

Adjectivity of a Non-prototypical Adjective: The Case of Finnish Past Passive Participles*

Radosław Wójtowicz

The present paper examines the adjectivity of past passive participles in Finnish. ADJECTIVITY is understood as the degree to which participles display properties typical of adjectives on the morphosyntactic and semantic level, as different from ADJECTIVISATION, which concerns the distance in morphosyntax and semantics a participle shows compared to its verbal counterpart. It is demonstrated that varying conclusions might be reached depending on which of the two approaches is adopted. This article studies the adjectivity of participles in the predicative position and shows that when used predicatively, participles demonstrate features comparable to those of lexical adjectives which have not been addressed in studies focusing on the attributive use of participles. Other morphosyntactic criteria of adjectivity examined in this paper include: displaying gradable properties, serving as a derivative basis for adverbs and forming antonyms. In terms of semantics, the key feature in explaining the adjectivity of participles is boundedness. It is argued that adjectivally used Finnish past passive participles designate properties which sometimes bear a relatively distant relation to the events included in the meaning of their verbal counterparts. Varying interpretations in the domain of boundedness between adjectivally and verbally used participles are taken to illustrate these differences in event-relatedness. This paper also suggests that several Finnish past passive participles be recognised as separate dictionary entries.

Keywords: *adjectivity, boundedness, event-relatedness, Finnish, past passive participle*

1 Introduction

It is generally agreed that participles reveal features of both adjectives and verbs. However, approaches differ as to what the starting point should be: are participles first and foremost verbal units which demonstrate adjectival behaviour or are they adjectives integrated into verbal paradigms? More structurally oriented approaches typically employ the former perspective: participles are verbal paradigms which inflect for case and other categories typical of NPs, and, in a way additionally, demonstrate features typical of adjectives - appearing as predicatives, forming adverbs, allowing modifications by degree modifiers, etc. This “additional” adjectival behaviour of participles is the point of departure for the present paper. This article rests on the assumption that participles can be regarded as to greater or lesser extent independent lexical units, i.e. adjectives. I will try to demonstrate that in this way, i.e. when studying the ADJECTIVITY of participles, different conclusions can be reached than when the focus is on their ADJECTIVISATION, which refers to the degree of non-verbality in different uses of participles. As a result, the

* I gratefully acknowledge Nicole Nau for her invaluable help and critical remarks on this article. I would like to thank Tapani Kelomäki for his in-depth comments, as well as Eva Havu and other participants of the 40th Finnish Conference of Linguistics for their useful comments concerning the earlier version of the paper. I am also very indebted to the two anonymous FULL reviewers, whose supportive criticism provided me with an opportunity to significantly improve the quality of my article. I am especially thankful to the reviewers for bringing the importance of boundedness to my attention, as well as for help in making the concept of event-relatedness more explicit.

most adjective-like participles can, but do not necessarily have to be, the least verb-like ones.

Seeking regularities which might help tell where the border between participles' adjectivity and verbality lies is in itself not an original research question. In terms of Finnish, the most extensive study of this kind is Koivisto (1987). The present paper differs from Koivisto (1987) in two main respects: its primary focus is not on adjectivisation but on adjectivity and it assigns more prominence to the predicative than to the attributive use of participles. In different contexts, the reading of the Finnish past passive participle can be adjectival or verbal. Sometimes, the interpretation of a participle is ambiguous between verbal (as a constituent of the perfect passive form of the verb) and adjectival (as a predicative), cf. (1):

- (1) *Bakteereiden läbde on nyt eristetty ja*
 bacteria.GEN.PL source **be.PRS.3SG** now **isolate.PPP** and
vesijohtoverkko huuhdeltu.
 water.supply.system rinse.PPP¹
 'The source of bacteria **is** now **isolated** ~ **has** now **been isolated**² and the
 water supply system rinsed (...).'³ (yle.fi³ 17.7.2012)

This type of equivocal syntactic behaviour is found in participles which can be considered to a greater or lesser degree lexicalised and it is mainly such cases that the present paper investigates. At first sight, adjectivally used Finnish past passive participles are semantically and morphosyntactically very similar to constituents of perfect passive constructions but as I will try to demonstrate, these differences are greater than could be expected. The method is a two-step one: first, I look at what sets of morphosyntactic features typical of adjectives the participles under investigation demonstrate and subsequently, seek for possible semantic motivation behind the fact that certain participles are used in multiple morphosyntactic adjectival contexts. Following the view presented in Paradis (2001), I take boundedness to be a vital component of the semantics of participles as adjectives. I maintain that differences in boundedness between a verbally and an adjectivally used participle speak of differences in event-relatedness between the two. Event-relatedness is a concept telling whether an event of the same nature and structure as that of the corresponding verb is included in a participle's meaning. Put simply, an event-related passive participle is one whose use implies that the event

¹ ABESS = abessive, ABL = ablative, ACC = accusative, ADESS = adessive, ADV = adverb, AGPTCP = agent participle, ALLAT = allative, COMP = comparative, ELAT = elative, ESS = essive, GEN = genitive, IMP = imperative, IMPERF = imperfect, INESS = inessive, INF = infinitive, INSTR = instructive, NEG = negation, NOM = nominative, PAP = past active participle, PART = partitive, PASS = passive, PL = plural, POSS = possessive suffix, POT = potential mood, PPP = past passive participle, PR = proper name, PRS = present, PRSAP = present active participle, PRSPP = present passive participle, PTCL = particle, Q = question particle, SG = singular, SUPERL = superlative, TRANSL = translative, VN = verbal noun

² The fact that in (1), *eristetty* is modified by *nyt* 'now' does not exclude the possibility of a verbal reading. The Finnish perfect differs from the perfect tenses found in Indo-European languages, e.g. Latvian or English, in that *nyt* can be in this context replaced by e.g. *eilen* 'yesterday'. Thus it would make the reading of *eristetty* verbal, i.e. a constituent of the perfect passive form of *eristää* 'isolate'.

³ The main source of examples used in this article is 'HS' for *Helsingin Sanomat*, Finland's biggest daily newspaper. Apart from HS, I also cite Internet versions of local Finnish dailies, as well as some other Internet services which include news, articles, columns, etc.

denoted by the corresponding verb has occurred. The concept of event-relatedness is not new, but it has mainly been employed in diachronic studies of grammaticalisation: e.g. Carey (1995) raises the question of the relevance of the event for the semantics of past participles in her examination of the development of the English perfect from resultative constructions. The following example illustrates an adjectival use of a past passive participle *hyväksytty* ‘approved of’ which is in a relatively distant relation to the event denoted by *hyväksyä* ‘accept, approve’. In (2) *hyväksytty* is preceded by a degree modifier *melko* ‘fairly’. This is at odds with the structure of a bounded event of accepting something:

- (2) *Vaikka maan suurimmat uskonnot subtantuvat kielteisesti*
 although country.GEN big.SUPERL.PL religion.PL relate.PRS.3PL negatively
homoseksualisuuteen, yhteiskunnallisesti homous on melko
 homosexuality.ILLAT socially homosexuality be.PRS.3SG fairly
hyväksyttyä.
accept.PPP.PART
 ‘Although the biggest religions in the country display a negative attitude towards
 homosexuality, it is quite approved of in the society.’
 (Maailman Kuvalehti 3/2007)

Resorting to differences in event-relatedness is based on the assumption that a participle refers to the event in a different way than its respective verb does. As I will demonstrate, participles can receive interpretations in the domain of boundedness irrespectively of whether their corresponding verbs refer to bounded or unbounded events. Under ‘events’, I do not mean a type of states of affairs, usually distinguished alongside situations, processes and actions (cf. e.g. Van Valin & La Polla 1997: 83), but I use ‘events’ as a working term which encompasses different states of affairs denoted by verbs.

Additionally, this paper suggests that the list of Finnish past passive participles which make separate dictionary entries could be broadened. In the most recent dictionary of the Finnish language – *Kielitoimiston sanakirja* (KTS) – there are seven such participles: *oikeutettu* ‘justified, justifiable’, *toivottu* ‘hoped for’, *haluttu* ‘wanted’, *hallittu* ‘controlled’, *sallittu* ‘allowed’ and *barkittu* ‘premeditated’, as well as *armoitettu* ‘born (e.g. of speaker, writer)’. The last one, however, is lexicalised in the sense that there is no corresponding verbal paradigm which *armoitettu* could be considered part of⁴. The remaining six might be regarded homonyms of their verbal counterparts, albeit such a view involves the slight oversimplification that verbally used participles alone could designate events.

In the subsequent section, I provide an elaborate discussion on the adjectival and verbal properties of participles. I also introduce Finnish past passive participles with a special focus on their predicative use. Then I proceed to presenting a study on the morphosyntactic adjectival properties of Finnish past passive participles completed as part of my master thesis (Wójtowicz 2011), followed by a brief discussion on the results. In Section 4, I address contextual factors important to the interpretation of participles as adjectives and discuss the semantics of participles. Section 5 summarises and concludes the paper.

⁴ It is also worth noting that *armoitettu* appears first and foremost as an attribute in fixed phrases, e.g. *armoitettu puhuja* ‘a born speaker’.

2 Past passive participles in Finnish

2.1 Participle: more adjectival or verbal?

The nature of participles as more or less independent adjectival units is addressed in Haspelmath (1994), who provides the following definition of a participle: “Participles are best defined as verbal adjectives, i.e. words that behave like adjectives with respect to morphology and external syntax, but are regularly derived from verbs.” (Haspelmath 1994: 152). Once the expression ‘verbal adjectives’ is used, participles are treated as adjectives that demonstrate properties of verbs rather than as verbal forms which behave like adjectives. However, it seems that most discussions on participles in general linguistics depart from (and revolve around) verbal features. In terms of passive participles, their status is distinguished on the basis of distinctions in verbal categories such as voice. For example, Bresnan (1982) shows that while intransitive verbs can form passive participles, they experience semantic restrictions in the formation of passives. Passive participles as different from passives are addressed in Levin & Rappaport (1986). The authors distinguish between ADJECTIVAL PASSIVES and VERBAL PASSIVES: passive participles are heads of constructions of the former type, but are regularly formable from heads of verbal passive constructions, i.e. verbs. In Fennistics, although the adjectival properties of participles are commonly acknowledged (e.g. Kangasmaa-Minn 1988: 202, ISK § 297), participles are similarly viewed as first and foremost verbal forms in that the point of departure for examinations of their properties in general is the corresponding finite verb. This mostly concerns traditional studies in the Finnish language, which tend to assign more importance to structural paradigms than to contexts of occurrence. Karlsson (1983: 225ff), for instance, illustrates differences between adjective-like and verb-like participles by making syntagmatic comparisons of their formal features. More recent studies also relate participle constructions they investigate to verbal properties: e.g. Pekkarinen (2011) focuses on constructions with Finnish passive present participles and demonstrates that they do not always fall simply into the verbal categories of passive and present, but display a number of modal meanings⁵.

The most exhaustive study of adjectivally used Finnish participles thus far is Koivisto (1987), where the attributive use of participles is analysed. The sizeable research material used for the study is composed of *Nyky-suomen Sanakirja* (NS) – the biggest dictionary of Finnish available at the time – and a bulk of press articles and literary works from the 1960s-1980s. Koivisto (1987) adopts an approach within the generative paradigm and examines the degree of adjectivisation of different participles with respect to their valence properties and meaning, compared with that of their respective verbs. Adjectivisation is understood as the ability of a participle to function as an adjective and it is studied whether there are contexts in which participles differ in the abovementioned criteria from their respective finite verbs. Therefore, contrary to the approach adopted in the present study, the question is whether or not, rather than to what degree, participles demonstrate adjectival behaviour. Koivisto (1987) distinguishes between adjectivised participles, which are the main interest of her study, and lexicalised participles⁶. The latter

⁵ As a matter of fact, the focus of Pekkarinen (2011) is not on the adjectival properties of participles.

⁶ Koivisto (1987) divides participles into four groups: *participles which preserve their verbality*, i.e. those which they get the same arguments as their finite verbs in all contexts, *adjectivised participles*, *lexicalised participles* and the so-called *pronominalised participles*, i.e. participles which function as pronouns

are understood as fully belonging to the class of adjectives and having specialised meanings (Koivisto 1987: 424). Their adjectivisation is considered permanent. Koivisto (1987) is another study which takes the verb as point of departure: generalisations concerning participles are sought in verbs grouped into different semantic types. The grouping principle is the degree of transitivity which is reflected in valence properties of the verbs. Importantly, the method employed in Koivisto (1987) involves analysing whole participial systems of verbs in each of the groups rather than individual participles. For instance, there are 27 adjectivised participles belonging to the paradigms of 20 volitional verbs (*tahtomisverbit*). For 12 of the verbs, only the present active participles are adjectivised, for 1 verb – the present active and present passive participle, for 2 verbs – the present active and the past passive, etc. (Koivisto 1987: 251, 414). Past passive participles are a fairly distinctive subgroup (67%) of adjectivised participles in verbs of processing (*käsittelyisverbit*) (Koivisto 1987: 414).

An approach such as that of Koivisto (1987) rests on the assumption that adjectival participles are those which fail to demonstrate verbal properties in certain contexts. As Koivisto herself remarks, examining the ADJECTIVISATION⁷ of participles in such a way involves studying their non-verbality (1987: 434). On the contrary, to take the prototypical adjective as the point of reference and primarily focus on whether participles are actually used as attributes and predicatives, whether they allow degree modification and serve as derivative basis for adverbs, etc., would be to study the ADJECTIVALITY of participles. Both approaches recognise the fact that participles demonstrate properties typical of the other word class. Employing the former one might seem more logical since not all Finnish participles demonstrate the above-mentioned adjectival properties. The idea of this paper is, however, to examine Finnish past passive participles which do, in this sense, behave like adjectives. Thinking in terms of adjectivality, e.g. *mietitty* '(well-)thought-of' and *odotettu* '(long-)awaited, predictable' can function as simple NP modifiers, appear in contexts in which they are univocally interpretable as adjectival predicatives, as well as demonstrate behaviour typical of gradable predicates. Thus, they are closer to the prototypical adjective than, for instance, *koottu* 'gathered' and *huomattu* 'spotted, caught sight of' which do not reveal such properties at all, although there are other contexts in which the morphosyntactic properties of the former two participles are fully verbal.

Mietitty '(well-)thought-of' and *odotettu* '(long)awaited, predictable' are examples of participles which can be considered lexicalised. According to Himmelmann (2004), a view on lexicalisation in which it is understood as the emergence of new lexemes is questionable as it emphasises only one aspect of this multi-faceted phenomenon (Himmelmann 2004: 29). Nevertheless, Himmelmann (2004) treats lexicalization as a process and not as a state. Diachronic views on lexicalisation seem to be predominant in contemporary linguistics and are elaborately addressed in Brinton & Traugott (2005). In contrast, synchronic understanding of lexicalisation is generally reduced to one pattern: meanings being lexicalised, i.e. expressed by means of lexical units, as opposed to grammaticised meanings, i.e. ones expressed by grammatical means; for such a view on lexicalisation consult e.g. Talmy (2000). Another possible synchronic interpretation of lexicalisation is as a result of a process, as opposed to the process itself, which happens over time. Historically, past passive participles are adjectives derived from verbal nouns,

and are not comparable with participles belonging to other groups, e.g. (*viimeksi*) *mainittu* 'last-mentioned, latter' (Koivisto 1987: 5–6).

⁷ My capitalisation.

which were interpreted as having passive orientation (Haspelmath 1994: 168). Obviously, it would not be justifiable to claim that participles are more adjectival than verbal because of their historical development, but the historical development provides an interesting research perspective: with lexicalisation viewed as gradable some participles might be less integrated into the paradigms of their respective verbs than others. Judging by the context of their usage, some Finnish past passive participles have multiple meanings, thereby giving rise to a hypothesis that they might be in homonymy with their verbal counterparts. However, drawing the boundary between participles which form such pairs and those which do not is very challenging.

An attempt to provide an answer to the question posed in the title of this subsection is best avoided, because irrespectively of how closely participles resemble adjectives in their morphosyntactic behaviour, they still are productive verbal derivatives. Such categorial ambivalence is typical of participles in almost all languages that have them (Koskinen 1999: 152). By their nature, Finnish past passive participles are therefore non-prototypical adjectives, but some of them, e.g. the aforementioned *odotettu* and *mietitty*, are closer to the prototype than others. Let me now proceed to a more detailed description of Finnish participles, and illustrate their different uses with examples.

2.2 Participles in Finnish

Depending on the approach, two, four or six participles are said to operate in the Finnish participial system. According to the most general distinction, there are two participles: the present and the past participle, each of them having an active and a passive form, which makes a total of four participial forms. This makes Finnish interesting since languages typically have asymmetric systems of participles and tend to distinguish present active and past passive participles only (Haspelmath 1994: 154ff). Because of the differences in meaning and function, the four Finnish participial forms are sometimes referred to as separate participles with use of their respective markers: VA for the present active, TAVA for the present passive, NUT for the past active and TU for the past passive participle. Oftentimes, as many as six participles are distinguished, with the agent participle MA and the negative participle MATON in addition to the four mentioned above (cf. Karlsson 2009: 241). Since there is vowel harmony in Finnish, each of the participle markers has two versions. They are illustrated in Table 1 with the examples of participles derivable from *sanoa* 'say' and *hyväksyä* 'accept'. It should be noted that because English and Finnish do not correspond in terms of how participles are formed and used, the English translations provide only a rough orientation in the meanings of Finnish participles. In this paper, I concentrate on past passive participles, i.e. the ones that end with either *-tu* or *-ty*. Examples of them can be found in the highlighted row of Table 1. In Fennistics, past passive participles are referred to as *TU-partisiipit*, literally 'TU-participles', as I shall call them henceforth, for brevity.

Verb			<i>sano-a</i> ‘say’	<i>hyväksy-ä</i> ‘accept’
Present Participle	Active	VA	<i>sano-va</i> ‘saying’	<i>hyväksy-vä</i> ‘accepting’
	Passive	TAVA	<i>sano-ttava</i> ‘to be said’	<i>hyväksy-ttävä</i> ‘to be accepted’, ‘acceptable’
Past Participle	Active	NUT	<i>sano-nut</i> ‘the one who said’	<i>hyväksy-nyt</i> ‘the one who accepted’
	Passive	TU	<i>sano-ttu</i> ‘said’	<i>hyväksy-ty</i> ‘accepted, approved’
Agent Participle		MA	<i>sano-ma</i> ‘said (by)’	<i>hyväksy-mä</i> ‘accepted (by)’
Negative Participle		MATON	<i>sano-maton</i> ‘unsaid’	<i>hyväksy-mätön</i> ‘not accepted’, ‘unacceptable’

Table 1: *The participial system in Finnish*

Some participles have multiple meanings. To take *hyväksyttävä* for example, in (3) it is used in a construction expressing a modal meaning, whereas in (4) it is an adjective, which could be translated into English as ‘acceptable’. With the meaning as in (4), *hyväksyttävä* is found in dictionaries of the Finnish language, including the KTS.

- (3) *Jos päätösten yleislinja on kuitenkin hyväksyttävä, vasemmistolitto pysyy mukana.*
 if decision.GEN.PL common.front be.PRS.3SG however
ACCEPT.PRSP PR STAY.PRS.3SG within
 ‘If a common decision line needs to be accepted anyway, the Left Alliance will stay involved.’ (Iltalehti 8.6.2013)

- (4) (...) *jos leikkauksesta on esimerkiksi uskonnolliseen identiteettiin liittyvä hyöty, sen tekeminen on hyväksyttävää.*
 if circumcision.ELAT be.PRS.3SG for.example religious.ILLAT
 identity.ILLAT connected.PART benefit.PART it.GEN do.VN
 be.PRS.3SG **ACCEPT.PRSP.PART**
 ‘If there are advantages of circumcision, for example those connected with religious identity, then performing it is acceptable.’ (HS 8.10.2013)

An example of an adjectival use of a TU-participle comparable to that of *hyväksyttävä* from (4) is shown in (5). In this example, *odotettu* is used adjectivally and means ‘(long-)awaited’. In its verbal use, the meaning of *odotettu* is in accordance with *odottaa* ‘wait’, cf. (6); the discussion on the formal basis on which the two readings (adjectival vs. verbal) are distinguished will follow in 2.3.

- (5) *Lapsi on hyvin odotettu ja toivottu. Marraskuussa on laskettu aika.*
 child be.PRS.3SG very **wait.PPP** and hope.PPP November.INESS be.PRS.3SG
 calculate.PPP time
 ‘The child is much awaited and hoped for. The birth is due in November.’ (Ilta-Sanomat 23.7.2009)

- (6) *Tätä päivää on odotettu niin kauan, ettei uuni enää maistu.*
 it.PART day.PART be.PRS.3SG **wait.PPP** so long that.NEG sleep
 anymore taste.NEG
 ‘They have been waiting for the day so long that one does not even feel like sleeping.’
 (HS 27.4.2013)

In most cases, adjectival TU-participles do not constitute “classical” instances of lexicalisation in that there is no morphological reduction in their structure and their meanings can be predicted from the semantics of their verbal counterparts. This is not the case with *suosittu*: it is the past passive participle of *suosia* ‘favour’, but it is mostly used in its specialised adjectival meaning ‘popular’. Although when *suosittu* is used adjectivally its meaning is not associated with the verb *suosia*, the internal structure of the participle is, this is one of the reasons why we can tell *suosittu* ‘popular’ is lexicalised. If the distinctions between word classes are to be put onto a continuum, then *suosittu* is closer to the prototypical adjective than e.g. *hyväksyty*. Even more lexicalised are *tuttu* ‘familiar’ and *tietty* ‘certain, particular’. They are instances of lexicalisation in its broader sense, meaning they do not belong to verbal paradigms and there is morphological reduction in their internal structure. There are verbal traces observable in the structures of both *tietty* and *tuttu*: they contain the past passive participle marker and can be easily associated with the meanings of *tietää* ‘know’ and *tuntea* ‘know, be familiar with’, respectively. However, they are independent lexical units, not identical to the participles derived from the two verbs: *tiedetty* ‘known’ and *tunnettu* ‘known (e.g. among people)’. For this reason, they are excluded from the present analysis.

An adjectivally used participle in Finnish can typically function both as an attribute and as a predicative (Koivisto 1987: 27). When used attributively, TU-participles demonstrate varying syntactic behaviours: from displaying the full valence of the finite verb, as shown in (7), to standing as simple, i.e. unmodified, modifiers of the head of an NP, as in (8):

- (7) *Viisi kertaa pääministeriksi nimitetty Ecevit*
 five time.PART **prime.minister.TRANSL** **appoint.PPP** PR
oli yksi viime vuosisadan merkittävistä hahmoista
 be.IMPERF.3SG one last century.GEN remarkable.ELAT.PL figure.ELAT.PL
Turkin politiikassa, mutta hänen maineensa
 Turkey.GEN politics.INESS but s/he.GEN reputation.3POSS
jää ristiriitaiseksi
 remain.IMPERF.3SG contradictory.TRANSL
 ‘Ecevit, who was five times appointed prime minister, was one of the most remarkable figures in Turkish politics, but his reputation remained controversial.’
 (HS 7.11.2006)

- (8) (...) *koulutyö on suunniteltava siten, että koulu on turvattu paikka sekä oppilaille että opettajille.*
 school.work be.PRS.3SG design.PRSP so that school
 be.PRS.3SG **safeguard.PPP** place both student.ALLAT.PL and
 teacher.ALLAT.PL
 ‘Schoolwork should be designed in such a way that school would be a safe place for both students and teachers.’ (Taloustaito 8/2003, available at aikakaus.fi)

In (7), *pääministeriksi* is an obligatory argument of the verb *nimittää* ‘appoint’ (*nimittää joku joksikin* ‘appoint somebody something’), while *turvattu* as used in (8) does not take the arguments of the verb *turvata* ‘safeguard’. In Finnish, unmodified participles such as *turvattu* in (8), mostly allow modifications by adverbial modifiers, but can function as heads of APs and modify an NP independently. The verbal use of *turvattu*, comparable with that of *nimitetty* in (7), is illustrated in (9), where *turvattu* selects an allative object. Conversely, *nimitetty* cannot function as a simple attribute. Unless it has been clarified who is appointed what in a context (especially in spoken language), a sentence cannot be rendered correct if *nimitetty* is not accompanied by the obligatory arguments of *nimittää*, cf. (10):

- (9) *USA on maailman suurimpana kasvihuonekaasujen päästövaltiona loukannut inuittien ympäristöllisiä ja kulttuurisia oikeuksia, jotka heille on turvattu Amerikan ihmisoikeusjulistuksessa.*
 USA be.PRS.3SG world.GEN big.SUPERL.ESS greenhouse.gas.GEN.PL
 emitter.state.ESS violate.PAP Inuit.GEN.PL environmental.PART.PL and
 cultural.PART.PL rights.PART.PL which **they.ALLAT** **be.PRS.3SG**
they.ALLAT **be.PRS.3SG**
safeguard.PPP America.GEN human.rights.declaration.INESS
 ‘As the world’s largest greenhouse gas emitter, the United States have violated Inuits’ environmental and cultural rights which had been guaranteed to them in the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man.’ (Kaleva 16.2.2005)
- (10) **Nimitetty Ecevit oli yksi viime vuosisadan merkittävistä hahmoista Turkin politiikassa, mutta hänen maineensa jäi ristiriitaiseksi.*
appoint.PPP PR be.IMPERF.3SG one last century.GEN
 remarkable.ELAT.PL figure.ELAT.PL Turkey.GEN politics.INESS but
 s/he.GEN reputation.3POSS remain.IMPERF.3SG contradictory.TRANSL
 ‘*The appointed Ecevit was one of the most remarkable figures in Turkish politics, but his reputation is controversial.’

Thus, as an attribute, *turvattu* can be used both adjectivally and verbally, while in the case of *nimitetty*, the only possible use is verbal. Judging solely by their attributive uses, *turvattu* is closer to the prototypical adjective than *nimitetty*.

The attributive use of Finnish participles has been quite exhaustively studied – it is exactly in the attributive position that Koivisto (1987) examines their adjectivisation. It is a generally accepted fact that the attributive use is the basic function of adjectives, which

is the case, especially if a separate word class of adjectives is to be distinguished⁸. Little attention has, on the other hand, been dedicated to the predicative use of participles, considered a secondary function of adjectives. Some examples of such a use have already been provided (see examples (2), (4) and (5)). Although instances of attributively used adjectival participles are in fact more frequent, I maintain that at least as far as TU-participles are concerned, the predicative use is worth paying special attention to. This is because there are some interesting phenomena which emerge in predicatively used participles, and which reveal interesting facts about their adjectivity.

2.3 TU-participles as predicatives

Together with the copula *olla* ‘be’ in third person singular, a TU-participle constitutes the perfect passive form of a verb. When speaking of passive in Finnish, I use the term in accordance with the traditional grammatical description of this language - the Finnish passive is in fact an impersonal in that a transformation of an active clause into the so-called passive involves subject deletion and not demotion, as well as no object-to-subject promotion⁹. The result of a transformation of an active sentence in example (11a) into the so-called passive would be (11b).

- (11) a. *Jose Mourinho on tehnyt päätöksen Chelseaan*
 PR be.PRS.3SG make-PAP decision.ACC1 PR.GEN
kapteenikysymyksessä.
 capitan.question.INESS.
 ‘Jose Mourinho has made the decision concerning Chelsea’s captain.’
 (Iltasanomat 11.6.2013)
- b. *Päätös Chelseaan kapteenikysymyksessä on tehty.*
 decision.ACC2 PR.GEN capitan.question.INESS. be.PRS.SG make-PPP
 ‘The decision concerning Chelsea’s captain has been made.’

Sometimes, the status of a TU-participle in the linear position as that of *tehty* ‘made’ in (11b) is obscure and it can be interpreted either as a constituent of the perfect passive or as a predicative adjective. The two are semantically close to each other, but in the former case, the argument (e.g. *päätös* ‘decision’ in 12) is the direct object, while in the

⁸ Adjectives are treated as a universal word class in Bhat (1994) and Dixon (2004). Wetzer (1996) is against such a view claiming that the tendency to argue in favour of adjectives’ universality is due to an Indo-European bias still lingering in the study of languages. Language-specifically for Finnish, consult Pajunen (1994) who treats the adjectival category as universal using the discourse approach.

⁹ Whether the Finnish passive can ultimately be analysed under the term PASSIVE is a matter of great dispute. Comrie (1977) argues in favour of such a view and considers the Finnish passive an instance of IMPERSONAL PASSIVE, which has subject removal in common with the PERSONAL PASSIVE. On the contrary, Blevins (2003) separates passives from impersonal constructions, treating the Finnish passive, among other constructions of this type found in Baltic Finnic languages, as an instance of the latter. An interesting approach to the Finnish passive is that of Shore (1986), where the Finnish verbal diathesis is divided into two categories: definite and indefinite, with ‘passive’ constituting the latter. The Finnish indefinite comprises two prototypes, called the P-prototype and the K-prototype, which represent two different uses of the Finnish indefinites: the spoken language-like and written language-like, respectively.

latter, it is the subject of the clause, characterized as ‘well-thought-out’¹⁰. Accordingly, *oli* in (12) can either be considered an auxiliary or a copula. What follows are temporal differences between the two possible readings – (12) contains an instance of a present perfect or a present tense:

- (12) *Myös pääministeri Jyrki Katainen (kok.) on todennut aiemmin,*
 also prime.minister PR PR be.PRS.3SG state.PAP earlier
että päätös oli harkittu.
 that decision.NOM/ACC2 be.PRS.3SG consider.PPP
 ‘Also the Prime Minister Jyrki Katainen (The National Coalition Party) has previously stated that the decision had been given consideration/the decision was well-thought-out’. (yle.fi 4.4.2013)

Such ambiguities can be dissolved thanks to several factors. Apart from the contextual and pragmatic ones (cf. Koivisto 1987: 32, 131), the syntactic properties of the clause or the morphological features of its constituents allow a verbal, but not an adjectival reading of a TU-participle or vice versa. There is subject-predicate agreement in number in a copular clause with an adjectival predicative, whereas the so-called passive lacks such type of agreement. (13a) and (13b) contain elements not distinguished formally, but the two examples receive different interpretations. In (13a), the finite form of *olla* ‘be’ is an auxiliary combined with the passive past participle to form the perfect passive of *hyväksyä* ‘accept, approve’. (13b) is a modification of (13a) into the so-called passive: the form of *olla* ‘be’ in (13b) functions as a copula and the participle as a predicative. Therefore, *hyväksytty* can be interpreted as an adjective with the meaning ‘approved’. Accordingly, the noun phrase *paikalliset tosipohjaiset jutut* in (13a) is in the accusative – one of the two possible cases for the Finnish object, alongside the partitive – whereas in (13b), it is in the nominative and is the subject of the clause. The difference is reflected formally in agreement: the nominative noun phrase in (13b) agrees in number with the verb, but the accusative NP in (13a) does not:

- (13) a. *Mukaan on hyväksytty vain paikallise-t, tosipohjaise-t*
 along be.PRS.3SG accept.PPP only local-ACC.PL truth.based-ACC.PL
jutu-t (...).
 story-ACC.PL
 ‘Only local stories based on truth have been accepted (...).’ (HS 11.1.2011)
- b. *Vain paikallise-t, tosipohjaise-t jutu-t ovat*
 only local-NOM.PL truth.based-NOM.PL story-NOM.PL be.PRS.3PL
hyväksytty-jä.
 accept.PPP-PART.PL
 ‘Only local stories based on truth are approved of.’

Some Finnish verbs govern particular cases, which makes it easy to determine whether a subject of a copular clause or an object of the so-called passive is in question. For instance, the first word in (14) comes in the partitive, which is an obligatory case for

¹⁰ In this context, however, the word meaning ‘decision’ can also appear in the partitive, thus making the reading of *harkittu* unequivocally verbal.

a direct object of *rakastaa* ‘love’. The clause in which *Frederikiä* appears is therefore interpreted as an instance of perfect passive. This is not the case in (15): the word *Prinsessa* is in the nominative, thus receiving an interpretation as subject, characterised by *rakastettu* – a predicative with the meaning ‘beloved’:

- (14) *Frederiki-ä on rakastettu enemmän, ja se näkyy*
PR-PART be.PRS.3SG love.PPP more and it be.visible.PRS.3SG
mm. sosiaalisena omatuntona.
 among.other.things social.ESS consciousness.ESS
 ‘They love Frederik more, and it can be seen, among other things, in the social consciousness.’ (HS 24.12.2007)
- (15) *Prinsessa oli perheessämme hyvin rakastettu ja me*
princess(NOM) be.PRS.3SG family.INESS.1PLPOSS very love.PPP and we
kaikki muistamme hänet iloisena, hauskana ja nokkelana
 all remember.1PL s/he.ACC1 joyful.ESS nice.ESS and smart.ESS
persoonana.
 person.ESS
 ‘The princess was dearly beloved in our family and we will all remember her as a joyful, nice and smart person.’ (HS 11.3.2013)

An unambiguous adjectival reading, in turn, is made possible by the fact that when appearing in the predicative position, some TU-participles are subject to case variation between the nominative and the partitive, which is typical of adjectives. In (16), the participle is in the partitive case (*hyväksyttyä*). In this context, the nominative (*hyväksytty*) is also possible:

- (16) *Jouluna harmaa talous on hyväksytty-ä*
 christmas.ESS black economy **be.PRS.3SG accept-PART**
joulukuusikaupassa.
 christmas.tree.trade.INESS
 ‘During Christmas black economy is accepted in Christmas tree trade.’
 (Kaleva 22.12.2010)

If a participle appears in the partitive case in this position, its reading is univocally adjectival. In plural, TU-participles typically come in the partitive case, as shown in (17a). The use of the nominative plural in this context is rather marginal and restricted to very specific meanings. It is sometimes dismissed as inconsistent with the nature of the Finnish passive since, due to the fact that the nominative plural and the accusative plural are homophonous, a clause containing a participle in the nominative plural might be interpreted as an instance of agreement in number (cf. Hakulinen 1979: 557). Compare *hotellihuoneet* ‘hotel rooms’ in (17b), which receives a translation identical to that of (17a), with (17c), which is the passive version of (17a):

- (17) a. (...) *kaikki pääkaupungin hotellihuonee-t ovat*
 all capital.GEN hotel.room-NOM.PL **be.PRS.3SG**
varattu-ja kesäkuun kahden ensimmäisen viikon
book.PPP-PART.PL june.GEN two.GEN first.GEN week.GEN
aikana (...).
 time.ESS
 ‘(...) during the first two weeks of June, all the hotels in the capital city are
 (fully) booked (...).’ (HS 3.6.1998)
- b. *Kaikki pääkaupungin hotellihuonee-t ovat varatu-t*
 all capital.GEN hotel.room-NOM.PL **be.PRS.3SG book.PPP-NOM.PL**
kesäkuun kahden ensimmäisen viikon aikana.
 June.GEN two.GEN first.GEN week.GEN time.ESS
 ‘During the first two weeks of June, all the hotels in the capital city are (fully)
 booked.’
- c. *Kesäkuun kahden ensimmäisen viikon ajaksi*
 june.GEN two.GEN first.GEN week.GEN time.TRANSL
on varattu kaikki pääkaupungin hotellihuonee-t.
be.PRS.3SG book.PPP all capital.GEN hotel.room-ACC.PL
 ‘For the first two weeks of June, all the hotels in the capital city have been
 booked.’

In studies of Finnish participles the case variation in singular is covered only as long as it is relevant to differences in meanings between various constructions, whereby participles are interpreted as constituents of verbal phrases¹¹. As I will demonstrate, TU-participles which experience case variation between the nominative and the partitive when used predicatively are among the most adjectival ones.

Not surprisingly, many participles are often used in fixed phrases, such as *ehdottomasti kielletty* ‘strictly forbidden’:

- (18) *Poika erotettiin, koska aseiden tuominen*
 boy.ACC2 expel.IMPERF.PASS because weapons.GEN bring.VN
tarhaan on ehdottomasti kiellettyä.
 kindergarten.ILLAT be.PRS.3SG **absolutely forbid.PPP.PART.**
 ‘The boy was expelled because bringing weapons to the kindergarten is strictly
 forbidden.’ (HS 12.4.2006)

They also reveal their ambiguous categorial status in many contexts, i.e. they demonstrate adjectival and verbal behaviour at the same time. In (19), *oikeutettu* is used as a predicative, but takes the arguments of the verb *oikeuttaa* ‘entitle’:

¹¹ Perhaps most attention to the case variation in Finnish participles is given in Pekkarinen (2005), which is a study on present passive participles.

- (19) (...) *vain yksinhuoltaja-äidit ovat olleet oikeutettuja sosiaaliapuun.*
 only single.parent-mother.PL **be.PRS.3PL be.PAP.PL**
entitle.PPP.PART.PL social.assistance.ILLAT
 ‘(...) only single mothers are entitled to social assistance.’ (HS 14.4.1992)

In the section that follows, I take a closer look at TU-participles in contexts in which they do demonstrate fully adjectival behaviour. My primary focus is on those TU-participles which are unequivocally adjectival in the predicative position and examine their adjectivality with respect to other morphosyntactic features. Besides being suited for attributive use, which has already been addressed, these are: serving as a derivative basis for adverbs, as shown in (20), forming comparatives and superlatives, as in (21), being preceded by modifiers typical of adjectives, which is illustrated in (22) and forming antonyms with the use of the prefix *epä-* ‘un-’, cf. (23):

- (20) *Naudan luomujanbeliba on rajoitettu-sti saatavana.*
 beef.GEN organic minced meat be.PRS.3SG **restrict.PPP-ADV** obtain.PRSPP.ESS
 ‘Organic minced beef is restrictedly available.’ (HS 30.3.2011)
- (21) a. *Joseph Haydnin pikkuveli Michael Haydn (1737-1806) on saanut juopon maineen, mutta oli kirkkomusiikin säveltäjänä kuuluisaa veljeään arvostetu-mpi.*
 PR.GEN younger.brother PR be.PRS.3SG
 gain.PAP drunkard.GEN reputation.ACC1 but be.PRS.3SG
 church.music.GEN composer.ESS famous.PART brother.PART.3POSS
esteem.PPP-COMP
 ‘Michael Haydn (1737-1806), Joseph Haydn’s younger brother, gained reputation of a drunkard, but as a church music composer, he enjoyed greater esteem than his famous brother.’ (HS 6.4.2007)
- b. *Nobelillakin kruunattu kirjailija on edelleen Amerikan luetu-impia.*
 Nobel.Prize.ADESS.PTCL crown.PPP writer be.PRS.3SG still
 America.GEN **read.PPP-SUPERL.PART.PL**
 ‘Crowned with, among others, the Nobel Prize, the writer is still one of the most popular in America.’ (HS 28.10.2008)
- (22) a. *Jälleen se oli melko unohdettu V75-peleissä.*
 again it be.IMPERF.3SG **quite forget.PPP** V75-game.PL.INESS
 ‘Again, it was much forgotten in V75-games.’ (HS 7.9.2000)
- b. *Juudaksen evankeliumi oli syntymessäänkin hyvin kiistelty.*
 Judas.GEN gospel be.IMPERF.3SG be.born.IMP2.INESS.3POSS.PTCL
very dispute.PPP
 ‘Even at the moment it appeared, the Gospel of Judas was much disputed.’ (HS 12.4.2006)

- (23) *On epä-oikeutettua olla ottamatta*
 be.PRS.3SG NEG-justify.PPP.PART be take.INF3.ABESS
huomioon subteita, joissa
 consideration.ILLAT circumstance.PART.PL which.INESS.PL
päätöstä on tehty.
 decision.PART be.PRS.3SG make.PPP
 ‘It is unjustified not to take into consideration the circumstances in which
 the decision was made.’ (HS 5.9.1998)

3 Morphosyntax: trying to measure adjectivality

3.1 Methodology and material

In 2011, I conducted a corpus-based study on the predicative use of Finnish past passive participles (Wójtowicz 2011). My assumption was simple: the greater the number of morphosyntactic criteria of adjectivality a participle meets, the more adjectival it can be considered. The criteria included the following: appearing as unmodified attributes, i.e. modifying the head of an NP while being unmodified itself at the same time (a use such as that of *turvattu* in example (8)), being suited for the predicative use, appearing with degree modifiers, forming comparatives and/or superlatives, adverbs and antonyms. The starting point was first to establish which TU-participles are used predicatively in Finnish newspaper language and then to examine instances of their other possible adjectival uses. I compared the results of my study with those of Koivisto (1987), where adjectivised participles were those which, when used attributively, differed in valence and meaning from their respective verbs.

For the purpose of the research, I selected 81 past passive participles that appeared both as separate entries (39 participles) and in examples illustrating uses of different Finnish words (42 participles) throughout in the WSOY Finnish-English-Finnish dictionary (2008). 81 is a number that can be viewed here as both large and small; seemingly too small to draw definite conclusions about the participial subsystem ‘TU’. On the other hand, the 81 participles constitute a diverse and balanced sample of the whole of the TU-subsystem in that there are random TU-participles present in the group: both adjectival participles (found as separate entries) and ones which tend to display verbal uses (those which appear in sample sentences and examples illustrating uses of various Finnish words). I found it possible to make some interesting generalisations concerning e.g. their semantics. For reasons mentioned in Section 2.2., I excluded *tietty* ‘certain, particular’ and *tuttu* ‘familiar’, as well as participles which function as nouns in Finnish: *ybdistetty* ‘Nordic combined’, *kiblattu* ‘fiancé(e)’ and *prostituoitu* ‘prostitute’.

The research was conducted on the basis of all newspaper articles from years 1990–2011 available on the Internet site of *Helsingin Sanomat* at the beginning of 2011. I looked at the number of criteria of adjectivality met by each participle. A criterion was considered met (+) if there were at least seven different appearances of a participle in a given structure throughout the corpus. The reason for the number being exactly seven is that when I searched through the corpus, the search engine would present seven different contexts where a participle fulfilled a given criterion, whereas if the number was smaller than seven, it was very common that the same contexts of usage (e.g. the same articles) were displayed multiple times.

The results of the study are summarised in 3.2 where all the 81 participles are listed. Participles absent from the list of adjectivised participles in Koivisto (1987, Liite I) are given in capitals. Columns 1 to 8 of Table 2 are the actual criteria of adjectivity examined in Wójtowicz (2011). Column 1 stands for the attributive use. Columns 2 to 4 refer to the predicative use of participles: it is indicated in separate columns whether a participle appeared, together with the copula, in the nominative singular (column 2), partitive singular (column 3) and partitive plural (column 4). Column 5 refers to participles which serve as a derivative basis for *sti*-adverbs. Column 6 stands for participles which can form comparatives and/or superlatives and column 7 – for those preceded by adverbs typically modifying adjectives (*täysin* ‘fully’, *erittäin* ‘highly’, *melko* ‘fairly, pretty’, *varsin* ‘quite’, *aivan* ‘quite’ and *hyvin* ‘very, well’). In column 8, I present a very few instances of antonyms formed with use of the prefix *epä-* ‘un-’ which I found within the corpus. In order that the processing of Table 2 is facilitated, the predicative-section (columns 2-4) and the section referring to the gradable properties of participles (columns 6-7) are marked with thicker lines. + and – indicate whether or not a participle demonstrated adjectival behaviour with respect to a given criterion. If the number of instances was smaller than seven, I marked it as ‘F’ for *a few* or gave the exact figure if there were only one or two appearances. ‘U’ for *unclear* was assigned to those instances where it was not possible to decide whether the reading of the participle is verbal or adjectival.

The greater the count of marks other than minuses was the higher up in the table the participle came. This is probably the most suitable pattern to help identify a general rule concerning the correspondence between the predicative use and meeting other criteria of adjectivity. If the principle had been to count, first and foremost, the number of pluses, then for example *kunnioitettu* ‘esteemed’ would have come much lower. It should also be remembered that differences are not that big after all, this is also the reason to distinguish between ‘+’ and ‘F’. At least when the distribution of criteria fulfilled by e.g. *vihattu* ‘hated’ and *pidetty* ‘liked’ is concerned, they differ from each other less than could be expected judging solely by the number of rows that set them apart.

3.2 Results

Participle	Attribute	Predicative			Adverb	Gradable properties		Antonym
		Nom.Sg	Part.Sg	Part.Pl		Comp. and/or	Degree Modifier	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 <i>oikeutettu</i> ‘justified, justifiable’	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2 <i>toivottu</i> ‘hoped for’								
3 <i>ansaittu</i> ‘(well-)deserved’	+	+	+	+	+	F	+	1

Participle	Attribute	Predicative			Adverb	Gradable properties		Antonym
		Nom.Sg	Part.Sg	Part.Pl		Comp. and/or Superl.	Degree Modifier	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4 <i>arvostettu</i> ‘(highly) esteemed’ 5 <i>hallittu</i> ‘controlled’ 6 <i>haluttu</i> ‘wanted’ 7 <i>harkittu</i> ‘premeditated’ 8 <i>huoliteltu</i> ‘refined’ 9 <i>rajoitettu</i> ‘restricted, limited’ 10 <i>sallittu</i> ‘allowed’ 11 <i>suosittu</i> ‘popular’ 12 <i>tunnettu</i> ‘(well-)known’	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
13 <i>kielletty</i> ‘forbidden’ 14 <i>perusteltu</i> ‘justified’	+	+	+	+	+	F	+	–
15 <i>kiistetty</i> ‘disputed’	+	+	2	+	+	+	+	–
16 <i>kunnioitettu</i> ‘respected’	+	2	–	1	1	F	2	1
17 <i>MIETTITY</i> ‘well thought–out’ 18 <i>taattu</i> ‘guaranteed’ 19 <i>turvattu</i> ‘safeguarded’	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–
20 <i>HYV.ÄKSYTTY</i> ‘approved’ 21 <i>koulutettu</i> ‘well-educated’ 22 <i>KYSYTTY</i> ‘sought-after’ 23 <i>ODOTETTU</i> ‘expected’	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	–
24 <i>suljettu</i> ‘closed’	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	–
25 <i>pidetty</i> ‘liked’	+	+	1	+	–	+	+	–
26 <i>tunnustettu</i> ‘recognized’	+	+	–	+	+	2	F	–
27 <i>hiottu</i> ‘refined’	+	–	+	–	+	+	F	1
28 <i>liioiteltu</i> ‘exaggerated’	+	+	+	+	–	F	1	–
29 <i>järjestetty</i> ‘organized’	F	+	+	1	–	1	–	1
30 <i>SÄÄNNÖSTELTY</i> ‘rationed’	+	F	F	2	F	1	–	–
31 <i>asuttu</i> ‘inhabited’ 32 <i>KEKSITTY</i> ‘made-up, invented’	+	+	+	+	–	1	–	–
33 <i>tarkoitettu</i> ‘meant, intended’	F	+	1	+	F	–	–	–
34 <i>rakastettu</i> ¹² ‘beloved’	+	+	–	+	–	+	F	–
35 <i>unohdettu</i> ‘forgotten’	+	+	–	+	–	F	F	–
36 <i>eristetty</i> ‘isolated’	+	+	–	2	–	+	F	–
37 <i>USKOTTU</i> ‘believed’	+	+	–	+	–	1	F	–
38 <i>määrätty</i> ‘fixed, determined’	+	+	1	–	F ¹³	F	–	–

¹² *Rakastettu* is not considered here in its nominal meaning, i.e. ‘lover’.

Participle	Attribute	Predicative			Adverb	Gradable properties		Antonym
		Nom.Sg	Part.Sg	Part.Pl		Comp. and/or Superl.	Degree Modifier	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
39 <i>vihattu</i> 'hated'	+	F	–	1	–	+	1	–
40 <i>PAKOTETTU</i> 'forced'	–	+	+	+	–	F	–	–
41 <i>VÄÄRENNETTY</i> 'forged'	+	+	2	+	–	–	–	–
42 <i>VARATTU</i> 'reserved, taken'	+	+	–	+	–	1	–	–
43 <i>menetetty</i> 'lost'	+	+	1	F	–	–	–	–
44 <i>KÄSITELTY</i> 'dealt with'	F	+	–	2	–	1	–	–
45 <i>sidottu</i> 'tied'	F ¹⁴	–	–	F	1	+	–	–
46 <i>alennettu</i> 'reduced', 47 <i>ASEISTETTY</i> 'armed' 48 <i>HIMMENNETTY</i> 'dimmed' 49 <i>vakuutettu</i> 'insured'	+	+	–	+	–	–	–	–
50 <i>KEHITETTY</i> 'developed' 51 <i>käytetty</i> 'used'	+	–	–	–	–	+	+	–
52 <i>LYHENNETTY</i> 'shortened' 53 <i>MIEHITETTY</i> 'occupied'	+	+	–	1	–	–	–	–
54 <i>abdistettu</i> 'harrassed' 55 <i>hylätty</i> 'rejected'	+	+	–	–	–	1	–	–
56 <i>hoidettu</i> 'managed, well-kept'	–	–	2	2	2	–	–	–
57 <i>YMMÄRRETTY</i> 'understood'	–	+	1	1	–	–	–	–
58 <i>koottu</i> 'gathered'	F ¹⁵	–	–	1	–	+	–	–
59 <i>huomattu</i> 'noticed'	F	–	–	1	–	–	F	–
60 <i>luettu</i> 'popular with readers'	+	–	–	–	–	+	F	–
61 <i>KOHDISTETTU</i> 'focused'	F	–	–	–	F	1	–	–
62 <i>VALITTU</i> 'elected'	+	–	–	–	1	1	–	–
63 <i>hävitetty</i> 'destroyed' 64 <i>kadotettu</i> 'lost, wasted' 65 <i>teeskennelty</i> 'feigned'	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
66 <i>täytetty</i> 'stuffed, filled out'	+	F U	–	1	–	–	–	–
67 <i>armoitettu</i> 'born (e.g. speaker)'	+	F	–	–	–	–	–	–
68 <i>TIEDETTY</i> 'known'	F	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
69 <i>PÄIVITETTY</i> 'updated'	+	U	–	–	1	–	–	–

¹³ In all the three instances, *määrätysti* is modified by *ennalta* 'in advance' and the phrase *ennalta määrätysti* can be translated as 'predeterminedly'.

¹⁴ All instances of the attributive use of *sidottu* 'bound' are in fixed phrases, such as *sidottuja osakkeita* 'restricted shares'.

¹⁵ All instances of the attributive use of *koottu* 'gathered' are in fixed phrases, such as *koottuja teoksia* 'complete works (of a writer etc.)'.

Participle	Attribute	Predicative			Adverb	Gradable properties		Antonym
		Nom.Sg	Part.Sg	Part.Pl		Comp. and/or Superl.	Degree Modifier	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
70 <i>NAUHOITETTU</i> ‘tape-recorded’	+	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
71 <i>hankittu</i> ‘acquired’	+	–	–	2	–	–	–	–
72 <i>JÄLJITELTY</i> ‘imitated’, 73 <i>MUUNNELTU</i> ‘modified’, 74 <i>PIDÄTETTY</i> ‘arrested’	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
75 <i>KASVATETTU</i> ¹⁶ ‘brought up’	F ¹⁷	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
76 <i>OSTETTU</i> ‘bought’ 77 <i>PIRRETTY</i> ‘drawn’ 78 <i>VARUSTETTU</i> ‘equipped’	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–
79 <i>HAVAITU</i> ‘spotted’ 80 <i>rakennettu</i> ‘built’ 81 <i>SJOITETTU</i> ‘placed’	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Table 2: *The morphosyntactic adjectival properties of past passive participles in Finnish.*

3.3 Comments

After checking the exact number of appearances within the corpus, I arrived at the conclusion that the participles which were subject to the investigation meet different numbers of criteria used in this research independently of their frequencies of usage. The frequencies of the participles from the uppermost line of Table 2 compared to the frequencies of the lowermost ones were in fact smaller: the two participles displaying the most adjectival behaviour are *oikentettu* ‘justified’ (the number of appearances of *oikentettu* on the HS Internet site: 7, 295) and *toivottu* ‘hoped for’ (8, 558). On the other extreme, there are: *havaittu* ‘spotted’ (6, 016), *sjoitettu* ‘placed’ (15, 720) and *rakennettu* ‘built’ (32, 194). Participles that met the same sets of criteria differed, sometimes quite considerably, in frequency – to mention the example pair of *rajoitettu* ‘restricted, limited’ (5, 769) vs. *tunnettu* ‘(well-)known’ (151, 685).

It is quite obvious that the participles located in the bottom rows of the table are the least adjectival ones from all the 81; they are also missing from the list of adjectivised participles in Koivisto (1987, Liite I). On the other hand, not all of the participles from the upper part of the table are present in Koivisto’s list, either. Of course, the different results are partially due to the type (and size) of research materials and the methodologies used (not all participles are suited for the attributive use as understood in the present

¹⁶ *Kasvatettu* was not examined in the meaning ‘bred’, e.g. *kasvatettu lohi* ‘bred salmon’.

¹⁷ As an attributive, *kasvatettu* ‘raised, brought up’ appears without restrictions only in the phrase *hyvin kasvatettu* ‘well-behaved’. Such a use is, however, adverbial and not degree-modifier and here, *hyvin* is an argument of *kasvattaa* ‘to bring up’ (*kasvattaa joku hyvin* ‘bring somebody up well’). This is an interesting counterexample to the rule according to which *hyvin* precedes its head if its use is degree-modifier and follows it when it is used adverbially.

paper, e.g. *rakennettu* ‘built’). Some participles might also be present in Table 2 but absent from Koivisto’s list and vice versa because of the different discourses of the 1980’s and the present day (e.g. *päivitetty* ‘updated’ or *nauhoitettu* ‘tape-recorded’). Curiously enough, however, there are at least a few participles, such as e.g. *hyväksytty* ‘accepted’ and *odotettu* ‘(long-)awaited, predictable’, which are absent from Koivisto’s list, but display quite a high degree of adjectival behaviour.

Irrespective of how pronounced the adjectival nature of participles is, *oikeutettu* remains a form derivable from *oikeuttaa* and *eristetty* from *eristää* etc., which makes comparisons to the proper finite verbs unavoidable. Transitivity is a commonly addressed verbal feature when passive participles are studied and Finnish does not significantly differ from other languages in that Table 2 almost exclusively contains participles belonging to the paradigms of transitive verbs. An interesting case is that of *pidetty* ‘liked’, which is derivable from *pitää* ‘like’ – an intransitive verb in Finnish. *Pidetty* is used predicatively in the same way as other TU-participles, as shown in (24a). In a corresponding verbal use, however, *pidetty* selects an elative and not an accusative/partitive object – as demonstrated in (24b).

- (24) a. *Tutkimus ei selvittänyt sitä, johtuuko pidetyn*
 research NEG explain.PAP it.PART result.3G.Q like.PPP.GEN
oppilaan maine siitä, että hän puuttuu
 student.GEN reputation it.ELAT that s/he intervene.PRS.3SG
kiusaamiseen, vai onko kiusaamiseen puuttuminen
 bully.vn.ILLAT or be.3SG.Q bully.vn.ILLAT intervene.VN
mahdollista, koska hän on pidetty (...).
 possible.PART because s/he be.PRS.3SG like.PPP
 ‘The research failed to explain whether a student’s opinion as liked is because s/he intervenes when somebody is bullying others, or s/he can intervene because s/heis liked.’ (Aamulehti 9.8.2013)

- (24) b. *Tutkimus ei selvittänyt sitä, johtuuko pidetyn*
 research NEG explain.PAP it.PART result.3G.Q like.ppp.GEN
oppilaan maine siitä, että hän puuttuu
 student.GEN reputation it.ELAT that s/he intervene.PRS.3SG
kiusaamiseen, vai onko kiusaamiseen puuttuminen mahdollista,
 bully.VN.ILLAT or be.3SG.Q bully.VN.ILLAT intervene.VN possible.PART
koska hänestä pidetään.
 because 3SG.ELAT like.PRS.PASS
 ‘The research failed to explain whether a student’s opinion as liked is because s/he intervenes when somebody is bullying others, or s/he can intervene because others like her/him.’

(24a) is therefore not comparable with (24b) in the way (13b) and (13a) could be compared. However, there are many TU-participles which meet more criteria of adjectivality than *pidetty*, but whose corresponding verbal uses are comparable to that of *hyväksytty* in (13a).

Upon looking at Table 2 it becomes clear that there are no sharp differences between sets of adjectival features which TU-participles display and that the differences in their adjectivality form a continuum. Although adjectival participles do not constitute a clear system, there are some visible patterns in the accumulation of criteria of

adjectivality. Not only is the greatest numbers of criteria met by participles suited for both the attributive and predicative use, but also the distribution of case in participles used predicatively plays a role. TU-participles which are used as predicatives both in singular and plural are most likely to meet other criteria of adjectivality, whereby participles which experience case variation in singular tend to be positioned higher in the table than those which appear in only one of the possible cases – nominative and not partitive, but usually not the reverse. Of the remaining criteria, the demonstration of behaviour typical of gradable predicates is the most prominent one: it is met by a fair amount of the participles listed in Table 2 and not exclusively those suited for the predicative use. Few participles, in turn, form *sti*-adverbs. Criterion 8 is met very rarely, but it seems to be fairly important: participles for which there are (also individual) manifestations of *epä*-antonyms more likely meet the remaining criteria.

4 Semantic adjectivality

4.1 Context of occurrence

Both the nominative and the partitive in Finnish adjectival predicatives have subject-related functions. For this reason, it is necessary to acknowledge the importance of contextual factors before any discussion on the adjectivality of TU-participles in isolation is commenced.

Other arguments in the clause quite often play a vital role in the interpretation of an adjectival predicative in Finnish. The semantics of both the subject and the predicative is morphologically reflected in the choice of case of Finnish adjectival predicatives. Roughly speaking, in singular, quantitatively indeterminate and divisible NPs¹⁸ trigger the partitive as the case of the adjectival predicative, while quantitatively determinate and indivisible NPs are predicated of by adjectives in the nominative; for a more detailed discussion, consult e.g. Itkonen (1976). Consider (25), where the subject is a collective noun, and (26), which contains a clause with an indivisible subject:

- (25) *Tarpeita ei enää tarvitse tehdä peltiämpäriin ja*
 need.PART.PL NEG more need.NEG do.INF tin.bucket.ILLAT and
henkilökunta on koulutettu-a.
 crew be.PRS.3SG educate.PPP-PART
 ‘(Physiological) needs are no longer satisfied with the use of a tin bucket and the crew are well-educated.’ (Oulu-lehti 31.8.2013)

¹⁸ Or, more precisely: NPs which can have various interpretations with regard to time and quantity due to the fact they are divisible. For more on the so-called NOMINAL ASPECT in Finnish adjectival predication consult Huomo (2007).

- (26) *Kulttuuri sanelee sen, että nainen on vapaampi*
 culture dictate.PRS.3SG it.ACC1 that woman be.PRS.3SG free.COMP
alkoholinkin subteen, kun hän on hyvin
 alcohol.GEN.PTCL ratio.ILL when 3SG be.PRS.3SG well
koulutettu.
educate.PPP(NOM)
 ‘It is a cultural thing that a woman is freer, also with regard to alcohol use, when she is well-educated¹⁹.’ (Iltalehti 14.4.2008)

Because TU-participles used predicatively in both the nominative and the partitive stand out as probably the most adjectival ones, it is unavoidable to address the type of NPs of which they predicate. Abstract notions form a fairly distinct group of typical subjects of Finnish ‘NP is AP’-clauses with a TU-participle as the predicative. According to Martin (1987), it is difficult to tell whether divisibility or indivisibility is in question when abstract NPs come into play (Martin 1987: 275). It is quite common for the head of the AP in a Finnish copular clause to come in the partitive case if the NP is abstract. This is illustrated in (27), which is an extract from a short article about a little boy who has to lead an isolated life due to his illness. If the NP denotes a concrete entity, as in (28) – extracted from an article about the similarities between sport stars and stars in the sky – it is typically in the nominative:

- (27) *Vaikka elämä on eristetty-ä, vauhtia ja*
 although life be.PRS.3SG isolate.PPP-PART pace.PART and
menoa riittää aamusta iltaan.
 going.PART suffice.PRS.3SG morning.ELAT evening.ILLAT
 ‘Although (his) life is isolated, there is enough pace to keep going from morning till night.’ (Kouvolan Sanomat 12.2.2013)
- (28) *Auringon vetovoima pitää planeettaa radallaan, mutta*
 sun.GEN gravitation keep.PRS.3SG planet.PART orbit.ADESS.3POSSbut
muuten Maa on eristetty ympäristöstään
 otherwise Earth be.PRS.3SG isolate.PPP(NOM) environment.ELAT.3POSS
 ‘The gravitation force of the Sun keeps the planet on its orbit, but otherwise the Earth is isolated from the environment.’ (Turun Sanomat 23.2.2010)

Case variation in adjectival predicatives is one thing; another is appearing in contexts which make the variation possible. To the best of my knowledge, the distribution of NPs having different levels of abstraction in copular clauses has not received any detailed study in Fennistics so far, at least as far as participial predication is concerned. Thus, I propose a hypothesis, based on my non-native-speaker intuition, that it is more likely for abstract NPs to occur with participial predicatives which designate psychological states, attitudes, judgments and other mental processes (e.g. *hyväksytty* ‘accepted’, *harkittu* ‘well thought-out’) rather than results of concrete actions (e.g. *miehitetty* ‘occupied’, *nauhoitettu* ‘recorded’, *sijoitettu* ‘set’). *Rakastettu* ‘beloved’ also refers to a psychological state, but when used predicatively, it does not appear in the partitive singular in the corpus. This may be again explained with factors favouring the choice of

¹⁹ Both *koulutettu* and *hyvin koulutettu* can be translated as ‘well-educated’. Literally, *koulutettu* means ‘educated’.

one of the cases for Finnish adjectival predicatives and not the other: typically, human and animate referents are far more plausible subjects of ‘NP on rakastettu’-clauses than e.g. abstract notions.

Because the semantics of other constituents of the clause may foster the case variation between nominative and partitive in some predicatively used TU-participles, it might seem questionable whether it is TU-participles as such that are more or less adjectival. On the other hand, participles which exhibit the case variation and are suited for predicative use in plural tend to be more likely to meet other criteria of adjectivality examined in this paper. This suggests that they systematically differ from their verbal counterparts.

4.2 TU-participles as non-verbs

Most participles which appear in the widest contexts of predicative use are derivable from verbs designating psychological states rather than from highly agentive actions. According to Koivisto (1987), participles with the former meanings are easily adjectivalised because they are typically lower in valence (Koivisto 1987, 106,412). Participles derivable from polysemous verbs which have both abstract and concrete meanings are typically used as adjectives in the abstract meaning, e.g. in the way *rajoitettu* ‘limited’ is used in (29):

- (29) *Kriisihallintatoiminnassa voiman käyttö on poikkeuksellista*
 crisis.management.INESS force.GEN use be.PRS.3SG exceptional.PART
sekä rajoitettua, ja sitä käytetään vain
 and limit.PPP.PART and it.PART use.PRS.PASS only
pakottavissa tilanteissa”, Halonen sanoi
 compel.PRSP.PART.INESS.PL situation.INESS.PL PR say.IMPERF.3SG
torstaina Norjan ulkopoliittisen instituutin
 Thursday.ESS Norway.GEN foreign-policy.GEN institute.GEN
esitelmätilaisuudessa.
 official.presentation.INESS
 “‘In crisis management, the use of force is exceptional and limited; force is used only in very urgent situations”, (President) Halonen said on Thursday in her official talk at the Norwegian Institute of Foreign Affairs.’ (HS 27.10.2007)

Properties of verbal semantics, such as telicity and resultativity, influence the possible uses of participles (see e.g. Volodin 1988). In the present study, the highest number of criteria of adjectivality is met by non-resultative participles, i.e. participles which do not designate states implying a previous event (cf. Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988, 5–6). In fact, differences in the semantic domains of level of abstraction and resultativity already help explain why participles such as *väärennetty* ‘falsified’ fail to demonstrate adjectival behaviour in contexts other than predicative and attributive use. On the other hand, resultative participles are also found in upper rows of Table 2. *Järjestetty* ‘(well-)organised’ derivable from *järjestää* ‘organize’ is one of them. Its adjectival use is shown in (30a). (30b) illustrates a corresponding verbal use:

- (30) a. *Jublapuheiden mukaan, veteraanikuntoutus on hyvin järjestettyä ja tehokasta.*
 keynote speech.GEN.PL according veteran rehabilitation be.PRS.3SG
 very **organise.PPP.PART** and effective.PART
 ‘According to the keynote speeches, the rehabilitation of veterans is very (well-)organised and effective.’ (HS 27.4.2008)
- b. *Laatukilpailu on järjestetty vuosittain 1992 alkaen ja ainoa suomalainen voittaja tähän mennessä on Nokia.*
 quality.competition be.PRS.3SG **organise.PPP** yearly 1992
 start.INF2.INSTR and only Finnish winner until now
 on Nokia.
 be.PRS.3SG PR
 ‘The quality competition has been organized on a yearly basis since 1992, and its only Finnish winner so far is Nokia.’ (HS 30.5.2002)

While (30b) shows a resultative use of *järjestetty*²⁰, it is unclear whether the participle in (30a) is resultative. Intuitively, it can be said that *järjestetty* in (30a) is less related to organising anything by anybody than in (30b). *Järjestetty* as used in (30a) designates a property of being operationally efficient, which does not necessarily imply that the event designated by *järjestetty* in (30b) has occurred²¹. In (30), the difference in meaning (property vs. event) coincides with the difference in syntactic function (predicative vs. constituent of the passive construction). Many participles from the upper part of Table 2 are used adjectivally in meanings which are in the same way different from those of their verbally used counterparts. The following two example pairs illustrate these differences: in examples (a), *odotettu* ‘expected, predictable’ and *perusteltu* ‘justifiable’ refer to properties, whereas examples (b) contain their verbal counterparts used in meanings which bear direct relation to the events denoted by *odottaa* ‘expect, wait’ and *perustella* ‘justify’, respectively:

- (31) a. *Kullan, hopean ja kahden pronssin saalis oli hyvin odotettu ja aika lailla sellainen, mitä viisimiljoonaiselta kansalta voi odottaa.*
 gold.GEN silver.GEN and two.GEN bronze.GEN loot be.IMPERF.3SG
 very **expect.PPP** and quite a lot such what.PART five.million.ABL
 nation.ABL can.PRS.3SG expect
 ‘A total of one gold, one silver and two bronze medals was very predictable, quite a lot of what one could expect from a five-million nation.’ (Turun Sanomat 25.8.2008)

²⁰ In this particular example, the meaning of *järjestetty* is also iterative.

²¹ The fact participles appear in conjunction with adjectives, like *järjestetty* in (30a), is another factor speaking in favour of their adjectivity.

- b. *Huhtikuun inflaatio oli myös hieman korkeampi, kuin*
 April.GEN inflation be.IMPERF.3SG also a bit high.COMP than
markkinnoilla oli odotettu.
 market.ADESS.PL be.IMPERF.3SG **expect.PPP**
 ‘Also in April, the inflation was a little higher than it had been expected on
 the markets.’ (HS30.4.2012)

- (32) a. *Jokaisen jäsenvaltion tulisi ehdottaa*
 every.GEN member.state.GEN come.COND.3SG recommend
komissaarin virkaan sekä naista että miestä.
 commissar.GEN office.ILLAT both woman.PART and man.PART.
Siksikin on perusteltua, että EU-vaaleihin
 therefore.PTCL be.PRS.3SG **justify.PPP.PART** that EU-elections.ILLAT
osallistuvat puolueet muistavat tämän (...).
 participate.PRSAP.PL party.PL remember.PRS.3PL it.ACC
 ‘Each member state should recommend a man and a woman for the
 commissar’s position. Also because of this, it is reasonable for parties
 running for the EU-elections to remember it (...).’ (HS 20.10.2012)

- b. *Tukia on perusteltu aluepolitiikalla.*
 support.PART be.PRS.3SG **justify.PPP** regional.policy.ADESS
 ‘They justified the support by regional policy.’ (HS 12.10.2013)

Dixon (2004: 7–8) notes that copula clauses differ considerably from transitive clauses in that they do not form a type of VPs (in a traditional NP-VP distinction). A copula clause is composed of a copula verb and a copula complement and it is the sole copula that constitutes the “VP”, while the copula complement is a separate argument which distinguishes copula clauses from transitive and intransitive ones. Following this distinction, the syntactic difference between participles referring to properties and events in the examples above is explicable by the fact that participles from examples (a) are adjectival copula complements and those from examples (b) – are parts of transitive verbal predicates. Resorting to the notion of boundedness helps bring to surface also the semantic differences in event-relatedness between adjectivally and verbally used TU-participles.

4.3 TU-participles as adjectives

4.3.1 Boundedness

The term BOUNDEDNESS is commonly employed to make aspectual distinctions between events reaching an endpoint and those which continue. Thus, bounded and unbounded events are distinguished. Kiparsky (1998: 14) notes that “boundedness is a property of situations and not just of individual predicates in isolation”. On the contrary, Paradis (2001) considers boundedness an inherent lexical feature of adjectives, which is associated with gradability. Since the present article approaches participles as adjectives, it assigns particular importance to boundedness understood as in Paradis (2001). On the other hand, the difference between these two approaches to boundedness is ultimately down to generative vs. cognitive views on language and it is not my purpose here to take a stance on whether it is events or lexemes that can receive interpretations in the domain of boundedness. Taking these two different points of view on boundedness into roughly

equal consideration, then, participles as adjectives are unbounded or bounded while their respective verbs refer to bounded or unbounded events. An adjectival participle receives interpretation as bounded if it is preceded by a proportional modifier and does not form comparatives and superlatives. Accordingly, a participle is interpreted as unbounded if it is modified by a degree modifier and forms comparatives and superlatives. Especially the type of adverbial modifiers the participle is preceded by plays a role (see discussion below). If the verbal counterparts of participles select accusative (total) objects, they refer to bounded events and if partitive (partial) objects to unbounded ones. By this token, event-related participles are those which receive same interpretations in the domain of boundedness as their verbal counterparts. If there are distinctions in this domain between adjectivally and verbally used participles, the former are less event-related, as the properties they denote fail to take similar values with respect to gradability to those of verbally used ones.

Gradability is characteristic of all predicates that can be associated with scale (Cabredo Hofherr 2010: 3), including adjectives. The term SCALE as understood by Kennedy & McNally (2005) refers to a structure of sets of degrees onto which predicates order their arguments. A scale can have extreme elements, in which case it is closed, or lack them, whereby it is an open scale. Adjective scales demonstrate varying structural properties: there are totally closed scales, characteristic of adjectives having maximum and minimum elements, such as *full*; upper closed, for adjectives that have maximum but lack minimum element (e.g. *pure*); lower closed, for those that have minimum but lack maximum element (e.g. *quiet*); and totally open, in the case of adjectives such as *open*, i.e. those that have neither maximum nor minimum elements. Roughly speaking, adjectives with totally open scales typically have context-dependent standards of comparisons (the comparison class is introduced by the meaning of a positive adjective within the context), whereas for other types of scales, the standard of comparison is largely determined by lexical properties. The scalar properties of an unbounded predicate are revealed by its appearance in comparative constructions and being modified by degree modifiers. In Finnish, these are e.g. *varsin* ‘quite’ and *melko* ‘fairly’. Bounded predicates, which have upper closed scales, can be modified by proportional modifiers, such as Finnish *täysin* ‘fully’, and do not normally form comparatives or superlatives²².

In Table 2, we find quite a large group of participles displaying properties typical of gradable predicates. *Oikentettu* ‘justified’ – one of the two participles which meet the largest number of criteria of adjectivity – appears in contexts where it receives an interpretation as unbounded, while its corresponding verb refers to a bounded event²³:

²² Consult Paradis (2001) for different names of modifiers – ‘scalar modifiers’ vs. ‘totality modifiers’ – which reflect a different conceptualisation of scale. According to Paradis (2001), not all objects of adverbial modification can be mapped onto a scale: this is the case in the so-called limit adjectives such as *dead* and *alive*. Following the interpretation suggested in Kennedy & McNally (2005), these two would have one value on their partially closed scales: *dead* on a lower-closed and *alive* on an upper-closed scale, respectively.

²³ Again, I am much obliged to the anonymous reviewer for focusing my attention on an important fact: the verb *oikenttaa* has two meanings: ‘entitle to sth’ and ‘justify sth’ and it is in the latter one to which a lexicalised *oikentettu* should be compared.

- (33) *Joskus on myös hyvä kysyä, miksi aikuisten mielipide*
 sometimes be.PRS.3SG also good ask.INF why adult.GEN.PL opinion
on oikeutetumpi kuin lapsen.
 be.PRS.3SG **justify.PPP.COMP** than child.GEN
 ‘Sometimes it is good to ask why the opinion of adults is more justified than
 that of children.’ (yle.fi 18.8.2011)

The other most adjectival participle, *toivottu* ‘hoped for’, is, in turn, unbounded as is the event denoted by *toivoa* ‘hope’, cf. (34); *toivoa* selects a partitive object. Again, adjectivality and non-verbality seem to not always go together. Judging by the appearance in comparative constructions, *toivottu* is more event-related than *oikeutettu*.

- (34) *Kiinassa poikalapset ovat oikeastaan aina olleet*
 China.INESSmale.child.PL be.PERF.3PL actually always be.PAP.PL
tyttöjä toivotumpia (...).
 girl.PART.PL **hope.PPP.PART.PL**
 ‘In China, boys have actually always been more hoped for than girls (...).’
 (Suomen Kuvalehti 2.10.2013)

The distribution of comparatives is, however, more context-dependent than that of degree modifiers as the possibility that comparatives and superlatives occur in a given context largely depends on the semantics of other elements in the clause (cf. Kennedy & McNally 2005: 368). The vast majority of participles which display properties typical of gradable predicates meet both criteria of gradability employed in this paper. According to the assumptions concerning boundedness, degree modifiers would be supposed to modify participles which refer to unbounded events, i.e. have upper open scales. This is often the case, cf. (35–36):

- (35) *Vantaan Lauri on Vantaalla joka tapauksessa tutkimuksen*
 PR be.PRS.3SG Vantaa.ADESS any case.INESS research.GEN
perusteella varsin luettu.
 basis.ADESS **quite read.PPP**
 ‘Judging by the results of the research, *Vantaan Lauri* is, in any case, quite
 popular with readers (lit. quite read) in Vantaa.’ (kotimaa24.fi 13.12.2011)

- (36) *Maynie Sirén oli chanson-laulajattarena erittäin arvostettu,*
 PR be.PRS.3SG chanson-singer.ESS **very esteem.PPP**
mutta Suomessa hänen edustamansa alue oli
 but Finland.INESS 3SG.GEN represent.AGPTCP.3POSS field be.IMPERF.3SG
marginaalinen.
 marginal
 ‘As a chanson singer, Maynie Sirén was highly esteemed, but in Finland, the
 field she represented was marginal.’ (HS 19.12.2003)

The occurrence of participles whose respective verbs refer to bounded events with degree modifiers is, however, not uncommon, either; cf. (37–38):

- (37) (...)Heinonen on tänä päivänä **melko unohdettu**, lähinnä
 PR be.PRS.3SG this.ESS day.ESS **fairly forget.PPP** mainly
vain vanhempien ihmisten muistama, jos heidänkään.
 only old.GEN.PL people.GEN remember.AGPTCP if 3PL.GEN.NEG.PTCL
 ‘Heinonen is pretty forgotten these days, mainly remembered only by older
 people, if at all.’ (elokuvauutiset.fi 22.7.2012)
- (38) *The King’s Sisters* on englantilainen miesääninen lauluhytye,
 PR be.PRS.3SG English male.lead.singer music.band
joka on meilläkin varsin tunnettu.
 which be.PRS.3SG 1PL.ADESS.PTCL **quite know.PPP**
 ‘The King’s Sisters is an English band with a male lead singer; the band is quite
 well-known also in here.’ (yle.fi/radio 9.1.2013)

Not surprisingly, the only proportional modifier studied in the present paper – *täysin* ‘fully’ – mostly appears together with participles having bounded interpretations, in accordance with the structure of events denoted by their corresponding verbs, cf. (39–40):

- (39) “*Termi torjuntavoitto on täysin perusteltu*,” Manninen
 term defensive.victory be.PRS.3SG **fully justify.PPP** PR
sanoi.
 say.IMPERF.3SG
 ‘“The term ‘defensive victory’ is fully justified,” Manninen said.’ (HS 5.9.2004)
- (40) *Milanin voitto oli täysin ansaittu*, sillä se
 Milan.GEN victory be.IMPERF.3SG **fully deserve.PPP** because it
juoksi valtavalla sykkeellä ja vaikutti
 run.IMPERF.3SG great.ADESS pulse.ADESS and seem.IMPERF.3SG
vaarallisemmalta läpi ottelun.
 dangerous.COMP.ADESS throughout match.GEN
 ‘(FC) Milan’s victory was fully deserved because they were running at a high
 heart rate and seemed more dangerous throughout the game.’ (HS 21.2.2013)

Again, *täysin* also modifies participles derivable from verbs denoting unbounded events, thereby giving participles interpretation as bounded, cf. (41):

- (41) *Oopperan kummituksen mahtipontisuus ja romanttinen paatos ovat*
 PR.GEN pomposity and romantic pathos be.PRS.3PL
täysin harkittuja *Ennio Morriconen ylenpalttista*
fully consider.PPP.PART.PL PR.GEN overwhelming.PART
musiikkia myöten (...).
 music.PART according
 ‘The pomposity of The Phantom of the Opera and its romantic pathos are fully
 premeditated, in accordance with Ennio Morricone’s overwhelming music.’
 (HS 30.7.1999)

Finally, some participles receive interpretations both as bounded (42) and as unbounded (43):

- (42) *Kari Jalosen valinta tulevaksi Leijona-päävalmentajaksi ensi kauden*
 PR.GEN choice future.TRANSL lions-main.coach.TRANSL next season.GEN
jälkeen oli täysin odotettu.
 after be.PRS.3SG fully expect.PPP
 ‘Choosing Kari Jalonen as the coach of the Finland’s national team for after the
 next season was fully predictable.’ (yle.fi 7.6.2013)
- (43) *Jo syyskuun parlamenttivaalien tulosten jälkeen*
 already September.GEN parliamentary.elections.GEN result.GEN.PL after
oli varsin odotettua, että hallituksen
 be.IMPERF.3SG quite expect.PPP that government.ACC1
muodostavat Solbergin johtama konservatiivinen Høyre ja Siv
 form.PRS.3PL PR.GEN lead.AGPTCP conservative PR and PR
Jensenin johtama oikeistopopulistinen edistyspuolue.
 PR.GEN lead.AGPTCP right.wing populist
 ‘Already after the September’s elections it was quite predictable that the
 government would be formed by the conservative *Høyre* run by Solberg and Siv
 Jensen’s right-wing populist Progress Party.’ (HS 16.10.2013)

Adjectival participles designate properties which, judging by the differences in the domain of boundedness, sometimes are relatively distantly related in semantics to their verbal counterparts. Those “surprising” uses of adverbial modifiers mostly concern participles which are interpreted as unbounded, but their corresponding verbs - bounded. Generally speaking, the uppermost rows of Table 2 contain participles which designate properties interpretable as unbounded, irrespectively of whether participles’ corresponding verbs refer to bounded or unbounded events.

4.3.2 TU-participles as value adjectives

Many of the participles found in the uppermost rows of Table 2 are translated into English with the use of *well*-. In contexts in which they receive interpretations as unbounded, they denote properties of a certain type, namely values²⁴. They are semantically comparable with adjectives such as *hyvä* ‘good’, whose scales similarly have no maximum (nor minimum) elements. The formation of polarity-reversing *epä*-antonyms is only possible for participles which refer to values²⁵:

- (44) *Jotain vakavaa ja epätoivottua*
 something.PART serious.PART and NEG.hope.PPP.PART
tapabtui ensimmäistä kertaa.
 happen.IMPERF.3SG first.PART time.PART
 ‘Something serious and unwanted happened for the first time.’ (HS 14.12.2010)

²⁴ In Koivisto (1987), they are characterised as ‘positively (or negatively) loaded’ (*positiivisesti latautuneita*), cf. e.g. Koivisto (1987: 250) for *toivottu* ‘hoped for’.

²⁵ Though, not all value participles have *epä*-antonyms. This is explicable by the fact that they are in relations of opposition with corresponding MATON-participles which have negative meaning. On the other hand, not all of the negative participles have TU-participles as their positive counterparts. For more discussion on the relations of opposition in Finnish consult Hakanen (1973).

Be it positive or negative, participles referring to values generally demonstrate more adjectival behaviour than participles which refer to properties which are in this sense neutral. Value TU-participles indeed appear in a number of constructions typical of adjectives, such as in the construction with an infinitive subject:

- (45) *Ei liene liioiteltua väittää, että tietty*
 NEG be.POT.NEG **exaggerate.PPP.PART** claim that certain
hyperkapitalistinen ylensyöminen on tullut tiensä
 hypercapitalistic overconsumption be.PRS.3SG come.PAP way.GEN.3POSS
päähän (...).
 end.ILLAT
 'It is probably not exaggerated to claim that a certain type of hypercapitalistic overconsumption has come to an end.' (Turun Sanomat 31.1.2012)

Value TU-participles form a small, but relatively distinct group that can be considered a subgroup of the adjective class VALUE in Finnish. VALUE is one of the classes of prototypical adjectives (Dixon 1977, 2004); however, compared to value adjectives such as e.g. *huono* 'bad' and *hauska* 'nice, funny', TU-participles are too obviously analysable as complex units and their link to the verbal meaning is too strong for them to be considered close to the prototype.

5 Summary and conclusions

This study has shown that paying special attention to Finnish past passive participles used predicatively helps bring to surface interesting facts about their adjectivity. When appearing together with an inflected form of *olla* 'be' in third person singular, adjectivally used TU-participles differ from their verbal counterparts not only in syntactic terms, but also with respect to semantics. Namely, participles used predicatively refer to properties of different kinds (e.g. values) and not to events. Although participles under investigation are too clearly identifiable as belonging to the paradigms of their corresponding verbs, in some cases differences in event-relatedness between adjectivally and verbally used participles are quite big. This can be told on the basis of distributions of formal expressions of grade, which reveal differences in the domain of boundedness between properties and events. The use of adverbial modifiers with certain participles shows that it is properties denoted by participles that are graded and not the events denoted by verbs. For example, *hyväksytty* 'acceptable, approved of' receives interpretation as unbounded, while its respective verb *hyväksyä* 'accept, approve' refers to a bounded event. For this reason, *hyväksytty* can be considered an adjective in its own right, albeit a non-prorotypical one. On the other hand, it is difficult to say how event-related participles are which receive the same interpretations in the domain of boundedness as their verbal counterparts. Any recommendations by a non-native speaker to add to the list of participles distinguished as separate dictionary entries should be made with caution and it is also worth remembering that issues such as proportions between "surprising" and "regular" uses of adverbial modifiers, frequencies of usage of participles in the adjectival and verbal meaning, etc., remain unaddressed in this paper. The above notwithstanding, I hold the view that judging by the range of their morphosyntactic adjectival behaviour and the differences from their verbal counterparts, it is justified to

recognise participles such as *hyväksyty* ‘acceptable, approved of’, *järjestetty* ‘well-organised’, *odotettu* ‘predictable’ and *unohdettu* ‘forgotten’, as well as *pidetty* ‘liked’, as separate lexical items.

Although Table 2 in Section 3 reveals that resembling the prototypical adjective is not only a matter of accumulation of morphosyntactic adjectival properties, it shows that they help identify some general tendencies. The most adjectival of all the TU-participles studied in this paper are those which function as simple attributes, as predicatives in singular and plural, possibly both in the nominative and the partitive singular, and receive unbounded interpretations as modified by degree modifiers. While in many cases ‘adjectival’ equals ‘non-verbal’, the most adjective-like participles do not necessarily need to be the least verb-like ones – consider for example *toivottu* ‘hoped for’ and *pidetty* ‘liked’.

There certainly is room for more exploration, e.g. a careful examination of the distribution of different degree modifiers would probably give a better insight into the scalar properties of TU-participles, and thus help portray their semantics in a more precise manner. The discussion on event-relatedness also remains open as this paper has unearthed the phenomenon, but only partially managed to explain its nature.

References

- Bhat, D.N. Shankara. 1994. *The adjectival category. Criteria for differentiation and identification*. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Blevins, James P. 2003. Passives and Impersonals. *Journal of Linguistics* 39. 473–520.
- Bresnan, Joan 1982. The passive in lexical theory. In Joan Bresnan (ed.), *The mental representation of grammatical relations*. 3–86. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Brinton, Laurel J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2005. *Lexicalisation and Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cabredo Hofherr, Patricia. 2010. Adjectives – an introduction. In Patricia Cabredo Hofherr & Ora Matushansky (eds.), *Adjectives – Formal analyses in syntax and semantics*. 1–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Carey, Kathleen. 1995. Subjectification and the development of the English Perfect. In Dieter Stein & Susan Wright (eds.), *Subjectivity and subjectivisation: Linguistic perspectives*. 83–102. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1977. In Defense of Spontaneous Demotion: the Impersonal Passive. In Peter Cole & Jerold M. Sadock (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 8. Grammatical Relations*. 47–58. New York: Academic Press.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 1977. Where have all the adjectives gone? *Studies in Language* 1. 19–80.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 2004. Adjective Classes in Typological Perspective. In R.M.W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Adjective Classes: A Cross-linguistic Typology*. 1–49. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hakanen, Aimo. 1973. *Adjektiivien vastakohtasubteet suomen kielessä*. SKST 311. Helsinki: SKS.
- Hakulinen, Lauri. 1979. *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1994. Passive participles across languages. In Barbara Fox & Paul J. Hopper (eds.), *Voice: Form and Function. Typological Studies in Language 27*. 151–177. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2004. Lexicalisation and grammaticalization: Opposite or orthogonal? In Walter Bisang, Nikolaus P. Himmelman & Björn Weimer (eds.),

- What makes Grammaticalization? A Look from its Fringes and its Components.* 21–42. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Huomo, Tuomas. 2007. Kvantiteetti ja aika II: nominaalinen aspekti ja suomen predikatiivin sijanvaihtelu. *Virittäjä* 111. 3–23.
- Itkonen, Terho. 1976. Erään sijamuodon ongelmia. *Opuscula Instituti Linguae Fennicae, Universitas Helsingiensis* 53. 173–217. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.
- ISK = Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen & Irja Alho (eds.). 2004. *Iso Suomen Kielioppi*. Helsinki: SKS.
- Kangasmaa-Minn, Eeva. 1988. Häilyvät partisüipit. *Sananjalka* 30. 202–204.
- Karlsson, Fred. 1983. *Suomen kielen äänne- ja muotorakenne*. Porvoo-Helsinki-Juva: SKS.
- Karlsson, Fred. 2009. *Suomen peruskielioppi*. Helsinki: SKS.
- Kennedy, Christopher & Louise McNally. 2005. Scale Structure, Degree Modification, and the Semantics of Gradable Predicates. *Language* 81. 345–381.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1998. Partitive Case and Aspect. In Miriam Butt & Wilhelm Geuder (eds.), *The Projection of Arguments*. 1–38. Stanford: CSLI.
- Koivisto, Helinä. 1987. *Partisüippien adjektiivistuminen suomen kielessä*. SKST 474. Helsinki: SKS.
- Koskinen, Päivi. 1999. Syntactic Category Changing in Syntax: Evidence from Finnish Participle Constructions. *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 27. 131–166.
- KTS = Grönros, Eija-Riitta, Minna Haapanen, Tarja Riitta Heinonen, Leena Joki & Liisa Nuutinen (eds.). 2006. *Kielitoimiston Sanakirja*. Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 140. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus.
- Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport. 1986. The formation of adjectival passives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17. 623–661.
- Martin, Maisa. 1987. Adjektiivipredikatiivin sijasta. *Virittäjä* 91. 274–278.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. & Sergej Je. Jaxontov. 1988. The typology of resultative constructions. In Vladimir P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of resultative constructions*. 3–63. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- NS = Sadeniemi, Matti et al. (eds.). 1961. *Nyky-suomen Sanakirja*. Porvoo-Helsinki: WSOY.
- Pajunen, Anneli. 1994. Adjektiivikategorian universaaliudesta. *Virittäjä* 98. 513–542.
- Paradis, Carita. 2001. Adjectives and boundedness. *Cognitive Linguistics* 12. 47–65.
- Pekkarinen, Heli. 2005. Sika on paha nyljettävä – mutta helppo ruokkia. Adjektiivin kanssa esiintyvät infiniittiset verbimuodot suomen kielessä. In Ilona Herlin & Laura Visapää (eds.), *Elävä kielioppi. Suomen infiniittisten rakenteiden dynamiikkaa*. SKST 1021. Helsinki: SKS.
- Pekkarinen, Heli. 2011. *Monikasvoinen TAVA-partisüippi: Tutkimus suomen TAVA-partisüipin käyttökonteksteista ja verbiliittojen kieliopillistumisesta*. Doctoral dissertation. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. Available online: <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-10-6965-9>.
- Shore, Susanna. 1986. *Onko suomessa passiivia?* Helsinki: SKS.
- Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a cognitive semantics. Vol. 2*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Van Valin Jr., Robert D. & Randy J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Volodin, Aleksandr P. 1988. Resultative and Perfect Passive in Finnish. In Vladimir P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of resultative constructions*. 469–477. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wetzer, Harrie. 1996. *The Typology of Adjectival Predication*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wójtowicz, Radosław. 2011. *Predikatiivin funktiossa esiintyvät TU-partisiipit nykysuomessa*. Master thesis. Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Faculty of Modern Languages.

WSOY Finnish-English-Finnish dictionary (2008) = *Suomi-englanti-suomisanakirja*. 2008. Helsinki: WSOYpro.

Radosław Wójtowicz

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Department of Modern Languages

rwojtowi@amu.edu.pl