

DOI: 10.2478/v10122-012-0002-4

VOICE AND CASE IN FINNISH IN THE LIGHT OF ZABROCKI'S THEORY OF PERSON

ROBERT BIELECKI

ABSTRACT: Robert Bielecki. *Voice and Case in Finnish in the Light of Zabrocki's Theory of Person*. *Lingua Posnaniensis*, vol. LIV (1)/2012. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences. PL ISSN 0079-4740, ISBN 978-83-7654-103-7, pp. 21–34.

This paper attempts to demonstrate the properties of the categories of voice and case in Finnish in the light of Zabrocki's theory of Person. The presented morphosyntactic, syntactic and semantic properties of words taking part in diathesis lead us to formulate sentences (theorems) belonging to the sphere of the postulated grammar of person of this language. In Finnish, particular personal meanings undergo both lexicalization (in the form of appropriate personal pronouns) and grammaticalization (in the form of personal endings). Moreover the Finnish language seems to operate with a collective personal meaning, where three particular communicative statuses do not undergo differentiation. This kind of personal meaning seems to be only grammaticalized in Finnish; it lacks a pronoun lexifying such a collective personal meaning. Because of the high degree of syncretism of the nominative and (endingless) accusative on the one hand and the passive and impersonal voice on the other, Finnish contains significant overlapping between passive structures – where the three personal meanings undergo specification – and impersonal structures – where the three personal meanings undergo unification. Notwithstanding, only in sentences of the type *Kana on tapettu* 'One has killed the hen', 'The hen has been killed' (and with smaller probability *Kana tapetaan* 'One kills (will kill) the hen', ('The hen is (will be) killed')) do we encounter total ambiguity in respect of the personal meaning semified by the predicate (the collective person vs. third person).

Robert Bielecki, Institute of Linguistics, Adam Mickiewicz University, al. Niepodległości 4, PL – 61-874 Poznań

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The categories of both voice and case in Finnish are, because of their specificity, the subject of many descriptions representing a very wide spectrum of approaches. As far as voice is concerned, some linguists assert the dimension of voice (understood as a set of all voice meanings) to be totally irrelevant for Finnish (at least in reference to the finite verb), whereas others propose to distinguish within its framework as many as three different meanings: active, impersonal and passive. The greatest interpretational challenge, however, seems to be not the possibility of the irrelevance of the dimension of voice – which appears to be rather an isolated point of the view – but the determination of the right number of meanings in this dimension. The greatest controversies concern ascribing the appropriate status to the finite verbal forms which do not belong to the active voice. Some linguistic

facts give evidence only of the impersonal interpretation, whereas others seem to contradict them in this aspect. In reference to the category of case relevant to voice, actually only three of its subcategories (cases) seem to be traditionally involved: nominative, partitive and accusative. In contemporary Finnish linguistics the conviction prevails that the accusative is no longer necessary for description of the language, because the overwhelming majority of its manifestations have become homophonic with manifestations of other cases: genitive singular or nominative singular and plural, which became harnessed to fulfill the function of the former/virtual accusative. The genitive and nominative in the function of the accusative have however retained their case labels. Such a terminological-notional solution could not remain without consequences for the interpretation of the whole diathetic structure of the Finnish language itself. The author has on many occasions criticized such an approach because of its extreme unilateralism. In this paper too the category of accusative is recognized as relevant for Finnish.

Zabrocki's theory, imposing a certain viewpoint on the category of person, seems to introduce a specific order which makes possible somewhat wider introspection into the categories of voice and case in Finnish. In the framework of this theory the category of person is conjoined with other grammatical categories: subject, diathesis, sentence. The considerations presented may represent a contribution to a clearer formulation of the grammar of person in Finnish against a broader linguistic background.

2. THE PROBLEM OF THE CATEGORIES OF VOICE AND CASE IN FINNISH

One of the most characteristic features of the diathetic structure of the Finnish language is the quite extensive phonic neutralization of the semic (i.e. grammatical) and syntactic opposition (cf. BAŃCZEROWSKI et al. 1982: 276–278) between words belonging to such morphosyntactic categories as: (i) nominative and accusative on the one hand and (ii) passive and impersonal on the other. In order to present this more clearly, we will operate with the following system of sentence paradigms:

I	II	III
(1) <i>Mies tappaa kanan.</i> 'The man kills a hen.' 'The man will kill a hen.'	(10) <i>Kana tapetaan.</i> 'One kills the hen.' 'One will kill the hen.'	(19) <i>Tapa kana.</i> 'Kill the hen.'
(2) <i>Mies tappaa hänet.</i> 'The man kills him.' 'The man will kill him.'	(11) <i>Hänet tapetaan.</i> 'One kills him.' 'One will kill him.'	(20) <i>Tapa hänet.</i> 'Kill him.'
(3) <i>Mies tappaa kanaa.</i> 'The man kills a hen (slowly).'	(12) <i>Kanaa tapetaan.</i> 'One kills the hen (slowly).'	(21) <i>Tapa kanaa.</i> 'Kill the hen (slowly).'
(4) <i>Mies tappaa häntä.</i> 'The man kills him (slowly).'	(13) <i>Häntä tapetaan.</i> 'One kills him (slowly).'	(22) <i>Tapa häntä.</i> 'Kill him (slowly).'
(5) <i>Mies ei tapa kanaa.</i> 'The man doesn't kill a hen.' 'The man won't kill a hen.'	(14) <i>Kanaa ei tapeta.</i> 'One doesn't kill the hen.' 'One won't kill the hen.'	(23) <i>Älä tapa kanaa.</i> 'Don't kill the hen.'
(6) <i>Mies ei tapa häntä.</i> 'The man doesn't kill him.' 'The man won't kill him.'	(15) <i>Häntä ei tapeta.</i> 'One doesn't kill him.' 'One won't kill him.'	(24) <i>Älä tapa häntä.</i> 'Don't kill him.'

- (7) *Mies tappaa kanat.*
 'The man kills (all) the hens.'
 'The man will kill (all) the hens.'
 'The man kills the (known set of) hens.'
 'The man will kill the (known set of) hens.'
- (8) *Mies tappaa kanoja.*
 'The man kills (some) hens.'
 'The man will kill (some) hens.'
- (9) *Mies ei tapa kanoja.*
 'The man doesn't kill (some) hens.'
 'The man won't kill (some) hens.'

- (16) *Kanat tapetaan.*
 'One kills (all) the hens.'
 'One will kill (all) the hens.'
 'One kills the (known set of) hens.'
 'One will kill the (known set of) hens.'
- (17) *Kanoja tapetaan.*
 'One kills (some) hens.'
 'One will kill (some) hens.'
- (18) *Kanoja ei tapeta.*
 'One doesn't kill (some) hens.'
 'One won't kill (some) hens.'

- (25) *Tapa kanat.*
 'Kill (all) the hens.'
 'Kill the (known set of) hens.'
- (26) *Tapa kanoja.*
 'Kill (some) hens.'
- (27) *Älä tapa kanoja.*
 'Don't kill (some) hens.'

IV	V	VI
(28) <i>Miehellä on kana.</i> 'The man has a hen.'	(36) <i>Pöydällä on kana.</i> 'There's a hen on the table.'	(42) <i>Kana on pöydällä.</i> 'The hen is on the table.'
(29) <i>Miehellä on hänet.</i> 'The man has him.'		(43) <i>Hän on pöydällä.</i> 'He is on the table.'
(30) <i>Miehellä on kanaa.</i> 'The man has (some) hen.'	(37) <i>Pöydällä on kanaa.</i> 'There's (some) hen on the table.'	
(31) <i>Miehellä ei ole kanaa.</i> 'The man doesn't have a hen.'	(38) <i>Pöydällä ei ole kanaa.</i> 'There's no hen on the table.'	
(32) <i>Miehellä ei ole häntä.</i> 'The man doesn't have him.'		
(33) <i>Miehellä on kanat.</i> 'The man has (all) the hens.' 'The man has the (known set of) hens.'	(39) <i>Pöydällä on kanat.</i> 'There are (all) hens on the table.' 'There's (known set of) hens on the table.'	(44) <i>Kanat ovat pöydällä.</i> '(All) The hens are on table.'
(34) <i>Miehellä on kanoja.</i> 'The man has (some) hens.'	(40) <i>Pöydällä on kanoja.</i> 'There are (some) hens on the table.'	
(35) <i>Miehellä ei ole kanoja.</i> 'The man doesn't have (some) hens.'	(41) <i>Pöydällä ei ole kanoja.</i> 'There are no hens on the table.'	
VII	VIII	
(45) <i>Kana on tapettu.</i> 'One has killed the hen.'	(54) <i>Kana on tapettu.</i> 'The hen is killed.'	
(46) <i>Hänet on tapettu.</i> 'One has killed him.'	(55) <i>Hän on tapettu.</i> 'He is killed.'	
(47) <i>Kanaa on tapettu.</i> 'One has killed the hen (slowly).'		
(48) <i>Häntä on tapettu.</i> 'One has killed him (slowly).'		
(49) <i>Kanaa ei ole tapettu.</i> 'One hasn't killed the hen.'	(56) <i>Kana ei ole tapettu.</i> 'The hen is not killed.'	
(50) <i>Häntä ei ole tapettu.</i> 'One hasn't killed him.'	(57) <i>Hän ei ole tapettu.</i> 'He is not killed.'	

(51) *Kanat on tapettu.*
 ‘One has killed (all) the hens.’
 ‘One has killed the (known
 set of) hens.’

(52) *Kanoja on tapettu.*
 ‘One has killed (some) hens.’

(53) *Kanoja ei ole tapettu.*
 ‘One hasn’t killed (some) hens.’

(58) *Kanat ovat tapettuja.*
 ‘The hens are killed.’

(59) *Kanat eivät ole tapet-
 tuja.*
 ‘The hens are not killed.’

The accusative admits the desinential form (i.e. possessing an ending) opposed to the non-desinential (endingless) nominative only in the singular in sentences in which the predicate belongs to the active voice (cf. I (1) *Mies tappaa kana/n*). In the sentences in which the predicate belongs to the impersonal voice, the accusative singular admits an endingless form phonically equal to the nominative (cf. II (10) *Kana/Ø tapetaan*) (apart from personal pronouns and the interrogative pronoun *kuka* ‘who’; cf. II (11) *Häne/t tapetaan*). Analogous properties characterize the sentences with imperative mood in the active voice of second person in both numbers (cf. III (19) *Tapa kana/Ø*, but (20) *Tapa häne/t*) (GENETZ 1882: 26–27; KETTUNEN 1936: 125; SETÄLÄ 1952: 48; HAKULINEN L. 1979: 98–99). Therefore the presence or absence of the ending in the accusative forms does not seem to be conditioned in the overwhelming majority of cases by the inflectional type of the word in question, like for example in an Indo-European language such as Polish, but by the syntactic context in which the word belonging to this case category should occur. The traditional nominal paradigms of the Polish language contain one form of the accusative in the appropriate number: (i) the desinential (for example: *kur/ę* ‘hen-Acc Sg’ ≠ *kur/a* ‘hen-Nom Sg’) or (ii) non-desinential (for example: *geś/Ø* ‘goose-Acc Sg’ = *geś/Ø* ‘goose-Nom Sg’). Most nominal paradigms of Finnish, on the other hand, should contain in the singular two forms of this case in parallel: (i) the desinential (*kana/n*) and (ii) non-desinential accusative (*kana/Ø*), which cannot be treated as a morphological alternation *sensu stricto*. The phonic opposition between the nominative and accusative in Polish, which is partially blurred (as for example in *geś/Ø*, where Acc Sg = Nom Sg), seems still to be systematically maintained thanks to such word types as *kurę*, where the accusative forms take a different ending than the nominative (*kur/ę* ≠ *kur/a*). In Finnish the dissolution of the phonic neutralization between the nominative and the analyzed type of the accusative on analogous principles as in Polish takes place only in the case of the aforementioned personal pronouns and the interrogative pronoun *kuka* ‘who’, which constitute a small island in the immensity of nominal stems which do not behave in this way (cf. the attitudes to this question in: PENTTILÄ 1963: 149; KIPARSKY 2001; HAKULINEN A. et al. 2004: 1178 and the discussion in: BIELECKI 2009). The question of whether such an insignificant amount has a sufficient reflection in Finnish linguistic consciousness to talk about a non-desinential accusative seems to be well motivated. In Finnish, however, the opposition between the accusative (non-desinential, of course) and the nominative seems to be maintained in a more flagrant way thanks to the separate (“already” desinential) case category called partitive. The forms of this case in the sentences with the active voice fulfill the function of the direct object, opposing (analogously to the forms of the desinential ac-

cusative) systematically the forms of the nominative fulfilling the function of the subject (cf. I (3) *Mies/Ø tappaa kana/a*, (5) *Mies/Ø ei tapa kana/a*, (8) *Mies/Ø tappaa kano/j/a*, (9) *Mies/Ø ei tapa kano/j/a*).¹ Forms of the partitive occur in the sentences with impersonal voice as well (cf. II (12) *Kana/a tapetaan*, (14) *Kana/a ei tapeta*, (17) *Kano/j/a tapetaan*, (18) *Kano/j/a ei tapeta*) and with imperative mood of the second person of both numbers (cf. III (21) *Tapa kana/a*, (23) *Älä tapa kana/a*, (26) *Tapa kano/j/a*, (27) *Älä tapa kano/j/a*), in which, as has been mentioned above, one asserts the occurrence only of the non-desinential accusative phonically equal to the nominative. The syntagmatic comparisons within the part of the system of sentence paradigms so far discussed seem to provide a solid confirmation for the disjointness of the two postulated morphosyntactic categories: (i) the nominative on the one hand and (ii) accusative (especially the non-desinential one) on the other, because if words like: *kana/n*, *kana/a* and *kano/j/a* (from I (1) *Mies tappaa kanan*, (3) *Mies tappaa kanaa*, (8) *Mies tappaa kanoja* etc.) do not fulfill the function of subject and do not belong to the nominative, then the words *kana/Ø*, *kana/a* and *kano/j/a* (from II (10) *Kana tapetaan*, (12) *Kanaa tapetaan*, (17) *Kanoja tapetaan* etc. and III (19) *Tapa kana*, (21) *Tapa kanaa*, (26) *Tapa kanoja* etc.) do not fulfill the aforementioned syntactic function and do not belong to the category of nominative either, in spite of the fact that the word type *kana/Ø* can belong to it when occurring in other sentence types (for example: VI (42) *Kana on pöydällä* etc.).

From the typological point of view the following property of the diathetic structure of Finnish seems extremely interesting: on the one hand in the nominative there occurs neutralization of such semantic categories as agent (the whole paradigm I) and stative (understood as: 'single actant of the intransitive verb' or 'being, entity referring to a certain state' cf. BAŃCZEROWSKI et al. 1982: 221) (the whole paradigm VI). The agent and stative are opposed within the active voice (unmarked diathesis) to the category of patient, which finds its manifestations in two desinential case categories: (desinential) accusative and partitive. Such a state of affairs corresponds fundamentally to so-called accusative languages. On the other hand, however, in Finnish there occurs neutralization of the patient and stative (cf. paradigms II and III (patient) and IV and V (stative)) in the partitive, non-desinential accusative (and partially in the accusative ending in *-t* in the case of personal pronouns and the interrogative pronoun *kuka* 'who'). The morphosyntactic opposition of the patient and stative, neutralized within the unmarked diathesis in the (non-desinential) absolute, to the agent manifested by means of the (desinential) ergative is a feature of so-called ergative languages (cf. DIXON 1994: 6–9). In Finnish this kind of neutralization seems to take place as well, within the unmarked diathesis (active voice) (cf. paradigms III, IV and V) and partially within the marked diathesis (impersonal voice) (cf. paradigm II), in the desinential partitive and in the accusative, which indeed is expressed in the analyzed sentence type non-desinentially, but as has been said, its distinguishing – thanks to appropriate syntagmatic comparisons from the non-desinential nominative – does not pose any fundamental difficulty. Terho Itkonen named this phenomenon *inverted ergativity*; the patient and stative in Finnish do not undergo neutralization in the forms of the nominative fulfilling the function of the subject, but in the case forms fulfilling the function of the direct object: (i) the

¹ Different aspectual, quantitative and informational meanings carried by the accusative and partitive in the affirmative mood in the analyzed sentence types will not be discussed here in more detail because they appear not to be relevant to the subject of the present paper (cf. ITKONEN 1975a).

(non-desinential) accusative and (ii) partitive (ITKONEN 1974, 1975b). In the case of the sentence type represented by paradigms IV and V, in which the predicate belongs to *verbum intransitivum*, in comparison with the sentences with the predicate expressed in the form of *verbum transitivum* (paradigms II, III), the opposition between the nominative and partitive, while maintaining, as has already been pointed out, the opposition between the nominative and the non-desinential accusative, undergoes obfuscation again (one would like to say regrettably). In order to describe the presented dependencies coherently, perhaps because of the lack of smaller syntactic categories than those regarded traditionally (cf. syntactems in BAŃCZEROWSKI 1980: 122–132), there seems to be some motivation for the distinction, which can appear quite surprising, of such a sentence part as direct object in the case of sentences without a transitive verb as well (cf. paradigms IV and V) (for example: HAKULINEN L. 1926; WIIK 1974). On the other hand classifying the words encoding the stative from paradigm IV or V in the category of the subject, which is no rarity in the Finnish linguistic literature (for example: HAKANEN 1972), creates a serious inconsistency, namely that in the process of assignment to the appropriate syntactic category the appropriate morphosyntactic encoding is being taken into account entirely selectively. This is because the words belonging to the non-desinential accusative and partitive sometimes fulfill the function of direct object (cf. paradigms II and III), and sometimes the function of subject (cf. paradigms IV and V). In such a situation there would seem to be some motivation for the assertion that if words like *kana/Ø*, (*häne/t*), *kana/a*, *hän/tä*, *kana/t*, *kano/j/a* from paradigm IV and V belong to the category of subject, then the same syntactic category should contain *mutatis mutandis* the words homophonic with them from paradigms II and III. In the Finnish linguistic literature such an approach, constituting an evident contradiction to what has been asserted previously about the syntactic function of the mentioned words in the paradigm types II and III, is not encountered; they are with full consistency treated as manifestations of direct object.

From the above description it results that in Finnish the non-desinential nominative is opposed to the desinential accusative only in such a syntagm type in which words belonging to both case categories can, constituting the argumento-predicative structure of the verb, occur in parallel (cf. for example I (1) and III (19)). The non-desinential variant (homophonic with the nominative) on the other hand seems to occur in such a syntagm type in which it is not being opposed semantically and morphosyntactically to the nominative (cf. for example II (10)) (It should be noted that in the case of the imperative mood forms in the active voice the lexicalization of the subject practically does not occur either.). The category of the accusative in Finnish seems therefore to be quite conspicuously split into two subcategories: (i) the desinential and (ii) non-desinential accusative. The syntactic contexts in which words belonging to both subcategories of this case can occur are quite different: (i) the forms of the desinential accusative qualify the transitive verb referring to the subject in the form of the nominative, while (ii) the forms of the non-desinential accusative qualify fundamentally the verb, which in such a form cannot be conjoined (or is not conjoined *de facto*, cf. the imperative mood) with the subject in the lexicalized form. A verb with such properties is usually assigned to the so-called impersonal voice. The specificity of the Finnish verb in this respect, however, requires further comment.

Finnish linguists have still not reached a consensus on the number of meanings which should be distinguished within the dimension of voice in reference to the finite verb. Kan-

gasmaa-Minn seems to assert, for example, that within the dimension of voice in Finnish only active voice occurs (KANGASMAA-MINN 1980: 69). The very essence of such a solution seems to be highly doubtful: how should one know about the Finnish verb that it belongs only to the active voice, if within the analyzed aspect it would not be opposed to any other homogenous meaning? The grammatical categories emerging from the linguistic analysis must after all be oppositional entities. Such an approach, regarded as too radical, or simply internally contradictory, is a minority one in Finnish linguistics. In it the axis of the dispute is shifted rather towards the question of distinguishing the impersonal from the passive voice, or the need to speak of the latter at all. The mere fact of the occurrence of at least two meanings within the dimension of voice is not usually questioned. The semificator (grammatical marker) distinguishing the impersonal (and passive) forms from the active, morphologically unmarked, forms is the morpheme with a generalized form (it is a form not taking into account any kind of consonant or vocal alternations): (i) *-TA-* (for the finite verb) and (ii) *-TU* (for the infinite verb). The words containing these morphemes can belong to the analogous categories of tense and mood as the forms of the active voice. In the relevant simple forms there occurs the allomorph *-TA-*, in the composed forms the allomorph *-TU*, which is connected with the appropriate finite forms of the auxiliary verb *olla* 'to be' (for example: *on tapettu* in VII (45), (46) or VIII (54), (55) etc.). In the contemporary Finnish language there seem to co-exist two, functionally different, sentence series with the predicate lexicalized by means of the finite forms of the auxiliary verb *olla* 'to be' and the participle of the transitive verb ending in *-TU*. In one of those series, revealing the fact of the concord in respect to number and person between the nominal and verbal clause, using the analogy with sentences with the active voice, does not pose any difficulty (cf. paradigm VIII). In the other series, however, it seems that the revealing of such a concord is beset with serious difficulties (cf. paradigm VII and especially its relation to II and III). In the light of the linguistic facts, however, it is difficult to deny the co-existence of two paradigm types, in spite of rather reluctant declarations by some linguists with purist inclinations in reference to the congruent series (cf. VIII) (SAARIMAA 1944; KARLSSON 1977: 373–374; HÄKKINEN 1994: 251–252). The properties of the two sentence types analyzed here (as well as the properties of other sentence types constituting the point of departure for the analysis) entitle us to formulate the following corollaries: (i) all composed forms of the transitive verb occurring in paradigm VII, belonging naturally to the impersonal voice, are homophonic with the forms occurring in paradigm VIII belonging to the passive voice (cf. *on tapettu* from VII (45), (46), (47), (48), (51), (52) and VIII (54), (55), *ei ole tapettu* from VII (49), (50), (53) and VIII (56), (57)), (ii) the inverse dependency does not take place; not all composed verb forms belonging to the passive voice belong to the impersonal voice (cf. VIII (58) *ovat tapettuja* and (59) *eivät ole tapettuja*), (iii) co-occurrence of the syncretism between the nominative and non-desinential accusative on one hand, and between the passive and impersonal voice on the other, implies the occurrence of total syntactic homonymy in the case of the sentence type *Kana on tapettu*, which in exactly the same form seems to belong to different sentence paradigms: VII and VIII. In a situation where in Finnish the neutralization between the nominative and accusative and between the passive and impersonal voice, particularly univocally in the case of the composed verb forms, assumes such great dimensions, it seems probably reasonable to conclude that in the case of simple verb forms too

(cf. paradigm II) we are dealing with syncretism of the impersonal and passive voice, whose extent in this case should be described as follows: (i) all simple affirmative forms of the impersonal voice belong simultaneously to the passive voice (accomplish the syntagmatic comparison between: I (10) *Kana tapetaan*, (16) *Kanat tapetaan* and VIII (54) *Kana on tapettu*, (58) *Kanat ovat tapettuja*), (ii) simple negative forms of the impersonal voice do not belong to the passive voice (accomplish the analogous comparison of the previous sentences with: II (14) *Kanaa ei tapeta*, (15) *Häntä ei tapeta* and (18) *Kanoja ei tapeta*). Additionally this fact seems to be indirectly corroborated by the correctness of the following compound sentence type created as the result of the paratactic fusion between: (i) the sentence with the predicate in the simple affirmative form of the impersonal (passive) voice (*N. valittiin puheenjohtajaksi* ‘One chose N. as chairman’ / ‘N. was chosen as chairman’) and (ii) the sentence with the predicate in active voice (*N. oli tässä toimessa vuoteen 1974* ‘N. remained in this post until 1974’ → *N. valittiin puheenjohtajaksi ja oli tässä toimessa vuoteen 1974* ‘N. was chosen as chairman and remained in this post until 1974’ (cf. ITKONEN 1974: 381). If *N.* fulfills the function of subject occurring in the nominative, then *valittiin*, fulfilling the function of predicate qualifying it, belongs to the passive voice. In this place it is proper to mention a sentence type that functions to some degree, especially in official documents, in spite of numerous reservations expressed by linguists (KANGASMAA-MINN 1980: 59–60; SADENIEMI 1959; VIHONEN 1966); namely the type *Kana tapetaan miehen taholta / toimesta* where the agent is lexicalized explicitly (the postpositional phrase *miehen taholta / toimesta* ‘from the side of the man’). This fact too seems to support the assignment of the *tapetaan* form to the passive voice.

3. THE CATEGORY OF PERSON IN ZABROCKI’S THEORY

The properties of the category of person in Zabrocki’s theory seem to emerge directly from the properties of the lingual message functioning within the framework of the communicative events.² The structure of the communicative events, because of its universality, seems to constitute a certain homogenous system of reference enabling analysis of every ethnic language. In the framework of the communicative event, there are ascribed to its participants properties reflected in their communicative statuses, namely the statuses of: (i) *locutor* (speaker, sender), (ii) *allocutive* (receiver, hearer, addressee) and (iii) *delocutive* (entity spoken of) (being neither *locutor* nor *allocutive*). The words designating the appropriate event participants can signify the appropriate communicational status, namely carry the meaning of the: (i) first, (ii) second and (iii) third person respectively. Since the structure of the communicative events provides for only three statuses for their participants, within the category of person there can be distinguished only three subcategories, namely three persons.

The fullest manifestation of the lingual message is a sentence. If the sentence does not assume a defective form because of redundancy overloading, then in its fundamental form it consists of two parts: (i) the subject in the form of a noun and (ii) the predicate in the form of

² The following elaborations: ZABROCKI 1980: 133–140; BAŃCZEROWSKI 1997, 1999 were used as written sources of knowledge about the discussed theory.

a verb qualifying the noun. In the lingual message the content of the verb is deictically subordinated to a certain personal category reflecting the appropriate communicative status and lexicalized in the noun. The sentence subject to which the predication refers must, for that reason, belong to some personal category. If for example the speaker identifies the subject with himself, then the subject will belong to the first person. If the subject is identified with the receiver, then it will belong to the second person etc. In Zabrocki's approach the subject is a compulsory category building up a sentence. There are no subjectless sentences. The Polish sentence type *Byłem w Warszawie* '(I) Was in Warsaw' is apparently subjectless since it represents only a defective, incomplete structure, which in this form is able to function as a lingual message because the affiliation of the subject to the appropriate person is signaled by the ending *-em*. This ending refers to the subject in the form of the personal pronoun *ja* 'I' which lexically conveys the meaning of the first person. Of course personal endings exist only in those languages which display grammaticalization of personal meanings.³ In languages where personal meanings are not grammaticalized, responsibility for carrying those meanings rests with lexical units such as personal pronouns; cf. the past tense of Russian verbs: *я был/Ø* 'I was', *ты был/Ø* 'you were' etc.

The tripartite category of person – as a kind of semantic *constans* bound with the appropriate communicative statuses emerging from the properties of the lingual message – in Zabrocki's theory is connected indissolubly not only with the category of subject or sentence as discussed above, but also with the category of diathesis, and within it with (grammatical) voice and of course case. If the speaker identifies the entity from which the action takes its source (agent) with the point of departure, namely with the subject, then we have active diathesis (for example: *Mężczyzna zabija kurę* 'The man is killing a hen'). If the identification refers to the entity in which the action reaches its goal (patient), then we have passive diathesis (for example: *Kura jest zabijana przez mężczyznę* 'The hen is being killed by the man'). The sender of the lingual statement can influence not only the locating of his point of the view in the subject in reference to the appropriate diathetically relevant semantic category (agent vs. patient), thereby regulating the voice of the verb (active vs. passive) and the cases of its arguments, but also in reference to the category of person to which he classifies both entities based on their communicative status. So, from the sentence *Ja zabijam kurę* 'I am killing a hen' it results that the sender makes the agent and himself the departure point, whereas from the sentence type *Kura jest zabijana przeze mnie* 'The hen is being killed by me' it results that the sender is the agent as well, but the departure point is the hen, toward which his action is directed.⁴

In accordance with Zabrocki's approach, if the personal meanings are grammaticalized, then within the defective structures the affiliation to the appropriate person of the words

³ Siewierska, in the case of some languages which grammaticalize particular personal meanings, gives examples which call into question the possibility of parallel lexicalization of personal meanings in those languages (SIEWIERSKA 2004: 19–21).

⁴ In the linguistic literature, voice is understood as the regulator of the argumento-predicative structure of the verb in a much broader sense than is anticipated in Zabrocki's approach. Klaiman, for example, suggests that voice can regulate not only the relation between appropriate semantic meanings as agent, patient etc. and the syntactic functions fulfilled by the appropriate nouns conveying these meanings, but also between such pragmatic functions as: (i) *ontological salience* (i.e. the grade of naturalness in fulfilling the appropriate function from the mental point of view of the language user) or (ii) *informational salience* (i.e. the grade of the importance considering the informational structure of the discourse) (KLAIMAN 1991: 23–33).

designating different kinds of event participants is encoded in the appropriate verb ending, for example: *Zabij/am kureę* ‘(I) Am killing a hen’ (the subject: 1st person singular, agent), *Jest/eś bity* ‘(You) Are being beaten’ (the subject: 2nd person singular, patient). In Polish or Finnish this kind of encoding within the finite verb refers only to the personal affiliation of the subject. In Hungarian, on the other hand, in the active voice the finite verb possesses appropriate endings distinguishing all three persons as regards the personal affiliation of the subject (for example: *lát/ok* ‘(I) see/Ø’, *lát/sz* ‘(you) see/Ø’, *lát/Ø* ‘(he) see/s’ etc.), but the personal distinction in reference to the direct object is manifested by means of an ending as well, although not in a complete way: only the 2nd person is opposed to the others when connected with the 1st person subject ending, for example: *lát/!ak* ‘(I) see/Ø (you (both))’ (cf. fully developed subject-predicate-object concord system in reference to the person and number in relatively closely related Hungarian Ob-Ugric languages: Khanty and Mansi (COLLINDER 1957: 327–328, 351–353). In Polish and Finnish the predicate shows concord only with the person of the subject, while in Hungarian and Ob-Ugric languages this phenomenon is more developed, because the predicate manifests such concord not only with the subject, but also (partially in Hungarian) with the direct object.

4. THE CONSEQUENCES OF ZABROCKI’S THEORY FOR THE CATEGORY OF VOICE, CASE AND PERSON IN FINNISH

Evidence of the grammaticalization of personal meanings in Finnish seems to be given by sentences in which the predicate belongs to the active voice (cf. paradigms I, III and VI). Here the verb assumes the appropriate endings referring to the personal affiliation of the subject (for example: (*Minä*) *Tapa/n* ‘(I) Kill/Ø’, (*Sinä*) *Tapa/t* ‘(You) Kill/Ø’, (*Hän*) *Tappa/a* ‘(He) Kill/s’ etc.). Also in the (not fully accepted by some purists) passive voice (cf. paradigm VIII) the appropriate ending of the auxiliary verb refers to the person of the subject (for example: (*Minä*) *Ole/n kutsuttu* ‘(I) Am invited’, (*Sinä*) *Ole/t kutsuttu* ‘(You) Are invited’, (*Hän*) *On/Ø kutsuttu* ‘(He) Is invited’ etc.). The lack of concord between the nominal and verbal phrase in the sentences from paradigm II in reference to the category of person seems in this light to be motivated by the morphosyntactic properties of both phrases of such a sentence type described in the second section. In Finnish there is no concord in reference to person between the predicate and direct object. The sentence type II (10) *Kana tapetaan* ‘One kills (will kill) the hen’ must then represent, in the framework of Zabrocki’s theory of person, incomplete, defective sentences, because the subject does not occur in lexicalized form. However the verb, by means of the appropriate ending (here *-an*), should convey the information about its personal affiliation. The meaning of which of three persons is semified (i.e. marked grammatically) by this ending cannot however be proved directly in literary Finnish, because it does not seem to be possible to complete the sentence type II (10) *Kana tapetaan* with an appropriate personal pronoun occurring in the nominative which conveys the personal meanings lexically. The sentences **Kana tapetaan minä*, **Kana tapetaan sinä*, **Kana tapetaan hän* are incorrect. Some indirect linguistic facts, however, make it possible to qualify it more precisely. Firstly, the ending of the 3rd person *-nsA/-Vn* attached to the nominal stems can, in one of its multiple functions, convey the meaning of the possessor (for example: *kana/nsa* ‘his / her / its hen’). This ending, attached for example

to the word fulfilling the function of the direct object, not provided with any disambiguating attributes, refers to the subject of the sentence; from the sentence type *Mies tappaa kana/nsa* it results that the man kills (will kill) his hen, in other words the man is the possessor of the hen he kills (will kill), not anyone else from the sphere of persons or personifiable entities which can have the status of the third person in the communicative system. Providing a word fulfilling the function of direct object on analogous principles in the sentence type II (10) *Kana tapetaan* (i.e. with the ending *-nsA/-Vn*) seems to be impossible because the sentences **Kana/nsa tapetaan* are incorrect. The conclusion can be drawn from this that the subject who kills the hen does not belong, at least univocally, to the third person. Secondly, the words fulfilling the predicative function or so-called state adverbial in connection with the analyzed verbal forms occur in the plural, signaled among other things by the affix *-i-*, for example: *Ol/la/an ilois/i/a* 'One is gay (*gays)', *Kana tape/ta/an tyytyväis/i/nä* 'One kills (will kill) the hen being gay (*gays)'. This implies that the subject implied by the form *ta-petaan* belongs rather to the plural than the singular. It is worth noticing at this stage that, considering the properties of the lingual message, the fact of the affiliation to the plural number with simultaneous prohibition of limitation of belonging only to the third person implies that the subject belongs also to the first person plural (*me* 'we') and/or second person plural (*te* 'you (both)'). If the subject belongs at least to the 1st person plural, then it can belong: (i) both to the 1st and 2nd person singular (cf. inclusive personal pronouns, for example in Udmurt *асьмеос* 'we' = 'me and you') or (ii) both to the 1st and 3rd person singular (cf. exclusive personal pronouns, for example in Udmurt *му* 'we' = 'me and him'). The validity of such an interpretation seems to be corroborated in some way by the structures found in colloquial Finnish in which the forms *tapetaan* 'one kills (will kill)', which in the literary variety of the language belong exclusively to the impersonal voice, undergo syntactic reinterpretation to become in the colloquial language *de facto* forms of the active voice supplanting the hitherto existing forms of this voice bound with the pronoun of the 1st person plural (cf. literary *Me tapamme kanan* 'We kill (will kill) the hen' with the colloquial *Me tapetaan kana* 'We kill (will kill) the hen'). Thirdly, the forms *tapetaan* 'one kills (will kill)' can be found in the inflectional paradigms of only those verbs which can possess all three personal forms in the active voice (for example: *tapan* 'I kill (will kill)', *tapat* 'you kill (will kill)', *tappaa* 'he kills (will kill)' etc.). Such verbs, sometimes rather metaphorically called poly-personal verbs (*monipersonaiset verbit*), are opposed to the verbs which in the active voice can be bound only with the 3rd person (so-called mono-personal verbs – *yksipersonaiset verbit*), for example: *ukkostaa* 'to thunder', *kannattaa* 'to be worth' etc. From the last type of verbs it is impossible to create the analyzed verbal forms: **ukkostetaan* '*one thunders', **kannatetaan* 'one is worth'. Such a limitation can be explained in the light of what has been said previously in the following way: verbs which can be bound with the subject in every person designate actions which can be carried out by people. To the 1st and 2nd person, if they are not used metaphorically, there can belong exclusively people. The only personal category in the non-metaphorical sense in which things can occur is the 3rd person. The verb *ukkostaa* 'to thunder' in the non-metaphorical sense can qualify only a subject belonging to the third person. Such a personal limitation, as has been shown, is inadmissible in the case of the analyzed Finnish verbal forms. Fourthly, for the Finnish native speaker the sentence type II (10) *Kana tapetaan* implies highly univocally the humanity of the non-

lexicalized subject, which additionally confirms what has been said earlier. Concerning the dependencies described above, in concordance with the terminology employed by Zabrocki it is possible to say that the sender of the statement type II (10) *Kana tapetaan* locates in the subject space entities which belong to all three persons simultaneously. The speaker does not want to declare in favor of any concrete personal communicative status for them. Those statuses coalesce to some extent (undergo neutralization). Following TUOMIKOSKI (1971), some Finnish linguists in this regard qualify those forms as forms of the 4th person of the active voice, in which additionally the opposition of number has been obliterated. Within Zabrocki's theory of person such a notion seems to be excluded; there are only three communicative statuses, and the question of their manifestation or – as here – neutralization cannot influence in any way the ultimate number of persons. In the framework of Zabrocki's theory so-called 4th person, opposed according to Tuomikoski at the same taxonomic level to the remaining persons, should be rejected as internally contradictory.⁵ Then in this light the grammaticalization of meaning embracing all three persons simultaneously seems to be a property of the Finnish language; such a meaning is not conveyed in Finnish lexically because it is impossible to connect these forms to any personal pronoun in the nominative case fulfilling the function of the subject (cf. however the personal reference of the French pronoun *on* 'one' (GREVISSE 1980: 644)). The forms *tapetaan* in reference to person seem to constitute the *suprasignificata* of the forms *tapan*, *tapat*, *tappaa* etc. Because of the impossibility (blocking) of the lexicalization of one of the diathetically relevant semantic categories (agent), which thus regulates the argumento-predicative structure of the sentence, and because of the morphological markedness of the analyzed verbal forms (cf. the affixes *-TA-* and *-TU*), it seems justified to speak of a separate morphosyntactic category, i.e. impersonal voice opposed to the active and passive voice. One should remember that the neutralization of personal meanings, namely the coalescence of all three communicative statuses vs. their differentiation or split, is very deep in this case in the sense that the contexts where it undergoes an eventual dissolution for the sake of the differentiation of separate personal meanings (more precisely only the 3rd person) embrace only the sentence types II (10) *Kana tapetaan* (maybe (16) *Kanat tapetaan* too) and VII (45) (VIII (54)) *Kana on tapettu* in which the function of the nominal phrase is fulfilled by a noun not belonging to the category of personal pronoun or interrogative pronoun *kuka* 'who'. These structures are characterized by the syncretism of the accusative and nominative on one hand, and the impersonal and passive voice on the other. The ending types *-an* in II (10) and maybe (16) and *-Ø* in VII (45) (VIII (54)) can refer both to: (i) all three persons simultaneously (impersonal interpretation) and (ii) exclusively to the 3rd person (singular or possibly plural) (passive interpretation). As has been shown in the second section, all composed forms of transitive verbs occurring in paradigm VII belonging to the impersonal voice are homophonic with forms occurring in paradigm VIII where they belong to the passive voice. The differentiation of the appropriate voice, and consequently of the personal meaning conveyed by the verb, in a broader syntactic context does not afford any difficulties; the predicate in sentence type VII (46)–(53) semifies the impersonal meaning (then the personal meanings coalesce), while the predicate in the sentence type VIII (55)–(59) semifies the passive meaning (then the separate personal meanings undergo differentiation/split). The

⁵ The concept was very strongly criticized by RAJANDI (1999: 68).

grammar of person in Finnish as postulated in the introduction should contain sentences which would reflect the dependencies described above.

5. RECAPITULATION AND CONCLUSIONS

The properties of the morphosyntactic encoding of words taking part in diathesis in Finnish which result from the relatively extensive phonic neutralization of the semic and syntactic opposition (leading in some cases to total ambiguity) seem to imply certain essential consequences for the grammar of person in that language. On the one hand in Finnish separate personal meanings undergo grammaticalization, being expressed by means of specialized personal endings. These endings make it possible to reconstruct the personal affiliation of the subject without the need to lexicalize it each time in the form of a noun or personal pronoun. On the other hand certain verbal forms seem not to be combinable (at least in literary Finnish) with a personal pronoun in the nominative fulfilling the function of subject. In accordance with Zabrocki's theory of person the personal affiliation of the non-lexicalized subject in languages which grammaticalize personal meanings should be encoded in the verb. From some indirect linguistic facts it is possible to infer the corollary that in the analyzed case this affiliation embraces all three persons taken together. Such a personal meaning in Finnish is subject only to grammaticalization, because Finnish does not have a personal pronoun lexifying such a personal reference. Because of the connections foreseen by Zabrocki's theory between person and diathesis – and within it, voice and case – it is possible to identify two fundamental types of phonic neutralization of the semic and syntactic opposition between verbal forms conveying the collective personal meaning (impersonal meaning) and forms conveying the meaning of the third person. In the first case the verbal forms carrying the personal meanings are indeed very often homophonic, but the wider syntactic context in which they occur makes it possible to disambiguate the personal meanings carried, for example: *on tapettu* from VII (46) *Hänet on tapettu* belongs to the collective personal meaning, whereas *on tapettu* from VIII (55) *Hän on tapettu* belongs to the 3rd person (singular). In the second case reference to such contextual support does not afford the desired effects; because of the properties of the diathetic structure of the Finnish language, *on tapettu* from VII (45) and VIII (54) belongs simultaneously to the collective personal meaning and to the 3rd person (singular). The sentences illustrating this kind of dependency are undoubtedly among the theorems of the grammar of person in Finnish as postulated in the introduction.

REFERENCES

- BAŃCZEROWSKI Jerzy. 1980. *Systems of Semantics and Syntax. A Determinational Theory of Language*. Warszawa–Poznań: PWN.
- BAŃCZEROWSKI Jerzy. 1997. "Towards a General Theory of the Category of Person." In: RAMISCH et al. 1997: 441–461.
- BAŃCZEROWSKI Jerzy. 1999. "Kategoria Osoby w ujęciu Ludwika Zabrockiego." In: BAŃCZEROWSKI & ZGÓŁKA 1999: 59–78.
- BAŃCZEROWSKI Jerzy, ZGÓŁKA Tadeusz (eds.). 1999. *Linguam amicabilem facere. Ludovico Zabrocki in memoriam*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

- BĄNCZEROWSKI Jerzy, POGONOWSKI Jerzy, ZGÓLKA Tadeusz. 1982. *Wstęp do językoznawstwa*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- BIELECKI Robert. 2009. "On the Nature of the Accusative in Finnish." *Lingua Posnaniensis* LI, 19–38.
- COLLINDER Björn. 1957. *Survey of the Uralic Languages*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- DIXON Robert M.W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GENETZ Arvid. 1882. *Finska Språkets Grammatik*. Helsinki: Hufvudstadsbladets Tryckeri.
- GREVISSE Maurice. 1980. *Le Bon Usage. Grammaire française avec des remarques sur la langue française d'aujourd'hui*. Paris–Gembloux: Duculot.
- HAKANEN Aimo. 1972. "Normaalilause ja eksistentiaalilause." *Sananjalka* 14, 36–76.
- HÄKKINEN Kaisa. 1994. *Agricolasta nykykieleen*. Porvoo–Helsinki–Juva: Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö.
- HAKULINEN Auli, VILKUNA Maria, KORHONEN Riitta, KOIVISTO Vesa, HEINONEN Tarja Riitta, ALHO Irja. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: Suomen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- HAKULINEN Lauri. 1926. "„Pojalla on vaaleat hiukset“ Subjektin ja predikaatin inkongruenssiako?" *Virittäjä* 30, 91–94.
- HAKULINEN Lauri. 1979. *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys*. Helsinki: Otava.
- ITKONEN Terho. 1974. "Ergatiivisuutta suomessa I." *Virittäjä* 78, 379–398.
- ITKONEN Terho. 1975a. *Erään sijamuodon ongelmia*. Helsinki: Helsingin Yliopiston Suomen Kielen Laitos.
- ITKONEN Terho. 1975b. "Ergatiivisuutta suomessa II." *Virittäjä* 79, 31–65.
- KANGASMAA-MINN Eeva. 1980. "Suomen kielen persoonallisesta passiivista." *Sananjalka* 22, 57–70.
- KARLSSON Fred. 1977. "Syntaktisten kongruenssijärjestelmien luonteesta ja funktioista." *Virittäjä* 81, 359–391.
- KETTUNEN Lauri. 1936. *Suomen kielioppi*. Porvoo–Helsinki: Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö.
- KIPARSKY Paul. 2001. "Structural Case in Finnish." *Lingua* 111, 315–376.
- KLAIMAN Miriam H. 1991. *Grammatical Voice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- PENTTILÄ Aarni. 1963. *Suomen kielioppi*. Porvoo–Helsinki: Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö.
- RAJANDI Henno. 1999. *Eesti impersonaali ja passiivi süntaks*. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Instituut.
- RAMISCH Heinrich, WYNNE Kenneth (eds.). 1997. *Language in Time and Space. Studies in Honour of Wolfgang Viereck on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- SAARIMAA Eemil A. 1944. "Pitäisikö tupakoinnin olla kiellettyä?" *Virittäjä*, 201–202.
- SADENIEMI Matti. 1959. "Muotisansoista muodostaa, taholta, toimesta." *Kielikello* 4, 88–89.
- SETÄLÄ Eemil N. 1952. *Suomen kielen lauseoppi*. Helsinki: Otava.
- STEWIERSKA Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TUOMIKOSKI Risto. 1971. "Persona, tekijä ja henkilö." *Virittäjä* 75, 146–152.
- VIHONEN Sakari. 1966. "Passiivityylistä." *Virittäjä* 70, 247–248.
- WIIK Kalevi. 1974. *Suomen eksistentiaalilauseiden "subjekti"*. Turku: Turun Yliopiston fonetiikan laitos.
- ZABROCKI Ludwik. 1980. *U podstaw struktury i rozwoju języka. At the Foundation of Language Structure and Development*. Warszawa–Poznań: PWN.