

The Causative Constructions in the Finnish Language*

Jun'ichi SAKUMA

It is a well-known fact that the Finnish language has two types of causative construction. One is the analytical causative construction, which contains a third infinitive in the illative case. The other is the curative construction, the predicate of which is a curative verb. In most of the cases these two constructions are not interchangeable. Sometimes they are nearly synonymous but there are still somewhat differences between them. In order to explain the difference, it will be useful to consider the argument structure of each construction. Considering the argument structure, it becomes clear that the two causative constructions differ in the focus of their description.

1. Introduction

In the Finnish language there are two types of causative construction. One is the analytical causative construction, in which the causee functions as the matrix object and the caused event is expressed by a third infinitive in the illative case. Take the following for example:

- (1) *Keisari pani orjat rakentamaan temppelin.*
emperor-nom.sg. make-3.sg.p. slave-nom.pl. build-3.inf.illat. temple-gen.sg.
The emperor made the slaves build a temple.

In this sentence the causer is the emperor and the causee is the slaves and they function as the matrix subject and the matrix object respectively.

The other type of causative construction is the so-called curative construction, in which the matrix predicate is a curative verb. In this type of construction the causee is expressed as an adverbial marked in the adessive case. The following serves as an example:

- (2) *Keisari rakennutti orjilla temppelin.*
emperor-nom.sg. make someone build-3.sg.p. slave-adess.pl. temple-gen.sg.
The emperor made the slaves build a temple.

In this sentence the causer is the emperor and functions as the subject. The causee, on the other hand, is the slaves and is indicated in the adessive case.

The event described in each sentence seems to be identical with each other. If this is the case, these two sentences are freely interchangeable. As is pointed out in literatures, however, this is not always the case¹. Then, the question is what the difference is between these two types of causative construction. The function served by each construction should also be clarified. Although many studies have been made on the causative constructions, additional studies are

still in need to solve these questions.

2. Causative derivation

Let us begin with the causative derivation. A curative verb meaning causation is derived from a basic verb. A curative verb is called *teettöverb*i in Finnish. In principle, the basis of the derivation of a curative verb is a transitive predicate². A causative suffix employed in the derivation is mainly *-utta-*. For example:

- | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|---|---|
| (3) | rakentaa 'to construct' | — | rakenn <u>uttaa</u> 'to make someone construct' |
| | kirjoittaa 'to write' | — | kirjoit <u>uttaa</u> 'to make someone write' |
| | ommella 'to sew' | — | ompe <u>luttaa</u> 'to make someone sew' |

In each line the verb in the right-hand is a curative verb and is derived from the basic verb in the left-hand.

What should be noticed here is that a curative verb can be derived from an intransitive predicate, too. In this case, it is *-tta-* that is most commonly employed as a causative suffix. Take the following for example:

- | | | | |
|-----|--------------------|---|--|
| (4) | putoa 'to fall' | — | pu <u>dottaa</u> 'to make something fall' |
| | sulata 'to melt' | — | sul <u>attaa</u> 'to make something melt' |
| | itkeä 'to cry' | — | itk <u>ettää</u> 'to make someone cry' |
| | tanssia 'to dance' | — | tans <u>sittaa</u> 'to make someone dance' |

It is important to note that the derived verbs listed in (4) should be divided into at least two subgroups. The verbs *pudottaa* and *sulattaa* belong to one subgroup, and the verbs *itkettää* and *tanssittaa* to another.

The verbs of the former subgroup contain the causative suffix *-tta-* indeed, but it is difficult to say that these verbs convey causality. For example:

- (5) *Lapsi pudotti lasin lattialle.*
 child-nom.sg. drop-3.sg.p. glass-gen.sg. floor-allat.sg.
 A child dropped a glass on the floor.

In this sentence, the referent of the object is not a human and it cannot be regarded as the causee. Moreover, it is not possible to introduce a third causee argument into this sentence. Then, it is better to characterize a verb belonging to the former subgroup merely as the transitive counterpart of a basic intransitive predicate.

On the other hand, the verbs of the latter subgroup do convey the causative meaning. The following serves as an example:

- (6) *Opettaja tansitti oppilaita.*
 teacher-nom.sg. make someone dance-3.sg.p. pupil-part.pl.
 The teacher made the pupils dance.

In this sentence, the subject and the object serve as the causer and the causee respectively. As

is pointed out in Pylkkänen (2008), intransitive predicates from which one can derive curative verbs are classified as unergative predicates.

We should not overlook, however, that the causee of this sentence is not marked in the adessive case but in the partitive case, which is the case available for objects. Then, one can exclude sentences like (6) from the curative construction because of the difference in the case marking of the causee. In fact, in the large-scale reference grammar, *Iso Suomen Kielioppi* (Hakulinen et al., 2004), a causative verb derived from an intransitive predicate is not regarded as a curative verb³. It is also possible, however, to regard the sentence (6) as an instance of the curative construction from a semantic point of view. The different case marking of the causee argument can be explained by the difference in the number of the required arguments. The sentence (2) above apparently contains three arguments: the causer, the causee (= the agent) and the patient. In this case, it is not the causee but the patient which is chosen as the object. This means that the causee argument cannot be marked in the cases available for objects. On the other hand, in the sentence (6) only two arguments, the causer and the causee, are needed to be present. Then, the causee argument can be chosen as the object and be marked in the cases available for objects.

The same can be said of the following two sentences:

- (7) *Opettaja laulatti kuoroa.*
 teacher-nom.sg. make someone sing-3.sg.p. choir-part.sg.
 The teacher made the choir sing.

- (8) *Opettaja laulatti kuorolla tuttuja sävelmiä.*
 teacher make someone sing choir-adess.sg. familiar-part.pl. melody-part.pl.
 The teacher made the choir sing familiar melodies.

Roughly speaking, these two sentences convey a similar meaning. However, they are different in their number of the required arguments. The sentence (8) apparently has three arguments, including the patient which is absent from the sentence (7). This is the reason the causee argument is marked not in the partitive case but in the adessive case in the sentence (8). On the other hand, in the sentence (7) the causee serves as the object and therefore can be marked in the partitive case.

3. Curative construction and analytical causative construction

It is important to note here that the causee can often be omitted in the curative construction. Take the following for example:

- (9) *Keisari rakennutti temppelin.*
 emperor-nom.sg. make someone build-3.sg.p. temple-gen.sg.
 The emperor commanded to build a temple.

Compared to the sentence (2) above, it is evident that the causee is missing in this sentence. If the causee can often be omitted, however, the question arises. How many arguments does the

curative construction contain?

In previous studies it is pointed out that the formation of a curative verb can be applied cyclically, deriving a curative verb from another one⁴. For example:

- | | | |
|------|-----------------|--|
| (10) | basic verb | tehdä 'to do, to make' |
| | → curative verb | teettää 'to make someone do, to have ... made' |
| | → curative verb | teetättää |
| | → curative verb | teetätyttää |
| | → curative verb | ?teetätytättää |

Needless to say, these verbs differ in their meaning. The verb *teettää* takes three participants, i.e. the causer, the causee (= the agent) and the patient, but the verb *teetättää* implies that there is one more participant. This additional participant functions as the causee with respect to the causer but functions as the causer with respect to the agent. Then, the four participants the verb *teetättää* takes are as follows: the causer, the causee that serves as the causer at the same time, the causee (= the agent) and the patient.

Being the causee, the second participant can be marked in the adessive case. It is not possible, however, to indicate the third participant in the adessive case, if the second participant is overtly expressed. Let us now compare the following two sentences. That is:

- (11) *Kapteeni haetti luutnantilla ratsunsa.*
 captain-nom.sg. make someone fetch-3.sg.p. lieutenant-adess.sg. horse-gen.sg.
 The captain made the lieutenant fetch his horse. (Pennanen 1986: 166)

- (12) *Kapteeni haetutti luutnantilla ratsunsa.*
 captain-nom.sg. command a person to make someone fetch-3.sg.p. lieutenant-adess.sg.
 horse-gen.sg.
 The captain commanded the lieutenant to have his horse fetched.
 (Pennanen 1986: 166)

In the sentence (11) the lieutenant serves both as the causee and as the agent. On the other hand, in the sentence (12) the agent is not the lieutenant but some other person that is not overtly expressed. It must be noted that the lieutenant can even be omitted from the sentence (11). That is:

- (13) *Kapteeni haetti ratsunsa.*
 captain-nom.sg. make someone fetch-3.sg.p. horse-gen.sg.
 The captain commanded to fetch his horse.

What are described in this sentence are the causer's causation and the accomplishment of the caused event. On the part of the causer's causation, however, the causer's counterpart, i.e. the causee, is not specified.

As a matter of fact, the distinction among verbs in a causative derivational chain like (10) above is not always explicit. Compare the following two sentences:

- (14a) *Käy säännöllisesti hammaslääkärilläsi poistamassa jo muodostunut hammaskivi.*
 go-2.sg.imp. regularly dentist-adess.sg. remove-3.inf.iness. already
 form-p.p.-nom.sg. scale-nom.sg.

Go to your dentist regularly to remove the already formed scale.

(Hakulinen et al. 2004: 312)

- (14b) *Käy säännöllisesti hammaslääkärilläsi poistattamassa jo muodostunut hammaskivi.*
 go-2.sg.imp. regularly dentist-adess.sg. make someone remove-3.inf.iness.
 already form-p.p.-nom.sg. scale-nom.sg.

Go to your dentist regularly to have the already formed scale removed.

(Hakulinen et al. 2004: 312)

The sentence (14a) is a passage printed on a package of toothpaste. Then, the referent of the covert matrix subject must be a consumer of that toothpaste. Since the third infinitive in the inessive case, *poistamassa*, has the same subject as the matrix predicate, the sentence (14a) literally means that a consumer should remove his scale by himself. On the other hand, in the sentence (14b) it is described that a consumer should have his dentist remove his scale. Although what would happen in reality is not the former but the latter situation, it is not (14b) but (14a) that is printed on a package.

On the contrary, in another example a basic verb is substituted by a curative verb. That is:

- (15) *Laihduttajat poistattavat nestettä vartalostaan syömällä purkkitolkulla ananasta.*
 dieter-nom.pl. remove-3.pl.pr. water-part.sg. body-elat.sg. eat-3.inf.adess.
 can after can pineapple-part.sg.

Dieters remove water from their body by eating can after can of pineapples.

(Hakulinen et al. 2004: 312)

Since the matrix predicate is a curative verb, it should not be dieters themselves but someone else who removes the water. As a matter of fact, however, the reverse is true and the corresponding basic predicate, *poistaa*, is a more suitable alternative. It is important to note that the causee is overtly expressed neither in the sentence (14b) nor in the sentence (15), though both sentences contain a curative verb⁵. Again, this shows that the causee is not an essential participant of the curative construction.

Let us now turn to the other type of causative construction, that is, the analytical causative construction. In this construction, the causee argument functions as the matrix object and therefore it is indispensable. It can be omitted only when it is recoverable from the context. Matrix causative predicates vary according to the degree of causality. With respect to the case marking, they can be divided into two subgroups. One is the group of verbs whose object can be marked in the genitive case. This group consists of verbs like *panna* 'to make', *komentaa* 'to command', *määrätä* 'to order', *pakottaa* 'to compel' and *houkutella* 'to induce'. The other is the

group of verbs whose object is always in the partitive case. The verbs that belong to the latter group are *kehottaa* 'to urge', *rohkaista* 'to encourage', *vaatia* 'to demand' and *käskää* 'to order', for example.

In the analytical causative construction a caused event is expressed not by a matrix predicate but by a third infinitive in the illative case. For example, the same situation described in the sentence (8) can be expressed by utilizing the analytical causative construction. That is:

- (16) *Opettaja* *pani* *kuoroa* *laulamaan* *tuttuja*
 teacher-nom.sg. make-3.sg.p. choir-part.sg. sing-3.inf.illat. familiar-part.pl.
sävelmiä.
 melody-part.pl.
 The teacher made the choir sing familiar melodies.

In this sentence the third infinitive in the illative case takes an object. A third infinitive does not always take an object, however. Take the following for example:

- (17) *Opettaja* *pani* *kuoroa* *laulamaan.*
 teacher-nom.sg. make-3.sg.p. choir-part.sg. sing-3.inf.illat.
 The teacher made the choir sing.

This sentence corresponds to the sentence (7) above. As is shown from these sentences, the curative construction and the analytical causative construction have some parallels. What is nevertheless important is the fact that there are still some differences between these constructions.

4. Event structure of the causative constructions

To solve the problem mentioned above, it would be useful to consider the structure of events described in each of the two causative constructions. First of all, the event structure of the causatives consists of two parts: one is the causer's causation and the other is the causee's performance of the caused event. The causer's causation presupposes an asymmetrical relationship between a causer and a causee. In principle a causer is an initiator but is not an actual agent of the caused event. It is a causee that functions as an actual agent. It is not always the case, however, that a causer does not participate in the caused event. For example:

- (18) *Mies* *tansitti* *yleisöä.*
 man-nom.sg. make someone dance-3.sg.p. public-part.sg.
 The man made the people dance. (Pajunen 2001: 133)

In this sentence not only the causee but also the causer can be interpreted as the agent of the caused event, if it was the causer himself that showed the people the way of dancing.

We should not overlook that two constructions differ in the part of the causee's performance of the caused event. In the curative construction the caused event should be thoroughly accomplished. This is evident from the fact that the following sentence sounds odd:

- (19) ?*Keisari rakennutti temppelin mutta temppeli*
 emperor-nom.sg. make someone build-3.sg.p. temple-gen.sg. but temple-nom.sg.
ei valmistunut.
 not finish-3.sg.p.
 The emperor commanded to build a temple but the temple was not finished.

It is strongly implied in this sentence that the construction of the temple has been finished.

It is important to note that the same is not necessarily true of the analytical causative construction. Whether or not the thorough accomplishment of the caused event is implied depends on the meaning of a matrix predicate. When a matrix predicate is a verb of accomplishment, the caused event should be thoroughly performed. On the other hand, a verb of compulsion and a verb of urging do not necessarily imply the thorough accomplishment of the caused event. Let us compare the following sentences. That is:

- (20) ?*Keisari pani orjat rakentamaan temppelin mutta*
 emperor-nom.sg. make-3.sg.p. slave-nom.pl. build-3.inf.illat. temple-gen.sg. but
temppeli ei valmistunut.
 temple-nom.sg. not finish-3.sg.p.
 The emperor made the slaves build a temple but the temple was not finished.

- (21) *Keisari määräsi orjat rakentamaan temppelin mutta*
 emperor-nom.sg. order-3.sg.p. slave-nom.pl. build-3.inf.illat. temple-gen.sg. but
temppeli ei valmistunut.
 temple-nom.sg. not finish-3.sg.p.
 The emperor ordered the slaves to build a temple but the temple was not finished.

- (22) *Keisari vaati orjia rakentamaan temppelin mutta*
 emperor-nom.sg. demand-3.sg.p. slave-part.pl. build-3.inf.illat. temple-gen.sg. but
temppeli ei valmistunut.
 temple-nom.sg. not finish-3.sg.p.
 The emperor demanded that the slaves should build a temple but the temple was not finished.

This difference between the two causative constructions is also evident from the following two sentences:

- (23) ?*Lähetysin kirjeen assistentilla.*
 make someone send-1.sg.p. letter-gen.sg. assistant-adess.sg.
 I made the assistant send the letter. (Pajunen 2001: 141)
- (24) *Pistin assistentin lähettämään kirjeen.*
 push-1.sg.p. assistant-gen.sg. send-3.inf.illat. letter-gen.sg.
 I pushed the assistant to send the letter. (Pajunen 2001: 141)

The oddity of the sentence (23) can be attributed to the fact that not the assistant but a

postman delivers the letter to the recipient. To put it the other way round, asking the assistant to deliver the letter does not ensure the arrival of the letter at the recipient. Since the curative construction implies the causee's thorough performance, the sentence (23) sounds odd. The oddity can be wiped away by adding a phrase 'to a mailbox'. That is:

- (25) *Lähetysin kirjeen postiin assistentilla.*
 make someone send-1.sg.p. letter-gen.sg. mailbox-illat.sg. assistant-adess.sg.
 I made the assistant take the letter to a mailbox. (Pajunen 2001: 141)

On the other hand, in the analytical causative construction it is not necessary that the caused event is completely finished. The sentence (24) is acceptable, even though an actual deliverer, i.e. a postman, is not mentioned in the sentence.

Thus, these examples cited above make it clear what is crucial to the analytical causative construction is not the causee's performance of the caused event but the causer's causation, and the reverse is true of the curative construction. As mentioned above, the causee marked in the adessive case in the curative construction can be often omitted. In this construction the causee's performance is crucial indeed, but the causee himself can be left without mention. This is because it matters little who is the causee, as far as the caused event is thoroughly performed.

Now we may recall that a curative verb derived from an unergative predicate can appear in the curative construction. The sentence (7), repeated here for convenience as the sentence (26), serves as an example:

- (26) *Opettaja laulatti kuoroa.*
 teacher-nom.sg. make someone sing-3.sg.p. choir-part.sg.
 The teacher made the choir sing.

This sentence can be paraphrased by the analytical causative construction as follows:

- (27) *Opettaja käski kuoroa laulamaan.*
 teacher-nom.sg. order-3.sg.p. choir-part.sg. sing-3.inf.illat.
 The teacher ordered the choir to sing.

What should be noticed here is that only two participants are involved in the event described by these two sentences. Moreover, these two participants cannot be omitted from either of the sentences. Then, it seems that these two sentences convey the same meaning. This is not the case, however, since each of the two sentences has a different implication from each other. This is evident from the following sentences with a slight modification of (26) and (27) respectively. That is:

- (28) *?Opettaja laulatti kuoroa mutta kuoro ei laulanut.*
 teacher-nom.sg. make someone sing-3.sg.p. choir-part.sg. but choir-nom.sg.
 not sing-3.sg.p.
 The teacher made the choir sing but the choir did not sing.

- (29) *Opettaja k ski kuoroa laulamaan mutta kuoro
 teacher-nom.sg. order-3.sg.p. choir-part.sg. sing-3.inf.illat. but choir-nom.sg.
 ei laulanut.
 not sing-nom.sg.
 The teacher ordered the choir to sing but the choir did not sing.*

The difference in grammaticality should be attributed to the difference of the meaning conveyed in each of the sentences. The sentence (28) sounds odd, since the former part of the sentence strongly implies that the caused event has been completed. Thus, the difference between the sentences (26) and (27) can be explained just in the same way as we have seen above as to the sentences containing three participants.

5. Valency of the causative constructions

From what has been said above it is clear that the causee cannot be counted as an obligatory argument of a curative verb. Although it is commonly claimed that in the causative derivation an argument is added to the predicate, this claim does not necessarily apply to the Finnish language⁶. In the previous studies it is pointed out that the affix employed in the causative derivation of the Finnish language has the same origin as that employed in the impersonal passive formation⁷. In fact, both of the affixes have *-tA* in common. If these two affixes have the same origin, it is possible that their functions have also some parallels. Since the function served by the latter affix is the suppression of the agent, the former might have the same function. In other words, both affixes may indicate that the actual agent of the described event is someone unspecified. It is worth noting that these two affixes can co-occur within one and the same sentence. For example:

- (30) *Palatsin rinnalle rakennutettiin temppeleli.
 palace-gen.sg. next to make someone build-pass.p. temple-nom.sg.
 It was commanded that a temple should be built next to the palace.*

This sentence is the impersonal passive counterpart of the curative construction. In this sentence not only the causee but also the causer is not overtly expressed.

On the other hand, the causee cannot be omitted in the analytical causative construction. This is because what is focused in this construction is the causer's causation directed to the causee. Moreover, in this construction a third infinitive complement cannot be omitted, either. Then, if we count an infinitival phrase as an argument, we can say that the analytical causative construction contains three arguments: the causer, the causee and the caused event.

In the analytical causative construction a third infinitive complement is indicated in the illative case⁸. The basic meaning conveyed by the illative case is a directional movement to a designated goal and the same is true of the allative case. In the Finnish language there are some verbs that take a case of directional movement as one of their arguments. Among them the verb *antaa* may be the most representative. Take the following for example:

- (31) *Joulupukki antoi lapsille lahjoja.*
 Santa Claus-nom.sg. give-3.sg.p. child-allat.pl. present-part.pl.
 Santa Claus gave presents to the children.

In this sentence the argument marked in the allative case serves as the recipient. The verb *antaa* indicates a transfer of possession from the referent of the subject to the referent of the recipient. A transfer of possession can be metaphorically regarded as a directional movement. Then, this is the reason the recipient is marked in the allative case.

On the other hand, in the following sentence a nominal marked in the allative case does not serve as an argument. It is an additional element and can be freely omitted. That is:

- (32) *Joka päivä hän kirjoitti äidilleen kirjeen.*
 every day he-nom. write-3.sg.p. mother-allat.sg. letter-gen.sg.
 Every day he wrote a letter to his mother.

In Pyllkkänen(2008) an additional element like this is called an applicative. The distribution of applicative elements is rather restricted indeed, but not only a transitive predicate but also an unaccusative predicate can take an applicative. For example:

- (33) *Joka päivä hänelle tuli kolme kirjettä.*
 every day he-allat. come-3.sg.p. three-nom.sg. letter-part.sg.
 Every day three letters came to him.

It is important to note that an applicative element can be regarded as the possessor of the co-occurred argument. For example, the mother in the sentence (32) can be interpreted as the possessor of the letter written by the referent of the subject, since the letter would be delivered to her. Similarly, in the sentence (33) the applicative element marked in the allative case becomes the possessor of the letters, once its referent receives them. Moreover, we should not overlook what is described in the sentences (32) and (33) is a directional movement of the referent of the object or the subject. Again, this is the reason applicative elements are marked in the allative case⁹.

Needless to say, the analytical causative construction does not convey a physical movement. What is indicated in the illative case is not a human entity but a caused event. However, a metaphorical movement can be assumed also in this construction, since the referent of the causee argument is caused to do something and the third infinitive in the illative case indicates a goal to be reached. Then, the illative marking of the third infinitive can be explained in the same way as mentioned above. We should notice that a directional movement does not necessarily imply the arrival at a designated goal. What is intended by a directional movement is not a movement *to* a goal but a movement *toward* a goal. Thus, a movement can be half-way finished. This is the reason the caused event described in the analytical causative construction is not necessarily accomplished.

6. Concluding remarks

From what has been said above, it becomes clear that the two causative constructions, i.e. the curative construction and the analytical causative construction, serve a different function from each other. Then, these two constructions cannot be interchangeable in principle. Sometimes two constructions can be nearly synonymous but there are still somewhat differences between them. Both constructions describe the causer's causation and the causee's performance of the caused event indeed, but they are different in the focus of their description. The curative construction focuses on the accomplishment of the caused event, while the analytical causative construction the causer's causation. This difference can be suitably explained by considering their argument structure. The former has two arguments and the causee is an optional element. Therefore, the causer's causation cannot be the focus of the curative construction. On the other hand, the latter has three arguments, but the third infinitive in the illative case does not necessarily imply the thorough accomplishment of the caused event. Thus, the accomplishment of the caused event cannot be the focus of the analytical causative construction.

Notes

- * This research was supported by a grant-in-aid for scientific research (C): 2009–2012, No. 21520435, from the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture, Government of Japan.
- 1 On the causative constructions in the Finnish language, see in particular Hakulinen et al. (2004: 310–313, 455–456, 474) and Pajunen (2001: 121–147). General information on the causative constructions can be found from Pyllkkänen (2008).
 - 2 For further details of the causative derivation, see Kytömäki (1978, 1989), Pajunen (2001: 137–147) and Pennanen (1986), for example.
 - 3 For a detailed argument, see Hakulinen et al. (2004: 312–313).
 - 4 As a matter of fact, curative predicates derived through multiple formation, e.g. *teetätyttää* and *teetätyttää*, are rarely used. For further details, see Pajunen (2001: 137–147), for example.
 - 5 The sentence (14b) contains a nominal indicated in the adessive case, i.e. *hammaslääkäriilläsi* indeed. But this nominal is a complement of the matrix predicate *käydä* 'to go' and indicates the destination of going.
 - 6 When the causee of a curative verb is indicated in one of the cases available for objects, it cannot be omitted. Then, it can be said that the predicate of the sentence (6) *tansittaa*, for example, is a two-place predicate, although the corresponding basic verb *tansia* takes only one argument. In other words, one argument is added through the derivation from *tansia* to *tansittaa*.
 - 7 For further details of the origin of the causative affix, see Lehtinen (1984), for example.
 - 8 The Finnish language also has a construction in which a third infinitive in the elative case appears as a complement. Take the following for example:
 - (i) *Lääkäri kielsi minua polttamasta tupakkaa.*
 doctor-nom.sg. prohibit-3.sg.p. 1-part. smoke-3.inf.elat. tobacco-part.sg.
 The doctor prohibited me from smoking.

This type of sentence conveys prevention. The referent of the object should be kept from the action described by the third infinitive. In the Finnish language, a starting point of a parting movement is marked either in the elative case or in the ablative case. Since prevention can be metaphorically regarded as a parting movement, the infinitive should be marked in the elative case.

 - 9 An applicative element can be marked also in the ablative case. The following serves as an example:
 - (i) *Liisa myi Matilta talon.*
 L-nom. sell-3.sg.p. M-ablat. house-gen.sg.
 Liisa sold Matti's house. (Pyllkkänen 2008: 36)

In this sentence the referent of the applicative element is the former owner of the sold house. Then, we can say that the relationship between an applicative element and its co-occurred argument is identical, irrespective of the case indicating it. For further details of the applicative construction in the Finnish language, see in particular Pyllkkänen (2008).

Abbreviations

nom.—nominative	gen.—genitive	part.—partitive	iness.—inessive
illat.—illative	elat.—elative	adess.—adessive	allat.—allative
ablat.—ablative	sg.—singular	pl.—plural	pr.—present
p.—past	imp.—imperative	pass.—impersonal passive	inf.—infinitive

References

- Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen & Irja Alho (eds.), 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Kytömäki, Leena, 1978. Kuratiivikausatiivit. *Rakenteita: Juhlakirja Osmo Ikolan 60-vuotispäiväksi* (Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 6): 129–150.
- Kytömäki, Leena, 1989. Teetoverbit: johdon ja taivutuksen välimaastoa. *Sananjalka* 31: 61–79.
- Lehtinen, Tapani, 1984. *Itämerensuomen passiivin alkuperästä*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Pajunen, Anneli, 2001. *Argumenttirakenne*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Pennanen, Esko V, 1986. On the so-called curative verbs in Finnish. *Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen* 47: 163–182.
- Pylkkänen, Liina, 2008. *Introducing Arguments*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.