



LUND UNIVERSITY

Properties and structure of Finnish tulla/joutua-passives

Manninen, Satu

2011

Document Version:
Other version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Manninen, S. (2011). *Properties and structure of Finnish tulla/joutua-passives*. Abstract from International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian, Lund, Sweden.

Total number of authors:
1

Creative Commons License:
Unspecified

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

Properties and structure of Finnish *tulla/joutua*-passives

In English, non-canonical passives with *get* are often analyzed as intransitive variants of the causative *get* - see (1)-(2). The subjects of passives as in (1) are assumed to have raised from inside the passive participial small clause complements; see e.g. (Haegeman 1985) for such claims. The same line of analysis is extended to many other uses of *get*, including those listed in (3)-(4). The subjects of sentences as in (3) are again assumed to have raised from inside the small clause complements:

1. Bill_i got [t_i killed]
2. John got [Bill killed]
3. Bill_i got [t_i ready] / Bill_i got [t_i into trouble]
4. John got [Bill ready] / John got [Bill into trouble]

In more recent work (e.g. Fleisher 2005) English *get*-sentences as in (1)-(4) are assumed to consist of a v head selecting for a VP or Root P complement. The external arguments are introduced by another v head, which is associated with different properties (e.g. voice, agentivity, causativity, and the like) depending on the sentence. *Get* is itself treated as the overt realization of this v head.

At first sight, Finnish seems to have very similar intransitive/causative pairs, except for the fact that the former make use of the verbs *tulla* 'get/become' and *joutua* 'get/end up' while the latter make use of the verb *saada* 'get/receive' – see (5)-(10) below:

5. *Pekka tul-i tape-tu-ksi.*
Pekka.nom get-past.3sg kill-PassPrtc-translative
'Pekka got killed'
6. *Jukka sa-i Peka-n tape-tu-ksi.*
Jukka.nom get-past.3sg Pekka-accusative kill-PassPrtc-translative
'Jukka got Pekka killed'
7. *Pekka tul-i valmii-ksi.*
Pekka.nom get-past.3sg ready-translative
'Pekka got / became ready'
8. *Jukka sa-i Peka-n valmii-ksi.*
Jukka.nom get-past.3sg Pekka-accusative ready-translative
'Jukka got Pekka ready'
9. *Pekka joutu-i pula-an.*
Pekka.nom get-past.3sg trouble-illative
'Pekka got into trouble'
10. *Jukka sa-i Peka-n pula-an.*
Jukka.nom get-past.3sg Pekka-accusative trouble-illative
'Jukka got Pekka into trouble'

In the previous literature on Finnish, sentences like (5) and (7) are almost invariably treated as ‘active’ sentences containing a ‘copula-like’ verb (*tulla*) and an adjectival phrase (*tapetuksi* vs. *valmiiksi*). Sentences like (9) are treated as ‘active’ sentences containing a lexical verb (*joutua*) and a noun phrase functioning as a locative adverbial (*pulaan*) – see e.g. Hakulinen & Karlsson (1979) for such views.

The purpose of this talk is two-fold. First, I will show that sentences like (5) differ from sentences like (7) in a number of ways, and that these differences can be explained if (5) is analyzed as a passive sentence, instead of an ‘active’ copular sentence. One such difference is the fact that (5) can contain an optional agent phrase, while (7) cannot – this is illustrated in (11)-(12):

11. *Pekka tul-i tape-tu-ksi Jukka-n toimesta.*
Pekka.nom get-past.3sg kill-PassPrtc-translative Jukka-gen by
‘Pekka got killed by Jukka’
12. **Pekka tul-i valmii-ksi Jukka-n toimesta.*
Pekka.nom get-past.3sg ready-translative Jukka-gen by
‘Pekka got / became ready by Jukka’

The main focus will be on the internal structure of passive participial phrases / small clauses in data like (5)-(6). As a first approximation, I will assume passive participial phrases in Finnish to contain an eventive vP which may itself be selected by an agentive or causative v as a complement; the fact that passive participial phrases may contain either an agentive or causative vP is also used to explain why data like (5)-(6) are experienced by many native speakers to be ambiguous between an agentive (i.e. Jukka/an unspecified human entity killed Pekka) and a causative reading (i.e. Jukka/an unspecified human entity caused Pekka to get killed). I will also look at the arguments for saying that the verbs *tulla/joutua* and *saada* in data like (5)-(6) are the actual overt realizations of the agentive/causative v head. I will then move on to contrast data like (5)-(6) with the ‘other’ uses of *tulla/joutua* and *saada* in Finnish, exemplified in e.g. (7)-(10) above. These latter types of sentences can usually only be interpreted as involving ‘pure’ causation, and my goal will be to examine the structure of the adjectival and noun phrases / small clauses in detail, and to determine if we are actually dealing with the ‘same’ verbs *tulla/joutua* and *saada* at all.

A second aim of this talk is to look at the analyses proposed for intransitive/causative sentences in general, and to determine if the raising-type analysis sketched in e.g. (1) and (3) above works for Finnish. The alternative line of analysis, proposed in e.g. Huang (1999) and Butler & Tsoulas (2006), is to treat these data as control constructions, so that instead of (1) we have something that looks like (13):

13. Bill_i got [PRO_i killed]

The main focus will be on passive sentences as in (5), which in Finnish seem to exhibit many properties which are unexpected under a ‘raising’ analysis, but fall out naturally under a ‘control’ analysis.