

Ritva Laury

**Pronouns and adverbs, figure and ground:
The local case forms and locative forms of the Finnish
demonstratives in spoken discourse**

1. Introduction

Finnish has a large variety of forms available for speaking about where something is located. This is particularly so for the demonstratives, which have special locative forms in addition to case forms in the six local cases. The purpose of this paper¹ is to examine the use of the local case forms and locative forms of the demonstratives in spoken Finnish in order to determine, first, what light the actual use of these forms may shed on the question of their lexical category as either demonstrative pronouns or adverbs, and, secondly, how speakers make the choice between the different forms.

2. Data

The data for the paper consist of ordinary conversations and spoken narratives recorded in Finland between the late 1930s and mid-1990s. The earlier narratives were recorded on disks and later transferred onto tapes; the later narratives were tape-recorded. There are altogether fifteen narratives from different dialectal areas; both eastern and western dialects are represented. The eight conversations were tape-recorded between 1958 and 1991. One of the conversations is from a pre-arranged meeting; all the rest are naturally occurring conversations between friends

¹ The paper is a slightly revised and expanded version of a part of Ch.3 of my 1995 University of California, Santa Barbara dissertation (Laury 1995).

and family members. Some of the narratives were spontaneously produced in the course of conversation, while others were elicited (for further details concerning the data, see Laury 1995).

3. The demonstratives and their forms

Finnish has three demonstratives, *tämä* 'this', *tuo* 'that' and *se* 'it; that; the'. As can be seen from the glosses, *tämä* is approximately equivalent to the English *this*. However, neither *tuo* nor *se* correspond directly to any English demonstrative. Traditionally, the meanings of the Finnish demonstratives have been thought to be based on concrete distance (see Larjavaara 1990: 93-190), but recent studies which have focused on their use in spoken discourse have suggested that social and interactive factors have at least as much to do with a speaker's choice of demonstratives than do concrete spatial factors (Seppänen 1995; Laury 1995; 1996). Based on their use in spoken discourse, the meanings of the demonstratives can be characterized as follows: use of *tämä* implies that the speaker considers the referent to be within his or her own (socially defined) sphere, while *tuo* is used for referents outside the speaker's sphere; the use of *se*, in turn, implies that the referent is within the addressee's sphere (Laury 1995: 56-57).

Just like the English demonstratives, the Finnish demonstratives can be used both independently (without a head noun) and as determiners. And unlike the English demonstratives, which can only be used independently for human referents in presentational clauses of the type *This is my mother*, the Finnish demonstratives can be used independently for human referents in all clause types.

All three demonstratives have forms for all the Finnish cases in the singular and the plural, and, as noted above, there are also special locative forms for each demonstrative. The table below shows the Finnish demonstrative forms that concern us in this paper: the local (internal and external) case forms and locative forms for all three demonstratives. In addition to the singular

forms given in the table, the demonstratives have plural forms in the internal and external local cases marked by the initial consonant *n-* instead of the singular *t-* and *s-*, and the plural *-i-* (compare the plural *näissä* 'in these' with the singular *tässä* 'in this; here'). The locatives lack plural forms.

<i>Tämä</i>		
Internal cases	External cases	Locatives
<i>tässä</i> INESSIVE	<i>tällä</i> ADESSIVE	<i>täällä</i> ADESSIVE
<i>tästä</i> ELATIVE	<i>tältä</i> ABLATIVE	<i>täältä</i> ABLATIVE
<i>tähän</i> ILLATIVE	<i>tälle</i> ALLATIVE	<i>tänne</i> LATIVE
<i>Tuo</i>		
Internal cases	External cases	Locative
<i>tuossa</i> INESSIVE	<i>tuolla</i> ADESSIVE	<i>tuolla</i> ADESSIVE
<i>tuosta</i> ELATIVE	<i>tuolta</i> ABLATIVE	<i>tuolta</i> ABLATIVE
<i>tuohon</i> ILLATIVE	<i>tuolle</i> ALLATIVE	<i>tuonne</i> LATIVE
<i>Se</i>		
<i>siinä</i> INESSIVE	<i>sillä</i> ADESSIVE	<i>siellä</i> ADESSIVE
<i>siitä</i> ELATIVE	<i>siltä</i> ABLATIVE	<i>sieltä</i> ABLATIVE
<i>siihen</i> ILLATIVE	<i>sille</i> ALLATIVE	<i>sinne</i> LATIVE

Table 1. Local case forms and locative forms of the Finnish demonstratives (standard Finnish).

As can be seen, for all three demonstratives, the internal case forms have case markers which distinguish them from both the external case forms and the locatives. However, the locative forms and the external case forms have identical case markers for the adessive (*-llä*) and ablative case (*-ltä*). For *tämä* and *se*, the locative forms are distinguished from the external case forms by the (respectively) long (*ää*) and diphthongized (*ie*) stem vowels which contrast with the simple (short) vowels (*ä/i*) in the external case forms.

For *tuo*, the external case forms are identical to the locative case forms in the adessive and ablative for the standard Finnish usage given in the table; however, in many spoken varieties (in all the dialects I am familiar with), the paradigm matches the paradigms for the other two demonstratives, as the external case

forms have simple vowels (*tolla, tolta, tolle*) and thus are, in a sense, more regular.

The lative (locative) form case marker *-nne* is distinct from the allative marker *-lle*, and the lative forms for *tämä* and *se* have simple (short) stem vowels. The standard Finnish lative form for *tuo* has a diphthongized vowel, as can be seen in the table, but for spoken Finnish, the paradigm matches the paradigms for the other two demonstratives here as well, as the spoken form has a simple vowel (*tonne*).

As can be seen, while there is some overlap in the morphology of the standard Finnish local case forms and the locative forms of the demonstratives, in spoken Finnish the paradigms are entirely distinct. The purpose of this paper is to investigate the syntactic and semantic differences in the use of these forms in spoken Finnish.

4. Spatial and extended use of the local case forms and locatives

We might reasonably assume that the basic function of the local cases, and therefore also the basic function of the local case forms and locative forms of the demonstratives, would be to express spatial relations.² However, in Finnish, and in the Uralic family of languages in general, there has been a persistent trend for local cases to be grammaticized into expressing non-local concepts such as possession and instrumentality (Alhoniemi 1969; Korhonen 1991; Huumo 1995a; for crosslinguistic manifestations of this tendency see Heine et al 1991).

When constructions expressing local concepts are extended into new domains, the earlier uses and the newer, extended (grammaticized) uses may exist simultaneously in the language

² I do not mean to imply that social meanings always develop from concrete meanings in grammaticization processes - in fact, they do not (see, for example, Hakulinen and Seppänen 1992; Laury 1996). However, there is good historical evidence that in the development of Finnish oblique cases into grammatical uses the local meanings were the earlier ones.

(Heine et al 1991: 151-152), resulting in what Campbell and Harris have called 'syntactic doublets' (1996). This is so with the Finnish local cases. As Huumo (1995b) shows, it is quite possible to construct sentences with two different uses of the same lexical item with the same case marker, where one of the uses is interpreted as a local, adverbial use while the other use receives a novel, say, possessive or instrumental interpretation. However, even though speakers find both the local and extended uses grammatical and are able to construct system sentences exhibiting both types of uses, it is still quite possible that one type of use is more frequent in actual speech production in context, while the other type is less frequent or cannot even be found in spoken data. This appears to be so for the external local case forms of the Finnish demonstratives. My database contained no uses of independent (non-determiner) external case (adessive, ablative, or allative) forms of the demonstratives to refer to locations. Although it is probably not ungrammatical to use these forms to refer to locations, such uses appear to be at least very rare. There were also no determiner uses of the external case forms with noun phrases which would have referred to locations, although such uses are quite possible to imagine and surely occur (for example, *tällä pöydällä* TÄMÄ-ADE *pöytä-ADE* 'on this table').

In contrast, there were numerous examples in my data of the use of the external local case forms of the demonstratives for non-local (abstract) concepts. The following example shows the use of the adessive form of *se*, *sillä*, for a possessor.

- (1) V: ... 'Onks *sillä* luistimet.
 be-Q-PTCL SE-ADE skate-PL
 Does s/he have skates? [PLAYMOBL]

Example (1) is taken from a conversation between two children while they are making inventory of a set of toys consisting of dolls and their winter sports equipment in order to determine what equipment each doll comes with. V is asking whether a particular doll, the referent of *sillä* 's/he (possessive)', has skates.

The adessive form is also used for instruments in my data, as shown in the next example. This example comes from the same conversation as example (1).

- (2) V: 'Mä leikin **tällä**.
 1SG play-1SG TÄMÄ-ADE
 I'll play with this one.

[PLAYMOBL]

In this example, V is choosing a doll to play with. The NP referring to the doll, *tällä* 'with this', is the adessive form of the demonstrative *tämä*.

The causee in causative constructions is expressed with the adessive case also, as shown in the following example from a conversation between several teachers of Finnish. The speaker is telling about having his students listen to a recording of a certain book.

- (3) ..^mä oon 'kuunteluttanu **näillä**,
 1SG be-1SG hear-FREQ-CAUS-P.PTC TÄMÄ-PL-ADE
 I have made these (students) listen,

... (1.2) tämmöst ^kymmenen pientä neekeripoikaa.
 TÄMÄ-ADJ-PAR ten little-PAR negro-boy-PAR
 to this "Ten little niggers".

[OPET]

In example (3), *näillä* 'these (students)', the plural adessive form of *tämä*, stands for the causees of the causative action the speaker is reporting having performed.

The allative case forms of the demonstratives code recipients. In example (4), also taken from the teachers' conversation, the speaker is suggesting that students should not be offered violent reading materials.

- (4) .. niin ^ei väkivaltaa **niille**.
 so NEG violence-PAR SE-PL-ALL
 So, no violence for them.

[OPET]

Like the external local cases, the internal local cases have also been extended into certain non-local uses. For example, the relative case is used for the source concept or state, or entity undergoing a change with verbs of becoming and transformation, as shown in the following example, which comes from a conversation recorded while two speakers were preparing fresh salted salmon. One of the speakers had just said that she added sugar to the marinade.

- (5) ... Muute **siit** tulee kovaa.
 otherwise SE-ELA come-3SG hard- PAR
 Otherwise it comes out hard.

[SUOLALOH]

In this example, *siit(ä)*³ 'it' the relative form of *se*, stands for the salmon which, it is claimed, will become hard if sugar is not added.

There are numerous examples in my data of the use of the external local case forms of the demonstratives to code possessors, instruments, causees and recipients, as illustrated above in examples (1)-(4), and examples of the use of the internal local case forms to code non-local concepts can also be found, as shown by example (5). However, as I have noted above, my data contained no examples of the use of the external local case forms of the demonstratives to refer to locations.⁴ In contrast, my data abound in examples of the use of the internal case forms and the locative forms of the demonstratives to code locations.

Examples (6)-(8) below are examples of the use of the internal local case forms of the demonstratives to point to

³ As can be seen here, and in many other examples in this paper, the demonstratives are often shortened in actual use by speakers so that the final vowel or the second syllable are dropped.

⁴ Since both the external case forms and the locative forms involve the same case markers, it is not surprising that a functional differentiation has developed. For the internal case forms, the possibility does not exist. I thank the SKY anonymous reviewer for pointing this out.

locations. In example (6), the speaker is reporting thoughts she had while cooking on an old stove in a building where her family lived when she was a young child.

- (6) ... 'Äiti teki täs ruokaa ja,
 mother make- PST TÄMÄ-INE food-PAR and
 Mother cooked here and,
 .. monet 'muut <P sen jälkeen P>.
 many-PL other-PL SE-GEN after
 many others after that.

[OMPELU]

In the first line of example (6), the inessive form *täs(sä)* 'here' refers to the place where the speaker was cooking at the time when she reported having these thoughts. In the next example, taken from the same conversation as examples (1) and (2), the children's grandmother is pointing out the location of a small ski pole.

- (7) .. Toss on ^sauva.
 TUO-INE is pole
 There's a pole.
 .. Älä hukkaa sitä.
 NEG.2SG.IMP lose SE-PAR
 Don't lose it.

[PLAYMOBL]

In this example, the inessive form of *tuo*, *toss(a)* 'there' stands for the place where the pole is to be found.

In example (8), also from the PLAYMOBL conversation, one of the children is concerned that her playmate has unfairly appropriated a pair of small skates because she has put them in a pile together with her doll's belongings.

- (8) Miks sä otit,
 why 2SG take-PST-2SG
 Why did you take

^lasten luistimet siihe.
 child-PL-GEN skate-PL SE-ILL
 the children's skates there.

[PLAYMOBL]

In the second line of this example, *siihe(n)* 'there', the illative form of *se*, stands for the place where the addressee of the utterance has put the skates.

Examples (6)-(8) above showed how speakers of Finnish use the internal case forms of the demonstratives to say where something is located. Examples (9)-(11) below show that the locative forms of the demonstratives are also used for a similar purpose.

Example (9) below comes from the PLAYMOBL conversation. The speaker is in the process of unpacking toys from a box.

- (9) **Tääll** on 'kummallekin näille
 TÄMÄ.LOC-ADE is both-ADE-also TÄMÄ-PL-ALL
 näköjään ^sukset
 apparently ski-PL

Looks like (there) are skis for both of these in here.

[PLAYMOBL]

In this example, *tääll(ä)*, 'here', the locative (adessive) form of *tämä* refers to the box where the toys the child is unpacking are located.

In the next example, taken from a dinnertable conversation, the speaker uses a locative form of *tuo* in a turn illustrating what she considers typical eating behaviour for young children.

- (10) M: ... Sit `leipä <H ^viskataan tonne H>.
 then bread throw-PASS-PERS TUO.LOC.LAT
 Then the bread gets thrown over there.

[SNAPSI]

In example (10), speaker M is using the lative locative form *tonne* 'there' to refer to a non-explicit location where a

hypothetical child would throw a piece of bread after licking off the topping.

The previous example as well as the next one illustrate the obvious fact that what is referred to as a location does not have to be a 'place' in a concrete sense. In example (11) below, one of the Finnish teachers is commenting on the violent nature of biblical stories.

- (11) joku ^R=aamattu <A esimerkiks ni A>
 some Bible example-TRA so
 Take the Bible for example,

sielhän on ^kaikkein ... % % kavalimmat petokset
 SE.LOC-ADE-PTCL is all-SUP foul-SUP-PL fraud-PL

esitely.
 present-P.PTC

all the foulest frauds are presented in there.

[OPET]

Here, the speaker uses *siel(lä)* 'there', the adessive locative form of *se*, to talk about the Bible as a location where foul frauds are presented.

We have seen that in the spoken data examined for this study, both the external and internal local case forms of the demonstratives have extended, non-local uses, while both the internal local case forms and locative forms of the demonstratives are used for referring to locations. In contrast, external local case forms of the demonstratives are not used for locations in these data. How have these uses of the demonstratives been reflected in Finnish grammarians' categorization of the forms?

5. Demonstratives or adverbs?

Traditionally, both the internal case forms and the locative forms of the demonstratives have been considered adverbs (Ahlman

1933; Airila 1940).⁵ Several contemporary accounts have also taken this approach. Thus Auli Hakulinen and Fred Karlsson (1979: 84) include both *tuolla* (a locative form) and *tässä* (an internal case form) in a list of pronominal adverbs, and likewise Östman (1995) calls both the internal case series and the locative series demonstrative adverbs. On the other hand, Lauri Hakulinen (1979: 51; 59; 127) includes only locative forms in his discussions of demonstrative adverbs. Likewise, Karlsson's (1982) reference grammar includes only case forms (internal and external) in the list of demonstratives (141) and lists the locative forms separately as adverbs of place (210).

None of the scholars mentioned in the previous paragraph discusses what factors led to classification of the case forms and locative forms as adverbs or demonstratives. The lexical category question is, however, taken up explicitly by Larjavaara (1990: 117), who directly challenges the traditional classification, and suggests that there are "no morphological and syntactic criteria" (1990: 123) which would support the classification of the internal case forms of the demonstratives as adverbs.

Larjavaara does not explain what the morphological and syntactic criteria might be that would support the classification of forms as adverbs. Such criteria are indeed difficult to come by. Schachter (1985: 20) notes that "the label adverb is often applied to several different sets of words in a language, sets that do not necessarily have as much in common with one another, either notionally or grammatically, as, say, the subclasses of nouns or verbs that may occur in a language", and that "there are no categorizations that are common to the entire class". Typically, adverbs are defined in terms of what they lack; thus Anderson (1985: 200) notes that adverbs manifest "inflectional poverty" and "do not normally manifest agreement". Schachter also notes

⁵ There seems to be tacit agreement among Finnish linguists that the external case forms of the demonstratives are not adverbs; none of the linguists who have discussed demonstrative adverbs include any external case forms in their lists or discussions. My data confirm this insight, insofar as the external case forms are not used to refer to locations.

that adverbs "function as modifiers of constituents other than nouns" (1985: 20).

Unless the locative forms are considered part of the demonstrative paradigm, they do manifest inflectional poverty in that they lack forms for all the other cases except for the external local cases (adessive, ablative, and (al)lative). Further, even if the locative forms are considered part of the demonstrative paradigm, they still lack the plural forms which both the internal and external case forms of the demonstratives have. Therefore, by morphological criteria, the locative forms are more adverbial than both the external and internal local case forms of the demonstratives, which have full paradigms in both singular and plural.

The locative forms are also adverbial in nature in that they sometimes do not agree with the head of the noun phrase which they precede in either case or number, although nominal attributes ordinarily, with very few exceptions, agree in both case and number with the head in a Finnish NP. There are many examples in my data where the locative demonstrative has a different case form from the following noun (phrase). Consider the following example, where the speaker is discussing her recent, slightly odd visit to a doctor's office.

- (12) ja ^sit se 'sanos et,
 and then SE say-PST COMP
 And then he said,
- 'joo et et,
 PTCL COMP COMP
 yeah,
- .. katotaas sinne ^kurkkuu,
 look-PASS-PTCL SE.LOC-LAT throat-ILL
 let's look at that throat,

[LAAKR]

As can be seen, the locative form *sinne* in the last line of the example is in the lative case, whereas the following noun *kurkkuu* 'throat' is in the illative case.

Another, similar example comes from the OPET conversation. This is shown in example (13) below.

- (13) jos aatellaan,
if think-PASS-PERS
if we think,

mennään ihan tonne j- juuriin.
go-PASS-PERS quite TUO.LOC-LAT FOOT-PL-ILL
(if we) go right there to the roots,

[OPET]

In this example, the locative form of *tuo* fails to agree with the following noun *juuriin* 'to the roots' in both case and number. The locative form is morphologically singular (recall that the locative demonstratives lack plural forms), and is in the locative case, while the following noun is plural and in the illative case.

Since the locative demonstratives sometimes fail to agree in either case or number with the noun phrases they precede, it seems reasonable to assume that they are indeed adverbs, and that they do not function as modifiers of the noun which follows, or at least that they are less closely associated with the noun phrase which they precede than the external case forms of the demonstratives, which always agree in case with the noun phrase they precede.

However, contrary to what Larjavaara's (1990) claim implies, the internal case forms of the demonstratives also sometimes behave syntactically like the locative forms of the demonstratives with respect to agreement, and thus might also be classified as adverbs, or at least can be said to manifest adverb-like syntactic behavior. There are many examples in my data where an internal case form of the demonstrative is followed by a noun phrase in an external case form. Consider the following example:

- (14) Mut pane tähä,
but put.2SG.IMP TAMÄ-ILL
But put (it) here,

.. ^vasemmalle puolelle
 left-ALL side-ALL
 on the left side

[SUOLALOH]

In this example, the internal case form of the demonstrative *tähä* 'into this; hither' in the first line does not agree with the external case form of the noun phrase *vasemmalle puolelle* 'onto the left side' in the second line. Besides the lack of agreement, the fact that the demonstrative is separated from the noun phrase it precedes by an intonation unit boundary and a pause⁶ adds to the impression that the demonstrative is not a part of the noun phrase, but rather external to it.

Furthermore, internal case forms of the demonstratives can also appear immediately before the noun phrase, and still not agree in case with them, as shown in example (15) below:

- (15) ... Ja siin ^puuhellalla,
 and SE-INE wood-stove-ADE
 and on the wood stove,

 .. kerran ni,
 once so
 one time,

 ... mää illalla ^paistoin.
 1SG evening-ADE fry-PST-1SG
 I was frying (mushrooms) at night

[OMPELU]

In this example the inessive form of *se, siin*, does not agree in case with the following adessive case noun *puuhellalla* 'on the wood stove'.

⁶ I am not suggesting here that the relationship between syntactic and intonational closure is one-to-one; it is not (see, for example, Tao (1996); Helasvuo (1992) for Finnish). Nevertheless, the fact that the demonstrative and the oblique NP are separated by an intonational boundary as well as a pause gives the impression that, in some sense, they are separate units to the speaker.

So far, we have seen that the internal case forms and the locative forms of the demonstratives appear to be more adverbial than the external case forms of the demonstratives. In my data, the external case forms of the demonstratives are only used for semantic roles which are closely associated with the verb, such as possessors and instruments, while both the internal case forms and the locative forms are used for more adverbial concepts, namely locations. However, the internal case forms are also used for non-locative concepts, while the locative forms are only used to code locations.

Secondly, the locative demonstratives exhibit inflectional poverty in that they have no plural forms, and thus are morphologically more adverbial than the external and internal forms of the demonstratives. Thirdly, when used prenominal, the external case forms of the demonstratives always agree with the head noun. In contrast, this is not always true of the internal case forms and the locative forms; they are syntactically more adverbial than the external case forms in that they do not always agree in case with the head of the noun phrase they precede.

Thus, the locative demonstratives and the internal case forms, at least in some of their uses, might be said to be external to the noun phrase in a way similar to the English demonstrative adverbs in expressions like *here in the U.S.*, *there in the kitchen*⁷ where the demonstrative adverbs are external to the prepositional phrase they precede.

However, the Finnish demonstratives are more closely bound to the noun phrase they precede by virtue of the nature of Finnish morphology; there is no intervening material between the noun phrase and the demonstrative which precedes it, while in the English examples given above, the preposition and the determiner intervene between the demonstrative adverb and the noun. Further, even the locative forms and the internal case forms of the demonstratives, when used for locations, always

⁷ I thank Wally Chafe for pointing out this parallel to me.

agree in directionality with the noun phrase they precede; that is, there were no cases where, for example, an ablative demonstrative (the 'from' type) would have preceded an illative noun (the 'into' type).

These data indicate that the local case forms of the Finnish demonstratives cannot be unambiguously placed into the categories of 'pronouns' and 'adverbs'. Instead, to better reflect their behaviour in discourse, they could be arranged on a cline where on the left, we have the external case forms which are not adverbial either semantically, morphologically or syntactically, with the internal case forms, which are used semantically both in adverbial and non-adverbial fashion, are not adverbs morphologically, but exhibit adverb-like syntactic behaviour, in the middle, and finally on the right, the locative forms which are adverbial both semantically, morphologically and syntactically, as shown in the figure below.

External case forms	Internal case forms	Locative forms
<i>tällä/välillä/tälle</i>	<i>tässä/tästä/tähän</i>	<i>täällä/täältä/tänne</i>
<i>tolla/tolta/tolle</i>	<i>tossalla/tostalta/tohon</i>	<i>tuolla/tuolta/tonne</i>
<i>sillä/siltä/sille</i>	<i>siinä/siitä/siihen</i>	<i>siellä/sieltä/sinne</i>

<< LESS ADVERBIAL << >> MORE ADVERBIAL >>

Table 2. The local case forms of the Finnish demonstratives (spoken forms) and the locative demonstratives arranged on a cline of adverbiality.

This section established that both the internal case forms and the locative forms of the demonstratives are used adverbially, in the sense that they form a looser bond with the noun phrase which they precede in terms of agreement than the external case forms of the demonstratives. Put together with the discussion in the previous section which showed that both the external case forms and the internal case forms (but not the locative forms) have grammaticized uses for non-local concepts, while both the internal case forms and the locative forms (but not the external

case forms) are used to speak about locations, we can now arrange the forms in question on a continuum of adverbiality.

The fact that the forms discussed here can not be unambiguously delegated to the classes of either pronouns or adverbs lends support to the suggestion of Hopper and Thompson (1984) that lexical categories should be viewed as abstract prototypes instead of discrete categories. These data are in accordance with Hopper and Thompson's observation that syntactic and morphological trappings characteristic of a particular lexical category accrue to linguistic items to the degree that the item is used for the function typical of that category. We see here that the external case forms, which are not used to speak about locations, lack the morphological and syntactic characteristics typical of adverbs, while the locative forms, which have only locative uses, are also the most adverbial. And the internal case forms, which have both the extended and locative uses are ambiguous morphologically and syntactically as well.

The next section concerns the differences between these two ways to refer to locations in Finnish.

6. Ways to talk about locations

Given that both the internal local case forms of the demonstratives and the locative demonstratives are used to talk about locations, how do speakers make the choice between them?

This topic has received quite a bit of attention in Finnish linguistics. Beyond the lexical category dispute, there has also been a rather wide variety of descriptions as to how the internal case forms differ from the locative forms.⁸ It has been suggested

⁸ This discussion has intersected with the wider question of the difference between the external and internal case marking in general, where the difference between the internal case forms and the locative forms of the demonstratives has been seen as a manifestation of this more general distinction. Such a suggestion has been made explicitly by Östman (1995) and is also implied by Hakulinen and Karlsson (1979:208). However, the distinction cannot be merely a consequence of the semantics of the case

that the difference resides in the exactness of reference, where the locative forms would be less exact than the internal case forms of the demonstratives (Siitonen 1979; Hakulinen and Karlsson 1979: 208). In contrast, Itkonen (1966: 421) proposes that the referents of the internal case forms are proximal, while the referents of the locative forms are distal. It has also been suggested that the area referred to by the internal case forms is bounded, while the area referred to by the locative forms is unbounded (Östman 1995); Östman also suggests that visibility could be a factor in the choice between the forms, so that the internal case forms would be associated with visibility, while the external case forms would include the possibility of non-visibility. Lehtinen (1967) has proposed that the size of the area is crucial, so that smaller areas would be referred to with the internal case forms, while the locative forms would refer to comparatively larger areas. On the other hand, Larjavaara calls the distinction 'areal opposition' (1990: 117-125) and indicates that the internal case forms situate a referent in a particular place within an area, while the locative forms refer to location within the bounds of an area.

In my opinion, all the views Finnish scholars have proposed on this topic are essentially correct. I regard them all as manifestations of a more comprehensive distinction which involves the conceptualization and linguistic expression of scenes in terms of figure and ground (Talmy 1978; 1983).

I suggest that speakers of Finnish use the internal case forms of the demonstratives for referents which are conceptualized as figures, while the locative forms are used for referents conceptualized as the ground. Accordingly, in keeping with Talmy's characterization of the properties of relatively figure-like vs. ground-like referents (1983: 230-231), further developed by

markers, since the demonstratives also have external case forms distinct from the locative forms, and the external case forms of the demonstratives do not make reference to locations, as has been discussed above.

Hanks (1992: 60-66), the referents (locations) expressed by the internal case forms of the demonstratives in Finnish tend to be relatively more foregrounded, more referential, smaller, geometrically simpler (point-like), more salient, anticipated, and proximal, and thus more likely to be visible than those expressed by the locative forms, whose referents (locations) will be relatively more backgrounded, less referential, larger, geometrically complex (with extent, shape, dimensionality), less salient, recalled, and distal, and thus less likely to be visible than the referents expressed by the internal case forms.

These characteristics cluster, so that a particular referent coded with an internal case form of the demonstrative may have several figure-like properties. They are also defeasible; a referent may lack some of the figure-like properties discussed above, and still be coded with an internal case form of the demonstratives.

The choice between the demonstrative forms does not have as much to do with the inherent, objective characteristics of the referent as it has to do with how a particular referent is conceptualized. Thus even an objectively bounded referent can be referred to with a locative form, as long as it is conceptualized as ground. In the following excerpt, part of which we have already seen as example (9) above, a child is taking new toys out of the box they came in.

(16) Hei,
PTCL
Hey,

.. ^tääll on,
TÄMÄ.LOC-ADE is
In here (there) are,

... Tääll on 'kummallekki näille
TÄMÄ.LOC-ADE is both-ADE-also TÄMÄ-PL-ALL

näköjään ^sukset.
apparently ski- PL

Looks like (there) are skis for both of these in here.

[PLAYMOBL]

The two uses of the adessive locative form *tääll(ä)* 'in here' in the second and third line of the example stand for the box from which the speaker is retrieving the toys. Consider that the speaker is not, as such, using the form to talk about the box as an object, but rather to talk about where the toys are. The box forms the ground, within which the toys are located. Thus, although the box is, of course, inherently a bounded space, it can be expressed with a locative form. Here, the box is relatively more backgrounded, less salient, less referential, and larger than the more foregrounded, more salient, more referential and smaller toys which emerge from it.

The fact that it is the conceptualization of a particular referent at a particular point in discourse, rather than the inherent qualities of a referent, which determines the forms used is revealed when we observe that speakers can switch to a locative form when the role of the referent in the discourse changes.

This is shown in the following example, also from the PLAYMOBL conversation. After the children have unpacked the toys from the boxes, their grandmother inquires whether the children have kept the boxes. One of the children assures her that the boxes have been kept, along with the plastic bags inside the boxes.

(17) Ja [^]pussitki on leikattu,
and bag-PL-PTCL is cut-P.PTC
And even the bags have been cut,

[^]sillee että sinne voi ..<P laittaa P>.
SE.MANN COMP SE.LOC-LAT can put-1 INF
so that (you) can put (them) in there.

[PLAYMOBL]

Although the speaker refers to the bags in line 87 with a lexical noun *pussitki* 'even the bags' in a way that is clearly figure-like

and referential, in the next line⁹ she uses a locative form, *sinne* 'in there' for the bags. Consider that in the first line, the noun phrase referring to the bags is plural; the locative demonstrative in the next line appears to have the same referent, but now the bags, coded with a locative form which fails to express a number distinction, are conceptualized as ground, a container where the toys may be placed.

However, the locations expressed by the internal case forms of the demonstratives can also be objectively more simple geometrically, or more point-like, and thus more exact than locations expressed by the locative forms, which are comparatively more complex, with extent and dimensionality, and thus less exact. This is shown in the next example, taken from a narrative where the speaker is describing the scene in an apartment where she had left a tap open:

- (18) A: ...Siel oli sillee että tota,
 SE.LOC-ADE be-PST SE-MANN COMP TUO-PAR
 It was (laid out) so that um,
 .. mm,
 um,
 .. parketti alko sitte niinku,
 parquet begin.PST then so-as
 (a) parquet (floor) began then like,
 ... Oli muovimatto keittiössä sit alko
 be-PST plastic-carpet kitchen-INE then begin.PST
 parketti.
 parquet
 There was a vinyl floor in the kitchen and then (a) parquet
 (floor) began.

⁹ In the interest of clarity, I have omitted one line, where another speaker is overlapping with the speaker whose utterance we are concerned with here.

B: .. Joo.
 PTCL
 Yeah.

A: .. Niin se oli niinku just **siihen** niinku,
 so SE be-PST so-as just SE-ILL so-as
 So it had like just there like,

se vesi oli just tullu **siihen**
 SE water be-PST just come-P.PTC SE-ILL
 The water had just come

parketin reunaan.
 parquet-GEN edge-ILL
 to the edge of the parquet.

... Et se %%,
 COMP SE
 So that it,

.. jos se ois <X siinä X> vallon kauan ollu vielä,
 if SE be-COND SE-INE very long be-P.PTC still
 if it had been there for a very long still,

ni se ois menny **sinne** **parketille.**
 so SE be-COND go-P.PTC SE.LOC-LAT parquet-ALL
 it would have gone onto the parquet.

[VESI]

The forms in which we are interested here are the bolded portions in A's second turn. Compare the use of the illative (internal case) form *siihen* 'there' in the first line of her turn and the prenominal use of the same form in *siihen parketin reunaan*¹⁰ 'to the edge of the parquet' in the next line with the use of the locative form in *sinne parketille* 'onto the parquet' in the last line. The location at

¹⁰ This phrase is a good example of the difficulties of distinguishing between the adverbial vs. the determiner uses of the prenominal demonstratives. The demonstrative is in an internal case form (the type that some scholars consider adverbs, while others claim they are just case forms, and not adverbs) and it agrees with the case of the rightmost member of the phrase *reunaan* 'to the edge'. We would have to determine whether the demonstrative is in fact showing case agreement or whether it is external to the phrase and just happens to have the same case.

the edge of the parquet is more exact and more geometrically simple (an edge being a line) than the suggested potential location on the parquet (the floor being a two-dimensional expanse); also, the latter expression leaves the part of the floor the water would have covered entirely open.

But I would still like to stress that what determines the speaker's choice between the locative forms and the case forms of the demonstratives is a matter of the speaker's viewpoint and ultimately the way the scene is conceptualized.

An example which clearly shows the effect of the speaker's shifting viewpoint on the choice of demonstrative form, as well as illustrating rather nicely the conceptual distinctions which these forms encode, is the following example, which comes from a narrative from the 1930s. The narrator is telling about a fox hunt. He is following the tracks of a fox in the woods, and it occurs to him that the fox may be at a wallow he is already familiar with.

(19) ... ja muistin,
and remember-PST-1SG
and I remembered,

... heill on siel toises pääs vuorta,
3 PL HUM-ADE is SE.LOC-ADE other-INE head-INE mountain-PAR
they have at the other end of the mountain,

... sellai kivi,
such rock
this rock,

jossa mie olin joskus nähny,
REL-INE 1SG be-PST-1SG sometime see- P.PTC
where I had seen in the past,

ketun makauksen ja,
fox-GEN wallow-ACC and
a foxwallow and,

... väläht mielehe että,
flash.PST mind-ILL COMP
(it) came to (my) mind that

- ... annas nyt olla,
let.IMP now be-1INF
let's see,
- ... sehän onki siel kiven pääl.
SE-PTCL be-PTCL SE.LOC-ADE rock-GEN top-ADE
it must be on top of the rock.
- ... Rupeen tarkkaamaan sit kiveä mut,
start-1SG look.for-3INF-ILL SE-PAR rock-PAR but
I start looking for the rock but,
- ... siell on niin lujaa mettää,
SE. LOC-ADE is so fast-PAR forest-PAR
the forest is so thick there,
- .. ei sit tahtonu näkyä sielt mut,
NEG.3SG SE-PAR want-P.PTC look-1INF SE.LOC- ABL but
it was hard to see it from there but,
- .. oli vähän niinku,
be-PST a.little so-as
(it) was a little as if,
- siin ois ollu jotakii siin kiven päällä
SE-INE be-COND be-P.PTC something SE-INE rock-GEN top-ADE
as if there had been something on top of the rock
- ... (I moved closer along the mountaintop and)
- .. näky että siin ol niinku kettu ois istunu
look.PST COMP SE-INE be-PST so-as fox be-COND sit-P.PTC
looked as if a fox were sitting there
- .. siin kiven päällä.
se-INE rock-GEN top-ADE
on top of the rock.

[KETTU]

In this example, the speaker first introduces a particular rock with a (formally indefinite) noun phrase *sellai kivi*, and reports his recollection that it is located on the other side of the mountain, *siel toises pääs vuorta*. The latter expression, preceded by the

locative form *siel*, has several ground-like properties; it is recalled, remote (the speaker is not on that side of the mountain), geometrically complex, and not visible at this point. In referring to the assumed location of the fox, the speaker again uses a locative form of *se, siel*, this time with the postpositional phrase *kiven pääl*¹¹ This location also has ground-like qualities, in that at this point in the story, it is recalled, remote (on the other side of the mountain), and thus not visible.

Observe that in the next bolded mention of the top of the rock, the speaker switches to an internal case form of *se*. This reflects the change in the speaker's reported perspective. At this point, the rock is visible, closer to the speaker, and anticipated, no longer recalled, as it was when the earlier mention was made; these are figure-like qualities, which, as I have claimed, are associated with the use of the internal case forms of the demonstratives. Thus it is the speaker's conceptualization of the referent, and not the inherent qualities of the referent, which determine the particular demonstrative form used for it.

7. Conclusion

This article concerned the categoriality and function of the local case forms and locative-adverbial forms of the Finnish demonstratives. I have suggested that the forms in question cannot be unambiguously assigned to the categories of pronouns

¹¹ That the locative forms and the internal case forms of the demonstratives can occur with postpositional phrases is another manifestation of their adverbiality. Postpositional phrases cannot take determiners; it would be ungrammatical to say *sillä kiven päällä* if one meant 'on the top of the rock', where the adessive form of *se, sillä*, would agree in case with the postposition *päällä* 'on top', although, as we can see, a locative preposed form can be used. On the other hand, prepositions can take determiners, and so it would not be ungrammatical to say *siin toises pääs vuorta* 'at the other end of the mountain', where the inessive form of *se, siin*, would agree with the preposition *pääs* 'at the end' (which also has an attribute *toises* 'another-INE', which is impossible with postpositions (Hakulinen and Karlsson 1979:154)).

and adverbs, but rather form a continuum with the external case forms being the least adverbial semantically, morphologically and syntactically, while the locative forms are the most adverb-like, with internal case forms in the middle. Both the internal case forms and the locative forms are used to speak about locations, while in these data, the external case forms are not used for locations.

These findings indicate that lexical categories are not discrete boxes into which linguistic items can be neatly sorted. Instead, as suggested by Hopper and Thompson (1984), they can be more profitably viewed as abstract prototypes. The closer the use of an item is to the prototype, the more morphological and syntactic characteristics typical of that category it acquires.

I have also proposed that a speaker's choice between the internal case forms and the locative forms of the demonstratives depends on whether the speaker is conceptualizing a particular location as a figure or as ground. In the spoken data discussed here, more figure-like locations are coded with the internal case forms of the demonstratives, while more ground-like locations are coded with the locative-adverbial forms. This explanation has the advantage that it offers a general conceptual distinction as a basis for the choice, while also being entirely compatible with all the earlier accounts, none of which alone can explain the full range of actual uses.

Appendix 1: Form Glosses

ABE – abessive; ABL – ablative; ACC – accusative; ADE – adessive; ADJ – adjective; ALL – allative; CAUS – causative affix; COND – conditional; COMP – complementizer; ELA – elative; ESS – essive; FREQ – iterative; GEN – genitive; HUM – human; ILL – illative; IMP – imperative; INE – inessive; INF – infinitive; LAT – lative; LOC – locative; MANN – manner; NEG – negation verb; NOM – nominative; PAR – partitive; PASS – passive; PERS – personal ending in the passive; PL – plural; PST – past tense; PTC – participle; PTCL – particle; Q – question clitic; REL – relativizer; SG – singular; SUP – superlative; TRA – translative

References

- Ahlman, Erik (1933) Adverbeista. [About Adverbs.] *Virittäjä* 37: 137-139.
- Airila, Martti (1940) Pronominitt. [The Pronouns.] *Virittäjä* 44: 301-314.
- Alhoniemi, Alho (1969) Välineen ilmaisemisesta tulosijan avulla tseremissin kielessä [About expression of instruments with allative case in Cheremis]. *Virittäjä* 73.
- Anderson, Stephen R. (1985) Inflectional morphology. In Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description. V. III Grammatical categories and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, Lyle and Alice C. Harris (1996) Syntactic doublets and language change. Paper given at the Annual Conference of the Linguistic Society of America. San Diego, California, January 4-7.
- Hakulinen, Auli and Fred Karlsson (1979) *Nykysuomen lauseoppia*. [Modern Finnish syntax.] Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Hakulinen, Auli and Eeva-Leena Seppänen (1992) The Finnish kato: From verb to particle. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18: 527-549.
- Hakulinen, Lauri (1979) *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys*. [The Structure and Development of the Finnish Language.] Helsinki: Otava.
- Hanks, William F. (1992) The indexical ground of deictic reference. In Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin (eds.) *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi and Friederike Hünemeyer (1991) *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa (1992) Intonation Units and their acoustic and syntactic correlates. MS. Department of Linguistics, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Sandra A. Thompson (1984) The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar. *Language* 60: 703-752.
- Huumo, Tuomas (1995a) Paikallissijan kieliopillistuminen datiiivi-genetiivin funktioon: Uralilaisen *n*-sijan ja itämerensuomalaisen adessiivin kehityksen vertailua. *Sananjalka* 37: 55-79.
- Huumo, Tuomas (1995b) Ongella Elmeri huitaisi Anselmia ongella. Lauseaseman vaikutuksesta eräiden adverbialityyppien tulkintaan. *Virittäjä* 99(1): 45-69.
- Itkonen, Terho (1966) Tutkimus suomen asyndetonista. *Virittäjä* 70: 402-423.
- Karlsson, Fred (1982) *Suomen peruskielioppi* [Basic Finnish Grammar]. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Korhonen, Mikko (1991) Remarks on the Structure and History of the Uralic Case System. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 83.
- Larjavaara, Matti. (1990) *Suomen deiksis*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

- Laury, Ritva (1995) *The interactional dynamics of demonstratives: The emergence of se as a definite article in spoken Finnish*. Unpublished dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara. Forthcoming as *Demonstratives in interaction: Emergence of a definite article in Finnish*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- (1996) Conversational use and basic meaning of Finnish Demonstratives. In Adele E. Goldberg (ed.) *Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Lehtinen, M. (1967) *Basic course in Finnish*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Östman, Jan-Ola (1995) Recasting the deictic foundation - using physics and Finnish. In Sandra A. Thompson and Masayoshi Shibatani (eds.) *Essays in semantics and pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schachter, Paul (1985) Parts-of-speech systems. In Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description. V. 1, Clause structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seppänen, Eeva-Leena (1995) *Pronominit tämä, tuo, se ja hän viittaamassa keskustelun osallistujiaan*. [The pronouns *tämä, tuo, se* and *hän* in reference to participants in a conversation.] Licentiate thesis. Department of Finnish, University of Helsinki.
- Siitonen, Kirsti (1979) Lokaalisten pronominaaliadverbien merkityseroista suomessa ja saksassa [Regarding differences in the meaning of local pronominal adverbs in Finnish and German.] In *Sanomia*. A festschrift in honor of the 60th birthday of Eeva Kangasmaa-Minn. Turku: Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 9.
- Talmy, Leonard (1978) Figure and Ground in Complex Sentences. In Joseph Greenberg et al (eds.) *Universals of Human Language*. V. 4. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Talmy, Leonard (1983) How Language Structures Space. In Herbert L. Pick and Linda P. Acredolo (eds.) *Spatial Orientation. Theory, Research and Application*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Tao, Hongyin (1996) *Units of Mandarin Conversation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ritva Laury
 Department of Linguistics
 California State University, Fresno
 Fresno, CA 93740-0092
 USA
 E-mail: ritva_laury@csufresno.edu