

Fluid intransitivity in Old Finnish

Fluid intransitivity designates the phenomenon that the intransitive subject (S) may be marked like a transitive subject (A) or an object (O) depending on the syntactic construction where it occurs. In Finnish, the S of existential and possessive clauses is marked like O in terms of case-marking and agreement.

This paper examines fluid intransitivity in Old Finnish through a corpus of intransitive clauses with indefinite subjects from Agricola's New Testament and the NT portion of the 1642 Biblia. I will examine various factor groups that may influence the variation found between A-like and O-like subjects in these clauses, such as polarity, quantity, clause type and others. I will then examine the relative strength of these factor groups by a multivariate analysis.

Results are that polarity is a stronger factor than quantity, and that possessive clauses exhibit O-like subjects to a greater degree than other clauses. Possible explanations for these results will be discussed.

1. Introduction
 - 1.1. Purpose and structure of this paper
 - 1.2. Existential and possessive clauses in Finnish
 - 1.3. The diachrony of existential clauses in Finnic
2. The corpus
3. General data
4. Factors affecting case-marking and agreement
 - 4.1. Polarity
 - 4.2. Divisibility
 - 4.3. Polarity and divisibility cross-tabulated
5. Factors affecting O-like marking
 - 5.1. Clause type
 - 5.2. Topical adverbials
 - 5.3. Lexical quantification
6. Multivariate analysis
7. Overview and discussion
 - 7.1. The question of language contact
 - 7.2. Overview of results

I. Introduction

I.1. Purpose and structure of this paper

In this paper, I intend to examine fluid intransitivity – a phenomenon that designates variation between object- and subject-like case-marking and agreement patterns of subjects in existential and possessive clauses –

in Old Finnish. I will introduce those case-marking patterns in Standard Finnish later in 1.2., and elaborate on some of the theoretical issues involved in their analysis, whereas in 1.3., I deal with some of the questions raised by the variation of those case-marking patterns in dialectal Finnish and other Finnic languages as to the diachronic development of existential and possessive subject constructions. Section 2 will describe the corpus, while section 3 describes general data about case-marking and agreement patterns. In section 4, I will treat two factors that directly affect the occurrence of partitive subjects, namely negation and quantity (which, following Itkonen (1980), I will treat in terms of divisibility). Section 5 will treat factors that I believe may indirectly affect case-marking and agreement patterns, by promoting either an underlying subject-like or object-like construction. These factors are clause type (that is, existential or possessive), the presence of an explicit indefinite modifier, and the presence of an adverbial topic. In section 6, I will attempt to compare the relative strength of these factors through a multivariate analysis. Section 7, finally, will deal with the issue of language contact and provide general conclusions.

1.2. Existential and possessive clauses in Finnish

Fluid intransitivity is a term introduced by Creissels (2008) and used by Metslang (2014: 66–68) to describe a phenomenon whereby the intransitive subject (S) may alternately be marked like the transitive subject (A) or like the object (O) depending on the specific construction in which S occurs, rather than, as with split intransitivity, on the specific verb. In the Finnic languages, the constructions that allow for O-like marking of S are so-called existential and possessive clauses.

The existential clause in Finnish is distinguished by a non-topical, usually indefinite subject argument (Vähämäki 1984: 285) and often, though not always, an expression of location in topic position. Though the verb typically expresses location, being, coming into being, etc., there appears to be no definite set of verbs that may occur in existential clauses (Vähämäki 1984: 346; Vilkuna 1989: 162–163). For example:

- (1) *kadu-lla o-n auto*
 street-ADE be-3SG car[NOM]
 ‘There is a car in the street.’

Although, as I will mention below, definite subjects occur occasionally in existential clauses, existential clauses and non-existential intransitive clauses may sometimes contrast in terms of subject definiteness. With clause (2) below, which differs from (1) only in terms of word order, the default reading of the subject would be definite:

- (2) *auto* *o-n* *kadu-lla*
 car[NOM] be-3SG street-ADE
 ‘The car is in the street.’

The clauses above conform to a cross-linguistic tendency for existential clauses (1) and locational clauses (2) to contrast in word order, and for this contrast to coincide with a contrast in definiteness (Clark 1978: 91–92; Wang and Xu 2013: 12). However, while the position of S is typically postverbal in Finnish existential clauses, it is by no means always so (Hakulinen et al. 2008 §893). It should also be noted that not all indefinite intransitive subjects occur in existential clauses (Schlachter 1958: 52): if indefiniteness is marked otherwise, for example through an indefinite pronoun or quantifier, subject case-marking may conform to that of A instead, as I will elaborate on further below.

Possessive clauses are structurally similar, as possession in Finnish is expressed by using a locational scheme (Stassen 2009: 48–50): a possessor marked with a local case is in topic position. The subject argument in a possessive clause differs from that of an existential clause in that it may easily be definite (4):

- (3) *minu-lla* *o-n* *auto*
 I-ADE be-3SG car[NOM]
 ‘I have a car/the car.’
- (4) *minu-lla* *o-n* *se* *kirja*
 I-ADE be-3SG that[NOM] book[NOM]
 ‘I have that book.’

In terms of case-marking, the subject of possessive and existential clauses conforms case-marking patterns typical of the object (Hakanen 1972: 44–45; Helasvuo 1996: 349). In examples (1)–(4) above, S is unmarked. However, this conforms to O-like marking in that, in Standard Finnish, O remains unmarked in clauses where no unmarked S can occur (Comrie 1975: 115–116). These include, for example, passive clauses and modal expressions

where the agent argument is marked with the genitive. Objects in Finnish are marked with the partitive if the clause is negated, the argument is quantitatively indefinite, or the verb is atelic or progressive in terms of aspect (Hakulinen et al. 2008 §930). Accordingly, in negated existential and possessive clauses, S is marked with the partitive, regardless of definiteness:

- (5) *kadu-lla e-i ole auto-a*
 street-ADE NEG-3SG be.CNG car-PTV
 ‘There is no car in the street.’
- (6) *minu-lla e-i ole si-tä kirja-a*
 I-ADE NEG-3SG be.CNG that-PTV book-PTV
 ‘I don’t have that book.’

Likewise, in accordance with Finnish object-marking, S in existential clauses is marked with the partitive if it signifies an open or unbounded quantity, that is, it is quantitatively indefinite (Siro 1957: 189), or alternatively, both notionally indefinite and divisible (Itkonen 1980). The interaction of quantification and definiteness in Finnish argument case-marking is highly complex and will be treated in some detail below. Here, the following examples should suffice:

- (7) *hana-sta valu-u vet-tä*
 tap-ELA flow-3SG water-PTV
 ‘Water is flowing from the tap.’
- (8) *minu-lla o-n kirjoja*
 I-ADE be-3SG book-PL-PTV
 ‘I have books.’

The third condition on which objects are marked with the partitive in Finnish, namely verbal aspect, is non-applicable to existential or possessive clause arguments (Vilkuna 1989: 159–160).

As mentioned, if the conditions for partitive case-marking do not apply, objects in Standard Finnish are unmarked in the absence of an unmarked subject argument. However, these conditions for unmarked objects do not apply to personal pronoun objects, which show a specific accusative marker *-t* (Hakulinen et al. 2008 §935). It is possible to construct a possessive clause with a pronominal subject marked with the accusative *-t*:

- (9) *onne-ksi minu-lla o-n sinu-t*
 luck-TRS I-ADE be-3SG you-ACC
 ‘Luckily I have you’

Hakulinen et al. (2008 §923) also mention an example involving a pronominal accusative subject in an existential clause, where, as I will exemplify further below, definite subjects may occasionally occur:

- (10) *tuo-ssa videonauha-n kohtaukse-ssa näky-y sinu-t-kin*
 that-INE videotape-GEN part-INE be.visible-3SG you-ACC-CLT
 ‘You, too, can be seen in that part of the videotape.’

The O-like marking of S in existential and possessive clauses has raised considerable theoretical interest. First of all, it has been argued that the subject of existential clauses is really an object, on some level of syntactic structure. This argument has been put forth by Wiik (1974), and, as far as pronominal subjects of possessive clauses are concerned, also Ikola (1954: 215), as well as Vilkuna (1996: 156–157) for possessive clauses in general. This analysis has in turn been criticized (Ikola 1954: 214; Hakanen 1972: 46). The issue is that the main verb in an existential clause is an intransitive one, which allows only one argument, namely a subject. In order to analyze this subject as an object, one would have to presuppose a deep structure with a transitive verb – and such an argument would have to be made within a theoretical framework (such as generative grammar) which needs to be accepted on its own merits. Even then, the proposal for a deep-structure object would have to have a broader explanatory value than just the case-marking of existential clauses in order not to be an *ad hoc* solution. Furthermore, such a solution would have to account for transitive clauses with partitive objects such as in the following example (11) – which have an explicit surface object. And, as Ikola (1954: 214) points out, the solution would lead to a situation in which the NP of (1) *kadulla on auto* ‘There is a car on the street’ would be an object, but that of (2) *auto on kadulla* ‘The car is on the street’ would be a subject, whereas the only semantic difference between them would be one of definiteness.

Alternatively, one may propose a neutral category between ‘subject’ and ‘object’, such as Karlsson’s (1982: 109) ‘ject’ (see also Vilkuna 1989: 156). However, such a category would need cross-linguistic support in order to be of real theoretical value, and furthermore, it would need to have wider

application in Finnish than the object-like subjects of existential clauses (Vähämäki 1984: 395).

The subjects of existential clauses are the keystone of Terho Itkonen's (1979) notion of 'inverted ergativity' in Finnish, as they form the subset of intransitive subjects that show object-like marking in terms of case, word order and agreement. This approach, according to which Finnish is ergative-like in that a subset of intransitive subjects align with objects, but ergativity is 'inverted' in that A, rather than S/O, remains unmarked, is followed in part by Nelson (1998: 98–105) as well as Sands and Campbell (2001: 274). If one does not *a priori* define subjects and objects in terms of case-marking, but rather in terms of verb argument structure, the fact that a number of subjects in Finnish behave like objects is not problematic: it just means that Finnish is not a perfectly well-behaved nominative-accusative language. The main problems with Itkonen's analysis lie not in the method itself, but in the apparent lack of cross-linguistic counterparts to the situation in Finnish. It has been regarded as something of a universal of ergative languages that the transitive subject is morphologically marked (ergative), but the intransitive subject as well as the object remain unmarked (absolutive) (Havas 2006: 105; Dixon 2010: 120). Even if we allow the basic case of the object in Finnish to be morphologically unmarked (Vähämäki 1984: 346), it still is marked in terms of word order at least. This said, there do seem to be counterexamples to the rule that ergative languages will show marked transitive subjects (Creissels 2009: 453–454), and one does not need to go as far as to label Finnish an ergative or an 'inverted ergative' language in order to agree with Itkonen's basic approach, which is to cast the system of subject and object case-marking in Finnish in a typological light.

A very different approach to the problem has been proposed by Helasvuo's (1996, 2001) and Huumo's (2003) recent research (see also Helasvuo and Huumo 2010). On the basis of a construction grammar approach, in which grammatical categories such as 'subject' and 'object' are not necessarily seen as given and no sharp line is drawn between the lexicon and the system of grammatical rules, these authors argue that the main argument of existential clauses is not a subject, as it does not conform to the main features of subjecthood in its most prototypical cases: aside from case-marking, word order and agreement (Helasvuo 2001: 33), there are the discourse properties of typical subjects which differ very much from those of the arguments of existential clauses (Helasvuo 2001: 100–103). No-

tably, existential clause arguments tend not to be tracked during discourse: they tend to be introduced once, but never revisited (Helasvuo 1996: 344). The arguments of existential clauses are seen as tightly linked to other properties such as the verb of the clause (and there is an undefined but restricted number of such verbs, making the existential clause somewhat lexically specific), which means one cannot speak of the subject of an existential clause without reference to the properties of the existential clause as a whole (as opposed to more prototypical subjects such as transitive subjects) (Helasvuo 2001: 101). Helasvuo (2001: 7, 13) thus speaks of *E-NP*, while Huumo (2003) uses the moniker *e-theme*. The term *E-NP* is used as well by Helasvuo and Huumo (2010: 171).

Importantly, the parameters that define existential clauses appear to be porous in a few respects. First of all, O-like subjects may, albeit marginally, occur with transitive clauses as well (Yli-Vakkuri 1979: 156–157; Sands and Campbell 2001: 264–266):

- (11) *Kieltenopettaj-i-a* *saa* *luona-mme* *työ-tä*
 language.teacher-PL-PTV get.3SG PSTP-PX1PL work-PTV
 ‘Language teachers will get work with us.’ (Sands and Campbell 2001: 265)

The sentence type exemplified by (11) seems to be transitional between the existential sentence with its O-like subject and a class of transitive sentences with topical objects and postverbal, indefinite non-agentive subject, described by Vilkuna (1989: 178–180):

- (12) *Puutarha-a* *ympäröi* *pensasaita*
 garden-PTV surround.3SG hedge[NOM]
 ‘The garden is surrounded by a hedge’ (Vilkuna 1989: 178)

Yli-Vakkuri (1979: 163–164) argues that transitive clauses with a partitive object are distinguished by specific verbs and conventionalized verb-object constructions (*seurata* ‘follow’, *kohdata* ‘encounter’, *saada surmansa* ‘die, lit. receive one’s death’, etc.). Furthermore, the subject phrase often includes an indefinite quantifier, e.g. *useita* ‘several (part. pl.)’, *joitakin* ‘some (part. pl.)’ (Yli-Vakkuri 1979: 167, 174–175).

Second, it seems that definite subjects do occur in existential clauses (Hakanen 1972: 53), though there is some difference of opinion on the acceptability of clauses like:

- (13) *Piha-lle ilmesty-i yhtäkkiä Virtase-n koira-t*
 yard-ALL appear-PST.3SG suddenly virtanen-GEN dog[NOM]-PL
 ‘Suddenly, Virtanen’s dogs appeared in the yard.’

This is approved of by Vähämäki (1984: 19). However, neither Sadeniemi (1955: 13) nor Ikola (1955: 326) would accept:

- (14) *Piha-lla juokse-e Niemelä-n lapse-t*
 yard-ADE run-3SG niemelä-GEN child[NOM]-PL
 ‘Niemelä’s children are running in the yard.’

The difference may lie in the adverbial *yhtäkkiä* ‘suddenly’: according to Vähämäki (1984: 291–292), definite subjects may occur in existential sentences if they express surprise. Note here that partitive subjects may often express incrementality (Huumo 2003: 469–470), a semantic feature specifically ruled out by the adverbial *yhtäkkiä*.

More clear-cut cases of definite subjects in existential clauses also exist. Though clause (15), in which the subject is a proper name, is rightly regarded as containing an indefinite subject by Vähämäki (1984: 286–287), namely, *Annaa* means ‘any person named Anna’ rather than a specific ‘Anna’, clause (16), a dialectal utterance mentioned by Ikola (1954: 227) contains an unquestionably definite proper name subject:

- (15) *Täällä e-i ole Anna-a*
 here NEG-3SG be.CNG Anna-PTV
 ‘There is no (person named) Anna here.’
- (16) *E-i-kö si-tä Tiina-a tullu’ si-rne*
 NEG-3SG-Q that-PART Tiina-PTV come-PTCP.PST.CNG there-ILL
Heikkala-an päin
 Heikkala-ILL toward
 ‘Didn’t that Tiina come to Heikkala?’

1.3. The diachrony of existential clauses in Finnic

The weakness of parameters such as verb intransitivity and argument indefiniteness in defining existential constructions is attested in Finnish dialects and other Finnic languages as well. Definite subjects may occur in existential clauses in dialectal Finnish (Setälä 1883: 7; Latvala 1895: 7; Kanisto 1902: 2), for example:

- (17) *e-i* *tääl-* *ollu* *tä-tä* *emäntä-ä*
 NEG-3SG here be-PTCP.PST.CNG this-PTV landlady-PTV
 ‘This landlady wasn’t here.’ (LA, Kokemäki)

The same phenomenon has been attested in other Finnic languages, for example South Veps:

- (18) *mam-dā-ž* *ile*
 mother-PTV-PX2SG NEG.be
 ‘Your mother isn’t there.’ (Kettunen 1925: 94)

Notably, Metslang (2012: 154, 160) does not regard subject indefiniteness as a defining feature of existential clauses in Estonian.

Transitive clauses may exhibit partitive-marked subjects in South Veps (Kettunen 1943: 50–51; Ritter 1989: 45–46) as well as in Livonian (Denison 1957: 128). In addition, divisible indefinite arguments such as in the earlier examples (7)–(8) are marked with the partitive in a much more restricted fashion than in Standard Finnish in a row of East Finnic languages, such as Kven (Beronka 1922: 6), Karelian (Ojajärvi 1950: 22–23) and Veps (Kettunen 1943: 46). The two South Veps examples below, for example, would receive partitive-marked subjects in Standard Finnish:

- (19) *i* *tuleškat* ‘*he* *šizlika-d* *i* *torakana-d*
 and begin.to.come PST.3PL lizard[NOM]-PL and cockroach[NOM]-PL
i *kaikutše-d* *hire-d*
 and all.kind.of[NOM]-PL mouse[NOM]-PL
 ‘And lizards appeared, and cockroaches, and all kinds of mice.’ (Kettunen 1920: 56)
- (20) *astu-bad* *per’t’-he* *razbajnika-d*
 step-3PL cottage-ILL bandit[NOM]-PL
 ‘And bandits stepped into the cottage.’ (Kettunen 1920: 88; this is the first mention of said bandits)

Nominative subjects governing agreement occur in existential clauses in Standard Estonian as well (Nemvalts 1996: 19). There is controversy surrounding the extent and historical background of these phenomena. The partitive-marked subjects with transitive clauses in South Veps, for example, have been argued by Ritter (1989: 45–46) to be the result of an analogical generalization internal to South Veps; however, similar phenomena have been noted in Finnish and Livonian. Ojajärvi (1950: 24) argued that the restricted

occurrence of partitive with divisible subjects in Karelian reflects an older state of affairs, conserved through contact with Russian. However, Ravila (1950: 458–459) cast doubt on the occurrence of the phenomenon as a whole, arguing that Ojajärvi's examples may have been affected by his elicitation technique. The attestation of similar phenomena in Veps and Kven, on the other hand, would suggest that the restricted occurrence of partitive subjects in East Finnic is genuine.

This raises questions regarding the extent to which the existential clause with its O-like subject argument can be reconstructed to Proto-Finnic. Though partitive marking of existential subjects as such occurs throughout the Finnic language area (Ojajärvi 1950: 128–129; Laanest 1982: 295), its earliest occurrence may not necessarily have amounted to the thoroughgoing O-like marking of existential and possessive S that occurs in Standard Finnish. This question is important, as certain features of the Finnic existential clause are shared with neighbouring language families: the genitive occurs as a subject marker in existential clauses in Latvian and Lithuanian under conditions similar to the partitive in Finnish (Bjarnadottir and De Smit 2013: 43–46). According to Larsson (1983), the partitive developed under Baltic influence as both a subject and an object marker in Finnic. To evaluate the role of language contact in the development of O-like subject marking in Finnic, however, a clearer picture of the extent and historical background of the variation of O-like subject marking within Finnic is needed. The present paper is intended to contribute toward building such a picture by studying fluid intransitivity in one variety of Finnic, namely Old Finnish, the literary language of Finland from its development during the reformation (1540s) to the time Finland became an autonomous duchy within the Russian empire (1809). This topic has hitherto hardly been researched, with the exception of the attention paid by Denison (1957) to Old Finnish examples in his research on partitive-marking in Finnic, and Forsman-Svensson's (2013 §26.1, 26.2) remarks on Old Finnish existential clauses. I will show that some of the variation encountered in Old Finnish may have consequences for the diachronic development of fluid intransitivity in Finnic as a whole.

2. The corpus

The basis of the corpus consists of two key Old Finnish texts: the New Testament translation of Mikael Agricola (*Se Wsi Testamenti*, 1548, henceforth A) and the corresponding New Testament section of the first Finnish

Bible translation (*Biblia*, 1642, henceforth B). The latter text depends in many aspects on the former: the 1642 Bible translation was the work of a committee led by the theologist Eskil Petraeus, which strove to correct many perceived sveticisms in Agricola's translation while at the same time, of course, building upon the groundwork laid by Agricola. This committee was the second appointed to direct the translation of the Bible: the first committee, led by Bishop Eric Sorolainen, failed to produce a printed version, though a manuscript translation may or may not have resulted from its work. Translations of the examples from the corpus mentioned below are my own, rather than based on any Bible translation, in order to facilitate understanding.

Defining selectional criteria for the corpus of clauses to be examined is complicated by the fact that existential clauses do not have any specific lexical or morphological marker. Furthermore, it cannot be taken for granted that existential clauses occur in Old Finnish with the same case-marking and agreement patterns as in Standard Finnish: the purpose of this article is to find out precisely whether they do. Therefore, the corpus of clauses should ideally contain all clauses that would correspond to existential and possessive clauses in Standard Finnish. I therefore selected all clauses that show both a) an indefinite subject argument and b) an intransitive main verb. This means that two areas of variation, namely the presence of definite subjects in existential clauses and the occurrence of partitive-marked transitive subjects, remain outside the scope of this investigation. It should be noted here that in Standard Finnish, indefinite S may be O-like (21) or A-like (22) in terms of case-marking and agreement (Schlachter 1958: 52) and that the corpus contains the Old Finnish equivalents of both clauses:

(21) *pöydä-llä o-n muutam-i-a mitale-j-a*
 table-ADE be-3SG several-PL-PTV medal-PL-PTV
 'There are several medals on the table.'

(22) *muutama-t mitali-t o-vat pöydä-llä*
 several[NOM]-PL medal[NOM]-PL be-3PL table-ADE
 'There are several medals on the table.'

Using indefiniteness as a selectional criterion is somewhat complicated, as indefiniteness need not be formally marked in Old or in Standard Finnish, and its interpretation may be highly contextual. For example, the subject of the following clause may, in principle, be interpreted in both ways:

- (23) *Silloin edheskeu-i-t* *Jesuse-n* *tyge / kirianoppenuua-t ia*
 then come.forth-PST-3PL jesus-GEN PSTP scribe[NOM]-PL and
Phariseuse-t *io-t-ca* *Jerosolima-st* *tullu-ua-t*
 pharisee[NOM]-PL which[NOM]-PL-CLT jerusalem-ELA come-PTCP-PL
ol-i-t
 be-PST-3PL
 ‘Then came to Jesus scribes and Pharisees, who came from Jerusalem...’
 (A, Matt. 15:1)

The scribes and Pharisees in (23) have not been mentioned before, and the relative clause is non-restrictive: the Pharisees and scribes from Jerusalem are not contrasted with any others. Thus, an indefinite reading (“some scribes”) is reasonable. On the other hand, scribes and Pharisees are (like the disciples, Romans, etc.) central, reoccurring actors in the gospel narrative, and ‘definite’ in the universe of discourse common to the narrator and the recipient: in terms of their actions in the narrative, their interaction with Christ, the Pharisees of clause (23) are representatives of the Pharisees as such. In this particular case, the subject argument could reasonably be regarded as indefinite, and the clause was therefore included in the corpus. However, the following clause was not:

- (24) *Teidä-n* *tykö-nä-n* *o-n* *aina* *waiwaise-t*
 you-GEN PSTP-ESS-PX2PL be-3SG always poor[NOM]-PL
 ‘The poor will always be with you.’ (B, Matt. 26:11)

The poor have been mentioned in the preceding clause, and therefore a reading of the argument as indefinite was hardly possible. The clause was thus excluded from the corpus, even though the subject shows O-like marking in its lack of agreement with the main verb.

Another clause that was excluded should be mentioned here, as it shows a partitive plural subject, which, as will be mentioned below, is fairly rare in A:

- (25) *Catzo* *ni-nen* *ialco-ij-a /* *io-t-ca*
 behold. IMP those-GEN.PL foot-PL-PTV which[NOM]-PL-CLT
sinu-n *Miehe-s* *hautas-i-t /* *o-uat* *Oue-n* *edes*
 your-GEN man-GEN.2SG bury-PST-3PL be-3PL door-GEN PSTP
 ‘Look! The feet of those who buried your husband are in front of the door.’
 (A, Acts 5:9)

The clause above is extraordinary in that a plural partitive co-occurs with a marked plural on the main verb, although some kind of contamination

with the intervening relative clause cannot be excluded. This is otherwise unknown in the corpus, and unknown in Standard Finnish as well. The clause was not included in the corpus, as the preceding modifier *ninen* determines the reference of the subject to such an extent it must be considered definite, i.e. ‘the feet of those’, with everyone of ‘those’ having two, rather than ‘there are feet of those...’ which would imply an open quantity of feet. Notably, source texts show marked definites here: Greek *οἱ πόδες* (Erasmus 1535), German *die füsse* (Luther 1541). The rare plural partitive and even rarer agreement pattern does deserve notice, however.

In order to analyze which factor groups affect the case-marking and agreement patterns of existential and possessive clauses in Old Finnish, the corpus should contain all the clauses of interest (here, those with indefinite S), but it is not necessary for it to be restricted to those clauses: the presence of some possibly definite, or ambiguous, subject arguments does not affect the analysis.

3. General data

The following table depicts the frequency of case-markers in the corpus of clauses with indefinite S in A (Agricola’s *Se Wsi Testamenti*) and B (the New Testament section of the *Biblia*):

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

Table 1: Case-marking of indefinite S in A and B

The categories are thus the following, aside from nominative and partitive, singular and plural: unknown, that is, cases where, for reasons of orthography, case-marking is ambiguous between nominative and partitive (26); and quantifier, which includes all numerals larger than 1 (which, in Finnish, are head phrases governing a partitive modifier), as in (27) but also expressions such as ‘many’, ‘much’, ‘more’, etc., as in (28). With most of these, the quantifier is again the head of the phrase and does not exhibit specific case-marking. With *moni* ‘many’, variation between nominative and partitive is in principle possible, but the partitive form *monta* tends to

be generalized in Standard Finnish (Hakulinen et al. 2008 §765), and this tendency cannot be excluded in Old Finnish. Therefore, it was grouped with quantifiers.

- (26) *jo-lla o-n walda maa-n Cuningas-t-en päälle*
 which-ADE be-3SG power-? land-GEN king-PL-GEN PSTP-ALL
 ‘Which has power over the kings of the land’ (B, Rev. 17:18)
- (27) *cadzo / täsä o-n caxi miecka*
 look.IMP here be-3SG two[NOM] sword(-PTV)
 ‘Look, here are two swords.’ (B, Luke 22:38)
- (28) *Sille ette si-lle yxineise-lle palio enembi Lapsia o-n*
 for that that-ADE lonely-ADE much more child-PL-PTV be-3SG
 ‘Because that lonely one has many more children.’ (A, Galatians 4:27)

The following table depicts the agreement patterns in clauses with indefinite S in A and B:

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

Table 2: Agreement patterns in clauses with indefinite S in A and B

The category “neutral” covers cases in which a singular S is governed by a verb marked with 3rd person singular (29). The category “explicit agreement” covers cases where the verb shows specific plural markers (regardless of whether S shows plural markers or whether it is a semantically plural, but morphologically singular noun) (30). Finally, the category “explicit non-agreement” covers cases where S shows plural marking (including plural partitive marking), but the verb does not (31). Note that agreement with plural partitive cannot occur in Standard Finnish, though this restriction does not appear to exist in Veps (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 658), and occasional examples occur in Old Finnish as well (see earlier example (25)).

- (29) *tul-i yxi hyue Huhu / ia*
 come-PST.3SG one[NOM] good[NOM] rumour[NOM] and
turuaine' wsisanoma se-n Jutta-n canssa-n seassa
 safe[NOM] new.report[NOM] that-GEN jew-GEN people-GEN PSTP
 'A good rumour, and a reassuring report, came to the Jewish people' (A, Preface)
- (30) *Ja cadzo / Engeli-t tul-i-t ja*
 and look.IMP angel[NOM]-PL come-PST-3PL and
palwel-i-t hän-dä
 serve-PST-3PL him-PTV
 'And look, angels came to serve him' (B, Matt. 4:11)
- (31) *Jo-lla on corwa-t cuulla / hän cuul-ca-n*
 who-ADE be-3SG ear[NOM]-PL to.hear he[NOM] hear-IMP-3SG
 'Whoever has ears to hear with, let him hear' (B, Matt. 11:15)

Tables 1 and 2 indicate that O-like marking of indefinite S, in terms of partitive case-marking and explicit lack of agreement, seems to be somewhat more common in B than in A. In A, plural partitive seems to be strikingly rare. Only nine examples occur in the material, such as:

- (32) *ia ol-i mös mu-i-ta Haax-i-a*
 and be-PST.3SG also other-PL-PTV boat-PL-PTV
hene-n cansa-ns
 he-GEN PSTP-PX3SG/PL
 'And there were also other boats with him' (A, Mark 4:36)
- (33) *ia minu-n alla-ni o-n sotamieh-i*
 and I-GEN PSTP-PX1SG be-3SG soldier-PL(-PTV)
 'And I have soldiers serving under me' (A, Luke 7:8)

Instead, in many clauses where one would expect partitive plural, nominative plural is used:

- (34) *ia mös Cauhistoxe-t ia swre-t Ihme-t*
 and also terror[NOM]-PL and great[NOM]-PL wonder[NOM]-PL
Taiuaha-st tapacta-uat
 heaven-ELA happen-3PL
 'And great terrors will happen, and great wonders from the heavens.' (A, Lk. 21:11)

Compare this to the equivalent clause in the 1992 Finnish Bible translation:

- (35) *Kauhittuttav-i-a asio-i-ta tapahtu-u, ja taivaa-lla*
 terrible-PL-PTV thing-PL-PTV happen-3SG and heaven-ADE
näky-y suur-i-a ennusmerkke-j-ä
 show-3SG great-PL-PTV sign-PL-PTV
 ‘Terrible things will happen, and great signs will be seen in the heavens.’

It seems that, with A at least, this phenomenon is paralleled with objects. As mentioned in the earlier examples (21–22), indefinite S may be marked like O, but also like A. With objects, there is no such variation: the objects in the two clauses below, which are both notionally and quantitatively indefinite, would have to be marked with partitive in Standard Finnish:

- (36) *Ja paluelia-t anno-i-t hene-lle coruapwsti-t*
 and servant[NOM]-PL give-PST-3PL him-ALL beating[NOM]-PL
 ‘And the servants gave him beatings’ (A, Mark 14:65)

- (37) *Mutama-t taas o-uat Pilco-i-a ia*
 some[NOM]-PL again be-3PL mockery-PL-PTV and
witzoituxe-t kersi-ny-et Ja wile sijttekin
 scourging[NOM]-PL suffer-PTCP.PST-PL and still then
Fangiuxe-t ia Torni-t
 imprisonment[NOM]-PL and tower[NOM]-PL
 ‘Others have suffered mockeries and scourgings, and more than that, imprisonments and dungeons’ (A, Hebr. 11:36)

Another possibility is that the corpus contains many clauses that are ambiguous as to definiteness, such as the earlier example (23). Some more examples:

- (38) *Catzo / silloin tul-i-t Tieteiije-t*
 look.IMP then come-PST-3PL wise.man[NOM]-PL
idhe-ste Jerusalemi-jn
 east-ELA Jerusalem-ILL
 ‘And look, then wise men came from the east to Jerusalem’ (A, Matt. 2:1)

- (39) *Ja catzo Engeli-t edheskeu-i-t /*
 and look.IMP angel[NOM]-PL come.forth-PST-3PL
ia paluel-i-t hen-de
 and serve-PST-3PL him-PTV
 ‘And look, angels came to serve him’ (A, Matt. 4:11)

In clauses (38) and (39) above, the most natural reading of the subject, marked in nominative plural, is indefinite (*some* wise men, and *some* angels), as they have not been mentioned previously in the relevant context and are introduced into discourse. Therefore, in Standard Finnish, they would be marked with the partitive. This alternative is chosen in the equivalent clauses in the 1938 Finnish translation of the Bible:

- (40) *tietäj-i-ä* *tul-i* *itäis-i-ltä* *ma-i-lta*
 wise.man-PL-PTV come-PST.3SG eastern-PL-ABL land-PL-ABL
Jerusalemi-in
 Jerusalem-ILL
- (41) *enkele-i-tä* *tul-i* *häne-n* *tykö-nsä*,
 angel-PL-PART come-PST.3SG he-GEN PSTP-PX3SG/PL
ja he tek-i-vät *häne-lle* *palvelus-ta*
 and they do-PST-3PL him-ALL service-PTV

However, both arguments represent re-occurring actors in the Gospel narrative. In that sense, they could be interpreted as definite. In Luther's 1545 translation, they are indeed marked with a definite article (which in and of itself could have affected the early Finnish translations):

- (42) *da kamen die Weisen vom Morgenland nach Jerusalem und sprachen* (Luther 1545)
 (43) *und siehe, da traten die Engel zu ihm und dienten ihm* (Luther 1545)

The relationship between the corpus and its source texts with regard to definiteness will be treated in more detail in section 7.1.

Research on definiteness has resulted in the establishment of a third category in between definiteness and indefiniteness, e.g. inferrable definites, which can be hearer-new and discourse-new, but yet interpretable as definite in a particular context, e.g. *door* in the clause *he walked by the Bastille and the door was painted purple*, where the preceding clause provides all the context for the hearer to understand precisely which door is being talked about (Prince 1988: 304–305). Similar instances are ‘weak definites’ or ‘bridging definites’ (Poesio 1994; Schwarz 2012), e.g. *side* in *the village is located on the side of a mountain*. Such arguments, where enough context is given in the surrounding discourse, or in an entailing clause such as in the latter example, are acceptable in existential constructions in several languages (Leonetti 2008: 132–133) and are argued by Schwarz (2012: 4) to be distinguished by specific articles in some Rhineland dialects of German.

The category of ‘weak definites’ overlaps with a subset of existential and possessive clause subjects that have been dubbed ‘half-definites’ by Penttilä (1955: 151–152), e.g.:

- (44) a) *Minu-lla o-n uude-t hampaa-t*
 I-ADE be-3SG new[NOM]-PL tooth[NOM]-PL
 ‘I have (a set of) new teeth’
- b) *Minu-lla o-n uus-i-a hampa-i-ta*
 I-ADE be-3SG new-PL-PTV tooth-PL-PTV
 ‘I have (an indeterminate number of) new teeth’
- (45) a) *Mieh-i-llä o-n kirvee-t mukana*
 man-PL-ADE be-3SG axe[NOM]-PL PSTP
 ‘The men had axes with them (each man had an axe with him)’
- b) *Mieh-i-llä o-n kirve-i-tä mukana*
 man-PL-ADE be-3SG axe-PL-PTV PSTP
 ‘The men had (an indeterminate number of) axes with them’

In clauses (44 a) and (45 a), the subject, which is in the nominative plural although not agreeing with the main verb, is given a context in which the hearer can infer what is being talked about, e.g. the particular set of teeth that I have, or the appropriate number of axes that each man would bear with him to carry out a specific task. In clauses (44 b) and (45 b), the usage of the partitive plural signifies that this context is not provided: I have some new teeth, but the hearer does not know which, or how many; the men carry a bunch of axes with them, perhaps for trading purposes, etc. These clauses (which will be treated in more detail below) have been generally treated under quantification, rather than definiteness: Siro (1957: 189) regarded them as notionally indefinite but quantitatively definite; Itkonen (1980) rejected the notion of quantitative indefiniteness and rather regarded the subjects of clauses such as (44 a) and (45 a) as indivisible, albeit indefinite.

One could argue subject arguments such as *Phariseuset* in (23) or *Engelit* in (39) to be similarly quantified, not by the immediate context of the clause but by the narrative as a whole: we do not know exactly which or how many Pharisees or angels appear, but we know from the Gospel as a whole what Pharisees and angels are, what they are supposed to do, whom they represent and what their role in the whole story is.

If that is so, subject arguments of this type should differ from typical existential clause arguments in one particular respect. Existential clause arguments in Finnish are generally not tracked in discourse: they are introduced but not followed up on (Helasvuo 1996: 344). Indefinite subject arguments that represent central actors of the narrative, however, would be expected to be tracked in discourse once they are introduced: to perform certain actions, to enter into dialogues, etc. Then, if a definiteness effect of the type above indeed occurs with plural subjects to the extent that it affects the distribution of plural nominative and plural partitive, a relationship between persistence in discourse and case-marking should be visible in the corpus.

The table below depicts the relationship between case-marking and discourse tracking of plural indefinite S in the corpus as a whole, with A and B combined:

Plural arguments in A and B	not tracked	tracked in the subsequent clause	tracked in later discourse
nominative, agreement	72	47	41
nominative, no agreement	41	6	6
partitive	23	9	6

Table 3: Marking and discourse tracking in A and B

The table shows clearly that non-agreeing nominatives and partitives mainly occur with arguments that are not tracked at all, whereas agreeing nominatives are overrepresented in similar fashion with arguments that are tracked in the following clause, or in later discourse.

However, another explanation is suggested by the fact that arguments that only occur in the subsequent clause behave similarly in terms of marking to arguments that are tracked in later discourse. Consider clause (39) and its translation equivalent in the 1938 Finnish Bible translation (41):

- (39) *Ja catzo Engeli-t edheskeu-i-t /*
 and look.IMP angel[NOM]-PL come.forth-PST-3PL
ia paluel-i-t hen-de
 and serve-PST-3PL him-PTV
 ‘And look, angels came to serve him’ (A, Matt. 4:11)

- (41) *enkele-i-tä* *tul-i* *häne-n* *tykönsä*,
 angel-PL-PTV come-PST.3SG he-GEN PSTP-PX3SG/PL
ja *he* *tek-i-vät* *häne-lle* *palvelus-ta*
 and they do-PST-3PL him-ALL service-PTV

In clause (39 a), the subsequent clause shows a coreferential deleted subject argument of a transitive verb. With existential clauses in Standard Finnish, this construction is impossible (Hakulinen 1982: 26), and indeed the later Finnish translation in (39 b) has an overt pronominal subject in the second clause. A coreferential deleted subject in (39 a) is made possible by the A-like marking of S in the preceding clause, and it is possible that A-like marking of S was introduced to fit the coreferentially deleted subject in order to more closely resemble source texts such as Luther's translation (see (42) and (43)). The following table depicts the occurrence of subsequent coreferential deleted arguments and case-marking:

Plural arguments in A and B	no subsequent coreferential deleted argument	subsequent coreferential deleted argument
nominative, agreement	122	38
nominative, no agreement	53	0
partitive	38	0

Table 4: Marking and coreferential deletion in A and B

As the table shows, the same restriction as in Standard Finnish occurs in Old Finnish: if intransitive S shows O-like marking in terms of case or lack of agreement, no coreferential deleted argument will follow. The number of agreeing plural nominatives followed by coreferential deleted arguments is high enough to have been able to affect the general distribution of case-markers.

The result is that there are a number of factors that could possibly be at the root of the high frequency of plural nominatives in the corpus: a general tendency for the nominative plural to be used with both objects and O-like subjects where Standard Finnish would show partitive; a possible definiteness effect affecting arguments denoting central characters of the narrative that are tracked into discourse; and the occurrence of coreferential deleted arguments which may be based on foreign models. As to the first of these factors, suffice it to say that this does seem to contradict

Denison's (1957: 181–186) thesis that the usage of the partitive object in Old Finnish confirmed, by and large, to that of Modern Finnish. There may be parallels with the East Finnic languages, where partitive case-marking is rarer than in Standard Finnish with quantitatively indefinite S, as mentioned above, but also to some extent with quantitatively indefinite O (Beronka 1922: 18; Kettunen 1943: 105–107; Ritter 1989: 70).

4. Factors affecting case-marking and agreement

Negative polarity and divisibility (or quantitative indefiniteness) are factors that will promote partitive marking and non-agreement: in Standard Finnish, negated objects and subjects in existential clauses, as well as divisible indefinite existential and possessive clause subjects and objects, are marked with the partitive.

4.1. Polarity

Negation appears to be the factor group where least variation occurs in the marking of S in existential and possessive clauses in the Finnic language area. In Metslang's study of existential clause subject marking in Estonian, negation is identified as the strongest factor affecting case-marking (Metslang 2012: 167), and whereas Veps, as mentioned, shows variation between nominative and partitive with divisible/quantitatively indefinite S, negated S in existential clauses is marked with the partitive (Kettunen 1943: 47–49) The following table depicts the distribution of case-markers in A and B, divided according to polarity:

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

Table 5: Case-marking and polarity

The following table depicts the same with agreement patterns:

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

Table 6: Agreement and polarity

The tables above show that polarity is a strong factor in agreement and case-marking: most, but not all, indefinite S in negated clauses are marked with the partitive; and explicit agreement in negated clauses does not occur in B and is extremely rare in A. Examples of the latter:

- (46) *Ett-e-i* *wiele* *paha* *himo* *ia* *syndi*
 that-NEG-3SG still evil[NOM] desire[NOM] and sin[NOM]
ie-uet *mei-hin* *ala-le-ns*
 remain-3PL we-ILL under-ALL-PX3SG/PL
 ‘That no evil desires and sin remain among us’ (A, Romans, Preface)

- (47) *quina* *ei-uet* *Töö-t* *poisiä*
 as NEG-3PL work[NOM]-PL remain.absent.CNG
 ‘The way in which works will not be absent’ (A, 3 John, Preface)

The construction in (46), with the main verb inflected in a negated clause, is completely unknown in Standard Finnish, though it does occur occasionally with Agricola and rarely elsewhere in Old Finnish (Savijärvi 1977: 222).

However, although partitive is very common in negated clauses (48), nominative does occur to an extent (49):

- (48) *Ninquin* *mu-i-lla* *iäsen-i-lle* *e-i* *ole*
 just.as other-PL-ADE member-PL-ADE NEG-3SG be.CNG
itze-ste-ns *walkiut-ta*
 self-ELA-PX3SG/PL light-PTV
 ‘Just as the other members do not have light in and of themselves’ (A, Matthew 6, comment)

- (49) *e-i ole yxi-gen swre-mbi ylestul-lut*
 NEG-3SG be.CNG anyone[NOM]-CLT greater-COMP come.forth-PTCP.PST
 ‘No-one greater has appeared’ (A, Matthew 11:11)

4.2. Divisibility

The interaction between indefiniteness, quantification and case-marking in Finnish is highly complex. In the 1950s, a discussion arose in Finnish linguistics on clauses such as the following, where a notionally indefinite and plural argument is marked with the nominative, which nonetheless does not force plural agreement markers on the verb (see also (44) and (45) above):

- (50) *koulu-ssa o-n huono-t opetusvälinee-t*
 school-INE be-3SG bad[NOM]-PL teaching.material[NOM]-PL
 ‘There are bad teaching materials in the school’,
 ‘The school has bad teaching materials’

Siro (1957) resolved the issue by arguing for two kinds of definiteness: notional and quantitative indefiniteness. The arguments of (50) would be notionally indefinite, but quantitatively definite, in that *opetusvälineet* in (50) refers to the total set of teaching materials that a school conventionally has, whereas the earlier example (45 a) is understood to imply that each man carries with himself one axe (Vilkuna 1992: 69).

This solution has remained widely accepted (for example, Hakulinen et al. 2008 §1421–1422), but has also received criticism: notably Itkonen (1980: 31–33), Vähämäki (1984: 28–29) and Vilkuna (1992: 52) have called into question whether notional and quantitative indefiniteness are really independent parameters. Whereas (50) represents a case of a notionally indefinite but quantitatively definite argument, it is unclear whether notionally definite but quantitatively indefinite arguments actually exist. The following clause has been presented as an example of such:

- (51) *tämä-n sarja-n os-i-a o-n sitoja-lla*
 this-GEN series-GEN part-PL-PTV be-3SG binder-ADE
 ‘Parts of this series are at the binder’

However, as Itkonen (1980: 31) points out, the modifier *tämän sarjan* does not suffice to determine the head *osia* to the point that it could be regarded

as definite: we do not know which parts are at the binder, and the argument is therefore notionally indefinite. Itkonen (1980: 35) instead proposes casting quantitative indefiniteness in terms of indivisibility. Arguments like those of (50) are contextually quantified to the point where they can be regarded as indivisible quantities.

Itkonen's solution is attractive because, in the case of singular nouns, divisibility is a semantic feature applicable to nouns signifying materials, foodstuff, etc., but not to nouns in general: indivisible singular NPs may of course be notionally definite or indefinite, but quantitatively indefinite only in a very restricted fashion (Penttilä 1956: 30):

- (52) *venet-tä näky-y jo nieme-n takaa*
 boat-PTV be.visible-3SG already peninsula-GEN PSTP
 '(Part of) the boat is already visible from behind the peninsula'

- (53) *jänis-tä o-n pöydä-ssä vielä jälje-llä*
 hare-PTV be-3SG table-INE still PSTP-ADE
 'There is still some hare left on the table'

The referent of S in (52) is, in principle, indivisible: half a boat is not another boat. However, in this specific clause, it is presented as being divisible in terms of what part is visible and what part is not. The referent of (52) is not an (indivisible) specimen of the animal species hare, but a (divisible) quantity of hare-meat. Cases such as (51), in which an indivisible referent can be represented, in the clause, as a divisible quantity, occur in a restricted fashion. The following clause would be, on the less horrific reading that the subject referent is in the process of getting up, at the very least highly dubious:

- (54) *?sängy-ssä o-n vielä poika-a*
 bed-INE be-3SG still boy-PTV
 'In the bed there is still (part of the) boy'

In contrast, singular divisible nouns can very well be notionally definite:

- (55) *ruoka o-n pöydä-llä*
 food[NOM] be-3SG table-ADE
 'The food is on the table'

All of this suggests that divisibility and notional definiteness are independent variables in Finnish, but quantitative and notional indefiniteness are not.

In short, O as well as S in existential and possessive clauses are marked with the partitive if they are notionally indefinite as well as divisible in terms of quantity. O and S that are quantified in a specific context, for example, signifying a contextually conventional amount (Vilkuna 1992: 61–64), behave like indivisibles. Such cases occur in the Old Finnish corpus as well:

- (56) *ia ol-i heide-n Pä-se-ns cullaise-t*
and be-PST.3SG they-GEN head-INE-PX3SG/PL golden[NOM]-PL

Crunu-t

crown[NOM]-PL

'And they had golden crowns on their heads' (A, Rev. 4:4)

- (57) *Ketu-i-lla o-n loola-t / ia Taiua-n linnu-i-lla*
fox-PL-AD be-3SG lair[NOM]-PL and heaven-GEN bird-PL-ADE

o-n pesä-t

be-3SG nest[NOM]-PL

'The foxes have lairs, and the birds of the heaven have nests' (A, Matt. 8:20).

In clause (56), there is one crown on each head, not an indeterminate number of crowns per head; similarly, in (57), each fox has his lair and each bird has his nest.

In this article, Itkonen's (1980) analysis is followed in that contextually conventional plural arguments such as (56) and (57), as well as *plurale tantum* arguments such as *hää-t* in example (58) below, were analyzed as indivisibles. Here, I also grouped arguments signifying paired body parts (59) as well as *hiukset* 'hair' (60):

- (58) *Ja colmande-na päiwä-nä ol-i-t hää-t*
and third-ESS day-ESS be-PST-3PL wedding[NOM]-PL

Galilea-n Cana-s

galilee-GEN Cana-INE

'And on the third day there was a wedding in Cana, in Galilee.' (B, John 2:1)

- (59) *Jo-lla o-n corwa-t cuulla / hän cuul-ca-n*
who-ADE be-3SG ear[NOM]-PL to.hear he[NOM] hear-IMP-2SG

'Whoever has ears to hear, let him hear.' (B, Matt. 11:15)

- (60) *jos häne-llä o-n pitkä-t hiuxe-t*
if he-ADE be-3SG long[NOM]-PL hair[NOM]-PL

'If he has long hair.' (B, 1 Cor. 11:14)

This means that divisibility, as a factor group, is independent from agreement, as a variable: plural and singular arguments may both be indivisible or divisible.

Table 8 depicts the distribution of case-markers in A and B according to divisibility. Table 9 depicts the same with agreement patterns.

A	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
indivisible	313	26	42	0	13	8
divisible	84	90	114	9	104	96
χ^2 (nom. vs. part.)	83.7 (significant)					
B	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
indivisible	313	22	34	1	7	8
divisible	136	75	114	31	102	116
χ^2 (nom. vs. part.)	91.4 (significant)					

Table 8: Case-marking and divisibility.

A	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
indivisible	369	12	21
divisible	342	105	50
χ^2 (explicit agreement vs. explicit non-agreement)	11.3 (significant)		
B	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
indivisible	353	11	21
divisible	399	75	100
χ^2 (explicit agreement vs. explicit non-agreement)	0.8 (not significant)		

Table 9: Agreement and divisibility.

The tables show a statistically significant correlation between case-marking and divisibility in that partitive tends to occur with divisible indefinite S in both texts; while in A, but not in B, there is also a statistically significant correlation between divisibility and agreement patterns (divisible arguments occur with explicit agreement markers to a greater extent in A).

These relations are nonetheless quite a bit weaker than those between marking and polarity. Whereas (61) and (62) below exemplify partitive-marked divisible arguments as one would expect based on Standard Finnish, (63) and (64) exemplify nominative-marked arguments, which occur fairly frequently, and which have been treated in more detail above:

- (61) *Ja e-i ole hei-lle söteue-t*
 and NEG-3SG be.CNG they-ADE food-PTV
 ‘And they do not have food’ (A, Matt. 15:34)
- (62) *ja tul-i rakeh-i-ta ja tul-da*
 and come-PST.3SG hailstone-PL-PTV and fire-PTV
were-llä secoite-ttu-a
 blood-ADE mix-PTCP.PASS.PST-PART
 ‘And hailstones fell, and fire mixed with blood’ (B, Rev. 8:7)
- (63) *Ja edheskeu-i-t hene-n tyge-ns*
 and walk.forth-PST-3PL him-GEN PSTP-PX3SG/PL
sockia-t ia onduua-t Templi-s
 blind[NOM]-PL and cripple[NOM]-PL temple-INE
 ‘And blind men and cripples walked forth towards him in the Temple’
 (A, Matt. 21:14)
- (64) *JA häne-n tygö-ns cocouns-i Phariseuxe-t /*
 and him-GEN PSTP-PX3SG/PL gather-PST.3SG pharisee[NOM]-PL
ja muutama-t Kirjanoppenu-i-sta
 and several[NOM]-PL scribe-PL-ELA
 ‘And at him gathered Pharisees, and several scribes.’ (B, Mark 7:1)

It should be noted that all the cases of contextually conventional plural NPs, such as in the earlier examples (56) and (57), are marked either with the nominative or with a quantifier. Aside from the aforementioned examples, there are also the following:

- (65) *Ja hen näk-i taa-mba-ta Fikunapuu-n /*
 and he[NOM] see-PST.3SG back-COMP-PTV fig.tree-ACC
iolla lehdhe-t ol-i-t
 which-ADE leaf[NOM]-PL be-PST-3PL
 ‘And further on he saw a fig tree, which had leaves’ (A, Mark 11:13)
- (66) *Mutta jo-i-lla uscollise-t Isännä-t o-wat*
 but who-PL-ADE faithful[NOM]-PL master[NOM]-PL be-3PL
 ‘But whoever has believing masters’ (B, 1 Tim. 6:2)

In (65), the leaves are the total set of leaves a tree conventionally has, and in (66), each referent of the relative pronoun is implied to have one master, not an indeterminate quantity of masters.

All of this suggests that divisible indefinite S is marked to a lesser degree with the partitive, and definitely not to a greater degree, than in Standard Finnish. This, again, may be simply the result of O-like indefinite S being marginalized in Old Finnish in favour of A-like indefinite S, both being in principle possible in Standard Finnish. However, it was observed above that particularly plural partitive-marked S was strikingly rare in the corpus, and that this, in A at least, occurred with plural partitive-marked O as well. This suggests that more may be going on than a simple competition of alternative constructions, and it should be noted that divisibility-based partitive is rarer in the East Finnic languages than in Standard Finnish. It may be that the Old Finnish material preserves a more archaic state of affairs.

4.3. Polarity and divisibility cross-tabulated

The following table cross-tabulates polarity and divisibility as factors affecting case-marking:

A		non-negated	negated	total
indivisible	nominative	321	18	339
	partitive	3	39	42
total		324	57	381
divisible	nominative	160	14	174
	partitive	61	62	123
total		221	76	297
B		non-negated	negated	total
indivisible	nominative	322	13	335
	partitive	4	31	35
total		326	44	370
divisible	nominative	74	16	211
	partitive	26	76	145
total		264	92	356

Table 10: Polarity, divisibility and agreement in case-marking

It clearly shows how polarity is the stronger factor of the two: the relative occurrence of partitives among negated arguments in general is much greater than that among divisible arguments in general. Cross-tabulating divisibility and polarity as factors affecting agreement is uninformative because, as is shown in Table 6, both explicit agreement and explicit non-agreement occur rarely with negated clauses.

5. Factors affecting O-like marking

The factor groups treated below – clause type, the presence of an indefinite modifier, and the presence of an adverbial phrase in topical position – are postulated to directly affect O-like or A-like marking of indefinite S, and thereby indirectly case choice (partitive or nominative) and agreement patterns. The presence of indefinite modifiers is expected to occur with subject-like marking to a greater extent as indefiniteness is already lexically expressed, leading to a preference for locational constructions of type (22) instead of existential constructions of type (21). With clause type, as I will argue below, the presence of a topical, typically human and therefore semantically subject-like possessor may lead to the subject, in turn, gaining stronger object-like features. And the presence of an adverbial topic could be expected to correlate with object-like case-marking of the subject for the same reasons.

As it should not be presupposed that case-marking and agreement are affected by these factors in the same way, statistics presenting the distribution of case-markers and agreement patterns will be presented as well as those depicting the distribution of A-like or O-like marking. The latter cannot be read directly from the former: a nominative singular argument, for example, is ‘neutral’ with regards to case-marking in a non-negated clause when followed by a 3rd person singular verb, but explicitly signifies S-like marking if it occurs in a negated clause (where one would expect the partitive).

5.1. Clause type

The following table depicts the distribution of case-markers in A and B, divided according to clause type. The moniker ‘existential’ in the following table covers all instances of indefinite S outside of possessive clauses, regardless of whether these are existential clauses according to the parameters of the construction in Standard Finnish or not:

A	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
existential	224	78	63	2	30	55
possessive	173	38	93	7	87	49
χ^2 (nom. vs. part.)	19.07 (significant)					
B	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
existential	235	67	66	20	35	67
possessive	214	30	82	12	74	57
χ^2 (nom. vs. part.)	3.1 (not significant)					

Table 11: Case-marking and clause type

The table below depicts agreement patterns in A and B, divided according to clause type:

A	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
existential	338	101	14
possessive	373	16	57
χ^2 (explicit agreement vs. explicit non-agreement)	82.5 (significant)		
B	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
existential	369	71	50
possessive	383	15	71
χ^2 (explicit agreement vs. explicit non-agreement)	35.2 (significant)		

Table 12: Agreement and clause type

The table below depicts the distribution of neutral, explicitly O-like an explicitly A-like marking, divided according to clause type. Here, non-agreeing plural nominatives as well as partitives were regarded as indicating O-like marking. The category ‘Unknown’ includes cases where, for orthographical reasons, it cannot be determined whether S is marked with the nominative or partitive.

A	A-like	Neutral	O-like	Unknown
existential	153	215	66	19
possessive	50	194	124	78
B	A-like	Neutral	O-like	Unknown
existential	136	230	97	27
possessive	53	213	119	84

Table 13: Alignment patterns and clause type.

Tables 11, 12 and 13 show clearly that features of O-like marking of S are more common with possessive clauses, both in terms of case-marking (a greater relative frequency of partitive) and in terms of agreement (a greater relative frequency of explicit non-agreement). In A, the differences are statistically significant at $p < 0.05$ according to a chi-squared test with both case-marking and agreement. In B, the relationship with case-marking is not significant, but it is close ($p = 0.079$). This relationship is also clearly visible in Table 13, which directly compares A-like and O-like marking with clause type. Here, it should also be noted that the category ‘Unknown’ is clearly overrepresented with possessive clauses and may conceal a significant number of partitive-marked S. In A, the relationship between marking and clause type appears to be somewhat stronger than in B.

One way of explaining this would be that the underlying semantics of the possessive clause are closer to that of a transitive clause, with the possessor being typically animate or indeed human, and the possessed typically inanimate. Here, it should of course be noted that the S of possessive clauses can be definite or indeed a personal pronoun (see (9) above), though such cases are excluded from this corpus. These semantic features could have led to a stronger object-like behaviour of indefinite S in possessive clauses. It should be noted here that some authors, such as Ikola (1954: 215) and Vilkuna (1996: 156–157), have entertained the notion that indefinite S in possessive (but not existential) clauses is indeed an object.

This explanation relates to a phenomenon which Stassen (2009: 209–210) dubbed *have*-drift: a cross-linguistic tendency for any major reanalysis of any possessive constructional type to be ‘directed’ towards a *have*-construction. Notably, Stassen (2009: 231–232) emphasizes that this type of diachronic change is attested with *with*-possessives (‘I’m with a dog’) and topicalized possessives (‘As for me, at me there’s a dog’) but not for locational possessives such as those exemplified by Finnish. Nonetheless,

Stassen argues that certain tendencies towards subject-like marking of the locational possessor phrase, and object-like marking of the possessed, may be discerned with locational possessives as well, such as the possibility of the locational possessor phrase in Hungarian to be coreferentially deleted in the subsequent clause (Stassen 2009: 241). Creissels (2013: 468–469, 2014: 36) has argued that Finnish exemplifies *have*-drift in the possibility for accusative-marked personal pronouns to occur as possessed arguments:

- (9) *onne-ksi minu-lla o-n sinu-t*
 luck-TRS I-ADE be-3SG you-ACC
 ‘Luckily I have you.’

According to Creissels (2013: 468–469), the accusative marker signifies that the possessed argument cannot be regarded as an inverted subject. However, the possibility of personal pronoun subjects to occur in possessive, but not existential, clauses is governed by the definiteness restrictions of Standard Finnish. Furthermore, accusative personal pronoun subjects do seem able to occur in existential clauses as well (see (10) above), and partitive-marked personal pronoun subjects may occur in Standard and dialectal varieties of Finnish, such as in the example below:

- (67) *ja mää tämmönem piäni ihmine e-i*
 and I[NOM] such[NOM] little[NOM] human[NOM] NEG-3SG
minnu-u näky-ny yhtää polstari-n alt
 I-PTV be.visible-PTCP.PST.CNG at.all mattress-GEN PSTP
 ‘And what with me being so small, I couldn’t be
 seen at all under the mattress.’ (SA, Pöytyä)

It is unclear to me why, in some very specific constructions, a *t*-accusative could not be a subject marker: all other morphological markers used in Finnish argument case-marking can mark both subjects and objects in specific constructions (e.g. the nominative, the partitive, but also genitive/accusative *-n* as subjects of certain non-finite constructions and *-t* as the marker of the nominative plural). However, the greater occurrence of O-like marking of indefinite S in possessive clauses in Old Finnish could indeed be an instance of *have*-drift.

Another explanation would be that, in Standard Finnish, the O-like S of existential clauses varies with an A-like S in intransitive clauses, as mentioned above (see examples (20) and (21)), but there is no similar variation with possessive clauses in Standard Finnish. S in a possessive clause will,

in Standard Finnish, invariably show O-like marking (e.g. partitive under specific conditions of polarity and quantification). Thus, perhaps through language contact with Old Swedish, medieval (Low) German, etc., O-like indefinite S in existential clauses such as clause (68) below could have become marginalized in favour of A-like indefinite S, as in clause (69):

- (68) *Nijn Jerusalemi-s asu-i Judalais-i-a / Jumala-ta*
 thus jerusalem-INE dwell-PST.3SG jew-PL-PTV god-PTV
pelkäväis-i-ä mieh-i-ä / caickinaise-sta Canssa-sta
 fearing-PL-PTV man-PL-PTV all.kind-ELA nation-ELA
 ‘Thus there were Jews living in Jerusalem, and
 god-fearing people of all nations’ (B, Acts 2:5)

- (69) *jo-i-sta cateus / rijta / häväistys*
 which-PL-ELA envy[NOM] quarrel[NOM] shame[NOM]
ja paha-t luulo-t tule-wat
 and evil[NOM]-PL thought[NOM]-PL come-3PL
 ‘From which envy, strife, shame and evil thoughts spring.’ (B, 1 Tim. 6:4)

This shift would be blocked with possessive clauses, which would have formed a more well-defined construction in Old Finnish through its greater lexical and semantic specificity (e.g. the lexical verb is virtually always ‘to be’, the theme a possessor adverb, etc.) as well as through its interlingual association with structurally very dissimilar constructions in the model languages (the ‘to have’ verbs in German, Swedish, etc.). This explanation is weakened by the fact that, while possessive clause S may be invariably O-like in Standard Finnish, it does vary in Old Finnish between O-like (70) and S-like (71) marking:

- (70) *caiki io-i-lla ol-i Sairah-i-ta moninais-i-s*
 all who-PL-ADE be.PST.3SG sick-PL-PTV many.kind-PL-INE
Taudh-i-s
 disease-PL-INE
 ‘Everyone who had sick people, with many kinds of diseases.’ (A, Luke 4:40)
- (71) *Ketu-i-lla lola-t o-uat ia Taiuahis-i-lla*
 fox-PL-ADE lair[NOM]-PL be-3PL and heavenly-PL-ADE
Linnu-i-lla pese-t
 bird-PL-ADE nest[NOM]-PL
 ‘The foxes have lairs, and the birds from the heavens have nests’ (A, Luke 9:58)

Table 13 as well shows that a significant number of indefinite S in possessive clauses still show A-like marking.

5.2. Topical adverbials

Assuming we are dealing with *have*-drift, that is, with possessive clauses being based on a more transitive underlying scheme because of the semantics of the possessor argument (typically human) and that of the possessed argument (typically inanimate), we should see a similar effect with topical adverbials in general. As mentioned, existential clauses often include a topical adverbial, for example, (68):

- (68) *Nijn Jerusalemi-s asu-i Judalais-i-a / Jumala-ta*
 thus jerusalem-INE dwell-PST.3SG jew-PL-PTV god-PTV
pelkäväs-i-ä mieh-i-ä / caickinaise-sta Canssa-sta
 fearing-PL-PTV man-PL-PTV all.kind-ELA nation-ELA
 ‘Thus there were Jews living in Jerusalem, and
 god-fearing people of all nations’ (B, Acts 2:5)

But this is not always the case. Clause (62) shows a subject argument that is postverbal, but the verb is not preceded by any adverbial phrase:

- (62) *ja tul-i rakeh-i-ta ja tul-da*
 and come-PST.3SG hailstone-PL-PTV and fire-PTV
were-llä secoite-ttu-a
 blood-ADE mix-PTCP.PASS.PST-PART
 ‘And hailstones fell, and fire mixed with blood’ (B, Rev. 8:7)

The Standard Finnish example (41) shows an O-like indefinite S that is preverbal and not preceded by any topicalized adverbial phrase. In terms of word order, (41) resembles a locational rather than a typical existential clause:

- (41) *enkele-i-tä tul-i hänen tykönsä,*
 angel-PL-PTV come-PST.3SG he-GEN PSTP-PX3SG/PL
ja he tek-i-vät häne-lle palvelus-ta
 and they[NOM] do-PST-3PL him-ALL service-PTV
 ‘Angels came to him, and they served him.’

The topical adverbial of existential clauses typically signifies a location, or a time, and therefore is not human, though a clause such as (72) is acceptable in Standard Finnish:

- (72) *minu-sta vuota-a ver-ta*
 I-ELA flow-3SG blood-PART
 ‘I’m bleeding’, lit.: ‘Blood is flowing from me.’

Possessive clauses, conversely, always show a possessor argument, which is typically human. Often, the possessor argument is in topic position, but not always:

- (73) *Mutta toinen Cunnia o-n nij-lle*
 but another[NOM] honour[NOM] be-3SG those-ADE
Taiualis-i-lla / Ja toinen nij-lle Maalis-i-lla.
 heavenly-PL-ADE and another[NOM] those-ADE earthly-PL-ADE
 ‘The heavenly (bodies) have one kind of honour, the
 earthly (bodies) another kind.’ (A, 1 Cor. 15:40)

I hypothesize that clauses with a topical adverbial phrase will show O-like marking to a greater extent, as the topical adverbial phrase has in common with typical subjects its topicality and its preverbal position, and that thereby the clause will have more in common with a typical transitive scheme than clauses showing no adverbial phrase, or a non-topical one. In possessive clauses, this effect should be much stronger due to the stronger subject-like features of the possessor phrase, but it should be discernible with non-possessive intransitive clauses as well.

Table 14 depicts the distribution of case-markers according to the presence or absence of a topical adverbial phrase, and Table 15 table depicts the distribution of agreement patterns according to the presence or absence of an adverbial phrase:

A	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
adverbial	268	69	119	8	107	75
no adverbial	129	47	37	1	10	29
B	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
adverbial	326	62	112	25	97	94
no adverbial	123	35	36	7	12	30

Table 14: Topical adverbial and case-marking of the subject

A	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
adverbial	529	55	62
no adverbial	182	62	9
B	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
adverbial	567	49	100
no adverbial	185	37	21

Table 15: Topical adverbial and agreement

The two tables clearly show that features indicating O-like marking, such as partitive case-marking and a lack of agreement, are much more common in clauses which do show a topical adverbial phrase. The same correlation clearly emerges from the following table, which directly compares alignment patterns and the presence of a topical adverbial, divided across constructions showing an explicitly A-like, explicitly O-like or a neutral construction:

A	A-like	Neutral	O-like	Unknown
adverbial	122	285	150	89
no adverbial	81	124	40	8
B	A-like	Neutral	O-like	Unknown
adverbial	127	316	170	103
no adverbial	62	127	46	8

Table 16: Topical adverbial and alignment patterns

Note, again, that most ‘Unknowns’ occur in clauses which show a topical adverbial phrase, and that the ‘Unknown’ category may hide many partitive-marked arguments.

These correlations, however, may simply result from O-like marking being more common in possessive clauses, and possessive clauses showing a greater number of topical adverbials. Table 17 cross-tabulates clause type and the presence of a topical adverbial.

Tables 14, 15 and 17 show that the vast majority of possessive clauses do, indeed, show a topical adverbial, and that correlations in the subgroup of existential clauses are much less clear. Though O-like marking does appear to be somewhat more common in clauses showing a topical adverbial phrase, the correlation is not significant in either text.

A		existential	possessive	total
adverbial	A-like	73	49	122
	Neutral	102	183	285
	O-like	37	113	150
total		212	345	
no adverbial	A-like	80	1	81
	Neutral	113	11	124
	O-like	29	11	40
total		222	23	
B		existential	possessive	total
adverbial	A-like	76	51	127
	Neutral	119	197	316
	O-like	62	108	170
total		257	356	
no adverbial	A-like	60	2	62
	Neutral	111	16	127
	O-like	35	11	46
total		206	29	

Table 17: Topical adverbial, clause type and alignment patterns cross-tabulated

This suggests that the positive correlation between marking and the presence of a topical adverbial in Tables 14–16 mostly result from O-like marking being more common in possessive clauses. The slight, but statistically insignificant, overrepresentation of O-like marking in existential clauses with a topical adverbial may indicate that the greater similarity to a transitive scheme exhibited by clauses with a topical adverbial may have a slight effect with existential clauses as well, and a much greater one in possessive clauses: in other words, we may be dealing with *have*-drift, which, with possessive clauses, could be facilitated by the presence of *have*-constructions in contact languages. However, it does not prove that this is the case, or disprove the alternative solution: that an alternative locational construction involving an A-like indefinite S is more readily available with non-possessive than possessive clauses.

5.3. Lexical quantification

As mentioned above, there is variation between A-like indefinite S and O-like indefinite S in intransitive clauses, with the exception of possessive clauses. However, if indefiniteness is not lexically expressed by an indefinite pronoun (e.g. *joku* ‘some (sg.)’) or an indefinite quantifier (*muutammat* ‘some, several’), the default reading of an A-like S would be definite (see examples (1) and (2) at the beginning of this article). It would therefore be interesting to examine whether the presence of an indefinite pronoun or quantifier is a factor in case-marking and agreement, specifically whether it is correlated with A-like marking of indefinite S.

Some examples follow. In the following clauses, indefiniteness is lexically expressed, and in (76), also through O-like marking of S:

- (74) *Ni-nen* *pä-le* *e-i* *ole* *si-lle* *toise-lla*
 those-GEN.PL PSTP-ADE NEG-3SG be.CNG that-ADE other-ADE
Colema-lla *yct-en* *woima*
 death-ADE any-PTV power.PTV
 ‘That other death has no power over them.’ (A, Rev. 20:6)

- (75) *ia* *mei-lle* *o-mpi* *yxi* *swri* *Pappi /*
 and we-ADE be-3SG one[NOM] great[NOM] priest[NOM]
Jumala-n *Hoonenhaltia*
 god-GEN steward[NOM]
 ‘And we have a high priest, the steward of God.’ (A, Hebrews 10:21)

- (76) *että* *wielä* *o-n* *muutam-i-ta* *ma-i-ta /* *ja*
 that still be-3SG several-PL-PTV land-PL-PTV and
Romi-n *Caupungi*
 Rome-GEN city[NOM]
 ‘That there are still some countries, as well as the city of Rome’ (B, Rev., preface)

In the following clauses, indefiniteness is not lexically expressed:

- (77) *Cu-lla* *tei-ste* *o-mpi* *Ysteue /* *ia* *mene-pi*
 who-ADE you-ELA be-3SG riend[NOM] and go-3SG
hene-n *tyge-ns* *poliöö-st* *ia*
 he-GEN PSTP-PX3SG/PL midnight-ELA and
 ‘Who among you has a friend, and goes to him at midnight, and’ (A, Luke 11:5)

- (78) *JA Phariseuxe-t tul-i-t häne-n tygö-ns /*
 and pharisee[NOM]-PL come-PST-3PL he-GEN PSTP-PX3SG/PL
kiusaman hän-dä
 to.test him-PTV
 'And Pharisees approached him, in order to test him.' (B, Matthew 19:3)

Table 18 depicts the distribution of case-markers in A and B according to the presence or absence of lexically expressed indefiniteness. Table 19 depicts the same with agreement patterns.

A	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
lexical	137	36	79	0	2	53
not lexical	260	80	77	9	115	51
χ^2 (nom. vs. part.)	10.7 (significant)					
B	nom. sg.	nom. pl.	part. sg.	part. pl.	unknown	quantifier
lexical	98	25	69	9	3	71
not lexical	351	72	79	23	106	53
χ^2 (nom. vs. part.)	29.2 (significant)					

Table 18: Case-marking and lexical quantification

A	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
lexical	242	51	14
not lexical	469	66	57
χ^2 (overt agreement vs. overt non agreement)	11.1 (significant)		
B	neutral	explicit agreement	explicit non-agreement
lexical	216	28	31
not lexical	536	58	90
χ^2 (overt agreement vs. overt non agreement)	1.2 (not significant)		

Table 19: Agreement and lexical quantification

The following table depicts the distribution of presence and absence of overt lexical quantification and alignment patterns:

A	A-like	Neutral	O-like	Unknown
lexical	53	170	82	2
not lexical	150	239	108	95
χ^2 (A-like vs. O-like)	12.7 (significant)			
B	A-like	Neutral	O-like	Unknown
lexical	41	149	81	4
not lexical	148	294	135	107
χ^2 (A-like vs. O-like)	12 (significant)			

Table 20: Alignment patterns and lexical quantification

The result is, surprisingly, that in both texts, overt lexical expression of indefiniteness favours partitive case-marking, and that in A (but not in B), overt lexical expression of indefiniteness also favours agreement. In other words, the two parameters of object-like marking show conflicting correlations in A. Table 20 shows, however, that overt lexical expression of indefiniteness significantly favours O-like marking in both texts. However, note from Table 18 and 20 that tokens where case-marking is unknown for orthographical reasons, and which therefore may be partitives, often tend to occur in clauses without overt lexical expression of indefiniteness: usually, indefinite pronouns and quantifiers are orthographically explicit in partitive case-marking.

A possible explanation for the second correlation, of overt lexical quantification favouring agreement in A, may be a tendency for *muutama* ‘several’ to appear with the nominative plural, e.g.:

- (79) *O-uat mutama-t nei-sse / io-t-ca*
 be-3PL several[NOM]-PL those-INE which[NOM]-PL-CLT
te-sse seiso-uat
 this-INE stand-3PL
 ‘There are several among those which stand here.’ (A, Mark 9:1)

It should also be noted that quantifiers such as *paljon* ‘many’ often govern plural agreement on the main verb in Old Finnish (though not in Standard Finnish):

- (80) *ia hene-n cansa-ns men-i-t palio hene-'*
 and he-GEN PSTP-PX3SG/PL go-PST-3PL many he-GEN
opetuslaps-i-a-ns
 disciple-PL-PTV-PX3SG/PL
 'And many of his disciples went with him.' (A, Luke 7:11)

A possible explanation for the first correlation, of overt lexical quantification favouring object-like case-marking, may be the presence of negative indefinite pronouns such as *ei yhtään* (see also (67) above):

- (81) *e-i-ke ol-lut hei-lle mi-te-ken sömis-t*
 NEG-3SG-CLT be-PTCP.PST.CNG they-ADE nothing-PTV-CLT eating-PTV
 'And they had nothing to eat' (A, Mark 8:1)
- (82) *e-i ole yh-tä-kän sure-mba-ta Johannes*
 NEG-3sg be.CNG any-PTV-CLT great-COMP-PTV John[NOM]
Castaja-ta tul-lut
 baptist-PTV come-PTCP.PST.CNG
 'None greater than John the Baptist has come.' (B, Matt. 11:11)

If this explanation is true, lexical quantification should favour partitive case-marking primarily in negated clauses. The following table cross-tabulates polarity and lexical quantification in accordance with case-marking patterns in B:

B		non-negated	negated	total
no lexical quant.	nominative	400	23	423
	partitive	40	62	102
	total	440	85	525
lexical quant.	nominative	117	6	123
	partitive	33	45	78
	total	150	51	201
total	nominative	517	29	602
	partitive	73	107	124
	total	590	136	726

Table 21: Polarity, lexical quantification and case-marking in B

The data from Table 21 invalidate the explanation proposed above: lexical quantification favours partitive case-marking in both negated and non-

negated clauses. Of the indefinite pronouns or quantifiers that frequently occur in A, some strongly tend towards nominative case-marking (such as the highly frequent *yksi* ‘one’, which is used as an indefinite article, as well as *muutammat* ‘several’, which does not occur with the partitive in A), while others tend towards partitive case-marking, including *ei yhtään* and *ei mitään* ‘none’, but also their non-negated counterpart *jota(k)in* ‘some, something’, the partitive-marked form of *jokin* ‘some’. There are 20 occurrences of *jota(k)in* in A; considering that the total number of partitives in non-negated clauses is 73, *jota(k)in* may partially account for the tendency for lexical quantification to favour partitive case-marking in non-negated clauses.

Another possibility is that some tokens of S which are really definite have been included in the corpus. I alluded to the difficulties with distinguishing indefinite and definite arguments above, and argued that the inclusion of some definite arguments does not make a difference in attempting to figure out which factor groups affect case-marking and agreement patterns; any corpus of clauses which includes all instances of indefinite S will do. While this is true, it presupposes that all factor groups are independent of definiteness. Obviously, the presence of an indefinite pronoun or quantifier is not. There is thus a possibility that the presence of such a pronoun or quantifier correlates with partitive case-marking because it involves only indefinite arguments, and only indefinite arguments may possibly be marked with partitive. While this possibility of interaction is troubling, I do not believe the proportion of doubtful indefinite cases to be so great as to lead to a significant correlation between lexical quantification and partitive case-marking.

The cause for the surprising correlation may rather lie in the interaction between lexical quantification and divisibility. Consider the following cross-tabulation of the two factors in A:

A		Divisible	Indivisible	total
Lexical quant.	nominative	38	135	173
	partitive	62	17	79
	total	100	152	252
No lexical quant.	nominative	136	204	340
	partitive	61	25	86
	total	229	197	426

Table 22: Lexical quantification, divisibility and case-marking in A

It is clear from the table that lexical quantification promotes partitive case-marking only in the category of divisibles: here, a clearly larger proportion of arguments in clauses that include overt lexical quantification are marked with the partitive than those in clauses that do not include overt lexical quantification. Among indivisibles, however, the ratios of the two groups are exactly identical (89 : 11). However, divisibles show a tendency to promote partitive case-marking also among clauses without lexical quantification, albeit to a lesser extent. This would suggest that lexical quantification is a dependent factor, whereas divisibility promotes partitive case-marking independently.

As with negation, as mentioned above, lexical quantification as a factor is not inherently dependent on divisibility, but this does not hold for the individual modifiers and pronouns involved. The most frequent ones in A are listed in the table below:

Indefinite modifiers, quantifiers and pronouns	Meaning	Number of tokens
<i>yksi</i>	‘a, one’	122
<i>ei mikään/mitään</i>	‘none, no’	21
<i>ei yksikään/yhtään</i>	‘none, no’	38
<i>jo(ta)kin</i>	‘something, some’	20
<i>muutama(t)</i>	‘several, some’	21
<i>paljon</i>	‘much’	26
<i>monta</i>	‘many’	20

Table 23: Indefinite modifiers, quantifier and pronouns in A

Of these modifiers, *yksi* strongly favours nominative case-marking and occurs with highly individualized, indivisible heads. However, *ei mikään* and *ei yksikään* strongly favour partitive case-marking, and the former generally occurs with divisible items, whereas the latter may modify or refer to either divisibles or indivisibles. Note from Table 22 that indefinite quantifiers tend to gravitate towards either nominative-marked indivisibles (such as *yksi*) or partitive-marked divisibles – aside from *ei mikään* also *jo(ta)kin*. The latter contribute to the skewed distribution in Table 22.

6. Multivariate analysis

A multivariate logistic regression analysis of the material was carried out with the help of the computer program Goldvarb. This method is based on the concept of variable rules developed in sociolinguistics: rules that may or may not be applied with a given statistical frequency, rather than categorically (Walker 2010: 17–19, 23–24). The material used here is, of course, written material rather than the spoken material used in sociolinguistic research. However, it has been noted that linguistic variation in Old Finnish, particularly the older texts, is often of a statistical rather than a categorical nature: though general tendencies governing the occurrence of specific variants can often be pinpointed, it is extremely difficult to find categorical rules underlying variation, and one easily finds syntactic variation in, for example, argument case-marking in virtually identical contexts (Inaba and Blokland 2001: 430; De Smit 2010: 113–115). The analysis provided by Goldvarb is binominal, which means that variants have to be reduced to two. For case-marking, nominative and partitive were picked as variants (which means that number has been left out of consideration); for agreement patterns, explicit agreement and explicit non-agreement were contrasted. The analysis proceeds by testing models, in which each factor group has a relative contribution or factor weight, against the raw data and picking the model that fits best (Walker 2010: 41–46). In addition to testing each given factor group for statistical significance, as was done above, this analysis thus provides us with a picture of the relative strength of each factor group in bringing about the distribution of variants in the corpus.

Tables 24–27 depict the results with, respectively, case-marking and agreement in A. Range signifies the difference between the higher factor weight (for example, positive clauses favouring nominative) and the lower (negated clauses favouring nominative), and thus gives a measure of the relative contribution of the factor group. Note that these tables include polarity and divisibility, which favour partitive case-marking directly, as well as clause type, lexical quantification and the presence of a topical adverbial, which favour partitive case-marking and non-agreement indirectly through favouring O-like marking of S.

To sum up, with case-marking, negation is the strongest factor promoting partitive case-marking of indefinite S in both texts, followed by divisibility. In A, possessive clauses favour partitive case-marking to a relatively greater degree than in B. With agreement patterns, the two texts differ

Relevant factor group	Influence	Range
Polarity	negation favours partitive	0.645
Divisibility	divisible favours partitive	0.583
Clause type	possessive favours partitive	0.440
Lexical quantification	quantification favours partitive	0.363

Table 24: Factor groups affecting case-marking in A

Relevant factor group	Influence	Range
Clause type	possessive favours non-agr.	0.668
Polarity	negated favours non-agr.	0.419

Table 25: Factor groups affecting agreement patterns in A

The following two tables depict the same in B:

Relevant factor group	Influence	Range
Polarity	negation favours partitive	0.611
Divisibility	divisible favours partitive	0.529
Lexical quantification	quantification favours partitive	0.381
Clause type	possessive favours partitive	0.242

Table 26: Factor groups affecting case-marking in B

Relevant factor group	Influence	Range
Clause type	possessive favours non-agr.	0.472
Divisibility	divisible favours non-agr.	0.257
Topical adverbial	topical adverb. favours non-agr.	0.193

Table 27: Factor groups affecting agreement patterns in B

more strongly: with A, the factor groups influencing agreement patterns are clause type followed by polarity; with B, clause type likewise affects agreement patterns, but it is followed by divisibility (with divisibility favouring non-agreement) and word order (with postverbal position favouring non-agreement). Polarity is not included because the effect of negation on agreement appears to be categorical rather than variable: there are no occurrences in B of explicit agreement markers in negated clauses. Lexical

quantification, finally, appears to affect case-marking only, and not agreement. Though I remarked above that lexical quantification interacts with divisibility, the analysis has selected it as an independent factor group.

Divisibility as a factor group favouring non-agreement is counter-intuitive. Likely, it is an artefact of the method. Consider the table below, where divisibility and clause type in B are cross-tabulated according to agreement patterns:

B		existential	possessive	total
divisible	non-agree	50	50	100
	agree	67	8	75
	total	117	58	175
indivisible	non-agree	0	21	21
	agree	4	7	13
	total	4	28	32
total	non-agree	50	71	121
	agree	71	15	86
	total	121	86	207

Table 28: Divisibility, clause type and agreement patterns in B

This shows that, when it comes to explicitly agreeing or explicitly non-agreeing indivisible arguments with existential, rather than possessive clauses, there are only four, and all show agreement markers. As clause type was selected as a factor group in the multivariate analysis, with possessive clauses favouring agreement, divisibility was also selected, with divisibles favouring non-agreement: excluding possessive clauses, non-agreement does not occur with indivisibles. Notably, if clause type is excluded as a factor group when the multivariate analysis is carried out, divisibility is not selected. As the numbers are very low, this says very little of the role played by divisibility in assigning agreement markers.

The statistics above combine factor groups which have a different effect: negative polarity promotes partitive case-marking, but not O-like marking as such; overt lexical quantification, on the other hand, should have an effect on alignment patterns and only indirectly on case-marking. If a test is carried out for only clause type, lexical quantification and the presence of a topical adverbial, with overt S-like marking and overt O-like marking as variables, the results are as follows:

Relevant factor group	Influence	Range
Clause type	possessive favours O-like	0.484
Lexical quantification	lexical quantification favours O-like	0.362

Table 29. Factor groups affecting alignment patterns in A.

Relevant factor group	Influence	Range
Clause type	possessive favours O-like	0.318
Lexical quantification	lexical quantification favours O-like	0.250

Table 30: Factor groups affecting alignment patterns in B

It thus appears that the presence or absence of a topical adverbial is only selected as a relevant factor for agreement patterns in B, but nowhere for case-marking, or for alignment patterns in general. It would seem obvious that, as suggested above, interference with clause type is at play, as possessive clauses overwhelmingly show topical adverbials, and tend towards O-like marking. However, carrying out a multivariate test for case while removing clause type as a factor leads to the same result: presence of a topical adverbial is eliminated as a factor. Hence, this must be a case of interference with some other factor group.

Consider the following two tables, cross-tabulating the presence of a topical adverbial with divisibility and overt lexical quantification in A:

A		Divisible	Indivisible	Total
No topical adv.	A-like	78	3	81
	O-like	29	11	40
	total	107	14	121
Topical adv.	A-like	103	19	122
	O-like	102	48	150
	total	205	67	272

Table 31: Cross-tabulation of divisibility, presence of a topical adverbial, and alignment patterns in A

A		Lexical quant.	No lexical quant.	Total
No topical adv.	A-like	33	47	81
	O-like	18	22	40
	total	51	70	121
Topical adv.	A-like	20	102	122
	O-like	64	86	150
	total	84	188	272

Table 32: Cross-tabulation of lexical quantification, presence of a topical adverbial, and alignment patterns in A

As is seen from the tables above, the distribution of O-like marking in clauses with topical adverbials is heavily skewed towards categories that also promote partitive or O-like marking, namely divisibles in Table 29 and clauses exhibiting overt lexical quantification in Table 30. The results are similar in B. Interference thus accounts for the absence of topical adverbials as a relevant factor group in the multivariate tests.

Recall that lexical quantification as a factor promoting O-like marking may be dependent on divisibility: many of the modifiers involved that are heavily skewed towards being marked with the partitive also usually refer to or modify divisibles. Table 31 provides no information on whether divisibility and the presence of a topical adverbial are independent or dependent factors: divisibility is a factor in case-marking, not alignment patterns. Note that Table 31 appears to show indivisibles skewing towards O-like marking, even though divisibles both favour partitive case-marking and non-agreement.

Table 33 cross-tabulates divisibility and presence of a topical adverbial as factors affecting case-marking rather than alignment patterns in A. The table shows that partitives are particularly strongly represented among clauses with a topical adverbial phrase and a divisible argument. However, divisibility seems to favour partitive case-marking in clauses without a topical adverbial as well, less strongly, but in a statistically significant manner. Within the category of indivisibles, partitives are represented in clauses with a topical adverbial to a slightly higher degree than in clauses without (12 and 8 percent, respectively), but the difference is not statistically significant. This suggests that divisibility is an independent, and the presence of a topical adverbial a dependent factor. Unlike the case of lexi-

		Divisible	Indivisible	Total
No topical adv.	nominative	71	105	176
	partitive	29	9	38
	total	100	114	214
Topical adv.	nominative	103	234	337
	partitive	94	33	127
	total	197	267	464

Table 33: Cross-tabulation of divisibility, presence of a topical adverbial, and case-marking in A

cal quantification, however, the dependent factor here cannot be shown to be clearly dependent on a more basic, lexical level: for some reason, there must be a tendency for clauses that contain a topical adverbial to also contain divisible arguments.

7. Overview and discussion

7.1. The question of language contact

Up to this point, fluid intransitivity in Old Finnish has been dealt with largely without reference to language contact. The reason is that the features under scrutiny here – case-marking and agreement in intransitive clauses with indefinite S – have no clear models in any of the source languages of the early Finnish Bible translations: Swedish, German, Latin and Greek. It was therefore necessary to explore the relation between variation in case-marking and agreement and internal factors before considering the question of language contact. All the same, the early Finnish Bible translations are translated texts, and the question of source language influence should be taken up. The following part is based on an examination of an excerpt of the material – A's translation of Luke's Gospel and its sources. Source texts are based on the Gustav Vasa Bible of 1541 (Swedish), Luther's German Bible of 1545, the Latin Vulgate, and Erasmus' Greek Bible of 1535. The total number of tokens in this excerpt is 133.

First of all, in the previous text, I described the variation in case-marking and agreement as variation between competing constructions with A-like (nominative and agreeing) subjects and O-like (nominative/partitive and non-agreeing) subjects (see examples 21 and 22). Both are acceptable

in Standard Finnish, but the occurrence of A-like subject constructions in Old Finnish appears to be more frequent than would be expected on the basis of Standard Finnish, with O-like subject constructions marginalized with, for example, plural indefinite subjects. This marginalization could be simply the result of source constructions following a standard intransitive scheme. In Swedish and German, dummy subject constructions often occur (83), but not always (84):

- (83) *NIn ol-i-t mutama-t sama-l aija-l sijne tyke-ne*
 thus be-PST-3PL several[NOM]-PL same-ADE time-ADE there PSTP-ESS
 ‘Thus several were present there at the same time’ (A, Luke 13:1)

Swedish: *På samma tidh, woro ther någhre tilstādhes*

German: *ES waren aber zu der selbigen zeit etliche dabey*

- (84) *Ja palio Caupungi-n Canssa keu-i hene-n*
 and much city-GEN people[NOM] go-PST.3SG he-GEN
cansa-ns
 with-PX3SG/PL
 ‘And many people from the city went with him’ (A, Luke 7:16)

Swedish: *Och en stoor hoop folck aff stadhen medh henne*

German: *Vnd viel Volcks aus der Stad / gieng mit jr.*

One type of presentational construction occurs in all source texts, namely one where the subject is signalled with Latin *ecce*, Greek *ιδὸν*, German *sihe* or Swedish *sij*. Agricola’s equivalent is *catzo* ‘look!’. One might think that *catzo*-constructions in Agricola could have been a mediator for the spread of A-like constructions, with the imperative verb serving as a lexically specific ‘anchor’ facilitating an identification between source and target language construction. However, a closer look at the material makes this doubtful. Though *catzo*-constructions occur widely, with definite subjects and transitive clauses as well, their number in A as a whole is only 30, about three percent of the whole. And whereas all *catzo*-constructions in the corpus either show A-like subjects or neutral constructions that can be interpreted either way, one clause not included in the corpus actually shows a definite partitive plural subject (24 above).

Earlier (examples (23), (38)–(41)), I raised the problem that some of the tokens in the corpus were ambiguous as to definiteness. This raises the question of the extent to which marked definites may have been used in the source languages for constructions here taken to have indefinite S; and

whether those marked definites may have conceivably influenced the frequency of A-like constructions, particularly with plural subjects. Of the 133 tokens in Luke's Gospel in A, 8 show marked definite source constructions in the Swedish Gustav Vasa Bible, 7 in Luther's 1545 Bible, and 4 in Erasmus' 1535 Greek Bible. No token has marked definite source constructions in all three of these source texts (Latin does not grammaticize definiteness); five have definite source constructions in two, and these are listed below:

- (85) *Nin ilmestu-i hene-lle HERRA-N Engeli*
 thus appear-PST.3SG him-all lord-GEN angel[NOM]
 'Thus, an angel of the Lord appeared to him' (A, Luke 1:11)
- Swedish: *Så syntes honom **Herrans** Ängel* (modifier implies definite reference)
 German: *ES erschein jm aber **der** Engel des HERRN* (definite article)
 Latin: *Apparuit autem illi angelus Domini*
 Greek: *ὡφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος Κυρίου* (indefinite)
- (86) *Sille ette tei-lle o-mbi tenepene syndy-nyt Wapactaija*
 for that you-ALL be-3SG today born-PTCP.PST saviour[NOM]
 'For today, a saviour has been born unto you.' (A, Luke 2:11)
- Swedish: *Ty jdagh är idher födder Frelsaren* (definite suffix)
 German: *Denn Euch ist heute **der** Heiland gebörn* (definite article)
 Latin: *quia natus est vobis hodie Salvator*
 Greek: *ὅτι ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν σήμερον σωτήρ* (indefinite)
- (87) *ia sielle istu-i-t mös Phariseuse-t/ ia lain opettaija-t/*
 and there sit-PST-3PL also pharisee[NOM]-PL and law teacher[NOM]-PL
 'And there were sitting Pharisees, and teachers of the law.' (A, Luke 5:17)
- Swedish: *och ther woro **the** Phariseer och Scrifftlärde sittianandes* (definite article)
 German: *Vnd sassen da **die** Phariseer vnd Schriftgelerten* (definite article)
 Latin: *Et erant pharisæi sedentes*
 Greek: *καὶ ἦσαν καθήμενοι Φαρισαῖοι* (indefinite)
- (88) *Hene-lle o-mbi Perkele*
 he-ADE be-3SG devil[NOM]
 'He has a devil' (A, Luke 7:33)
- Swedish: *Han haffuer dieffuulen* (definite suffix)
 German: *Er hat den Teufel* (definite article)
 Latin: *Dæmonium habet*
 Greek: *δαίμόνιον ἔχει*

- (89) *Mutta quitengin tul-i-t coira-t*
 but nonetheless come-PST-3PL dog[NOM]-PL
 ‘Nonetheless, dogs came...’ (A, Luke 16:21)

Swedish: *Doch komo hundar* (indefinite)

German: *Doch kamen die Hunde* (definite article)

Latin: *sed et canes veniebant*

Greek: *ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες ἐρχόμενοι* (definite article)

Examples (85), (86) and (88) concern singular nominative subjects which thus do not show either unambiguous A-like or O-like marking, and their inclusion in the corpus should not affect the result. The same does not necessarily go for the plural nominative, agreeing subjects in (87) and (89). In the excerpt concerned, a total of 15 plural nominatives (and 2 plural partitives) occur. Recall from Table 8 that, among divisible S, there are 90 plural nominatives and 9 plural partitives in A. Though it is hazardous to extrapolate from the small excerpt examined here, even if as much as twenty percent of these have definite source constructions in some source language, most of the overrepresentation of nominative plural, or, more exactly, the overrepresentation of A-like S in the corpus, would still remain unexplained.

One possible, more subtle effect of language contact should be mentioned here, however. Recall that clause type is a factor in both case-marking and agreement patterns in A: possessive clauses show a greater degree of both explicit non-agreement and partitive. The correlation that can be observed between the presence of a topical adverbial and O-like marking appears to be down to clause type as well: possessive clauses show a topical adverbial, namely a possessor adverbial, to a much greater degree than other intransitive clauses with indefinite S. The following Table 34 depicts word order patterns in the source texts according to the clause type in A, namely SV order (with a subject argument preceding the inflected verb) or VS word order (with a subject argument succeeding the inflected verb). Note that not all source constructions show a subject, and the numbers between the source texts therefore differ somewhat.

As the table shows, VS source patterns are relatively more common with source constructions of possessive clauses in all source languages except German (where subordinate clauses show verb-final word order patterns). Previously, I considered whether the greater frequency of O-like subject constructions among possessive clauses could qualify as an instance of *have-drift*: a tendency towards a construction more in line with

	Existential in A, SV in source	Existential in A, VS in source	Possessive in A, SV in source	Possessive in A, VS in source
Swedish	29	46	10	35
German	18	64	11	21
Latin	37	41	9	32
Greek	49	37	13	29

Table 34: Clause type and source language word order patterns in A

a *have*-verb. Not all possessive clauses in A have *have*-verbs in their source texts, but the vast majority of them do. And the object of possession of a *have*-construction is typically postverbal and grammatically an object in all four source languages in question here, with accusative case-marking in Greek, Latin and German. It seems possible that the combination of a typically postverbal, detopicalized position and of accusative case-marking and other trappings of objecthood in the source languages could have contributed to a trend towards O-like marking among the subjects of possessive clauses in Old Finnish.

7.2. Overview of results

Of the two factor groups that directly control case-marking and agreement, polarity appears to be the strongest factor group in both texts: in negated clauses, indefinite S strongly tends towards partitive case-marking and non-agreement. This, however, only amounts to a categorical rule with agreement in B: here, no indefinite S in negated clauses governs an agreeing verb. With case-marking, there seems to be no genuine difference between A and B: in B, roughly two-thirds of indefinite S in negated clauses are marked with the partitive, and the figure is slightly less in A. Divisibility is a factor in case-marking to a similar degree in both texts. Divisible arguments tend to occur with specific agreement markers more often in A than in B, though this does not show up in the multivariate analysis. Again, the rarity of plural partitives in A and a tendency for plural arguments to be marked with the nominative, and govern agreement, may be behind this. The tendency for divisible arguments to occur with explicit non-agreement in B appears to be spurious.

Divisibility is a weaker factor in assigning case-marking than would be expected based on Standard Finnish: plural indefinite S in particular is often marked with the nominative where we would expect partitive. A number of possible explanations have been raised above. To an extent, the occurrence of indefinite arguments that represent central actors in the Gospel narrative, such as angels, Pharisees and the like, and tend to be revisited in subsequent text, may influence statistical distribution. However, though some of these do occur with marked definite articles or modifiers in the source texts, their number appears to be small. More clearly, a number of plural nominative arguments occur with coreferential deletion in the subsequent clause, and the structure of the preceding clause may have been adapted to fit the possibility of coreferential deletion in the subsequent clause. However, not all cases of unexpected plural nominative can be explained in this manner. It can be shown in A that divisible objects, too, appear with plural nominative where partitive would be expected, which indicates that we may be dealing with a phenomenon affecting case-marking of divisible arguments in general. Divisibility-based partitives appear to occur more rarely in some East Finnic languages than in Standard Finnish, which means the situation in A may be archaic.

The area of plural nominatives is also one where case-marking patterns and agreement patterns diverge: plural nominative may or may not govern agreement markers on the verb. It should be remarked first of all that agreement is less reliable as an indicator of A-like or O-like marking of S than is case-marking: lack of agreement markers with 3rd person plural subjects is common in spoken and dialectal Finnish (Hakulinen et al. 2008 §1283). In Standard Finnish, the only possibility for a nominative plural to appear in an existential clause is when it signifies a contextually conventional amount, in other words, it is indivisible (examples (43 a) and (44 a) above). In possessive clauses, it may occur if S is definite. However, none of these cases in Standard Finnish will have agreement.

The situation in Old Finnish is different in that, in both A and B, nominative plural occurs where we would expect partitive plural in Standard Finnish – that is, outside of indivisible plural S – and in the vast majority of cases, it governs agreement. In this respect, the situation in Old Finnish is similar to that of Estonian in that Estonian existential clauses will always show agreement if the subject argument is a nominative plural (Nemvalts 1996: 19) and the same goes for many other Finnic languages as well (Hakkanen 1978: 64–65). The following is an example:

- (90) *Ja tul-i-t äne-t ia Pitkeise-t*
 and come-PST-3PL sound[NOM]-PL and lightning[NOM]-PL
ia Leimauxe-t
 and thunder[NOM]-PL
 'And there were noises, and lightning and thunder.' (A, Rev. 16:18)

To some extent, even indivisible arguments may govern agreement markers:

- (91) *Ja näk-i taa-mba-na ficunapuu-n / jo-sa*
 and see-PST.3SG back-COMP-ESS fig.tree-ACC which-INE
ol-i-t lehde-t
 be-PST-3PL leaf[NOM]-PL
 'And further on he saw a fig tree, which had leaves.' (B, Mark 11:13)

A much smaller number of cases occur in both texts where a nominative plural argument does not govern agreement on the verb. Most of these involve indivisible arguments, e.g.:

- (92) *Jo-lla o-n corua-t cwlla / se cwl-ka-n*
 who-ADE be-3SG ear[NOM]-PL to.hear he[NOM] hear-IMP-3SG
 'Whoever has ears to hear with, let him hear.' (A, Matt. 13:9)

Precisely the above phrase, and similar possessive constructions (e.g. involving *silmä-t* 'eyes'), are very frequent in the corpus. A smaller part of non-agreeing instances do not involve indivisible arguments, e.g.:

- (93) *JA häne-n tygö-ns cocouns-i Phariseuxe-t /*
 and he-GEN PSTP-PX3SG/PL gather-PST.3SG pharisee[NOM]-PL
ja muutama-t Kirjanoppenu-i-sta
 and some[NOM]-PL scribe-PL-ELA
 'And at him gathered Pharisees, as well as some of the scribes.' (B, Mark 7:1)

It seems to me that the frequent occurrence of possessive constructions such as (92), which represents a repeating turn of phrase in the Gospels, may account for the importance assigned to clause type in agreement in the multivariate analysis. Of clauses with nominative plural arguments and non-agreement, they make up a fairly big share.

Of the factors that should directly affect alignment markers, only clause type can be demonstrated as independently significant. Lexical quantification appears to interact with divisibility, and the presence or absence of a topical adverbial with both divisibility and lexical quantification: in

all these cases, divisibility seems to independently support partitive case-marking and non-agreement, with the two other factors dependent on divisibility (note, though, that lexical quantification is selected as a relevant factor group in the multivariate test, but the presence of a topical adverbial is not).

With clause type, there is a genuine difference between the two texts: it is a stronger factor in A, which means that there is a greater relative occurrence of partitive and explicit non-agreement in possessive clauses in A than in other clauses. In other, that is, existential clauses, on the other hand, agreement and nominative case-marking are more common in A. This may be partially conditioned by the fact that plural partitives are extremely rare in A, and somewhat more common in B. The tendency of possessive clauses to exhibit O-like alignment patterns to a greater extent than existential clauses may well be an example of what Stassen (2009) called *have*-drift: the tendency of possessive constructions to drift towards a more transitive underlying scheme, with the (locative) possessor exhibiting more subject-like behaviour and the possessed (which is the surface subject of the clause) to exhibit more object-like behaviour. This would be driven by the semantics of both arguments – the locative possessor is typically human, the possessed typically inanimate – but also possibly by *have*-constructions in contact languages such as German, Swedish and Latin. Language contact may be a stronger explanation than the more prototypically transitive scheme of the possessive clause. If the latter were a factor, one would expect arguments in clauses that have a topical adverbial (which resembles the prototypical subject at least in terms of topicality) in general to exhibit O-like marking to a greater degree. However, this cannot be demonstrated to be the case in either text, and the presence of a topical adverbial is consistently rejected as a factor in the multivariate tests carried out.

Fluid intransitivity, all in all, is significantly more marginal in Old Finnish than it is in Standard Finnish: O-like marking of indefinite intransitive subjects competes to a great degree with A-like marking, particularly in A, to a slightly lesser degree in B. O-like marking of S appears to be more common in possessive clauses than in other intransitive clauses. Of particular interest is the position of plural partitive S, which is very marginal in A. As mentioned in section 3, this appears to be matched by a marginality of plural partitive with O, and would thus not seem to be incompatible with O-like marking; however, the general occurrence of agreement

with nominative plural arguments does. As mentioned, divisibility-based partitive case-marking appears to occur in East Finnic languages, such as Veps and Karelian, on a more restricted basis than in Standard Finnish. As Agricola studied in Viborg and his works do show East Finnish features to some extent (Häkkinen 1994: 439–441), the marginality of plural partitive S may be related to its more restricted occurrence in East Finnic languages. It would have, to some extent, survived into the 1642 *Biblia* because of the relative lack of salience of the feature, as opposed to other features of Agricola's language, such as prefigated verbs, which were purged from B (Häkkinen 1994: 445). However, to support this hypothesis, more clarity on the occurrence of divisibility-based partitive S in languages such as Karelian as well as East Finnish dialects would be needed.

Merlijn De Smit
Dept. of Slavic and Baltic Languages,
Finnish, Dutch and German
Stockholm University
SE 106 91 Stockholm

Abbreviations

1SG	first person singular	ILL	illative
2SG	second person singular	IMP	imperative
3SG	third person singular	IN	inessive
1PL	first person plural	NEG	negative
2PL	second person plural	NOM	nominative
3PL	third person plural	PART	partitive
ABL	ablative	PASS	passive
ACC	accusative	PL	plural
AD	adessive	PST	past
ALL	allative	PTCP	participle
CNG	connegative	Q	interrogative suffix
GEN	genitive	TRS	translative
EL	elative		
ESS	essive		

References

Primary source material

- A = Agricola, *Se Wsi Testamenti*, 1548 = Mikael Agricolan Teokset osa II, Porvoo 1987. Digital Corpus. Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus, Helsinki. Last modified: 14.2.2007.
Available at <http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/vks/meta/agricola/agrizuti_rdf.xml>
- B = *Biblia: Se on: Coco Pyhä Ramattu Suomexi*, 1642. Digital Corpus. Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus, Helsinki. Last modified: 15.12.2006.
Available at: <http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/vks/meta/biblia/biblia_coll_rdf.xml>

Other source material

- Luther 1545 = Luther, *Biblia: das ist: Die gantze heilige Schrift: Deudsch*. Electronically available at: <<http://lutherbibel.net/>>. Last modified: 13.11.2010.
- Vasa 1541 = Gustav Vasas Bibel, 1541. Available at: <<http://project2.sol.lu.se/fornsvenska/Nysvenska/C.R05-GVB.html>>. Accessed: 04.05.2014
- Vulgate = Jerome's Vulgate (1598 version). Available at: <<http://www.sacred-texts.com/bib/vul/>>. Accessed: 04.05.2014.
- Erasmus 1535 = *Novum Testamentum*. Available at: <<http://www.originalbibles.com/erasmus-greek-new-testament-1535-pdf/>>

Other references

- BERONKA, JOHAN 1922: *Syntaktiske iagttagelser fra de finske dialekter i Vadsø og Porsanger*. Videnskapsselskapets skrifter II:10. Kristiania.
- BJARNADOTTIR, VALGERDUR & DE SMIT, MERLIJN 2013: Primary argument case-marking in Baltic and Finnic. – *Baltu Filologija* XXII (1). 31–65.
- CLARK, EVE V. 1978: Locational: Existential, Locative and Possessive Constructions. – Greenberg, Joseph H. (ed.): *Universals of Human Language 4*. Stanford University Press. Stanford. 85–126
- COMRIE, BERNARD 1975: The antiergative. Finland's answer to Basque. – *Chicago Linguistics Society* 11. 112–121.
- CREISSELS, DENIS 2008: Remarks on split intransitivity and fluid intransitivity – Bonami. – Olivier and Cabredo Hofherr, Patricia (eds): *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics 7*. 139–168. <http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss7/index_en.html>
- 2009: Uncommon patterns of core term marking and case terminology. – *Lingua* 119:3. 445–59.
- 2013: Control and the evolution of possessive and existential constructions. – Van Gelderen, Elly, Cennamo, Michela and Barðdal, Jóhanna (eds): *Argument structure in flux*. Benjamins. Amsterdam. 461–476.

- 2014: Existential predication in typological perspective (revised May 2014). <<http://www.deniscreissels.fr/public/Creissels-Exist.Pred.pdf>>
- DENISON, NORMAN 1957: *The partitive in Finnish*. Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden kirjapaino. Helsinki.
- DE SMIT, MERLIJN 2004: Negation in Old Finnish legal texts. – *Wiener elektronische Beiträge des Instituts für Finno-Ugristik* 2004-3.
- 2006: *Language contact and structural change. An Old Finnish case study*. Almqvist & Wiksell. Stockholm.
- 2010: On some problems of Old Finnish syntax – Saarinen, Sirkka, Siitonen, Kirsti and Vaittinen, Tanja (eds): *Sanoista kirjakieliin. Juhlakirja Kaisa Häkkiselle 17. marraskuuta 2010*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 259. Société Finno-Ougrienne. Helsinki. 113–128.
- DIXON, ROBERT M. W. 2010: *Basic linguistic theory Vol. 2: Grammatical topics*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- HAKANEN, AIMO 1972: Normaalityläuse ja eksistentiaalityläuse. – *Sananjalka*. 36–76.
- 1978: *Kontrastiivista lauseanalyysia. Eksistentiaalityläuseet*. Turun yliopiston Suomen kielen laitoksen julkaisuja 1. Turku.
- HAKULINEN, AULI, VILKUNA, MARIA, KORHONEN, RIITTA, KOIVISTO, VESA, HEINONEN, TARJA-RIITTA & ALHO, IRJA (eds) 2008: *Iso suomen kieliopin verkkoversio*. <<http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk/etusivu.php>>
- HAVAS, FERENC 2006: Die Ergativität und die Uralischen Sprachen. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 59. 81–131.
- HELASVUO, MARJA-LIISA 1996: Ollako vai eikö olla? Eksistentiaalityläuseen subjektin kohtalonkysymys. – *Virittäjä*. 340–356.
- 2001: *Syntax in the making. The emergence of syntactic units in Finnish conversation*. Benjamins. Amsterdam.
- HELASVUO, MARJA-LIISA AND HUUMO, TUOMAS 2010: Mikä subjekti on? – *Virittäjä*. 165–195.
- HUUMO, TUOMAS 2003: Incremental existence. The world according to the Finnish existential sentence. – *Linguistics* 41:3. 461–493.
- HÄKKINEN, KAISA 1994: *Agricolasta Nykykieleen. Suomen kirjakielen historia*. WSOY. Porvoo.
- IKOLA, OSMO 1954: Suomen lauseopin ongelmia I–III. – *Virittäjä*. 209–245.
- 1955: Suomen lauseopin ongelmia IV. – *Virittäjä*. 319–331.
- INABA, NOBUFUMI AND BLOKLAND, ROGIER 2001: Allative, genitive and partitive. On the dative in Old Finnish. – *Congressus Nonus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum 7–13. 8. 2000 Tartu. Pars IV*. Tartu. 421–431.
- ITKONEN, TERHO 1979: Subject and object marking in Finnish: An inverted ergative system and an “ideal” ergative sub-system. – Plank, Frans (ed.): *Ergativity: towards a theory of grammatical relations*. Academic Press. London. 79–101
- 1980: Spesies suomessa ja germaanisissa kielissä. – *Virittäjä*. 27–38.
- KANNISTO, ARTTURI 1902: *Lauseopillisia havaintoja Etelä-Hämeen kielimurteesta*. Suomi III:20. Helsinki.
- KARLSSON, FRED 1982: Kieliteorian relevanssi suomen kielen opetukselle. – Karlsson, Fred (ed.): *Suomi vieraana kielinä*. WSOY. Porvoo. 89–114.

- KETTUNEN, LAURI 1920: *Näytteitä Etelävepsästä I*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Helsinki.
- 1925: *Näytteitä Etelävepsästä II*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Helsinki.
- 1943: *Vepsän murteiden lauseopillinen tutkimus*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 86. Société Finno-Ougrienne. Helsinki.
- KING, RUTH 2000: *The lexical basis of grammatical borrowing. A Prince Edwards Island French case study*. Benjamins. Amsterdam.
- LA = *Lauseopin Arkisto*. Syntax Archive. University of Turku. <<http://www.utu.fi/fi/yksikot/hum/yksikot/suomi-sgr/palvelut-yhteistyö/arkistot/Sivut/home.aspx>>
- LAANEST, ARVO 1982: *Einführung in die ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Helmut Buske. Hamburg.
- LARSSON, LARS-GUNNAR 1983: *Studien zum Partitivgebrauch in den ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Studia Uralica et Altaica Upsaliensia 15. Acta Univ. Upsaliensis 1982. Uppsala.
- LATVALA, SALU 1895: *Lauseopillisia havaintoja Luoteis-Satakunnan kansankielestä*. Helsinki. Suomi III:12.
- LEONETTI, MANUEL: Definiteness effects and the role of the coda in existential constructions. – HØEG MÜLLER, HENRIK AND KLINGE, ALEX 2008 (eds): *Essays on nominal determination: From morphology to discourse management*. Benjamins. Amsterdam. 131–162.
- METSLANG, HELENA 2012: On the case marking of existential subjects in Estonian. – *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 25. 151–204.
- 2014: Partitive noun phrases in the Estonian core argument system. – Luraghi, Silvia and Huumo, Tuomas (eds): *Partitive cases and related categories. Papers from the partitives workshop (SLE annual meeting, September 2010)*. De Gruyter. Berlin. 177–255.
- NELSON, DIANE C. 1998: *Grammatical case assignment in Finnish*. Routledge. New York.
- NEMVALTS, PEEP 1996: *Case marking of subject phrases in Modern Standard Estonian*. Studia Uralica Upsaliensia 25. Acta Univ. Upsaliensis. Uppsala.
- OJAJÄRVI, AULIS 1950: *Sijojen merkitystehtävistä Itä-Karjalan Maaselän murteissa. Nominatiivi, genetiivi, akkusatiivi ja partitiivi. Vertaileva funktio-opillinen tutkimus*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 97. Société Finno-Ougrienne. Helsinki.
- PENTTILÄ, AARNE 1956: Subjektin totaalisuudesta ja partiaalisuudesta. – *Virittäjä*. 28–48.
- POESIO, MASSIMO 1994: Weak definites. – Harvey, Mandy and Santelmann, Lynn (eds): *SALT IV*. Cornell University. Ithaca. 282–299.
- PRINCE, ELLEN F. 1988: The ZPG letter. Subjects, Definiteness, and Information-status. – Mann, William C. and Thompson, Sandra A. (eds): *Discourse Description. Diverse linguistic analyses of a fund-raising text*. Benjamins. Amsterdam. 295–326.
- RAVILA, PAAVO 1950: Review of Ojajärvi (1950). – *Virittäjä*. 457–460.
- RITTER, RALF P. 1989: *Untersuchungen zum Partitiv im Wepsischen*. Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 26. Societas Uralo-Altaica. Wiesbaden.
- SAVIJÄRVI, ILKKA 1977: *Itämerensuomalaisten kielten kieltoverbi I: Suomi*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Helsinki
- 1988: Agricolan kieltolause – Koivusalo, Esko (ed.): *Mikael Agricolan kieli*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Helsinki. 69–93.

- SCHLACHTER, WOLFGANG 1958: Partitiv und Inkongruenz beim Subjekt des Finnischen. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 33. 3–95.
- SCHWARZ, FLORIAN 2012: Different types of definites cross-linguistically. Pre-final draft. <<http://www.florianschwarz.net/wp-content/uploads/papers/CrossLingDef.pdf>>
- SADENIEMI, MATTI 1955: Subjektin totaalisuudesta ja partiaalisuudesta. – *Virittäjä*. 10–18.
- SANDS, KRISTINA AND CAMPBELL, LYLE 2001: Non-canonical subjects and objects in Finnish. – Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., Dixon, Robert M. W. and Onishi, Masayuki (eds): *Non-canonical marking of subjects and objects*. Benjamins. Amsterdam. 251–305.
- SETÄLÄ, EEMIL NESTOR 1883: *Lauseopillinen tutkimus Koillis-Satakunnan kansankielestä*. Suomi II:16. Helsinki.
- SIRO, PAAVO 1957: Suomen kielen subjektista kielen rakenteen osana. – *Virittäjä*. 181–190.
- STASSEN, LEON 2009: *Predicative possession*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- VÄHÄMÄKI, BÖRJE 1984: *Existence and identity. A study of the semantics and syntax of existential sentences in Finnish*. Åbo Akademi. Turku.
- VILKUNA, MARIA 1989: *Free word order in Finnish. Its syntax and discourse functions*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Helsinki.
- 1992: *Referenssi ja määräisyys suomenkielisten tekstien tulkinnassa*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Helsinki.
- 1996: *Suomen lauseopin perusteet*. Edita. Helsinki.
- WALKER, JAMES A. 2010: *Variation in linguistic systems*. Routledge. London.
- WANG, YONG AND XU, JIE 2013: A systemic typology of existential and possessive constructions. – *Functions of Language* 20:1. 1–30
- WIIK, KALEVI 1974: Suomen eksistentiaalilauseiden ”subjekti”. Turun Yliopiston Fonetikan laitoksen julkaisuja 13. Turun Yliopisto. Turku.
- YLI-VAKKURI, VALMA 1979: Partitiivisubjektin toiset juuret. Eräs kvantiteetin ilmaisujärjestelmän ilmentymä. – Kallio, Jussi, Häkkinen, Kaisa and Kytömäki, Leena (eds): *Sanomia. Juhlakirja Eeva Kangasmaa-Minnin 60-vuotispäiväksi 14.4.1979*. Turun Yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 9. Turun Yliopisto. Turku. 155–192.