

## **Object case alternation in Finnish complement clauses under negation: A quantitative study**

Olli Silvennoinen (Åbo Akademi University), Héloïse Calame (University of Helsinki), Matti Miestamo (University of Helsinki), Ksenia Shagal (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich) & Chingduang Yurayong (University of Helsinki)

As is well known, the contrast between total and partitive objects (see examples (1a) and (1b)) is neutralised in negative clauses in Finnish and other Finnic languages (see (2)). Less appreciated is the fact that this partitive of negation can occur across clause boundaries (see however Almqvist 1987). Thus, in (3), both total (realised as genitive) and partitive objects are possible even though the adverbial *loppuun asti* ‘until the end’ forces a perfective reading, consistent with a total object.

In cases such as (3), we can infer competing motivations (Du Bois 1985): the semantics of the complement clause would motivate a total object with genitive case, while the negation in the main clause motivates a partitive object. This leads us to ask which factors are associated with either total or partitive object in complement clauses under negation in Finnish. To answer this question, we turn to corpus data, more specifically the Suomi24 corpus, which represents discussion forum discourse from the website of the same name. The corpus was queried for a selection of 15 complement-taking predicates that were negated. The predicates represent various semantic classes (Noonan 2007), which have been found to correlate with different degrees of structural integration in previous studies (see Givón 1980). The resulting dataset of approximately 4,400 tokens was annotated for a number of variables such as type of complement clause (finite, participial, infinitival), constituent order (between verb and object), type of verb phrase (mood, voice), and type of object (noun, pronoun, adjective). The data is then analysed statistically using logistic regression.

The corpus data will be used to test typological predictions regarding structural integration in different types of complement clause (e.g. along the hierarchy proposed by Cristofaro 2003). We hypothesise that complement clauses that are more structurally integrated (i.e. infinitival and participial clauses) will have more partitive objects. We also hypothesise that object marking will show distance effects such that

objects that precede the verb in the complement clause will be more likely to have partitive objects. The findings will also be discussed against a larger areal frame, with reference to similar phenomena in cognate Finnic and neighbouring Indo-European languages in the Circum-Baltic area such as Lithuanian (Arkadiev 2016).

### Examples

(1)a. Hän piti **puheen.**

3SG hold.PST.3SG **speech.GEN**

‘He/She gave a speech.’

b. Hän piti **puhetta.**

3SG hold.PST.3SG **speech.PAR**

‘He/She was giving a speech.’

(2) Hän ei pitänyt {**\*puheen** / **puhetta**}.

3SG NEG.3SG hold.PTCP **speech.GEN** / **speech.PAR**

‘He/She didn’t give a speech / He/She wasn’t giving a speech.’

(3) En tiennyt hänen pitäneen {**puheen** / **puhetta**}

NEG.1SG know.PTCP 3SG.GEN hold.PTCP.GEN **speech.GEN** / **speech.PAR**

loppuun asti.

end.ILL until

‘I didn’t know that he/she gave the speech until the end.’

### Abbreviations

3SG = third person singular, GEN = genitive, ILL = illative, NEG = negation, PAR = partitive, PST = past tense, PTCP = participle

### References

- Almqvist, I. 1987 *Om objektsmarkering vid negation i finskan*, PhD diss., U Stockholm.
- Arkadiev, P. M. 2016. Long-distance genitive of negation in Lithuanian. In A. Holvoet & N. Nau (ed.), *Argument realization in Baltic*, 37–82. John Benjamins.
- Cristofaro, S. 2003. *Subordination*. OUP.
- Du Bois, J. W. 1985. Competing motivations. In J. Haiman (ed.), *Iconicity in syntax*, 343–365. John Benjamins.

Givón, T. 1980. The binding hierarchy and the typology of complements. *Studies in Language* 4. 333–377.

Noonan, M. 2007. Complementation. In T. Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, Vol. II: *Complex constructions* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.), 52–150. CUP.