

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

On embedded questions in Finnish

Hakulinen, Auli

Indiana University Press
1977

Hakulinen , A 1977 , On embedded questions in Finnish . in D Sinor (ed.) , Studies in Finno-ugric Linguistics : Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series . vol. 131 , Indiana University Press , Bloomington .

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/236515>

cc_by
publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

→ INDIANA UNIVERSITY URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES

VOLUME 131

STUDIES IN
FINNO-UGRIC LINGUISTICS

In Honor of Alo Rann

edited by

DENIS SINOR

BLOOMINGTON

1977
Kotimästen kielten tutkimuskeskus
SUOMALAIS-UGRILAINEN
KIRJASTO

klassen nun auch für den permischen Bereich. Denn ebenso wie für das Finnisch-Wolgaische darf nun auch für das Permische und damit schliesslich auch für das Finnisch-Permische die — offenbar auf einer ursprünglichen Funktionsunterscheidung basierende — potentielle Zweistämmigkeit aller Nomina angenommen werden.

2. Die heutigen Verhältnisse, die einen lebendigen Stammwechsel innerhalb eines Dialekts nur noch relativ selten bewahrt haben, sind als Normierungen, also als Ausgleichungen nach jeweils einem der beiden Stämme, aufzufassen. Diese Normierung wurde offenbar durch Verblässung bzw. Verlust der alten Funktionsunterscheidung der beiden Stämme ausgelöst bzw. begünstigt.

3. Synchronisch *-j* entspricht wotjakisch *-j*; beide gehen auf permisch **-ji* zurück. Permisch **-ji*: *-ø* entspricht finnisch-wolgaisch **-a/-ä*: *-ø*. Das heisst, es gab in der finnisch-permischen Grundsprache einen *ø*-Stamm (= Kons.-Stamm) und einen Stamm mit einer Endung, aus der sich im Finnisch-Wolgaischen **-a/-ä*, im Permischen **-ji* entwickelt hat.

4. Die Annahme einer historischen Identität von syrj. *-j* und frühurfinn. **-e* war ein Irrweg der bisherigen Forschung.

ON EMBEDDED QUESTIONS IN FINNISH

AULI HAKULINEN

0. In this paper I shall attempt to give a tentative description of the syntactic behaviour of embedded questions in Finnish. This is a topic that has been either overlooked or only marginally touched upon by Finnish grammarians. The reason for this is an obvious one: there is nothing ambivalent or shaky about the use of embedded questions — no problem to be tackled, no norms to be set, and no historical development specific to the Finnish language which would need to be explained. In other words, it seems to form an area where our linguistic behaviour is self-evident. It is just in these instances that a generative grammarian will find work to do. He will be interested in explicating and clarifying what is self-evident to a normal speaker-hearer. He wants to see what the self-evident behaviour consists of.

As I said, Finnish grammarians have had little to say about embedded questions. Setälä in his *Suomen kielen lauseoppi* states that there are “subordinated questions” and that they can be characterised as “those by-clauses which have interrogative pronouns (prominals) or particles as their initial elements”. His examples include questions which are embedded in sentences with the following matrix predicates: *tieltä, kysyvä, sanaa, kuulla*. Penttilä has nothing to add to this treatment. Siro presents a wider collection of predicates that take a question either as their subject or object complement: *on omiuisista, näkyä, tuntuu, jää salasuudeksi; tajuaa, huomauttaa, kuvittelee. Nyky-suomen sanakirja* (under the entries for various pronouns) has, as often is the case, a still larger array of examples than any of the grammars. They have been included among the examples in the present treatment.

1.1 The first topic that will be dealt with is the difference or similarity between direct and embedded questions. Unlike in many Indogermanic languages (e.g. English), there is no difference in word order between the two in Finnish, nor is there any different choice of question particles between them (cf. English *whether*, Swedish *om* in embedded questions only). Let us look at some simple examples.

1. *Onko hän sairas?* 'Is he ill?'
 2. *Haluun tietää, onko hän sairas.* 'I want to know whether he is ill.'

However, there are some differences. The embedded question is used only in the illocutionary function of a question. That is, it cannot take any morphological indications of other kinds of speech acts like rhetorical questions, suggestions or exclamations. These functions must be expressed by a higher verb but not by particles added to the predicate of the embedded question itself.

- 3a. *Kukahan hän on?* 'I wonder who he is.'
 b. **En tiedä* } 'I don't know'
 **Muistan* } *kukahan* hän on. } 'I remember who I wonder he is.'
- 4a. *Missäpä* saisi olla rauhassa! 'Where is the place where one could
 b. **On* vaikka huomata, *missäpä* be at peace!'
 saisi olla rauhassa. 'It is hard to notice, where...'
 5a. *Eikö ollutkin hauskaa?* 'Wasn't it fun?'
 b. **Oleiko* kuullut, *eikö ollutkin*
 *hauskaa?*¹ 'Have you heard, whether it wasn't fun.'

This restriction is a universal one, as can be seen from the unacceptable translations of the examples.

There is another question type that can never occur in an embedded structure. This is the peculiar way of asking about the "comment" of a sentence by using the initial particle *entä*:

- 6a. *Entä* vaara terveydelle? 'How about the danger to health?'
 b. **Hän* ei tiennyt, *entä* vaara 'He did not know how about the
 terveydelle. danger to health.'
 7a. *Entä* miten minun käy? 'What will become of me?'
 b. **Haluais*in vain tietää, *entä* 'I would like to know what will
 miten minun käy. become of me.'

There is, on the other hand, one instance where only the embedded question is possible. If a direct question is grammatical at all, it is felt to be elliptic. This is the case where the embedded question has undergone Equi deletion and has thereby become non-finite:

¹ We can find this structure in a subordinate clause as follows:
 Hän kysyi, eikö ollutkin hauskaa. 'He asked whether it wasn't fun!
 This, in my opinion, should rather be seen as a case of indirect discourse and not embedding.'

- 8a. *Kuljimme tietämättä, minne* 'We walked not knowing where to
 mennä. go.'
 8b. *Minne* mennä? (= *En* tiedä, 'Where to go? (= I don't know
 minne mennä.) where to go.)'

1.2 Next we have to take a stand as to how the description might look. Although the present discussion should be seen as preliminary and is therefore not formalised to any extent, I want to review the possibilities that have been suggested for a formal description. Baker (1970) has taken up the use of a clause-initial morpheme *Q* which could be used for both direct and embedded questions. If it is used for both, it cannot have a performative reading like the one suggested by Katz and Postal. This is because subordinate clauses do not possess illocutionary power other than that which is evident from the matrix clause.

It has been pointed out by Langacker (1969) that postulating a morpheme in the deep structure which never gets a surface realisation but is used only for the purpose of triggering off some movement transformations is always doubtful. More in accordance with our intuition would be the postulating of an abstract performative verb for the direct questions, and trying to take into account the semantic features of the predicates of the matrix clause for the embedded questions.

It sounds plausible when Langacker claims that both yes-no questions and wh-questions are special cases of a more general question type, namely disjunctives. For Finnish, we could say that there is a disjunctive morpheme *ko* (real, not abstract) which always occurs in the first part of any disjunction, whether a question or a statement:

- 9a. *Onko* hän tullut (vai ei)? 'Has he come (or not)?'
 b. *Kuka* hän on (*Kalleko* vai...)? 'Who is he (K or...)?'
 c. *Sinne* tulee *joko* Kalle tai Ville. 'Either Kalle or Ville will come
 there.'

If the two disjuncts have different predicates, the morpheme *ko* has to be repeated. However, if the questioned item is also the theme of the embedded clause, this repetition is impossible:

10. *En* ole varma, *voitaako* 'I am not sure whether Kalle will
 Kalle vai *luovuttaako* Pekka. win or Pekka yield.'

2.2 The predicates (verbs and adjectives) that take questions as their subject complement can be grouped as follows.

(1) Predicates that EXPRESS UNCERTAINTY:

<i>on epäilteisiä</i>	'is doubtful'
<i>on epävarmaa</i>	'is insecure'
<i>näyttää epävarmalta</i>	'seems insecure'
<i>ei näytä itsestään selvältä</i>	'doesn't seem self-evident'
<i>on epäselvää</i>	'is unclear'
<i>on kyseenalaista</i>	'is questionable'
<i>epäilyttää</i>	'looks suspicious'

Some examples of the occurrence of these:

20. Onko tätä kirjaa suositeltava psykologeil-
le, ei näytä itsestään selvältä.
'Should this book be recommended to psychologists, doesn't seem self-evident.'

(2) Predicates that EXPRESS INDECISION. The speaker leaves the question open; the answer depends on the outcome of the event mentioned in the other half of the sentence:

<i>ilmenee</i>	'turns out; becomes evident'
<i>riippuu jstkn</i>	'depends on'
<i>seuraa</i>	'follows'
<i>vaikuttaa</i>	'influences'

21. Missä määrin lait ovat hyödyllisiä, riippuu lain säätäjän poliittisesta tahdosta.
'To what extent laws are useful depends on the political will of the legislator.'

22. Myöhemmin tulee ilmenemään, kuinka riippumaton tuomioistuin säätää toimintaansa ohjaavan lain.
'Later it will become evident how the independent tribunal will legislate about its own activities.'

23. Lähtäjän strategiaan vaikuttaa, onko ao.puolueen edustaja hallituksessa vai ei.
'The short term strategy will be influenced by whether the party has a representative in the government or not.'

(3) Predicates that EXPRESS INDIFFERENCE on the part of the speaker:

<i>ei ole tärkeää</i>	'is not important'
<i>jää ... omalle vastuulle</i>	'will be left at the responsibility of...'
<i>on saman-, yhdenketevä</i>	'makes no difference'

24. On yhdentekevää, minne minut haudataan.
'It makes no difference where I will be buried.'

Most of the verbs in groups (1) and (2) can take only questions as their object complements. The verbs in group (3), on the other hand, can take either an *että*-clause or a question. What should we do with the description of this group? It sounds artificial to postulate two phonologically identical surface verbs (see Fretheim 1970) which show different syntactic behaviour. There is one pair of real verbs in Finnish, however, which happen to differ with respect to a q-feature only: *riippuu* 'depends' and *johuu* 'follows'. The latter can take only *että*-clauses, while the former takes only embedded questions. Sentence (21) with the latter alternative would look like this:

- 21'. Lainsäätäjän poliittisesta tahdosta *johuu*, että lait ovat näin hyödyllisiä.

With verbs like *ilmenee* 'is evident', *seuraa* 'follows' and *vaikuttaa* 'influences' the difference could be characterised as follows. When they go with *että* they state or predict a certain fact; when they take a question, they leave the future undecided. The latter has more often a future reading; the statement, on the other hand, is mostly in the past tense. Let us briefly look at the semantic difference involved in tärkeä 'important' (the negation has no influence here):

- 25a. Seuskotaanko teoriaan, ei ole tärkeää.
'Whether the theory is believed in is not important.'
- b. Se että teoriaan uskotaan, ei ole tärkeää.
'That the theory is believed in is not important.'

The difference cannot be in factivity, as *tärkeä* in both cases ought to be a factive emotive verb. But the former is explicitly indifferent to the fact that there is both belief and disbelief. The predicate *ei tärkeä* apparently then has a choice: It is either + or -indifferent.

2.3 Let us now turn to the main bulk of examples, questions which

occur as object complements of certain verbs. Bresnan (1970) has claimed that all embedded sentences are introduced by one of three complementizers (that, *q*, *for*). If these complementizers are specified in the deep structure, verbs must be sub-categorised for the type of complement they take. In this way nothing semantic need to be marked in the feature matrices of the higher predicates: it is a purely syntactic choice. But somehow this is a bit unsatisfactory: unless the higher verbs are not distinguished by any semantic features, the co-occurrence seems to be arbitrary, which it cannot be anymore than linguistic behaviour is arbitrary in any of its part. Moreover, it makes a lot of sense to postulate an underlying complementizer *että* for all object clauses. This may, in spoken Finnish, turn up in an embedded question as well:

26. Mies kummasteli, *että* *mitä* 'The man wondered that what was
siellä oikein oli tekellä. going on there.'
27. Jo alkaa katsoa, *että* *tunteeko* '(He) begins to look that whether he
hänet. knows her.'

I would stick to the view then that all questions have in their deep description a disjunctive morpheme *ko*; in addition the morpheme occurs in disjunctive statement. When this morpheme co-occurs with certain features of a higher predicate, abstract or real, a question will ensue. All embedded, complement clauses are initiated by the complementizer *että*.

The verbs that take embedded questions as their object complements, either solely or among other alternatives, are all mental verbs. They form the following semantic classes:

	<i>Uncertainty</i>	<i>perception</i>	
	<i>aavistaa</i>	<i>havaita</i>	'observe'
	<i>arvalla</i>	<i>huomata</i>	'notice'
	<i>ennustaa</i>	<i>katsoa</i> ,	
		<i>katsoella</i>	'look'
	<i>ihmetellä</i>	<i>kuulla</i>	'hear'
	<i>kysyä</i>	<i>käsittää</i>	'comprehend'
	<i>(ei) tietää</i>	<i>nähdä</i>	'see'
	<i>muistaa</i>	<i>oivaltaa</i>	'grasp'
	<i>unohittaa</i>	<i>oppia</i>	'learn'
	<i>ymmärtää</i>		'understand'

<i>trying to find out</i>		<i>news announcement</i>	
<i>kontrolloida</i>	'control'	<i>ilmoittaa</i>	'inform'
<i>mieltä</i>	'reflect'	<i>kertoa</i>	'tell'
<i>mitata</i>	'measure'	<i>kuvalta</i>	'describe'
<i>määrittää</i>	'order'	<i>kirjoittaa</i>	'write'
<i>pohita</i>	'ponder'	<i>käsitellä</i>	'deal with'
<i>päätellä</i>	'conclude'	<i>luetella</i>	'list'
<i>ratkaista</i>	'solve'	<i>mainita</i>	'mention'
<i>selvittää, servii 'sort out'</i>		<i>näyttää</i>	'show'
<i>sopia</i>	'agree'	<i>osoittaa</i>	'point out'
<i>testata</i>	'test'	<i>palsiastaa</i>	'lay bare, reveal'
<i>todentaa</i>	'verify'	<i>puhua, sanoa</i>	'speak, say'
<i>tutkia</i>	'investigate'	<i>selittää</i>	'explain'
		<i>vihjaila</i>	'hint'

For the sake of clarity I have grouped the verbs in that manner. Quite clearly, they could be made to form two larger groups: verbs of feeling and saying (perception + news announcement), and verbs of uncertainty where problem solving verbs would fit as a subcategory. On the other hand, there are some differences among verbs within the groups. The first general observation to be made on the basis of my little sample of examples is that almost a half of them (55 out of 123) have some modal element in the predicate of the matrix clause: it is negation, imperative or conditional; can/may/must or difficult/possible/important. When the verbs themselves have no feature [indication] or [uncertainty], as in the case of *kertoa* 'tell' or *tietää* 'know', it is this modal element that contributes the feature to the matrix predicate phrase. The following verbs in my sample get preferably a question complement only when they are negated: *aavistaa*, *arvilla*, *katsoa*, *muistaa*, *sanoa*, *ilmoittaa*, *kirjoittaa*. This leads us to presume that it is not the co-occurrence of a lexical verb and an embedded question that we are after, but rather the co-occurrence of the whole of a higher predicate and an embedded question. For this reason, it would be misleading to mark only the verbs according to which "complementizers" they take.

There are a few verbs that obligatorily take only questions, and cannot have *että* at all:

- kysyä*, *tutkia*, *serviä*, *ratkaista* (verbs of inquiry)
mieltä, *pohita* (verbs of pondering)

katella, kunnella, tarkastella (verbs of conscious observing)
kuvara, luetella (describing, listing)

All these can be said to have the feature [+uncertainty] in their lexical description, as the outcome of asking, pondering or listing cannot be known to the subject. The verbs which take both are equally problematic as *tärkeä* in our earlier discussion. Observe for example the following sentences:

- 28a. Epäilen, onnistutko. 'I doubt whether you'll succeed.'
 b. Epäilen, että onnistut. 'I doubt that you'll succeed.'
 c. Epäilen, että et onnistu. 'I doubt that you won't succeed.'

Strictly taken there should be no difference in meaning between *a* and *b*. In colloquial practice there tends to be no difference in meaning between *a* and *c*. The sentence *b* actually means 'I have a suspicion that you'll succeed.' We might say, then, that in this case we do have two lexical items which are phonologically, but not syntactically identical: *epäillä* + *q* 'doubt', and *epäillä* + *että* 'suspect'. Let us now look at a verb which lacks the inherent feature of uncertainty, like *kerroa* 'tell':

- 29a. Maija ei kertonut, että he 'Maija did not tell that they had
 olivat syöneet. eaten.'
 b. Maija ei kertonut, olivatko 'Maija did not tell whether they had
 he syöneet. eaten.'

At first look one would be ready to say that the difference is one of factivity. But let us now look at a real factive verb.

- 30a. Hän ei tiedä, että Maija tuli 'He does not know that Maija came
 ajoissa. on time.'
 b. Hän ei tiedä, tuliko Maija 'He does not know whether Maija
 ajoissa. came on time.'

That the verbs *kerroa* and *tiedä* belong to different groups in respect with factivity, can be illustrated through the following experiment: It is quite possible to say (29), but we get an ungrammatical sentence if we continue the other sentence in the same way (30):

- 29a'. Maija ei kertonut, että he 'Maija did not tell that they had
 olivat syöneet, eivätkä he eaten, and they hadn't.'
 olleetkaan.

- 30a'. Hän ei tiedä, että Maija tuli 'He does not know that Maija came
 ajoissa, *eikä hän tullut- on time and she didn't.'
 kaan.

This proves that we are not dealing with factivity but uncertainty: the two do not always coincide.

Among verbs which can only have an *että*-complement but not a question are the following ones:

ehdottaa, huomauttaa, vakuuttaa 'suggest, remark, assure'
luulla, luottaa, uskoa 'let, allow, want'
sallia, suoda, tahraa 'let, allow, want'
hävetä, ilkkua, harmittella 'mock, feel ashamed, regret'

These verbs quite clearly lack the feature uncertainty, nor do they have anything to do with indecision. Here again, factivity plays no decisive role: there are verbs of both types in this group.

2.4 For most of the verbs that take embedded questions we do not have to make any difference between a yes-no question and a wh-question. Some of them, however, cannot take a yes-no question at all. Some examples of these are given here:

<i>aavistaa</i>	'anticipate'	<i>kuvata</i>	'describe'
<i>ovivalaa</i>	'grasp'	<i>lausua</i>	'pronounce'
<i>ymmärtää</i>	'understand'	<i>luetella</i>	'list'
		<i>osoittaa</i>	'show, point out'

Two of them, *kuvata* and *luetella*, do not take an *että*-clause, either. In other words, they cannot have propositions as complements, but only NPs. This may apply to *lausua* as well. What we are obviously being led to here is the problem of the so-called free relatives. The question we are facing here is whether the complements of *kuvata* and *luetella* can be regarded as questions anymore, or whether they should be included among relative clauses. The line between the two structures is vague, and it has aroused some discussion (Baker 1970, Andersson 1974). There is a semantic difference between them:

Free relatives are supposed to denote things, questions are not.² Andersson has come up with an appealing solution. He groups verbs into three categories: intensional verbs like wonder, obligatorily extensional(ised) verbs like wash, and verbs which are ambiguous to this feature. According to this treatment, free relatives have the same deep structure as embedded questions, but they are 'extensionalised' if the governing verb demands that, and become relatives through derivation. The confusion between a question relative arises less easily in Finnish than in English, because there the free relative mostly gets a pronominal antecedent: *se, mikä*. The following are, to my judgement, free relatives, with the matrix verb extensionally used, and not embedded questions at all.

31. Ja hän kirjoitti, mitä minä olin 'And he wrote what I had been telling.'
ketonut.
32. Hän puhui, mitä oli nähnyt ja 'He spoke about what he had seen and heard on the yard.'
kuullut pihamaalla.
33. Todistaja alkoi luetella, mitä 'The witness began to list what he knew about the things.'
tiesi asiasta.

The following pair of sentences could serve as an illustration of the difference between the structures.³ In this case, the second verb is not even ambiguous; it can only take a free relative:

- 34a. Hän kysyi, mitä pihalla oli 'He asked what had happened on the yard.'
tapahnut.
- b. Hän toisti, mitä pihalla oli 'He repeated what had happened on the yard.'
tapahnut.

3. Let us now turn to the question forming rule. We learn from Bach (1971) that the question word movement is unbounded, i.e. it can move as many sentences up as necessary with no sentence boundaries stopping it. All leftward moves are unbounded in this way. If

² In a lecture (summer 1970) J. R. Ross preferred to draw a line between 'disjunctive' = real questions and 'conjunctive' questions which are generated through coordination. The latter correspond to the free relatives.

³ A possibly suitable test that helps to keep the two apart is the adding of *oikeastaan* 'actually' in the embedded clause. It can only be inserted in the question: Hän kysyi/tiesi, mitä pihalla oli oikeastaan puhuttu.

*Hän toisti, mitä pihalla oli oikeastaan puhuttu.

there are some restrictions to the movement of the questioned NP, these must be due to violations of some other principles or constraints. Let us see how things are in Finnish.

35. Minne sanoi hänen mennään? 'Where did you say he went?'
36. Miksi uskot hänen tehneen 'Why do you believe he did it?'
- sen?
37. Kuinka sanoisit hänen 'How would you say he succeeded?'
- onnistuneen?

In these sentences the question word has moved from the participial complement to the front of the matrix clause, and the result is perfectly acceptable. Let us now look at sentences where there still is an internal sentence boundary:

- 38a. Minkä rikoksen sanoi että 'Which crime did you say he committed?'
- hän on tehnyt?
- b. Minne sanoi että hän meni? 'Where did you say he went?'
- c. Miksi uskot että hän on 'Why do you believe that he did it?'
- tehnyt sen?*
- 39a. *Mitä kadut, että meneit? 'What do you regret that you lost?'
- b. *Missä hän tietää, että kissa 'Where does he know that the cat piileksii?'
is hiding?'
- c. *Kenet näit että hän tapasi? 'Whom did you see that he met?'
- d. *Minne ihmettelte, että 'Where did you wonder that he was hänet valittiin?'
- elected?'

Sentences 39a.-d. are bad because the verb of the matrix clause is factive. We could say that they are barred because of the complex NP constraint. This constraint says that you cannot pull out a constituent from a sentence which has a complex NP-node dominating it. Semantically the same restriction can be formulated like this: You can pull out a constituent from a lower sentence if you are focussing on it or asserting it. When the higher predicate is factive, it is semantically anomalous to focus, by questioning, or something in the presupposed complement clause rather than questioning the factive verb itself.

4.1 As the last problem, I want to take up embedded questions which do not have overt subjects. The subject has either been deleted

⁴ To many speakers these sentences do not feel quite acceptable, particularly when seen in the written form. In spoken Finnish, however, they abound.

by Equi, or it is a 'missing person', that is, a non-occurring third person corresponding to Eng. 'obe'. In Finnish, the use of an infinitive question complement is much more restricted than in English:

- 40a. We tell it how to recognise the right number.
 b. *Me kerromme sille, miten luntela numeron.

In Finnish, infinitives are produced by Equi only, as is illustrated by the following sentences.

- 41a. Partioijat miettivät, ketä 'The scouts wondered whom to totella.
 b. Kuljimme tietämättä, minne 'We walked without knowing where mennä.
 c. Hänellä ei ollut selvillä, mien 'He had no idea how to begin and aloittaa.⁵
 d. Hänen päässään liikkui 'In his head other thoughts crossed: mutakin ajatuksia: miten jä- how to approach the blonde hestytä vaaleata naista. woman.'

Corresponding to the English infinitive in cases like (40a), there is a finite generic expression in Finnish:

- 40c. Me kerromme sille, miten oikean numeron *tuntee*.

This generic expression is the only way out when the matrix clause has no overt subject under identity with which Equi could apply, or when the matrix has a missing person as well:

42. On samantekevää, 'It is all the same,
 { mitä tekee. } what one does
 { *mitä tehdä. } what to do.
 43. Ei tiedetä, 'It is not known,
 { minne pitää mennä. } where one should go.
 { *minne mennä. } where to go.
 44. Koskaan ei tiedä ihan 'One never knows for sure when one
 varmasti, milloin pääsee is allowed home.'
 kotiin.

⁵ When we compare examples 40a and 41c we realise that the reason for the ungrammaticality of the former is not that the controller of Equi is in oblique case. 41c shows that Equi applies under identity with the deep subject, not necessarily with the surface one.

An interesting semantic difference can be observed between a sentence with a deleted pronoun and one which has undergone Equi:

- 45a. Hän ei tiennyt, kuka on. 'He didn't know who (he) is.'
 b. Hän ei tiennyt, kuka olla. 'He didn't know who to be.'

The latter sentence demands to be interpreted so that it depends on the subject (*hän*) who he chooses to be; this interpretation is not possible with the former sentence. The distinction in meaning will become clearer through the following pair of examples:

- 46a. Hän ei tiennyt, *kuinka on. 'He did not know how (he) is.'
 b. Hän ei tiennyt, kuinka olla. 'He did not know how to be.'

We have here two different verbs *olla*: in the *b* examples it has the meaning 'to behave', and in the *a* examples it is just an empty copula.

As I said earlier, the use of an infinitive in embedded questions is limited. Examples are hard to come across. The reason for this is that verbs which take embedded questions also tend to take tensed that-clauses. Only tenseless complements can be infinitivised, as Kalevi Wiik has pointed out. Also, the other condition for an infinitive complement, the application of Equi, is rarely met. This is because there is rather seldom reason to question one's own future doings, i.e. to get a referential subject in the verb of uncertainty and in the embedded clause. The verbs with which we do find infinitive complements are those which can take only question complements:

47. Toimikunta pohiti/mietti/ 'The committee deliberated/
 kysyi/tiedusteli, mitä tehdä. pondered/asked/enquired about
 what to do.'

Or else the matrix predicates denote 'not knowing':

48. En tiedä/ole selvillä/käsitä/ 'I don't know/see/grasp/understand
 ymmärrä, mihin ryhtyä. what to take up.'

There is a restriction concerning the verbs in the complement clause. It has to be an action verb, and not one which doesn't involve the active initiation on the part of the subject person. The violation of this restriction produces ungrammatical results of the following type:

49. *En tiedä, milloin päästä 'I don't know when to be allowed
 kotiin täältä. home from here.'

REFERENCES

- Andersson, Lars-Gunnar
1974 "Questions and Other Open Structures", *Logical Grammar Reports*, Göteborg.
- Bach, Emmon
1971 "Questions", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 11/2.
- Baker, Leroy
1970 "Notes on the Description of English Questions", *Foundations of Language*, 6.
- Bresnan, Joan
1970 "On Complementizers", *Foundations of Language*, 6/3.
- Freiheim, Thorstein
1970 "Some Notes on Norwegian Verbs Taking 'whether' Complementation", Osculd mimeo.
- Kiparsky, Paul, and Kiparsky, Carol
1971 "Fact", *Progress in Linguistics*, ed. by M. Bierwisch and K. R. Heidolph. The Hague, Mouton.
- Langacker, Ronald W.
1969 "An Analysis of English Questions, I-IV", Preliminary draft, mimeo.
- Penttilä, Aarni
1957 *Suomen kieloppi*. Porvoo, WSOY.
- Setälä, E. N.
1952 *Suomen kielen lauseoppi*. Helsinki, Otava.
- Siro, Paavo
1964 *Suomen kielen lauseoppi*. Helsinki, Sanoma Oy.

ZUR GESCHICHTE DER TEMPORA IM
UNGARISCHEN

B. KÄLMÁN

1. Im Leben einer jeden Sprache wirken zwei entgegengesetzte Tendenzen, nämlich das Streben nach Einfachheit aber auch nach einem genaueren, nuancierteren Ausdruck. Bald wirkt sich die eine, bald die andere Tendenz stärker aus. Eine Teilstruktur scheint eine bei- nahe vollkommene Entwicklungsstufe zu erreichen; bald darauf wird ihre Systemhaftigkeit plötzlich aufgelöst, indem parallele Formen mit der gleichen Bedeutung entstehen; von ihnen erweisen sich einige als überflüssig, die dann nach ein paar Generationen veralten, oder von zwei parallelen Ausdrucksformen wird sich nur die eine behaupten können. Es ist oft äusserst schwierig, die Ursache von solchen Veränderungen zu erkennen. Die Literatursprache wirkt manchmal für lange Zeit hemmend auf die Herausbildung einiger Tendenzen ein; es kann auch vorkommen, dass sich geschriebene und gesprochene Sprache für eine gewisse Zeit trennen. In dem Falle gibt es zwei Möglichkeiten: entweder passt sich die Schriftsprache der gesprochenen Sprache an (was meistens erst mit gewisser Verspätung erfolgt), sie lockert etwas an ihren strengen Regeln, sie übernimmt neu entstandene Formen oder lehnt schon veraltete Varianten ab.

Will die Literatursprache aber diesen Kompromiss nicht eingehen, dann kann sie sich von der gesprochenen Sprache vollkommen lösen und auf diese Weise entsteht eine sakrale oder gelehrte Sprache, wie das Lateinische, das Kirchenslawische oder neuerdings das norwegische *riksmål* im Vergleich zum *landsnål*. Eine ähnliche Erscheinung war auch die mit arabischen Elementen vollgestopfte literarische und offizielle Sprache der Türkei im Gegensatz zum gesprochenen Türkischen bis zu den zwanziger Jahren des 20. Jahrhunderts. Manchmal kann dann eine zur Sakralsprache erstarrte, gestorbene Literatursprache auf künstliche Weise wieder zum neuen Leben erweckt werden, wie im Staat Israel, wo in unserem Jahrhundert das Hebräische zur offiziellen Sprache wurde.

Das Französische hat im Laufe der lautlichen Veränderungen sein ganzes von dem Lateinischen geerbtes Kasussystem verloren. Im Altfranzösischen wurde die Deklination auf nur noch zwei Kasus reduziert;