***kissan**

cat.**ACC(0)**/***ACC(N)**

'I needed to make Merja happy by buying a cat'