

Satu Manninen, Lund University (Satu.Manninen@englund.lu.se)

### 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<sub>i</sub> got [ t<sub>i</sub> killed ]
2. John got [ Bill killed ]
3. Bill<sub>i</sub> got [ t<sub>i</sub> ready ] / Bill<sub>i</sub> got [ t<sub>i</sub> 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<sub>i</sub> got [ PRO<sub>i</sub> 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.