Generatiivse grammatika grupi aastakoosolek. Annual Meeting of the Research Group for Generative Grammar. 1971. Teesid. Abstracts, Tartu 1971. 78 pp.

On December 9, 1971, the Generative Grammar Group working at the Estonian Language Chair of Tartu State University held their third annual meeting. The reports predominantly treated of problems of Modern Estonian and of general linguistics (not only from the point of view of generative grammar, as might be concluded from the name of the group). Most of the papers were narrow excerpts from the speakers' investigations, completed or about to be so.

Phonology was represented in two reports. Mati H i n t, in his paper "On Boundary Signals in Estonian", dealt with both phonetic and structural boundary signals, to the extent that they have hitherto been studied. The study and systematic description of boundary phenomena was said to be necessary, but at the same time it was underlined that these phenomena were not so regular as had been presumed in the juncture theory of descriptivists. Language does not tend to create a fixed system of boundary signals: the signalling of morphological and syntactical boundaries by phonetic means and by rules of morphemic structure is a phenomenon redundant in the total system of language. M. Hint noted that modern linguistic schools had failed to provide a better-founded and clearer theory of boundary signals than that given already by Trubetzkoy.

Tiit-Rein V i i t s o ("On *i* : *e* Alternations in Estonian") spoke about the problems in the phonology of Modern Estonian connected with the traditionally assumed change *ti* > *si*. He demonstrated that it was impossible to describe the change by ordered rules

(1) $e \rightarrow i$ / __{#} (i. e. *e* gives *i* before a word boundary (#), etc.),

(2) $t \rightarrow \acute{s}$ / __ *i*, where *i*|*e* → *i* (i. e. *t* gives *s* before *i*, the *i* having been given by *e*), e. g. *käte* → *käti* (1) → *käsi* (2).

In Estonian we are in the given case concerned with the rules

(3) $t \rightarrow s$/ __ *j*# and

(4) $j \rightarrow i$/C __ #, where C is a consonant. Thus, for example, *kätj* → *käsj* (3) → *käsi* (4).

As such rules are also required in Livonian and as they are likewise applicable to other Balto-Fennic languages, T-R. Viitso considered them to be characteristic of Proto-Balto-Fennic as well. The *e*, which is usually seen as a stem final vowel, in most cases must be regarded as epenthetic; it is only in a few cases that *e* is a stem final vowel (e. g. in *veli* : *velje*).

In the last few years increasing attention has been given to the application of statistical methods in linguistics. Jüri V a l g e ("Some Differences in the Vocabulary of TASS Reports and Sport Articles") has studied the peculiarities of newspaper language. He showed that there existed certain semantic groups of words which in various kinds of newspaper language are used with different frequency. Thus the most typical of TASS reports are words related to informing or speaking as well as words denoting events, places and purposeful activities, whereas in sport articles words marking quantity, numbers and movement are the most frequent. J. Valge's report was a good example of how the results of statistical investigations should be interpreted linguistically.

Two reports were devoted to syntax. Ellen U u s p õ l d ("On the *des*-Construction in Estonian") emphasized once more that it was not the basic condition for the acceptability of sentences containing a *des*-construction that the deep agent of the *des*-construction should appear as the subject of the principal clause, as is usually stated in the traditional grammar of Estonian. Quite acceptable and unambiguous are such sentences where the *des*-construction is associated with an animate agent while the predicate verb of the principal clause requires an inanimate subject (e. g. *Televiisorit vaadates kustus vanaisa* (~ *vanaisal*) *piip* 'Watching TV grandfather's pipe was extinguished'). What is essential here is rather that the deep agent of a *des*-construction should just make its

appearance in the principal clause. It may be expressed in addition to the subject by a genitival attribute, a partitival object or an adverbial in the inessive, allative, adessive or comitative case, e. g. *Keskkoolis õppides oli Peetrit huvitanud ajalugu'* (When) learning at secondary school, history had interested Peeter' (see also the above example, etc.).

Helle N i i n e m ä g i in her report "On the Structure of Syntactic-Analogical Parallelism in Estonian Alliterative Verse" brought out several syntactic regularities peculiar to parallelism in Estonian (alliterative) runic folk-songs.

She proceeded from the assumption that the sentence is a hierarchic system consisting of levels of successive subordination. An element of the highest level (the predicate verb) binds the government structure; elements of lower levels (complements of the second and subsequent ranks) provide figurativeness. In the transition from the primary verse to the second, elements of a higher level tend to drop out, whereas elements of a lower level are added. The most widely spread types of the primary and the second verse as well as the commonest transitions from the former to the latter were presented schematically in the report.

Folklore was also the subject matter of Arvo K r i k m a n n's paper "On the Semantic Indefinitness of Proverbs". The author drew attention to the fact that the semantics of proverbs could not be specified unequivocally; he brought out several different aspects of indefinitness. The specification of the meaning of a proverb depends first of all on whether we proceed only from its text in itself or from its actualization in speech. Further, the specification of the semantics of proverbs is made more difficult by their great variability in oral tradition, by the polysemy of tropes, by the looseness of modal values, etc. Much depends on whether proverbs are treated from the informative, evaluative or prescriptive aspect.

The majority of the papers were in one way or another connected with linguistic semantics. Jaan K a p l i n s k i noted in his paper, "On Nominative and Predicative Semes in Estonian", that some specific morphological means could be found in Estonian to distinguish between nominative and predicative semes. Nouns with the suffixes *-tu* and *-nu* are nominative; but nouns with the suffixes *-tud* and *-nud* are predicative, since they can never occupy the position of the subject in the sentence. The *tav*-participle can be either nominative or predicative. J. Kaplinski also claimed that the *nomen agentis* with the ending *-ja* was without exception nominative in Modern Estonian, and the present participle with the ending *-v* was without exception predicative. Apparently this is not a case as absolute as that, however, for there are perfectly acceptable sentences like the following: *Haukuja koer ei hammusta* 'The barking (= barker) dog does not bite', *Juhtuv ei huvitanud teda* 'The happening (= what happened) did not interest him'.

Derivational semantics is the field of two members of the group R. Kasik and A. Mölder, Asta M ö l d e r ("Über zwei Aspekte der Untersuchung der Verbenableitung") proceeded from the viewpoint that the meaning of the verb derived is formed as a result of the semantic interplay of the stem and the derivational suffix of the verb. Suffixes provide the derivative with semantic features characterizing the nature of the action taking place (causativity, reflexivity, translativity, frequentativity, etc.). In order to determine the role of the underlying word, semantic relationships between the words being in derivational connection have to be studied. A. Mölder had found six such relationships that were essential in Estonian: 1) the relationship of instrument (*höövel — hööveldama* 'plane — to plane'), 2) of addition (*sõrmus — sõrmustama* '(finger-)ring — put a ring on'), 3) of result (*kikkis — kikitama* 'acock — to cock up'), 4) of state (*vaga — vagatsema* 'pious — play the pious'), 5) of place (*rand — randuma* 'shore — pull in to the shore'), 6) of object (*kala — kalastama* 'fish — to fish').

Reet K a s i k in her report "On the Semantic Relation between Verbs and Verbal Nouns" demonstrated the possibility of describing Estonian verbal nouns in terms of Fillmore's case grammar. The author gave closer consideration to two types of verbal nouns: the products of action nominalization (e. g. *mine*-deriva-

tives: *keeldumine* 'refusal, declining' and the like) and the products of argument nominalization (e. g. agent noun *kaitsja* 'defender' and the like). The author also brought out some problems connected with this particular way of description that would crop up when a verbal noun contained information coming from a source other than the verb itself (a case is the word *lendur* 'flier', indicating a person's profession).

In the paper "On Action Situation and Intrasentential Pronominalization in Estonian" Ülle V i k s analysed two cases of intrasentential pronominalization. On the one hand it was about reflexive and possessive pronominalization (*Peeter peseb ennast* 'Peeter is washing himself', *Peeter kaotas oma sulepea* 'Peeter lost his penholder'), on the other hand about reciprocal pronominalization (*Ants ja Jaan tervitavad teineteist* 'Ants and Jaan are greeting each other'). The author declared that while sentences of the first type were usually derived from one underlying sentence having two co-referential noun phrases (*Peeter peseb Peetrit → Peeter peseb ennast* 'Peeter is washing Peeter → Peeter is washing himself'), with reciprocal pronominalization sentences derived from two or more (according to the number of subjects) underlying sentences expressing different directions of the action ((*Ants tervitab Jaani*), (*Jaan tervitab Antsu*) → *Ants ja Jaan tervitavad teineteist* '(Ants is greeting Jaan), (Jaan is greeting Ants) → Ants and Jaan are greeting each other'). There is a rather grave counterargument to Ü. Viks' treatment of reciprocal pronominalization, however, which is the existence of sentences that belong to the same type and yet cannot be described in the above way, e. g. *Need viis meest tervitavad üksteist* 'These five men are greeting one another', *Mõned mehed tervitavad üksteist* 'Some men greet one another', etc. Actually, reflexive and possessive pronominalization is not quite as simple either. Here, too, problems arise in case of sentences with a subject noun phrase in the plural or with one containing a quantifier.

Huno R ä t s e p ' s report "On the Situation Analysis of the Estonian Verbs *tulema* 'come' — *minema* 'go' and *tooma* 'bring' — *viima* 'take' " was no doubt one of the most interesting reports of the

meeting. The author's aim had been to find out the presuppositions embedded in the semantic structure of the above verbs. In principle the analysis was much the same as the kind that is advanced in papers on generative semantics, as well as in Fillmore's case grammar, although at a first glance the reader or listener may overlook that.

The results of the analysis proper may be summarized as follows. The verbs *tulema* and *tooma* are used in Estonian to express 1) that the speaker (1st person) is (or will be) moving, or carrying something, to the place at or near which the listener (2nd p.) is located during the act of speaking and/or moving or carrying (e. g. in the sentences *Ma tulen poodi* 'I shall come to the shop', *Ma toon lapse haiglasse* 'I shall bring the child to the hospital'); 2) that the listener or a third person is (or will be) moving, or carrying something, to the place at or near which the speaker is located during the act of speaking and/or moving or carrying (e. g. in the sentences *Sa tuled poodi* 'You will come to the shop', *Sa tood lapse haiglasse* 'You will bring the child to the hospital', *Ema tuleb poodi* 'Mother will come to the shop', *Ema toob lapse haiglasse* 'Mother will bring the child to the hospital'). When neither the speaker nor the listener is present at the target place at the proper moment, the verbs *minema* and *viima* are used. This explanation is not quite complete, however. First: When the speaker is the person who moves, the preterite and future use of the verbs *tulema* and *tooma* may indicate an action directed at the speaker himself. For example: *Ma tulin (eile) poodi* 'I came to the shop (yesterday)', *Ma tõin eile lapse haiglasse* 'I brought the child to the hospital yesterday', *Ma lähen praegu koju ja tulen pärast poodi tagasi* 'I am going home now and shall come back to the shop later', *Ma sõidan kohe teile ja toon lapse haiglasse* 'I shall go (drive) to your place immediately and bring the child to the hospital'. The necessary condition here is that the speaker is in the shop, or in the hospital, at the moment of speaking. Second: When a third person moves or carries, the listener's location at the target place may as well be deduced from sentences with *tulema* and *tooma*. Thus we also use the sentence *Ema tuleb poodi*

'Mother will come to the shop' when we communicate that fact (e. g. over the telephone) to a shop assistant we know. Particularly obvious is listener-orientation in the type of sentences like *Ema toob sulle haiglasse õunu* 'Mother will bring you apples to the hospital' which is missing altogether in H. Rätsep's set of examples. In fact all sentences with *tulema* and *tooma* where the mover or the carrier is a third person allow of twofold interpretation. Consequently the following explanation might possibly take us somewhat nearer to the truth. The verbs *tulema* and *tooma* are used in Estonian to express that 1) a) the speaker is (or was or will be, of course) moving or carrying something to a place at or near which the listener is located during the act of speaking and/or moving or carrying, b) somewhere in the past or in the future the speaker moved / will move or carried / will carry something to a place at or near which he is present himself during the act of speaking; 2) the listener moves or carries something to a place at or near which the speaker is located during the act of speaking and/or moving or carrying; 3) a third person moves or carries something to a place at or near which at least one of the participants in the act of speaking (the speaker or the listener) is located during the act of speaking and/or moving or carrying. By the way, it is interesting to note that in the region of the Southern Estonian dialects (at least in the region of the Võru dialect) the verb *tulema* is used to denote (if not only, then at least chiefly) the movement directed at the speaker, i. e. to express that the listener or a third person moves over to a place where the speaker is located during the act of speaking and/or moving, or that the speaker himself moved some time ago or will move in the future over to the place at or near which he is located when speaking. Thus the usage *Mina tulen...*

'I am coming...' is quite an exceptional phenomenon there.

Haldur Õim's name is associated with several significant amendments he has made in generative semantics, and he was not short of fresh ideas on this occasion either. This time in his report "Predicates, Nouns and Referring Structures", he aimed his criticism at the absolutism of predicates in generative grammar which, as will be remembered, originated with E. Bach and has persisted more or less firmly up to the present time. The author stated that in view of the communicative function of language it was no longer reasonable to treat classes of linguistic units (either predicates only or, according to Ö. Dahl, predicates and nouns) as the basic concepts of semantics; the basic concepts should rather be certain functions or functional positions in which those linguistic units can occur, namely the referring function (presented by nouns) and the predicative function (and the existence of some other functions is not excluded). "The referring position is the position of the unit (or structure) about which something is said or, in formal terms, which is operated upon in the corresponding message, whereas the predicative position is the position of the unit carrying the information that will operate upon the first structure" (p. 69). In principle, any linguistic unit can occur either in the predicative or in the referring position. The word classes of the surface structure are but certain reflections of these semantic classes.

Comprehension of the papers presented at the meeting was greatly facilitated by a publication brought out for the occasion. In spite of its name, "Abstracts", this publication included almost all the papers in full, translated into English or German.

ÜLLE VIKS, MATI ERELT (Tallinn)