

## Analytic Causatives in Finnish: An Analysis of the Embedded Predicate of *panna* ‘put’ and *saada* ‘get’

1. In the Finnish language, there is a group of verbs that take the construction [Subject + Verb + Object + 3<sup>rd</sup> Infinitive Illative<sup>1</sup>] and mean “persuading (someone to do something)” or “conducting (someone/something to an act)” (Setälä 1973<sup>16</sup>:115).<sup>2</sup>

- (1) *Minä* { *käsk-i-n* / *pyys-i-n* } *hän-tä* *luke-ma-an*.  
I.NOM order-IMP-1SG ask-IMP-1SG (s)he-PAR read-3INF-ILL  
“I { ordered / asked } her to read.” (Setälä 1973<sup>16</sup> *ibid.*)
- (2) *Liisa* *tuomi-ttiin*<sup>3</sup> *maksa-ma-an* *10 päiväsakko-a*.  
L.ACC sentence-PASS.IMP pay-3INF-ILL 10 day fine-PAR  
“Liisa was given a 10 days fine.” (Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979: 384)

Many lexical items, including verbs, adjectives, or even nouns, can govern the 3<sup>rd</sup> Infinitive Illative (henceforth just Infinitive). As to transitive, Penttilä (1963<sup>2</sup>:405) refers to about 70 such transitive verbs, while Jönsson-Korhola & White (1997) list 42 verbs. The corpus on which this study is based<sup>4</sup> includes altogether 178 different types (over 1300 tokens) of transitive matrix verbs of this construction.

In this paper I focus on the two most frequent verbs, namely *saada* ‘get’ (the most frequent, 352 tokens) and *panna* ‘put’ (88 tokens).

- (3) *Äiti* *pan-i* *poja-n* *pyytä-mä-än* *anteeksi*.  
mother.NOM put-IMP.3SG boy-ACC ask-3INF-ILL sorry  
“The mother forced her son to make an apology.” (PS, *panna* 1.)
- (4) ... *joka* *sa-isi* *sinu-t* *naura-ma-an*.  
REL.NOM get-COND.3SG you-ACC laugh-3INF-ILL  
“(You need something) which may get you to laugh.” (sk-40:2197)

These two verbs deserve special attention not only because of their high frequency, but because both of them show the interesting constructional characteristics of the analytic causative.

---

<sup>1</sup> Morphologically the 3<sup>rd</sup> Infinitive is formed with the infinitive marker *-ma/-mä-* and a case ending suffix (either Inessive, Elative, Illative, Adessive, Abessive, or marginally with Instructive), and thus lacks passive and any tense marking.

<sup>2</sup> The abbreviations used in the gloss are listed at the end of this paper.

<sup>3</sup> As this example (2) shows, when the matrix verb is in the passive voice, the Subject is dropped and some other phrasal element (here the Object of the main verb) is often fronted to the position of the Subject.

<sup>4</sup> The data I use here is taken from a 1.2 million-word corpus of a Finnish magazine (collection of articles of the year 1987 *Suomen Kuvalehti*), which is maintained by the Department of General Linguistics, University of Helsinki. Sentences were collected in February 1998. I thank the Department for the permission of the use of the corpus. Examples taken from this corpus are referred to as (sk-[file number]-[line number]).

2. Let us first examine the syntactic/semantic status of the Infinitive. First, it is important to note that the Infinitive in a *panna* / *saada* clause functions as an obligatory predication adjunct, not as a purposive or optional adjunct (cf. Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979:384). This is manifested by the fact that the Infinitive of *panna* and *saada* cannot be dropped.

- (5) a. 31% *vastanne-i-sta pane-e mene-mä-än yli 500.*  
 31%.NOM Replied-PL-ELA put-3SG go-3INF-ILL over 500  
 “31% of answerers spend over 500 (marks).” (sk-11:2629)  
 b. \*31% *vastanne-i-sta pane-e Ø yli 500.*

While with many other verbs the sentence often remains acceptable even if the Infinitive phrase is dropped.

- (6) a. ... *tarvi-ttiin puhetulkke-j-a kääntä-mä-än viittomakielel-tä.*  
 need-PASS.IMP interpreter-PL-PAR translate-3INF-ILL sign language-PAR  
 “Interpreters were needed to translate from the sign language” (sk-31:1743)  
 b. ... *tarvi-ttiin puhetulkke-j-a Ø.*

Secondly, the unacceptability of the fronting of the Infinitive reflects its strong dependence on the governing transitive verb: in the *panna* and *saada* clause, the Infinitive cannot be fronted, unless the lexical meaning of the verb is retained<sup>5</sup>. Compare examples (7) and (8):

- (7) a. *hän sa-i vallanpitäjä-t rakenta-ma-an*  
 (s)he.NOM get-IMP.3SG man of power-PL.ACC build-3INF-ILL  
*itse-lle-en laboratorio-n.*  
 oneself-ALL-PX3 laboratory-ACC  
 “He got the men of power to build a laboratory for himself” (sk-36:868)  
 b. \**Rakenta-ma-an laboratorio-n hän sa-i vallanpitäjä-t.*  
 (8) ... *nii-tä rakenta-ma-an ol-i oste-tta-va ihmisi-ä.*  
 they-PAR build-3INF-ILL be-IMP.3SG buy-PASS-PRPT people-PAR  
 “To build them people had to be purchased.” (sk-28:900)

This evidence shows that the Infinitive always remains in the post-verbal position and thus adjacent to the Object (unless the Object is fronted in the passive, see footnote 3).

Thirdly, it is widely accepted that when the 3<sup>rd</sup> Infinitive Illative occurs with a transitive, it is always Object-oriented, i.e. the action indicated by the 3<sup>rd</sup> Infinitive Illative is performed by the Object of the matrix verb, not by the Subject of it (Siro 1964; Dubrovina 1968). This semantic characteristic and the above-mentioned syntactic status of the Infinitive indicate that, governed by *panna* and *saada*, the Object and the Infinitive form a loose, but unseparable unit, and that the Infinitive is constructionally fixed, thus **embedded** in the Object-neighboring, verb-final position.

3. Now let us proceed to the analysis of the constructional aspect of the *panna* and *saada* clause. I will point out two features common to the *panna* and *saada* clause.

1) The lexical meaning of the verb is abstracted and thus grammaticalized.

<sup>5</sup> It is interesting to note here that the fronting of the Infinitive, which is normally unacceptable in the *panna* and *saada* clause, is possible if the main verb retains its lexical meaning. In the corpus we find one attested example of *saada*:

- (i) *Ura-a tasoitta-ma-an hän sa-i 50000 marka-n stipendi-n.*  
 career-PAR level-3INF-ILL (s)he get-IMP.3SG 50000 mark-GEN scholarship-ACC  
 “In order to get her career going she got a scholarship of 50000 marks.” (sk-36:1531)

With the lexical meaning retained, *saada* may allow the Infinitive to be dropped, too.

It is very important to note that the “change of location of an object” -sense, which pertains to the lexical meaning of the verb *panna* ‘put something somewhere’ and *saada* ‘get something from someone/somewhere’, is often lost when they appear with an Infinitive (Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979:384). Thus we find many examples where the change of location is no longer implied (9), or the direction of the change is no longer the same as was anticipated (example (10), cf. *saada*: “get from there to here”):

- (9) *Heidä-t pan-naan arvioi-ma-an oma-a jännittämise-n aste-tta-an.*  
 they-ACC put-PASS estimate-3INF-ILL own-PAR strain-GEN grade-PAR-PX3  
 “They are asked to estimate how stressful they feel” (sk-25:684)
- (10) *Mikä saa nuore-t muutta-ma-an Siperia-an?*  
 what.NOM get.3SG young-ACC.PL move-3INF-ILL Siberia-ILL  
 “What gets the young to move to Siberia?” (sk-21:2441)

Related to this lexical abstractness, it is appropriate to note here that with the Infinitive, *panna* and *saada* can take both human and non-human referent as their Object: In over 50% of the cases in my database these verbs include a human Object. The situation is different from the lexical verb *panna* and *saada*, because they normally take a non-human Object.

2) The construction entails that the event expressed by the Object and the Infinitive is accomplished. The following examples are modified from (1):

- (11) a. *\*Minä sa-i-n häne-t luke-ma-an, mutta hän*  
 I.NOM get-IMP-1SG (s)he-ACC read-3INF-ILL but (s)he.NOM  
*ei suostu-nut.*  
 VNEG.3SG comply-PSPT
- b. *Minä käsk-i-n hän-tä luke-ma-an, mutta hän*  
 I.NOM order-IMP-1SG (s)he-PAR read-3INF-ILL but (s)he.NOM  
*ei suostu-nut.*  
 VNEG.3SG comply-PSPT  
 “I ordered her to read, but she refused.”

1) and 2) (see examples above) allow us to characterize the two verbs as constructing **analytic causative constructions** (Shibatani 1976:2; Kemmer & Verhagen 1994:119).

4. In spite of the striking constructional similarities stated above, the difference of the verbs often resides in the sharp semantic difference. A few substitution tests will give a clue to the problem. For example, there are many sentences where the change of the main verb causes the meaning of the sentence to change.

- (12) a. *Äiti pan-i poja-n pyytä-mä-än anteeksi.*  
 mother.NOM put-IMP.3SG boy-ACC ask-3INF-ILL sorry  
 “The mother forced her son to make an apology.” (adapted from (3))
- b. *Äiti sa-i poja-n pyytä-mä-än anteeksi.*  
 mother.NOM get-IMP.3SG boy-ACC ask-3INF-ILL sorry  
 “The mother got her son to make an apology.” (modified from (3))

In the first example the mother ordered her son directly, by shouting at him, for example. In the second example her action toward him is unclear, thus whether she forced him in any way remains unknown.

Moreover, it is well known, though not widely discussed in the literature, that the meaning of the sentence diverges systematically in a negative and an interrogative sentence. In the *panna* clause, for example, what is negated and questioned is the activity of the Subject itself, while in the *saada* clause it is the truth condition of the event expressed by the Object and the Infinitive that is of concern.

- (13) a. *Minä en pan-nut hän-tä luke-ma-an, mutta hän*  
 I.NOM VNEG.1SG put-PSPT (s)he-PAR read-3INF-ILL but (s)he.NOM  
*luk-i kuitenkin.*  
 read-IMP.3SG however  
 “I did not force her to read, but she read anyway.” (Modified from (1))
- b. ?*Minä en saa-nut hän-tä luke-ma-an, mutta hän*  
 I.NOM VNEG.1SG get-PSPT (s)he-PAR read-3INF-ILL but (s)he.NOM  
*luk-i kuitenkin.*  
 read-IMP.3SG however
- (14) a. *miten siellä on kameli-t-kin saa-tu lisäänty-mä-än?*  
 how there be.3SG camel-PL.ACC-& get-PASS.PSPT multiply-3INF-ILL  
 “How did one breed camels there?” (sk-37:611)
- b. *miten siellä on kameli-t-kin pan-tu lisäänty-mä-än?*  
 how there be.3SG camel-PL.ACC-& get-PASS.PSPT multiply-3INF-ILL  
 “Why did one breed camels there?”

Sometimes the two verbs are not even substitutable, for substitution turns the sentence into a totally ungrammatical one. Because besides the main verb all words remain intact, the test indicates that the type of the embedded predicate (Infinitive) can affect the grammaticality of the sentence. In the examples (15-17) *saada* cannot be exchanged for *panna*, and the examples (18-19) include *panna* and they are hardly compatible with *saada*.

- (15) *show, joka { \*pane-e / saa } Irangate-n unohtu-ma-an.*  
 show REL.NOM put-3SG get.3SG Irangate-ACC be forgotten-3INF-ILL  
 “The show which makes the Irangate Incident be forgotten.” (sk-46:1918)
- (16) *konee-n ääre-ssä { \*pane-e / saa } aja-n pysähty-mä-än.*  
 machine-GEN edge-INE put-3SG get.3SG time-ACC stop-3INF-ILL  
 “At the machine one can stop time.” (sk-40:1653)
- (17) *Hän { \*pan-i / sa-i } silmä-ni avautu-ma-an.*  
 (s)he.NOM put-IMP.3SG get-IMP.3SG eye-PL.ACC.PX1SG be opened-3INF-ILL  
 “She made my eyes open.” (sk-41:2218)
- (18) *Muutama-t joukkuee-t { pane-vat / \*saa-vat } raha-a haise-ma-an*  
 several team-PL.NOM put-3PL get-3PL money-PAR stink-3INF-ILL  
*sadoin tuhansin.*  
 hundreds thousands  
 “Several teams spent lots of money.” (sk-14:2183)
- (19) *31% vastanne-i-sta { pane-e / ?saa } mene-mä-än yli 500.*  
 31%.NOM Replied-PL-ELA put-3SG get.3SG go-3INF-ILL over 500  
 “31% of answerers spent over 500 marks.” (= (5))

From the examples above, it seems that the difference of the *panna* causative and the *saada* causative would be accounted for by the notion of **directness of causation**. This can be summed up as follows: If the Subject cannot directly affect the Object, the use of *saada* is necessary and that of *panna* is impossible; conversely, if the situation (i.e. the relationship of the embedded event and the Subject) requires the Subject to manipulate the Object directly, only *panna* is acceptable and *saada* cannot be used.

5. Now it is time to examine the Infinitives which appeared with *panna* and *saada*. First, let us look at the verbs in terms of transitivity. As Table 1 shows, in the *panna* clause the transitive and the intransitive are used almost as much, while in the *saada* clause the distribution is apparently skewed and the intransitive is predominant.

Table 1: Transitivity of the Infinitives appeared with *panna* and *saada*

Verbs classified \ Frequency	<i>panna</i>		<i>saada</i>	
	type	token	type	token
<b>Intransitive</b> (+ Clause)	32 0	36 0	149 14	209 15
<b>Transitive</b> (Null Object) (+ Infinitive, Clause, Participle Construction)	30 4 4	35 4 10	64 7 7	86 7 14
<b>Others</b>	3	3	2	2
<b>Total *</b>	73	88	243	333

\* As the example sometimes includes multiple Infinitive clauses, the total of Infinitives exceeds the total of their matrix verb.

Why is the intransitive so frequent with the verb *saada*? If one looks closely at the profiles of the Infinitives, a strong tendency is found with the *saada* causative: in the examples of *saada* found in the corpus, many intransitive Infinitives were such that the Subject corresponds to the Object of the corresponding transitive, not to the Subject of it.

Let us call this type of intransitive as S=O Intransitive. The most typical S=O Intransitive is the one derived from transitive with the suffix *-u/-y-*, *-utu/-yty-*, or *-ntu/-nty-*. Some attested examples of such derived S=O Intransitive are listed below.

S=O Intransitive		Corresponding Transitive	
<i>innostu-a</i>	‘become enthusiastic’	<i>innosta-a</i>	‘inspire’
<i>kirkastu-a</i>	‘become brighter’	<i>kirkasta-a</i>	‘make brighter’
<i>loukkaantu-a</i>	‘be injured’	<i>louka-ta</i>	‘hurt’
<i>muuttu-a</i>	‘change (into)’	<i>muutta-a</i>	‘change’
<i>näky-ä</i>	‘be seen’	<i>näh-dä</i>	‘look at’
<i>toteutu-a</i>	‘come true’	<i>toteutta-a</i>	‘carry out’
<i>unohtu-a</i>	‘be forgotten’	<i>unohta-a</i>	‘forget’
<i>vakuuttu-a</i>	‘convince oneself’	<i>vakuutta-a</i>	‘convince’

In addition to this, there are many other S=O Intransitives which appeared with *saada*. For example:

<i>huolestu-a</i>	‘be worried’	<i>huolestutta-a</i>	‘worry’
<i>peräänty-ä</i>	‘retreat’	<i>peräännyttä-ä</i>	‘withdraw’
<i>kylme-tä</i>	‘get colder’	<i>kylmentä-ä</i>	‘make colder’

In about 70% (143 tokens) of the cases of the intransitive infinitive verbs co-occurring with *saada* were the S=O Infinitive. On the contrary, this type of Infinitive remains marginal with *panna*, amounting to as much as 30% (11 tokens) of the total occurrences of the intransitive Infinitive.

The high frequency of this S=O type Infinitive is thus a good reason for the overall high frequency of intransitive Infinitive in the *saada* causative. Then, why does the *saada* causative prefer the S=O Intransitive? The Subject of the S=O Intransitive is not agentive, but under the influence of an outer factor (note that the Infinitive lacks voice distinction. See footnote 1). Further, the S=O Intransitive normally expresses a state of the Subject or a change of it. Considering these features I conclude that in the *saada* causative the embedded event tends to pick up the ultimate target to which a change is brought about. No such tendency is found for the *panna* causative.

6. To sum up, the comparison of the *panna* and *saada* causative shows the interesting differences between them. Qualitatively, the two causatives differ with their directness of causation. Quantitatively, *saada* tends to express the change of state that the embedded event states. *Panna* shows no such peculiarity.

The two findings on the difference of the *panna* and *saada* causative are not mutually incompatible, but rather they can be nicely put in the category of **attitude of the speaker toward the event**: while in the former the action of the Subject itself is focused on, in the latter the change in the state of the Object is highlighted.

### Acknowledgements

The present study is supported by the Project of “[The Endangered Languages of the Pacific Rim](#)” (Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Priority Areas) financed by the Japan Ministry of Education, Science, Sport and Culture. This study is a contribution by one of the research units in the project (“[Digitalization of Linguistic Data and Information Retrieval for the Study of Endangered Languages](#)”) and the intention is to develop a computer-searchable database of minority languages.

### Abbreviations

&	= Enumerative Particle	NOM	= Nominative
1,2,3	= Person	PAR	= Partitive
INF	= Infinitive (1 <sup>st</sup> – 3 <sup>rd</sup> )	PASS	= Passive
ACC	= Accusative	PL	= Plural
ALL	= Allative	PRPT	= Present Participle
COND	= Conditional	PSPT	= Past Participle
ELA	= Elative	PX	= Possessive Suffix
GEN	= Genitive	REL	= Relative Pronoun
ILL	= Illative	SG	= Singular
IMP	= Imperfect	VNEG	= Negative Verb
INE	= Inessive		

### References

- Dubrovina, Z. 1968 “III infinitiivin illatiivimuoto intransitiivi- ja transitiiviverbien kanssa suomen kielessä” *Congressus Secundus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum*. (CIFU II) 1. Helsinki: Societas Fenno-Ugrica. pp. 99–105.
- Hakulinen, Auli & Fred Karlsson 1979 *Nyky-suomen lauseoppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Jönsson-Korhola, Hannele & Leila White 1997 *Tarkista tästä*. Helsinki: Edita.
- Kemmer, Suzanne & Arie Verhagen 1994 “The grammar of causatives and the conceptual structure of events” *Cognitive Linguistics* 5: 115–156.
- Haarala, Risto (Editor in Chief) 1990-1994 *Suomen kielen perussanakirja*. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus.
- Penttilä, Aarni 1963<sup>2</sup> *Suomen kielioppi*. Porvoo: Werner Söderström.
- PS = Haarala, Risto (Editor in Chief) 1990-1994
- Setälä, E. N. 1973<sup>16</sup> [1880] *Suomen kielen lauseoppi*. Edited by Sadeniemi, Matti. Helsinki: Otava.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi 1976 “The grammar of causative constructions: A conspectus” In Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.) *The Grammar of Causative Constructions*. Syntax and Semantics 6. New York: Academic Press. pp. 1–40.
- Siro, Paavo 1963 *Suomen kielen lauseoppi*. Helsinki: Tietosanakirja.