

The Permissive Construction in the Finnish Language^{*)}

Jun'ichi Sakuma

1. Introduction

I have already argued in my previous paper (1995) that the participial construction in the Finnish language is related to the construction with *sallia* or *antaa*. In both of the constructions, the semantic subject of a complement is indicated in the genitive case¹⁾. For example:

- (1) *Toinen tutkimus kertoo suomalais-ten*
 other-nom. sg. study-nom. sg. tells Finn-gen. pl.
tietä-vä-n nykyaja-n ruto-sta paljon.
 know-pr. p. gen. today's plague-el. sg. much

The other study tells that Finns know much about the today's plague.²⁾

- (2) *Naise-t sall-i-vat mies-ten hyväillä*
 woman-nom. pl. allow-3. pl. p. man-gen. pl. caress-1. inf.
käs-i-n he-i-dän sile-i-tä päälak-i-a-an.
 by hand their smooth-part. pl. crown-part. pl.

Women allowed men to caress their smooth crown by hand.³⁾

In (1), *suomalaiset*, the semantic subject of the present participle *tietävän*, is indicated in the genitive case. In (2), *miehet*, the semantic subject of the first infinitive *hyväillä*, is marked also in the genitive case. In the Finnish language, while the genitive case is identical in form with the so-called accusative case in the singular, it is not identical in the plural. And, both of the nouns in question are in the plural. Then, their case-marking admits of no other interpretation. Neither noun in question can be the object of the matrix predicate.

The semantic subject of a first infinitive is also indicated in the genitive case, when the matrix predicate is *antaa*, as the following example shows:

- (3) *Joulunaatto-na äiti anto-i*
 Christmas Eve-ess. sg. mother-nom. sg. allow-3. sg. p.
me-i-dän valvoa myöhään.

our sit up-1. inf. late

On Christmas Eve Mother allowed us to sit up late.

The semantic subject of the first infinitive *valvoa* is *meidän*, which is the genitive form of the first person plural pronoun. Since the accusative form of the personal pronoun is not identical with the genitive form, *meidän* in (3) cannot be interpreted to be the object of the matrix predicate *antaa*.

And, the same is true of the matrix predicate *suoda*⁴⁾. Take the following for example:

- (4) *Häne-n ei suo-tu nähdä laps-i-a-an*
 his not allow-pass. p. see-1. inf. child-part. pl.
aikuis-i-na.
 adult-ess. pl.

He was never to see his children grown up.⁵⁾

Here, *hänen*, the semantic subject of the first infinitive *nähdä*, is the genitive form of the third person singular pronoun and it cannot be regarded as the object of the matrix predicate *suoda*.

We should notice, however, that the construction with *sallia*, *antaa* or *suoda*, what is called the permissive construction, is somewhat peculiar⁶⁾. In the permissive construction, the referent of the semantic subject of a first infinitive complement is not the same as that of the matrix subject. And, the semantic subject of a complement can be omitted. In this case, the referent of it should be the generic person. For example:

- (5) *Poliisi sall-i tori-lle*
 police-nom. sg. allow-3. sg. p. square-all. sg.
kokootua mielenosoitukse-en.
 assemble-1. inf. demonstration-ill. sg.

The police allowed holding a demonstration in the square.

On the other hand, in other constructions which take a first infinitive as their complement, the referent of the semantic subject of a complement cannot be different from that of the matrix subject. The semantic subject of a complement is always omitted, and the referent of it cannot be the generic person. Take the following for example:

- (6a) *Halua-t-ko taistella maa-si puole-sta?*
 want-2. sg. pr. fight-1. inf. country-gen. sg. for

Do you want to fight for your country?

The referent of the semantic subject of the first infinitive *taistella* in (6a) is not the

generic person but is the same as that of the matrix subject, that is, elliptic *sinä* (=you). If the semantic subject of a complement refers to a different entity, not a first infinitive but a participle or an *että*-clause should be used as the complement, as (6b), (6c) and (6d) show:

(6b) **Halua-t-ko minu-n/minu-a taistella*
 want-2. sg. pr. I-gen./I-part. fight-1. inf.

maa-si puole-sta?

country-gen. sg. for

Do you want me to fight for your country?

(6c) *Halua-t-ko minu-n taistele-va-n*
 want-2. sg. pr. I-gen. fight-pr. p. gen.

maa-si puole-sta?

country-gen. sg. for

(6d) *Halua-t-ko että minä taistele-n*
 want-2. sg. pr. that I-nom. fight-1. sg. pr.

maa-si puole-sta?

country-gen. sg. for

It may also be worth pointing out that the semantic subject of a third infinitive complement, unlike that of a first infinitive complement, can refer to the generic person. For example:

(7) *Pyydä-n lopetta-ma-an riida-n.*
 ask-1. sg. pr. end-3. inf. ill. quarrel-gen. sg.⁷⁾

I ask that the quarrel be ended.

The semantic subject can also be overtly expressed, as the following example shows:

(8) *Pyydä-n sinu-a lopetta-ma-an*
 ask-1. sg. pr. you-part. sg. give up-3. inf. ill.

tupakanpolto-n.

smoking-gen. sg.

I ask you to give up smoking.

When this is the case, the semantic subject of a complement, however, is indicated as the object of the matrix predicate. In (8), for example, *sinä*, the semantic subject of the third infinitive *lopettamaan*, is indicated in the partitive case. Then, it should be regarded as the object of the matrix predicate *pyytää*, while the semantic subject of a complement of the permissive construction cannot be the object of the matrix predi-

cate, as the examples above, (2), (3) and (4) show.

These facts show that the permissive construction is peculiar. It is different from other constructions that take a first infinitive as their complement. It differs also from constructions which take a third infinitive as their complement in the case-marking pattern of the semantic subject of the complement⁸⁾. Then, how can this peculiarity of the permissive construction be explained? The purpose of this paper is to study in detail the permissive construction as compared with the participial construction and also other related constructions, and seek some suitable explanation to the peculiarity of the permissive construction.

2. Participial construction

Let us start with the participial construction. As has been pointed out in the previous studies⁹⁾, an element of a subordinate participial clause of the participial construction can be moved across the clausal boundary. In fact, we can find lots of examples of the participial construction in which elements are scrambled irrespective of the clausal boundary. In most of the cases, the predicate of the matrix clause is in the passive voice. And the typical word order is S2-V1-X1-V2-X2. Here, S2 represents the subject of the subordinate participial clause, V1 the predicate of the matrix clause, and V2 the predicate of the subordinate clause, i.e. a participle. X1, other elements of the matrix clause, and X2, other elements of the subordinate clause, are optional. An example of this is as follows:

- (9) *Tuule-n odote-ta-an laantu-va-n*
 wind-gen. sg. expect-pass. pr. subside-pr. p. gen.
yöksi.
 for the night

It is expected that the wind will subside at night.¹⁰⁾

In this example, *tuulen* is S2, *odotetaan* is V1 and *laantuvan* is V2. From one of the corpora of the Department of General Linguistics, Helsinki University, 289 examples of the participial construction are found¹¹⁾. Out of 289, 112 examples have a matrix predicate in the passive voice. And, the word order of 73 examples out of 112 is, in fact, S2-V1-X1-V2-X2. Moreover, there are also other examples where elements are scrambled, even though the predicate of their matrix clause is in the active voice. Take the following for example:

- (10) *Pankk-i-en sijoittumise-n ulkoma-i-lle*

bank-gen. pl. investment-gen. sg. foreign country-all. pl.

ei Tuominen usko enää

not T. -nom. sg. believe-3. sg. pr. any longer

sama-lla tavo-i-n laajene-va-n kuin vielä

in the same way expand-pr. p. gen. as still

vuosi pari sitten.

one or two years ago

Tuominen does not believe any longer that the foreign investment of the banks will expand in the same way as it still did one or two years ago.¹²⁾

Here, *pankkien sijoittumisen ulkomaille* is S2, *Tuominen* is S1, *usko* is V1 and *laajenevan* is V2. Then, the word order of (10) is S2-S1-V1-V2. Scrambling like this does never take place in the construction that takes an *että*-clause as its complement.

The participial construction is different from the construction with an *että*-clause also in the case-marking pattern of the object of the complement. In the construction with an *että*-clause, the case-marking of the object of a complement is determined in principle irrespective of factors outside the complement. On the other hand, in the participial construction, a factor outside a participial complement could have some influence upon the case-marking of the object of the complement. When a participial complement co-occurs with a negative matrix clause, the object of the complement is marked in the partitive case under the influence of the negation of the matrix clause.

For example:

(11) *Hän ei usko kene-n-kään aloitta-va-n*

he not believe-3. sg. pr. anybody-gen. sg. open-pr. p. gen.

tietoisesti sota-a Euroopa-ssa.

intentionally war-part. sg. Europe-in. sg.

He does not believe that anybody opens war in Europe intentionally.¹³⁾

While the verb *aloittaa* usually takes a genitive object, *sota*, the object of *aloittavan*, the present participle of the verb, is in the partitive case because of the negation of the matrix clause.

We should notice, however, that the case-marking of the object of a participial complement is not always determined under the influence of factors outside the complement. The object of a participial complement is not marked in the nominative case, even when the predicate of the matrix clause is in the passive voice or in the imperative mood. The following serves as an example:

- (12) *Pakkase-n laske-ta-an välillisesti*
 cold weather-gen. sg. estimate-pass. pr. indirectly
aiheutta-nee-n usea-n ihmise-n kuolema-n
 cause-p. p. gen. many-gen. sg. man-gen. sg. death-gen. sg.
liikenneonnettomuuks-i-ssa.
 traffic accident-in.pl.

It is estimated that many people died in traffic accidents under the indirect influence of cold weather.¹⁴⁾

In (12), while the matrix predicate *laskea* is in the passive voice, *kuolema*, the object of the participle *aiheuttaneen*, is not in the nominative case but in the genitive case.

This is in contrast with the fact that the object of an infinitive complement is always marked in the nominative case under the condition stated above. For example:

- (13) *Minu-a pyyde-tti-in anta-ma-an kyläläis-i-lle*
 I-part. ask-pass. p. give-3. inf. ill. villager-all. pl.
neuvo.
 piece of advice-nom. sg.

I was asked to give villagers a piece of advice.

Here, *neuvo*, the object of the third infinitive *antamaan*, is marked in the nominative case, since the matrix predicate *pyytää* is in the passive voice. This fact suggests that the clausal boundary of the participial construction indeed serves as a barrier in some cases.

The participial construction can be characterized also by the meaning it conveys. Not all verbs can take a participial complement. For instance, following verbs are used as a matrix predicate in examples of the participial construction found from one of the corpora of the Department of General Linguistics, Helsinki University¹⁵⁾. Verbs can be classified into three groups according to their meaning. First, some belong to the so-called speech act verbs:

sanoa (say); *kertoa* (tell), *viestittää* (tell); *ilmoittaa* (report); *paljastaa* (show); *vihjailla* (suggest); *todeta* (state); *väittää* (claim); *osoittaa* (prove), *todistaa* (prove); *päätellä* (conclude); *myöntää* (admit), *tunnustaa* (admit); *muistuttaa* (remind); *varoittaa* (warn); *valittaa* (complain); *jupista* (grumble); *mainostaa* (advertise)

Secondly, some verbs denote thinking in a broad sense:

luulla (think), *ajatella* (think); *arvella* (suppose), *olettaa* (suppose), *otaksua*

(suppose); *epäillä* (doubt); *kuvitella* (imagine); *arvata* (guess); *ennustaa* (forecast), *ennakoida* (forecast); *arvioida* (estimate), *laskea* (estimate); *tulkita* (interpret)

Following verbs may form a subdivision of this class:

uskoa (believe); *odottaa* (expect); *toivoa* (hope); *haluta* (want)

And, finally, they are the verbs of sensation.

nähdä (see), *katsoa* (see); *kuulla* (hear); *tuntea* (feel); *pelätä* (fear); *aistia* (sense); *havaita* (observe), *kokea* (observe); *huomata* (realize), *ymmärtää* (realize); *tietää* (know); *muistaa* (remember)

None of these verbs with a participial complement imply direct influence of the matrix subject upon the semantic subject of the complement. In other words, the process or situation expressed in a participial complement can be true independently, whether the matrix clause is affirmative or not.

This fact will lead us into further consideration. That is, the semantic independence of a participial complement may account for the case-marking pattern of the object of the complement. As stated above, the case-marking of the object of a participial complement is not always influenced by factors outside the complement. This is because the participial complement is semantically independent from the matrix clause.

What has to be noticed is, however, that there can also be a deviation as is the tendency of human language. Then, under the influence of the negation of the matrix clause, the object of a participial complement is marked in the partitive case, although the propositional meaning of the complement is not affected by the negation.

3. The permissive construction

Let us now turn to the permissive construction¹⁶⁾. As stated above in the beginning of this paper, the case-marking pattern of the subject of a complement is a peculiarity of the permissive construction. To explain this peculiarity, a comparison with the participial construction may be helpful, since the case-marking pattern of the subject of a complement is common to these two constructions.

There are indeed also differences between these two constructions. For example, in the permissive construction, unlike in the participial construction, factors outside a complement always influence the case-marking of the object of the complement. The following provides an example:

(14) *Heti tämä-n jälkeen salli-tti-in hallitsija-*

soon this-gen. sg. after allow-pass. p. ruler and
pari-lle tuoda Iso-britania-n
 consort-all. sg. bring-1. inf. Great Britain-gen. sg.
lahja-na kerran kuu-ssa laatikollinen
 present-ess. sg. once month-in. sg. case-nom. sg.
appelsiine-j-a ja grape-hedelm-i-ä.
 orange-part. pl. and grapefruit-part. pl.

Soon after this, bringing once a month a case of oranges and grapefruits as a present from Great Britain to the ruler and the consort was permitted.¹⁷⁾

In (14), *laatikollinen*, the object of the first infinitive *tuoda*, is in the nominative case, since the matrix predicate *sallia* is in the passive voice. In this respect, the permissive construction does not differ from other constructions with an infinitive complement.

On the other hand, from a semantic point of view, the permissive construction should be distinguished from other constructions with an infinitive complement, because what is expressed in the permissive construction is not compulsion or request but permission to do something. In the permissive construction, the semantic subject of a complement is permitted to do something, then, affected by the matrix subject indirectly at most, and the process or situation expressed by the complement is not fully dependent on the content of the matrix clause.

Then, we may say that semantically the permissive construction lies halfway between other constructions with an infinitive complement and the participial construction. And, if we suppose that the case-marking pattern of the semantic subject of a complement reflects this intermediateness, it helps to explain the peculiarity of the permissive construction. The semantic subject of a complement of the permissive construction should be marked in the genitive case to indicate the indirect semantic relationship to the matrix clause, just as the semantic subject of a participial complement. And, at the same time, this intermediateness of the permissive construction is reflected in the fact that, in the permissive construction, like in other constructions with an infinitive complement, the case-marking of the object of a complement is determined under the influence of factors outside the complement.

4. Construction with *sallia*

The usage of the verb *sallia* may support the argument above.
 The verb *sallia* can take three different types of complements. They are:

- A) a noun phrase in the genitive case + 1. infinitive
(= permissive construction)
- B) a noun phrase in the genitive case + participle
(= participial construction)
- C) *että*-clause

And, the following are a few random examples found from one of the corpora of the Department of General Linguistics, Helsinki University¹⁸⁾. They are:

- (15) *Karavaan-i-en ja kauppia-i-tten he*
caravan-gen. pl. and tradesman-gen. pl. they
salli-vat kulkea maa-nsa halki vain
allow-3. pl. pr. go-1. inf. country-gen. sg. across only
määrätty-j-ä te-i-tä pitkin.
particular-part. pl. road-part. pl. along

They allow caravans and tradesmen to go across their country only along the particular roads.¹⁹⁾

- (16) *Lääkäri ei kuitenkaan voi sallia*
doctor-nom. sg. not however can-3. sg. pr. allow-1. inf.
potilaa-nsa kuole-va-n.
patient-gen. sg. die-pr. p. gen.

The doctor, however, cannot let his patient die.²⁰⁾

- (17) *Salli-mme-ko tosiaan, että tuo ympäri-*
allow-1. pl. pr. really that that-nom. sg. circumcised
leikattu maka-a neitsy-i-tte-mme kanssa ja
-nom. sg. lie-3. sg. pr. virgin-gen. pl. with and
häpäise-e temppeli-mme.
desecrate-3. sg. pr. temple-gen. sg.

Do we really let that circumcised lie with our virgins and desecrate our temple?²¹⁾

In the corpus there are 88 examples in all, 68 of which are the type A, 10 the type B, and 10 the type C. There is considerable difference in frequency among them and occurrence of the type B seems to be almost confined to negative context²²⁾. The meaning carried by each type of complement, however, hardly differs from each other. Then, it is safe to say that these three types of complements are more or less in free variation with the verb *sallia*²³⁾. If this is the case, it is likely that the case-marking

of the semantic subject of a complement in the type A is determined by analogy with the type B. That is, the semantic subject of a complement is marked in the genitive case not only in the type B, the participial construction, but also in the type A, the permissive construction.

5. Construction with *käskä*

On the other hand, the verb *käskä* is somewhat problematic. Along with the verb *sallia*, *antaa* and *suoda*, the verb *käskä* can also be used in the permissive construction as a matrix predicate. The meaning of this verb is, however, different from that of *sallia*, *antaa* or *suoda*. That is, the verb *käskä* does not mean giving permission, but giving orders. The subject of the verb *käskä* influences directly the semantic subject of its complement to do something. For example:

- (18) *Hän käske-e minu-n hyppiä ja juosta*
 he order-3. sg. pr. I-gen. jump-1. inf. and run-1. inf.
aamu-sta ilta-an kipe-i-llä jalo-i-lla-ni.
 from morning to evening bad-ad. pl. foot-ad. pl.

He orders me to jump and run with my bad feet from morning to evening.²⁴⁾

Then, why is the semantic subject of a complement of the verb *käskä*, *minä* in (18) for example, still marked in the genitive case?

This may be explained by the fact that the semantic subject of a first infinitive complement of the verb *käskä* is not controlled. In other words, the referent of the semantic subject of a first infinitive complement can be different from that of the matrix subject. Take the following for example:

- (19) *Jos luokse-ni kanne-tti-in saira-i-ta,*
 if to me bring-pass. p. patient-part. pl.
jo-t-ka nä-i-n parantumattom-i-ksi,
 who-nom. pl.²⁵⁾ see-1. sg. p. incurable-transl. pl.
käsk-i-n viedä he-i-dät Elämä-n
 order-1. sg. p. carry-1. inf. them Life-gen. sg.
talo-on.
 house-ill. sg.

When patients who I saw incurable were brought to me, I ordered that they should be carried to the house of Life.²⁶⁾

Here, the semantic subject of the first infinitive *viedä* is not elliptic *minä* (= I), which

is the matrix subject, but the generic person. As stated above in the beginning of this paper, the verb *sallia*, *antaa* and *suoda* also have this property. All of these verbs, including the verb *käskää*, are different from other verbs with regard to the interpretation of the semantic subject of their first infinitive complement. This difference should also be reflected in the case-marking pattern. Then, the semantic subject of a first infinitive complement of these four verbs is marked in the same way, that is, in the genitive case. This genitive-marking shows that the referent of the semantic subject of a first infinitive complement is not identical with that of the matrix subject.

I have pointed out in the previous section that the semantic subject of a first infinitive complement of the verb *sallia* is marked in the genitive case, since there is an analogy between the participial construction and the permissive construction. We are now in a position to say that the genitive-marking is not a mere analogy. The referent of the semantic subject of a participial complement of the participial construction can also be different from that of the matrix subject, as (16) above shows. Then, the semantic subject of a complement of the verb *sallia*, whether the predicate of the complement is a first infinitive or a participle, should be indicated in the genitive case to show that the referent of the semantic subject of the complement is different from that of the matrix subject.

In connection with the verb *käskää*, one other thing is worth a mention. The verb *käskää* can take as its complement not only a first infinitive but also a third infinitive. For example:

(20) <i>Stalin</i>	<i>nimitt-i</i>	<i>riikalais-ta</i>	
S.-nom. sg.	call-3. sg. p.	man from Riga-part. sg.	
<i>hölmö-ksi</i>	<i>ja</i>	<i>käsk-i</i>	<i>tä-tä</i>
stupid-transl. sg. and		order-3. sg. p.	this-part. sg.
<i>heti</i>	<i>päästä-mä-än</i>	<i>laiva-t</i>	<i>mere-lle.</i>
at once	let-3. inf. ill.	ship-nom.pl.	sea-all. sg.

Stalin called the man from Riga stupid and ordered him to let the ships to sea at once.²⁷⁾

In (20), the verb *käskää* has a third infinitive *päästämään* as its complement. These two alternatives, the expression with a first infinitive and that with a third infinitive, do not differ in meaning from each other and seem to be in free variation²⁸⁾. Then, why is the alternative expression with a third infinitive available? This is because the meaning of *käskää* does not fully conform to that of the other verbs used as a matrix

predicate in the permissive construction, i.e. *sallia*, *antaa* and *suoda*. Since the verb *käskää* does not mean giving permission but giving orders and many other verbs which mean giving orders take a third infinitive as their complement, a third infinitive is a semantically more suitable complement for the verb *käskää*.

What has to be noticed is, however, the semantic subject of a third infinitive complement of the verb *käskää* is not marked in the genitive case but in the partitive case. For example, in (20) above, *tämä*, the semantic subject of the third infinitive *päästämään*, is in the partitive case. As stated above in the beginning of this paper, the referent of the semantic subject of a third infinitive complement can also be different from that of the matrix subject. Then, why is the genitive case unavailable for the semantic subject of a third infinitive complement of the verb *käskää*? This is because, considering the meaning conveyed by the verb *käskää*, the argument in question functions as the object of the matrix predicate rather than as the subject of the predicate of the complement. In other words, the semantic subject of a third infinitive complement of the verb *käskää* is indicated in the partitive case for the semantic reason, while that of a first infinitive complement of the same verb is marked in the genitive case for the syntactic reason.

With many other verbs which mean giving orders, the semantic subject of a third infinitive complement is also marked in the partitive case. With some verbs, the argument in question is indeed marked in the genitive case, but this genitive-marking is different from that of the permissive construction. Take the following for example:

- (21a) *He pakott-i-ivat Kapitah-in otta-ma-an*
 they force-3. pl. p. K. -gen. sg. take-3. inf. ill.
valtamerki-t käsi-i-nsä ja paino-i-ivat
 badge of power-nom. pl. hand-ill. pl. and push-3. pl. p.
väkisin häne-t istu-ma-an valtaistuime-lle.
 forcibly he-acc. sit-3. inf. ill. throne-all. sg.
 They forced Kapitah to take the badges of power in his hands and pushed him forcibly to take the throne.²⁹⁾

- (21b) *He pakottivat häne-t ottamaan valtamerkit käsiinsä*
 he-acc.
 ja [. . .].

- (22a) *Horemheb ei salli-nut Aziru-n tavata*
 H. -nom. sg. not allow-3. sg. p. A. -gen. sg. meet-1. inf.

vaimo-a-an ja poik-i-a-an ennen kuin teloitus-
 wife-part. sg. and son-part. pl. before place of
paika-lla.
 execution-ad. sg.

Horemheb did not allow Aziru to meet his wife and sons before arriving at the place of execution.³⁰⁾

(22b) *Horemheb ei sallinut häne-n tavata vaimoan ja*
 he-gen.
poikiaan ennen kuin teloituspaikalla.

When the argument in question is one of the personal pronouns, it is indicated in the accusative case with the verb *pakottaa*, as (21b) above shows. On the other hand, in the permissive construction (22b), it is still marked in the genitive case. And, while the genitive-marking of the permissive construction does never change, the case-marking of the verb *pakottaa* can change into the partitive case. For example:

(23) *Jos et halua, kukaan ei pakota*
 if not want-2. sg. pr. nobody-nom. sg. not force-3. sg. pr.
sinu-a teke-mä-än si-tä.
 you-part. sg. do-3. inf. ill. it-part. sg.

If you don't want, nobody forces you to do it.

These facts show that the argument in question in (21a) is indicated in the genitive case not because it is the semantic subject of the complement but because it is the object of the matrix predicate. And, this interpretation is consistent with the meaning carried by the matrix predicate.

6. Conclusion

From what has been said above, we come to the following conclusion:

- 1) Among infinite constructions in the Finnish language, the permissive construction can be placed between the participial construction and the construction which takes a third infinitive as its complement, on the basis of the meaning carried by each construction. The case-marking pattern of the object of a complement of the permissive construction reflects this intermediateness.
- 2) The semantic subject of a first infinitive complement of the permissive construction is marked in the genitive case. This genitive-marking can be explained by the fact that the semantic subject of a complement of the permissive construction is not

controlled. The referent of the semantic subject of a complement can be different from that of the matrix subject. To show that the semantic subject of a complement refers to a different entity from the matrix subject, it is indicated in the genitive case in the same way as the semantic subject of a complement of the participial construction.

3) Although the semantic subject of a third infinitive complement can also refer to a different entity from the matrix subject, the case-marking pattern of it is not the same as that of the permissive construction. This is because the matrix predicate which takes a third infinitive complement means giving orders rather than giving permission. The semantic subject of the complement functions at the same time as the object of the matrix predicate. And, this semantic difference is reflected in the case-marking pattern of the semantic subject of a third infinitive complement.

To sum up, the case-marking pattern of the semantic subject of a complement of the permissive construction can be properly explained by considering both semantic and syntactic factors.

Notes

- * I am indebted to Maria Vilkuna for helpful suggestions. The material in this paper is derived mainly from the corpora of the Department of General Linguistics, Helsinki University. I wish to thank the department for permission to use the material of the corpora.
- 1) As is shown in the previous studies, in the earlier stage of the language, the semantic subject of a complement of both constructions was indicated in the accusative case. The genitive-marking of the semantic subject is a later development after the fusion of the ending of the accusative singular case and that of the genitive singular case. For further details, see Forsman-Svensson (1992), for example.
- 2) If an example is drawn from one of the corpora, the name of the corpus and its sentence number in the corpus are cited. For example, in the case of (1), /corp/fin/sk87 (Suomen kuvalehti No. 8), 469.
- 3) /corp/fin/wsoy (Mika Waltari, *Sinuhe Egyptiläinen*), 2002.
- 4) The frequency of the verb *suoda* as a matrix predicate of the construction in question is considerably lower than that of the verb *sallia* or *antaa*. See also Forsman-Svensson (1992:70).
- 5) *Nykysuomen sanakirja*. 1976³. Porvoo: Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö, p. 331.
- 6) Also the verb *käskeä* is a possible matrix predicate of the permissive construction. This verb is, however, somewhat different from the other verbs, i.e. *sallia*, *antaa* and *suoda*. Then, I will take up this verb later, in section 5.
- 7) In the traditional grammar, *riidan* in (7) is said to be in the accusative singular case. The so-called accusative singular case is, however, identical in form with the genitive singular case. Only the personal pronouns have a distinct accusative form. Then, in this paper, I will not call the form like *riidan* in (7) the accusative singular form but the genitive

- singular form.
- 8) On the peculiarity of the case-marking pattern of the permissive construction, see also Vilkuna (1996:195).
 - 9) See, in particular, Härmä (1977), and also Sakuma (1994a). On the participial construction in general, see, for example, Hakulinen (1979⁴:565-572), Ikola (1974:24-29), Nielsen (1995) and Siro (1964:145-147). For further details of the case-marking pattern of the semantic subject of a participial complement, see Sakuma (1994b, 1996).
 - 10) /corp/fin/sk87 (Suomen kuvalehti No. 10), 917.
 - 11) I picked out examples of the participial construction from the texts of the first ten issues in 1987 of the weekly magazine, *Suomen kuvalehti*. I left out of the count examples where the predicate of the participial complement is in the passive voice. Examples whose matrix predicate is *näyttää*, *tuntuu* or *kuulua* are also not included in the count, since the syntactic characteristics of these verbs are different from those of other verbs which take a participial complement. The semantic subject of a participial complement of these verbs is always marked in the nominative case and agrees in number and person with the matrix predicate.
 - 12) /corp/fin/sk87 (Suomen kuvalehti No. 1), 1177.
 - 13) /corp/fin/sk87 (Suomen kuvalehti No. 10), 1462.
 - 14) /corp/fin/sk87 (Suomen kuvalehti No. 3), 500.
 - 15) The material is the same as that mentioned in the note 11 above. Other verbs whose meaning is similar to that of the verbs cited here can also take a participial complement. On this point, see also Shore (1992:283).
 - 16) On the permissive construction in general, see, for example, Ikola (1974:30-32), Siro (1964:95-96). There are two interpretations of the structure of the permissive construction. According to one interpretation, the semantic subject of a first infinitive complement functions as the object of the matrix predicate at the same time, like the semantic subject of a third infinitive complement. Then, a matrix predicate of the permissive construction takes as its arguments both an object and a complement. According to the other interpretation, however, the semantic subject of a complement cannot be regarded as the object of the matrix predicate. Then, a matrix predicate of the permissive construction does not take an object as its argument.
 - 17) /corp/fin/wsoy (Veikko Huovinen, Rasvamaksa), 1238.
 - 18) The source of the material is /corp/fin/wsoy (Mika Waltari, *Sinuhe Egyptiläinen*).
 - 19) /corp/fin/wsoy (Mika Waltari, *Sinuhe Egyptiläinen*), 4461.
 - 20) /corp/fin/wsoy (Mika Waltari, *Sinuhe Egyptiläinen*), 8709.
 - 21) /corp/fin/wsoy (Mika Waltari, *Sinuhe Egyptiläinen*), 5285.
 - 22) The percentage of negative sentences in each type is as follows: 44% in the type A, 90% in the type B and 40% in the type C. These figures may, however, reflect the idiolect of the author, in this case, Mika Waltari.
 - 23) According to Maria Vilkuna (personal communication), it is possible that the stylistic property of the verb *sallia* has an effect on the variation. The verb *sallia* is used in somewhat literary or poetic style, compared with the verb *antaa*.
 - 24) /corp/fin/wsoy (Mika Waltari, *Sinuhe Egyptiläinen*), 2237.

- 25) In the same way as the accusative singular case, the so-called accusative plural case is identical in form with the nominative plural case. Only the personal pronouns have a distinct accusative form. Then, in this paper, I will not call the form like *jotka* in (19) the accusative plural form but the nominative plural form.
- 26) /corp/fin/wsoy (Mika Waltari, *Sinuhe Egyptiläinen*), 1768.
- 27) /corp/fin/sk87 (Suomen kuvalehti No. 38), 2052.
- 28) In the same source as is mentioned in the note 18 above, there are 31 examples of the construction with a first infinitive complement and 5 examples of that with a third infinitive complement. There may be a slight difference in nuance between two alternative expressions. The meaning of giving orders may be more directly expressed by the construction with a third infinitive complement than that with a first infinitive complement. And, this inference is in accord with the argument in this paper. Maria Vilkuna (personal communication) says that it is possible that the usage of the verb *käskää* varies with the dialect. Dialects are indeed worth considering, but in this paper I limit the discussion to the present-day standard Finnish.
- 29) /corp/fin/wsoy (Mika Waltari, *Sinuhe Egyptiläinen*), 3958.
- 30) /corp/fin/wsoy (Mika Waltari, *Sinuhe Egyptiläinen*), 10305.

Abbreviations

sg. - singular	pl. - plural
nom. - nominative	gen. - genitive
acc. - accusative	part. - partitive
ess. - essive	transl. - translative
in. - inessive	ill. - illative
ad. - adessive	all. - allative
el. - elative	pass. - passive
pr. - present	p. - past
pr. p. - present participle	p. p. - past participle
1. inf. - first infinitive	3. inf. - third infinitive

References

- Forsman-Svensson, Pirkko. 1992. *Vanhan kirjasuomen nominaalirakenteista*. Stockholm Studies in Finnish Language and Literature 8.
- Hakulinen, Lauri. 1979⁴. *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys*. Keuruu: Otava.
- Härmä, Juhani. 1977. Eräiden suomen siirtotransformaatioiden soveltamisesta lauserajan yli. *Virittäjä* 81: 157-166.
- Ikola, Osmo. 1974. *Lauseenvastikeoppia*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Nielsen, Torben Bach. 1995. *Participialkonstruktion i finsk*. Aarhus Universitet, Institut for Lingvistik, Finsk Afdeling. Unpublished dissertation.
- Sakuma, Jun'ichi. 1994a. On the Default Theme in the Finnish Language. *Nagoya Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyu Ronsyu* 118:25-38.
- , 1994b. Distribution of Possessive Suffixes and Genitive Forms in the Finnish Language. *Uralica* 10: 27-40.

- , 1995. The genitive form of the first and second person pronouns in the Finnish language. *Nagoya Working Paper in Linguistics* 11: 225-247
- , 1996. Distribution of Possessive Suffixes in the Finnish Language. *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress for Finno-Ugric Studies, Pars III*: 189-192.
- Shore, Susanna. 1992. *Aspects of a Systemic-Functional Grammar of Finnish*. Macquarie University, School of English and Linguistics. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Siro, Paavo. 1964. *Suomen kielen lauseoppi*. Helsinki: Tietosanakirja Oy.
- Vilkuna, Maria. 1996. *Syntaksin peruskurssi (Kokeiluversio toinen osa)*. Manuscript.