

MONI OR MONTA? THE COLLECTIVE VS. DISTRIBUTIVE OPPOSITION BETWEEN TWO FORMS OF THE QUANTIFIER ‘MANY’ IN FINNISH

Tuomas Huumo

University of Turku

Abstract. In this work I explore the semantics of two case forms of the Finnish quantifier *moni* ‘many’: the regular nominative *moni* and the regular partitive *monta* [*mon-ta* many-PARTITIVE], which however has taken on a function similar to that of the nominative of numerals and is thus not a functional partitive anymore. This development has apparently motivated the rise of the pleonastic *montaa* [*mon-ta-a* many-PARTITIVE-PARTITIVE] to unambiguously mark the partitive. I argue that an important difference between *moni* and *monta* is the opposition between a distributive and a collective meaning: in ambiguous contexts, *moni* is clearly distributive and *monta* collective. I compare the two with the nominative form of the near-synonymous quantifier *usea* ‘several; a number of which in similar contexts displays ambiguity between the distributive and collective readings. The analysis sheds new light to the division of labor between the two (functional) nominative forms of *moni*, showing that they divide the functions of the nominative in an idiosyncratic way.

Keywords: quantifiers, case, partitive, collective vs. distributive meaning, Finnish

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2017.8.2.01>

1. Introduction: quantifiers in Finnish

The class of nominal quantifiers in Finnish is heterogeneous and comprises elements often classified as (indefinite) pronouns and (quantifying) adverbs (e.g., the comprehensive grammar of Hakulinen *et al.* 2004: §657, §740–762 and the classification of Finnish pronominal elements presented in Tuomikoski 1969). Hakulinen and Karlsson (1979: 81–82, 144) propose the distinction between **mass quantifiers** and **number quantifiers**. The class of mass quantifiers includes words such as *paljon* ‘a lot of’, and *vähän* ‘[a] little’, which are unvarying forms that quantify nominals headed by either a singular mass noun or a plural form, both in the partitive case (examples 1–2). Number

quantifiers such as *moni* ‘many’ or *usea* ‘several’ quantify count nouns in the singular and in the plural, and they agree with the quantified noun in number and case (examples 3–4).

- (1) *Jo-i-n paljon vet-tä.*
 drink-PST-1SG a.lot.of water-PAR
 ‘I drank a lot of water.’
- (2) *Parkkipaika-lla seiso-o paljon auto-j-a.*
 parking.lot-ADE stand-PRES.3SG a.lot.of car-PL-PAR
 ‘There are a lot of cars standing in the parking lot.’
- (3) *Moni kirja on rikki.*
 many.SG.NOM book.SG.NOM be.PRES.3SG broken
 ‘Many books are [lit. Many a book is] broken.’
- (4) *Mone-t silminnäkijä-t näk-i-vät onnettomuude-n.*
 many-PL.NOM eye-witness-PL.NOM see-PST-3PL accident-ACC
 ‘Many eyewitnesses saw the accident.’

By comparing (1–2) with (3–4) one can see that the mass quantifier *paljon* is unvarying in form and able to quantify both singular and plural partitive forms (for the syntax of this quantifier, see Karttunen 1975). One main function of the Finnish partitive case is the indication of an unbounded quantity, and in the construction exemplified by (1–2) such a quantity is exposed to quantification by the mass quantifier, which renders the quantity bounded. By contrast, number quantifiers such as *moni* ‘many’ in (3–4) agree with the quantified noun in number and case. This feature allows number quantifiers to be used even with oblique-case-marked nominals, which are grammatically adverbials (examples 5–6 below). Since mass quantifiers compel the quantified nominal to be in the partitive, their uses are confined to NPs with such grammatical functions that allow partitive-marked NPs, i.e., the grammatical object (1) and the existential S-argument E-NP (2; traditionally the E-NP is called the “existential subject”; for arguments against analyzing it as a subject, see Huumo and Helasvuo 2015). Mass quantifiers cannot be used with nominals in an oblique case (7). It is also worth pointing out that many words used as mass quantifiers can alternatively function as adverbs modifying the verb, as in (8).

- (5) *Mone-lla lapse-lla ol-i leija.*
 many-ADE child-ADE be-PST.3SG kite
 ‘Many children [lit. Many a child] had a kite.’
- (6) *U-i-n use-i-ssa järv-i-ssä.*
 swim-PST-1SG several-PL-INE lake-PL-INE
 ‘I swam in several lakes’.
- (7) **Paljo-n laps-i-lla oli leija.*
 a.lot.of child-PL-ADE be-PST.3SG kite
 *‘A lot of children had a kite.’
- (8) *! U-i-n paljon järv-i-ssä.*
 swim-PST-1SG a.lot lake-PL-INE
 ‘I swam a lot in [the] lakes.’ [not: ‘I swam in a lot of lakes’]

In (5), the number quantifier *moni* quantifies the possessor nominal in a canonical Finnish possessive construction, where the possessor is marked with the adessive case. The quantifier is likewise in the adessive. In (6), the number quantifier *usea* quantifies a locative adverbial in the plural inessive (‘in’) case, and is itself in the plural inessive. Example (7) is ungrammatical because the quantifier *paljon* is not capable of quantifying oblique case forms. While example (8) is grammatical as such, the word *paljon* is not used as a quantifier but as a quantifying adverb (‘a lot’): it quantifies the activity designated by the verb (cf. Karttunen 1975).

Since Finnish number quantifiers alternate between the singular (3) and the plural (4), it is an intriguing question what the semantic difference between the singular and plural forms actually is – after all, both seem to refer to a multiplicity of referents. In the spirit of Cognitive Grammar and Langacker’s (2008: 272–275, 292–296; 2014) analysis of English quantifiers, I propose that the singular forms of such quantifiers pick a virtual (fictive) referent and then give a predication that applies to the virtual referent which is a representative instance of the whole set (cf. Langacker’s 2008: 293–295 treatment of the English *each*, *any* and *every*). In contrast, plural forms of quantifiers refer directly to a plurality (as the English *several* or *many*, which quantify plurals). Note, though, that even such a plurality can be virtual, as is the case with the English proportional relative quantifiers such as *most* or *some*, according to Langacker (2008: 292).

A detailed treatment of the singular vs. plural opposition is beyond the scope of the present paper, in which I concentrate on the analysis of the singular nominative and partitive forms of the quantifier *moni* ‘many’ and, for comparison, those of *usea* ‘several’. At first sight, these two quantifiers appear near-synonymous: both are number quantifiers that, when used in the singular, pick a virtual referent as a representative instance of a more extensive set of referents. Furthermore, they indicate a quantity that surpasses an implicit norm (i.e., ‘a larger proportion than might be expected’), and in this sense they function as absolute quantifiers, as opposed to relative quantifiers such as the English *some* or *most* (Langacker 2014).

In the following discussion I demonstrate that in spite of the superficial synonymy between *moni* and *usea*, there are important differences between the two. These concern first and foremost different manifestations of the opposition between a collective and a distributive meaning (an overview of the expression of distributive vs. collective meanings in Finnish is Vilkuna 1992: 48–51; quantified nominals in particular are analyzed by Huumo 2016a, 2016b). My focus will be on three case forms of the quantifier *moni* ‘many’, which I compare with two forms of the quantifier *usea* ‘several’. As regards *moni*, I will analyze 1) the nominative *moni* ‘many’, 2) the morphologically regular partitive *mon-ta* [many-PAR], which however has taken on a function similar to the nominative of numerals (Branch 2001), and 3) the pleonastic “double partitive” *mon-ta-a* [many-PAR-PAR], which has replaced (or is replacing) *monta* in contexts where it is important to explicitly distinguish between the nominative and the partitive, as the two mark a semantic opposition (which is in most cases related to aspect or quantification). In morphological terms, there thus appear to be one nominative and two partitive forms in the paradigm of *moni*, while the opposite is true from the syntactic point of view of, since, as argued by Branch (2001), the morphologically regular partitive *monta* behaves like a nominative of a numeral in many contexts. As regards *usea* ‘several; a number of’, my analysis concerns the nominative (*usea*) and the both morphologically and syntactically regular partitive *usea-a* [several-PAR]. Since *usea* behaves regularly and is semantically a near-synonym of *moni*, it provides an excellent point of comparison for the two distinct forms of the latter (i.e., *moni* vs. *monta*).

In the following discussion I argue that the opposition between *moni* and *monta* in the marking of S arguments (this refers to intransitive subjects and E-NPs) is to a significant extent based on the opposition between the distributive meaning indicated by *moni* and the collective

meaning indicated by *monta*. In the following sections I first present the general functions of *moni*, *monta* and the “double partitive” *montaa* in Section 2, and then analyze the opposition between *moni* and *monta* as opposed to *usea* in Section 3. Section 4 sums up the results of the study.

2. *Monta* – a partitive or a nominative?

2.1. *Moni* vs. *monta*: differences in definiteness

In this section I give an overview of the uses of the three forms of the quantifier *moni* to be analyzed in detail in this work: the regular nominative *moni*, the morphologically regular partitive *mon-ta* [many-PAR], which (according to Branch 2001) is a functional nominative, and the pleonastic, functional partitive *mon-ta-a* [many-PAR-PAR]. It may be worth pointing out that until the 1990’s, *montaa* was considered a language error by the Finnish language planning authorities (Länsimäki 1995, Nyman 2000).

The fact that *monta* has undergone a nominativization, according to Branch (2001), might be expected to mean that *moni* and *monta* are now synonymous, sharing the function of the nominative.¹ This is, however, far from the truth: it is more appropriate to say that the two divide the functions of the nominative in such a way that *moni* is used in contexts where an unquantified nominal in the singular would equally be in the nominative, while *monta* has functions similar to the nominative of numerals, which are likewise quantifiers. One way of characterizing the function of *monta* is to say that it is an indefinite numeral (as argued by Branch 2001). Furthermore, in some respects *monta* still displays behavior typically associated with the partitive, perhaps the most important such feature being indefiniteness (for a general account of indefiniteness and the Finnish partitive, see Chesterman 1991). Therefore clauses where *monta* quantifies the S argument have traditionally been

¹ Another option, suggested to me by an anonymous reviewer, is to analyze *moni* and *monta* as lexically different quantifiers. In such an analysis, *moni* agrees in case and number with the quantified noun, while *monta* is only inflected in the partitive (as *montaa*). The problem with such an approach is that *moni* would then either lack a (singular) partitive form altogether, or *monta* would serve both as the partitive of *moni* and as the nominative of the (lexically different) quantifier *monta*. It would then be very difficult to tell apart the two functions of *monta*. The account would also be problematic in the analysis of the plural forms *mone-t* [many-NOM.PL] and *mon-i-a* [many-PL-PAR]. For considerations of space, I will not discuss the plural forms of *moni* in this work.

classified as existential clauses. The reason is that nominals with *monta* have been considered partitive NPs, and according to the received view, the so-called partitive subject [a partitive-marked E-NP in the present terminology] is only used in existential clauses.

To get a grasp of the division of labor between *moni* and *monta*, first observe that even though *moni* is still in use in the present-day language and is able to modify a singular nominative head, it sometimes conveys a more specific meaning that can be characterized as a *semantic partitive* (‘many of the Xs’; cf. Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001, Luraghi and Huumo 2014 and the literature cited there) – note that this characterization of the construction is purely semantic and not morphological. In Finnish, the semantic partitive construction typically takes the quantified nominal in the elative (‘from’) case, e.g., *moni me-i-stä* [many we-PL-ELA] ‘many of us’ (see Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001). In other words, the nominative form *moni* sometimes (but not always) implies a definite set of which it then picks a virtual referent as a representative instance of a relevant subset of the entities in the set. The sentence then gives a predication about this virtual entity, as in (9–10). In particular example (10) conveys the meaning where *moni* picks a subset of a definite set: ‘many of the pupils [e.g., of the school]’. If *monta* is used in the same construction (11), then the quantified nominal is understood as genuinely indefinite and the construction is classified as an existential clause, according to the classical criteria.

- (9) *Moni suomalaisen lomaile-e Viro-ssa.*
 many.NOM Finn.NOM vacation-PRES.3SG Estonia-INE
 ‘Many Finns [lit. ‘many a Finn’] vacation in Estonia.’

- (10) *Moni oppilas leikki-i koulunpiha-lla.*
 many.NOM pupil.NOM play-PRES.3SG schoolyard-ADE
 ‘Many [of the] pupils [of the school] play / are playing in the schoolyard.’

- (11) *Mon-ta oppilas-ta leikki-i koulunpiha-lla.*
 many-PAR pupil-PAR play-PRES.3SG schoolyard-ADE
 ‘[There are] many pupils playing in the schoolyard’.

Examples (9) and (10) give a predication about the (virtual) referent of the quantified nominal. While (9) can be a predication about Finns in general (‘many of them vacation in Estonia’), (10) is most naturally understood as a semantic partitive construction (‘many of the pupils

of the school’); such implications are in fact typical of the nominative forms of Finnish number quantifiers, as observed by Yli-Vakkuri (1973, 1979). Indeed, the quantified S argument in (10) is not natural if it is understood as introducing an all-new referent², which on the other hand is the function of (11) with *monta*. This suggests a difference related to definiteness: only *monta* is able to introduce an all-new referent, while *moni* often implies a definite set of which the quantifier then picks a representative instance. Another difference between examples (9–10) vs. (11) is that the *moni* examples can be understood as habitual predications (‘Many Finns have the habit of vacationing in Estonia’; ‘Many pupils of the school typically play in the schoolyard’), while (11) indicates an ongoing, actual event.

In sum, the nominative *moni* is less felicitous than *monta* in typical contexts of indefiniteness. In Finnish, definiteness is not obligatorily marked in NPs (there are no articles), but word order often gives clues about definiteness: for instance, S arguments placed towards the end of the clause (after the verb) are typically indefinite (see Vilkuna 1989 for details). However, such clues can be overridden for instance by using demonstrative pronouns, some of which have developed an article-like function (cf. Laury 1997). Example (12) shows that *moni* evokes the reading with a definite set even in postverbal S arguments: (12) can only be understood as indicating that there is a definite set of children, of which *moni* then picks a sub-set (for instance, in a context such as the following one: ‘There are many families with children living in this house. Now the weather is fair and many families are spending the afternoon outdoors. In the yard, many [of the] children are playing’). Thus, in spite of its word order which is typical of an existential clause, (12) does not receive the reading of an existential clause proper where the S argument introduces a discourse-new referent in a location. Such a meaning can only be conveyed by *monta*; cf. (13).

- (12) *Piha-lla leikki-i moni lapsi.*
 yard-ADE play-PRES.3SG many child

‘In the yard, many [of the] children [there] are playing.’

2 With *all-new* I mean a referent that is none of the following: a) mentioned previously in the discourse, b) implied by another referent previously mentioned, c) inferable from the linguistic or extra-linguistic context or d) part of world-knowledge of the interlocutors. As for example (10), this means that the notion of ‘pupil’ belongs to one of these groups (a-c). By contrast, example (11) allows an all-new reading where the notion of ‘pupil’ is not activated in any way in the previous discourse.

- (13) *Piha-lla leikki-i mon-ta las-ta.*
 yard-ADE play-PRES.3SG many-PAR child-PAR
 ‘There are many children playing in the yard’.

In sum, *moni* often implies a definite set of entities of which it then picks a representative instance, while *monta* behaves as an indefinite expression proper.

2.2. *Monta* – a functional nominative of an indefinite numeral?

In spite of its partitive ending, *monta* has been generalized to uses where it has a function similar to the nominative form of cardinal numerals (Branch 2001). To grasp the idiosyncratic nature of *monta* phrases, consider first the use of cardinal numerals in Finnish. Finnish cardinal numerals in the nominative quantify a nominal headed by a singular partitive form that indicates the quantified entity, e.g. *viisi mies-tä* [five.NOM man-SG.PAR] ‘five men’. Such expressions can be alternatively understood as definite or indefinite depending on the context. If the quantified nominal is in the subject function, then the opposition between definiteness and indefiniteness can be grammatically signaled in the verb (in Standard Finnish): a singular verb form indicates indefiniteness of the subject nominal (14), whereas a plural verb form indicates its definiteness (15).

- (14) *Kaksi edustaja-a-mme istu-u tuolla.*
 two representative-PAR-PX1PL sit-PRES.3SG there
 ‘Two representatives of ours are sitting there’.

- (15) *Kaksi edustaja-a-mme istu-vat tuolla.*
 two representative-PAR-PX1PL sit-PRES.3PL there
 ‘The two representatives of ours are sitting there’.

The indefinite nature of *monta* phrases is corroborated by the fact that they only accept a verb in the singular, not in the plural (16).

- (16) *Mon-ta edustaja-a-mme istu-u (~*istu-vat) tuolla.*
 many-PAR representative-PAR-PX1PL sit-PRES.3SG(*3PL) there
 ‘Many representatives of ours are sitting there’.

This is plausible, since *monta* is itself morphologically a singular partitive form (unlike the numerals, which are in the nominative) and here functions as an indefinite numeral. (Note that partitive-marked S-arguments, which belong to the class of E-NPs, always trigger the singular 3rd person verb form in Finnish.)

When inflected in cases other than the nominative, Finnish numerals function like adjectival modifiers and agree in case with the quantified nominal. In such a case, the numeral itself can also be in the partitive if used for instance in the function of a partitive object (which generally indicates non-culminating aspect; cf. Huumo 2010 and the literature cited there). Consider (17) in comparison with the pattern illustrated by (14) and (15) where only the quantified nominal is in the partitive but the numeral itself is in the nominative.

- (17) *Heikki rakasta-a kolme-a nais-ta.*
 name love-PRES.3SG three-PAR woman-SG.PAR

‘Heikki loves three women.’

Before moving on to a detailed analysis of the uses of *moni* in the quantification of S arguments, it is worth taking a look at the distribution of its forms in object marking, where there is likewise remarkable idiosyncrasy. An overview of these forms will be given in subsection 2.3.

2.3. The forms of *moni* used in object marking

It is in object marking where the functional idiosyncrasy of case-inflected forms of *moni* is most evident. The regular accusative *mone-n* has been practically supplanted by *monta*, and *monen* (as an accusative³ form) is considered ungrammatical by standard grammars (e.g., Hakulinen and Karlsson 1979; however, Huumo 2016b points out that the *monen* accusative still survives in certain infinitival constructions).

The general aspectual function of the Finnish accusative object is to indicate the culmination of a telic event. The accusative object is in a complementary distribution with the partitive object, which indicates

3 The form *monen* can also be a genitive form, in which case it is fully productive. The fact that the singular forms of the accusative and the genitive are identical (with the ending *-n*) has resulted in some terminological confusion in Finnish syntax. In the present work, I follow the tradition and use the term *accusative* for the object-marking *-n*.

the lack of culmination of the event, for instance in cases where the event is atelic (18), or inherently telic but does not culminate (e.g., it can be progressive or cessative⁴, as in 19; for details, see Huumo 2010 and the literature mentioned there).

- (18) *Liisa katsel-i televisio-ta.*
 name watch-PST.3SG television-PAR

‘Liisa was watching tv’; ‘Liisa watched tv’.

- (19) *Liisa luk-i kirja-a.*
 name read-PST.3SG book-PAR

‘Liisa was reading a/the book’; ‘Liisa read from a/the book but did not finish’.

In (18) the accusative object (*televisio-n*) is not acceptable at all, because the lexical aspect of the verb is atelic. In (19), the accusative (*kirja-n*) is a possible alternative to the partitive, meaning that Lisa finished reading the book. Obviously, these few examples only give a simplified picture of Finnish object marking but they suffice for the present purposes (for a more detailed account, see Huumo 2010).

The forms of *moni* used in nominals with the function of an object are *monta* and *montaa*, since the regular accusative *monen* has practically disappeared. In general, *monta* plays the role of the accusative, and is able to indicate the culmination of the event for instance in clauses that express an achievement. Because an achievement is punctual, the partitive object cannot be used to indicate progressive aspect. Example (20) is an unquantified instance with the achievement verb ‘find’, while (21) shows that the only form of *moni* available for this function is *monta*, i.e., the nominativized partitive.

- (20) *Liisa löys-i kirja-n (~*kirja-a).*
 name find-PST.3SG book-ACC (~*PAR)

‘Liisa found a/the book’.

- (21) *Liisa löys-i mon-ta(*-a) kirja-a (~*mone-n kirja-n).*
 name find-PST.3SG many-PAR(*-PAR) book-PAR (~*ACC)

‘Liisa found many books’.

4 A cessative event is one that ends before reaching its culmination, e.g., *Yesterday I read a book but did not finish it.*

In (20), the unquantified singular object can only be in the accusative case: the partitive is ungrammatical because with an achievement verb there is no progressive (non-culminating) reading. Example (21) shows that in the paradigm of *moni*, it is the form *monta* that must be used in such a context; the expected accusative **monen* has been supplanted, and the pleonastic *montaa* is ungrammatical (for the same reason the partitive is ungrammatical in 20). This demonstrates that in object marking the form *monta* is used in the aspectual function of the accusative object.

It is in sentences indicating an accomplishment such as (19) above where the accusative and partitive alternate, reflecting the opposition between the culmination of the event and the lack of it. In such expressions, *monta* and *montaa* are in opposition in the present-day language: *monta* indicates culmination and *montaa* non-culmination. In this function, *monta* most clearly resembles the nominative of numerals: Finnish numerals likewise lack an *-n* accusative, and when used in object nominals they are either in the nominative (to mark culmination) or in the partitive (to mark the lack of culmination). Thus in (22) the nominative of the numeral ‘five’ and *monta* both indicate culmination, while in (23) the partitive of the numeral and *montaa* both indicate non-culmination (cf. Branch 2001).

- (22) *Liisa luk-i viisi (~ mon-ta) kirja-a.*
 name find-PST.3SG five.NOM ~many-PAR book-PAR
 ‘Liisa read five books ~ many books (completely)’.

- (23) *Liisa luk-i viit-tä (~ mon-ta-a) kirja-a.*
 name find-PST.3SG five-PAR ~many-PAR-PAR book-PAR
 ‘Liisa was reading (or: read without finishing) five books ~ many books’.

In examples such as (22–23), *monta* thus patterns with the nominative of numerals to indicate culmination, as emphasized by Branch (2001), and is in an opposition with the pleonastic *montaa*, which patterns with the partitive of numerals to indicate non-culmination.

However, in cases where the verb is irrefutably atelic, as in (17) above (‘love’), *monta* can still be used in the partitive function as an alternative to *montaa* (24). In such contexts, numerals only occur in the partitive, and their nominative is ungrammatical (25). Likewise, the *-n* accusative of unquantified nominals is ungrammatical (26). This demonstrates that *monta* still has the ability to function as an aspectual

partitive in contexts where it cannot be interpreted as an indicator of culmination.

- (24) *Heikki rakasta-a mon-ta(-a) nais-ta.*
 name love-PRES.3SG many-PAR-PAR woman-PAR
 ‘Heikki loves many women.’
- (25) *Heikki rakasta-a kolme-a (~*kolme) nais-ta.*
 name love-PRES.3SG three-PAR (~*NOM) woman-PAR
 ‘Heikki loves three women.’
- (26) *Heikki rakasta-a vaimo-a-an (~*vaimo-nsa).*
 name love-PRES.3SG wife-PAR-PX3SG (~*wife-ACC.PX3SG)
 ‘Heikki loves his wife.’

Furthermore, *monta* is able to perform as the partitive object in negated clauses, where all objects generally take the partitive case irrespective of the aspectual type of the verb (examples 27 and 28; for details, see Huumo 2010). Such a context, in the same way as clauses with atelic verbs (24–26), requires the partitive in any case, and thus there is no risk of misinterpretation.

- (27) *Iltakävely-llä e-n kohdan-nut mon-ta(-a)*
 evening.walk-ADE NEG-1SG meet-PRTC many-PAR(-PAR)
tuttava-a.
 acquaintance-PAR
 ‘On my evening walk I did not meet many acquaintances.’
- (28) *Heikki ei luke-nut mon-ta(-a) kirja-a*
 name NEG.3SG read-PRTC many-PAR-PAR book-PAR
 ‘Heikki did not read many books.’

In sum, in the quantification of object nominals, *montaa* is used in contexts where numerals are likewise in the partitive, e.g., in the functions of aspectually partitive-marked or negative-polarity partitive objects. *Montaa* is in a grammatical opposition with the nominativized *monta* in contexts where aspect can alternatively be understood as culminating or non-culminating; on the other hand, *montaa* can only be used in the function of a partitive object.

3. *Moni* and *monta* in S arguments: distributive vs. collective meanings

In this section I take a closer look at the division of labor between the regular nominative *moni* and the functionally nominativized *monta* when used in S arguments. With the term S argument I refer to the single argument of intransitive predications (for the term, see Comrie 2013) which may but need not be a grammatical subject. As for Finnish in particular, my use of the term S comprises both subject arguments of non-existential intransitive predications and E-NPs of existential clauses. As regards *moni* and *monta*, the traditional view has taken the former to be used in a nominal with the function of a nominative subject and the latter as one to be used in existential “partitive subjects” (i.e., partitive-marked E-NPs). However, such a view is problematic for the reason that the latter is a phrase headed by a singular count noun, when in general partitive E-NPs are headed by either a singular mass noun or a plural form, and indicate quantitative indefiniteness (a more detailed analysis will follow below).

To begin with canonical existential clauses with an XVS word order, observe that *monta* is the neutral option to be used in E-NPs that introduce a discourse-new referent (29 [= 13]). In such contexts, *moni* receives the reading as a semantic partitive (‘many of the...’); cf. (30 [= 12]).

- (29) *Piha-lla leikki-i mon-ta las-ta.*
 yard-ADE play-PRES.3SG many-PAR child-PAR
 ‘There are many children playing in the yard’.

- (30) *Piha-lla leikki-i moni lapsi.*
 yard-ADE play-PRES.3SG many.NOM child.NOM
 ‘Many [of the] children in the yard are playing’.

Example (29) receives the existential reading proper with *monta* quantifying the discourse-new, indefinite S argument. In contrast, (30) only has the semantic partitive reading ‘Many of the children in the yard are playing’: the *moni* phrase does not introduce an all-new referent. This again demonstrates how *monta* behaves like an indefinite numeral, while *moni* is able to function as a semantic partitive expression and to quantify a subset from a definite set.

Monta keeps its indefiniteness even in clause-initial position, which is the typical position of the subject; therefore expressions such as (31) are traditionally classified as existential clauses (with a non-canonical SVX word order), as opposed to non-existential intransitive clauses such as (32).

- (31) *Mon-ta suomalais-ta lomaile-e Viro-ssa.*
 many-PAR Finn-PAR vacation-PRES.3SG Estonia-INE
 ‘Many Finns are vacationing in Estonia’; ‘There are many Finns vacationing in Estonia.’

- (32) *Moni suomalainen lomaile-e Viro-ssa.*
 many.NOM Finn.NOM vacation-PRES.3SG Estonia-INE
 ‘Many Finns vacation ~ are vacationing in Estonia.’

In classical terms, the difference between (31) and (32) is that (31) is an existential clause, since it has a partitive E-NP (“existential subject”, or the S argument of an existential clause⁵) in spite of its SVX word order, while (32) is a non-existential intransitive clause with a nominative subject. Another relevant difference is that (31) indicates an actual state of affairs where the signified Finns are vacationing in Estonia (simultaneously), i.e., ‘There are many Finns vacationing in Estonia’. Example (32), on the other hand, gives a predication about its subject referent: the signified Finns (a subset of all Finns) vacation in Estonia, but not necessarily simultaneously. Example (32), unlike (31), can also be understood as a habitual predication about the Finns: ‘whenever they vacation, they go to Estonia’.

This suggests that *moni* and *monta* reflect a difference that distinguishes Finnish existential clauses from their non-existential counterparts in general: a non-existential clause selects its subject as a starting point (in terms of Langacker 2008: 372–373) and follows the activities of the subject referent through time, while an existential clause selects a location as its starting point and follows the location over time (i.e., what happens in the location over time; see Huumo 2003). Therefore the

5 Finnish existential clauses (see e.g. Huumo 2003 and the literature mentioned there) are generally distinguished from non-existential ones by three features: the XVS word order (vs. SVX in non-existential clauses), lack of person and number agreement between the S argument and the verb, and the possibility of marking the S argument with the partitive case if it is headed by a mass noun or is a plural form. In negated existentials, all S arguments receive the partitive marking.

vacationing of the Finns signified by the quantified nominal in (31) is understood as simultaneous. This difference is also related to the opposition between distributive and collective meaning: the predication in (31) is collective (‘There are many Finns vacationing in Estonia, all at the same point of time’), while the one in (32) can be understood as a distributive predication about each individual Finn.

To elaborate the distributive vs. collective opposition between *moni* and *monta*, consider the following two examples.

- (33) *Moni norsu mahtu-u tä-hän häkki-in.*
 many.NOM elephant.NOM fit-PRES.3SG this-ILL cage-ILL
 ‘Many an elephant fits in this cage (one at a time, i.e., only smaller ones).’

- (34) *Mon-ta norsu-a mahtu-u tä-hän häkki-in.*
 many-PAR elephant-PAR fit-PRES.3SG this-ILL cage-ILL
 ‘Many elephants fit in this cage (together).’

Example (33) has a distributive interpretation only and means that the cage is spacious enough for one elephant at a time (i.e. only smaller elephants fit in the cage: a distributive meaning), whereas (34) means that the cage is spacious enough for several elephants at a time (and thus has a collective reading; but see examples 53–54 below, which show that there is some variation in this regard in colloquial written Finnish). For comparison, consider the near-synonymous quantifier *usea* ‘several; a number of (35), which is morphosyntactically regular and lacks a counterpart for *monta* (it does have the partitive form *usea-a*, but this behaves as a partitive proper and is only available in contexts where *mon-ta-a* is also acceptable). The nominative *usea* in (35) is ambiguous between the distributive and collective readings.⁶

- (35) *Usea norsu mahtu-u tä-hän häkki-in.*
 several.NOM elephant.NOM fit-PRES.3SG this-ILL cage-ILL
 ‘Several elephants fit in this cage (either one at a time or together).’

6 An anonymous reviewer points out to me that the (plural) partitive of *usea* (*use-i-ta norsu-j-a* [several-PL-PAR elephant-PL-PAR]) likewise receives the collective reading in this context. This appears to be the case with plural partitives of quantified NPs in general. However, the singular partitive of *usea* (*usea-a*), as well as the pleonastic *mon-ta-a*, cannot be used in this context, since these are partitive forms proper and can only quantify an existential S argument in the singular when each quantified instance is itself a mass (as in ‘There were several kinds of coffee available’).

These intuitions regarding examples (33–35) have been corroborated to me by other native speakers of Finnish. Since *moni* appears to be strongly distributive, its function comes close to that of a relative quantifier (exemplified by quantifiers such as the English *most* in *Most elephants fit in this cage*, which also receives the distributive ‘one at a time’ reading). In contrast, *monta* behaves as an absolute quantifier and designates a set of elephants which all fit in the cage at the same time.

To demonstrate that similar oppositions are at work in transitive clauses where *moni* and *monta* quantify the A argument, consider examples (36–38); to save space, examples (37) and (38) only display the relevant parts of the expression.

- (36) *Nä-iden apino-iden viestinnä-ssä... ...moni*
 this-PL.GEN monkey-PL.GEN communication-INE many.NOM
kiljahdus tarkoitta-a vaara-a.
 scream.NOM mean-PRES.3SG danger-PAR

‘In the communication of these monkeys, many a scream (each) means danger’.

- (37) *...mon-ta kiljahdus-ta tarkoitta-a vaara-a.*
 many-PAR scream-PAR mean-PRES.3SG danger-PAR

‘(In the communication of these monkeys,) many screams (= a sequence of screams) mean danger’.

- (38) *...usea kiljahdus tarkoitta-a vaara-a.*
 several.NOM scream.NOM mean-PRES.3SG danger-PAR

‘(In the communication of these monkeys,) several screams (each individually or as a sequence) mean danger’.

As before, example (36) means that there are many qualitatively different screams, each of which signifies danger, i.e., the interpretation is distributive. By contrast, what signifies danger in example (37) is a sequence of screams (which need not be qualitatively different from one another). Again, the nominative of the quantifier *usea* in (38) has both readings.

Summing up, the two (functional) nominative forms of *monta* divide the functions of the nominative in such a way that *moni* is used for distributive meanings and *monta* for collective ones. Furthermore, example (37) is noteworthy since it has a partitive-marked nominal in the function of the A argument. In general, nominals in the partitive

can only be used in the functions of O and S (in the latter case, as E-NPs in existential clauses). Nonetheless, it has been pointed out by many scholars that partitive-marked A arguments do sometimes occur in actual usage, and that they typically include a quantifier which is likewise in the partitive (Yli-Vakkuri 1979, Huumo, forthcoming). Among such phrases, the ones quantified by *monta* are common. However, since a *monta* phrase resembles functionally phrases with a numeral in the nominative, such occurrences are not actually partitive phrases, at least in a functional sense.

The distributive vs. collective opposition between *moni* and *monta* can be further elaborated by analyzing their relationship with durative adverbials of the type ‘in X time’ (in Finnish, such phrases take the inessive ‘in’ case). In contexts that allow the durative adverbial to alternatively designate the duration of a single sub-event or a collective (replicate) event, *moni* only allows the former, i.e., a distributive reading (39), while *monta* requires a collective reading (40). Again, *usea* allows both (41).

- (39) *Moni turisti kiipeä-ä vuore-lle tunni-ssa.*
 many.NOM tourist.NOM climb-PRES.3SG mountain-AL hour-INE
 ‘Many a tourist climbs the mountain in an hour’ (= it takes each tourist an hour to climb the mountain).

- (40) *Mon-ta turisti-a kiipeä-ä vuore-lle tunni-ssa.*
 many.PAR tourist-PAR climb-PRES.3SG mountain-ALL hour-INE
 ‘Many tourists an hour climb the mountain’.

- (41) *Usea turisti kiipeä-ä vuore-lle tunni-ssa.*
 several.NOM tourist.NOM climb-PRES.3SG mountain-ALL hour-INE
 ‘Several tourists climb the mountain in an hour’ (= either ‘it takes each tourist an hour to climb the mountain’, or ‘several tourists an hour climb the mountain’).

Thus (39) means that each singular climbing event has the duration of an hour, while (40) means that during any hour the number of tourists who climb the mountain reaches the quantity ‘many’. Thus example (40) does not say anything about the duration of a single climbing event; the duration ‘in an hour’ is associated with the gradually growing quantity of tourists, which during the interval of an hour reaches the (vague) limit specified by the quantifier (cf. the English *This mountain*

is climbed by a hundred tourists an hour). Example (41) with *usea* [nominative] again allows both readings: either each one of the ‘several tourists’ climbs the mountain in one hour (distributive), or during one hour the mountain is climbed by several tourists (collective). As argued in Huumo (2003), such an opposition is typical between Finnish plural nominative subjects and partitive E-NPs in general: with a nominative subject, the durative adverbial typically signifies the duration of each individual accomplishment by the referents of the subject (42), but with a partitive E-NP it signifies the duration of the event at a collective level and often from the point of view of an implicit or explicit location (43).

- (42) *Muuttolinnu-t lentä-vät Suome-en kaksi viikko-a.*
 migrating.bird-PL.NOM fly-PRES.3PL Finland-ILL two.NOM week.NOM
 ‘Migrating birds fly two weeks to Finland’ (= it takes them two weeks to fly the distance to Finland).

- (43) *Muuttolintu-j-a lentä-ä Suome-en kaksi viikko-a.*
 migrating.bird-PL-PAR fly-PRES.3SG Finland-ILL two.NOM week.NOM
 ‘For two weeks migrating birds fly to Finland’ (= there are arrivals of birds for a period of two weeks).

The pair of examples (42) and (43) neatly illustrates the opposition between a non-existential intransitive clause with a nominative subject triggering person and number agreement in the verb, on the one hand, and an existential clause with a plural partitive E-NP, on the other hand. Example (42) follows the activities of the birds over the period of time indicated by the adverbial of duration, while (43) selects the point of view of the location (‘Finland’) and observes the duration of the event from this point of view. For the event to have such a duration, it is necessary that the birds arrive in a sequence that spans over the time of two weeks in (43). In (42), on the other hand, it is possible that the birds fly together or one by one; the relevant difference is that the durative adverbial designates the (average) duration of their activity (the flight to Finland).

This difference suggests that in spite of its singular number, a *monta* phrase actually profiles a multiplicity of referents in the same way as numerals do (recall that Finnish numerals likewise take the quantified nominal in the singular). *Moni*, in contrast, profiles a singular virtual instance of the category and gives a predication about it. Grammatically, the difference is clearly manifested by the number of a relative

pronoun that has the quantified nominal as its antecedent: *moni* only allows a relative pronoun in the singular, while *monta* requires the relative pronoun to be in the plural; consider (44) vs. (45).

- (44) *Moni lapsi, joka tul-i* (~**jotka tul-i-vat*)
 many.NOM child.NOM REL.SG come-PST.3SG (~*REL.PL come-PST-3PL)
aamu-lla bussi-lla koulu-un...
 morning-ADE bus-ADE school-ILL
 ‘Many children [or: Many a child] who[SG] took the bus to school in the morning...’

- (45) *Mon-ta las-ta, jotka tul-i-vat* (~**joka tul-i*)
 many-PAR child-PAR REL.PL come-PST-3PL (~*REL.SG come-PST.3SG)
aamu-lla bussi-lla koulu-un...
 morning-ADE bus-ADE school-ILL
 ‘Many children who[PL] took the bus to school in the morning...’

In (44), the relative pronoun *joka* must be in the singular form, as it has a *moni* phrase as its antecedent. The plural *jotka* is ungrammatical. The opposite is true in (45), where the antecedent of the relative pronoun is the *monta* phrase. This of course is substantial evidence supporting the analysis where *moni* profiles a singular virtual entity as a representative instance of the quantified set, while *monta*, in spite of its singular number, profiles a multiplicity of entities. Again, numerals (in the nominative) pattern with *monta*: only the plural form of the relative pronoun is acceptable in the expression *kaksi lasta, jotka...* [TWO.NOM child-PAR REL.PL...].

The following examples illustrate another difference between *moni* and *monta*, when the two quantify the subject nominal of a copulative construction. With *moni*, the predicate nominal in (46) attributes a quality to the (virtual) referent of the quantified subject nominal, while in (47), the use of *monta* results in a reading where the predicate nominal characterizes the quantity, not a quality of the referent.

- (46) *Moni lapsi on vanhemm-i-ll-e taakka.*
 many.NOM child.NOM be.PRES.3SG parent-PL-ALL burden.NOM
 ‘Many a child (each individually) is a burden to the parents.’

- (47) *Mon-ta las-ta on vanhemm-i-lle taakka.*
 many-PAR child-PAR be.PRES.3SG parent-PL-ALL burden.NOM
 ‘[Having] many children [= their copiousness] is a burden to the parents.’

What constitutes a burden to the parents in (46) is each individual (e.g., ill-behaved) child, while in (47) it is the plentifulness of children that constitutes the burden (cf. the English *A lot of children mean a lot of work*). In this context, *monta* thus triggers a reading where it is the quantity as such (and not a quality of the individuals constituting the quantity) that is characterized by the predicate nominal. This is, of course, another manifestation of the distributive vs. collective opposition between the two forms. Furthermore, if the predication is irrefutably distributive, then *monta* is often unacceptable; consider (48) and (49); (50) shows that it is not the verb ‘speak’ as such that blocks the use of *monta* in (49) but the distributive nature of the predication.

- (48) *Moni vieras puhu-i ranskalaise-lla korostukse-lla.*
 many.NOM guest.NOM speak-PST.3SG French-ADE accent-ADE
 ‘Many a guest spoke with a French accent.’

- (49) **Mon-ta vieras-ta puhu-i ranskalaise-lla korostukse-lla.*
 many-PAR guest-PAR speak-PST.3SG French-ADE accent-ADE
 ‘Many guests spoke with a French accent.’

- (50) *Mon-ta vieras-ta puhu-i keskenään*
 many-PAR guest-PAR speak-PST.3SG with.one.another
kahvipöydä-ssä.
 coffee.table-INE
 ‘Many guests were speaking with each other at the coffee table.’

Speaking with an accent (48–49) is an individual quality that cannot be performed collectively; thus (48) with the distributive *moni* is fine while (49) with *monta* is unacceptable. Example (50) shows that it is not the verb ‘speak’ as such that causes this difference: if the ‘speaking’ is a collective activity, then *monta* is acceptable as a quantifier in the subject phrase of the verb meaning ‘speak’.

Lastly, the scope of negation is a factor that sets *moni* and *monta* apart. *Moni* typically remains outside the scope of negation, while *monta* is subsumed under it (like partitive-marked phrases are in general); consider (51–52).

- (51) *Moni suomalainen ei tul-lut konferenssi-i-mme.*
 many.NOM Finn.NOM NEG.3SG come-PRTC conference-ILL-PX1PL
 ‘Many Finns did not attend out conference (= there were many who did not attend).’
- (52) *Mon-ta suomalais-ta ei tul-lut konferenssi-i-mme.*
 many-PAR Finn-PAR NEG.3SG come-PRTC conference-ILL-PX1PL
 ‘Not many Finns attended out conference (= only few did).’

In (51), the quantified nominal is outside the scope of negation: the clause presents a predication about its subject nominal, stating that there were many Finns who chose not to attend the conference. The quantity is thus outside the scope of negation. In contrast, (52) states that not many Finns attended the conference, i.e., that there were only few Finns present. The quantity indicated by *monta* is now under the scope of negation. In this respect, *monta* behaves like partitive-marked nominals in general and can be replaced with the pleonastic *montaa*, which would have a similar relation with negation. This again suggests that in spite of its many nominative-like functions in affirmative clauses, *monta* still behaves like a partitive when under negation. However, this state of affairs seems not to be absolute for all language users, as suggested by examples (53) and (54), which I have picked from the Internet. They include a *monta* phrase as an S argument outside the scope of negation. According to my native-speaker intuition, these expressions are not fully idiomatic (*moni* would be the expected choice) but not blatantly ungrammatical, either. The fact that such uses do occur may suggest that the speaker community’s intuition about *monta* is in a constant flux and *monta* is acquiring a nominative-like function in negated clauses as well.

- (53) *Mon-ta ihmis-tä ei kykene taas*
 many-PAR person-PAR NEG.3SG be.able.to.CNG again
työskentele-mä-än ry[h]mä-ssä
 work-INF-ILL group-INE
 (jonka pelisäännöt tulee ylemmiltä tahoilta).
 ‘Then again, many people are not capable of working in a group (where the playing rules are dictated from above).’
http://www.kansanuutiset.fi/scripts/edoris/edoris.dll?app=server&com=sqlxml&tem=d_aihpuu.tpl&topicid=117794&selected=117889

- (54) *Näin mon-ta ihmis-tä ei voi ol-la väärä-ssä.*
 so many-PAR person-PAR NEG.3SG can.CNG be-INF WRONG-INE
 ‘So many people cannot be wrong.’
<http://blogi.advanceb2b.fi/23-pysayttavaa-faktaa-b2b-myynti-slideshare>

In (53) the *monta* phrase is outside the scope of negation: there are many people who are not able to work in workgroups of the intended kind. Here *moni* would be a (more idiomatic) alternative, while *montaa* would not be acceptable, even though above we observed that it is typically a possible substitute for *monta* under negation. The reason is, of course, that *monta* in (10) is outside the scope of negation, and in this respect it behaves like a nominative. *Montaa*, by contrast, always behaves like a partitive proper. Example (54) resembles semantically example (47) by foregrounding the quantity, not the quality of the referent as the factor triggering the designated state of affairs. In other words, it is not the signified people as such who, according to the writer, cannot be wrong, but rather the fact that there are so many of them – their large number makes their opinion more reliable.

4. Conclusions

Summing up the observations made in this work, we have seen that the semantic opposition between *moni* (morphologically nominative) and *monta* (morphologically partitive) is not one between a nominative and a partitive form; rather, the two split up the functions of the nominative in an idiosyncratic way, and if partitivity needs to be explicitly expressed, then the pleonastic *montaa* is used. As pointed out by earlier scholars such as Branch (2001), the form *monta* behaves like a nominative of an indefinite numeral in many respects. On the other hand, we have seen that *monta* is still capable of serving the function of a partitive form in contexts where no risk of a misunderstanding arises: in atelic predications and under negation. However, examples such as (53) and (54) suggest that *monta* may be losing its partitive function in some negated contexts as well and can be understood as remaining outside the scope of negation.

The differences between *moni* and *monta* observed above relate with the kind of reference each performs, their nature as indefinite pronouns (as *moni* is traditionally classified), the opposition between distributive and collective meanings, quantification, as well as the vague notion of

existentiality and the (likewise vague) dividing line between existential and non-existential predications in Finnish. As regards the kind of reference, *moni* picks a singular virtual referent which then functions as a representative instance of a multiplicity, and the clause gives a predication about this virtual entity which can then be generalized to other instances as well. In contrast, *monta*, in spite of being a singular form, refers to a multiplicity of referents overtly. The clearest grammatical manifestation of this opposition is the choice of the relative word which has the quantified nominal as its antecedent: for *moni*, the relative word must be in the singular (ex. 44), for *monta*, in the plural (45). Note that the fact that both *monta* and the nominal it quantifies are in the singular is not counterevidence to this, as Finnish numerals in general take the quantified nominal in the singular.

As regards definiteness, it has been pointed out e.g. by Yli-Vakkuri (1973, 1979) that the nominative forms of some Finnish quantifiers often have a more restricted usage than nominative forms in general, as they may indicate that the quantity of referents picked by the quantifier belongs to a larger, definite set (the so-called semantic partitive construction). According to Yli-Vakkuri, this may then motivate the spread of the partitive forms of quantified nominals into functions where the nominative or the accusative (in object marking) would be expected. Such a meaning (e.g., ‘many of the Xs’) seems to be typical with the nominative *moni*.

These two differences are of course directly related to the distributive vs. collective opposition that in many contexts distinguishes the two forms. As *moni* picks a single virtual referent of which the clause then gives a predication, it strongly favors a distributive reading, a difference that has been illustrated in many examples throughout this work. In such expressions, the quantified referents act one by one and not (necessarily) simultaneously. The opposite is true of *monta*, which strongly favors a collective meaning in the contexts considered: the referents participate in a single event simultaneously. A comparison with the nominative form *usea* ‘several; a number of’ of this near-synonymous quantifier has demonstrated the ability of the nominative to indicate both distributive and collective meanings (as is usual of nominatives referring to a multiplicity of referents in Finnish). This, however, is different in the case of *moni*: *monta*: these two forms divide the functions of the nominative in such a way that a distributive meaning is indicated by *moni* and a collective one by *monta*.

It can also be speculated that this association of *monta* with a collective meaning has been a factor motivating the development in object

marking, where *monta* has practically replaced the accusative **monen* and fulfills the function of the accusative object by indicating the culmination of the event in expressions of an achievement or an accomplishment. It is especially in object marking where *monta* is in opposition with the pleonastic *montaa*, which is a partitive form proper and indicates the lack of culmination in expressions with accomplishment verbs (ex. 23) and is likewise ungrammatical with achievement verbs (21). However, the fact that *monta* can still serve in the function of a partitive in atelic (24) and negated expressions (27–28) demonstrates that it has not yet fully given up its ability to be a functional partitive in object marking. A full analysis of course would have to take into account not only singular but also plural forms of the quantified phrases, but for considerations of space that discussion must be left to future research.

Finally, consider the relationship of *moni*: *monta* with the everlasting debate on Finnish existential clauses and the dividing line between existential and non-existential predications. In classic terms, *moni* is a nominative form and takes the quantified nominal likewise in the nominative; therefore, when quantifying an S argument, it correlates with the non-existential nature of the clause. By contrast, *monta* is morphologically a partitive form and takes the quantified nominal in the partitive; this is why classic accounts have treated S arguments quantified by *monta* as “existential subjects” or E-NPs. While such an analysis is compatible with the indefiniteness of *monta* phrases, it is not unproblematic – at least it needs to be carefully pointed out that *monta* phrases are very untypical partitive-marked E-NPs, because they are not headed by mass nouns or plural forms, the quantity of which is then rendered unbounded by the partitive case. By contrast, while the quantity indicated by *monta* is inexact, it is not of the unbounded but rather of the bounded type in the traditional classification, as pointed out in the insightful analysis of Yli-Vakkuri (1973). This, according to Yli-Vakkuri, may be the factor motivating the spread of quantified nominals even into the function of the A argument, where partitive-marked nominals in general are not acceptable (see also Huumo, forthcoming).

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the Academy of Finland (Project 285739) and the Finnish Cultural Foundation (Grant 00152335).

Address:

Tuomas Huumo
Department of Finnish and Finno-Ugric languages
20540 University of Turku
Hämeenkatu 1
Turku, Finland
E-mail: tuomas.huumo@utu.fi

Abbreviations

ACC – accusative, ADE – adessive, ALL – allative, CNG – connegative, ELA – elative, GEN – genitive, ILL – illative, INE – inessive, INF – infinitive, NOM – nominative, PAR – partitive, (number+)PL – (person+)plural, PX(+number) – Xth person possessive suffix, PRES – present tense, PRTC – participle, PST – past tense, REL – relative pronoun, (number+)SG – (person+) singular

References

- Branch, Hannele (2001) “*Montaa* kielivirheenä. Näkymättömän käden jäljillä”. *Virittäjä* 105, 193–215.
- Chesterman, Andrew (1991) *On definiteness: a study with special reference to English and Finnish*. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 56.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Comrie, Bernard (2013) “Alignment of case marking of full noun phrases”. In Matthew S. Dryer and Martin Haspelmath, eds. *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Available online at <<http://wals.info/chapter/98>>. Accessed on 7.04.2016.
- Hakulinen, Auli and Fred Karlsson (1979) *Nykysuomen lauseoppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen, and Irja Alho (2004) *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Huumo, Tuomas (2003) “Incremental existence: the world according to the Finnish existential sentence”. *Linguistics* 41, 3, 461–493.
- Huumo, Tuomas (2010) “Nominal aspect, quantity, and time: the case of the Finnish object”. *Journal of Linguistics* 46, 1, 83–125.
- Huumo, Tuomas (2016a) “S-argumenttia kvantifioivien paljous- ja lukumääräkvanttorien syntaksia ja semantiikkaa”. *Sananjalka* 58, 24–48.

- Huumo, Tuomas (2016b) “Objektia kvantifioivien paljous- ja lukumääräkvanttorien syntaksia ja semantiikkaa”. *Virittäjä* 120, 4, 517–552.
- Huumo, Tuomas (forthcoming) “The partitive A: on uses of the partitive case in the marking of A arguments in Finnish”. In Ilja A. Seržant, Alena Witzlack-Makarevich, and Kelsey Mann, eds. *The diachronic typology of differential argument marking*. (Studies in Diversity Linguistics.) Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Huumo, Tuomas and Marja-Liisa Helasvuo (2015) “On the subject of subject in Finnish”. In Marja-Liisa Helasvuo and Tuomas Huumo, eds. *Subjects in constructions: canonical and non-canonical*, 13–41. (Constructional approaches to language, 16.) Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Karttunen, Lauri (1975) “On the syntax of the word *paljon* in Finnish”. In V. Hallap, ed. *Congressus tertius internationalis fenno-ugristarum, I: Acta linguistica*, 227–235. Tallinn: Valgus.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (2001) ““A piece of the cake” and “a cup of tea”: partitive and pseudo-partitive nominal constructions in the Circum-Baltic languages”. In Östen Dahl and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm, eds. *The Circum-Baltic languages 2: Grammar and typology*, 523–568. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (2008) *Cognitive grammar: a basic introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (2014) “Nominal grounding and English quantifiers”. A plenary presentation at the conference *Constructions and cognition: the 6th annual conference of the German cognitive linguistics association*. Erlangen, Germany, 30.9. – 2.10.2014.
- Laury, Ritva (1997) *Demonstratives in interaction: the emergence of a definite article in Finnish*. (Studies in discourse and grammar, 7.) Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Luraghi, Silvia and Tuomas Huumo (2014) “Introduction”. In Silvia Luraghi and Tuomas Huumo, eds. *Partitive cases and related categories*, 1–16. (Empirical approaches to language typology, 54.) Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Länsimäki, Maija (1995) “*Montaa-partitiivi*”. *Kielikello* 2. Available online at <<http://www.kielikello.fi/index.php?mid=2&pid=11&aid=264>>. Accessed on 7.04.2016.
- Nyman, Martti (2000) “Näkymätön käsi ja kielitieteen epistemologia”. *Virittäjä* 104, 46–70.
- Tuomikoski, Risto (1969) *Asemoisilmaustemme luokittelusta*. (Suomi, 114: 4.) Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Vilkuna, Maria (1989) *Free word order in Finnish: its syntax and discourse functions*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Vilkuna, Maria (1992) *Referenssi ja määräisyys suomenkielisten tekstien tulkinnassa*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Yli-Vakkuri, Valma (1973) *Suomen kielen peruslauseen komplektisista konstruktioista: Suomen kielen objektikonstruktioista*. An unpublished Licentiate’s thesis. University of Tampere, Department of Finnish.

Yli-Vakkuri, Valma (1979) “Partitiivisubjektin toiset juuret: eräs kvantiteetin ilmaisu-järjestelmän ilmentymä”. In Jussi Kallio, Kaisa Häkkinen, and Leena Kytömäki, eds. *Sanomia. Juhlakirja Eeva Kangasmaa-Minnin 60-vuotispäiväksi 14.4.1979*, 155–192. (Publications of the department of Finnish and general linguistics, 9.)
Turku: University of Turku.

Kokkuvõte. Tuomas Huumo: *Moni* või *monta*? Distributiivse ja kollektiivse tähenduse vastandus soome keele kvantori *moni* ‘mitu’ kahe käändevormi vahel. Artikkel käsitleb soome keele kvantori *moni* ‘mitu’ kahe käändevormi tähenduserinevusi. Võrdlusobjektideks on reeglipärane nominatiiv *moni* ning reeglipäraselt moodustatud partitiivivorm *monta* [*mon-ta* mitu-PARTITIIV ‘mitut’], millel siiski on tekkinud arvsõnade nominatiivile sarnane funktsioon ning mis seetõttu ei ole enam funktsionaalne partitiiv. See areng on tõenäoliselt motiveerinud ka pleonastilise, kahe partitiivilõpuga vormi *mon-ta-a* [mitu-PARTITIIV-PARTITIIV] teket, mis väljendab ühetähenduslikult partitiivi funktsioone. Artikli põhiväide on, et oluline erinevus vormide *moni* ja *monta* vahel on distributiivse ja kollektiivse tähenduse vastandamine: mitmetitõlgendatavates kontekstides annab *moni* edasi distributiivset, *monta* aga kollektiivset tähendust. Artiklis võrreldakse nimetatud kaht vormi lisaks ka semantiliselt lähedase kvantori *usea* ‘mitu; arvukas’ nominatiivivormiga. *Usea* on sarnastes kontekstides mitmetähenduslik ning võib edasi anda nii distributiivset kui ka kollektiivset tähendust. Kokkuvõttes valgustab analüüs seni käsitlemata vaatenurgast kvantori *moni* kahe (funktsionaalses mõttes nominatiivi-)vormi tööjaotust, mis on üsnagi idiosünkraatiline.

Võtmesõnad: kvantor, kääne, partitiiv, kollektiivne vs. distributiivne tähendus, soome keel