

Objecthood of the Elative Argument of the Finnish Language*

Jun'ichi SAKUMA

In the Finnish language the elative case, whose ending is *-sta* or *-stä*, is classified as an internal locative case and mainly used to indicate a place from which some entity moves outwards. However, the elative case has many other usages and some of them are in the process of grammaticalization. First of all, an elative stimulus argument of some psych verbs has something in common with a partitive stimulus argument, which serves clearly as the object. Second, some predicates, not so many though, can take as their complement both a partitive argument and an elative argument alternatively. This fact also shows that an elative argument of some predicates has object-like properties to some extent. Third, an elative argument of some predicates referring to a target of the described activity has a part-whole relation with a co-occurring object. All these things suggest that an elative argument can be sometimes regarded as a quasi-object, although the degree of objecthood is very low indeed. This quasi-object refers to a predefined entity that is QUALITATIVELY definite.

1. Introduction

In the Finnish language the psych verbs expressing a mental state or event can be divided into subgroups according to the morphological cases that are used to mark their arguments¹. The psych verbs have two arguments: one is the experiencer and the other is the stimulus. The experiencer argument of some psych verbs is marked in the partitive case and the stimulus argument in the nominative case. For example:

- (1) *Matematiikka inhotta-a minu-a.*
mathematics-nom.sg. disgust-3.sg.pr. I-part.sg.
Mathematics disgusts me.

In this sentence the verb agrees in person and number with the nominative stimulus argument. This means that the subject of this sentence is not the experiencer but the stimulus. The experiencer argument of this sentence functions as the object, since the partitive is the default case that is available for the object. Such verbs, whose stimulus argument functions as the subject, belong to a causative subgroup.

On the other hand, the experiencer argument of other psych verbs is marked in the nominative case and what functions as the subject is the experiencer argument. Take the following as an example:

- (2) *Minä inhoa-n matematiikka-a.*
I-nom.sg. detest-1.sg.pr. mathematics-part.sg.

I detest mathematics.

In this sentence the stimulus is marked in the partitive case and it can reasonably be assumed to be the object. However, the stimulus argument is not always marked in the partitive case. As is shown in the following sentence, the stimulus argument of some psych verbs is marked in the elative case². That is:

- (3) *Mies raivostu-i huhu-i-sta.*
 man-nom.sg. get furious-3.sg.p. rumor-elat.pl.
 The man got furious at rumors.

The argument in question cannot be regarded as the object, since the elative is not the case available for the object. The semantic role it carries on is, however, identical to that of the partitive argument of the sentence (2). Then, it is reasonable to assume that the elative stimulus argument of the sentence (3) and the partitive stimulus argument of the sentence (2) have something in common, even if the former is not a full-fledged object.

What should be noticed here is that some verbs can take both a partitive argument and an elative argument alternatively. For example:

- (4a) *Tyttö itk-i kohtalo-a-an.*
 girl-nom.sg. weep-3.sg.p. fate-part.sg.-3.sg.Px
 The girl wept over her fate.
- (4b) *Tyttö itk-i suru-sta.*
 girl-nom.sg. weep-3.sg.p. grief-elat.sg.
 The girl wept for grief.

Needless to say, there is some difference in meaning between these two instances, but it seems that the semantic role of the elative argument is the same as that of the partitive argument. If this is the case, what is the difference between the elative argument and the partitive argument? What do these two kinds of argument share with each other? The purpose of this paper is to investigate the object-like character of the elative argument and to consider the syntactic status of the elative marked argument among other arguments.

2. Usages of the elative case

Before turning to a closer examination of the syntactic character of the elative case, let us survey the usages of the elative case as a verbal complement. The Finnish language has 14 cases, including the cases referring to the locative relations³. The elative case is one of the locative cases and its ending varies between *-sta* and *-stä*, depending on the quality of stem vowels. It is one of the three internal locative cases and it refers to an outward spatial movement. The most typical instance can be found in the following sentence. That is:

- (5) *Leinoja karkas-i häki-stä.*
 lion-nom.sg. escape-3.sg.p. cage-elat.sg.
 The lion escaped from the cage.

The Finnish language has another case indicating an outward movement, i.e. the ablative case. This case is one of the three external locative cases and refers to a movement from a surface or a spot. Take the following for example:

- (6) *Maljakko putos-i pöytä-ltä*
 vase-nom.sg. fall-3.sg.p. table-ablat.sg.
 The vase fell off the table.

To indicate a locative relation is indeed the primary function of the locative cases, but they have other functions as well, and the elative case is no exception⁴. First of all, the elative case can indicate a source or a starting point, even when an actual outward movement is not entailed in the described situation. This is a natural consequence, since the referent of the noun phrase marked in the elative case can be interpreted to be a source or a starting point of a virtual outward movement. For example:

- (7) *Sää viilene-e öisin loppuviiko-sta koko maa-ssa.*
 weather-nom.sg. get cooler-3.sg.pr. at nights weekend-elat.sg. all country-iness.sg.
 It gets cooler at nights from the weekend in all the country.

In this sentence the elative case indicates a starting point of a meteorological change. Another example is:

- (8) *Tä-stä aukea-a uusi ikkuna, jo-sta klikka-a*
 this-elat.sg. open-3.sg.pr. new-nom.sg. window-nom.sg. which-elat.sg. click-3.sg.pr.
 “*Hae tiedosto.*”
 search-imp.2.sg. file-nom.sg.
 From this button a new window opens and you can click the button “Search a file” from the window.

In this sentence the elative case is used to indicate a point to be contacted. Also its referent, however, can be regarded as a starting point of a virtual outward movement, since touching the entity triggers the subsequent change described in the sentence in question. The elative argument of psych verbs, which expresses a cause of an emotional state, can be explained in the same line, because a cause, or a stimulus, is a trigger of the emotional change described in the sentence. Take the sentence (3), repeated here as the sentence (9), for example:

- (9) *Mies raivostu-i huhu-i-sta.*
 man-nom.sg. get furious-3.sg.p. rumor-elat.pl.
 The man got furious at rumors.(=(3))

In the following section I shall be examining this usage in detail.

The elative case is also used in the so-called resultative construction. For example:

- (10) *Poj-i-sta tul-i isä-n ammatti-n jatkaj-i-a.*
 son-elat.pl. become-3.sg.p. father-gen.sg. occupation-gen.sg. successor-part.pl.
 The sons became the successors of their father's occupation.

In this construction the noun phrase in the elative case indicates an entity that has grown or will grow into something. In other words, the elative case refers to the initial state of the entity. The resultant state of the entity is marked either in the nominative case or in the partitive case. The elative case can also indicate a person who has some feeling. For example:

- (11) *Minu-sta tuntu-u, että tulevaisuus on toivoton.*
 I-nom.sg. feel-3.sg.pr. that future-nom.sg. be-3.sg.pr. hopeless-nom.sg.
 I feel that the future is hopeless.

What is described in this sentence is that the person marked in the elative case has come to have a feeling, while he does not have such a feeling at the initial state. This means that the elative noun phrase of the sentence (11) has some parallels with that of the sentence (10), referring to the initial state of an entity. The elative case in the following sentence refers also to the initial state of an entity. That is:

- (12) *Tuoree-sta maido-sta valmiste-taan suklaa-ta.*
 fresh-elat.sg. milk-elat.sg. make-pass.pr. chocolate-part.sg.
 Chocolate is made from fresh milk.

In this sentence the elative case is used to indicate material of a product. Moreover, when a considerable change has happened or will happen to an entity or the part of it, the entity or its part is also indicated in the elative case. The following provides an example:

- (13) *Talo-sta hajos-i kolme ikkuna-a.*
 house-elat.sg. break-3.sg.p. three-nom.sg. window-part.sg.
 Three windows were broken up from the house.

The entity marked in the elative case in these sentences (10)–(13) can also be considered to be a starting point of a virtual outward movement, since the change that has occurred to the entity can be figuratively regarded as a kind of outward movement. The difference between (7)–(9) and (10)–(13) lies in what undergoes a changing process. In the latter sentences it is the entity in the elative case itself, while it is another entity in the former sentences.

On the other hand, the following shows another usage of the elative case. That is:

- (14) *Pääministeri kerto-i mielipitee-nsä tapabtuma-sta.*
 prime minister-nom.sg. tell-3.sg.p. opinion-gen.sg.-3.sg.Px event-elat.sg.
 The prime minister told his opinion about the event.

In this sentence the elative case indicates a topic of speech activity. Moreover, the elative case sometimes refers to some divisible entity that has filled up or will fill up a space.

- (15) *Festivaali-n aika-na kaupunki täytty-y ihmis-i-sta.*
 festival-gen.sg. time-ess.sg. city-nom.sg. fill-3.sg.pr. people-elat.pl.
 At the time of festival the city fills up with people.

It is interesting that the elative case can indicate the opposite: i.e. some divisible entity that has been removed or is to be removed from a space⁵.

- (16) *Pankkiautomaatti tyhjenty-i käteise-stä.*
 cash dispenser-nom.sg. empty-3.sg.p. cash-elat.sg.
 The cash dispenser became out of cash.

The elative is also the case expressing the value of something to be purchased or the amount of compensation.

- (17) *Lähetys on vakuute-ttu 10 000 euro-sta.*
 shipment-nom.sg. be-3.sg.pr. insure-pass.p.p. 10 000 euro-elat.sg.
 The shipment is insured for 10 000 euros.

In these instances (13)–(17) it is difficult to identify the noun phrase marked in the elative case as a starting point of a virtual outward movement indeed. But the elative case in these instances refers to the target of the described activity. If this is the case, these usages can be regarded as extensions of the more basic one.

3. Psyche verbs and its elative argument

Let us now return to the main topic of this paper. We should consider whether the elative argument of psych verbs, like that in the sentence (9) above (=3)), has some object-like character or not. The sentence (9) is repeated here as the sentence (18) for convenience. That is:

- (18) *Mies raivostu-i huhu-i-sta.*
 man-nom.sg. get furious-3.sg.p. rumor-elat.pl.
 The man got furious at rumors. (=3), (9))

It was observed in the preceding section that the elative case refers to a starting point of an outward movement, whether the movement is real or not. In principle, what counts as the object is an entity that is affected by an activity whose agent is the referent of the subject. If the elative argument is purely a starting point of an outward movement, it is difficult to consider it to be the object. However, the extent to which the referent of the object is affected varies considerably according to the transitivity of the predicate. Especially, the referent of the object of non-causative psych verbs is hardly affected. The sentence (2), repeated here as the sentence (19) for convenience, is a good illustration of this point. That is:

- (19) *Minä inhoa-n matematiikka-a.*
 I-nom.sg. detest-1.sg.pr. mathematics-part.sg.
 I detest mathematics. (=2))

In this sentence, the partitive argument can indeed be regarded as the object by relying on the case marking, but its referent is hardly affected. Rather, it is the referent of the subject that is affected, since the partitive argument functions as the stimulus. This means that the partitive argument of this sentence has very low degree of objecthood. Since the elative argument of the sentence (18) is also the stimulus, it cannot be necessarily denied immediately that the same observation applies to the elative argument of the sentence (18). In other words, it is possible that the elative argument has very low degree of objecthood.

What is important to note is that the elative argument of the sentence (18) and the partitive argument of the sentence (19) are alternatively marked in the nominative case, when the predicate is altered to the corresponding causative psyche verb. That is:

(20) *Huhu-t raivostutt-i-vat miehe-n.*
 rumor-nom.pl. make furious-3.pl.p. man-gen.sg.
 Rumors made the man furious.

(21) *Matematiikka inhotta-a minu-a.*
 mathematics-nom.sg. disgust-3.sg.pr. I-part.sg.
 Mathematics disgusts me. (= (1))

This means that not only a partitive stimulus argument but also an elative stimulus argument can be converted to the subject of causative psyche verbs.

These two types of stimulus argument differ from each other to some extent. A partitive stimulus argument co-occurs with stative predicates. Therefore, it can be said that a partitive stimulus argument denotes an object of an emotional attitude. On the other hand, an elative stimulus argument co-occurs with inchoative predicates. This means that an elative stimulus argument is a trigger of a change of mental state. An elative stimulus argument, however, can also be regarded as an object of an emotional attitude at the same time, since a change of mental state evoked by some trigger usually lasts at least for a while. From all these things we can say that an elative stimulus argument is a quasi-object, although the degree of objecthood it has is very low.

4. Alternation between an elative argument and a partitive argument

Let us now consider predicates that can take as their complement both a partitive argument and an elative argument alternatively. Such predicates are not abundant, but are not necessarily so remarkable. For example:

(22a) *Tyttö itk-i kohtalo-a-an.*
 girl-nom.sg. weep-3.sg.p. fate-part.sg.-3.sg.Px
 The girl wept over her fate. (= (4a))

(22b) *Tyttö itk-i suru-sta.*
 girl-nom.sg. weep-3.sg.p. grief-elat.sg.

The girl wept for grief. (= (4b))

In these sentences both the partitive argument and the elative argument of the verb *itkeä* ‘weep’ can be regarded as a cause of weeping, although they differ from each other in their aspectual entailment. The partitive argument entails that it will keep the nominative experiencer weeping for a good while. On the other hand, the elative argument entails that weeping may end in a short time, although it is also possible that weeping lasts for a longer time.

The verb *kaubistua* ‘be frightened’ can also take both types of argument alternatively. Take the following for example:

(23a) *Kaubistu-i-n* *pastori-n* *aikEE-sta* *polttaa* *Koraane-j-a*.
 be frightened-1.sg.p. clergyman-gen.sg. idea-elat.sg. burn-1.inf. Koran-part.pl.
 I was frightened by the clergyman’s idea to burn the Korans.

(23b) *Kaubistu-i-n* *ajatus-ta* *kuolinpilleri-stä*.
 be frightened-1.sg.p. notion-part.sg. pill for death-elat.sg.⁶
 I was frightened by the notion of a pill for death.

As to this verb, *puhe* ‘speech’, *viesti* ‘message’ and *aiE* ‘idea’, for example, is marked in the elative case. On the other hand, *ajatus* ‘notion’ and *väite* ‘claim’, for example, is marked in the partitive case. An elative complement and a partitive complement probably differ from each other in their aspectual meaning, as is the case with the verb *itkeä* exemplified above. However, the semantic distinction between nouns to be marked in the elative case and nouns to be marked in the partitive case is not so clear-cut that it is difficult to state explicitly the difference between an elative complement and a partitive complement.

On the other hand, there is a clear difference as to the verb *paeta* ‘escape’. For example:

(24a) *Perhe* *paken-i* *palava-sta* *talo-sta*.
 family-nom.sg. escape-3.sg.p. burning-elat.sg. house-elat.sg.
 The family escaped from the burning house.

(24b) *Perhe* *paken-i* *Venäjä-n* *vallankumous-ta* *Suome-en*.
 family-nom.sg. escape-3.sg.p. Russia-gen.sg. revolution-part.sg. Finland-illat.sg.
 The family escaped from the Russian revolution to Finland.

Concerning the verb *paeta*, an elative argument clearly refers to a concrete place, while the referent of a partitive argument is some dangerous situation to be fled from. This is because the verb *paeta* usually means a concrete activity and a concrete place from which to escape can often be specific. If a place is explicit in the described situation, it should be marked in the elative case.

From these examples (22)–(24) it follows that the more concrete the described situation is, the clearer the difference between elative arguments and partitive arguments becomes. Therefore, an elative argument of some verbs expressing an abstract situation cannot be readily distinguished from a partitive argument, which is clearly the object of the sentence. Although

a partitive argument entails that the described situation continues for a longer duration than an elative argument entails, the difference is not necessarily evident. Thus, this fact also shows that an elative argument of some predicates has object-like properties to some extent.

5. An elative argument and an object in a part-whole relation

In the Finnish language there are many verbs which take an elative argument together with a partitive argument. The following are a few random examples:

(25) *Pääministeri kerto-i mielipitee-nsä tapahtuma-sta.*
 prime minister-nom.sg. tell-3.sg.p. opinion-gen.sg.-3.sg.Px event-elat.sg.
 The prime minister told his opinion about the event.(=(14))

(26) *Suome-ssa mi-tä ajatel-tiin tä-stä asia-sta?*
 Finland-iness.sg. what-part.sg. think-pass.p. this-elat.sg. thing-elat.sg.
 What do people in Finland think about this thing?

In these sentences the elative argument cannot be considered to be the object, since what serves as the object in these sentences is undoubtedly the partitive argument. The elative argument refers to a target of the activity. In other words, it fixes the domain in which the described activity is involved. For example, in the sentence (25), the 'event' is the topic of the story indeed but what is talked is the prime minister's opinion about this 'event'. What should not be overlooked is, however, that the relation between the elative argument of these sentences and the predicate taking it can be captured in the corresponding noun phrase by using a passive participle of the same predicate. That is:

(25') *kerro-ttu tapahtuma*
 tell-pass.p.p.-nom.sg. event-nom.sg.
 the talked event

(26') *ajatel-tava asia*
 think-pass.pr.p.-nom.sg. thing-nom.sg.
 the thing to be thought about

In (25') and (26') the head noun corresponding to the elative argument is modified by a passive past participle and a passive present participle respectively. Generally speaking, only a subject and an object can be modified by a participle, when the sentence in question is converted into the corresponding noun phrase. However, these instances show that not only a subject and an object but also an argument marked in the elative case can be modified by a participle in the corresponding noun phrase under some specific condition. Also, they show that some of the elative arguments have some parallels with the object. The same observation applies to the relation between the verb *kiistellä* 'dispute' and its elative argument. For example:

- (27) *Eduskunta kiistel-i {budjeti-sta / *budjetti-a}*.
 parliament-nom.sg. dispute-3.sg.p. budget-elat.sg. budget-part.sg.
 The parliament disputed the budget.

It is worth while noting that this verb cannot take an object. Nevertheless, this sentence can be converted to the corresponding noun phrase (27'), in which the head noun corresponding to the elative argument is modified by a participle. That is:

- (27') *kiistel-ty budjetti*
 dispute-pass.p.p. budget-nom.sg.
 the disputed budget

This again shows that the elative argument of this verb has some object-like properties.

There is another fact that would support this observation. As to the Finnish compounds whose head is a deverbal noun, a genitive marked element before the head functions as the subject or the object of the deverbal head noun. However, some of the elative arguments can be incorporated into a compound as a genitive marked modifier. Take the following for example:

- (28) *rauhanneuvottelu (= rauha-n + neuvottelu)*
 peace negotiation-nom.sg. peace-gen.sg. negotiation-nom.sg.
 the peace negotiation

The head of this compound *neuvottelu* is derived from the verb *neuvotella* 'negotiate'. This verb does not take a partitive argument and the genitive marked modifier *rauhan* corresponds to the elative argument in the following sentence. That is:

- (28') *Poliitiko-t neuvottel-i-vat rauha-sta.*
 politician-nom.pl. negotiate-3.pl.p. peace-elat.sg.
 The politicians negotiated peace.

This means that some of the elative arguments can be treated in the same way as the object in the formation of compounds.

The question then arises about the condition on which the elative arguments are treated like the object. To answer this question, we should first consider the properties of the object. In the Finnish language the case marking of the object reflects the aspectual difference of a predicate heading it. That is, the object is marked in the partitive case, when the aspectual interpretation of the predicate is imperfective. On the other hand, perfective aspect is one of the necessary conditions for an object to be marked in the genitive or the nominative case. However, the case marking of the object is dependent not only on the aspectual opposition but also on the quantitative definiteness. That is, the object is marked in the partitive case, if it refers to a quantitatively indefinite entity. On the other hand, the referent of the genitive or the nominative object should be quantitatively definite. What should be noticed here is that the definiteness which is relevant here is quantitative definiteness⁷. It is also worth while noting that a quantitatively definite argument is not always QUALITATIVELY definite. This means that the qualitative definiteness is irrelevant to the opposition of the case marking of the object.

It is interesting to note that the referent of the elative argument of the sentences (25)–(28) seems to be QUALITATIVELY definite. This definiteness can be attributed to a part-whole relation between the elative argument and the overt or covert object. For example, the elative argument of the sentence (25) is *tapahutama* ‘event’ and the genitive object is *mielipide* ‘opinion’. Needless to say, what the ‘opinion’ is about should be the ‘event’ indicated in the elative case. Thus, the referent of the object should be involved in the domain fixed by the referent of the elative argument and this leads to a part-whole relation between them. In this part-whole relation, what counts as a whole, i.e. the elative argument, should be QUALITATIVELY definite, since no part can be identified without reference to the whole domain involving it. In other words, what counts as a whole is predefined, and therefore QUALITATIVELY definite as a natural consequence. On the other hand, what counts as a part, i.e. the object, need not be QUALITATIVELY definite.

It is worth while noting that both the partitive case and the elative case can be used with quantifier nominals⁸. For example:

- (29) *Anna minu-lle pala tä-stä hyvä-stä kaku-sta.*
 give-imp.2.sg. I-allat.sg. bit-nom.sg. this-elat.sg. good-elat.sg. cake-elat.sg.
 Give me a bit of this good cake. (Koptjeskaja-Tamm 2001: 531)
- (30) *Kuinka paljon pala tä-tä hyvä-ä kakku-a maksa-a?*
 how much bit-nom.sg. this-part.sg. good-part.sg. cake-part.sg. cost-3.sg.pr.
 How much does a bit of this good cake cost? (Koptjeskaja-Tamm 2001: 533)

Needless to say, they differ considerably in their meaning. The elative complement in (29) refers to a presupposed set of items and a quantifier nominal taking it as its complement indicates a subset of presupposed items. In other words, the referent of the elative complement is QUALITATIVELY definite. On the other hand, the partitive complement in (30) simply indicates the kind of the entity the preceding quantifier refers to. This means that the referent of the partitive complement is QUALITATIVELY indefinite. What is important is that this difference between the elative complement and the partitive complement is similar to that found between the elative argument and the object.

To sum up, the elative argument can be treated in the same way as the object on the condition that the elative argument is in a part-whole relation with the co-occurring overt or covert object. The elative argument refers to a QUALITATIVELY definite, predefined entity, while the co-occurring object is not always QUALITATIVELY definite.

6. Concluding remarks

From what has been said above it follows that some of the elative arguments can be sometimes regarded as a quasi-object, although the degree of objecthood is very low indeed. When we conclude that some of the elative arguments serve as a quasi-object, this is equivalent to saying that the elative case is in the process of grammaticalization⁹. As to the grammaticalization of the elative case, it will be useful to reconsider the resultative construction. In the sentence (10), repeated here as the sentence (31), for example, the elative

argument serves as a quasi-subject, though it does not agree in number and person with the predicate. That is:

- (31) *Poj-i-sta tul-i isä-n ammatti-n jatka-j-i-a.*
 son-elat.pl. become-3.sg.p. father-gen.sg. occupation-gen.sg. successor-part.pl.
 The sons became the successors of their father's occupation.(=(10))

What is common between the elative argument as a quasi-object and that as a quasi-subject is that both of them refer to a predefined entity. In other words, the referent of both a quasi-subject and a quasi-object is QUALITATIVELY definite. It is not always the case that the referent of the subject and the object is predefined indeed, but it is nevertheless true that the typical subject and the typical object refer to a predefined entity. Thus, one can safely state that the reference to a predefined entity is a basis for the grammaticalization of the elative argument.

Notes

- * This research was supported by a grant-in-aid for scientific research (C): 2009–2012, No. 21520435, from the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture, Government of Japan.
- 1 For a discussion of the psych verbs of the Finnish language, see Siirainen (2001) for example.
 - 2 The definition of the argument varies among linguists. In this paper not only the subject and the object but also noun phrases marked in a locative case, like *huhuista* in the sentence (3), are treated as arguments on condition that they are essential to the composition of the sentence in question.
 - 3 The so-called accusative case is not included among 14 cases. This is because the so-called accusative case is identical in form with the genitive case in the singular and with the nominative case in the plural except for that of the personal pronouns.
 - 4 For further details of the usages of the elative case, see Hakulinen et al. (2004: 1201–1203) for example.
 - 5 The elative case in the following example refers to some divisible entity that is lacking and should be supplemented.
 - i) *Helsinki-ssä on pula suome-n kiele-n kurssi-i-sta.*
 Helsinki-iness.sg. be-3.sg.pr. shortage-nom.sg. finnish-gen.sg. language-gen.sg. course-elat.pl.
 Courses of the Finnish language are short in Helsinki.
 - 6 In this sentence *kuolinpilleri* is indeed in the elative case, but this is not an argument of the predicate *kaubitusta* but a complement of the preceding noun *ajatusta*.
 - 7 For a discussion of the definiteness in the Finnish language, see Itkonen (1980) for example.
 - 8 For further details of the characteristics of quantifier phrases in the Finnish language, see Alho (1992), Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2001) and Seppänen (1983) for example.
 - 9 For a discussion of the grammaticalization process of a locative case in the Finnish language, see Huomo (2006) for example.

Abbreviations

nom.—nominative	gen.—genitive	part.—partitive	iness.—inessive
illat.—illative	elat.—elative	allat.—allative	ablat.—ablative
ess.—essive	sg.—singular	pl.—plural	Px.—possessive suffix
pr.—present	p.—past	inf.—infinitive	pr.p.—present participle
p.p.—past participle	imp.—imperative	pass.—impersonal passive	

References

- Alho, Irja H. 1992. Distinguishing kind and set in Finnish. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 22:1. 1–16.
- Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen & Irja Alho. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: SKS.
- Huomo, Tuomas. 2006. "I woke up from the sofa" Subjective directionality in Finnish expressions of a spatio-cognitive transfer. In: Marja-Liisa Helasvuo & Lyle Campbell (eds.), *Grammar from the Human Perspective: Case,*

- space and person in Finnish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 41–65.
- Itkonen, Terho. 1980. Spesies suomessa ja germaanisissa kielissä. *Virittäjä* 84: 27–38.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 2001. “A piece of the cake” and “a cup of tea”: Partitive and pseudo-partitive nominal constructions in the Circum-Baltic Languages. In: Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *Circum-Baltic Languages, volume 2: Grammar and Typology*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 524–568.
- Seppänen, Aimo. 1983. Finnish ‘kaksi poikaa’. *Studia Linguistica* 37:2. 161–174.
- Siirainen, Mari. 2001. The semantics and derivational relations of Finnish emotive verbs. *Papers from the 16th Scandinavian conference of linguistics*. Turku: University of Turku. 392–402.