

CLAIMS ABOUT SYNTACTIC CHANGE AND FINNISH
HISTORICAL SYNTAX

Lyle Campbell

State University of New York, Albany
and
Memorial University of Newfoundland

ABSTRACT

This paper examines a number of important claims that have recently been made concerning syntactic change. These include the role of surface structure reanalysis and the thesis of the autonomy of syntax (e.g., Lightfoot 1979, Muysken 1977); the claims that syntactic change precedes morphological change (e.g., Givón 1971, Lightfoot 1979), and that syntactic change affects main clauses prior to subordinate clauses (e.g., Givón 1984); the role of grammaticalization of lexical elements in syntactic change (e.g., Givón 1984, Langacker 1977); and the principle of synonymy, or the extent to which synonymous lexical items are subject to the same rules of diachronic syntax (e.g., Ard 1975). These claims are tested by application to several well-known developments in Finnish historical syntax.

1. Introduction

Recent years have witnessed immense growth in the enthusiasm for diachronic syntax. In this literature, proposals for the explanation of syntactic change abound, but with little agreement. This is illustrated at the broadest level by the following quotes from one of the most recent books on syntactic change (Fisiak 1984):

the longer I deal with linguistics the more certain I am that language is a simple phenomenon and that all true explanations of language phenomena are equally simple. (Mańczak 1984:242)

nowadays it is often questioned whether explanation of linguistic change, and particularly syntactic change, is possible at all. (Gerritsen 1984:114)

My purposes in this paper are to consider a few important claims about syntactic change and to test their explanatory value against several documented, well-understood syntactic changes in Finnish grammar. It is hoped that understanding of historical syntax will be advanced by examining how explanatory claims fare against actual cases, and also that the discussion will help explain some aspects of Finnish historical syntax.

2. Reanalysis

Syntactic reanalysis based on misunderstanding or reinterpretation of surface structure similarities and ambiguities has received much attention, often discussed in connection with transparency/opacity (cf. Allen 1977, Breckenridge and Hakulinen 1976, Langacker 1977, Lightfoot 1979, Muysken 1977, Timberlake 1977, among others). The following Finnish example illustrates this most commonly proposed kind of explanation of syntactic changes.

Finnish (and its close relatives) underwent the sound change of final *-m to -n. Formerly, the accusative singular (*-m) and genitive singular (*-n) had been distinct, but after the sound change these were left homophonous, both -n. Thus, for example, the distinct pronouns, e.g. *minu-m I-ACC and *minu-n I-GEN ('my'), were no longer distinguishable, both minu-n. This 'opacity' led to reanalyses. The partitive case already functioned to signal objects in many instances, e.g. partial (not totally affected) objects, and objects of negative verbs. Since humans, whom the pronominal forms represent, are not normally acted upon in parts or pieces, either the partitive or the accusative case could be employed in compensation for the now ambiguous accusative form in order to signal a full pronominal object. Thus, in Old Finnish (and in Estonian and Votic, as well), the partitive (e.g. minu-a I-PARTITIVE) took the place of the accusative in pronouns in order to prevent misunderstanding with the genitive case, which had become identical in shape with the accusative. Old Finnish texts have examples of pronominal objects in both the partitive case and in the ambiguous genitive-like accusative. However, in time Finnish stabilized its accusative singular for pronouns with yet another alternative reanalysis; namely, it called upon the plural accusative ending (-t) to signal the singular accusative of pronouns. This would occasion no misunderstandings, since there is no plural/singular contrast for these pronominal objects. Thus today Finnish pronouns bear the following endings, as illustrated for 'I':

minä	NOMINATIVE
minu-t	ACCUSATIVE (cf. miehe-t [man-PL.ACC] 'men', miehe-n [man-ACC.SG, GEN.SG] 'man, man's')
minu-a	PARTITIVE
minu-n	GENITIVE

Given the surface-structure ambiguity of the genitive and accusative singular cases, Finnish reanalyzed cases for pronouns, first by employing the partitive case in place of the ambiguous accusative, and then later by employing the plural accusative (cf. Hakulinen 1968, Ikola 1968).

While this example is relatively straightforward, other reanalyses in the history of Finnish grammar bear on the validity of several theoretical claims. The following case will prove instructive for a number of such claims, to be considered presently.

A reanalysis involving Finnish participial constructions has been much written about (cf. Anttila 1972, Breckenridge and Hakulinen 1976, Hakulinen and Leino 1985, Ikola 1959, Svensson 1983, Timberlake 1977, etc.). In one construction with verbs of perceiving and saying, the participial phrase functions as the surface object of the main verb, with the participle's surface (as well as its logical) subject in the genitive case, e.g.:

- 1) näe-n miehe-n tule-va-n
see-I man-GEN.SG come-PRES.PRT-ACC.SG

'I see the man coming/I see that the man is coming'

- 2) huomasi-i-n miehe-n juo-nee-n vet-tä
notice-PAST-I man-GEN.SG drink-PAST.PRT-ACC.SG water-PART.SG

'I noticed that the man drank/had drunk water'

Today the whole participial phrase (with the genitive surface/logical subject as one of its modifiers) functions as a sentential object of the main verb. Originally, the construction had a different form and a different analysis. Corresponding to (1), Proto-Finnic had (3):

- 3) *näe-n miehe-m tule-va-m
see-I man-ACC.SG come-PRES.PRT-ACC.SG

(same meaning as 1)

The constituent structure did not represent a sentential object phrase, as in Modern Finnish. Rather, the NP in the accusative case was the surface object of the main verb, while the participle was its adjectival modifier or complement. The reanalysis was triggered by the same sound change as seen above, where final *-m changed to -n, leading the accusative singular and the genitive singular to be homophonous, both -n. This syncretism of case endings led to the reanalysis in which the former accusative case of the NP, the former surface object of the main verb, was misidentified as a genitive, as the surface (as well as logical) subject of the participle, with the participle itself being taken to be the object of the main verb. This reinterpretation is particularly clear from plural nouns, where the accusative and genitive were not homophonous. Thus Old Finnish had examples such as:

- 4) nä-i-n venee-t purjehti-va-n
 see-PAST-I boat-ACC.PL sail-PRES.PRT-ACC.SG

'I saw the boats sailing/I saw the boats sail'

This corresponds to the Modern Finnish:

- 5) nä-i-n vene-i-den purjehti-va-n
 see-PAST-I boat-PL-GEN sail-PRES.PRT-ACC

(same meaning as 4)

(For detailed arguments, see Breckenridge and Hakulinen 1976, Hakulinen 1968, Ikola 1959, Timberlake 1977). I now turn to the several implications of this example.

2.1. Surface structure continuity

It is often repeated that one constraint on syntactic change is surface structure continuity from one generation to the next. Some have suggested that reanalysis can involve only reinterpretation of the structure, but that the actual surface configurations must remain unchanged (cf. for example, Muysken 1977:169). This claim, however, clearly cannot be maintained, given the abundant counter-examples. In the Finnish participial construction, for example, with the reanalysis of the former accusative surface object of the main clause as a genitive surface (and logical) object of the participial phrase, the surface forms did not all remain unchanged. The accusative plural (-t), as in (4) above was replaced by the

very different genitive plural (-i-den), as in (5) above, showing lack of surface structure continuity in plural forms. As Allen (1977:386) aptly puts it:

morphological identity of lexical items plays an important role in generalization and reanalysis. Even when two constructions still have distinct analyses...reanalysis may come about even when there is evidence in the language learner's data against the new analysis of a construction. While one might propose a theory of syntactic reanalysis which stipulated that a construction would be reanalyzed only when the evidence for the earlier analysis had disappeared, such a theory fails... How much of the evidence for the older construction needs to be depleted before a new analysis may appear is an open question.

Clearly, the existence of obvious distinctions between the accusative and the genitive in the plural was not sufficient to prevent the reanalysis of the Finnish participial construction.

2.2. Autonomous reanalysis

Related to the proposed surface-structure continuity constraint is another claim, also apparently false. This claim maintains that syntactic change (and indeed syntax in general) is autonomous, and therefore reinterpretation of certain categories takes place exclusively on the basis of the surface structure configurations, independently of underlying semantic relations (cf. Muysken 1977:171). Lightfoot (1979:153) stakes a large portion of his theory on this claim:

I have argued for a notion of pure syntactic change within the framework of an autonomy thesis, but claiming that such changes are consequences of opacity...and of a principle of grammar requiring transparent derivations.

The autonomy thesis has been heavily criticized (cf. Romaine 1981). For our purposes here, it is sufficient to point out that syntactic rules cannot be assumed to operate independently of meaning and use; even Lightfoot admits therapeutic changes and perceptual strategies (both involving meaning and language use), in spite of his pretensions toward total autonomy. In reanalysis of the Finnish participles, the change in interpretation of the surface (accusative) object of the main verb to the surface/logical (genitive) subject of the embedded verb (participle) is quite natural. The genitive

case functions to mark subjects of several other constructions, e.g. of verbs of obligation and of other nominalizations and embedded constructions. Thus, the shifted interpretation of the ambiguous surface case endings is unsurprising. However, it is not to be expected that just anything could be reinterpreted as anything else based on surface structure identity alone. For example, it seems highly doubtful that the surface structure identity of, say, an article and a subjunctive marker in some language would lead to one being reinterpreted as the other. Thus, meaning and function play some role. For example, the identity in Finnish of the accusative singular and first person pronominal suffixes (both -n) evidences no tendency for reinterpretation, not would anyone expect them to, since they share no meaning. (For discussion, see Lightfoot 1979, Muysken 1977:171, Romaine 1981).

2.3. The necessity of reanalysis

Another related claim is that reanalyses happen only when necessary:

re-analyses take place only when necessary and not randomly. That is, they occur only when provoked by some principle of grammar such as Transparency. (Lightfoot 1979:124)

To assess this claim, I turn to new Finnish examples. In the colloquial language of the younger generation in Helsinki, infinitives have changed considerably. These are best presented by first considering the concomitant changes which brought the infinitival differences between Standard Finnish (henceforth SF) and colloquial Helsinki into existence.

The regional dialects from which colloquial Helsinki speech was formed (cf. Mielikäinen 1984) underwent a phonological change in which Vowel-a and Vowel-ä sequences monophthongized. Later, analogy operated on the results of this sound change. To begin with, the 3rd pers sg pres of verbs is signalled by a copy of the final root vowel, e.g. anta-a 'gives', tule-e 'comes'. For verbs in -aa (a very large class), 3rd pers sg pres is very similar to the so-called first infinitive, e.g. antaa 'gives', antaaX 'to give' (X represents the so-called 'final-aspiration', which has no phonetic content of its own, but results in a copy of the initial sound of a following word, e.g. /antaaX tänne/ [antaat tänne] 'to

give (it) here'. This (near) identity, together with the monophthongization, led to the analogical extension in which other phonetically appropriate first infinitives became more similar to the third pers sg forms. For example:

sanoo 'says': sanoaX 'to say' > sanoo : sanooX

This produced a morphological change; first -VVX in roots of this type was reinterpreted as the marker of first infinitives, e.g.: anta-aX (SF antaaX 'to give'), luke-eX (SF lukeaX 'to read'), sano-oX (SF sanoaX 'to say'), leikki-iX (SF leikkiäX 'to play'), puhu-uX (SF puhuaX 'to speak'). Then this pattern was extended to other verb classes which originally did not involve vowel clusters (and hence no potential for monophthongization) in the infinitive, e.g. vasatataX > vastaaX 'to answer'. These new forms came to be used as infinitival verb complements; compare hän antaa 'he gives' : hänen pitää antaaX 'he must give', with hän uppoo 'he sinks' : hänen pitää uppooX 'he must sink' (SF hän uppoo, hänen pitää upotaX).

Another infinitive construction, the so-called 'third infinitive in the illative case', is required in SF in certain contexts, particularly after verbs of motion. It is formed with the suffix -ma/-mä plus the illative case, -Vn, where the vowel matches the immediately preceding vowel, e.g. tulee anta-ma-an 'comes to give'. In this dialect, however, this third infinitive construction has changed to -Vn, where the V is a copy of the root vowel, resulting in long V + n, e.g. tulee antaan 'comes to give'. Subsequent sandhi changes make the first and third infinitives phonologically identical in certain contexts. That is, in the dialect the -n of the third infinitive assimilates fully to a following h, n, m, l, r, j, v, V and #, e.g. tulee antaan lääketä > tulee antaal lääketä 'comes to give medicine' (cf. SF tulee antamaan läkettä). Since the 'final-aspiration' (X) of first infinitives always assimilates to the following sound, the two infinitives became homophonous in the overlapping contexts, e.g. /pitää antaaX lääketä/ > [pitää antaal lääketä] 'must give medicine'. Based on this phonetic identity with the first infinitive in these contexts, assimilation of final -n in the third infinitive illative is often extended by analogy to instances before words beginning in p, t, k, and s, also. This led to a third infinitive illative which is no longer phonologically distinct from the first infinitive, e.g. antaaX ('to give') for both.

This phonological identity between first infinitive and third infinitive in the illative case in most verb classes led to a

grammatical reanalysis. In SF, verbs of motion govern third infinitive illative (-maan/-mään), and this is still the case in colloquial Helsinki dialect with clear motion verbs, mennä 'go', tulla 'come', etc. This is seen in the class of verbs whose conjugation maintains a phonetic difference in first infinitives and third infinitives in the illative case, e.g. menee tekeeX 'go do', and pitää tehdäX 'must do', but not *menee tehdäX (cf. SF menee tekemään 'go to do', pitää tehdä 'must do', not *menee tehdä). The reanalysis involves those verbs which in SF govern third infinitive illative, but in the modern language no longer show clear, concrete motion, e.g. joutua 'to be involved in, to end up in', kyetä 'to be able, to be capable of', pakottaa 'to force, to compel', pystyä 'to be able', and sattua 'to happen, occur'. Since these no longer involve clear semantic motion, they have shifted to take first infinitives in colloquial Helsinki: joutuu tehdä 'is involved in going, falls into doing' (cf. SF joutuu tekemään). Colloquial Helsinki has restructured so that only concrete motion verbs get third infinitives in the illative case, and other, more abstract verbs take first infinitives. (For details, see Sorsakivi 1982; cf. also Mielikäinen 1984).

Since first infinitive and third infinitive illative became homophonous in many contexts, one might take the change to first infinitive except for verbs of concrete motion as an instance of reanalysis for the sake of transparency, due to surface structure ambiguity. It should be pointed out, however, that some verbs in other dialects have also undergone related changes, usually from third infinitives in the illative case to first infinitives. The explanation in these instances, however, is not phonetic similarity and surface structure ambiguity, as in the case of the wholesale shift in colloquial Helsinki, but rather, analogy with other verbs in the same semantic class. For example, some dialects have pyrkiä tehdä 'strive to do' (SF pyrkiä tekemään), on the model of such verbs as SF yrittää tehdä 'try to do'. For details, see below. These verbs are quite different from colloquial Helsinki, since phonologically their first and third infinitives are still quite distinct; they merely changed analogically to have grammatical patterns more like semantically related verbs. (See below for a discussion of the principle of synonymy).

These further analogical changes are not counter-examples to Lightfoot's 'transparency' explanations, but they do show that similar results require no motivating opacity from surface structure identity. Thus, the claim that reanalysis happens only when necessary is called into question. This is confirmed in other examples.

In SF and nearly all regional dialects the verbs of obligation (pitää, täytyy, tulee 'must', pitäisi, tulisi 'should', etc.) are a special class, with subjects in the genitive case, e.g.:

- 6) minu-n pitää tulla
I-GEN must come

'I must come'

In Western Finnish, however, due to analogy with 'regular' (non-obligational) verbs (and to Swedish influence), these verbs have shifted, no longer taking genitive, but rather nominative subjects, with which the verb agrees, e.g.:

- 7) (minä) täydy-n tehdä
(I-NOM) must-I do

'I must do (it)'

- 8) (sinä) pidä-t mennä
(you) must-YOU go

'you must go'

In certain western Finnish dialects there has been an additional analogical change based on these forms. SF has another, rarer, obligation construction with nominative subjects, but with its non-finite verb in the so-called 'third infinitive accusative case', e.g.:

- 9) minä pidä-n mene-mä-n
I.NOM must-I go-3RD.INF-ACC

'I must go'

However, in a few dialects this form has changed to bear a genitive subject, e.g.:

- 10) minu-n pitää mene-mä-n
I-GEN must go-3RD.INF-ACC

'I must go'

This change is the result of an analogical blending of the two constructions, of minä pidän menemän + minun pitää mennä (cf. Saukkonen

1984:184). The cause is quite simply surface structure analogy, but without signs of being driven by opacity. These cases of reanalysis seem to violate Lightfoot's (1979:124, 375) assumption that "reanalyses take place only when necessary". Given that the transparency principle operates 'abductively' (i.e. analogically) to resolve surface ambiguity or opacity, it fits the colloquial Helsinki reanalysis of infinitives, but has nothing to say about 'abductive' and analogical reanalyses of these last two cases where no surface ambiguity was in question. Reanalysis, then, is not limited to cases only where it is necessary. Indeed, if reanalysis were necessary in these cases, then Standard Finnish would not have maintained its different forms from which these dialects have departed.

2.4. Does syntactic change precede morphological change?

One additional related claim, repeated in a variety of guises, maintains in its basic form that syntactic change precedes morphological change. Givón's (1971) slogan, yesterday's syntax is today's morphology, is related and is the inspiration for some versions of the claim. More directly, it is believed that "morphology is notoriously slow to adapt to changing syntax and may reflect syntactic patterns of...antiquity" (Lightfoot 1979:160). Changes in structure may affect syntactic relations before the morphology that encodes them, with the result that morphology may reflect a previous syntactic situation (cf. Comrie 1980, Givón 1971, 1984, etc.). In an absolute sense, this claim is false. While in some cases, syntactic change may precede, with morphological marking lagging behind, this is by no means always the case. In fact, it is often just the opposite, that morphological change comes before syntactic change, triggering syntactic reanalysis. The reanalysis of Finnish participles is a case in point. It was the morphological reinterpretation of ambiguous surface -n from original 'accusative singular' to 'genitive singular' which triggered the syntactic reanalysis whereby the former surface object of the main verb (in the accusative case, with its modifying participial verb form) was reanalyzed as the surface subject (in the genitive case) of the participle, now held to be a sentential object of the main verb.

3. Change in Main vs. Subordinate Clauses

A variety of related and overlapping but nearly identical claims has been made about change in main clauses as opposed to subordinate structures. We might expect main and subordinate

clauses to be roughly equal in susceptibility to grammatical change, but many have not thought so. In the recent literature on discourse analysis and pragmatics (cf. for example Hopper and Thompson 1980, 1984, Givón 1984) it is claimed that subordinate clauses are typically background material in a discourse, not normally part of the foreground or salient part of the temporal sequences of a discourse. It is claimed that nouns and verbs not salient to the discourse are reduced in the number and kind of morphosyntactic trappings they can exhibit, the full range often being limited only to the introduction of full participant nouns into a discourse and to verbs that report discourse (foregrounded) events. Accordingly, it is thought that subordinate clauses, exhibiting a more restricted range of morphosyntactic trappings for nouns and verbs due to their backgrounding function in discourse, are more conservative and less subject to syntactic change than main clauses. While several Finnish changes may be relevant to these claims, I will consider only word-order changes here.

It is claimed that in general subordinate (complex) clauses tend to preserve earlier word orders which have become 'frozen', although the opposite (conservatism in main clauses) has also been reported (cf., for example, Givón 1984:212). This proves to be true of Finnish relative clauses in two ways. First, one of the two types of relative clause constructions in Finnish preserves the type of relative clause (RC) found in its ancestor, Proto-Uralic, an SOV language. Second, it preserves SOV order in this RC, although Finnish (or better said, Proto-Finnic) changed to SVO basic order in main clauses (Korhonen 1981a). While syntactic reconstruction via supposed consistency among different word-order patterns has been heavily criticized (cf. Hawkins 1983), there are some aspects of the tendency for different orders to cluster which hold up after careful scrutiny; these prove useful in explaining the Finnic changes.

Finnish, for example, exhibits the basic word-order patterns:

S-V-O

Adjective-Noun

Genitive-Noun

Noun-Postposition

Relative Clause-Head/Head-Relative Clause (RC-H/H-RC)

Adj-Marker-Standard/Standard+PART-Adjective (AMS/SMA)

While SVO languages show much greater variation across these patterns than do, for example, SOV or VSO languages, these data are significant because only in SOV languages can RC-H (preposed relative clauses)

arise naturally. That is, verb-initial languages tend to have H-RC in harmony with their typical Head-Modifier orders within the NP. SOV may have RC-H in accord with the tendency towards Modifier-Head orders. Nevertheless, the 'heaviness principle' is also involved, that heavier constituents tend to be placed to the right of their heads to avoid the perceptual difficulty of processing the roles of nominal arguments (Hawkins 1983:90). In effect, then, only some SOV languages naturally contain RC-H, in harmony with their preferred Modifier-Head orders, while others may conform to the heaviness principle with RCs after their head Nouns (H-RC). With all this taken together, only in an SOV language could RC-H arise naturally. The Finno-Ugric languages are mostly SOV with preposed relative clauses (though a few have also developed postposed relatives under foreign influence). Moreover, as in many SOV languages (Keenan 1985), these preposed relative clauses do not contain finite verb forms, but rather are made of nominalized or participial constructions which bear case markings, and contain no relative pronouns (Korhonen 1981a). While Finnic also has postposed relative clauses (consistent with its SVO order, as well as with the heaviness principle), the alternative with preposed relatives preserves an aspect of its former SOV structure, since only in SOV languages does RC-Head arise naturally. These two relative-clause orders are illustrated in the following Finnish examples:

RC-Head:

- 11) huomas-i-n kova-lla ääne-llä puhu-va-n miehe-n
 notice-PAST-I hard-BY voice-BY speak-PRES.PRT-ACC man-ACC

'I heard the man who speaks with a loud voice'

- 12) nä-i-n jok-een aja-nee-n miehe-n
 see-PAST-I river-INTO drive-PAST.PRT-ACC man-ACC

'I saw the man who drove/has driven into the river'

Head-RC:

- 11') huomas-i-n miehe-n joka puhu-u kova-lla ääne-llä
 notice-PAST-I man-ACC REL.PRON.NOM speak-3RD.PRES hard-BY
 voice-BY

(same meaning as 11)

- 12') nä-i-n miehe-n joka ajo-i jok-een
 see-PAST-I man-ACC REL.PRON.NOM drive-PAST river-INTO

(same meaning as 12)

These preposed RCs are conservative in another way as well; they preserve OV word order in spite of the SVO of main clauses, as seen in the following examples:

- 13) vet-tä juo-va mies läht-i pois
 water-PART.SG drink-PRES.PRT.NOM man.NOM.SG. leave-PAST away

'the man who drinks water went away'

- 14) nä-i-n vet-tä juo-nee-n miehe-n
 0 V
 see-PAST-I water-PART-SG drink-PAST-PRT-ACC.SG man-ACC.SG

'I saw the man who drank/had drunk water'

- 15) nä-i-n naise-n näh-nee-n miehe-n
 0 V
 see-PAST-I woman-ACC.SG see-PAST.PRT-ACC.SG man-ACC.SG

'I saw the man who saw/had seen the woman'

Thus, while Finnish has innovated the postposed relatives with relative pronouns and finite verb forms consistent with its SVO basic word order, it is conservative in both maintaining the alternative RC construction, which could only originate in an SOV language, and in retaining OV order within that RC.

4. Grammaticalization

It is frequently claimed that a (if not the) major mechanism of syntactic change is the bleaching of lexical items and pragmatic devices, pressing them into full and conventionalized grammatical services, hence the name 'grammaticalization'. I will consider a few examples of related claims.

4.1. The source of 'futures'

Bybee and Pagliuca (1985) claim that grammatical 'futures' in the world's languages arise always from limited sources, from verbs of 'desire' (e.g. will), 'movement' (e.g. going to), and from 'possession' ('have/become', not grammaticalized in English). Finnish may be well on its way to conforming to their claim. Thus while Finnish has no real 'future' tense, a construction in which the verb tulla 'to come' plus another verb in the third infinitive illative case signals 'future', e.g.:

- 16) eräänä päivänä tule-n osta-ma-an uude-n talo-n
 some day come-I buy-3RD.INF-ILLATIVE new-ACC.SG house-ACC.SG
 'some day I will buy a new house'

4.2. Other grammatical morphemes

Givón (1984:48), among others, claims that the general process by which grammatical morphemes come about is: grammatical morphemes eventually arise out of lexical words, by a parallel process of semantic bleaching and phonological reduction. Thus, in the instance of the 'future' just seen, the semantic meaning of 'to come' is being bleached in this construction, leaving the grammatical morpheme meaning 'future'. Other Finnish cases seem to conform to this claim. For example the verbs of obligation (modals in English, 'must, should, ought to') in Finnish are also from former main verbs whose semantic content is bleached, leaving them in a grammatical function unlike their original senses. Some examples are (all require subjects to be in the genitive case, direct objects (if present) in the nominative or partitive case):

tulee	'must' (otherwise 'come')
pitää	'must' (otherwise 'hold')
täytyy	'must' (originally but no longer 'to be filled')
tulisi	'should' (otherwise 'would come')
pitäisi	'should' (otherwise 'would hold')

4.3. Boundary loss and 'morphologization'

Another kind of 'grammaticalization' involves the change by which independent words become bound morphemes. Langacker's (1977:102) 'signal simplicity' includes such frequent changes whereby word

boundaries are reduced, resulting in former words becoming clitics or bound morphemes. He says:

I think the tendency toward signal simplicity is an undeniable aspect of the evolution of natural language. Not only are all these kinds of change massively attested, but also they are largely unidirectional. Boundary loss is very common, for instance, but boundary creation is quite uncommon by comparison. Words are frequently incorporated as affixes, but affixes show no great tendency to break away and become independent words. (Langacker 1977:104) (Cf. also Givón 1971, 1984:19, 93).

Finnish and related languages have abundant examples illustrating this grammaticalization by loss of word boundary. I will consider only the development of case morphemes from postpositions.

In several instances, unstressed postpositions became cliticized to a preceding nominal form, eventually losing their independent status, and ultimately becoming case suffixes. Status as a case suffix is shown unequivocally when they come to be borne by adjectives as markers of case agreement with the case of head nouns, and when their vowels harmonize with the vowels of the root to which they have become attached.

The full trajectory from independent (ungrammaticalized) noun phrases to postpositions and on ultimately to case suffixes is well documented in Finnish developments. The postpositions developed from a constituent containing a noun 'head' (usually in the genitive case) with a noun modifier or attribute (often bearing locative case endings) used adverbially, e.g. Finnish talo-n ede-ssä [house-GEN front-IN] 'in front of the house'. Postpositions developed out of the relationship between the main word and its nominal attribute, as seen in the still ambiguous Finnish example: lapse-n rinna-lla [child-GEN chest-ON], meaning either 'on the chest of the child', the literal reading with 'child-GEN' as an attribute to the head noun 'chest-ON', or 'beside the child/side by side with the child' (cf. Eng. 'abreast of'), where 'chest-ON' has been reinterpreted as a locative postpositional governing genitive case, with 'child-GEN' as the object of the postposition. The development from noun to postposition is evident with pronominal attributes, which are signalled by possessive pronominal endings suffixed to the etymological noun root + locative case endings, e.g. rinna-lla-ni [beside-ON-MY] 'beside me'.

Cases develop from postpositions when the postposition is felt to be so closely connected to its attribute noun that together they are reinterpreted as one word; semantic and morphophonemic changes often take place which conceal the word boundary and change the status of the elements, resulting in new case suffixes. This is especially clear in Finnish dialects, where some show the development to cases while others preserve the postpositions. Standard Finnish has the postposition kanssa 'with' (with dialect shapes of kans, ka:s, kah, etc.), e.g. lapse-n kanssa [child-GEN with] 'with the child'. In several Upper Satakunta and Savo dialects, however, this has developed into a 'comitative/instrumental' case, -ka(h), -ka:n, e.g. isänka 'with father' (isä 'father'; koiranka:n 'with the dog', koira 'dog') (Kettunen 1930:29, Oinas 1961; cf. also Comrie 1980, Givón 1971, 1984, Langacker 1977).

It is important to point out that while such 'grammaticalizations' are typically unidirectional and irreversible (as so often is pointed out, cf. Langacker 1977:104, Vincent 1980:58), this is by no means absolute. Cases exist where bound morphemes come to be segmented and become independent words. One example is found in Lapp dialects (Northern, Itä-Enontekio, and Kola Lapp), where the suffix -taga 'without' has become an independent word (Nevis 1985).

5. Lexical Diffusion

Many syntactic changes described in recent literature are relatively 'localistic', i.e. have to do with changes in the syntactic properties of individual lexical items, for example, a verb changing the kind of complements it permits (cf. Langacker 1977 for several examples). It is claimed that some syntactic changes occur primarily by gradual diffusion through the lexicon (cf. Naro and Lemle 1976). This is comparable to Givón's (1984:57) iconicity principle: semantic, propositional and/or discourse-pragmatic features that are closely associated with each other also tend to co-lexicalize.

A subvariety of this claim is the 'principle of synonymy' (Ard 1975:75): synonymous lexical items tend to have the same syntactic privileges of occurrence. That is, they tend to occur in the same underlying structural configurations and be subject to the same syntactic rules. Finnish presents examples which fall into this class of change. As seen above, Standard Finnish grammar requires the so-called 'third infinitive' in the illative case with main verbs of motion, the first infinitive otherwise, e.g.:

- 17) tulee puhu-ma-an
comes speak-3RD.INF-ILLATIVE

'come to speak'

- 18) haluaa puhu-a
wants speak-1ST.INF

'wants to speak'

There is also a sizable number of verbs with no concrete meaning of motion, but which nevertheless govern 'third infinitives', e.g.:

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| 19) rupeaa puhu-maan | 'begins to speak' |
| pyrkii puhu-maan | 'strives to speak' |
| pystyy puhu-maan | 'is able to speak' |

In Vermland and Häme dialects some of these have shifted to govern 'first infinitives', based on analogy with other verbs of similar meaning which have the first-infinitive pattern, for example: rupeaa puhu-a (cf. alkaa puhu-a 'begins to speak'), pyrkii puhu-a (cf. yrittää puhu-a 'tries to speak'), while others have remained with 'third infinitive' complements (Saukkonen 1984:182-3). The pattern is clear, but the change is sporadic, involving lexical diffusion one verb at a time, based on synonymy.

One can wonder, naturally, about the explanatory strength of the synonymy principle, since, presumably if it were very powerful, Standard Finnish would not maintain its different syntactic patterns for synonymous verbs, the dialects' (piecemeal) elimination of which the principle is supposed to explain.

6. Syllable and Morpheme Boundary Coincidence

Part of Langacker's notion of transparency is 'boundary coincidence', the claim that changes will follow the tendency for boundaries to coincide--in particular, for morpheme boundaries to occur at syllable boundaries rather than in the middle of a syllable (Langacker 1977:66, 111). While this claim, as a tendency, may have considerable merit, changes in Finnish have frequently gone against it. For example, several Finnish cases have evolved by amalgamating formerly distinct locative endings, e.g.:

-ltA	'from (external)',	(< -l 'locative', -tA 'ablative')
-stA	'from (internal)',	(< -s 'locative', -tA 'ablative')
-lla	'on, by (external)',	(< -l 'locative', -nA 'in, on')
-ssa	'in (internal)',	(< -s 'locative', -nA 'in, on')

(cf. Hakulinen 1968, Korhonen 1981a, 1981b).

These morphemes were formed in spite of the fact that their boundaries do not coincide with syllable boundaries. For example, in talo-sta 'from the house', with syllable boundaries (shown with a 'dot') [ta.los.ta], the syllable boundary falls inside the morpheme (-s.ta), and the morpheme boundary comes inside a syllable (lo-s).

7. Conclusions

It is clear for the discussion of syntactic changes in Finnish that several theoretical claims are not well founded at all, given Finnish counter-examples. Other claims, on the other hand, while perhaps at times imprecisely formulated, prove useful for an understanding of certain Finnish changes. Future research might well occupy itself with the issue of determining to what extent these uncontroverted claims are explanatory as opposed to being merely descriptive metaphors.

ABBREVIATIONS

ACC	accusative
ADJ	adjective
ADV	adverb
AMS	Adjective-Marker-Standard (comparisons)
GEN	genitive
H-RC	Head-Relative Clause
INF	infinitive
NOM	nominative
PART	partitive
pas, PASS	passive
PPP	past passive participle
PL	plural
PRES	present
PRT	participle
RC	relative clause
RC-H	Relative Clause-Head
REL.PRON	relative pronoun
SG	singular
SMA	Standard-Marker-Adjective (comparisons)

REFERENCES

- ALLEN, Cynthia Louise. 1977. Topics in Diachronic English Syntax. University of Massachusetts dissertation.
- ANTTILA, Raimo. 1972. An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics. New York: Macmillan.
- ARD, Josh. 1975. Raising and Word Order in Dischronic Syntax. UCLA dissertation.
- BRECKENRIDGE, Janet and Auli Hakulinen. 1976. 'Cycle and after.' In Sanford B. Steever, Carol A. Walker, and Salikoko S. Mufwene (eds.), Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax, 50-68. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- BYBEE, Joan L. and William Pagliuca. 1985. 'The evolution of future meaning.' Paper presented at the International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Pavia, Italy.
- COMRIE, Bernard. 1980. 'Morphology and word order reconstruction: problems and prospects.' In Jacek Fisiak (ed.), Historical Morphology, 83-96. The Hague: Mouton.
- FISIAK, Jacek (ed.). 1984. Syntactic Change. Berlin: Mouton.
- GERRITSEN, Marinel. 1984. 'Divergent word order developments in Germanic languages: a description and a tentative explanation.' In Jacek Fisiak (ed.), Syntactic Change, 107-136. Berlin: Mouton.
- GIVÓN, Talmy. 1971. 'Historical syntax and synchronic morphology: an archaeologist's field trip.' Chicago Linguistic Society 7:394-415.
- . 1984. Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction, vol I. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- HAKULINEN, Auli and Pentti Leino. 1985. 'The history of the Finnish participial construction from a discourse point of view.' Paper presented at the International Finno-Ugric Congress, Syktyvkar, Soviet Union.

- HAKULINEN, Lauri. 1968. Suomen Kielen Rakenne ja Kehitys. (3rd edition). Helsinki: Ottava.
- HAWKINS, John A. 1983. Word Order Universals. New York: Academic Press.
- HOPPER, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. 'Transitivity in grammar and discourse.' Language 56:251-299.
- . 1984. 'The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar.' Language 60:703-752.
- IKOLA, Osmo. 1959. 'Eräistä suomen syntaktisista siirtymistä.' Suomen Kielen Seuran Vuosikirja 1:39-60. Helsinki.
- . 1968. 'Zum Objekt in den ostseefinnischen Sprachen.' In Paavo Ravila (ed.), Congressus Secundus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum, Helsingiae Habitus 23-28. VIII. 1965: Pars I: Acta Linguistica, Helsinki: Societas Fenno-Ugrica (Suomalais-Ugrilais Seuran), 188-195.
- KEENAN, Edward L. 1985. 'Relative clauses.' In Timothy Shopen (ed.), Language Typology and Syntactic Description, II: Complex Constructions, 141-170. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KETTUNEN, Lauri. 1930. Suomen Murteet II: Murrealueet. (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Toimituksia 188). Helsinki.
- KORHONEN, Mikko. 1981a. 'Onko suomen kieli konservatiivinen?' Virittäjä 1981.3:181-194.
- . 1981b. 'Typological drift in the Finno-Ugric languages with special reference to the case system.' Hangeu 173-4:687-710. Korea.
- LANGACKER, Ronald W. 1977. 'Syntactic reanalysis.' In Charles N. Li (ed.), Mechanisms of Syntactic Change, 59-139. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- LIGHTFOOT, D.W. 1979. Principles of Diachronic Syntax. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- MAŃCZAK, Witold. 1984. 'If I was instead of if I were.' In Jacek Fisiak (ed.), Syntactic Change, 237-246. Berlin: Mouton.
- MIELIKÄINEN, Aila. 1984. Nykypuhe-suomen Alueellista Taustaa. (Nykysuomen Rakenne ja Kehitys 2: Näkökulmia Kielen Muuttumiseen. Tietolipas 95). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- MUYSKEN, Pieter. 1977. Syntactic Developments in the Verb Phrase of Ecuadorian Quecha. (Studies in Generative Grammar 2). Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press.
- NARO, Anthony J. and Miriam Lemle. 1976. 'Syntactic diffusion.' In Sanford B. Steever, Carol A. Walker, and Salikoko S. Mufwene (eds.), Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax, 221-240. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- NEVIS, Joel A. 1985. 'Decliticization and deaffixation in Saame (Lappish).' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Seattle, Washington.
- OINAS, Felix. 1961. The Development of some Postpositional Cases in Balto-Finnic Languages. (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia, 123). Helsinki.
- ROMAINE, Suzanne. 1981. 'The transparency principle: what it is and why it doesn't work.' Lingua 55:277-300.
- SAUKKONEN, Pauli. 1984. 'Infinitiivirakenteidemme historiaa.' In Heikki Paunonen and Päivi Rintala (eds.), Nykysuomen Rakenne ja Kehitys 2: Näkökulmia Kielen Vaiteluun ja Muuttumiseen. (Tietolipas 95). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- SORSAKIVI, Merja. 1982. 'Infinitiivijärjestelmän muutoksia lasten kielessä.' Virittäjä 86:377-391.
- SVENSSON, Pirkko Forsman. 1983. Satsmotsvarigheter i Finsk Prosa under 1600-Talet: Participialkonstruktionen och därmed Synonyma Icke-finita Uttryck i Jämförelse med Spraokbruket före Och efter 1600-Talet. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

- TIMBERLAKE, Alan. 1977. 'Reanalysis and actualization in syntactic change.' In Charles N. Li (ed.), Mechanisms of Syntactic Change, 141-177. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- VINCENT, Nigel. 1980. 'Iconic and symbolic aspects of syntax: prospects for reconstruction.' In Paolo Ramat (ed.), Linguistic Reconstruction and Indo-European Syntax: Proceedings of the Colloquium of the 'Indogermanische Gesellschaft', 47-68. (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, series 4, vol. 19). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.