

The Case-marking of the Object of the Second Infinitive Instructive in the Finnish Language^{*)}

Jun'ichi SAKUMA

1. Introduction

In the Finnish language, the instructive is one of the morphological cases. As a declensional form of nominals, however, it occurs almost exclusively in a few fixed, idiomatic expressions like *om-i-n silm-i-n* (with one's own eyes), *tyhj-i-n käs-i-n* (with empty hands), *palja-i-n jalo-i-n* (with bare feet) and so on. Then, we can say that the instructive is not productive anymore in the Finnish language.

This nearly obsolescent case can also be used to shape one of the non-finite verb-forms, that is, the second infinitive instructive. This form, mainly expressing manner, occurs most commonly in a number of fixed expressions¹⁾. For example:

- (1) *Näin oll-e-n* *vaikka useiden maitten päätös vähentää*
 such be-2.inf.instruct. though many country decision cut
CFC-kaasujen käyttöä *aerosoleissa alentaa päästöjä*
 CFC-gas consumption aerosol lower emission
väliaikaisesti, jatkuu *CFC:n kasautuminen ilmakehässä.*
 temporarily continue CFC accumulation atmosphere
 Consequently, although many countries' decision to cut CFC-gas consumption in aerosols will lower the emission temporarily, CFC-gas accumulation in the atmosphere will continue. (SK87:5-1193)

However, it can also be used in non-idiomatic expressions and can take its own argument(s) and adverbial modifier(s) just like a finite verb-form. Take the following for example:

- (2) *Äkkiä jostakin* *tuli nuoli ja iskeytyi Einarin jouseen*
 suddenly from somewhere come arrow and hit E. bow
rikko-e-n *se-n* *kappaleiksi.*
 break-2.inf.instruct. it-GEN.SG.²⁾ piece

Suddenly an arrow came from somewhere and hit against Einari's bow breaking it to pieces. (SK87:2-743)

- (3) *Siellä tehdään töitä metsärajan tuntumassa ja se*
 there is done work boundaries of forest near and it-NOM.SG.
muista-e-n *tulokset ovat jopa ihmeen hyviä.*
 remember-2.inf.instruct. outcome are quite surprisingly good
 The work is being done near the boundaries of forest and, remembering this, the outcome is surprisingly good. (SK87:43-19)

In both of the examples above, the second infinitive instructive takes its own object, that is, *sen* in (2) and *se* in (3) respectively. The important point to note is that they are different from each other in the case-marking of the object of the infinitive. While the object of the infinitive in (2) is marked in the genitive case, that in (3) is marked in the nominative case. Then, what is the cause of the difference in the case-marking of the object of the infinitive? Several studies have already pointed out this problem. However, it is still in controversy. The purpose of this paper is to explore a little further into this problem by examining examples taken from the corpora of the Finnish language³⁾.

2. The Second Infinitive Instructive Dependent on the Matrix Clause

As is commonly known, the matrix subject can control the interpretation of the semantic subject of a first or third infinitive, when it functions as a complement to the matrix predicate⁴⁾. The semantic subject of the second infinitive instructive is also interpreted under the control of the matrix subject in many cases. The following serves as an example:

- (4) *Mielenosoittajat marssivat rantakadun vallankumousneuvoston*
 protest marcher march promenade board of revolution
edustalta Kansan Aukiolle tukki-e-n täysin vanhan
 front the People's Plaza block up-2.inf.instruct. fully old
Shanghaiin liikekeskusta-n.

Shanghai business center-GEN.SG.

Protest marchers marched from the front of the board of revolution at the promenade to the People's Plaza, fully blocking up the business center of old Shanghai. (SK87:3-768)

In this sentence, the referent of the semantic subject of the infinitive is identical with that of the matrix subject. This is also true of the semantic subject of the infinitive in (2) cited above. Both the semantic subject of the infinitive and the matrix subject refer to the same entity, *nuoli*.

Generally speaking, when the interpretation of the semantic subject of an infinitive is controlled by one of the arguments of the matrix predicate, in other words, when an infinitive is dependent on the matrix clause, the case-marking of the object of the infinitive is also influenced by factors of the matrix clause. Then, in some cases, the object of a first or third infinitive as a complement to the matrix predicate is marked in the nominative case under the influence of factors of the matrix clause. For example:

- (5) *Ydinvoimala* *on päätetty* *rakenta-a*
 nuclear power plant-NOM.SG. has been decided construct-1.inf.
vastustuksesta huolimatta.

opposition despite

It has been decided that the nuclear power plant be constructed despite opposition.

- (6) *Esimerkiksi mansikasta poistetaan vesi* *muutta-ma-lla*
 for example strawberry is removed water change-3.inf.adess.
se *suoraan jäätä hyöryksi noin 0,1 millibarin alipaineessa.*
 it-NOM.SG. directly ice steam about millibar low pressure
 For example, water is removed from a strawberry by changing it directly from ice to steam at low pressure of about 0.1 millibars.
 (SK87:8-553)

Here, the object of the infinitive, *ydinvoimala* and *se* respectively, is marked in the nominative case, since the matrix clause is in the passive voice.

The same observation applies to the second infinitive instructive dependent on the matrix clause. That is, when the matrix clause is in the passive voice, the object of the second infinitive instructive is also marked in the nominative case. Take the following for example:

- (7) *Ylituotannon markkinointiin käytetyt miljardit voitaisiin käyttää*
 overproduction marketing spent billion could be spent
järkevämminkin ja samalla viljelijäväestön
 more reasonably and at the same time farmers

elintaso**turvat-e-n.**

living standard-NOM.SG. secure-2.inf.instruct.

Billions of marks spent on marketing of the overproduction could be spent more reasonably and securing the living standard of farmers at the same time. (SK87:10-758)

In this sentence, the object, *elintaso*, is marked in the nominative case, since the matrix clause is in the passive voice. On the other hand, in (2) and (4), the matrix clause is in the active voice. Then, the object, *sen* and *liikekeskustan* respectively, is marked in the genitive case.

In the Finnish language, there is a group of verbs expressing necessity or obligation. These verbs take a first infinitive as their complement. The object of the infinitive, if any, is marked not in the genitive case but in the nominative case. And, this rule also holds for the object of a deeply embedded infinitive, provided the interpretation of its semantic subject is controlled by one of the matrix arguments. In the following examples, the third infinitive adessive and the second infinitive instructive are embedded respectively. That is:

- (8) *Miksi ihmeessä kykkimään tottumaton lautakunta pitäisi väsyttää*
 why on earth crouch inexperienced committee must tire
heti alkuun kaata-ma-lla uurnan sisältö
 right beginning dump-2.inf.adess. ballot box contents-NOM.SG.
lattialle?
 floor

Why on earth must we make the inexperienced committee tired from crouching at the very outset by dumping out the contents of the ballot box on the floor? (SK87:10-1548)

- (9) *Pikemminkin pitäisi mahdollisimman tehokkaasti ja ahkeruudella*
 rather must as effectively as possible and diligence
hankkia toimeentulo luonnon kiertokulku
 earn living nature circulation-NOM.SG.
ymmärtä-e-n, *jotta luonto säästyisi.*

understand-2.inf.instruct. so that nature is preserved

Rather, we must earn our living as effectively as possible and with diligence, understanding the circulation of nature, in order that nature would be preserved. (SK87:7-393)

Here, the object of the infinitive, *sisältö* and *kiertokulku* respectively, is indicated in the nominative case because of the lexical property of the matrix predicate, *pitää*.

From what has been said above, it is clear that the case-marking of the object of the second infinitive instructive is determined in the same way as that of the object of a first or third infinitive, when the interpretation of its semantic subject is controlled by one of the matrix arguments.

3. The Second Infinitive Instructive as a So-called Free Infinitive

The third infinitive adessive is not always dependent on the matrix clause. It can also be used independently. For example:

- (10) *Teoriassa se tapahtuu ymppää-mä-llä munasoluun tai siittiöön*
 theory it happen graft-3.inf.adess. egg sell or sperm
sairaaseen geenin tilalle normaali.
 ill gene place normal-NOM.SG.

In theory it happens by grafting a normal gene in place of an ill one into an egg sell or a sperm. (SK87:6-1637)

In this case, the object of the infinitive, *normaali*, is marked in the nominative case. This is because the infinitive functions as an adjunct and is not dependent on the matrix clause. Hereafter, to refer to such an infinitive, which is called *illallinen infinitiivi* in Karlsson(1979), I will use the term 'free infinitive'. In the Finnish language, as is commonly known, the object of a free infinitive is generally marked in the nominative case. Here is another example:

- (11) *Supervalloilla on kyky hävittää maailma, mutta ei ole*
 superpower is ability destroy-1.inf. world-NOM.SG. but not is
kykyä hallita sitä.
 ability rule it

Superpowers have the ability to destroy the world but do not have the ability to rule it. (Vilkuna:292)

Here, the infinitive, *hävittää*, modifies the preceding noun and can be analyzed as an adjunct. Then, the object of the infinitive, *maailma*, is marked in the nominative case.

The object of the second infinitive instructive as a free infinitive is also marked in the nominative case. For example:

- (12) *He kuittaavat kulukorvaus mukaan*
 they receipt reimbursement of expenses-NOM.SG. along
luki-e-n vähän alle neljätoista ja puoli
 count-2.inf.instruct. a little less fourteen and half
tonnia kuukaudessa.
 thousand marks month

They receipt in a month a little less than fourteen and a half thousand marks including the reimbursement of expenses. (SK87:7-1098)

In (12), the object, *kulukorvaus*, is marked in the nominative case, since the second infinitive instructive, *lukien*, functions as a free infinitive. Here, we may recall that, in (3) cited above, the object of the second infinitive instructive is marked in the nominative case. This can be explained in the same way. The second infinitive instructive in (3), *muistaen*, functions as a free infinitive. Then, the object, *se*, is marked in the nominative case.

As is already pointed out in the previous studies, however, the object of the second infinitive instructive as a free infinitive is sometimes marked in the genitive case. Take the following for example:

- (13) *Baritoneista on eniten tarjontaa, kilpailu on, siksi kova,*
 baritone is most offer competition is therefore strong
ja se-n-kin huomioonotta-e-n Hynnisen
 and it-GEN.SG. take into consideration-2.inf.instruct. H.
ura on vaikuttava.
 career is impressive

We have the most offers of baritones, then there is strong competition.

Considering all of this, Hynninen's career is still impressive. (SK87:49-3262)

In (13), although *huomioonottaen* functions as a free infinitive, its object is marked not in the nominative case but in the genitive case.

The question now arises. Why is the object of the second infinitive instructive as a free infinitive marked sometimes in the nominative case and sometimes in the genitive case? So far little is known about factors that may have some influence over the choice between the nominative case and the genitive case. In the following section, I shall try to look deeper into this question.

4. Object in the Nominative Case vs. Object in the Genitive Case

As Karlsson(1979) pointed out, some expressions containing the second infinitive instructive can take both a nominative object and a genitive object⁵⁾. Among others, *huomioon ottaen* is one of such expressions. In some cases, *huomioon ottaen* as a free infinitive takes an object in the nominative case, indeed. For example:

- (14) *Samana aikana lämpötila vaihtelee +3 asteesta jopa -48*
 same time temperature vary degree even
asteeseen, ja kylmimmän jakson tuulivaikutus huomioon
 degree and coldest period effect of wind-NOM.SG. attention
otta-e-n aina alas -70 asteeseen.
 take-2.inf.instruct. even down degree

At the same time the temperature varies from +3 degrees even to -48 degrees, and considering the effect of wind of the coldest period even down to -70 degrees. (SK87:44-1615)

But in some other cases, it takes a genitive object. Karlsson(1979), for instance, cited the following examples:

- (15) *Henrik Tikkasen äitikuva lienee säälimättöimpiä*
 H. T. image of mother may be most ruthless
äitikuvia, mitä meidän kirjallisuutemme, sekä suomen-
 image of mother which our literature both Finnish
että ruotsinkielisen proosa-n huomioon otta-e-n,
 and Swedish prose-GEN.SG. attention take-2.inf.instruct.
ylipäätään tarjoaa.
 on the whole offer

Henrik Tikkanen's image of mother may be the most ruthless one that, considering both Finnish and Swedish prose, our literature on the whole offers. (Karlsson:185)

- (16) *Kieliohjelman monipuolistumista on pidetty sekä*
 language program diversification has been considered both
Suomen maantieteellisen asema-n että kulttuuripolitiika-n
 Finnish geographical position-GEN.SG. and cultural policy-GEN.SG.
ja kauppapolitiika-n huomioon otta-e-n tärkeänä.
 and trade policy-GEN.SG. attention take-2.inf.instruct. important

The diversification of the language program has been considered important, considering both the geographical position of Finland and the cultural and trade policy. (Karlsson:185)

In both (15) and (16), the object is marked in the genitive case, though *huomioon ottaen* functions as a free infinitive.

Then, why is the object in the examples above marked not in the nominative case but in the genitive case? Let us start with (15). To explain the genitive marking of the object of *ottaen* in (15), a comparison with the following example may be helpful. In the following example, the second infinitive instructive, *muistaen*, also takes a genitive object, though it functions as a free infinitive. That is:

- (17) *Kymmenen vuoden takaisen keskustelu-n* *muista-e-n*
 ten year ago argument-GEN.SG. remember-2.inf.instruct.
se on Meriläisen mielestä hyvä saavutus.
 it is M. mind good achievement
 Remembering the argument ten years ago, Meriläinen thinks that it is
 a good achievement. (SK87:22-1525)

Here, one may notice that the semantic subject of *muistaen* is *Meriläinen* and it can also be regarded as the virtual subject of the matrix clause. If so, *muistaen* in this sentence is not free enough from the matrix clause to be considered a perfectly free infinitive. This may be the reason why the object of *muistaen* is not marked in the nominative case. Instead, it is marked in the genitive case, just like the object of the second infinitive instructive in (2) and (4) above. The case-marking of the object in (15) can be explained on similar lines. In (15), *meidän kirjallisuutemme*, the subject of the matrix clause, contains a possessive suffix in the first person plural. And, the first person plural can be regarded as the semantic subject of the infinitive, *huomioon ottaen*. Then, it can be said that the infinitive in (15) is dependent on the matrix clause to some extent. Since the infinitive is not free enough, the object of the infinitive is not marked in the nominative case.

On the other hand, (16) is rather problematic. To begin with, is it really appropriate to regard the second infinitive instructive in (16) as a free infinitive? It is also possible to assume that the interpretation of the semantic subject of the infinitive is controlled by the matrix subject which is not overtly

expressed, like that of the semantic subject of the second infinitive instructive in (7) above. If this is the case, the infinitive in (16) is not a free infinitive and need not be marked in the nominative case. However, there remains a question. When the semantic subject of an infinitive is interpreted under the control of the matrix subject, the case-marking of the object of the infinitive is influenced by factors of the matrix clause. In (16), since the matrix clause is in the passive voice, then the object should be marked, contrary to the fact, in the nominative case.

One may notice that, in both (15) and (16), *huomioon ottaen* appears within the boundary of the matrix clause. Then, one possibility is to assume that the position of an infinitive in a sentence has some influence upon the case-marking of its object. That is, when an infinitive appears within the boundary of the matrix clause, the object of the infinitive is likely to be marked in the genitive case in order to clarify its syntactic relation to the infinitive.

Another factor which may have some influence on the case-marking of the object of *huomioon ottaen* as a free infinitive is the relative word order. From the material, it seems that the object of *ottaen* is more often marked in the genitive case when *ottaen* precedes its object. The following are a few random examples:

- (18) *Tukikohdassa asutaan ympäri vuodet mikä lienee kovaa touhua*
 base live round year which may be hard business
otta-e-n huomioon asumusten lautamökkimäisen
 take-2.inf.instruct. attention lodging like a boarded hut
olemukse-n.
 nature-GEN.SG.

They are living in the base throughout years, which may be a hard thing to do, considering the lodging in a boarded hut. (SK87:9-2078)

- (19) *Suomen maa-alueen hyväksi käyttämiseen saattaisi olla suuri*
 Finnish territory good use may be great
kiusaus otta-e-n huomioon Jäämeren
 temptation take-2.inf.instruct. attention the Arctic Ocean
rantakaistaleen kapeude-n yksine pääteineen.
 strip of seashore narrowness-GEN.SG. one trunk road

There may be a strong temptation to take advantage of the territory of Finland, considering that the strip of seashore of the Arctic Ocean with one trunk road is narrow. (Karlsson:185)

In both (18) and (19), *ottaen* precedes its object and the object is marked in the genitive case.

In the following example, however, the object of *ottaen* is marked in the nominative case, although *ottaen* precedes its object. That is:

- (20) *Jos puhelinlaitosten muodostamaa kokonaisuutta pidettäisiin yhtenä*
 if telephone office form whole is regarded one
yrittäjänä, ja huomioon otta-e-n niiden alhainen
 company and attention take-2.inf.instruct. their low
velkaantumisen, ei Suomessa ole toista näin kannattavaa
 indebtedness-NOM.SG. not Finland is another such lucrative
ja vakavaraista yritystä.
 and respectable company

If the whole formed by the telephone offices is regarded as one company, and considering that they have a small debt, no other company in Finland is more lucrative and respectable. (SK87:5-2618)

It is interesting to note that *huomioon* in (20), unlike that in (18) and (19), precedes the infinitive, *ottaen*. Given that the relative positions of *ottaen* and *huomioon* influence the case-marking of the object, we can explain why the case-marking of the object in (20) is different from that of the object in (18) and (19). This hypothesis needs, however, further investigation. Since our information is very limited, I cannot choose but leave the matter open.

Let us now consider more problematic examples. Although the following have about the same sentence structure, the object of *ottaen* is marked in the nominative case in one example and in the genitive case in the other. That is:

- (21) *Virhemarginaali huomioon otta-e-n-kin ero*
 margin of error-NOM.SG. attention take-2.inf.instruct. difference
on raju.
 is sharp

Considering the margin of error, the difference is still sharp. (SK87:22-203)

(22) *EC:n maatalouden ylituotanno-n huomioon*

EC agriculture overproduction-GEN.SG. attention

otta-e-n *se on täysin mahdollista.*

take-2.inf.instruct. it is quite possible.

Considering the agricultural overproduction of EC, it is quite possible.

(SK87:16-730)

Then, what is the difference between (21) and (22)? And, what determines the case-marking of the object of *ottaen* in each case? I cannot say for certain whether some definite principle underlies the case-marking of the object in (21) and (22). It is possible that the nominative in (21) and the genitive in (22) are free variants of the morphological realization of the object of *ottaen*. Recall here that the object of *huomioonottaen* in (13) above is marked in the genitive case. The same may be said of the genitive marking of the object in (13). Since we lack definite information, we should leave the matter to further investigation in near future.

5. Conclusion

From what has been said above, it follows that there is no much difference between the second infinitive instructive and the first and third infinitives in the way their object is marked. When an infinitive functions as a free infinitive, its object is marked in principle in the nominative case. As regards the second infinitive instructive, however, there are a few exceptions to this general rule. Its object is sometimes marked in the genitive case. I offered above some possible reasons the case-marking of the object alternates between the nominative case and the genitive case. There is, however, room for argument on this matter.

Another possible explanation for this unusual case-marking is that the object of the second infinitive instructive is marked in the genitive case on the analogy of that of the second infinitive inessive. The second infinitive inessive is used in the temporal construction. While the second infinitive instructive functions as an adjunct, the second infinitive inessive, together with its argument(s) and adverbial modifier(s), forms a subordinate clause of the temporal construction. The case-marking of the object of a subordinate clause is determined independently from factors of the matrix clause but, at

the same time, in the same way as that of the matrix object. Then, the object is marked in the nominative case, when a *subordinate* clause is in the passive voice. For example:

- (23) *Valkoisten valitsema hallitus jätti intiaanien*
 white man elect government leave Indian
maaoikeudet perustuslain ulkopuolelle säätä-e-ssä-än
 laws relating to land fundamental law outside legislate-2.inf.iness.
se-n yli sata vuotta sitten.
 it-GEN.SG. over hundred year ago

The government elected by the white men left the Indians' laws relating to land out of the fundamental law, legislating it over hundred years ago. (SK87:1-322)

- (24) *Kirjoite-tta-e-ssa maksumääräys suoraan työntekijälle*
 be issued-2.inf.iness. payment order-NOM.SG. directly employee
tämä voi saada rahaa jo alkuviikosta.
 this can get money already beginning of the week

If a payment order is issued directly to an employee, he can get money already at the beginning of the week. (Vilkuna:310)

In (23), since the second infinitive inessive is in the active voice, its object is marked in the genitive case. In (24), on the other hand, the second infinitive inessive is in the passive voice. Then, its object is marked in the nominative case.

From the above, it is clear that the second infinitive inessive is different from the second infinitive instructive in the way its object is marked. In the meaning conveyed, however, these two have much in common. For the former is used to refer to an action simultaneous with that of the matrix predicate and the latter indicates manner of action. Moreover, these two are similar in form (e.g., *oll-e-ssa* vs. *oll-e-n*). Then, it seems reasonable to suppose that the case-marking of the object of the second infinitive instructive is influenced to some extent by that of the object of the second infinitive inessive. This hypothesis needs, however, further investigation. We may leave it to studies in near future.

Notes

*) The material examined in this paper is derived mainly from the corpus of the Department of General Linguistics, Helsinki University. I wish to thank the department for permission to use the material of the corpus. The corpus is made up of the texts of all the issues in 1987 of the weekly magazine *Suomen kuvalehti*. It contains 1,257,716 words in all. 'SK87' in the parentheses after an example shows that it is drawn from the corpus. In the parentheses, the number of the issue the example is drawn from and the sentence number in the issue are also noted.

- 1) Ikola(1978²:44-47, 50-55) classified expressions containing the second infinitive instructive into two types: one is the status construction (*status-lauseenvastike*) and the other the modal construction (*modaalinen lauseenvastike*). In this paper, we deal only with the modal construction.

These two constructions differ from each other in the case-marking of the semantic subject of the second infinitive instructive. In the status construction, the semantic subject is marked either in the nominative case or in the partitive case. For example:

- (i) *Lokki lensi siive-t vettä viistä-e-n.*
 gull fly wing-NOM.PL. water trail-2.inf.instruct.

The gull flew with its wings trailing sprays of water. (Ikola:50)

Here, the semantic subject of the infinitive is marked in the nominative case. On the other hand, in the modal construction, the semantic subject is not always expressed. When overtly expressed, it is marked in the genitive case. Take the following example:

- (ii) *Ne eivät usein ehdi sulaa yhden kesän aikana, vaan jäätyvät uudestaan talve-n tull-e-n yhteen.*
 they not often have time melt one summer time but freeze
 again winter-GEN.SG. come-2.inf.instruct. together

Often they do not melt completely during the summer, and they freeze up again when winter comes. (SK87:9-2012)

The semantic subject, *talven*, is marked in the genitive case.

In Ikola(ibid.), it is said that the modal construction cannot take an object, while the status construction can. But this is not true. As the examples cited in this paper show, and Karlsson(1979) pointed out, the modal expression can take an object.

- 2) In the traditional grammar, *sen* in (2) 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 *sen* in (2) the accusative singular form but the genitive singular form.
- 3) The so-called accusative plural case is identical in form with the nominative plural case. The genitive plural case is not used to mark an object. Then, the choice between the genitive case and the nominative case is irrelevant in the plural.

On the other hand, the object of the second infinitive instructive can also be

marked in the partitive case. The distribution of partitive objects, however, is complementary to that of genitive and nominative objects. Then, in this paper, we are not concerned with partitive objects.

- 4) For further details of the control of the interpretation of the semantic subject, see, in particular, Vilkuna(1996:270-275) and also Sakuma(1996, 1997).
- 5) Karlsson(1979:185) stated that, *huomioon ottaen*, *muistaen*, *tietäen*, *tuntien* and *ymmärtäen* usually take a genitive object, even when they function as a free infinitive. They can also take a nominative object, however, as (3), (9), (14), (20), (21) show. Moreover, according to my informant, Petri Niemelä (graduate student at Chiba University, Japan), the object of *huomioon ottaen* as a free infinitive should always be marked in the nominative case. It is possible that native speakers of present-day Finnish regard the nominative marking as a standard. Our information is, however, limited. In the corpus, *huomioon ottaen* appears only 8 times (*muistaen* 4 times, *tietäen* 4 times, *tuntien* 2 times and *ymmärtäen* 2 times). On such limited information, I cannot say for certain whether the object of *huomioon ottaen* is more often marked in the genitive case or in the nominative case.

Abbreviations

NOM-nominative
 GEN-genitive
 SG-singular
 PL- plural
 inf-infinitive
 iness-inessive
 adess-adessive
 instruct-instructive

References

- Ikola, Osmo. 1978². *Lauseenvastikeoppia*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Karlsson, Göran. 1979. Irrallisen infinitiivin akkusatiiviobjekti. *Virittäjä* 83: 179-199.
- Sakuma, Jun'ichi. 1996. The Participial Construction and the Permissive Construction in the Finnish Language. *Nagoya Working Paper in Linguistics* 12: 167-193.
- Sakuma, Jun'ichi. 1997. The Permissive Construction in the Finnish Language. *Nagoya Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyu Ronsyu* 127: 5-21.
- Vilkuna, Maria. 1996. *Suomen lauseopin perusteet* (Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 90). Helsinki: Edita.