

Hebedová, Petra

The illative case in Estonian and Finnish from the perspective of cognitive grammar : summary

In: Hebedová, Petra. *Estonský a finský illativ v pohledu kognitivní gramatiky*.
Vydání první Brno: Filozofická fakulta, Masarykova univerzita, 2016, pp.
248-251

ISBN 978-80-210-8292-2

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/135773>

Access Date: 30. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

THE ILLATIVE CASE IN ESTONIAN AND FINNISH FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF COGNITIVE GRAMMAR SUMMARY

The work at hand seeks to provide a description of the illative case in standard Estonian and Finnish in terms of Langacker's cognitive grammar. The aim of the work is to apply this theoretical framework to the description of Estonian and Finnish morphology and to test its possible contribution in dealing with some traditional morphological topics of Estonian and Finnish. Primary focus is on the forms of the illative case, which in both languages is relatively rich in allomorphy. The work concentrates on standard variants of both languages, which is why the development of illative forms in the standardization process is also taken into consideration. However, as the illative case is considered a symbolic unit, the description of its meaning cannot be omitted. Therefore the polysemy of the illative is described as well. This provides a possibility to compare the use of the theoretical framework on matters of meaning and matters of form. The description of the polysemy of the illative relies on existing descriptions of the semantics of local cases in the cognitive grammarian framework. In the description of forms, on the other hand, a novel description is proposed and compared with some traditional approaches.

The description of allomorphy and polysemy utilizes the concept of schematic networks as well as the conception of categorization in more general sense. It is argued that concepts of categorization used in cognitive linguistics and Langacker's schematic network are helpful and insightful when dealing with allomorphic variation. Allomorphs are traditionally described as a distributional class, but the description shows that categorizing relations based on similarities of form are detectable between them.

The traditionally described patterns for forming the illative are schemas in terms of cognitive grammar; they are abstractions based on phonological prop-

erties of concrete forms. For example, in two of the Finnish schemas for forming the illative, [ILL.SG/...Vn] and [ILL.SG/...hVn], the vowel of the ending *V* is schematic compared to concrete forms such as *talo* ‘house’ ~ ill.sg. *taloon*, *seinä* ‘wall’ ~ ill.sg. *seinään*, *kyky* ‘ability’ ~ ill.sg. *kykyyn*, etc. for the first schema, or *puu* ‘tree’ ~ ill.sg. *puuhun*, *työ* ‘work’ ~ ill.sg. *työhön*, *maa* ‘land’ ~ ill.sg. *maahan*, etc. for the second one. Traditional descriptions of Finnish include six patterns for the illative: three for the singular ([ILL.SG/...Vn], [ILL.SG/...hVn], [ILL.SG/...seen]), and three for the plural ([ILL.PL/...in], [ILL.PL/...hin] [ILL.PL/...siin]). As for relations between these, the plural variants can be considered extensions of the respective singular variant, for example [ILL.SG/...hVn] → [ILL.PL/...hin], [ILL.SG/...seeɐ] → [ILL.PL/...siin]. At the same time, all three plural variants can be considered examples of a schema that unites them. This schema states that the vowel in the plural illative ending is *i*, reduplicating the plural ending vowel (e.g. *seinä* ‘wall’ ~ ill. pl. *seiniin*, *puu* ‘tree’ ~ ill. pl. *puihin*, where the plural stems are *seini-*, *pui-*). The allomorphs of the illative in Finnish – including variants that appear before possessive suffix such as used in e.g. *taloomme* ‘into our house’ (PX1PL *-mme*), *työhönsä* ‘into his/her/their work’ (PX3 *-nsa* ~ *-nsä*) – usually share at least one phonological property, but none of the phonological properties that appear in illative forms are common to all illative forms.

In the case of the Estonian illative, the analysis in terms of a schematic network leads to a proposal to reconsider some of the traditionally described patterns. These can be distinguished by giving a list of properties that the form should meet in order to be considered a good example of a certain pattern. This applies, for example, to the distinction between the so-called long illative (formed with the suffix *-sse* attached to the stem, which ends in a vowel) and short illative (formed by introflective morphology), where the crucial criterion is whether a form is agglutinative or inflective. It is suggested that the description can be altered from the one based on a criterial-attribute model of categorization to a description utilizing the concept of a schematic network. In that case it is possible that some schemas (patterns for forming the illative) do not meet the conditions of any of the traditional patterns (for example, illative forms such as *üllatus* ‘surprise’ ~ ill. sg. *üllatusse*, *oluline* ‘important’ ~ ill.sg. *olulisse*, *inimene* ‘person’ ~ ill.sg. *inimesse* are not wholly unproblematic examples of either the long illative or the geminate illative), but in the schematic network these forms can be considered motivated from different directions, being partially sanctioned by more than one traditionally recognized schema. The possibility of departing from the prototype is assumed in the framework and can be readily described. Other relevant examples of extensions are polysyllabic geminate illatives of nouns formed with the derivative suffix *-elu* (e.g. *arutelu* ‘discussion’, ill.sg. *arutellu*) or nouns where the consonant *j* undergoes the germination process (e.g. *maja* ‘house’ ~ ill.sg. *majja*, *aju* ‘brain’ ~ ill.sg. *ajju*).

Concepts from Langacker's cognitive grammar concerning distribution are also used in the work at hand. The strict productive/unproductive dichotomy utilized by some morphological descriptions is set aside when trying to reconsider the notion of productivity in morphology. Rather, the most useful concepts in the description of distribution prove to be cognitive salience and elaborative distance. Various patterns for forming the illative are compared as regards the cognitive salience of the schema and the salience of individual forms. Data from corpora are used in the description of distribution in order to test the usage of the schemas as described in grammars or as proposed in this work. Searching the corpora mostly confirmed earlier statements concerning the distribution of illative forms in both languages. In Estonian, only one illative is usually used for one noun, even though prescriptive grammars often allow for two variants (this is for example typical for illatives with the ablaut morpheme or the zero ending). However, stems that have forms of the geminate illative also have forms with the ending *-sse* that appeared to be in use alongside the geminate illative forms (for example *pere* 'family' ~ ill. sg. *perre* ~ *peresse*, *küla* 'village' ~ ill. sg. *külla* ~ *külasse*). The use of the long illative with the ending *-sse* was also analyzed specifically for words of unspecified or un-specifiable morphological behavior, such as abbreviations, recent loans, or proper nouns which are not often used in Estonian.

The nominal types in Finnish that can in theory have more than one illative ending also showed clear preferences for only one illative form (with only few exceptions such as *usea* 'many' ~ ill.pl. *useihin* ~ *useisiin* or *ateljee* 'atelier' ~ ill.pl. *ateljeehen* ~ *ateljeeseen*). Polysyllabic stems ending in *-kka*, *-kko*, and *-kkö* were subject to special attention as their illative plural forms are mostly in the weak grade, in contrast to all other illative forms, singular or plural. Forms in the weak grade were predominant among nouns ending in *-kko* ~ *-kkö* (e.g. *otsikko* 'headline', ill. pl. *otsikoihin*, *yksikkö* 'unit', ill.pl. *yksiköihin*, *laatikko* 'box', ill.pl. *laatikoihin*) and almost exclusively used for nouns ending in *-kka* (e.g. *piirakka* 'pie', ill.pl. *piirakoihin*, *mansikka* 'strawberry', ill.pl. *mansikoihin*). This is explained in terms of a local schema that, due to its specificity, can be considered more salient than more abstract schematic representations of the nominal stem in the illative that would subsume all illative forms.

In the description of the distribution of the plural endings *-siin* ~ *-hin* and in the description of the stem alternation of nouns ending in *-kka*, *-kko*, and *-kkö*, the notion of declensional type and some reflection of paradigmatic cohesion was necessary. The notion of declensional type was in consequence slightly reconsidered in terms of cognitive grammar and in relation to the concept of schema, conceptions of categorizing relationships in general, and a usage-based approach to morphology.

A cognitive grammarian description of integration of morphemes into larger assemblies was adopted as well. Illative morphemes are bound morphemes that only

occur in combination with nominal stems. It was attempted to illustrate how it is in this respect possible to avoid putting agglutinative morphology into a special position when compared to introflective morphology or any other kind of morphological operation. It was attempted to show how the same theoretically grounded and coherent approach can be used to describe both Estonian and Finnish morphology.

In Finnish, the description of illative forms must include suffixation and reduplication. In Estonian, the description must include suffixation, ablaut morphemes, and the zero ending – which is considered a special case of ablaut in accordance with Langacker (1987: 344–345). The illative morpheme is a dependent morpheme and appears only in combination with a nominal stem. The mutual interaction between the nominal stem and case ending is an issue of special concern especially in Finnish inflectional morphology (cf. Anttila 1974). In terms of Langacker’s cognitive grammar the dependent morpheme (e.g. illative suffix) always refers to the nominal stem. The dependent morpheme has the schematic stem as its subpart, cf. the Finnish illative suffix *...seen*, where the schematic part (here ‘...’) serves as the elaboration site in valence relation between the nominal stem and the ending.

The illative morpheme can also be a part of larger morphological assemblies, consisting of a nominal stem, a plural morpheme, an illative morpheme, and in Finnish also a possessive suffix. In such assemblies we can recognize the hierarchy of constituents. A constituent is however something very different from a unit (Langacker 1987: 313). This allows for a description in which the “ready-made” combination of a plural and an illative morpheme is considered a unit, e.g. Finnish [ILL.PL/...iin], [ILL.PL/...ihin], [ILL.PL/...isiin], and Estonian [ILL.PL/...desse], [ILL.PL/...tesse].

The conclusions argue that the concept of a local schema is an especially useful contribution of cognitive grammar. Such a schema is usually not overly abstract, but is cognitively salient. Some patterns for forming the illative traditionally described in grammars can be examples of such schemas. The concept of the local schema has been used to describe the plural morphology of Finnish nouns ending in *-kka*, *-kko*, and *-kkö*. One can in a similar manner find local schemas in the polysemic network of illative meanings. The properties one abstracts away from when using these schemas may be different, but the abstraction of local schemas unites the description of meaning and form. The framework does not deny more abstract schemas such as is the illative morpheme, where both its expression and its meaning represent very abstract and almost empty schemas. It is the concept of cognitive salience, lacking a counterpart in other frameworks, which proves viable in the description. Such a description can also be readily adopted for pedagogical goals. It is also argued that a different approach to categorization in language has a substantial effect on the description and offers possibilities to reconsider other established morphological topics.

