

## NON-SUBJECT CAUSER CONSTRUCTIONS IN FINNISH: BECOME-CLAUSES VS. DO-CLAUSES

Juhani Hiirikoski

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to compare the thematic uses of the Finnish OVS order and Finnish intransitive clauses with causer obliques to each other and to the use of the English agent passive on the basis of a corpus of translation equivalents. I will concentrate on the semantic differences between Finnish transitive and intransitive clauses.

I have elsewhere (Hiirikoski 1991b) provided evidence showing that the frequency of OVS order used for rhematizing the subject can be seen as a function of the semantic transitivity of the clause (in the sense of Hopper & Thompson 1980). In this paper I will relate the use of OVS order to other rhematizing devices in Finnish. Formally transitive<sup>1</sup> clauses will be compared to formally intransitive clauses; these two models - the transitive and the intransitive - have been regarded as meaningful choices made by the speaker, reflecting his view of the importance of the participants in the event. In particular, I will concentrate on the relationship between clauses like

Vanhuus tappoi hänet  
G: Old-age killed he-ACC<sup>2</sup>  
'Old age killed him'

Hänet tappoi vanhuus  
G: He-ACC killed old-age  
'He was killed by old age'

Hän kuoli vanhuuteen  
G: He died old-age-ILL  
'He died of old age'.

The first two clauses are mirror images of each other, differing only in

their word order (SVO vs. OVS), but not in their grammatical functions. The last clause, on the other hand, differs from the first two in coding the affected entity with a thematic subject, the causer with an oblique.

Finnish has no construction corresponding to the English agent passive. However, there are other constructions that resemble the passive in its thematic function. Thus, I consider intransitive clauses like the one above functional variants of SVO clauses with new subjects.

To my knowledge, there is no systematic investigation on the relationship between the use of intransitive constructions and OVS order in Finnish. In Hakulinen (1972:248) we can find a brief reference to experiencer clause pairs like

Jussi pelkää onnettomuutta  
G: Jussi fears accident-PAR  
'Jussi is afraid of an/?the accident'

Onnettomuus pelottaa Jussia  
G: Accident frightens Jussi-PAR  
'The accident frightens Jussi'

and

Maija hyötyi retkestä  
G: Maija benefited trip-ELA  
'Maija benefited from the trip'

Retki hyödytti Maijaa  
G: Trip benefited Maija-PAR  
'The trip benefited Maija'.

Hakulinen suspects that this variation is possibly related to that between the active and passive in transitive clauses. Lehtinen (1984:93-94) discusses intransitive constructions exemplified by Hakulinen's latter example pair also in other clause types than experiencer clauses (eg. pairs like *purkaa: purkautua* 'take apart: come apart'). She refers both to the possibility of intransitive constructions being used to retain the initial constituent and to the use of intransitives for emphasizing the "unintentionality or passivity of the action" (ib. 94).

The position taken in this paper is that, in Finnish, intransitives are used in rhematizing, and that there is a connection between intransitives and the use of OVS for postponing new subjects: OVS is most frequent with clauses coding events that have alternative codings

with intransitives. Intransitive clauses seem to provide an analogue for the use of OVS with these semantic frames, as existentials have been considered to provide an analogue for locative OVS clauses.

The two clause types - the transitive and the intransitive - have been considered to represent two different ways of constructing reality, giving "different 'pictures' of the same state of affairs" (Dik 1978:71). The Finnish intransitive model will be compared to the English agent passive, and a hypothesis will be presented that Finnish as a language favours the intransitive model rather than the transitive one when coding non-agentive causative events, while English favours the transitive model.

This typological difference between the two languages has not been explicitly discussed before. A similar position seems to be implicit in Lehtinen (1984), and a brief note to the same effect can be found in Vilkuina (1989:179), who comments that "It is not very typical of Finnish to represent location with transitive sentences". Vilkuina's note is, however, restricted to the use of the two models for coding case frames denoting locative events only.

Finnish will be compared to English on the basis of translations. I will investigate what constructions are used in Finnish to correspond to the textual use of the English agent passive.

The data for this paper consist of clause pairs containing an English clause with the agent passive construction and its Finnish finite equivalent. The clause pairs have been collected from three genres: from five Finnish novels translated into English, from five English novels translated into Finnish, and from Finnish subtitles of approximately a thousand English-speaking films (see Hiirikoski 1989). The novels and films from which examples have been drawn for the present paper have been listed at the end of the paper.

I have assumed that both the English and the Finnish version of a clause pair refer to the same event in the same textual context, and that if we can find systematic differences in the thematic orders or construction types used in the two languages, they may be an indication of a typological difference between the two languages.

It is hoped that using the English agent passive as a constant will help in detecting phenomena that may go unnoticed if using Finnish data only. The results obtained from this comparison are to be tested on other genres and non-contrastive corpora (for Finnish live ice hockey reporting, see Hiirikoski 1991a, and for other genres, Hiirikoski,

forthcoming).

This paper is organized as follows. After introducing the grammatical roles relevant for the paper, I will first consider transitive clauses and summarize the results of Hiirikoski (1991b) concerning the connection between the semantic transitivity of the clause and the occurrence of OVS order. It will be shown that referentially new causative roles are frequently coded with preverbal subjects. Next I will consider an alternative model, the intransitive coding. In intransitive clauses the given causee role is coded with the preverbal subject, the new causer role with a postverbal oblique. Three kinds of intransitive constructions differing in the explicitness with which they express causality will be considered, and a hierarchy of these constructions will be given. After investigating intransitives, I will introduce other similar constructions pairing the given subject and the theme. In all these constructions the rhematic causer corresponding to the English agent phrase referent is coded with a causatively weaker grammatical role in Finnish. The frequencies of these causatively weaker constructions will be given. It will be seen that Finnish most often uses constructions in which the causativity is expressed less explicitly than in English. A hypothesis will be presented that Finnish favours constructions expressing SOMETHING HAPPENED rather than constructions expressing SOMETHING CAUSED SOMETHING when introducing new non-agentive causers. In intransitives, new non-agentive causers are coded as non-primary participants; if the causer is coded as the primary participant, i.e. with the transitive subject, it tends to take the preverbal position. My conclusion will thus be that intransitives rather than OVS is the principal rhematizing device used in non-agentive causative clauses.

## 2. THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The grammatical roles relevant for this paper are the subject, the object, and the oblique. Grammatical roles have been assumed to have meanings of their own, different from the meanings of semantic roles (Dik 1978:13). The subject is the most important grammaticalized element of the clause. The meaning of the grammatical category of the subject of a transitive clause (or of the subject of a clause with two obligatory complements in general) is that the referent coded

with it is the participant considered by the speaker to have most control over the event indicated by the verb (cf. Lakoff 1977:248-249), i.e. it is in some sense viewed as the instigator of the event (rather than the object referent), even though its cognitive role may in fact be non-causative. Of various grammatical roles, the transitive subject codes causativity most explicitly, i.e. it is causatively the strongest grammatical role.

In single-complement clauses the difference in meaning between the subject and the object is neutralized (cf. DeLancey 1987:61). The meaning of the subject of a clause in which there is no other obligatory complement is that it is the primary clausal topic (Givón 1984:151ff), "entity which is taken as a point of departure for the presentation of the state of affairs in which it participates" (Dik 1978:87). Thus the speaker codes with the subject what he considers to be the most important participant in the event. I have considered intransitive subjects syntactically weaker than transitive subjects.

Besides the subject, two-place verbs take either an object or an oblique. Object assignment is dependent upon the occurrence of the subject, i.e. it is assumed that the speaker chooses the subject first (Dik 1978:73). The referent of the object is, in addition to being the secondary topic of the clause, also "the participant **most affected** by the event, the one registering the crucial **change of state**" (Givón 1984:154). The object is the least causative grammatical role: it expresses most explicitly the opposite of causation, affectedness.

The referent of the oblique is the participant "less involved, less affected, auxiliary object in terms of semantic change coded in the clause" (Givón 1984:154), but which is still important from the point of view of the information structure. Three kinds of obliques will be discussed in this paper. They differ in the explicitness with which they express causativity: some of them are more like subjects in being causative, some are more like objects in being rather affected than causative.

By coding an entity with either the subject or the object the speaker brings it into perspective, by coding it with an oblique he leaves it out of perspective (Fillmore 1977:72ff). Obliques are syntactically weaker than the subject and the object, since, in the corpus clauses of this paper, they can be left out of the clause without making it ungrammatical, unlike the subject and the object; cf. *He died* instead of *He died of old age*. While the subject and the object belong in the

core of the clause, which consists of one or two arguments of the predicate, depending on its valence, the oblique belongs in the periphery of the clause, which contains arguments expressing the spatio-temporal setting of the event (Foley & Van Valin 1984:77). I have assumed that participants coded with obliques are regarded by the speaker as less important from the point of view of the discourse than those coded with the subject and the object, i.e. oblique coding is used for backgrounding participants.

We will be mostly concerned with clauses coding transitive events consisting of two participants, one undergoing a change of state, and the other causing this change (cf. Foley & Van Valin 1984:27). Matching the cognitive role of causer and the grammatical role of transitive subject would result in a transitive clause. Formally transitive clauses can be associated with foregrounding in discourse "because events which approximate the transitive prototype are more likely to be of interest" (DeLancey 1987:55).

However, I will provide evidence showing that Finnish differs from English in preferring intransitives and coding new non-agentive causers with an oblique rather than with the transitive subject, the principal grammatical role. In these cases, the Finnish oblique coding leaves causers out of perspective, and expresses their causativity less explicitly than the coding with the transitive subject. The grammatical and cognitive roles do not match: in causative intransitives, the cognitively weaker role of causee is coded with the syntactically strong grammatical role of subject, while the cognitively stronger role of causer is coded with a syntactically and causatively weaker grammatical role of oblique. The thematic principle behind the use of intransitives seems to be that the intransitive coding results in the positioning of the given referent, coded with the subject, in the theme position. Thus, while English and Finnish code the causer with different grammatical roles, they end up with the same thematic structure.

It is to be noted that, as for English, the meaning given above for the transitive subject is connected with the subjects of active clauses only. In passive clauses the passive morphology of the verb indicates a marked subject choice: the meaning of the active subject is connected with the agent phrase, and the meaning of the active object with the subject of the passive clause. According to this view, the meaning of an English agent phrase is (approximately) the same as that of the subject of a corresponding active clause.

Thus I assume that, although the agent phrase of the English agent passive takes an oblique form (cf. Foley & Van Valin 1984:81, 149), it codes the stronger of the cognitive roles, the causer, and that the Finnish syntactic equivalent of the English agent phrase is the transitive subject. If Finnish codes the referent of the agent phrase with a grammatical role other than the transitive subject, I have considered the Finnish construction causatively weaker than the English construction.

To summarize the grammatical roles: There are, both in Finnish and English, three kinds of grammatical roles, the subject, the object, and the oblique. Of these, the subject is syntactically the strongest, and by coding a referent with the subject the speaker indicates that he considers it the most important participant in the event. The object is the second strongest grammatical role, and codes the second important participant. The oblique is the weakest of the three. The subject coding is used for foregrounding, the oblique coding for backgrounding. The hierarchy of grammatical roles is as follows: transitive subject > intransitive subject > object > oblique (cf. Givón 1984:174).

Of the grammatical roles, the transitive subject codes causativity most explicitly, i.e. it is causatively the strongest grammatical role. The object is the weakest grammatical role in coding causativity. Obliques are between these two: a hierarchy of obliques, based on the explicitness of causativity they express, will be given below.

### 3. BACKGROUND

In this section I will concentrate on such Finnish clauses occurring as translation equivalents of English agent passives in which the English agent phrase corresponds to the Finnish transitive subject. I have taken only those instances of English agent passives in which the subject of the passive is more given than the agent phrase, and the verb new (hence 'topic clauses').

I have used a rather simplistic operational definition of 'givenness', based on Givón (1983:13). 'Given' is defined as 'mentioned later in the preceding text': of two referents, the one mentioned later in the preceding text is the more given (see Hiirikoski 1989). The definition of givenness used in the present paper is supposed to correlate with any wider definition offered.

In the English agent passive, the subject is typically the more given, the agent phrase more new, i.e. the use of the English agent passive can be seen as a function of the textual material between the subject and agent phrase referents and the previous mentions of the same referents.

I have also excluded from the corpus those Finnish clauses where the subject was textually more given than the object. The higher textual givenness of the subject has been the only criterion of exclusion, and thus I have not excluded from the corpus SVO equivalents in which OVS order would have been unacceptable for other than formal reasons. As an example, consider the English agent passive clause provided by Itkonen-Kaila (1974:211), **The Roman attempt to push east of the Rhine was checked by Arminius and his Germans**. According to her, the clause cannot be translated into Finnish with the OVS clause **Roomalaisten yrityksen tunkeutua Reinin itäpuolelle estivät Arminius ja hänen germaaninsa**, because 'Arminius' would be unnecessarily emphatic, i.e. the OVS order has a different meaning from the English agent passive. The Finnish version would be most likely to occur in a context where both the object and the verb would be given (and maybe the hearer is even assumed to have wrong information about the subject referent), i.e. it is most likely to be an answer to the question 'Who checked the attempt?', while the English version is appropriate in a context where only the object is given, answering the question 'What about the attempt?'. Cases like these, where an OVS order would have had a different presupposition from the English agent passive, have not been excluded from the corpus, but have been treated in the same way as, say,

Roomalaisia odottivat vaikeudet  
 G: Romans-PAR waited difficulties  
 'The Romans met with difficulties',

where the subject is not emphatic. The reason why Itkonen-Kaila's clause is most likely interpreted as having an emphatic subject is that the subject is agentive, and thus high on semantic transitivity, and agentive clauses rather rarely take OVS order in the topic clause function: an OVS clause with an agentive subject is most often a clause in which both the object and the verb are given, i.e. not a topic clause.

If we change the subject of Itkonen-Kaila's clause to non-agentive (and maybe add some kind of connector), as in **Roomalaisten**

**yrittöksen tunkeutua Reinin itäpuolelle estivät kuitenkin monenlaiset vaikeudet** 'The Roman attempt to push east of the Rhine was, however, checked by various difficulties', the resultant clause seems to me to have a less emphatic subject. The clause is semantically less transitive than the agentive clause, and semantically less transitive clauses quite often occur with OVS in the topic clause function: non-agentive OVS clauses are more often than not topic clauses.

However, since we are concerned with the comparison of the textual use of the English agent passive and Finnish OVS, it does not matter what the reason behind the non-use of OVS is, be it a matter of choice or necessity (i.e. cases where OVS could have been used in the same function as the English agent passive but was not, vs. cases where OVS would have had a different function from the English); what is relevant is that OVS is not used in the same way as the English agent passive is, and that its use is determined by principles other than that of the English agent passive. One such principle affecting the choice of Finnish OVS but not the use of English agent passive will be investigated in this section: semantic transitivity of the clause, already mentioned in connection with Itkonen-Kaila's example clause.

Hiiirikoski (1989, 1991b) provided evidence showing that the use of Finnish OVS order in topic clause function depends on the semantic transitivity of the clause<sup>3</sup>: the higher the clause is on semantic transitivity, the less frequently it takes OVS order.

The relationship between semantic transitivity and the occurrence of OVS can be seen in Table 1. It shows the frequencies of OVS order in various clause classes in one genre, Finnish subtitles. It can be seen that, in general, the less transitivity features a clause class has, the more frequently OVS order occurs in it.

Table 1 shows that the more we move down on the semantic transitivity scale, the more easily the clause inverts. Transitive clause eligibility for OVS order follows a graded scale: the more transitive the clause is semantically, the lesser degree of corresponding OVS eligibility there occurs. This hierarchy reveals a basic difference between the use of the English agent passive and the Finnish OVS as topic clauses: the English agent passive is used mostly with constructions occurring at the top of the hierarchy to remove AG from the subject position to allow a marked subject choice<sup>4</sup>, whereas in Finnish these transitive constructions tend to have the iconic SVO order, and OVS order is typically employed in constructions low on the hierarchy.

Table 1. The frequencies of OVS clauses occurring in topic clause function in various clause classes differing in their semantic transitivity in Finnish subtitles. The number of the transitivity features has been indicated for each clause.

|  | %    |
|--|------|
| Varomattomat ihmiset levittivät sitä tautia/<br>Careless people spread the disease | 17.3 |
| (6: ATH, FO, ANIM, NE, non-LO sub, non-LO obj)                                     |      |
| Joku löi häntä/Somebody hit him  | 18.3 |
| (6: AG, ATH, FO, ANIM, DIR, non-LO sub)  |      |
| Joku otti sen/Somebody took it   | 30.1 |
| (7: AG, ATH, FO, ANIM, NE, DIR, non-LO obj)  |      |
| Jotkut piirittivät sitä/Some people surrounded it                                  | 36.1 |
| (5: AG, ATH, FO, ANIM, non-LO sub)   |      |
| Joku lähestyi häntä/Somebody approached him  | 39.4 |
| (6: AG, ATH, FO, ANIM, DIR, non-LO sub)  |      |
| Joku tarkkaili häntä/Somebody watched him  | 43.1 |
| (6: AG, ATH, FO, ANIM, non-LO sub, non-LO obj)                                     |      |
| Joku kaivoi sen/Somebody dug it  | 43.8 |
| (6: AG, ATH, FO, ANIM, non-LO sub, non-LO obj)                                     |      |
| Jokin rikkoi sen/Something broke it  | 44.4 |
| (4: FO, NE, non-LO sub, non-LO obj)  |      |
| Jokin täytti sen/Something filled it   | 45.2 |
| (4: FO, NE, DIR, non-LO sub)   |      |
| Joku näki sen/Somebody saw it  | 47.2 |
| (3: ANIM, non-LO sub, non-LO obj)  |      |
| Jokin seurasi sitä/Something followed it   | 48.8 |
| (2: DIR, non-LO sub)   |      |
| Joku suunnitteli sen/Somebody planned it   | 50.0 |
| (6: AG, ATH, FO, ANIM, non-LO sub, non-LO obj)                                     |      |
| Jokin kiinnosti häntä/Something interested him)                                    | 54.6 |
| (4: FO, NE, non-LO sub, non-LO obj)  |      |
| Jokin synnytti sen/Something produced it   | 55.7 |
| (3: FO, non-LO sub, non-LO obj)  |      |
| Joku johdi heitä/Somebody led them   | 58.8 |
| (6: AG, ATH, FO, ANIM, NE, non-LO obj)   |      |
| Joku omisti sen/Somebody owned it  | 60.5 |
| (2: ANIM, non-LO obj)  |      |
| Jokin koristaa sitä/Something decorates it   | 63.4 |
| (3: FO, NE, non-LO sub)  |      |
| Joku sai sen/Somebody got it   | 65.4 |
| (3: ANIM, DIR, non-LO obj)   |      |
| Joku voitti hänet/Somebody beat him  | 68.8 |
| (2: ANIM, DIR)   |      |
| Jokin ympäröi sitä/Something surrounded it   | 86.7 |
| (1: non-LO sub)  |      |

To sum up: postverbal subjects are mostly non-agentive, or even non-causative. A transitive clause with a postverbal subject is most often a locative clause, while typical causative clauses take SVO order.

#### 4. TRANSITIVE VS. INTRANSITIVE MODELS

The previous section summarized the use of OVS clauses as a function of semantic transitivity. In the present section we will concentrate on events involving a non-agentive causer. These events consist of a causer and a causee, and they can be coded with a transitive clause. However, often the same cognitive relations can be expressed by using other kinds of constructions, reflecting another model of structuring reality, namely the non-transactive model (Kress & Hodge 1979:8). This model is manifest in intransitive clauses. These clauses leave the causal status vague (ib. 42). As examples, Kress & Hodge give the clauses **The coffee dissolved the sugar**, **The sugar dissolved in the coffee**. The former expresses the causer transparently, whereas in the latter the causation is expressed obliquely (ib. 43).

The intransitive clause given by Kress & Hodge has a non-directional locative oblique. However, as we have already seen, there are intransitives with directional obliques as well, eg. the goal case: **kuolla johonkin** 'die from'. Next we will investigate how directional obliques express causativity: are they closer to the transitive subject or to the stative oblique given by Kress & Hodge?

The use of Finnish OVS order has widely been considered to correspond to one function of the English agent passive, the thematic function of postponing new referents. The passive has, however, other functions as well. According to Givón (1981:168, 1990:575), the main functional domains of the passive are the following:

- 1) Clausal topic assignment/non-agent promotion,
- 2) Impersonalization/agent suppression,
- 3) De-transitivization/verb stativization.

Finnish OVS order can be said to have only the first function under 1), topicalization. Intransitive clauses of the type **Hän kuoli vanhuuteen** 'He died of old age', on the other hand, have all the functions: 1) they place the non-causer at the theme position and promote it into the

subject, 2) they can leave out the causer role, coded with an oblique, and 3) they make the clause semantically less active, less transitive. Thus it could be assumed that intransitives are functional variants of SVO, used for arranging the thematic structure of a clause: in intransitives, the causer practically always occurs in the rhematic position, and there are no restrictions corresponding to those found in transitives, in which new causer subjects often take the theme position.

The question we will be concerned with in this section is the relationship between a transitive with a causer subject and an intransitive with a causer oblique. There are two possibilities: 1) The transitive and intransitive clauses have the same meaning, i.e. they refer to the same events and the speaker considers them to represent the same view of reality. The two clause types are mere thematic variants. 2) The two clause types are not (only) thematic variants, but represent different ways of constructing reality by contributing to the causer role a different degree of causality.

We will see that the thematic order of given - new is achieved in intransitives at the expense of weakened causativity. We saw in section 3 that, in transitive clauses, subjects with semantic roles high on the transitivity scale tend to occur preverbally; in the rest of the paper I will provide evidence that the preverbal element is also most often the grammatically strong role of subject in cases where the order of complements is given -new.

The four possible codings of a causative event are exemplified by the following sets, given for the lexical pairs *tappaa*: *kuolla/kill*: *die* and the verb *väsyä/tire*:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (1a) <i>Kuumuus tappoi hänet</i><br>G: Heat killed he-ACC<br>'Heat killed him'  | <i>Kuumuus väsytti hänet</i><br>G: Heat tired he-ACC<br>'Heat tired him'       |
| <i>Hänet tappoi kuumuus</i><br>G: He-ACC killed heat<br>'He was killed by heat' | <i>Hänet väsytti kuumuus</i><br>G: He-ACC tired heat<br>'He was tired by heat' |
| (1b) <i>Hän kuoli kuumuudesta</i><br>G: He died heat-ELA<br>'He died from heat' | <i>Hän väsyi kuumuudesta</i><br>G: He tired heat-ELA<br>'He tired from heat'   |

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (1c) Hän kuoli kuumuuteen<br>G: He died heat-ILL<br>'He died of heat'  | Hän väsyi kuumuuteen<br>G: He tired heat-ILL<br>'He got tired of heat, he tired from heat' |
| (1d) Hän kuoli kuumuudessa<br>G: He died heat-INE<br>'He died in heat' | Hän väsyi kuumuudessa<br>G: He tired heat-INE<br>'He tired in heat'                        |

Examples from the corpus for the lexical pair **kill: die** are given under (2-7) below. (2-3) are examples of model (a), (4) is an example of model (b), (5) of model (c), and (6-7) of model (d).

- (2) He's been dying of the same heart attack for twenty years.
- (i) Sama sydänkohtaus on tappa- / nut häntä jo 20 vuotta<sup>5</sup>  
G: Same heart attack has killed he-PAR already 20 years
- (ii) Hän on ollut kuolemassa samaan / sydänkohtaukseen 20 vuotta  
(Coppola 1972-1974)
- (3) Any doctor would think he died of a heart attack, but you and I will know that he was victim of the kiss of death.  
Lääkäri sanoisi, että / hän kuoli sydänkohtaukseen // Me tiedämme että hänet / tappoi kuoleman suudelma (Bilson 1966)  
G: he-ACC killed death's kiss
- (4) Douglas C. Neidermayer. '63. / Killed in Vietnam by his own troops.  
Douglas C. Neidermayer [sic] kuoli / Vietnamissa omien luodeista (Landis 1978)  
G: Douglas C. Neidermayer died in Vietnam his-own's bullets-ELA
- (5) Those babies were killed by bullets and hunger.  
Vauvat olivat kuolleet / luoteihin ja nälkään (Fuller 1989)  
G: Babies had died bullets-ILL and hunger-ILL
- (6) John Hay Forrest / killed in accident. / Noted Scientist / and Philanthropist / Was Also Cheesemaker / and Father of Three
- (i) John Hay Forrest / kuollut onnettomuudessa  
G: John Hay Forrest died accident-INE
- (ii) JOHN HAY FORREST KUOLLUT / Kuuluisa tiedemies ja filantrooppi (Reiner 1982)  
G: John Hay Forrest died

- (7) I can't bring Timothy out. The chill and the air will kill him.  
 En voi viedä Timiä. / Hänhän kuolee kylmässä (Bluth 1982)  
 G: He die cold-INE

Type (1a) is most explicit as to the cause of death, whereas in type (1d) the causative relation is most obscure: the oblique is in a stative, non-directional case, indicating the place where the event took place. It is up to the hearer's world knowledge to decide whether the oblique referent can be interpreted as the cause of the event.

In type (1b), the locative source case ending on the final noun 'heat' indicates that it is the causer of the dying - dying coming from heat, as it were; in many languages cause is marked identically with spatial source (DeLancey 1982:26, 1984:188,204). However, the oblique marking of cause has been here considered less explicit than the coding with the transitive subject in (1a).

The difference between the meanings of (1a) and (1b) may be difficult to state; DeLancey (1984:198), for example, notes that "even as a native speaker of English I am not certain how to characterize that difference".

Indeed, there seems to be a variety of views about the relationship between the subject coding and the source coding. Ikegami (1987:137-138), for instance, regards source obliques like these as quasi-agents. He equates them with the agent phrases of English passives. A similar position is taken by Allerton (1982:126), who states that there is an "element of minor agency" evident in *from* phrases. Tarvainen (1987:91), on the other hand, considers the source case ablative "the syntactic equivalent of the Agent" in *Olen saanut häneltä kirjeen* 'I received a letter from him', and also Gruber (1976:207) considers *from* and AG "different manifestations of the same thing". The view taken in this paper is that the subject and source codings differ in the explicitness with which they express causativity.

One difference between the two codings is that while the transitive subject can be used for coding "prototypical direct causation, in which a volitionally acting agent acts upon a patient in order to cause a change of state" (DeLancey 1984:196), say, *Karhu tappoi hänet* 'The bear killed him', the source oblique can only be used for coding what DeLancey (ib. 189) calls "inactive" causers, i.e. causes that are not in control of the event. Thus

Hän kuoli karhusta  
 G: He died bear-ELA  
 'He died from the bear'

cannot mean the same as **Karhu tappoi hänet** 'The bear killed him': the effect does not come about as a result of the bear's volition (ib. 192). The clause **Hän kuoli karhusta** can probably code only an event in which the death came about as a result of, say, eating the meat of the bear. Thus semantically less transitive clauses are coded with the (1b) type, and in them the causativity is expressed less explicitly, the causer receiving coding other than the transitive subject. The subject indicates causativity more explicitly than a source oblique.

In (1c) a directional goal case is used, as if **he** were going to **heat**. In this case we may deduce on the basis of our world knowledge (as also in type 1d) that **heat** was the cause of the death, but this need not be the case with the goal case:

Napoleon sortui juopotteluun  
 G: Napoleon fell drinking-ILL

can be interpreted either as 'Napoleon was defeated by drinking', or 'Napoleon succumbed to drinking' (cf. Leino et al. 1990:237).

The difference in meaning between (1b) and (1c) may again be difficult to state. There are few verbs that can take both the source case and the goal case, with the same meaning of causer. For instance, the second verb given in set (1a-d), *väsyä* 'tire', seems to indicate physical tiredness with the source case, and mental tiredness, boredom, with the goal case. In the latter case it is more like a content of emotion than a cause, and thus semantically less transitive.

Thus the oblique would be a more direct cause in (1b) than it is in (1c). The same seems to be the case with the verb **kuolla** 'die', which can take either the source or goal oblique, as evidenced by (4) and (5) above. To me, (4) is more appropriate for coding events in which the death followed immediately, while (5) is more appropriate in cases where the connection between being wounded and dying is more indirect. Notice that the less explicit goal case is used in Finnish for coding an illness as a cause of death, as in (8).

- (8) A: Your son has pneumonia. B: Pneumonia? A: It's not uncommon, but you can die from it.  
 Pojalla on keuhkokuume. / Siihen voi kuolla (Bluth 1982)  
 G: It-ILL can die 'One can die from it'

Disease is less of a prototypical causer, because it produces its effect invisibly, is immaterial and of unknown origin (DeLancey 1984:198, 206): "its action, while not externally generated, is not generated by internal volition, and is typically invisible - one cannot observe liquor taking its toll of a man's health the way one can directly observe a bear or a bullet disrupting his physical integrity" (ib. 193). It seems that the more concrete causes are coded with the source case rather than the goal case in Finnish:

Hän kuoli kirveestä  
 G: He died axe-ELA  
 'He died from an axe'

is more likely than

\*Hän kuoli kirveeseen  
 G: He died axe-ILL  
 '\*\*He died of an axe'

Goal cases coding diseases as causes of death can be compared to goal cases coding contents of emotions discussed above; in English, too, both of these can receive the same coding with the preposition *of*, indicating lesser semantic transitivity (DeLancey 1987: 61).

In other cases there is a difference in meaning between the source case and the goal case: the source may indicate the reason for an action rather than the cause of an event; compare the pair

Hän kuoli rakkaudesta  
 G: He died love-ELA 'He died for love'

Hän kuoli rakkauteen  
 G: He died love-ILL 'He died of love'.

The meaning of the source intransitive seems to be 'He let himself be killed because of love'.

Thus the goal case illative can have both the causative mean-

ing, indicating the cause of an event, and the locative meaning, indicating the place to which the subject referent moved. Both of these meanings are present in the verb *hukkua* 'drown' in (9) below: the illative with *keitto/soup* denotes the substance into which the subject referent submerged, and this substance is also the cause of death (cf. also example 7, where a similar situation is coded with the non-directional inessive case).

- (9) Parson, the man you replaced, he went to Paris last year, with the best of intentions, and promptly died from a bowl of bouillabaisse.  
 Edeltäjänne meni Pariisiin / ja hukkuu bouillabaisseen (Levy 1965)  
 G: drowned bouillabaisse-ILL

Sometimes the goal case of illative in type (1c) seems to have rather a non-directional locative meaning than directional or causative, as in (10) below, where the twins did not move to the wilderness, but were already there.

- (10) The twins were abandoned and surely would have died in the wilderness if they hadn't been saved by- by a what?  
 He olisivat kuolleet luontoon / jos heitä ei olisi pelastanut..? (Daniel 1985)  
 G: They would have died nature-ILL

However, even in this clause the wilderness can be interpreted as the cause of their death (lack of food, warmth, children not coping on their own etc.). Still, the illative can occur also in a purely locative function: the illative in

Hän kuoli autoon  
 G: He died car-ILL

is basically similar to the non-directional inessive in

Hän kuoli autossa  
 G: He died car-INE 'He died in a/the car',

of type (1d). There is no necessary movement of the subject referent to the car, and the car cannot be interpreted as the cause of death. The difference between the illative and the inessive clauses is slight, and they can both be translated into English as 'He died in a/the car'; however, the illative version can have, in addition to the meaning 'He

died in a/the car', also the meaning 'His body remained there'.

To sum up the discussion so far: The preverbal transitive subject expresses causativity most explicitly. In Finnish, the postverbal subject is typically less agentive than the preverbal. The source oblique expresses causativity less explicitly than the subject, but more explicitly than the goal oblique. The latter codes less evident causers, but is also often purely locative

In English, the agent passive with the preposition *by* can code the semantic frames high on semantic transitivity; according to Bolinger (1975:68), the passive is possible with "the meaning of transitivity, i.e., [we] view the person or thing as affected", eg **The river flooded the plain vs. The plain was flooded by the river** (ib. 70).

Bolinger's statement is, however, concerned with the semantic transitivity of the object referent, which is not the causer. Another view of the semantic transitivity of the English passive is taken by DeLancey (1984:208), who discusses the coding of the causer. According to him, the agent passive version in the clause pair **Lightning killed him: He was killed by lightning** is more natural in English, because **lightning** is "like an agent, but not a perfect exemplar", i.e. semantically less transitive causers should occur as agent phrases rather than active subjects. However, most if not all event types can be coded with either the active or the passive in English (Foley & Van Valin 1984:117), even though semantically less transitive events may favour the passive construction.

Of the three functions assigned to the passive by Givón, the function of clausal topic assignment seems to be generally considered to be the most important in the use of the English agent passive; according to Foley & Van Valin (1984:115), for example, the passive represents syntacticization of discourse factors in clause-internal grammar. Therefore, the *by* passive might be considered to belong in the same class of transitives as the corresponding active clauses. It may be also assumed that the other two functions - impersonalization and de-transitivization - are more evident in other oblique constructions.

Semantically less transitive frames, those expressing more existential relationships, may take other prepositions than *by*, eg **Happiness flooded my heart vs. My heart was flooded with happiness** (Bolinger 1975:70). The use of a preposition other than *by* indicates lesser causativity of the agent phrase referent, and some passive verb phrases are interchangeable with intransitive verbs, eg **I was filled with**

**admiration vs. The sails filled with wind.**

Also in English intransitives we can distinguish between three types of coding the causer. First, the causer can be coded with a directional source case (**He died from a wound**), second, with a directional non-source case (**He died of grief**), and third, with a non-directional locative case (**He died in an accident**).

We have seen that there are various ways of expressing causativity. As DeLancey (1987:55) states, "human beings categorize events according to various relevant features, and [...] particular morphosyntactic constructions code particular event categories". The morphosyntactic constructions coding causativity can be seen as forming a continuum, with the subject of an active SVO clause expressing causativity most explicitly, and a non-directional oblique of an intransitive clause least explicitly. This continuum is given in Figure 1.

---

Figure 1. The continuum of clauses coding causative events, from the most explicit coding of the causer to the least explicit coding.

<syntactically coded as more --- less transitive>

SVO OVS OTHER PASSIVE \* SOURCE-OBL GOAL-OBL STATIVE-OBL  
BY PASSIVE

---

It was stated above that English *by* passives have been considered in this paper as more or less equal in transitivity to their corresponding actives, and Finnish OVS order more or less equal to SVO order. The status of passive clauses having agent phrases introduced by a preposition other than *by* is less clear, since these are semantically less transitive and may be replaced by intransitives. However, the division has been made on formal grounds: if the verb is marked formally as passive, I have considered it to belong in the transitive model. I have assumed that the use of the passive morphology is an indication that the speaker considers the event semantically more transitive than he would have if he had used an intransitive clause. The passive morphology signals for the hearer that the clause has a marked subject choice (Foley & Van Valin 1984:111). The relation of the subject referent of a passive clause to the event is seen as the same as the relation of the object referent to the event in the corresponding active clause (cf. Foley & Van Valin 1984:29,107-108).

To summarize: The constructions to the left of the asterisk in Figure 1 represent the more explicit transitive models, the constructions to the right represent the less explicit intransitive models.

Next I will provide corpus examples of Finnish clauses where a non-subject coding is used for rhematizing the causer. First I will investigate constructions in which the non-agentive causer (hence FO for 'force', a non-volitional causer) is coded with a postverbal oblique and the causee (hence NE for 'neutral', an entity which undergoes a change) with the subject. In these, the causer is made syntactically and causatively less powerful, and the causee role syntactically more powerful by coding it with the subject. The intransitive coding of FO will be compared, first, to the transitive coding, second, to the coding of AG, and third, to the coding of non-causative events. Other constructions not coding the causer with a subject are introduced. These are the following: an intransitive without a causer, a transitive converse, a clause introducing a preverbal subject referent from the context, and an equative clause<sup>6</sup>. These will be briefly compared to a Finnish construction typically used for introducing new referents by coding them with a postverbal subject, the existential clause. After introducing these equivalents, I will give their frequencies in the three genres, and then consider what is common to all these equivalents.

## 5. NON-SUBJECT CAUSER CONSTRUCTIONS IN FINNISH

### 5.1. Intransitives with oblique causers

In examples (11-12) below there is no syntactic indication of causality; instead, the causer role expressed by the English agent is coded syntactically as a location. Notice that the role of the English agent phrase is FO in (11), but AG in (12).

- (11) Behind him Rokka saw more men, but fortunately the trench was so narrow that they were held up by the man in his arms.  
 Onneksi hauta oli niin kapea, etteivät takana tulevat päässeet heti ohi, vaan jäivät Rokan sylissä olevan miehen taakse. (Linna 235/330)  
 G: stayed Rokka's in-arms being man's behind

- (12) 'The child,' replied Monks, 'when her father died in a strange place, in a strange name, without a letter, book, or scrap of paper that yielded the faintest clue by which his friends or relatives could be traced - **the child was taken by some wretched cottagers, who reared it as their own.**'

"Lapsi", vastasi Monks, "kun hänen isänsä kuoli tuntemattomassa paikassa, väärällä nimellä jättämättä jälkeensä ainuttakaan kirjaa, kirjettä tai paperilappua, missä olisi ollut hänen oikea nimensä, jonka avulla olisi voitu etsiä hänen ystäviään tai sukulaisiaan - **lapsi joutui joittenkin talonpoikien huostaan, jotka kasvattivat sen omanaan.**" (Dickens 400/ 361)

G: child came some cottagers' custody-ILL

'the child ended up in the custody of some cottagers'

In example (13) the causality is expressed by a directional source case, indicating a source, potential causer weaker than a causer expressed by the transitive subject.

- (13) A man identified as Nicky Arane, who allegedly shot the prize thoroughbred was himself fatally **wounded by the park police** as he attempted to shoot his way out of the parking lot.

Mies nimeltä Nicky Arane, / lämminverisen oletettu ampuja, - // haa-voittui itse kuolettavasti / poliisiin luodista - //yrittäessään ampumalla raivata / itselleen pakotien parkkipaikalta (Kubrick 1956)

G: was-wounded(ACT) himself fatally policeman's bullet-ELA

Event involving FO can, of course, be coded also with transitives. Consider the two clauses with the same case frames in (14):

- (14) Her attacks don't spring from any physical weaknesses. They are brought on by her emotions, her temper, and her frustrations.

Kohtaukset eivät johdu / mistään fyysisestä viasta // Hänen tunteensa, mielialansa, / turhaumansa aiheuttavat ne (Litvak 1948)

G: Attacks do not spring any physical defect-ELA. Her emotions, moods, frustrations cause they-ACC

The first clause in (14) codes FO as a postverbal oblique, and the second as a preverbal subject. In clauses coding FO events the thematic order is usually given - new, as indicated by Table 2: the frequency of SVO order, starting with the new causer, is rather low (15.5%). But, as can be seen, the given - new order is mostly (20.1%) achieved by using intransitive codings, and only secondarily by using OVS order.

Table 2. The proportions of OVS, S V OBL and SVO of all Finnish equivalents of the English agent passive when the role of the agent phrase referent was FO.

|         | Subtitles |      | Finnish novels |      | English novels |      | Total   |      |
|---------|-----------|------|----------------|------|----------------|------|---------|------|
|         | (N=88)    |      | (N=133)        |      | (N=282)        |      | (N=503) |      |
|         | n         | %    | n              | %    | n              | %    | n       | %    |
| OVS     | 10        | 11.4 | 20             | 15.0 | 44             | 15.6 | 74      | 14.7 |
| S V OBL | 14        | 15.9 | 26             | 19.5 | 61             | 21.6 | 101     | 20.1 |
| SVO     | 14        | 15.9 | 16             | 12.0 | 48             | 17.0 | 78      | 15.5 |

The causer in example (13) is FO: there are no AG sources (unlike in non-source clauses 11-12, of which the latter had a stative oblique corresponding to an AG English agent phrase). In section 3 we saw that postverbal AG subjects are rare, while postverbal FO subjects are almost twice as common (25% vs. 45%, cf. Table 1); in this section we have noted that postverbal directional AG obliques are non-existent, but postverbal FO obliques are rather widely used. Thus there seems to be a connection between intransitive and transitive clauses. Next I will investigate the relationship between AG/FO transitives and AG/FO intransitives.

## 5.2. Are there AG obliques in Finnish?

OVS order seems to be rarely used if compared to other devices available. The most important device for thematic purposes seems to be the use of pairs of verbs that can be regarded as variants of the same predication. These lexical pairs have been called converses by eg. Sgall & Hajicova & Benesova (1973:230), and it has been proposed (ib. 167-168) that these pairs produce the same result as the use of the agent passive: "the choice of one variant or the other depends first of all on the communicative dynamism [my givenness] of the participants of the verb in the given sentence". An example of this kind of pair is the transitive *määrätä* 'determine' vs. the intransitive *määräytyä* 'be determined', exemplified by (15).

(15a) Intelligence is determined by social experience

- (15b) Sosiaaliset kokemukset määräävät älykkyyden  
G: Social experiences determine intelligence-ACC
- (15c) Älykkyyks määrättyy sosiaalisen kokemuksen kautta  
G: Intelligence is-determined(ACT) social experience's through  
'Intelligence is determined through social experience'

The intransitive clause (15c) could be regarded as a thematic variant of (15b) with a new preverbal subject. In (15c) the causer is coded with a rhematic oblique, and it could be seen as corresponding in function to the English agent passive. Similarly, *haavoittua* 'be wounded' in (13) is the intransitive lexical pair of the transitive *haavoittaa* 'to wound'. Notice that the derivation type exemplified by these examples represents the *u*-derivation, called 'passive-reflexive' in Finnish grammars, by which we can derive verbs denoting that something is happening by itself, that the event does not involve volition. There are thousands of such verbs in Finnish (cf. Kiuru 1991:13 for a rapid growth of such verbs in Finnish).

The verbs in the pairs mentioned above are lexically related. There are, however, pairs that are semantically related but lexically unrelated. One such pair was given in (14) above, *johtua: aiheuttaa* 'spring from: cause'. I have considered as converses also verb pairs in which the intransitive verb lacks the causative element, i.e. the meaning of the intransitive is only part of the meaning of the transitive. As examples, consider (11) and (12) given above. The verb *jäädä* 'stay' in (11) can be considered a converse of *pitää* 'hold', and *joutua* in (12) 'go to' of *ottaa* 'take'. The transitive verbs of the pairs have the logical structure CAUSE (BECOME *be-at*), while the CAUSE component is absent from the intransitive verbs (cf. Foley & Van Valin 1984:47ff).

It seems that Finnish word order in transitives is not as free as has been assumed, at least where AG clauses are concerned. It could be stated, modifying Sgall et al. (1973:237) a little, that converse verbs are used because the word order in transitive clauses is not as free as to allow placing causer subjects at the end of the clause; or the other way round, because of the converse verbs available, there is no need to resort to OVS.

These converse pairs of verbs may provide an analogy for the use of OVS in non-agentive causer transitives, in the same way as existentials have been assumed to have provided an analogue for the use of OVS in locative transitives (eg. Vilkuna 1989:178ff). Consider

examples (16) and (17), both referring to an event coded by the verb **kill**:

- (16) A: A minute later and **you would have been killed by an old lady** falling out of a window. B: What happened this time?  
 Pian sinut olisi tappanut ikku- / nasta putoava vanhus. -Mitä nyt?  
 (Reiner 1970)  
 G: Soon you-ACC would have killed from-window falling old-person
- (17) Before he could send in his report **he and his wife were killed by a Cuban hit man, Hector Gonzales.**  
 mutta hänet ja hänen vaimonsa tappoi / kuubalainen ammattitappaja  
 Gonzales (Glen 1981)  
 G: he and his wife-ACC killed Cuban hit-man Gonzales

OVS is clearly more frequent with type (16) clauses than with type (17) clauses. The difference between the examples is that (17) contains an AG subject, (16) a FO subject. As we have seen, for the FO subject type there is a converse verb that can be used to achieve the desired order of the roles (causee, 'the killed' - causer, 'the killer'):

- (18) There had been six wounded but **the two in front had been killed by the same burst** as the driver and the orderly.  
 Haavoittuneita oli ollut kuusi, mutta näistä oli kaksi edessä ollutta  
 kuollut samasta suihkusta kuin kuljettaja ja lääkintämieskin. (Linna  
 269/377)  
 G: two in front had died same burst-ELA

It could be presumed that the typical place of a new FO is after the verb, and there are many intransitive constructions that allow its placement there. These constructions are the primary choice. However, it is also possible to code FO with a postverbal subject; this order may be based on the analogy of intransitives with postverbal obliques that can be used for coding the same event: because it is possible to say *hän kuoli johonkin* 'he died of something' it seems natural to say *hänet tappoi jokin* with OVS order. Still, if FO is coded with the subject, there will be a tendency for the subject to take the theme position, according to the iconic principle of Causer First - Causee Second (Hiirikoski 1990, 1991a:224).

Thus OVS occurs mainly in clauses with case frames that have an alternative coding with an intransitive clause. There are few converse pairs available for AG subject clauses. Instead, verbs with dif-

ferent stems may be used. (See example 22 below, in which the converse of *johdattaa* 'to lead' is *seurata* 'to follow'. The change of the verb also changes the roles of **Oliver** and **Bumble**: **Oliver** becomes AG, and **Bumble** a location.) OVS is practically the only device for rhematizing agents, and new agents most often take the theme position, as evidenced by Table 3. The frequency of SVO order, starting with the new, is three times the frequency of SVO order with FO subjects (cf. Table 2).

Table 3. The proportions of OVS, S V OBL and SVO of all Finnish equivalents of the English agent passive when the role of the agent phrase referent was AG.

|         | Subtitles<br>(N=117) |      | Finnish novels<br>(N=37) |      | English novels<br>(N=52) |      | Total<br>(N=206) |      |
|---------|----------------------|------|--------------------------|------|--------------------------|------|------------------|------|
|         | n                    | %    | n                        | %    | n                        | %    | n                | %    |
| OVS     | 15                   | 12.8 | 11                       | 29.7 | 6                        | 11.5 | 32               | 15.5 |
| S V OBL | 1                    | 0.9  | 0                        | -    | 1                        | 1.9  | 2                | 1.0  |
| SVO     | 63                   | 53.8 | 8                        | 21.6 | 24                       | 46.2 | 95               | 46.1 |

Kirkwood (1978:242) states that in German 'inversion forms' - which I take to include intransitive converses presented above - will not have been developed or be used so extensively as in English, because the German word order is freer to express information structure and there is no need for other structures. However, it seems that in Finnish the free word order is used mostly with those clause types that do have an alternative of using intransitive verbs. On the other hand, the clause types that do not have intransitive alternatives take OVS less readily. In Finnish the restrictions on the use of word order for expressing the thematic principle of Given First are not grammatical as in English, but semantic. In topic clauses, Finnish word order is primarily determined by the semantic structure of the clause, by the principle Agent First, and secondarily - if the semantic frame of the clause does not contain roles high on semantic transitivity - by the thematic principle of Given First, and thirdly by the grammar.

### 5.3. OVS and intransitives as alternatives in non-causative clauses

Above we saw that source intransitives can be used instead of OVS with FO clauses but not with AG clauses. There seems to be a correlation between intransitives and OVS: if intransitives can be used with the class, the frequency of OVS clauses is high, i.e. OVS is an available thematic alternative to SVO in cases where the same event can be coded with an intransitive.

The examples presented so far have contained a causer, either AG or FO. For non-causative case frames, referring basically to (changes of) locations, alternative intransitive constructions are even easier to find. As an example, consider the two translations of (19).

- (19) Look alive, lads! That gold belongs to him with the sharpest eye.  
 (i) Kultaraha kuuluu sille / jolla on tarkin silmä  
 G: Gold coin belongs he-ALL who [---]  
 (ii) Ripeästi! Kultarahan / saa tarkkasilmäisin (Huston 1956)  
 G: Gold coin-ACC gets he-with-sharpest-eye

In (19) translator (i) has used a stative intransitive coding the resultant state of the transfer, while translator (ii) has used a directional transitive OVS clause. Translator (i) codes the beneficiary (one who gets something, hence BE) with a locational oblique and NE with the subject, translator (ii) codes BE with the transitive subject and NE as the object; translator (i) has used the intransitive model, translator (ii) the transitive.

The possessive event exemplified by (19) is locative in nature, and thus low on semantic transitivity. Such events can easily be expressed with intransitive clauses, in which the subject can move freely (Hiirikoski 1991a:226-227). And thus, analogously, word order can quite easily be employed also in non-causative transitives to express the thematic principle of Given First, i.e. possessive intransitives with rhematic BE obliques provide an analogue for the use of OVS in clauses with BE subjects.

#### 5.4. Other equivalents with a causatively weaker grammatical role in the rheme position

We have seen that, in intransitives, the causer coded with an oblique can quite readily be placed towards the end of the clause. These expressions have a locative nature, because FO is coded with a locative case. They express "what happened" or "becoming so and so", while the English agent passive expresses "what caused what".

Instead of coding FO with the transitive subject and crediting it with instigating the action rather than being the affected party, intransitives code it with the syntactically and causatively weaker role of oblique, thus lessening its causativity. The causer coded with the syntactically weakest role of oblique can also be left out altogether. This is exemplified by (6ii) above: it omits the oblique present in the (i) version.

The cognitively weaker role of causee, on the other hand, is coded with the syntactically strong role of subject, thus making it the most important participant in the event.

Next I will introduce constructions that are similar to intransitives in coding the cognitively stronger role, the causer, with a syntactically and causatively weaker (non-subject) complement in the rheme position. However, these do not answer the question "what happened". The first two equivalent classes actually code the event as transitive, but differ from the English versions in reversing the causativity: the referent on the left is coded as more causative, not the one on the right. Equative clauses do not code events at all, but relations. Finally, existentials code locations.

##### 5.4.1. Transitive converses

In this group the referent of the English agent phrase has been coded with the object in Finnish, thus denying its causativity; the thematic referent of the English passive subject, on the other hand, has been coded with a preverbal transitive subject. The referent of the agent phrase is treated as NE in (20), as a result of the event in (21), and a location in (22). In (23) the adverbial refers to the causer. In all of these examples the weakening of the grammatical role of the referent of the English agent phrase is accompanied by a strengthening of

the grammatical role of the referent of the English subject, i.e. while in the following English clauses the more causative role is on the right, in the rheme position, in the Finnish versions the complement on the left, in the theme position, is the more causative. In (20), for example, instead of saying that the submarine is powered by batteries, Finnish says that the submarine uses batteries, reversing the causativity involved.

- (20) I think it is **powered by sulphuric acid batteries** and uses canaries to detect escaping gas.  
**Se käyttää rikkihappoparistoja / ja linnut paljastavat kaasupäästöt**  
 (Wilder 1970)  
 G: It uses sulphuric acid batteries-PAR
- (21) I rinse her body, armpits, neck, breasts, and when I direct the shower again to the sensitive spot, **she is at once shaken by a new, urgent series of spasms.**  
 Huuhdon hänen vartalonsa, kainalot, kaulan, rintojen alukset, ja kun suuntaan suihkun uudestaan herkkään kohtaan, **hän nytkähtää välittömästi uuden, kiihkeän sarjan.** (Kilpi 22/30)  
 G: she shakes new, urgent series-ACC  
 'she gives a new series of spasms'
- (22) With the slice of bread in his hand, and the little brown-cloth parish cap on his head, **Oliver was then led away by Mr. Bumble from the wretched home** where one kind word or look had never lightened the gloom of his infant years.  
 Leipäpala kädessä ja köyhäintalon ruskea verkkalakki päässä **Oliver sitten seurasi Mr. Bumblea pois** kolkosta kodista, missä ainoakaan ystävällinen sana tai katse ei milloinkaan ollut valaissut hänen synkkää lapsuuttaan. (Dickens 9/12)  
 G: Oliver then followed Mr. Bumble-ACC away
- (23) even though he had been prompted by his own desire for a smoke.  
 Vaikka hän oman tupakantuskansa takia olikin everstin polttamista vihoitellut. (Linna 120/175)  
 G: Even-though he his-own desire-for-a-smoke's sake had colonel's smoking-PAR fretted  
 'Although it was because of his own desire for a smoke that he had fretted at the colonel's smoking'

With three-place beneficiary verbs a non-causative transitive converse verb can be used to eliminate the agentiveness of the last complement. In such clauses directionality is coded with an oblique

source case; the English version codes one of the participants as AG, while the Finnish version omits the causer, leaving only the transfer of NE explicit.

- (24) **I had previously been given a large stipendium by the parish.**  
 Aikaisemmin olin saanut jo yhden ison apurahan seurakunnalta.  
 (Rintala 16/15)  
 G: I had got already one large stipendium-ACC parish-ABL

#### 5.4.2. Equivalents with a more powerful role in the preverbal position

One way of reducing the causativity of a participant and easing its occurrence in the final position is to make it weaker by introducing a more powerful grammatical role before the verb. This can be done by introducing a subject referent implicit in the context, as **joku** in (25-26), and **Salo** in (27). In (25-26) the subject role is actually agentive, i.e. it is both syntactically and cognitively more powerful, but in (27) the subject is a controller of the action only syntactically; cognitively the causer of distortion is the pain, coded in Finnish with a source case. Another device is using the passive, which implies the agent (cf. Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979:255), as in (28-30).

In the equivalents of this class, the referent of the English agent phrase is reduced to NE in Finnish, as in clauses where the referent of the English phrase agent is coded with the object in Finnish (example 25), or it is made an instrument, as in (28), or left implicit, as in the passives of (29-30). Sometimes the role of AG is first introduced implicitly by the passive, and subsequently made explicit in the next clause, as in (29). In these cases the latter clause is no more a topic clause, because also the verb is given besides the object. Clauses with this type of information structure take OVS more readily than topic clauses (Hiirikoski 1992).

- (25) **He had been wounded with some missiles from the crowd on the day of his capture, and his head was bandaged with a linen cloth.**  
 Sinä päivänä, jona hänet otettiin kiinni, oli kansanjoukosta joku heittänyt kiven hänen päähänsä, ja siihen oli sidottu liinainen kääre.  
 (Dickens 408/368)  
 G: had from-the-crowd somebody thrown stone-ACC his head-ILL

- (26) **At last the silence was broken by a whisper:**  
 Viimein katkaisi joku äänettömyyden sanoen kuiskaten:  
 (Linna 28/44)  
 G: Broke somebody silence-ACC by saying:
- (27) **Salo continued to hold his back, his face distorted with pain.**  
 Määttä katseli kiveä ylimielisen rauhallisena, mutta Salo piteli yhä selkäänsä ja vääristeli kasvojaan kivusta. (Linna 199/282)  
 G: distorted his face-PAR pain-ELA  
 'distorted his face with pain'
- (28) **But these impertinences were speedily checked by the evidence of the surgeon, and the testimony of the beadle;**  
 Mutta moinen röyhkeys lannistettiin nopeasti lääkärin antamalla todistuksella ja köyhäntalon vahtimestarin oilessa vieraana miehenä. (Dickens 5/9)  
 G: impertinence-ACC was-checked-PAS speedily doctor's given testimony-INS  
 'impertinence was checked with the testimony given by the surgeon'
- (29) **He is brought down to Chertsey, by men who seem to have taken a violent fancy to him, whether he will or no;**  
 Hänet on tuotu Chertseyhin, ja sen ovat tehneet miehet, jotka näyttävät raivokkaasti pitävän hänestä kiinni, tahtoi hän sitten tai ei. (Dickens 225/204)  
 G: He-ACC has been brought-PAS to Chertsey, and this-ACC has done men
- (30) **My sources in Tokyo inform me that Ilse von Hoffmannsthal was arrested last week by the Japanese counter-intelligence service for spying on naval installations in Yokohama harbour.**  
 "Tokion tietolähteeni kertovat - // että Ilse von Hoffmannsthal / pidätettiin viime viikolla - // syytettynä vakoilusta / Yokohaman satamassa" (Wilder 1970)  
 G: Ilse von Hoffmannsthal-ACC was-arrested-PAS

### 5.4.3. Equative clauses without case roles

Besides the transitive and intransitive models, we also have what Kress & Hodge (1979:8) call the relational model, manifested in copular clauses. These clauses have no semantic roles, they merely equate two referents with each other:

- (31) **The second platoon was commanded by a very young second lieutenant, a boy just graduated from a small-town school in West Finland who desperately tried to measure up to what had been expected of a second lieutenant in the Winter War by assuming an air of arrogant self-importance.**  
**Toisen joukkueen johtaja oli nuori varusmiesväenrikki, länsisuomalaisen kauppalan yhteiskoulusta ylioppilaaksi päässyt poika, joka yritti verhoutua jonkinlaiseen tärkeyteen koettaessaan täyttää talvisodan luoman reserviväenrikkimyytin puitteet. (Linna 10/9)**  
**G: The second platoon's commander was young second lieutenant**

#### 5.4.4. Existentials

Locative intransitives with OBL V S order (existentials) are quite often used as equivalents of the English agent passive when the clause is semantically less transitive, especially when the English verb has a locative feature, as in examples (32-37), but sometimes also with non-locative verbs, as in (38). These Finnish equivalents differ from the other equivalents discussed in this paper in that they code the referent of the English agent passive with the subject; however, this is an intransitive subject, and the second complement is an adverbial denoting a location, devoid of any meaning of affectedness. Existentials express only that something is somewhere, omitting causality:

- (32) **The mighty cocked-hat was replaced by a modest round one.**  
**Muhkean kolmikolkkahatun tilalla oli nyt pyöreä, vallan vaatimaton hattu. (Dickens 267/242)**  
**G: Mighty cocked-hat's place-ADE was now round rather modest hat**  
**'In the place of the mighty cocked-hat there was now a rather modest round one'**
- (33) **We're at the base and the island is surrounded by warships.**  
**Olemme tukikohdassa ja / ympärillä on sotalaivoja (Fleischer 1954)**  
**G: around-ADE is warships-PAR**
- (34) **Probably the entire area is surrounded by UNCLE agents, but don't let that worry you.**  
**Täällä kuhisee UNCLE:n agentteja / mutta älkää antako sen häiritä (Gries 1965)**  
**G: Here-ADE swarms UNCLE's agents-PAR**  
**'The place is swarming with UNCLE agents'**

- (35) A: She's getting away. Get the Jeep! B: Okay! **It's blocked in by a truck.**  
 Hän karkaa. Hae jeeppi! / -Sen edessä on kuormuri (Levinson 1987)  
 G: It's front-INE is truck
- (36) I don't know whether or not **the land grants you claim to have, signed by the king of Spain or the Emperor of Mexico,**  
 Väitätte että maakirjoissa / on Espanjan kuninkaan - // tai Meksikon keisarin allekirjoitus (Sturges 1972)  
 G: land-grants-INE is Spanish king's or Mexico's Emperor's signature
- (37) A: **Headed by the greatest brains in the world.** B: Correction: criminal brains.  
 Johdossa maailman älykkäimmät / ihmiset. -Vain rikollisista (Young 1962)  
 G: Lead-INE world's most intelligent people  
 'Under the management of the most intelligent people in the world'
- (38) China's being ripped apart by civil war.  
 Kiinassa raivoaa sisällissota (Dmytryk 1955)  
 G: China-INE rages civil war  
 'There is a civil war raging in China'

Existentials are the syntactic device mainly used for introducing new referents postverbally. However, existentials code the event as less causative than a transitive clause does. This again means that Finnish is more prone to use less transitive constructions when introducing new referents postverbally.

### 5.5. Frequencies of the equivalents with causatively weaker grammatical roles

The frequencies of the Finnish equivalents presented above can be seen in Table 4 for two-place clauses (constructions not having a finite verb - with the exception of agent participle constructions - have been left out). As can be seen, in most cases (57%), the Finnish versions have the same theme as the English versions. Thus it seems to be possible in most cases to preserve the original thematic order in Finnish, although the most frequent single equivalent is SVO (22%), where the English rheme occurs as the theme in Finnish. The use of

OVS is rarer when compared to the use of SVO. Instead, in cases where the thematic structure is the same as in English, the most frequent equivalent is intransitive with an oblique causer (20%). OVS is the second with the frequency of 14%. Thus, in the majority of cases (51%), the device used for rhematizing the referent corresponding to that of the English agent passive is other than the postponement of a transitive subject.

To summarize: in the large majority of cases the Finnish equivalent has the referent of the English agent phrase coded with the subject occurring in the preverbal position (22%), or weakened (i.e. coded with a grammatical role other than the transitive subject: object, complement, instrumental, or other oblique) after the verb (57%), or both weakened and preverbal (7%).

It seems that Finnish on the whole favours intransitives for rhematizing a new referent at the expense of transitives. For instance, the typical Finnish syntactic device for introducing new referents postverbally, the existential, codes events only as non-causative. It expresses that something is somewhere.

Besides existentials, other intransitives with locative obliques occur as equivalents. Source cases express causativity, goal cases express movement towards a location, stative obliques locations. Sometimes the latter two may be interpreted as causative. The causer oblique can also be left out altogether. These constructions express that something is happening. Equative clauses, on the other hand, express only relations between referents, not events.

When Finnish uses the transitive model, the causality may be reversed: the participant on the left is coded as more causative. On the other hand, if the cognitively stronger role of causer is coded with the transitive subject, the thematic order may be reversed: Finnish starts with the new causer.

Thus the causal part not only tends to occur before the verb, but causality is often not expressed syntactically at all, or it is weakened.

Table 4. The frequencies of finite clause equivalents of the English agent passive with two-place clauses in Original Finnish novels, Novels translated from English to Finnish, and Subtitles.

|   | Orig. F.<br>novels |      | Tr. novels |      | Subtitles |      | Total  |      |
|---|--------------------|------|------------|------|-----------|------|--------|------|
|   | N=412              |      | N=782      |      | N=476     |      | N=1670 |      |
|   | n                  | %    | n          | %    | n         | %    | n      | %    |
| Rheme of the English<br>the same in Finnish:              |                    |      |            |      |           |      |        |      |
| OVS   | 69                 | 16.7 | 113        | 14.5 | 53        | 11.1 | 235    | 14.1 |
| OBL V S   | 43                 | 10.4 | 21         | 2.7  | 27        | 5.7  | 91     | 5.4  |
| Trans. converse   | 19                 | 4.6  | 32         | 4.1  | 34        | 7.1  | 85     | 5.1  |
| Intr. converse  | 81                 | 19.7 | 167        | 21.4 | 88        | 18.5 | 336    | 20.1 |
| AG introduced   | 29                 | 7.0  | 52         | 6.6  | 58        | 12.2 | 139    | 8.3  |
| Agent participle  | 45                 | 10.9 | 100        | 12.8 | 25        | 5.3  | 170    | 10.2 |
| Equative  | 2                  | 0.5  | 12         | 1.5  | 9         | 1.9  | 23     | 1.4  |
| Rheme of the English has<br>no correspondence in Finnish: |                    |      |            |      |           |      |        |      |
| Int. converse   | 29                 | 7.0  | 39         | 5.0  | 36        | 7.6  | 104    | 6.2  |
| Rheme of the English as<br>theme in the Finnish:          |                    |      |            |      |           |      |        |      |
| SVX   | 47                 | 11.4 | 178        | 22.8 | 145       | 30.5 | 370    | 22.2 |
| Tr. converse  | 4                  | 1.0  | 9          | 1.2  | 0         | -    | 13     | 0.8  |
| Intr. converse  | 12                 | 2.9  | 10         | 1.3  | 0         | -    | 22     | 1.3  |
| AG introduced   | 8                  | 1.9  | 7          | 0.9  | 0         | -    | 15     | 0.9  |
| Agent participle  | 24                 | 5.8  | 41         | 5.2  | 1         | 0.2  | 66     | 4.0  |
| Equative  | 0                  | -    | 1          | 0.1  | 0         | -    | 1      | 0.1  |

## 6. CONCLUSION

I started from the assumption that in the English agent passive coding the cognitive and grammatical roles match: the cognitively stronger role of causer is coded with the syntactically and causatively strongest role of transitive subject (**by agent**), and the cognitively weaker role of causee with the causatively weakest role of object (passive subject). Both the causer and causee are foregrounded.

On the other hand, there is a mismatch between the two sets

of roles in the weaker Finnish equivalents. In the Finnish versions, the cognitively weaker role of causee is coded with the intransitive subject, and thus foregrounded at the expense of the causer. The causer is backgrounded by coding it with an oblique. This situation is summarized in Figure 2.

Figure 2. The backgrounding of causee and causer in Finnish as compared to the English coding with agent passive.

| English:  | Hierarchy of grammatical roles<br>based on syntactic importance: | Finnish:  |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| CAUSER -> | TRANSITIVE SUBJECT / BY AGENT<br>INTRANSITIVE SUBJECT            | <- CAUSEE |
| CAUSEE -> | OBJECT / ENGL. PASS. SUBJECT<br>OBLIQUE                          | <- CAUSER |

In Finnish, the backgrounding of causer is accompanied by a weakening of its causativity, brought about by the oblique coding. Obliques form a hierarchy according to the explicitness of causativity they express. The hierarchy is given in Figure 3. The more we move down on the hierarchy, the more weakly the second complement codes causativity, and the greater the mismatch between the cognitive and grammatical roles becomes.

Figure 3. The weakening of the causativity of the causer in Finnish as compared to the English coding with agent passive.

| English:  | Hierarchy of grammatical roles<br>based on explicitness of causativity: | Finnish:   |
|-----------|---|------------|
| CAUSER -> | TRANSITIVE SUBJECT / BY AGENT   |            |
|           | SOURCE-OBLIQUE  | <-         |
|           | GOAL-OBLIQUE  | <- -CAUSER |
|           | NON-DIRECTIONAL OBLIQUE   | <-         |
|           | OBJECT / PASS. SUBJECT  | <-         |

It can be seen from Figure 2 that Finnish codes the causee with a grammatical role that is higher on the hierarchy than the gram-

matical role coding the causer. It will be remembered that in the clauses of the present corpus the causee is given and the causer new. The use of weaker Finnish equivalents results in positioning the given causee at the theme position, and rhematizing the new causer. When the causer is rhematized, it is often backgrounded and made causatively weaker by coding it with a locational oblique. The theme referent in clauses with the order given - new is most likely to have been coded with the strong grammatical role of subject, and the new rheme referent with a weaker grammatical role.

Thus, in causatives, the theme position is connected with the strong syntactic role of subject. In the intransitive model, the subject codes the causee, in the transitive model the causer. In transitives, the theme position is also connected with semantic roles high on semantic transitivity, since new causer subjects often take the theme position.

In causative transitives the iconic Causer First principle is most often employed, while the intransitive coding allows the thematic principle of Given First to be used.

The restriction on the subject placement does not, however, apply in non-causative clauses. While in clauses denoting causative events there is a tendency to combine the theme position and the subject, whether the causer is coded with the subject or not (in the latter case it is coded with an oblique), in non-causative/locative clauses the subject can rather freely take either the theme or rheme position. The word order in non-causative clauses is determined by the principle Given First.

The coding and positioning of referentially new causative and non-causative roles in topic clauses is summarized in Figure 4.

---

Figure 4. The typical codings and positions of referentially new causative roles compared to the codings and positions of non-causative roles.

| The new role: | Coding: | Position:   |
|---------------|---------|-------------|
| CAUSER        | --> sub | ----> Theme |
|               | --> obl | ----> Rheme |
| NON-CAUSER    | --> sub | --          |
|               | --> obl | --          |

This means that Finnish verb classes differ in their acceptance of OVS order for introducing new subjects. Agentive events are coded with transitives, usually by SVO order. Non-agentive causative events can be coded either with transitives or intransitives, and OVS occurs as frequently as SVO. Non-causative events are most often coded with intransitives, and if coded with transitives, the order is usually OVS. OVS is used mostly in clauses that have an alternative intransitive coding.

On the basis of my contrastive corpus of clauses with new causer roles, there is, however, in Finnish a tendency to suppress the notion of non-agentive causation syntactically by coding the causer with an oblique rather than the transitive subject. Although the thematic order with this event type is usually given - new, the order is mostly achieved by using intransitive codings, and only secondarily by using OVS order.

In this respect Finnish is more like a BECOME-language, such as Japanese, than a DO-language, such as English (Ikegami 1978:190-191). In a BECOME-language "an event is taken as a whole and no special focus is given to the agent which may be involved in the event" (ib. 191), while in a DO-language "something which acts as agent in an event is given special prominence and the linguistic representation of the event is lexically and grammatically organized in such a way as to assign a central place to what acts as agent" (ib. 190).

Finnish is a DO-language as far as explicit agents are concerned (i.e. discounting cases where the agent is made implicit): there is no alternative coding for the agent besides the subject, the strong grammatical role. AG subjects are given special prominence in Finnish also by making them themes, even when they are referentially new.

However, Ikegami's statement does not apply to the role of FO. FO is often coded with an oblique, a locative case, and not with the transitive subject. The former coding contributes less causativity to FO than the subject coding does. In the intransitive coding the causer is left out of perspective, treated as less important by the speaker, by coding it with the syntactically weakest grammatical role of oblique. The event is seen more as a whole and the causer is devoid of any special prominence.

The high frequency of intransitive codings may represent the fact that Finnish as a language is more empiricist, antitheoretical (cf. Kress & Hodge 1979:43) than English in the sense that Finnish does

not use clause type (1a), which indicates the causer explicitly, as frequently as English. In an empiristic clause the event is seen as a whole, and "the direction of causality, who is doing what to whom, what is acting on what, is left uncertain" (Kress & Hodge 1979:42), not "requiring an understanding on the part of the speaker or hearer of the causality involved" (ib. 43): spatial relationships replace causal relationships (cf. the causer subject in 1a to the locational 'causer' in 1d). In the more 'scientific' model, the transitive clause, there is a clear causal relationship between the two entities and the process: one entity, coded with the subject, is acting on the other, coded with the object. The process is seen as one event causing another. The division into empiricist and scientific clauses corresponds to the division into BE-COME-clauses and DO-clauses proposed by Ikegami.

To sum up: in Finnish, the semantic role of AG is coded with the subject and it is the primary choice for the theme position, even when new. If the semantic frame of the clause contains a weaker causer role than AG, it need not necessarily be coded with the preverbal subject, but can be coded with an oblique, or the subject in rhematic position. However, also in cases where FO, non-agentive causer, is coded with the subject, there is a tendency for the subject to take the theme position. If a transitive clause does not have a causer role in its semantic frame, the theme position is most likely to be taken by a complement with a given referent. In intransitive non-causative clauses the effect of the semantic frame on word order is small; instead, word order is determined by thematic principles, usually by the Given First principle. There is a correlation between intransitive clauses and OVS: OVS is more frequent with those clause classes that have alternative codings with intransitives. Intransitives seem to be the primary choice for rhematizing a causer, and they provide an analogue for the use of OVS.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> In this paper we are concerned with both semantic and formal transitivity. The former will be referred to as 'semantic transitivity', while 'transitive' otherwise refers to a formally defined class of clauses having an object. Also 'intransitive' always refers to a formally defined class.

<sup>2</sup> The following abbreviations will be used in this paper:

The **glosses**: G = Grammar. The essential structure, grammatical form, of the Finnish clause rendered in quasi-English. G-forms are given for the relevant parts of the Finnish clause only (written in **boldface**) The subject case NOM has not been marked. If the verb has not been marked for the voice, it is active. Case endings have been indicated only for the complements relevant for the discussion. " = Closest meaning equivalent in English for the Finnish clause. Given only if the Finnish version differs crucially from the English. **Surface cases**: ABL = Ablative. Meaning 'from a surface, from a person', ACC = Accusative. Case of the object, meaning 'totally affected', ADE = Adessive. Meaning 'on top of, on a person', ALL = Allative. Meaning 'towards a surface, to a person', ELA = Elative. Meaning 'out from inside', ILL = Illative. Meaning 'into', INE = Inessive. Meaning 'inside', INS = Instrument. Meaning 'means with', NOM = Nominative. Case of the subject, PAR = Partitive. Meaning with subject 'indefinite amount', with object also 'not totally affected'. '(s) = Genitive. Meaning 'possession'. For Finnish case system in general, see Karlsson (1983). The **verb**: ACT = Active, PAS = Passive. The **clause**: OBL = Oblique. O = Object. S = Subject. V = Verb. X = Second complement, object or oblique. Abbreviations for **semantic roles** and transitivity features are given in note 3.

<sup>3</sup> Various components of semantic transitivity are discussed by Hopper & Thompson (1980:251). The transitivity features relevant for this section are as follows (the abbreviations used for them are given in parentheses): 1) The subject referent is an Agent (AG). The subject referent volitionally does something that causes an intended change, eg **murder**. 2) The subject is an Author (ATH). The subject referent does something volitionally that causes an unintended change, eg **kill by accident**. 3) The subject referent is a Force (FO). The subject referent causes a change without any volition or intentionality being involved, eg **the stone broke the window**. Of the three causer roles, AG is the most transitive, FO the least. 4) The subject referent is animate (ANIM). Animate subjects are more transitive than the inanimate, because they are potential agents and authors. 5) The object referent is affected by the event (NE). The object referent existed before the event, and undergoes a change because of the event. Events involving a change in the state of the object are more transitive than those that do not involve a change. Resultant objects have been considered less transitive than NE objects. 6) The clause is directional (DIR). The clause involves movement of an entity, either change of location or possession. The opposite of directional is stative, involving the place or possessor of an entity. Directional clauses are more transitive than stative ones. 7) The clause is locative (LO). The clause involves a location or owner of an entity, and it may be either directional or stative. The location may be coded either with the subject (eg **He took it**, where the subject codes the place to which the object referent moved), or with the object (eg **The agent followed the suspect**, where the object codes the direction taken by the subject referent). Clauses having a locational feature are less transitive than purely causative ones.

<sup>4</sup> This is the position taken by eg. Langacker (1987:234); for a corpus-based count with results supporting Langacker's claim, see Granger (1983:190). However, the results of my own text counts (Hiirikoski, forthcoming, Chapter 6) do not quite support these claims (although it is to be noted Langacker probably has meant his statement to apply to by passives only, while my corpus contains agent phrases introduced by other prepositions as well): in a corpus of 2352 clauses, the most frequent agent phrase role was FO (22.3%). AG agent phrases had the frequency of 9.3%. Non-agentive locative agent passives were more frequent than what Langacker and Granger claim: the total of various kinds of locative passive clauses was 16.2%.

<sup>5</sup> To save space, the examples from subtitles do not follow the original line division on the tv-screen. The end of the line has been marked by a slash ('/'), a new frame by a double slash ('//').

<sup>6</sup> One equivalent not discussed here - although its frequency has been given in Table 4 - is the Finnish agent participle construction, consisting of a genitive followed by a non-finite form of a verb:

That's the threat, that's what's important. You Europeans, you don't know anything about it, **you've all been brainwashed by the Communists** just like those politicians in Washington.

Se on tärkeää. **Te eurooppalaiset / olette kommunistien aivopesemiä** (Russell 1967)

G: You Europeans are communists' brainwashed

The agent participle construction has been excluded because in it the genitive phrase corresponding to the English agent phrase actually occurs before the lexical verb, and not after it as in the other constructions investigated in this section.

Examples used in this paper are from the following sources:

Novels:

Dickens, Charles: **Oliver Twist** (1837-1839). Oxford University Press, Glasgow 1968.

- **Oliver Twist**. Translated by Maini Palosuo. Kustannusosakeyhtiö Otava, Helsinki 1954.

Kilpi, Eeva: **Tamara** (1972). Werner Söderström, Porvoo 1973. - **Tamara**. Translated by Philip Binham. Delacorte Press/Seymour Lawrence, United States of America 1978.

Linna, Väinö: **Tuntematon sotilas** (1954). Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö, Porvoo 1956. - **The Unknown Soldier**. Translator not mentioned. G. P. Putnam's Sons, United States of America 1957.

Rintala, Paavo: **Sissiluutnantti** (1963). Kustannusyhtiö Otava, Keuruu 1963. - **The Long Distance Patrol**. Translated by Maurice Michael. George Allen and Unwin Ltd, Kent 1967.

Subtitles:

- Bilson, Bruce: **Get Smart**. Salainen agentti 86. USA 1966. Episode36: Kuolon suudelma. Subtitles by Jari Sarantaa. 2.7.1990 TV3.
- Bluth, Don: **The secret of NIMH**. Rouva Brisby ja hänen salainen maailmansa. USA 1982. Subtitles by Liisa Korkkula. 10.8.1992 TV3.
- Coppola, Francis Ford: **The godfather saga**. Kummisetä. Episode 9: Yksin maailmassa. USA 1972-1974. Subtitles by Kristiina Liukkonen. 17.2.1991 MTV2.
- Daniel, Rod: **Teen wolf**. Teen wolf. USA 1985. Translator unknown. Video.
- Dmytryk, Edward: **The left hand of God**. Luojan vasen käsi. USA 1955. Subtitles by Risto Säämänen. 31.5.1991 TV1.
- Fleischer, Richard: **20 000 leagues under the sea**. Sukelluslaivalla maapallon ympäri. USA 1954. Subtitles by Jukka Keskinen.
- Fuller, Samuel: **Madonna and the Dragon**. Madonna ja lohikäärme. France 1989. Subtitles by Satu Miettinen. 12.2.1991 TV3.
- Gries, Tom: **The man from U.N.C.L.E.** Napoleon Solo. The discotheque affair. Episode 22: Discojytää. USA 1965. Subtitles by Maija-Liisa Vuorjoki. 2.8.1992 TV3.
- Glen, John: **For your eyes only**. Erittäin salainen. USA 1981. Subtitles by Videosuomennos Oy. Video.
- Huston, John: **Moby Dick**. Moby Dick - valkoinen valas. USA 1956. (i) Subtitles by Liisa Korkkula. 1985 MTV1. (ii) Subtitles by Tiina Siltanen. 8.11.1991 TV1.
- Kubrick, Stanley: **The Killing**. Peli on menetetty. USA 1956. Subtitles by Antero Helasvuo. 27.11.1988 TV3.
- Landis, John: **National Lampoon's Animal House**. Deltajengi. USA 1978. Subtitles by Kalle Niemi. 31.10.1988 MTV1.
- Levinson, Barry: **Good morning, Vietnam**. Hyvää huomenta, Vietnam. USA 1987. Subtitles by VIDEOSUOMENNOS OY, Leena Vallinsaari SKTL. 2.6.1992 TV3.
- Levy, Ralph: **Do not disturb**. Älkää häiritkö. USA 1965. Translator unknown. 15.3.1992 TV3.
- Litvak, Anatole: **The snake pit**. Käärmeenpesä. USA 1948. Subtitles by Maija-Liisa Vuorjoki. 21.6.1990 TV3.
- Reiner, Carl: **Where's Poppa**. Poikamiehen painajaiset. USA 1970. Subtitles by Videosuomennos Oy. Video.
- **Dead Men Don't Wear Plaid**. Kuollut mies ei palttoota kaipaa. USA 1982. (i) Subtitles by Emere Lodewijks-Vaaja. 6.12.1988 TV3. (ii) Subtitles by Marjatta Rusko. Video.

- Russell, Ken: Billion Dollar Brain. Miljardin dollarin aivot. Great Britain 1967. Translator unknown. Video.
- Sturges, John: Joe Kidd. Joe Kidd. USA 1972. Subtitles by Liisa Keravuori. 18.4.1988 MTV1.
- Wilder, Billy: The Secret Life of Sherlock Holmes. Sherlock Holmesin salaisuus. USA 1970. Subtitles by VIDEOSUOMENNOS OY. Video.
- Young, Terence: Dr. No. Salainen agentti 007 ja Tohtori No. a.k.a. James Bond salainen agentti 007 ja tohtori No. Great Britain 1962. Subtitles by Videosuomennos Oy, Kalle Niemi. 19.8.1991 MTV1.

## REFERENCES

- Allerton, D. J. 1982. Valency and the English verb. London: Academic Press.
- Bolinger, D. L. 1975. On the passive in English. Makkai, A. & V. B. Makkai (eds.), *The first Lacus forum 1974: 57-80*. Columbia, South Carolina: Hornbeam Press, Incorporated.
- DeLancey, S. 1982. Lhasa Tibetan: a case study in ergative typology. *Journal of Linguistic research* 2: 21-31.
- 1984. Notes on agentivity and causation. *Studies in Language* 8.2: 181-213.
- 1987. Transitivity in grammar and cognition. Tomlin, R. S. (ed.), *Coherence and grounding in discourse. Outcome of a symposium, Eugene, Oregon, June 1984: 53-68*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dik, S. C. 1978. *Functional grammar*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Dirven, R. & G. Radden 1987, eds. *Concepts of case*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1977. The case for case reopened. Cole, P. & J. M. Sadock (eds.), *Grammatical relations. Syntax and semantics* 8: 59-82. New York: Academic Press.
- Foley, W. A. & R. D. Van Valin, Jr. 1984. *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Givón, T. 1981. Typology and functional domains. *Studies in Language* 5.2: 163-193.
- 1983, ed. *Topic continuity in discourse: a quantitative cross-language study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 1984. Direct object and dative shifting: semantic and pragmatic case. Plank, F. (ed.), *Objects. Towards a theory of grammatical relations: 151-182*. London: Academic Press.
- 1990. *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction, volume 2*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Granger, S. 1983. *The be+past participle construction in spoken English with special emphasis on the passive*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Gruber, J. S. 1976. *Lexical structures in syntax and semantics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

- Hakulinen, A. 1972. Mitä subjektin alla? *Virittäjä* 76: 241-253.
- Hakulinen, A. & F. Karlsson 1979. *Nykysuomen lauseoppia*. Jyväskylä: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Hiirikoski, J. 1989. The English Agentful Passive vs. Word Order in Finnish. Tirkkonen-Condit, S. & S. Condit (eds.): *Empirical studies in translation and linguistics: 47-86*. Studies in languages n:o 17. Joensuu: Joensuun yliopisto, Humanistinen tiedekunta.
- 1990. The principles of "animated first" vs. "theme first" in Finnish novels and subtitles. Niemikorpi, A. & T. Pakkala (eds.). *Erikoiskielet ja käännteoria*. Vakki-seminaari X. *Vöyri* 10.-11.2.1990: 52-63. Vaasa: Vaasan korkeakoulu, Kielten laitos.
  - 1991a. Information structure in Finnish live ice hockey reporting: an answer to Tomlin (1983). Sajavaara, K. & D. Marsh & T. Keto (eds.), *Communication and discourse across cultures and languages: 203-237*. AFinLA Yearbook. Jyväskylä: Suomen soveltavan kielitieteen yhdistyksen (AFinLA) julkaisuja no. 49.
  - 1991b. Transitivity of the clause and the OVS order in Finnish: A hierarchy of semantic roles. Niemi, J. (ed.): *Papers from the eighteenth Finnish conference of linguistics: 13-29*. Studies in languages 24. Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Faculty of arts.
  - 1992. The information structure of the Finnish OVS clause. Stenfors, J. & S. Ruokangas (eds.), *Erikoiskielet ja käännteoria*. Vakki-symposiumi XII. *Vöyri* 8.-9.2.1992: 80-89. Vaasa: Vaasan yliopisto. Kielten laitos.
  - forthcoming. The information structure of Finnish transitive clauses: the textual function of the Finnish OVS word order compared to that of the English agent passive. Factors affecting the choice of word order in Finnish, with special reference to the effect of semantic roles. A licentiate thesis. University of Joensuu, Savonlinna School of Translation Studies.
- Hopper, P. J. & S. A. Thompson 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56: 251-299.
- Ikegami, Y. 1978. DO-language and BECOME-language - an implication of the localistic analysis of the representation of 'change' and 'state' in language. Dressler, W. U. & W. Meid (eds.), *Proceedings of the twelfth international congress of linguistics, Vienna, August 28 - September 2, 1977: 190-194*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- 1987. 'Source' vs. 'goal': a case of linguistic dissymmetry. Dirven, R. & G. Radden (eds.): 122-146.
- Itkonen-Kaila, M. 1974. Passiivilauseiden suomentamisesta. *Virittäjä* 78: 210-214.
- Karlsson, F. 1983. *Finnish Grammar*. Translated by Andrew Chesterman. Porvoo: Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö.
- Kirkwood, H. W. 1978. Options and constraints in the surface ordering of noun phrases in English and German. *Journal of Pragmatics* 2: 225-245.
- Kiuru, S. 1991. Joko potilaskin hoituu? *Kielikello* 3/1991: 13-15.

- Kress, G. R. & R. I. V. Hodge 1979. *Language as ideology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Lakoff, G. 1977. Linguistic gestalts. In Beach, W. A. & S. E. Fox & S. Philosoph (eds.), *Papers from the thirteenth regional meeting*: 236-287. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Langacker, R. W. 1987. *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Volume 1: Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Lehtinen, M. 1984. *Observations on subjectivization in English and Finnish*. A licentiate thesis in English Philology, University of Jyväskylä.
- Leino, P. & M.-L. Helasvuo & P. Lauerma & U. Nikanne & T. Onikki 1990. *Suomen kielen paikallissijat konseptuaalisessa semantiikassa*. *Kieli 5*. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.
- Sgall, P. & E. Hajicova & E. Benesova 1973. *Topic, Focus and Generative Semantics*. *Forschungen Linguistik und Kommunikationswissenschaft 1*. Kronberg Taunus: Scriptor Verlag GmbH.
- Tarvainen, K. 1987. Semantic cases in the framework of dependency theory. Dirven, R. & G. Radden (eds.): 75-102.
- Vilkuna, M. 1989. *Free word order in Finnish. Its syntax and discourse function*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.

Address: Savonlinna School of Translation Studies  
PL 48  
57101 Savonlinna