

Φ -agreement constraint on subject extraction in Finnish

This presentation provides an outline of Finnish extraction islands focusing on subject extraction. The main proposal is that Finnish subject extraction is constrained by the presence of subject-predicate agreement, thus exhibiting anti-agreement effect (Ouhalla, 1993). The extraction conditions are examined with regard to the following ϕ -agreement constraint for subject extraction:

(1) **Φ -agreement constraint on subject extraction**

Extraction of a subject is not possible out of a ϕ -agreement phrase.

An XP is a ϕ -agreement phrase if X^0 can display overt ϕ -feature (person, number) agreement with an overt pronoun. Constructions in which the presence of ϕ -agreement correlates with the absence of subject extraction in Finnish include non-finite clauses and adposition phrases. In these phrases (as well as DPs and APs) the presence of agreement surfaces as a possessive suffix (Kanerva, 1987).

Finnish allows extraction of arguments and adjuncts out of non-finite complement clauses and rejects extraction out of non-finite clauses that occupy an adjunct position (Vilkuna, 1989, Toivonen, 1995, Hakulinen et al., 2004, §1397). The example (2) shows that a non-finite complement clause (A-infinitive) allows extraction of the subject. This non-finite verb form does not display ϕ -agreement in any context.

- (2) Sinun-ko Pekka käski [_ lähteä] ?
 you.GEN-ko Pekka.NOM ordered leave.A
 'Was it you that Pekka ordered to leave?'

However, as observed by Toivonen (1995) and Huhmarniemi (2009), certain non-finite clauses that typically occupy an adjunct position allow limited extraction. One of these clause types is MATTA-infinitive, which allows extraction of the object argument, although native speakers report varying judgements. However, subject extraction (3b-c) is found ungrammatical by all speakers. The example (b) shows that the MATTA-infinitive displays ϕ -agreement in the presence of a pronominal subject.

- (3) a. % Sinua-ko Pekka lähti [huomaamatta _] ?
 you.PAR-ko Pekka.NOM left notice.MATTA
 'Was it you that Pekka left without noticing?'
 b. *Sinun-ko Pekka lähti [_ huomaamattasi] ?
 you.GEN-ko Pekka.NOM left notice.MATTA.Px/2SG
 c. *Merjan-ko Pekka lähti [_ huomaamatta] ?
 Merja.GEN-ko Pekka.NOM left notice.MATTA

For speakers that accept extraction of the object in (3a), the MATTA-infinitive thus occupies the complement position. However, subject extraction ceases to be grammatical, following the ϕ -agreement constraint (1) on subject extraction. The constraint is related to the 'anti-agreement effect' on extraction observed for several languages (see Ouhalla, 1993, Phillips, 1998, Richards, 2001, and the references cited

therein). The anti-agreement effect refers to the phenomenon in which the extraction of the subject correlates with impoverished or absent subject agreement morphology.

Finally, Finnish finite complement clauses provide a context in which agreement can be dissociated from EPP-movement of the subject, as illustrated in examples (4a-b) (Holmberg and Nikanne, 2002, p. 78). In an ungrammatical example of long-distance movement (5a), the nominative subject both agrees with the finite T and has undergone EPP-movement to the specifier of T. In (b), the subject agrees with the finite T but resides within the *v*P.

- (4) a. Graham Greene on kirjoittanut tämän kirjan.
 Graham.NOM Greene.NOM has written this.ACC book.ACC
 b. Tämän kirjan on kirjoittanut Graham Greene.
 this.ACC book.ACC has written Graham.NOM Greene.NOM
- (5) a. *Kuka Pekka kertoi että _ kirjoitti tämän kirjan?
 who.NOM Pekka told that write.3SG this.ACC book.ACC
 b. *?Kuka Pekka kertoi että tämän kirjan kirjoitti _?
 who.NOM Pekka.NOM told that this.ACC book.ACC wrote.3SG

The launching site of the subject seems to have only a minor role on extraction conditions. However, EPP-movement coincides with ϕ -agreement in most of the other phrase types that display overt subject-predicate agreement in Finnish.

References

- Hakulinen, A., Vilkuna, M., Korhonen, R., Koivisto, V., Heinonen, T. R., Alho, I. (Eds.), 2004. Iso suomen kielioppi. SKS, Helsinki.
- Holmberg, A., Nikanne, U., 2002. Expletives, subjects and topics in Finnish. In: Svenonius, P. (Ed.), Subjects, Expletives and the EPP. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 71–105.
- Huhmarniemi, S., 2009. Extraction islands in Finnish. *Biolinguistica Fennica Working Papers* 1, 21–78.
- Kanerva, J., 1987. Morphological integrity and syntax: The evidence from Finnish possessive suffixes. *Language* 63, 498–501.
- Ouhalla, J., 1993. Subject-extraction, negation and the anti-agreement effect. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11, 477–518.
- Phillips, C., 1998. Disagreement between adults and children. In: Mendikoetxea, A., Uribe-Etxebarria, M. (Eds.), *Theoretical Issues on the Morphology- Syntax Interface*. ASJU, San Sebastian, pp. 359–394.
- Richards, N. W., 2001. *Movement in Language: Interactions and architectures*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Toivonen, I., 1995. A study of Finnish infinitives. Master's thesis, Brandeis University.
- Vilkuna, M., 1989. *Free word order in Finnish: Its syntax and discourse functions*. Finnish Literature Society, Helsinki.