

1985

## Case Theory and the Grammar of Finnish

Gary Milsark  
*Temple University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/nels>



Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Milsark, Gary (1985) "Case Theory and the Grammar of Finnish," *North East Linguistics Society*. Vol. 15 :  
Iss. 1 , Article 22.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/nels/vol15/iss1/22>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Linguistics Students Association (GLSA) at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in North East Linguistics Society by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@library.umass.edu](mailto:scholarworks@library.umass.edu).

## Case Theory and the Grammar of Finnish

Gary Milsark

Temple University

One of the more enduring puzzles in linguistics is the distribution of direct case in Finnish. Traditional grammarians of Finnish have long been intrigued by the peculiarities of this system, and the phenomena have recently attracted some interest within generative grammar as well. (See, for example, Carlson (1981a,b), Taraldsen (1984), Gilligan (1984), Van Nes-Felius (1984).) In the context of contemporary linguistic theory, the facts derive their interest primarily from their relationship to certain claims in Case Theory and their relevance to the question of the real nature of what has come to be known as "Burzio's Generalization," the observation that the non-assignment of object Case in passives and similar constructions is accompanied by the suppression of the subject theta role. In addition, they bear on the significant but rather underresearched issue of the nature of the relationship between abstract Case and the traditional notion of morphological case marking. In this paper, I shall attempt to demonstrate that the Finnish case assignment phenomena are consistent with a linguistic theory in which abstract Case marking is restricted to the government domain of a Case-assigning element and morphological case spellout utilizes only information represented in word structure, contrary to claims that have been expressed or implied in other work on Finnish case assignment, such as that of Carlson and Van Nes-Felius. I shall argue further that the most insightful

analysis of these phenomena requires that one claim that certain NP argument positions in Finnish are Caseless, and thus that the Case Filter is in some sense a parametrized universal, one which, I would speculate, is related to certain fundamental and traditional distinctions in the morphological typology of languages. Finally, I shall argue that the analysis developed here exposes a crucial case bearing upon the nature of Burzio's Generalization and upon the question of the independence of Case Theory and Theta Theory.

I shall assume that Finnish is an SVO configurational language with an X' phrase structure of the usual sort. This assumption is not altogether uncontroversial (see Taraldsen (1984) for a contrary opinion). The morphology is suffixing and largely agglutinative. The overt morphological structure of nominals conforms to the schema shown in (1) below.

(1) stem+(plural)+(case)+(possession)+(various clitics)

All elements enclosed in parentheses are optional; thus, some nominals appear as apparent bare stem forms; this is the consistent form of singular nominative nouns and pronouns. The plural marker is generally /i/, but a suppletive form in /t/ appears when the plural marker is word-final. There are upwards of a dozen case forms in productive use, most of which are various sorts of oblique local cases which are of no particular interest here. Among direct cases, it is conventional to distinguish among a nominative in / $\emptyset$ / (the bare stem forms alluded to above), a genitive in /n/, an accusative whose form is /n/ in singulars and / $\emptyset$ / in plurals, and a partitive in /ta/. Whether all four of these putatively distinct cases are in fact distinct from one another is a question of substantial interest to a deeper investigation of the theoretical position which I shall sketch here, but there is no space to discuss it in this forum. For present purposes I shall assume the traditional distinctions cited above. Also beyond the scope of this paper is any serious discussion of the case system of pronominals, which shows potentially quite interesting divergences from that sketched above for nouns and adjectives, both in its morpho-phonology and in its syntactic distribution. These two issues are in fact rather closely related, I think, and when properly pursued suggest certain modifications and deepening of the claims made in this paper. Finally, I must for reasons of brevity abjure any consideration here of the interesting matter of the distribution of object case forms in nonfinite complements.

In general, the syntactic distribution of the overt direct case forms is not particularly unusual. Subjects are uniformly in nominative case; genitive case appears in the arguments of

gerundives and other nominals and as the unmarked object of postpositions; accusative case appears in verbal objects. Partitive case, an element with essentially the core meaning of the English quasi-quantifier *sm*, alternates freely with accusative case in object position and with nominative in predicate position, and is present obligatorily in NP governed by quantifiers or negation. It never appears in subject position in the absence of an explicit quantifier, a fact which provides a useful diagnostic for subject constituency.

There is one important respect, however, in which the distribution of morphological direct case in Finnish differs strikingly from that of more familiar languages. In a number of clause types, nominative, rather than accusative, case appears in object position (non-partitive) NPs. The major constructions in which this phenomenon occurs are exemplified in (1)-(3) below. They may be contrasted with the ordinary transitive sentences in (4), where object position shows accusative case (alternating with partitive) and nominative is impossible.

- (1) Imperatives
- a. Osta olut/olutta.  
buy beer/beer-partitive  
"Buy the beer/some beer."
  - b. Lue kirja/kirjaa.  
read book/book-partitive  
"Read the book/read in the book."
  - c. \*Osta oluen.  
buy beer-accusative
  - d. \*Lue kirjan.  
read book-accusative
- (2) Existentials/possessives
- a. Saarella on talo.  
island-on is house  
"There's a house on the island."
  - b. \*Saarella on talon  
island-on is house-acc
  - c. Lasissa on olutta.  
glass-in is beer-part  
"There's some beer in the glass."
  - d. \*Lasissa on oluen.
  - e. Kadulla menee miehiä.  
street-on walk-3sg man-pl-part  
"There walked some men on the street."
  - f. Kadulla menee mies.  
street-on walk-3sg man  
"There walked a man on the street."
  - g. \*Kadulla menee miehen.  
street-on walk-3sg man-acc

- h. Meillä on suuri talo.  
us-on is big house  
"We have a big house."
- i. Meillä on viiniä.  
us-on is wine-part  
"We have wine."
- j. \*Meillä on suuren talon.  
us-on is big-acc house-acc
- k. "Meillä on viinin.  
us-on is wine-acc

(3) Impersonals

- a. Ostattiin olut/olutta.  
buy-past-impers beer/beer-part  
"The beer/some beer was bought."
- b. \*Ostattiin oluen.  
buy-past-impers beer-acc
- c. Luettiin kirja/kirjaa.  
read-past-impers book/book-part  
"The book was read/read in."
- d. \*Luettiin kirjan.  
read-past-impers book-acc

- (4) a. Liisa osti oluen/olutta.  
Lisa buy-past3sg beer-acc/beer-part  
"Lisa bought the beer/some beer."
- b. \*Liisa osti olut.
- c. Liisa luki kirjan/kirjaa.  
Lisa read-past3sg book-acc/book-part  
"Lisa read the book/in the book."
- d. \*Liisa luki kirja.

The most obvious property which distinguishes the constructions in (1)-(3) requiring nominative objects (henceforth "NO constructions") from those in (4) which require accusative objects (henceforth "AO constructions") is that the former lack an overt subject argument. Beyond this, the impersonal and existential/possessive constructions have certain peculiarities which bear upon the issues here and require a brief diversion.

In the case of the existential/possessive construction, it is not antecedently clear that the lack of accusative case marking requires explanation at all. That the NP present in such examples is not in subject position is clear from the possibility of partitive case in examples such as (2)c, e, and i, and from the fact that agreement fails in examples such as (2)e, but this is not equivalent to a demonstration that the NP should be expected to assume accusative case, particularly since the verbs found in such constructions are characteristically intransitive, as is the case in existential constructions universally.

Accordingly, the real mystery is not the absence of accusative case in this construction, but rather the presence of nominative. Other instances of NP governed by copula, e.g. predicate nominals and postposed subjects of existentials in languages such as English, are generally assumed to acquire nominative case by agreement with the subject or by coindexation with an empty nominal element in subject position (see Safir (1982)); the former mechanism is clearly inapplicable here, and the latter would, if Safir is correct, incorrectly predict the existence of definiteness effects in the postverbal NP (but see Gilligan (1984) for arguments against the validity of this prediction in general).

The so-called impersonal constructions exemplified in (3) also require special comment. Here, as in the existential/possessive structures, the presence of partitive case makes it clear that the single overt argument present in such examples is a non-subject, or to put it another way, that these structures are not an instance of NP movement from object to subject position. This contention is verified by the absence of agreement: the impersonal verb forms are invariant in person and number. Some discussions of these structures within the Government-Binding Theory, for instance that of Van Nes-Felius (1984), assume that they involve suppression of the external theta role in the manner of Indo-European passives. My own belief is that this assumption is incorrect. Finns seem quite consistently to claim that the impersonal construction carries the interpretation of action by an unspecified entity, similar to the interpretation of arbitrary PRO. Carlson, for example, characterizes the thematic force of these constructions as follows (1981b, p. 10):

The passive in Finnish does not involve promotion of object in subject position as in the English personal passive, but represents an active sentence with a subject unspecified for person or number. Like the French on or the German man passives, the passive person designates human (or intelligent) agents.

As a demonstration of the correctness of this intuition, one might note that truly agentless English passives such as "John was killed in a fall." cannot be translated into Finnish by using this construction. Accordingly, I shall assume that the Finnish impersonals are in fact two-argument sentences containing arbitrary PRO subjects. This carries certain interesting implications and raises issues which will be discussed later in this paper.

These preliminaries disposed of, let us address the question of the nature of the essential difference between AO and NO constructions. Finnish traditional grammarians have long maintained that the essential property of NO constructions is their lack of

an overt subject, a position endorsed in part by Carlson (1981a) and present in spirit in other recent work as well. While this idea has the appeal of directness and has a certain functionalistic flavor ("case-mark only when the presence of more than one argument makes it necessary for clarity") that some may find attractive, it raises rather daunting empirical and theoretical problems.

Among the former, one should note first of all that it is simply not always the case that NO sentences are without overt lexical material in subject position. Carlson (1981b) notes that in colloquial Finnish, impersonal constructions may contain a pleonastic element (the first person plural pronoun *me*) in subject position, yet the object remains nominative. Contrarily, not all varieties of overtly empty subject have the same effect on object case marking. The PRO which presumably occupies the subject position of impersonals and whatever element is present in the subject position of imperatives would, on this theory, count as empty subjects for the purposes of the principle which determines object case marking, since both these constructions require nominative objects, as noted above. However, as examples (5) and (6) show, pro and WH trace are not so construed, since sentences in which they occupy subject position are AO structures.

- (5) a. Ostimme oluen.  
buy-past-1pl beer-acc  
"We bought the beer."  
b. \*Ostimme olut.
- (6) a. Kuka osti oluen?  
who buy-past beer-acc  
"Who bought the beer?"  
b. \*Kuka osti olut?

It would seem, then, that any analysis which attempts to predict the distribution of nominative and accusative objects as a consequence of the presence or absence of a subject argument is forced to postulate a taxonomy of NP types in which pro and WH trace are grouped as a natural class with lexical NP, while PRO, pleonastics, and the empty element present in imperatives constitute a second natural class of NP which are invisible to the principle selecting object case forms. Motivating such a taxonomy would seem nontrivial.

A somewhat more interesting difficulty faced by the traditional analysis is that it implies a rather bizarre and powerful principle of case assignment. If indeed Finnish has a standard phrase structure containing a phrasal projection of V, as I am assuming, any principle which determines object case as a direct consequence of the presence or absence of an overt subject, however the notion of overt subject is to be construed, will be structurally global to a degree that is unprecedented and undesirable. If one takes the

distinction between overt nominative and overt accusative case-marking in objects to be a reflex of the assignment of different abstract Cases in AO and NO structures, the object Case assignment metric would be sensitive to structural information represented outside the government domain of V. Matters are worse yet if one takes the overt object case distinction to be a matter of a differing morphological spellout of a single abstract Case, since this would grant an equivalent degree of structural globality to morphological case spellout processes, a subcomponent of the grammar which should in principle be insensitive to information not represented in word structure.

A more promising approach to characterizing the essential difference between AO and NO structures, it seems to me, is to proceed from the observation that all the NO structures contain verb forms which are either lexically intransitive or, in some not entirely clear sense of the term, uninflected. Impersonals are characterized by the presence of a morphological element which inflects for tense and aspect, but is invariant in person and number. Imperatives exist in 1st person plural and 2nd person singular and plural forms, but are otherwise morphologically invariant. Existentials and possessives are found only in 3rd person form, of course, and do not inflect for number as is the case in languages such as English; in any event, the verbs found in these structures are always intransitive, making them unlikely assigners of accusative case, as noted above. It would seem, then, that one might reasonably attempt to relate the absence of accusative case on object NPs to these peculiarities of the verb forms in NO structures, either by stipulating that accusative case in Finnish is assigned under government of inflected (in whatever appropriate sense) transitive verbs, or by stipulating that imperative and impersonal morphology in Finnish absorbs accusative case in the manner of passive morphology in more familiar languages. However one carries out this approach in detail, however, it should be clear that the appropriate interpretation of this accusative case assignment metric is as a principle for the assignment of abstract Case, not the realization of morphological case, since it makes crucial appeal to the morphological structure of a governing verb, in the manner of Case assignment metrics, not that of spellout principles for morphological case.

While this fairly obvious analysis would seem to account easily for the absence of accusative Case in object NPs of NO structures, it says nothing about the more difficult and intriguing question of why these NPs instead acquire nominative Case. A number of approaches suggest themselves here. Gilligan (1984) suggests that the "rule R" posited by Chomsky (1981) and others to assign nominative Case to postverbal subjects in Italian is implicated here, effecting pre-S-structure movement of



the agreement element onto V, whence it governs and assigns nominative Case to object position. Taraldsen (1984) takes a different approach, giving nominative Case an essentially axiomatic status as a default Case which is normally characteristic of subjects but can appear in object position by a special provision in languages where S-level syntax is non-configurational, which he assumes to be the case in Finnish. Both of these fairly plausible approaches leave a number of problems unresolved. The appeal to a Romance-style syntactic movement of AGR is somewhat confounded by the existence of the colloquial impersonals cited by Carlson, in which a pleonastic nominative pronoun appears in subject position, coexisting with a nominative object. More seriously, the Finnish NO structures differ from the putatively analogous phenomena in Romance in important respects: the verb forms involved do not, for instance, agree with their nominative objects as the Italian verbs do with their postposed subjects, markedly reducing the plausibility of the claim that AGR is implicated in the assignment of Case to NO's. Taraldsen's alternative inherits the first of these difficulties in slightly different form, and requires a fairly arcane stipulation concerning the "priority" of nominative forms and an ad hoc condition on the well-formedness of a nominative NP governed by a V projection. Further, the implication of this analysis that S-level nonconfigurationality should correlate with the existence of NO constructions seems to be widely counterexemplified. Another approach which has appeared in the literature is that of Van Nes-Felius (1984), who simply stipulates two distinct Case assignment principles for objects, leading to the statement given below (p. 8), where "n-ACC" and " $\emptyset$ -ACC" are equivalent, respectively, to the notions accusative and nominative in other work on this phenomenon.

ACC-rule

A verb assigns n-ACC to its object if assignment of an external theta-role to its subject is not suppressed and the subject position is governed,...else it assigns  $\emptyset$ -Acc...

Clearly, a statement as global and richly stipulative as this is undesirable.

The approach which I shall take to these phenomena is somewhat different and in some respects more radical. Recall that one of the properties of the Finnish case morphology is that there is no explicit morpheme associated with nominative case, resulting in the generalization that nominative case nominals are overtly indistinguishable from uninflected stems, except for certain purely phonological phenomena associated with final position in word structure. I shall take the position

that this fact is an indication not that abstract nominative Case has no phonological realization in Finnish, as is commonly assumed, but rather that "nominative" NPs in Finnish are in fact Caseless at all levels of analysis. Assuming that the morphology is in this instance telling the truth about abstract Case solves the major descriptive problem under review in a rather immediate way. Accusative Case can be assigned in the entirely standard manner suggested above: under government of a transitive verb whose morphological structure does not absorb Case. The problem of defining a coherent metric for the assignment of nominative Case both to subjects and to the objects of NO sentences simply disappears, since there is no nominative Case to assign, and there need be no appeal to an idiosyncratically global Case assignment metric, a syntactic demotion of AGR, or any other machinery amounting to a stipulation of the assignment of nominative Case to object position.

More interestingly, this analysis raises a series of issues of general relevance to syntactic theory. First, and most obviously, it implies that Finnish is for some reason immune to the effects of the Case Filter. This in turn raises two questions: do the predictions this makes about other phenomena within the grammar of Finnish in fact hold, and why should it be the case that this language does not exhibit the effects of this putative principle of UG? Second, there are related but distinct issues concerning the nature of Case Theory and the factors underlying Burzio's Generalization. I shall consider these matters in sequence.

The claim that the Case Filter is ineffective in Finnish generates, so far as I can see, two major predictions: lexical subjects should be possible in nonfinite sentences, and objects should be permitted in VPs headed by verbs with case-absorptive morphology, obviating the intraclausal application of NP movement. The latter prediction seems to be confirmed. There is nothing analogous to passive constructions in Finnish; rather, there is the impersonal construction described above, in which the external theta role is retained and realized by PRO and the (Caseless) object NP remains in situ. This is exactly what one would expect on the assumption that the Case Filter is suspended. Note, by the way, that the presence of PRO in subject position of finite sentences is in itself an indication that this position is ungoverned, requiring one either to postulate some variant assignment metric for nominative Case or to claim, as I have done, that "nominative" positions in this language are not assigned Case at all. Interestingly, Anderson (1982) reports the existence of an impersonal construction in Breton which seems to exhibit exactly the complex of syntactic properties seen here in the grammar of Finnish. The prediction that lexical NP should be free to occur in the subject position of infinitivals is, how-

ever, disconfirmed. Infinitival complements of control verbs are uniformly without overt subjects, and raising predicates require NP movement from infinitivals embedded beneath them.

- (7) a. Haluan mennä  
want-pres1sg to go  
"I wanna go."  
b. \*Haluan Matti mennä  
"I want Matti to go."  
c. Miehet näyttävät nukkuneen hyvin.  
man-pl seem-pres3pl to have slept well  
"The men seem to have slept well."  
d. \*Näytää miehet nukkuneen hyvin.  
seem-pres3sg man-pl to have slept well

I have little to say about this problem at present beyond the observation that it is at least as likely to be indicative of an inadequacy of Case Theory as it is to reveal a contradiction in the current analysis. The Case-theoretic account of the restrictions on subject position in nonfinite clauses encounters well-known difficulties even in more familiar languages such as English, and reports such as those of Carrier-Duncan (1983) and Hale (1981), in which infinitival subject position is noted to bar lexical NP in nonconfigurational languages where the notion of direct Case may not even be well-defined, suggest that the attempt to construct a Case-theoretic explanation of this very general phenomenon may be mistaken. Alternate accounts are easily imaginable. One might, for instance, adopt Taraldsen's (1984) suggestion that subjects must take part in an agreement relationship, taking this as a direct condition of well-formedness on sentences containing lexical subjects. The absence of an agreement element in nonfinite clauses would then imply the impossibility of lexical subjects in these structures. In essence, the Case-theoretic approach has moved in this direction independently as AGR has been taken to constitute the governing element necessary to assign Case to a subject. The revision under discussion here simply removes Case assignment from its status as the perhaps otiose metaphor linking the presence of an agreement element with the possibility of a lexical subject NP. One might still maintain the Case-theoretic account of the ability of complements of "exceptional Case-marking" verbs in English to contain lexical subjects by means of some provision to the effect that accusative Case marking prevents the NP in such instances from counting as a subject for the purposes of the principle requiring coindexation with an agreement element. This sort of revision entails a certain loss of explanatory power, of course, since it claims that it is not possible to deduce the interdependence of AGR and lexical subjects entirely from the principles of Case Theory, and introduces a substantial degree of explanatory redundancy in the account of infinitival

subject phenomena in languages which obey the Case Filter. This is an unwelcome result, and should be added to a number of other indications that a deeper rethinking of the nature of subject Case assignment, perhaps on the lines suggested by Taraldsen, is due.

More interesting, to my mind, is the question of what sort of parametrization is revealed in Case Theory if one takes the analysis suggested here to be correct. Clearly, it accomplishes little to state baldly that the Case Filter is a parametric universal subject to crosslinguistic variation; this is at most a statement of a problem. My suspicion, although one can scarcely dignify it with any other name at present, is that the essential parameter of variation at issue here is related to a very simple, and very traditional, distinction: that between bound and free morphemes. Suppose that there are languages in which nominal stems are inherently bound and languages in which they are inherently free. One might then take the Case Filter to be the projection into the syntax of the fact that a particular language is of the former type, and its absence that it is of the latter. Clear cases of bound-stem languages would be provided by classical "inflectional" languages such as Russian, Latin, and Old English, while clear cases of free-stem languages would include Finnish, Estonian, and other languages in which an extensive nominal morphology coexists with overtly uninflected stems in phonological representation. The former would, on this theory, be expected to be Case Filter languages while the latter would not. English and other modern Germanic and Romance languages provide ambiguous and problematic cases. Overtly, such languages are characterized by the virtual absence of nominal morphology, yet the Case Filter figures largely in explanations of various aspects of their syntactic structure. Perhaps here as in other areas, history casts a long shadow. It is clear in any event that the existence of languages of this sort requires that the notion of bound- vs. free-stem systems be interpreted as a property of a morphological feature calculus, rather than of overt morphemes; this makes the empirical force of the proposal somewhat more difficult to evaluate, but raises no difficulties in principle.

If the preceding speculation is even approximately correct, there is one further implication of substantial interest. Since the seminal work on abstract Case by Siegel (1974) and continuing through the later enrichment of this construct by Rouveret and Vergnaud (1980), Chomsky (1980), and others, it has been assumed that Case Theory is in essence an abstraction of the traditional notion of morphological case projected into the syntax as a well-formedness condition on configurations containing lexical noun phrases. Recently, this construal has come into question due to suggestions by Chomsky (1981) and others that the Case

Filter be regarded as a condition on the "visibility" of arguments at Logical Form, ultimately a theorem derivable from more fundamental principles of grammar, in particular the Theta Criterion. While this approach gains a certain appeal from the extensive explanatory redundancy of Theta Theory and Case Theory, there are also a number of well-known phenomena which make this particular attempt at reduction of primitives seem mistaken, among them the existence and distribution of PRO, pleonastic subjects, and complement sentences. If it should turn out that I am correct in speculating that the cross-linguistic extension of the Case Filter is a consequence of differences in nominal morphology types, the attempt to reduce Case Theory to Theta Theory looks even more implausible. In fact, even if this speculation should prove to be in error but the particular analysis of Case structure in Finnish should prevail, a similar conclusion follows. Manifestly, Finnish honors the principles of Theta Theory; its ability blithely to go its own way with respect to those of Case Theory argues rather directly against the latter being a consequence of the former.

Finally, I should like to point out that the apparent suspension of the effects of the Case Filter in languages such as Finnish and Breton opens the possibility of separately inspecting the phenomena of object Case absorption and external theta role suppression which, as Burzio has noted, are associated with one another in the constructions of more familiar languages, and of gaining evidence concerning the question of which of these phenomena "drives" the other in the cases where they are associated. In both these languages, it seems that the absence of Case Filter effects allows the existence of constructions in which object Case is not assigned, but the subject theta role is retained. This argues rather strongly that the mechanism underlying Burzio's Generalization in the languages in which it obtains is the necessity for an unCased object NP to move to a Cased position. In general, the only position available to receive such an NP, given the strictures of Binding Theory, Theta Theory, and the Projection Principle, is that of an athematic subject. In the absence of the Case Filter, and thus of any necessity for a Caseless object NP to undergo movement, thematic subjects can coexist with Case-absorptive verbal elements; nothing special need be said about the relationship of these two grammatical phenomena. Levin and Massam (this volume) argue to a similar conclusion on entirely independent grounds.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, S.R. (1982), "Where's Morphology?", Linguistic Inquiry 13, pp. 571-612.
- Carlson, L. (1981a), "Central Problems in Finnish Syntax", unpublished manuscript, M.I.T.
- Carlson, L. (1981b), "Grammatical Case in Finnish", unpublished manuscript, M.I.T.
- Carrier-Duncan, J. (1983), "The Representation of Grammatical Relations in a Nonconfigurational Language", unpublished manuscript, Rutgers University.
- Chomsky, N. (1980), "On Binding", Linguistic Inquiry 11, pp. 1-46.
- Chomsky, N. (1981), Lectures on Government and Binding, Foris Publications, Dordrecht.
- Gilligan, G. (1984), "The Case of Finnish Nominative Assignment and the Universal Passive", unpublished manuscript, University of Southern California.
- Hale, K. (1981), "On the Position of Walbiri in a Typology of the Base", unpublished manuscript, M.I.T., distributed by Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Levin, J. and D. Massam, "Surface Ergativity: Case-Theta Relations Reexamined", this volume.
- Rouveret, A. and J.-R. Vergnaud (1980), "Specifying Reference to the Subject: French Causatives and Conditions on Representations", Linguistic Inquiry 11, pp. 97-202.
- Safir, K. (1982), Syntactic Chains and the Definiteness Effect, unpublished Doctoral dissertation, M.I.T.
- Siegel, D. (1974), Topics in English Morphology, unpublished Doctoral dissertation, M.I.T.
- Taraldsen, K.T. (1984), "On the Distribution of Nominative Objects in Finnish", unpublished manuscript, University of Tromsø.
- Van Nes-Felius, J. (1984), "Suppression of the External Theta Role in Finnish", paper delivered at the 1984 annual meeting of Generative Linguists in the Old World.