



ON TEMPORAL FACTORS MOTIVATING THE USE OF FINNISH DIRECTIONAL LOCATIVES

Kari Hiltula

University of Tampere/Greifswald

15 May 2010

**14th INTERNATIONAL
MORPHOLOGY MEETING
Budapest, 13–16 May 2010
Workshop on Uralic case**

Outline of the talk

- ❑ The problem (1): Why a directional locative (DL) in Finnish expressions that involve no actual motion, e.g., with *remain*-type verbs?
- ❑ Solutions to the problem range from temporal factors and logical relations (Rahkonen 1977; Dahl 1987) and diphasic event structure (Fong 1997, 2003) to layering (Kracht 2002) and fictive dynamicity (Huumo 2006, 2007)
- ❑ The putative inadequacy of temporal factors (see Fong 1997; Huumo 2006, 2007) may have to be reconsidered on close reading of the original sources
- ❑ Additional problem (2): To what extent can the semantic analysis of DLs rely on case structure information alone?
- ❑ The upshot: proposed solutions to (1) and (2) need to specify dependency relations within the sentence

Why a directional locative?

- **The received wisdom:** a DL in Finnish is used in expressions of remaining which in Indo-European languages in general are expressed with a static locative :

"A. – – die Verwendung der Wohin-Kasus in bestimmten Fällen, wo die idg. Sprachen im allgemeinen die Entsprechungen der ural. Wo-Kasus verknüpfen. Der Wohin-Kasus ist dann gewöhnlich mit einem Verb verknüpft, welches ein Verbleiben oder Zurücklassen irgendwo bedeutet, wobei diese Verbalbedeutungen möglichst umfassend zu denken sind – – B. – – daß im Fi. in gewissen Fällen der Woher-Kasus steht, wo im Indogermanischen wie oben der Wo-Kasus verwendet wird." (Hakulinen 1960: 223, 225.)

- (1) *Hän jätti meidät pulaan* 'Er hat uns **im** Stich gelassen'
- (2) *Ukko väsyi tielle* 'Der Alte blieb vor Erschöpfung **am** Wegrande liegen'
- (3) *Karhu ammuttiin pesänsä* 'Der Bär wurde **in** seiner Höhle erschossen'
- (4) *Unohdin avaimet pöydälle* 'Ich habe die Schlüssel **auf dem** Tische liegenlassen'
- (5) *Sormus löytyi lattialta* 'Man hat den Ring **auf dem** Fußboden gefunden'

Why a directional locative?

- Hakulinen (1960: 223) notes that the three-way system of the Finnish local cases [prototypically conveying the semantic roles LOCATION, SOURCE and DESTINATION] is also known in Turkic but not in, e.g., Indo-European: the Swedish preposition *i* and its French synonym *dans* correspond to the Finnish inessive [LOC] and illative [DEST], and the preposition *under* in Swedish and English corresponds both *alla* [LOC] and *alle* [DEST] in Finnish etc.
- Hakulinen (1960: 227) argues that the use of a DL is on the representational level connected to the **result of the action** or to the **consequence of the event**
- According to this view the location of the event as such in (2) is not as important as the fact that the process of exhaustion lead to the appearance of a particular individual on the road: the old man was not on the road before the event; similarly with (5), in which the speaker concentrates on the result of the action of finding that leads to the taking of the ring into safe keeping

Temporal factors (1): Rahkonen (1977)

- Rahkonen (1977: 21–22) conceives of a DL either as a
a) **locative adverbial** or b) **directional adverbial**: genuine motion verbs, e.g. *run*, *walk* and *fly* typically require the latter whereas the former occurs with a variety of verb types; a locative adverbial does not express a change of location but a rest state:

(6) *Liisa on autossa* 'Liisa is **in** the car'

- As there is no change of location in sentences such as (4) and (5) above, and in spite of the fact that the DLs in them behave like directional adverbials in some respects, Rahkonen (ibid.) claims that the sentences have a locative adverbial; compare them to (7) and (8):

(7) *Kalle heitti kirjan hyllylle* 'Kalle kastade boken **på** hyllan'

(8) *Kalle poimi kadulta* kympin 'Kalle plockade upp en tia **från** gatan'

Temporal factors (1): Rahkonen (1977)

- The Swedish preposition *från* cannot appear in the translations of (5) and (9):

(9) *Kalle löysi kadulta kymppiä* 'Kalle hittade en tia **på** (*från) gatan'

- If the verb *löytää* 'find' would behave as a motion verb *poimia* 'pick up', as in (8), the referent of the subject or the object could not reside at the location pointed at by the adverbial after the activity denoted by the verb has ended: (9) does not **implicate** that the ten-mark note did not lie on the street after it had been found; mutatis mutandis for the verb *unohtaa* 'forget, leave behind': (4) does not **presuppose** that the keys were not on the table before they were forgotten
- Rahkonen (1977: 50) rejects the account given by Hakulinen (1960) on the grounds that the hypotheses about, e.g., the alleged result of the action turn out to be **extralinguistic**

Temporal factors (2): Dahl (1987)

- Dahl (1987: 150–154) sees the verbs such as a) *jäädä* 'remain', *jättää* 'leave' and *unohtaa* 'forget, leave behind' and b) *hakea* 'search', *etsiä* 'look for', and *löytää* 'find' to exemplify borderline cases between what are prototypically seen as **location** (e.g., be situated) and **direction** (e.g., move)
- In (10) the complement of the Finnish verb *jäädä* is marked **formally** as direction whereas in Russian the corresponding phrase is marked as location. As for the complements of the English verb, location and direction are not kept apart by any overt marking:

(10) *Hän jäi Lontoonseen* 'He remained **in** London' 'On ostalsja **v** Londone'

Similarly for (11):

(11) *Hän etsii avainta taskusta* 'He is looking for the key **in** (his) pocket'

Temporal factors (2): Dahl (1987)

- ❑ **A detour:** Chafe (1970: 162–163) notes that some sentences such as *Tom fell in the kitchen*, *Mary danced under the tree* or *Tom threw the ball behind the house* are clearly ambiguous as to their having either a state or (action-)process reading (two separate verb roots vs. derived verb roots in Chafe's terminology)
- ❑ Dahl (1987: 153) interprets the DL in (10) not as fitting the usual definition for the semantic role DESTINATION "the final point of a movement" but rather "the point at which something is located as the **result** of what is said to take place in the sentence"; similarly for (11): instead of the definition for the semantic role SOURCE "the initial point of a movement" Dahl (ibid.) states the definition "the point at which the object is situated at the **beginning** of what is said to take place in the sentence"
- ❑ Dahl (1987: 153, footnote 6) is keen to note that in (11) there is no implication that the key is in the pocket at all!

Temporal factors (3): Rahkonen (1977) revisited

- ❑ Rahkonen (1977: 43) gives similar examples (12–13) to Dahl's:
 - (12) *Kalle etsi taskustaan markkaa* 'Kalle looked for a mark (coin) **in** his pocket'
 - (13) *Kalle löysi taskustaan markan* 'Kalle found a mark (coin) **in** his pocket'
- ❑ DLs do not always presuppose the location where the referent of the subject or the object resides before the activity denoted by the verb has begun: Rahkonen (ibid.) sees (12) as **indifferent** to where the coin might be located, and (13) as only **implicating** that the coin was in the pocket before it was found (cf. 9)
- ❑ Rahkonen's (1977: 27) example (14) fits Dahl's alternative definition of the semantic role DESTINATION, confirmed by the fact that (14) expresses where the tower **is** after being completed:
 - (14) *Lapsi rakensi pöydälle tornin* 'The child built a tower **on** the table'

Fong's (1997) critique of Dahl (1987)

- The two alternative definitions given by Dahl (1987: 152–153) for DESTINATION and SOURCE respectively reflect the fact that the borderline status of the verbs in question allows them pattern either with motion verbs in involving **at least two points in time**, or, with state verbs in involving **only a single location**
- Dahl's use of the semantic role GOAL for DESTINATION (cf. Blake 1994: 70) may have lead Fong (1997: 20) to claim that Dahl's theory overgeneralizes as in Finnish, "sometimes, goals are expressed with direct objects, in partitive or accusative case":

(15) *Tuovi tavoitteli täydellisyyttä* 'Tuovi strove for perfection'

(16) *Tuovi saavutti maalin* 'Tuovi reached **the** goal'

- Fong (ibid.) adds that *remain/stay*-type verbs do not take goals in accusative case:

(17) *Tuovi jäi *huoneen/huoneeseen* 'Tuovi stayed *room/**in** the room'

Fong's (1997) critique of Dahl (1987)

- ❑ Dahl (1987: 151, footnote 4) qualifies his use of the semantic role GOAL with a (in his words) pre-theoretical notion of *direction*; he also qualifies the meaning of the term *complement* as being more specific than *argument* and excluding, e.g., subjects (ibid. 153, footnote 6)
- ❑ Fong can be criticized a) for not succeeding to differentiate between various uses of the role GOAL, and b) for the fact that she subsumes under that role all non-peripheral participants of the sentence (cf. Matthews 1981: 140; Somers 1987: 26–27)
- ❑ In sentences (15–16) what is expressed is the location of the subject referent in relation to the object referent; arguably the action could be directed towards something as in (15), but this is most often expressed by an optional complement DL which is not an integral part of the meaning of the verb (VISK § 461):

(18) *Seurasin häntä etuovelle* 'I followed her **up to** the front door'

Huumo's (2006, 2007) critique on Rahkonen (1977) and Dahl (1987)

- Huumo (2007: 79) gives credit to Rahkonen (1977) for first putting forward an idea that temporal factors are involved in the use of a DL in lieu of a non-directional one in Finnish, even though the explicit argument for such factors was formulated by Dahl (1987)
- Huumo (*ibid.*, cf. 2006: 46–50) finds the explanation based on temporal factors problematic, however, because it “cannot be generalized to explain all kinds of inchoative or terminated events where a participant either is in the location before the event or remains there after the event, since in general the static cases are used in such sentences” as in (19):

(19) *Lapsi aloitti leikin lattialla* ‘The child started the game on the floor’

(20) *Lapsi aloitti leikin lattialta* ‘The child started the game on the floor [and moved elsewhere]’ (Huumo 2006: 49)

Huumo's (2006, 2007) critique on Rahkonen (1977) and Dahl (1987)

- If we take Rahkonen's and Dahl's arguments seriously, (19) and (21) below express the location where the referent of the subject was at the time of starting the game (or finishing the dance); we remain in the dark as to what happened before (or after) the action (see also Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979: 208):

(21) *Liisa lopetti tanssin pöydällä* 'Liisa finished her dance **on** the table'

(22) *Liisa lopetti tanssin pöydälle* 'Liisa finished her dance **on** the table
[she had moved there]'

- In (19–22) the aspect is perfective, i.e., the action has been completed, which means that contrary to what Huumo (2006: 47–48; 2007: 79–80) claims, there is no inchoative or terminative aspect that would render the examples different in meaning; however, in analogy with motion verbs, e.g., *poimia* 'pick up' (8), (20) and (22) implicate that there was a change of location

DLs at the crossroads of semantics and syntax (1)

- ❑ Two main syntactic issues that have been touched on in the review of the studies on DLs above :
 - a) DLs are either place adverbials or directional adverbials (cf. Rahkonen)
 - b) *Remain*-type verbs require a DL complement which, if needed, should be distinguished from the more central participants of the sentence (cf. Dahl)
- ❑ In addition, it is useful to ask the following question:
 - c) What are DLs, complements or adjuncts (or perhaps a bit of both) (cf. Kracht 2002: 158)?
- ❑ The failure to account for a–c hints at a semantic analysis of DLs in which case structure information overrides information about syntactic configuration, i.e., what are the dependency relations within the sentence

DLs at the crossroads of semantics and syntax (2)

- The importance of syntactic and also phrasal configuration becomes all the more clear if we look at the analyses of the following sentences by Fong (1997:2, 17, 26–27), Kracht (2002: 170, 207) and Huumo (2007: 85–86) (cf. examples 4, 5, 9, 13 above):

(23) *Tuovi unohti kirjan auto**on**/***autossa**/***autosta*** 'Tuovi forgot the book **in** the car'

(24) *Tuovi löysi kirjan auto**sta**/***autoon**/***autossa*** 'Tuovi found the book **in** the car'

- Fong and Kracht deem the sentences that have the DLs with the asterisk (*) as not grammatical, whereas Huumo finds them grammatical with a particular reading

DLs at the crossroads of semantics and syntax (3)

- ❑ Kracht (2002: 207–209) sees the issue simply as a case of **mode selection** (i.e., the preposition or the case ending that is valency-bound is semantically void): the verb *unohtaa* ‘forget’ selects a complement in (directional) **cofinal** mode, while **static** and (directional) **coinitial** mode are impossible; *löytää* ‘find’ is expected to select coinitial mode and to reject both static and cofinal mode
- ❑ Huumo (2007: 84–85) argues that a) because these verbs may also be used in simple SVO constructions, they do not actually require the presence of a DL, and b) they do allow **different kinds** of locatives in the same sentence
- ❑ What needs to be explained, then, are the kinds of locative expressions that are possible, not only from a semantic but also a syntactic point of view

DLs at the crossroads of semantics and syntax (4)

- In (25) the intended reading resembles the one that was given for (19) above:

(25) *Tuovi löysi kirjan autossa* 'Tuovi found the book [when she was] **in the car**' (Huumo 2007: 85)

- In fact, (25) is ambiguous between this reading (having an adverbial clause of which the locative complement *autossa* 'in the car' is a part) and the one in which it is the referent of the object that is in the car, i.e. the locative expression is used **adnominally** as the local case attribute in *kirja autossa* 'the book in the car' (cf. Lindén 1954, Koivusalo 1968, Yli-Vakkuri 1970), contradicting Kracht's (2002: 200–201) claim that this is not possible in Finnish; still further readings can be made
- The argument of grammaticality fails because the syntactic configuration **and** the position of the DL in that configuration change with every reading

Conclusions

- ❑ After having reviewed particular earlier studies on the semantics and syntax of Finnish DLs, the analyses therein seem to hold good at least for the following:
 - a) No extralinguistic hypotheses (cf. Rahkonen): one should not be led astray by contextual assumptions that the expressions themselves do not warrant
 - b) The analysis of temporal and logical relations are constrained by the meaning of the verb

- ❑ What needs more precision is:
 - c) The specification of syntactic configuration together with case structure information

LITERATURE

- Blake, Barry J.**. 1994. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chafe, Wallace L.**. 1970. *Meaning and the structure of language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dahl, Östen**. 1987. "Case grammar and prototypes". In René Dirven & Günther Radden, eds. *Concepts of case*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 147–161.
- Fong, Vivienne**. 1997. *The order of things: What directional locatives denote*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Stanford University.
- Hakulinen, Auli – Fred Karlsson**. 1979. *Nykysuomen lauseoppia* [Syntax of present-day Finnish]. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 350. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Hakulinen, Lauri**. 1960. *Handbuch der finnischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Huumo, Tuomas**. 2006. "'I woke up from the sofa': Subjective directionality in Finnish expressions of a spatio-cognitive transfer". In Marja-Liisa Helasvuo & Lyle Campbell, eds. *Grammar from the human perspective: Case, space and person in Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 51–75.

LITERATURE

- Huumo, Tuomas.** 2007. "Force dynamics, fictive dynamicity, and the Finnish verbs of 'remaining'". *Folia Linguistica* 41: 73–98.
- Koivusalo, Esko.** 1968. "Objektiin liittyvä olosijamääräite" [The static local case modifier of the object]. *Virittäjä* 72: 27–34.
- Kracht, Marcus.** 2002. "On the semantics of locatives." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25: 157–232.
- Lindén, Eeva.** 1954. "Paikallissija-attribuutista" [On the local case attribute]. *Virittäjä* 58: 288–293.
- Matthews, P. H.** 1981. *Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rahkonen, Matti.** 1977. "Suomen paikanilmauksista" [On the Finnish locative expressions]. *Virittäjä* 81: 21–52.
- Somers, Harold L.** 1987. *Valency and case in computational linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Yli-Vakkuri, Valma.** 1970. "Konkreettisen substantiivin paikallissija-attribuutti suomen paikallissijajärjestelmässä" [The local case attribute of the concrete noun in the Finnish local case system]. *Sananjalka* 12: 35–71.