

On the Present Participle Passive and the First Infinitive in the Finnish Language*

Jun'ichi SAKUMA

The Finnish language has three kinds of infinitives and four kinds of participles. Participles are subject to the voice distinction, while infinitives lack in a passive form, except for the second infinitive in the inessive case. In a particular syntactic environment, an infinitive and a participle are interchangeable, and a first infinitive in the active voice sometimes corresponds to a present participle passive in the translative case. The difference between them lies in their degree of the involvement with the matrix predicate. The former functions as an integral part of the whole sentence and can make up a syntactic construction together with the matrix predicate. This difference is relevant also to the diachronic development of the permissive construction.

1. Introduction

The present participle passive is one of the participial forms in the Finnish language¹. Like other participial forms, the present participle passive can function as an adjectival modifier. As an adjectival modifier, the present participle passive usually precedes the noun it modifies. For example:

- (1) *kursilla* *käytettävä* *oppikirja*
course-adess.sg. use-pr.p.pass.-nom.sg. textbook-nom.sg.
the textbook that is intended to be used in the course

When a participle precedes the noun it modifies, it agrees with the noun in number and case. The present participle passive, however, can also modify a noun preceding it. The following is an example:

- (2) *Äiti* *toi* *maitoa* *lapsen* *juotavaksi*.
mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. child-gen.sg. drink-pr.p.pass.-transl.sg.
Mother brought some milk for the child to drink.

In this sentence the participle is in the translative case, while the preceding noun *maito* is in the partitive case. This means that the present participle passive need not agree in case with the noun preceding it. It is interesting to note that the present participle passive in this sentence can be replaced by a first infinitive without a change in the meaning². That is:

- (3) *Äiti* *toi* *maitoa* *lapsen* *juoda*.
mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. child-gen.sg. drink-1.inf.

Mother brought some milk for the child to drink.

What should be noticed here is that the first infinitive in the sentence (3) is not in the passive voice but in the active voice. The question then arises as to the voice distinction of the non-finite forms in the Finnish language. How can the correspondence between the present participle passive and the first infinitive active be explained?

Diachronically, the first infinitive had both an active and a passive form indeed. But the first infinitive passive became obsolete³. Then, the first infinitive passive is not available as an alternative to the first infinitive active in the sentence (3) at least in the present-day standard Finnish, although the first infinitive passive corresponds to the present participle passive much more straightforwardly. Let us compare the sentence (3) with the following:

- (4) **Äiti* *toi* *maitoa* *lapsen* *juotaa*.⁴
 mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. child-gen.sg. drink-1.inf.pass.
 Mother brought some milk for the child to drink.

The reason for the decline of the first infinitive passive is another question to be clarified.

To be accurate, the first infinitive active in (3) is in the lative case, although the lative case itself is now obsolete as a morphological case of the Finnish language⁵. The first infinitive active has another form, too. This form, which is always accompanied by a possessive suffix, is in the translative case. These two forms can be used in the same syntactic environment. Compare the following two sentences:

- (5) *Äiti* *toi* *maitoa* *lapsen* *juoda*.
 mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. child-gen.sg. drink-1.inf.
 Mother brought some milk for the child to drink. (=3))
- (6) *Äiti* *toi* *maitoa* *juodaksemme*.
 mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. drink-1.inf.transl.
 Mother brought some milk for us to drink.

What is common to these two sentences is that the first infinitive indicates the purpose of the action designated by the matrix predicate. Especially, the first infinitive in the translative case is the most ordinary means to express the purpose in the Finnish language. However, the present participle passive in the translative case is also available. Take the following for example:

- (7) *Äiti* *toi* *maitoa* *lapsen* *juotavaksi*.
 mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. child-gen.sg. drink-pr.p.pass.-transl.sg.
 Mother brought some milk for the child to drink. (=2))

Then, what is the difference among these sentences?

The purpose of this paper is to answer these questions concerning the relationship between the first infinitive and the present participle passive in the translative case. In my previous paper (2005), I discussed the diachronic development of the permissive construction. What is characteristic to the permissive construction is that the subject of the first infinitive is not the same as that of the matrix subject. The following serves as an example:

- (8) *Äiti antoi lapsen juoda maitoa.*
 mother-nom.sg. let-3.sg.p. child-gen.sg. drink-1.inf. milk-part.sg.
 Mother let the child drink some milk.

As I pointed out, the permissive construction is a later development. The non-finite predicate involved in the original construction was not a first infinitive but a present participle passive in the translative case. Compare the sentence (8) with the following:

- (9) **Äiti antoi lapsen maitoa juotavaksi*
 mother-nom.sg. give-3.sg.p. child-gen.sg. milk-part.sg. drink-pr.p.pass.-transl.sg.
 Mother gave the child some milk to drink.

It is important to note that a first infinitive does again correspond to a present participle passive in the translative case. I will also take up the diachronic development of the permissive construction, since this subject calls for further discussion.

2. The voice distinction of the first infinitive

Let us start with the question concerning the voice distinction of the first infinitive. Take the following for example:

- (10) *Äiti toi maitoa juoda.*
 mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. drink-1.inf.
 Mother brought some milk to drink.

In this sentence, the first infinitive *juoda* is in the active voice. Then, *maitoa* cannot be regarded as the subject of the first infinitive. The subject of the infinitive is not specified. If the referent of the subject is specific, it is indicated in the genitive case. The following serves as an example:

- (11) *Äiti toi maitoa lapsen juoda.*
 mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. child-gen.sg. drink-1.inf.
 Mother brought some milk for the child to drink. (=3)

In this sentence *lapsen* is in the genitive singular case and functions as the subject of the infinitive *juoda*. On the other hand, *maitoa* serves primarily as the matrix object, though it is indeed possible to interpret it as the object of the infinitive. The same is true to *maitoa* in (10). When the subject of the first infinitive is not overtly expressed, it is possible to regard its referent as the generic person. In the Finnish language, when the subject refers to the generic person, an impersonal passive form is usually employed for the corresponding predicate. Then, if the referent of the subject is not only non-specific but also generic, the first infinitive passive may be a more suitable alternative. Compare the sentence (10) with the following:

- (12) **Äiti toi maitoa juotaa.*
 mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. drink-1.inf.pass.

Mother brought some milk to drink.

However, the first infinitive passive is not available in the present-day standard Finnish.

According to Leino (2005), more than half instances of the first infinitive passive are found in the necessitative construction. For example:

- (13) *Kalat piti perattaa ensi.*
 fish-nom.pl. must-3.sg.p. clean-1.inf.pass. first
 Firstly the fishes had to be cleaned. (Leino 2005: 239)⁶

In this sentence the first infinitive passive functions as the complement to the necessitative predicate *pitää*. In the present-day standard Finnish, however, the first infinitive passive should be converted to the active form.

- (14) *Kalat piti perata ensin.*
 fish-nom.pl. must-3.sg.p. clean-1.inf. first
 Firstly the fishes had to be cleaned.

It is worth noting that in the Finnish language the active voice is also available when the referent of a subject is the generic person. Take the following for example:

- (15) *Asian voi korjata nopeasti.*
 matter-gen.sg.⁷ can-3.sg.pr. alter-1.inf. quickly
 The matter can be altered quickly.

In this sentence the subject referring to the generic person is not overtly expressed. The predicate in the active voice is conjugated in the third person singular. Compare this sentence with the following impersonal passive sentence:

- (16) *Asia voidaan korjata nopeasti.*
 matter-nom.sg. can-pass.pr. alter-1.inf. quickly
 The matter can be altered quickly.

These two sentences are slightly different in their meaning indeed. The former describes the situation that is applicable to any individual, while the latter describes the situation that is relevant to humans in general⁸. But, concerning these two sentences, the difference is too small to treat them separately. This means that the semantic difference between the active sentence without an overt subject and the impersonal passive sentence becomes neutralized in specific circumstances. What is important to note is that the sentences (13)–(16) are modal expressions. It is a well known fact that modal expressions are the very candidates for such circumstances. The sentences (10)–(12) can also be regarded as modal expressions, since the first infinitive in these sentences expresses a possibility. Then, it seems reasonable to suppose that the difference between the first infinitive active in (10) and the first infinitive passive in (12) is also neutralized.

We should notice that (15) and (16) are different from each other in the form of their matrix predicate, i.e. the ordinary active form in the third person singular and the impersonal

passive form respectively. On the other hand, the difference between (13) and (14) resides not in their matrix predicate but in their verbal complement. Although their verbal complements differ from each other in their voice marking, their matrix predicates are identical. In both of the sentences the matrix predicate is *piti* in the active voice. The same observation applies to the sentences (10) and (12). They have the identical matrix predicate *toi* in the active voice, while the verbal complement in (10) is opposite in its voice marking to that in (12). Since the verbal complement is subject to the matrix predicate, the opposition between the first infinitive active and the first infinitive passive does not make much difference to the meaning conveyed in the whole sentence. In other words, the functional load the voice opposition of the first infinitive bears in the sentences (10)–(14) is too small to preserve the opposition. This may be the reason for the decline of the first infinitive passive.

3. The voice distinction of participles

The first infinitive in the sentence (10) above can be altered to a present participle passive in the translative case. That is:

- (17) *Äiti* *toi* *maitoa* *juotavaksi*.
 mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. drink-pr.p.pass.-transl.sg.
 Mother brought some milk to drink.

The question is the reason a participle corresponding to a first infinitive active is not in the active voice but in the passive voice. To answer this question, we should recall the nature of the participles in the Finnish language. Since any participle has characteristics both as a verb and as an adjective, *juotavaksi*, the present participle passive in (17), should also be regarded as an attribute of the preceding noun *maitoa*. When a participle is in the passive voice, the noun it modifies serves as its object. Considering the meaning, the noun *maitoa* in (17) should be the object of the verbal complement *juoda*. If the participle is in the active voice, the noun *maitoa* turns to be the subject of the verbal complement. Then, the verbal complement should be a present participle passive. A present participle active is not available in the sentence (17).

In (17) the subject of the present participle passive is not specified. This is consistent with the fact that a phrase containing a present participle passive can be paraphrased by using a relative clause whose predicate is in the impersonal passive voice. For example, the following is a paraphrase of (1) above:

- (18) *oppikirja*, *joka* *käytetään* *kurssilla*.
 textbook-nom.sg. which-nom.sg. use-pass.pr. course-adess.sg.
 the textbook that is intended to be used in the course

However, the subject of the present participle passive can sometimes be overtly expressed⁹. The following serves as an example:

- (19) *Äiti* *toi* *maitoa* *lapsen* *juotavaksi*.
 mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. child-gen.sg. drink-pr.p.pass.-transl.sg.

Mother brought some milk for the child to drink. (=2)

In this sentence the subject of the participle is indicated in the genitive case. Now, the question arises. What is the reason the present participle passive can take an overt subject?¹⁰

We must draw attention to the fact that the Finnish language has another participle expressing the relationship between a predicate and its object. This is the agent participle. Take the following for example:

- (20) *oppilaiden kursorilla käyttämä oppikirja*
 pupil-gen.pl. course-adess.sg. use-agt.p.-nom.sg. textbook-nom.sg.
 the textbook that is used by pupils during the course

In this phrase, *oppilaiden* functions as the subject of the agent participle *käyttämä*. It is necessary for the agent participle to be accompanied either by a genitive subject or by a possessive suffix. In other words, the subject is indispensable not to the present participle passive but to the agent participle. Considering the functional similarity, however, we may say that the genitive marking of the subject was extended from the agent participle to the present participle passive¹¹.

It is also important to note that the present participle passive tends to take on a modal meaning. Then, *luettava kirja*, for example, means 'a book which should be read' rather than 'a book which will be read'. The present participle passive can also be used in the necessitative construction. The following serves as an example:

- (21) *Tämä kirja on luettava.*
 this-nom.sg. book-nom.sg. be-3.sg.pr. read-pr.p.pass.-nom.sg.
 This book should be read.

In this sentence *on luettava* carries out the same function as *pitää* in (14). As is generally known, in the necessitative construction the subject is indicated in the genitive case. A subject in the genitive case can be added also to the sentence (21).

- (22) *Oppilaiden on luettava tämä kirja.*
 pupil-gen.pl. be-3.sg.pr. read-pr.p.pass.-nom.sg. this-nom.sg. book-nom.sg.
 Pupils should read this book.

Then, it seems reasonable to suppose that the necessitative construction like (22) is another source of the genitive marking of the subject of the present participle passive.

4. The first infinitive in the translative case

The first infinitive in the translative case is usually followed by a possessive suffix indicating its subject. This form is used to express the purpose of the action designated by the matrix predicate, as can be seen from the following example:

- (23) *Äiti toi maitoa juodaksemme.*

mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. drink-1.inf.transl.
 Mother brought some milk for us to drink. (=6)

As stated above, the present participle passive in the translative case can take the subject in the genitive case. Moreover, it can be used in the same way as the first infinitive in the translative case. Take the following for example:

(24) *Äiti* *toi* *maitoa* *lapsen* *juotavaksi.*
 mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. child-gen.sg. drink-pr.p.pass.-transl.sg.
 Mother brought some milk for the child to drink. (=2)

The subject of the participle can sometimes be indicated by a possessive suffix. For example:

(25) *Äiti* *toi* *maitoa* (*meidän*) *juotavaksemme.*
 mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. we-gen. drink-pr.p.pass.-transl.sg.
 Mother brought some milk for us to drink.

Out of these two types of sentence, (23) on one hand and (24)–(25) on the other, the former is used more frequently. It does not seem that there are any significant differences between the two types of sentence, but the subject of the first infinitive in the translative case cannot be indicated by an independent noun phrase in the genitive case. This means that the subject of the first infinitive in the translative case should be either identical with the matrix subject or inferable from the context as in (23). If this is the case, it is possible to say that the first infinitive in the translative case is strongly bound by the matrix predicate. In other words, the first infinitive in the translative case and the matrix predicate constitute a syntactic construction. On the other hand, the present participle passive in the translative case is nothing more than an adverbial modifier. Then, the participle and the matrix predicate cannot make up a construction.

This difference between the first infinitive and the present participle passive is observable also in the following pair of sentences¹².

(26) *Hevonen* *on* *vaikea* *hoitaa.*
 horse-nom.sg. be-3.sg.pr. difficult-nom.sg. care for-1.inf.
 It is difficult to care for the horse. (Pekkarinen 2005: 142)

(27) *Hevonen* *on* *vaikea* *hoidettava.*
 horse-nom.sg. be-3.sg.pr. difficult-nom.sg. care for-.pr.p.pass.-nom.sg.
 The horse is difficult to care for. (Pekkarinen 2005: 142)

In this type of sentence the present participle passive is usually marked in the nominative case, but the translative case is sometimes also available.

(28) *Kala* *on* *valmis* *tarjottavaksi.*
 fish-nom.sg. be-3.sg.pr. ready-nom.sg. serve-pr.p.pass.-transl.sg.
 The fish is ready to serve. (Pekkarinen 2005: 138)

In all of the sentences the matrix subject functions at the same time as the object of the

non-finite predicate, i.e. the object of the first infinitive in (26) and the object of the present participle passive in (27)–(28). The meaning of the former sentence is, however, slightly different from that of the latter two sentences. In the latter two sentences the adjective, together with the present participle passive, designates a characteristic of the referent of the matrix subject, while in the former sentence the adjective characterizes the nature of the whole process described in the rest of the sentence. To put it another way, although in (27) what makes it difficult to care for is the nature of the referent of the matrix subject, in (26) it is the nature of the process itself. This fact again shows that the first infinitive is more integrated into syntactic constructions than the present participle passive.

5. The diachronic development of the permissive construction

Let us now attempt to extend the observation concerning the difference between the first infinitive and the present participle passive into the diachronic development of the permissive construction¹³. The sentence (8), repeated here for convenience as (29), serves as an example of the permissive construction.

- (29) *Äiti antoi lapsen juoda maitoa.*
 mother-nom.sg. let-3.sg.p. child-gen.sg. drink-1.inf. milk-part.sg.
 Mother let the child drink some milk. (=8)

What is characteristic to the permissive construction is among others that the subject of the first infinitive is indicated in the genitive case. As for the first infinitive used as a verbal complement, the subject is usually identical with the matrix subject, except for that of the permissive construction.

As I have argued in my previous paper (2005), the permissive construction developed from the construction containing a present participle passive in the translative case. The following is an assumed original construction of the sentence (29).

- (30)**Äiti antoi lapsen maitoa juotavaksi*
 mother-nom.sg. give-3.sg.p. child-gen.sg. milk-part.sg. drink-pr.p.pass.-transl.sg.
 Mother gave the child some milk to drink. (=9)

Since the present participle passive in this sentence functions only as an adverbial modifier, it is difficult to say that the participle and the matrix predicate are close enough to make up a fixed construction. In order to be regarded as a fixed construction, the non-finite predicate should become a more integral part of the sentence in question. Then, a reanalysis must have taken place to achieve this requirement. As a result of the reanalysis, the noun phrase serving as the object both of the matrix predicate and of the non-finite predicate ceased to function as the matrix object. This means that the matrix predicate lost its original meaning 'to give someone something'. At the same time, the noun phrase marked in the genitive case became also unstable, since it was no longer possible to interpret it as the recipient of the matrix predicate. Then, the noun phrase was reinterpreted as the subject of the non-finite predicate.

The reanalysis sketched above is plausible indeed, but what triggered the reanalysis, if it

actually took place? To be accurate, the case form of the recipient in (30) is not the genitive case but the dative-genitive case. However, the dative-genitive case became obsolete in the diachronic development of the Finnish language. Since the dative-genitive case and the genitive case are identical in form, it became gradually prevailing to interpret the noun phrase in question as being in the genitive case. Moreover, the existence of a sentence like (2) probably played an important role in the diachronic development of the permissive construction. In the sentence (2), repeated here for convenience as the sentence (31), there appears a present participle passive in the translative case together with a noun phrase in the genitive case.

- (31) *Äiti* *toi* *maitoa* *lapsen* *juotavaksi*.
 mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. child-gen.sg. drink-pr.p.pass.-transl.sg.
 Mother brought some milk for the child to drink. (=2)

This noun phrase clearly functions as the subject of the participle. Then, it seems reasonable to suppose that a sentence like (31) served as a model for the reanalysis of a sentence like (30). In addition, the sentence (31) has a variant containing a first infinitive instead of a present participle passive. Compare the sentence (3), repeated here for convenience as the sentence (32), with the permissive construction like (29) above.

- (32) *Äiti* *toi* *maitoa* *lapsen* *juoda*.
 mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. child-gen.sg. drink-1.inf.
 Mother brought some milk for the child to drink. (=3)

They are different from each other in their matrix predicate and their word order indeed, but they are parallel in other respects. Then, it may safely be assumed that the sentence (30) was converted into the permissive construction via intermediate stages like the following.

- (33)* *Äiti* *antoi* *maitoa* *lapsen* *juotavaksi*.
 mother-nom.sg. give-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. child-gen.sg. drink-pr.p.pass.-transl.sg.
 Mother gave some milk for the child to drink.
 (34)* *Äiti* *antoi* *maitoa* *lapsen* *juoda*.
 mother-nom.sg. give-3.sg.p. milk-part.sg. child-gen.sg. drink-1.inf.
 Mother gave some milk for the child to drink.

Since the matrix predicate of the sentence (32), i.e. *tuoda*, designates a concrete activity of bringing something to someone, the referent of its object should be something portable. In a metaphorical context, the referent can be an abstract concept indeed, but a verbal noun is not available. Because of this, the following sentence is ungrammatical.

- (35)* *Äiti* *toi* *lapsen* *juoda* *maitoa*.
 mother-nom.sg. bring-3.sg.p. child-gen.sg. drink-1.inf. milk-part.sg.

On the other hand, the matrix predicate of the sentences (33)–(34), i.e. *antaa*, has not only a literal meaning ‘giving someone something’ but also a derived permissive meaning ‘allowing someone to do something’. If the verb *antaa* designates permission, a noun phrase expressing a concrete entity is not suitable for its object. Thus, it is necessary for the matrix object *maitoa* to

be reinterpreted as the object of the first infinitive. In other words, the availability of another interpretation of the matrix predicate *antaa* made it possible for the sentences (33)–(34) to go through the further development, ending up in the permissive construction. What is important to note is that through the reanalysis the first infinitive in (34) became an integral part of the predicate chain. This means that the resultant sentence (29) was qualified to be treated as a syntactic construction, i.e. in this case as the permissive construction.

6. Conclusion

From the discussion above one general point becomes very clear. In the Finnish language, an infinitive and a participle are interchangeable in a particular context. For example, the purpose of the action designated by a matrix predicate can be expressed both by a present participle passive and by a first infinitive. The voice of a participle is determined by the relationship the participle has to a noun phrase it is semantically connected to. Then, a participle should be marked in the passive voice, if a correlated noun phrase serves as the object of the participle. On the other hand, the first infinitive lacks in a passive form. Being a verbal complement, the first infinitive forms a predicate chain with the matrix predicate. In the predicate chain the inflection of the first infinitive is regulated by the matrix predicate. To indicate that the subject of the first infinitive refers to the generic person, not the passive form but the active form is required. This means that the first infinitive is more integrated to overall syntactic constructions than the present participle passive. This difference between the first infinitive and the present participle passive is observable in several seemingly unrelated environments. From the observations in the last section, it is also clear that the difference had some influence not only over the synchronic distribution of non-finite predicates but also over the diachronic development of the permissive construction.

Notes

- * This research was supported by a grant-in-aid for scientific research from the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture, Government of Japan.
- 1 The Finnish language has four kinds of participles: the present participle, the past participle, the agent participle (ending in -mA) and the negative participle (ending in -tOn). The first two types are subject to the voice distinction. Then, four distinct forms should be distinguished. They are the present participle active (ending in -vA), the present participle passive (ending in -(t)AvA), the past participle active (ending in -nUt) and the past participle passive (ending in -(t)U). 'A', 'O' and 'U' stand for 'a or ä', 'o or ö' and 'u or y' respectively. For further details of the participles, see Hakulinen et al. (2004: 515–530).
- 2 The Finnish language has three kinds of infinitives: the first infinitive (the stem plus -A), the second infinitive (the stem plus -e) and the third infinitive (the stem plus -mA). 'A' stands for 'a or ä'. Each type has several forms followed by a particular case ending. For further details of the infinitives, see Hakulinen et al. (2004: 489–514).
- 3 The first infinitive passive is attested in some documents of the older stage of the language. In some dialects, especially in the Häme dialect, the first infinitive passive survived until recently. But it is not familiar to the most of the speakers of the present-day standard Finnish. For a discussion of the first infinitive passive, see Leino (2005).
- 4 Here and henceforth an asterisk indicates obsolescence, unless otherwise noted.
- 5 On the lative case, see Hakulinen (1968: 93–95) for example.
- 6 This sentence, collected from Kuhmoinen, the middle of Häme region, is recorded to *muoto-opin arkisto*, the archive of the Finnish dialects.
- 7 According to the traditional grammar, the -n case assigned to the object in the singular is called the accusative. The so-called accusative case is, however, identical in form with the genitive case in the singular and with the

- nominative case in the plural. Only the personal pronouns have a distinct accusative form. Then, in this paper, I don't use the term 'accusative' as to nominals other than the personal pronouns.
- 8 For further details of the difference between the impersonal passive sentence and the active sentence without an overt subject, see Hakulinen et al. (2004: 1297–1299).
- 9 Similar examples are abundant:
- (i) *Hän antoi asian miehen hoidettavaksi.*
 (s)he-nom. give-3.sg.p. matter-gen.sg. man-gen.sg. handle-pr.p.pass.-transl.sg.
 (S)he let the matter be handled by the man. (Ikola 1978: 80)
- (ii) *Kaikki suomalaiset eivät edes halua maalle hyttysten syötäväksi.*
 all Finn-nom.pl. not-3.sg. even want-1.inf. countryside-allat.sg. mosquito-gen.pl.
 eat-pr.p.pass.-transl.pl.
 All Finns don't even want to go to the countryside to be bitten by mosquitoes. (Hakulinen et al. 2004: 527)
- In the latter sentence the present participle passive is in the plural in accordance with its subject *hyttysten*.
- 10 The subject of the past participle passive can also be indicated in the genitive case. For example:
- (i) *Tämä on hiiren syötyä leipää.*
 this-nom.sg. be-3.sg.pr. mouse-gen.sg. eat-p.p.pass.-part.sg. bread-part.sg.
 This is bread eaten by a mouse. (Hakulinen 1968: 479)
- A sentence like this has been called the agent construction (*agenttirakenne* in Finnish) by some grammarians. This construction contains a non-finite predicate and its subject indicated either by a noun phrase in the genitive case or by a possessive suffix. The following are a few random examples:
- (ii) *Auto oli käytettävänäimme.*
 car-nom.sg. be-3.sg.p. use-pr.p.pass.-ess.sg.
 The car was at our disposal. (Hakulinen 1968: 479)
- (iii) *Meillä on marjoja syödäksemme.*
 we-adess. be-3.sg.pr. berry-part.pl. eat-1.inf.transl.
 We have berries for ourselves to eat. (Hakulinen 1968: 479)
- (iv) *Tämä on terveellistä kenen tahansa nauttia.*
 this-nom.sg. be-3.sg.pr. good-part.sg. whoever-gen.sg. enjoy-1.inf.
 This is good for anyone to take. (Hakulinen 1968: 479)
- Sentences like (2), (3) and (6) are also examples of the agent construction. For further details of the agent construction, see Hakulinen (1968: 477–482) and Ikola (1978: 78–81).
- 11 On the relationship between the agent participle and the other participles, see Koivisto (2005).
- 12 On this point, see Pekkarinen (2005).
- 13 For a full account of the diachronic development of the permissive construction, see Leino (2003).

Abbreviations

nom.—nominative	gen.—genitive	part.—partitive	ess.—essive
transl.—translative	allat.—allative	adess.—adessive	sg.—singular
pl.—plural	pr.—present	p.—past	pass.—passive
pr.p.—present participle	p.p.—past participle	inf.—infinitive	agt.p.—agent participle

References

- Hakulinen, Auli et al. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Hakulinen, Lauri. 1968. *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys*. Keuruu: Otava.
- Ikola, Osmo. 1978. *Lauseenvastikeoppia*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Koivisto, Vesa. 2005. Monikasvoinen *-mA* ja suomen agenttipartisiipin tausta. In Ilona Herlin & Laura Visapää (eds.), *Elävä kielioppi. Suomen infiniittisten rakenteiden dynamiikkaa*: pp. 146–172. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Leino, Jaakko. 2003. *Antaa sen muuttua. Suomen kielen permissiivirakenne ja sen kehitys*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Leino, Jaakko. 2005. Passiivin infiniitivimuodot suomen murteissa. In Ilona Herlin & Laura Visapää (eds.), *Elävä kielioppi. Suomen infiniittisten rakenteiden dynamiikkaa*: pp. 231–257. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Pekkarinen, Heli. 2005. Sika on paha nyljettävä – mutta helppo ruokkia. Adjektiivin kanssa esiintyvien infiniittisten

- muotojen käytön tarkastelua. In Ilona Herlin & Laura Visapää (eds.), *Elävä kielioppi. Suomen infiniittisten rakenteiden dynamiikka*: pp. 127–145. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Sakuma, Jun'ichi. 2006. On the Diachronic Development of the Permissive Construction in the Finnish Language. *Nagoya University Journal of the School of Letters* 2, pp. 1–10.