

# ON THE DEFAULT THEME IN THE FINNISH LANGUAGE\*

Jun'ichi SAKUMA

## 1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to show that the default theme should be introduced to the Finnish grammar and without this notion we cannot properly explain some syntactic phenomena.

As I have pointed out in my previous papers (1988, 1992), in the Finnish grammar the theme plays an important role. Sentences of the Finnish language do not always have the syntactic subject. Whether with or without the syntactic subject, there is no difference in possibility of applying some syntactic processes to a sentence. In such cases syntactic processes do not operate on the syntactic subject but on the theme. This is why I have claimed the importance of the theme in the Finnish grammar.

The theme is a pragmatic notion and it is defined as follows: the theme represents what is already known and hints at what is going to be said in the rest of the sentence. This definition means that the theme of a sentence can be fixed only on the surface level. I will show, however, that the most favorite for the theme of a sentence is already specified in the lexicon. This most favorite, which I call the default theme, is described in the lexicon as the left-most argument and appears as the theme on the surface level. But the theme is not always derived from the default one. In some contexts, in spite of the specification in the lexicon, some other argument can be chosen as the theme of a sentence. This type of theme, however, should be distinguished from the theme which is derived from the default one. In this paper, I will also demonstrate that this distinction is justified with respect to, at least, some syntactic processes. The theme derived from the default one is called in this paper the primary theme and the theme chosen on the surface level the secondary theme.

## 2. Reflexive expression in a simple sentence

We will begin by considering the following sentences:

- (1) Pekka tappo-i itse-nsä.  
 Pekka-nom. killed-3sg. himself-gen.<sup>1)</sup>  
 'Pekka killed himself.'
- (2) Peka-lla on vain itse-nsä.  
 Pekka-adess. is only himself-gen.  
 'Pekka has no one to depend on but himself.' [Hakulinen 1983 : 246]
- (3) Pekka-a inhotta-a epäonnistumise-nsa.  
 Pekka-part. disgusts his own failure-nom.  
 'Pekka is disgusted with his own failure.' [ibid.]

All of the sentences above have a reflexive expression; reflexive pronoun in (1) and (2), possessive suffix in (3). What is the antecedent of each reflexive expression? The antecedent of the reflexive pronoun in (1) is clearly the subject 'Pekka'. In fact, it has been said that the antecedent of a reflexive expression should be the subject of the sentence, but this is not true. Both of the sentences, (2) and (3), do not have the syntactic subject. Although in (2) and (3) 'Pekka' should be interpreted as the antecedent of the reflexive expression, 'Pekka' is not the syntactic subject in these sentences. Then, what function does the antecedent carry out in the Finnish language? 'Pekka' in (2) and (3) functions as the theme of the sentence. 'Pekka' in (1), the syntactic subject, is the theme of the sentence as well. All these things make it clear that the antecedent of a reflexive expression should serve as the theme in each of the sentences.

Strictly speaking, however, the tentative conclusion above leaves out of account some facts about reflexive expressions. Let us consider the sentence below:

- (4) \*Pekka inhotta-a itse-ä-än.  
 Pekka-nom. disgusts himself-part.  
 'Pekka is disgusted with himself.' [Hakulinen 1974 : 82]

The verb in the sentence (4), 'inhottaa', takes two arguments: one is the cause of the feeling, marked in the nominative case, and the other is the person who has the feeling, marked in the partitive case.<sup>2)</sup> Normally, as in the sentence (3), the argument in the partitive appears in the initial position of the sentence and the other one in the nominative appears after the verb. To the contrary, in the sentence (4), the initial position is occupied by the argument in the nominative. This nominative argument, 'Pekka', clearly functions as the theme of the sentence. If so, why the sentence (4) is ungrammatical? The best account for the ungrammaticality of the sentence (4) can be found in the fact that the sentence (4) is an inverted sentence. In inverted sentences the initial argument cannot be the antecedent of

a reflexive expression in spite of the fact that it serves as the theme of the sentence on the surface level. Given that this is true, we can explain why the sentence (4) is ungrammatical.

But why the theme chosen on the surface level cannot be the antecedent of a reflexive expression? This can be explained by the fact that the Finnish language is quite flexible as regards the arrangement of arguments. Because of this flexibility, the reflexivization of an argument should precede the inversion of arguments. Otherwise, the reflexivization could not be described in a simple way. The precedence of the reflexivization over the inversion means that the antecedent of a reflexive expression should be fixed before arguments are inverted. Then, the theme chosen on the surface level cannot be the antecedent of a reflexive expression.

It follows that, when the inversion of arguments takes place, the theme on the surface level should be distinguished from that on the deeper level. Let us call the theme on the deeper level the primary theme, and that on the surface level the secondary theme.

By the way, if we want to say 'Pekka is disgusted with himself' in Finnish, what expression can be used? In this case, we should use the following expression:

(5) Pekka            inhoa-a itse-ä-än.

Pekka-nom. detests himself-part.

'Pekka detests himself.' [Hakulinen 1974 : 82]

Here, the verb 'inhota' also takes two arguments, but one argument which denotes the person who has the feeling is marked in the nominative case and the other one which denotes the cause of the feeling is marked in the partitive case. Besides, with this verb the argument in the nominative usually occupies the initial position. This means that in the sentence (5) the arguments have not been inverted. Therefore, the theme on the surface level, 'Pekka', is the primary theme and can be the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun. This is why the whole sentence is grammatical.

### 3. Reflexive expression in a complex sentence

#### 3. 1. Complement types

Let us now attempt to extend the range of discussion into the sentences with a complement. The Finnish language has three complement types; infinitive clause, participial clause and finite clause (että-clause). One of the differences between these complement types lies in the possibility of moving an argument across the clausal boundary.<sup>3)</sup> While arguments of infinitive clauses can be moved most easily, those of finite clauses are

most difficult to move across the boundary. This can be seen from the example below:

(6a) ?Kirja-t jo-t-ka on tärkeä-tä että  
 books-nom. which-nom. pl. is important-part. sg. that-conj.  
 lue-t ovat työpöydä-llä-si.  
 read-2sg. pr. are-3pl. your desk-adess.

(6b) Kirja-t jo-t-ka sinu-n on  
 books-nom. which-nom. pl. you-gen. sg. is  
 tärkeä-tä lukea ovat työpöydä-llä-si.  
 important-part. sg. to read-inf. are-3pl. your desk-adess.

'The books which it is important for you to read are on your desk. [Härmä 1977 : 161]

In both of the sentences 'kirjat' is originally the object of the complement predicate 'lukea'. Since 'luet' in (6a) is a finite form, 'kirjat' in (6a) is originated from the object position of a finite complement. On the other hand, in (6b) the predicate 'lukea' is an infinitive. Then 'kirjat' in (6b) is the former object of an infinitive complement. If there is a difference in acceptability between the sentences above, it should be attributed to the fact that the complement type of (6a) is different from that of (6b). While the object 'kirjat' can be moved out of the infinitive complement in (6b), it is difficult to move out of the finite one in (6a). This is why the sentence (6a) is less acceptable than the sentence (6b).

### 3. 2. Infinitive complement

#### 3. 2. 1. Antecedent of a reflexive expression

The difference stated above in the possibility of moving arguments out of a complement is also reflected in the determination of the antecedent of a reflexive expression in a complement. If a reflexive expression is in an infinitive complement, the theme of the main clause can be the antecedent of the reflexive expression. Here are some examples:

(7) Jeesus kehott-i tule-ma-an luokse-en.  
 Jesus-nom. asked-3sg. to come-inf. to himself-postp.  
 'Jesus asked people to come close to him.' [Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979 : 367]

(8) Pekka anto-i satee-n kastella itse-nsä.  
 Pekka-nom. let-3sg. p. rain-gen. to soak-inf. himself-gen.  
 'Pekka let the rain soak him.' [ibid.]

In the sentence (7) the antecedent of the possessive suffix in the complement is the theme of the matrix, 'Jeesus'. The reason for this is that in the complement, which has a generic

subject, there is no syntactically qualified argument that can function as the antecedent. In the sentence (8), on the other hand, the theme of the matrix, 'Pekka', functions as the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun in the complement because 'sateen', an argument of the complement predicate, is not semantically qualified as the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun.

The following also serves as an example:

- (9) Juontaja        vaat-i        yleisö-ä  
 compere-nom. demanded-3sg. audience-part.  
 kuuntele-ma-an itse-ä-än.  
 to listen to-inf. himself/themselves-part.

'The compere demanded that the audience should listen to him/themselves.'

[Hakulinen 1974 : 87]

In this sentence the reflexive pronoun in the infinitive complement can indicate the theme of the main clause 'juontaja'.

But what has to be noticed is the fact that an argument other than the theme of the main clause can be the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun here. In other words, not only 'juontaja' but also 'yleisöä', which is the object of the main clause, can serve as the antecedent. As we have seen in the section 2, the antecedent of reflexive expressions should be the primary theme. Then, why the reflexive pronoun in (9) can indicate the object of the main clause? To properly explain this, we must look more carefully into this sentence.

'Yleisöä' is syntactically the object of the main clause predicate 'vaati', indeed, but semantically it serves as the subject of the complement predicate 'kuuntelemaan'. This phenomenon admits of two explanations. One explanation may be that 'yleisöä' has been raised from the subject position in the complement to the object position in the main clause. Since the complement is infinitival, the raising like this is indeed possible. The more likely explanation, however, is that the notional subject of the complement has been equi-deleted under identity with the object of the main clause 'yleisöä'. Since 'vaatia' is a three-place predicate, this latter explanation is preferable.

In any case, 'yleisöä' in (9) functions both as the object of the main clause and as the subject of the complement. This may help account for the fact above, that is, the fact that 'yleisöä' can be the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun in the complement. 'Yleisöä' can serve as the antecedent not because it is the object of the main clause but because it is the subject of the complement.

3. 2. 2. Default theme<sup>4)</sup>

It is necessary, at this point, to examine further the property of complements. In the Finnish language, unless arguments are not inverted, the subject serves at the same time as the theme. Then, the subject of a complement also functions as the theme of the complement, doesn't it? But, what is the theme of a complement in the first place? As stated above, the theme is fixed on the surface level. But, a complement is embedded in a main clause as an argument of the matrix predicate. Then, on the surface level we cannot handle the arguments of the complement. If so, it would be meaningless to talk about the theme of the complement.

It may be, however, too much to say that talking about the theme of a complement is senseless. There is one other thing that we should not ignore. What would happen if a complement is not embedded in a main clause? The complement appears on the surface level as an independent sentence. For example, if the embedding does not take place, the complement in (9) would be as follows:

(10a) Yleisö kuuntel-i itse-ä-än.  
audience-nom. listened to-3sg. themselves-part.

'The audience listened to themselves.'

(10b) Yleisö kuuntel-i juontaja-a.  
audience-nom. listened to-3sg. compere-part.

'The audience listened to the compere.'

Here, in both of the cases, the subject 'yleisö' clearly functions as the primary theme of the sentence. Then, the notional subject of a complement can serve as the primary theme when the complement, without being embedded, appears by itself. This means that the notional subject of a complement is *qualified* as the primary theme, although it is not the primary theme in reality.

Now, it seems reasonable to suppose that in the Finnish language for each predicate one of the arguments is *qualified* as the primary theme in the lexicon. If a predicate makes up an independent clause and the arguments are not inverted, the qualified argument will be realized as the primary theme on the surface level. On the other hand, if a predicate constitutes a complement, the qualified argument does not appear as the primary theme in reality.

The merit of this assumption is that we can more simply describe the fact about the antecedent of reflexive expressions in complements. For example, in (9) the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun is either 'juontaja' or 'yleisöä'. The former is the subject, then the

primary theme of the matrix predicate 'vaati'. The latter is the notional subject of 'kuuntelemaan'. But, if the notional subject of the complement has been qualified already in the lexicon as the primary theme of the complement predicate, we can say that the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun in (9) is either the primary theme of the matrix predicate or the argument qualified as the primary theme of the complement predicate.

Thus, one can safely state that in the Finnish language for each predicate one of the arguments has been qualified as the primary theme already in the lexicon. From now on, I will call this argument qualified as the primary theme the default theme. And, using this notion of the default theme, we can re-define the primary theme and the secondary theme. The theme which is originated from the default one is the primary theme and the theme which is not is the secondary one.

### 3. 2. 3. Scrambling of arguments

Further support for the existence of the default theme can be got from the discussion below. Let us start with the following example:

(11) Yleisö-ä vaat-i juontaja kuuntele-ma-an itse-ä-än.

This sentence differs from the sentence (9) only in the word order. It seems that in (11) the subject and the object of the main clause are inverted. Then, what is the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun in (11)? The antecedent is, again, either 'juontaja' or 'yleisöä'. But, 'yleisöä' in (11) is clearly the theme of the whole sentence. In other words, 'yleisöä' functions as the secondary theme of the whole sentence. If the notion of the default theme is not available, we have to say that the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun in (11) is either the primary theme or the secondary theme of the matrix predicate 'vaati'. But, as can be seen in sentence (4), the secondary theme cannot function as the antecedent of reflexive expressions. To avoid this contradiction, the notion of the default theme is helpful. In (11) 'yleisöä' is the default theme of the complement predicate 'kuuntelemaan'. 'Yleisöä' can serve as the antecedent not because it is the secondary theme of the whole sentence but because it is the default theme of the complement predicate.

Let us now turn to other examples. In the Finnish language it is easy to scramble arguments irrespective of clausal boundaries.<sup>5)</sup> For example, the following sentences are equally possible:

(12a) Ei me voi-da las-ta lähettää kalja-a  
not we can-pass. child-part. to send-inf. beer-part.  
osta-ma-an.

to buy-inf.

'We cannot send a child to buy beer.' [Vilkuna 1989 : 234]

(12b) Ei me las-ta voi-da kalja-a lähettää osta-ma-an.

(12c) Ei me las-ta kalja-a voi-da lähettää osta-ma-an.

In these sentences 'lasta' is the object of the matrix predicate 'lähettää' and 'kaljaa' is the object of the complement predicate 'ostamaan'. But, as in (12c), the objects of both the matrix and the complement predicates can be arranged side by side. If the object of the matrix predicate is pronominalized, even the following expression is possible:

(12d) Ei me kalja-a voi-da si-tä lähettää osta-ma-an.

In this sentence 'kaljaa' is distant from the predicate governing it and it seems that 'kaljaa' has moved over 'sitä', the object of the matrix predicate.

Then, let us now return to the sentence (9). The arguments of the sentence (9) can be re-arranged as follows:

(13a) Itse-ä-än juontaja vaat-i yleisö-ä kuuntele-ma-an.

(13b) Itse-ä-än vaat-i juontaja yleisö-ä kuuntele-ma-an.

In these sentences the initial position is occupied by the object of the complement predicate, that is, the reflexive pronoun. In each of the cases what is the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun? The reflexive pronoun in (13a) usually indicates 'juontaja', but in some cases it can also indicate 'yleisöä'. The same is true of the reflexive pronoun in (13b). Here, it must be noted that in these sentences 'juontaja' does not function as the theme. Since 'juontaja' in (13a) is in a pre-verbal position, there is a possibility of interpreting it as the theme of the main clause. In (13b), however, 'juontaja' is in a post-verbal position, it is impossible to interpret it as the theme. Then, why 'juontaja', which is not the theme, can be the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun? This would be difficult to answer if the notion of the default theme is not available. 'Juontaja' can function as the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun simply because it is the default theme of the matrix predicate.

All these things stated above make it clear that, with the notion of the default theme, we can explain the facts about the antecedent of reflexive expressions in a simple and a consistent way. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that in the Finnish language for each predicate one of the arguments has been qualified as the primary theme already in the lexicon. In other words, the default theme is fixed in the lexicon for each of the predicates.



## 3. 3. Participial complement

Let us now attempt to extend the observation about the infinitive complement into another type of complement, that is the participial complement. When a complement is participial, what is the antecedent of a reflexive expression in the complement? Can a reflexive expression refer to an argument of the matrix predicate?

Following the norm of the traditional grammar, arguments of a matrix predicate cannot be the antecedent of a reflexive expression in a participial complement. This can be seen from the sentence below :

- (14) Vaimo kerto-i miehe-n yrittä-nee-n  
 wife-nom. told-3sg. husband-gen. having tried-p. p. gen.  
 tappaa itse-nsä.  
 to kill-inf. himself-gen.  
 'The wife told that her husband had tried to kill himself/\*her.'  
 [Hakulinen 1974 : 84]

Here, the reflexive pronoun 'itsensä' cannot refer to the subject of the matrix predicate, that is 'vaimo', but to the subject of the complement predicate, that is 'miehen'.

Then, what argument a reflexive expression in a participial complement can refer to? Although in (14) the antecedent is the subject of the complement, it is not restricted to the subject of a complement. An example to show this is:

- (15) Liisa totes-i Pekka-a inhotta-va-n  
 Liisa-nom. found-3sg. Pekka-part. disgusting-pr. p. gen.  
 epäonnistumise-nsa.  
 his own failure-nom.

'Liisa found that Pekka was disgusted with his/\*her own failure.'

Here, the antecedent of the possessive suffix in the complement is not 'Liisa', but 'Pekkaa', which is not the subject of the complement. Then, what function does 'Pekkaa' carry out? As the sentence (3) shows, when the complement of (15) appears as an independent sentence, 'Pekkaa' would be the theme of the sentence. This means that 'Pekkaa' is qualified as the theme. In other words, 'Pekkaa' is the default theme of the complement. Therefore, we can say from this example that the antecedent of a reflexive expression in a participial complement is the default theme of the complement.

By the way, the norm stated above is indeed applicable to most of the cases, but some cases are not covered by this norm. In some cases a reflexive expression in a participial complement can refer to an argument of the matrix predicate. One of the reasons for this

is that in the complement there is no syntactically qualified argument that can function as the antecedent. Let us consider the following example:

- (16) Pekka aavist-i itse-ä-än  
 Pekka-nom. had a feeling-3sg. himself-part.  
 rakaste-tta-va-n.  
 being loved-pr. p. pass. gen.

‘Pekka had a feeling that he was loved by someone.’ [Hakulinen 1974 : 85]

In the sentence above the complement is impersonal. Then, in the complement itself there is nothing that can serve as the antecedent of the reflexive expression in the complement. In this case, for the syntactic reason, the reflexive pronoun in the complement can refer to the subject of the matrix predicate.

On the other hand, there are some cases where an argument of a matrix predicate can function as the antecedent of a reflexive expression for semantic or pragmatic reasons. The following are a few random examples:

- (17) Mies aavist-i laiskuude-n  
 man-nom. had a feeling-3sg. laziness-gen.  
 valtaa-va-n itse-nsä.  
 seizing-pr. p. gen. himself-gen.

‘The man had a feeling that laziness had seized him/\*itself.’

[Hakulinen 1974 : 86]

- (18) Nainen arvel-i miehe-n  
 woman-nom. thought-3sg. man-gen.  
 kosi-nee-n itse-ä-än.  
 having proposed-p. p. gen. herself-part.

‘The woman thought that man had proposed to her/\*himself.’ [ibid.]

In each of the cases above, considering the meaning of the sentence, the subject of the matrix predicate is the only possible antecedent of the reflexive pronoun in the complement.

Thus, in some exceptional cases like (16)–(18), the subject of a matrix predicate can function as the antecedent of a reflexive expression in a participial complement. Unless arguments are inverted, the subject of a matrix predicate functions as the primary theme as well. As the primary theme is derived from the default one, we may reasonably conclude that the default theme of either a complement predicate or a matrix predicate can be the antecedent of a reflexive expression in a participial complement.

## 3. 4. Finite complement

Let us now turn to another type of complement, that is the finite complement. When a complement is sentential, can a reflexive expression refer to an argument of the matrix predicate? Let us consider the following example:

- (19) Juontaja vaat-i että yleisö  
 compere-nom. demanded-3sg. that-conj. audience-nom.  
 kuuntel-i itse-ä-än.  
 listened to-3sg. themselves-part.

‘The compere demanded that the audience should listen to themselves/\*him.’

In the sentence (19) the reflexive pronoun in the complement can refer only to the default theme of the complement predicate, ‘yleisö’. Although ‘juontaja’ is the default theme of the matrix predicate, it cannot function as the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun. If we want to say ‘the audience should listen to the compere,’ we have to use the 3rd person singular pronoun instead of the reflexive pronoun as in (20) :

- (20) Juontaja vaat-i että yleisö  
 compere-nom. demanded-3sg. that-conj. audience-nom.  
 kuuntel-i hän-tä.  
 listened to-3sg. him-part.

‘The compere demanded that the audience should listen to him.’

From these examples above we can see that arguments of a matrix predicate cannot be the antecedent of a reflexive expression in a finite complement. Then, it becomes clear that the norm of the traditional grammar mentioned in 3.3. above is observed in finite complements. More noteworthy, however, is the fact that only the default theme of a complement predicate can function as the antecedent of a reflexive expression in a finite complement. Although in the sentence (19) the default theme of the complement is the subject as well, it does not necessarily serve as the subject. An example to show this is:

- (21) Liisa totes-i että Pekka-a  
 Liisa-nom. found-3sg. that-conj. Pekka-part.  
 inhott-i epäonnistumise-nsa.  
 disgusted-3sg. his own failure-nom.

‘Liisa found that Pekka was disgusted with his/\*her own failure.’

In this sentence, ‘Pekkaa’ is indeed the antecedent of the possessive suffix, but it is not the subject of the complement. Then, if the notion ‘default theme’ is not available, we cannot explain in a simple way why ‘Pekkaa’ in (21) can function as the antecedent of the reflexive

expression in the finite complement.

#### 4. Conclusion

Now, let me summarize the main points that have been made in the preceding sections. In section 2, we have seen that the primary and the secondary theme should be distinguished from each other in order to properly interpret reflexive expressions in simple sentences. In section 3.1, we have expanded this argument into complex sentences and classified complements into three types: The first is the infinitive complement; The second is the participial complement; The third is the finite complement. In the rest of the section 3, with respect to each complement type, we have examined how a reflexive expression in a complement is interpreted. The result of this examination can be summarized in the following sentences :

- (1) A reflexive expression in an infinitive complement can refer not only to an argument of the complement predicate but also an argument of the matrix predicate.
- (2) A reflexive expression in a participial complement refers in principle to an argument of the complement predicate.
- (3) A reflexive expression in a finite complement can refer only to an argument of the complement predicate.
- (4) The argument of a matrix predicate qualified as the antecedent of a reflexive expression is the primary theme of the main clause.
- (5) The left-most argument of a complement predicate qualified as the antecedent of a reflexive expression will function as the primary theme when the complement is not embedded in the main clause.

In order to explain the facts above in a simple and a consistent way, we should introduce the notion 'default theme'. Since the default theme is defined as the argument *qualified* as the primary theme, it can refer not only to the primary theme in a main clause but also to the left-most argument in a complement. Then, we can say that the antecedent of reflexive expressions in complements in general is the default theme either of the main clause or of the complement. If it were not for the notion 'default theme', we could not deduce such a simple and a consistent generalization from the facts stated above. We may, therefore, reasonably conclude that in the Finnish language an argument of each predicate is chosen in the lexicon to be the default theme of the predicate.

## Notes

- \* ) This is an expanded and revised version of the paper read at the 20th General Meeting of the Uralic Society of Japan, June 20, 1993. I wish to express my gratitude to Mrs. Raija Okuda, Tokai University, and Mr. Petri Niemelä, Chiba University, for their informant work.
- 1 ) In the Finnish language, traditionally, the object is said to be marked either in the accusative case or in the partitive case. Then, 'itsensä' in (1) is ordinarily regarded as being in the accusative singular form. But the so-called accusative singular form is identical with the genitive singular form. So, in this paper I will not call the form in question accusative.
  - 2 ) In the Finnish language many other verbs ending in -ttaa/ttää behave like 'inhottaa'. These verbs are called causative in the Finnish grammar.
  - 3 ) For further details of the differences between the complement types, see Hakulinen (1973, 1974) and Härmä (1977).
  - 4 ) On the default theme, see also Vilkuna (1989). Her views on the Finnish syntax have much in common with those of mine.
  - 5 ) For a discussion of the scrambling of arguments in complex sentences, see Vilkuna (1989).

## Abbreviations

sg.-singular	pl.-plural
nom.-nominative	gen.-genitive
part.-partitive	adess.-adessive
pr.-present	p.-past
pr. p.-present participle	p. p.-past participle
inf.-infinitive	pass.-passive
conj.-conjunction	postp.-postposition

## References

- Hakulinen, Auli. 1973. Semanttisia huomioita lauseenvastikkeista. *Sananjalka* 15 : 38-68.
- . 1974. Samaviitteiset nominilausekkeet yhdylauseessa. In N.E. Enkvist (ed.), *Reports on text linguistics : Four papers on text, style, and syntax. Meddelanden från Stiftelsens för Åbo Akademi Forskningsinstitut* 1 : 76-93. Åbo : Åbo Akademi.
- . 1983. Subjektikategoria vai nominaalijäsenten subjektimaisuus? In Auli Hakulinen & Pentti Leino (eds.), *Nykysuomen rakenne ja kehitys*, 238-251. Pieksämäki : Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Hakulinen, Auli & Fred Karlsson. 1979. *Nykysuomen lauseoppia*. Jyväskylä : Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Härmä, Juhani. 1977. Eräiden suomen siirtotransformaatioiden soveltamisesta lauserajan yli. *Virittäjä* 81 : 157-166.
- Sakuma, Jun'ichi. 1988. Finrando-go-ni-okeru syugo-to syudai-no kankei-ni-tsuite [Subject and theme in the Finnish language]. *Tokyo University Linguistics Papers '88*, 301-320.
- . 1992. Finrando-go suuryoo-siji-bun-no toogo-ron-teki kaisyaku [On the grammatical interpretation of the quantifying sentence in the Finnish language]. *Gengo Kenkyu* 102 : 121-147.

Vilkuna, Maria. 1989. *Free word order in Finnish*. Helsinki : Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.