

Tokyo University Linguistic Papers '88 (TULIP)

Department of Linguistics

Faculty of Letters

University of Tokyo

December 1988

REMARKS ON OBLIQUE-CASE ATTRIBUTES IN ESTONIAN

KAZUTO MATSUMURA

*Institute for the Study of Languages
and Cultures of Asia and Africa
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies*

REMARKS ON OBLIQUE-CASE ATTRIBUTES IN ESTONIAN*

KAZUTO MATSUMURA

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the present paper is to discuss some inadequacies found in the standard analysis of noun phrase dependents occurring in oblique cases (oblique-case attributes) in Estonian.¹ By "standard" are meant such authoritative works as Valgma & Remmel (1968), Mihkla et al. (1974) and Mihkla & Valmis (1979).

Though considerable improvement is expected to be made in the new version of standard grammar of Estonian which is currently being worked upon by a group of linguists headed by Mati Ereht at the Institute of Language and Literature in Tallinn,² very little is known to the outsider at the moment about the details of how various types of noun phrase dependents are treated there, so that any substantial reference to the new version of Estonian standard grammar will not be made in the present study.

Without committing myself to any "macrotheory" of syntax, I will assume that a (non-elliptical) noun phrase (NP) consists of a *head* and one or more generally optional elements which are dependent on the head or *dependents* for short. This assumption is based upon two further assumptions of a more fundamental sort. In the first place, it assumes that there are syntactic units which are intermediate between word and sentence, and phrases are among such units. This assumption may be called "principle of constituency". Secondly, it assumes a certain model of the inner structure of phrases: a phrase is so constructed that there is in each phrase one element, head, to which the other elements in the same phrase are subordinated, or, to put it differently, on which they are dependent. A phrase is named according to the word class its head belongs to. Thus a phrase with a noun as head is a noun phrase, one with a verb as head is a verb phrase, and so on. This second assumption may be named "principle of dependency".³

2. THE TRADITIONAL ANALYSIS

2.1. The most detailed overall exposition of NP dependents or *täiend* 'attribute' in Estonian to date is the chapter titled *Täiend* written by Riikoja in Mihkla et al. (1974). This chapter will be referred to as Riikoja (1974) throughout the present discussion.

Riikoja's description of attributes is based on a traditional, now largely superseded, model of syntactic analysis in which sentences are analyzed, among others, in terms of *sõnaihend* 'word collocation' (WCL):

In a sentence, words are often semantically and grammatically related (*seotud*) with each other. [...] Words collocate in pairs. Words thus related

are called word collocations.

(Valgma & Rimmel 1968: 142)

For example, four WCLs can be identified in sentence (1); *mees ostis* '(the) man bought', *ostis eile* '(he) bought yesterday', *ostis maja* '(he) bought (a) house', and *uue maja* '(a) new house':⁴

- (1) *Mees osti-s eile uue maja.*
 man buy-PAST-3SG yesterday new-ACC house-ACC
 'The man bought a new house yesterday.'

In a subordinative WCL,⁵ the two words forming a WCL are related to each other in such a way that

one of them, called head word (*põhisõna*) has the fundamental meaning, and the other, which completes (*täiendab*) or extends (*laiendab*) the head word, is called extension (*laiend*). (Valgma & Rimmel 1968: 142)

The head word subordinates to itself (*alistab endale*) the extension word (*laiendsõna*) by putting the latter into a certain form or by means of an adposition (*kaassõna*).⁶ [...] In a subordinative word collocation, the extension word depends on the head word (*sõltub põhisõnast*) grammatically and semantically. (Mihkla et al. 1974: 13)

The subordination in a WCL manifests itself in two ways: agreement (*ühildumine, kongruents*) and government (*sõltumus/sõltumine, rektsoon*). Agreement is when 'the extension occurs in the same number and case or in the same number and person as the head word' (Valgma & Rimmel 1968: 144): e.g., *tubli-de-le mees-te-le* (good-PL-ALL man-PL-ALL) 'to good men' and *meie õpi-me* (we learn-1PL) 'we learn'. Government is when 'the form of the extension depends on the meaning of the head word' (Valgma & Rimmel 1968: 144): e.g., *haigestu-b grippi* (fall ill-3SG grippie-ILL) '(one) catches flu', *eksam matemaatika-st* (examination mathematics-ELA) 'a math exam' and *teadlik selle-st* (aware this-ELA) 'aware of this'.

2.2. Let us refer to such a model of syntactic analysis as "WCL model", for convenience. It is easy to see that the WCL model of syntax can be interpreted as a variant of dependency model of syntax. That this is the case is revealed in a clear way by Mihkla & Valmis (1979: 26), for example. It is generally accepted that any model of syntax based purely and simply on dependency is not able to properly deal with phrases.⁷ Moreover, one notices upon further scrutiny that grammarians working with the WCL model, in all probability, have been doing without the notion of phrase at all.

In the model of syntax assumed in the present paper, you can posit a syntactic unit called noun phrase and each such unit is analyzed as consisting of a head, usually a noun, and one or more generally optional elements which are considered to be dependent on the head. Thus the syntagm *see tüdruk Tartust* 'this girl from

Tartu' in sentence (2) below, for example, is identified as an NP which is constructed in the following way: the noun *tüdruk* functions as the head of the phrase and the other elements, *see* and *Tartust*, are dependent on the head *tüdruk*:

- (2) *Mulle meeldi-b see tüdruk Tartu-st.*
 to me please-3SG this girl Tartu-ELA
 'I like this girl who is from the town of Tartu.'

The WCL model, on the other hand, would describe the same syntagm in the following fashion: the word pairs *see tüdruk* and *tüdruk Tartust* each form (subordinative) WCLs, and in either case the noun *tüdruk* occurs as head. In other words, the WCL model deals with each 'head word-extension' relation separately, without paying attention to the construction which the noun *tüdruk* forms with its two attributes *see* and *Tartust* together. Since no mention is made in this model of the fact that the syntagm *see tüdruk Tartust* is a syntactic unit, it is very difficult, and perhaps impossible, to make a generalization such as that the syntagm in question represents the same type of NP structure as the syntagm *tema uus raamat Jaapani ajaloo kohta* 'his new book about Japanese history' in (3):

- (3) *Tema uus raamat Jaapani ajaloo kohta ilmu-b järgmise-l*
 his new book Japan-GEN history-GEN about appear-3SG next-ADE
aasta-l.
 year-ADE
 'His new book on Japanese history will be published next year.'

As a good example of clumsiness deriving from the lack of proper understanding of constituency, we might cite the following statement:

In a sentence, nouns or words used as noun which are extended by an attribute may occur as any part of sentence except predicate. (Riikoja 1974: 242)

If we were to say the same thing, we would replace 'nouns or words used as noun which are extended by an attribute' with mere 'noun phrases'.

With such a model of syntactic analysis in hand, it is not surprising that Riikoja (1974) shows hardly any interest in the structure of NPs as syntactic units comprised of a head and a number of attributes. Instead she deals almost exclusively with morphological and semantic ('functional') 'classifications' of attributes, to which over nine-tenths of the 120-odd-page chapter is devoted. We will refer to the tradition represented by Riikoja (1974) as traditional analysis of attributes.

2.3. Though the WCL model of syntax has a serious drawback, this should not imply that the analysis of attributes based on this model of syntax is to be rejected on an a priori basis. On the contrary, it seems that the better part of the results of Riikoja's analysis is convertible by a fairly simple procedure into a form that can serve as a kind of hypothesis to be confirmed or eventually rejected in a

syntactic model in which the analysis of attributes is an integral part of the analysis of NP structure. The convertibility is guaranteed by the fact that the WCL model is, as we have seen above, a type of dependency model of syntax, and so the traditional notions of 'head word' (*põhisõna*) and 'extension' (*laiend*) can be regarded as sufficiently accurate equivalents of our notions of *head* and *dependent* respectively.

It is necessary to agree upon terminology here. From now on, a noun phrase (NP) will be referred to as an entity comprised of a HEAD (*põhi*) and ATTRIBUTES (*täiend*). Thus any NP dependent is called attribute.⁸ The terms 'head word' and 'extension' will no longer be used except in direct citations from works using these terms.

3. CRITICISM OF THE TRADITIONAL ANALYSIS

Although the best use should be made of the product of traditional analysis of attributes such as Riikoja (1974), we had better be fully aware of the theoretical problems which tag along with the machinery of traditional analysis. One of the most serious of them concerns the notion of subordination. Namely, the view held by the traditional analysis that agreement (*ühildumine*, *kongruents*) and government (*sõltumus/sõltumine*, *rektsioon*) constitute two (and the only) types of subordination (*alistus*) cannot be considered quite appropriate. Though it cannot be denied that these two phenomena have very much to do with subordination, it can be shown that the alleged opposition of agreement and government has little direct relevance to the typology of subordination in Estonian.

3.1. Let us first examine the notion of agreement. As defined by Valgma & Rimmel (1968: 144), agreement is the occurrence of a dependent 'in the same number and case or in the same number and person' as the head.⁹ With this definition in mind, let us compare (4a) and (4b):

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|
| (4) | a. | <i>tehtava-te-le</i> | <i>töö-de-le</i> | 'to jobs that are to be done' |
| | | to be done-PL-ALL | job-PL-ALL | |
| | b. | <i>tehtud</i> | <i>töö-de-le</i> | 'to jobs that have been done' |
| | | done | job-PL-ALL | |

Without hesitation, anyone would be ready to recognize (4a) as a case of agreement. But what about (4b) then? On one hand, you could hardly deny that it is an instance of subordination. On the other, it is impossible to regard it as a case of agreement, because the attribute *tehtud* is not congruent in number nor case with the head *töö-de-le*. Nor would it hardly be justified to maintain that it is an instance of the other type of subordination, namely government, because the 'grammatical form', whatever it may mean in this context, of the noninflecting word *tehtud* cannot possibly be prescribed by the meaning, or any other property, of the head *töödele*.

There is, however, good reason to maintain that (4b) should represent the same type of subordination that (4a) does. For one thing, the semantic relation between the attribute *tehtud* and the head *töödele* does not seem to differ from that between *tehtavatele* and *töödele* at all. For another, the two words occurring as attribute, *tehtav* and *tehtud*, belong to the same strictly defined grammatical class of words: they are both participles of the verb *tegema* 'to do'. These features shared by (4a) and (4b) are so impressive that it is very difficult to justify the traditional analysis giving the priority to the occurrence or absence of agreement when it establishes its typology of subordination.

Another set of circumstances which discourage us from considering agreement as such to be a type of subordination are provided by the phenomenon called 'subject-predicate agreement'.¹⁰ In the first place, you find yourself in a similar sort of situation to the one you have encountered in connection with (4) above. Namely, agreement is obligatory in cases like *ma taha-n* (I want-1SG) 'I want', *me taha-me* (we want-1PL) 'we want', etc.; it is optional in cases like *ma taha-ks(i-n)* (I want-COND-1SG) 'I would want', *me taha-ks(i-me)* (we want-COND-1PL) 'we would want', etc.; and it is impossible in cases like *ma ei taha* (I not want) 'I do not want', *me ei taha* (we not want) 'we do not want', etc. Secondly, it is rather doubtful whether the subject-verb agreement is the same type of phenomenon as the noun-adjective agreement. In the latter case, it is the dependent, attribute, that is put into the form which is congruent with the form of the head. In the subject-verb agreement, however, it is the head, predicate verb, that is said to agree with the dependent, which runs counter to the very definition of agreement in the traditional analysis: agreement is when the dependent occurs 'in the same number and case or in the same number and person' as the head (Valgma & Remmel 1968: 144).¹¹

3.2. It is not impossible to circumvent this kind of clumsy situations: the problem immediately disappears if we simply accept that agreement is after all not a TYPE of subordination, but a MARKER, apparently not necessarily obligatory, of certain types of subordination.¹² In other words, the phenomenon understood by the name of agreement is one of the modes of overt manifestation of subordination, but not the relation of subordination itself. Agreement serves as a marker for a number of types of subordination, of which the head-attribute relation and the subject-verb relation are the most typical. It should be borne in mind that though the presence of agreement always implies a relation of subordination, it is not a necessary condition for two words to be in a relation of subordination.

As far as NP dependents are concerned, it is well-known that agreement is a phenomenon typical of the adjective occurring as attribute, and to the type of subordination of which the adjectival attribute is representative we will refer as MODIFICATION here. It is now unnecessary to regard the two examples in (4), *tehtava-te-le töö-de-le* and *tehtud töö-de-le*, as representing distinct types of subordination: both are instances of one and the same type of subordination, namely modification. The only difference between them is that one is marked as such by agreement, whereas the other is not. We will later return to the opposition of modification to the other type(s) of subordination.

3.3. If we turn to the sphere of government, we soon find that its case is hardly better, or perhaps even worse. As is traditionally understood in Estonian grammar, government (*sõltumus/sõltumine, reksioon*) covers a rather wide range of dependents: it is defined to be the dependence of the 'extension' on the (lexical) meaning of the head (Valgma & Remmel 1968: 144; Mihkla et al. 1974: 15; Mihkla & Valmis 1979: 10). In recent years, however, apparently under the influence of valency grammar, attempts have been made to redefine it more narrowly, especially when it concerns VP dependents.¹³ This development seems to account for the inconsistency in the use of the term 'government' by Mihkla & Valmis (1979), who introduce the distinction between 'free extensions' and 'bound extensions' among VP dependents:

Free extensions (*vaba laiend*) are those extensions of verb whose form the verb does not prescribe, but whose presence in the sentence it presupposes/allows (*eeldab, lubab*). They can extend any verb, and when they do so, the meaning of the verb is irrelevant, for the verb does not condition the form of the extension. [...] Bound extensions (*seotud laiend*) belong to the 'structure of government' (*reksioonistruktuur*) of the predicate verb. Their presence as well as their form is prescribed by the meaning of the verb. (Mihkla & Valmis 1979: 29)

It is not clear whether the authors intend to maintain that 'free extensions' do not enter into a relation of government with the verb. If they do, then the authors seem to be inconsistent in their use of the term 'government', since such VP dependents as *tehas* 'in the factory' in (5) which they classify as 'free extension' (Mihkla & Valmis 1979: 29) seem to have traditionally belonged to the realm of government:

(5) *Minu vend tööta-b tehase-s.* 'My brother works in the factory.'
my brother work-3SG factory-INE

If, on the other hand, the passage cited above is not intended to imply that 'free extensions' are outside the sphere of government, then the characterization given by the authors of 'bound extensions' is certainly misleading. It gives the impression that only 'bound extensions' are government-related to the verb, though there is certain ambiguity about the expression 'structure of government of the predicate verb'.

Let us take a small side trip here and see how Erelt (1986) handles the notion of government. According to Erelt, government is a type of subordination which is 'independent of the grammatical form of the head' (Erelt 1986: 10). This definition of government is novel in wording, but its practical content is rather traditional because it seems to be intended to cover all the cases of subordination that are not included in the realm of agreement. It is also a bit of miscarriage, because if it is to apply verbally, then constructions like (4b) *tehtud töödele* which are not marked by agreement may possibly be tempted to seek their way into the category of government. The novel wording is, however, his advantage when

he introduces the distinction between 'bound extensions' and 'free extensions', because he can do so without giving up the requirement of consistency:

In terms of the tightness of head-extension relation, government-related extensions (*rektsiooniline laiend*) are divided into *bound* and *free* extensions. Bound extensions (*seotud laiend*) are conditioned in content and form directly by the meaning of the head [...]. The conditioning by the head on a free extension (*vaba laiend*) is minimal (*minimaalne*); the extension, say an extension of place, may occur with a variety of heads with different semantics. (Erelt 1986: 10)

Thus it appears that Estonian grammarians now think more or less unanimously that the traditional characterization of government gives a rather simplified picture of VP dependents, in view of the fact that some dependents are more tightly bound to the verb than others. However, the influence of such observation seems to have remained mainly in the theoretical part of the grammar they write, leaving the description part dealing with the details largely intact. The introduction, if not mere mention, of the distinction between 'bound' and 'free extensions' does not seem to have changed in a noticeable way the analysis and description of VP dependents by Mihkla & Valmis (1979) as compared with Mihkla et al. (1974), for example. Moreover, nothing concrete is said about the possibility of applying the same type of distinction to NP dependents, though if the distinction in question is to be characterized in the way Erelt (1986) defines it, then it is expected to apply to NP dependents as well.

3.4. The traditional analysis of attributes seems to take it for granted that oblique-case NP dependents are, without exception, governed¹⁴ by the head:

The substantival attribute, whether in the genitive or some other case, is governed by its head. (Valgma & Remmel 1968: 180)

The substantival attribute, in whatever form, does not agree with its head word, but is governed by the latter; in other words, the head word requires that the substantival attribute be employed in a certain fixed form. (Riikoja 1974: 294)

The substantival attribute is, in most cases,¹⁵ government-related with the head word; i.e., the head word requires that the attribute be employed in a certain fixed form. (Mihkla & Valmis 1979: 102)

If we repeat the traditional definition of government, it is a type of subordination in which the 'grammatical form' of the dependent is prescribed by the 'meaning' of the head (let us forget Erelt's definition for the time being). With this definition in mind, we will examine whether it is appropriate to characterize all oblique-case attributes as government-related to the head.

Let us choose the following two types of oblique-case attributes for the

purpose of comparison: those occurring with a deverbal noun in *-ja* and those occurring with a common noun denoting a person. These two types of oblique-case attributes are illustrated by (6) and (7) respectively:

- (6) a. *bussi-s istu-ja* 'one who is sitting in the bus'
 bus-INE sit-ER
- b. *lõpp-peatus-te-sse sõit-ja-d*
 end-stop-PL-ILL go-ER-PL
 'those who are traveling to the terminals'
- c. *koosoleku-st osa-võt-ja* 'one who takes part in the meeting'
 meeting-ELA part-take-ER
- d. *sekretäri-ks taht-ja* 'one who wants to become a secretary'
 secretary-TRA want-ER
- e. *uimasti-te-ga kaubitse-ja* 'one who traffics in drugs'
 narcotic-PL-COM trade-ER
- (7) a. *paanika-s kontoriametnik* 'a clerk who is in a panic'
 panic-INE clerk
- b. *eestlase-st pastor* 'a pastor who is an Estonian'
 Estonian-ELA pastor
- c. *pensionil pedagoogi-d* 'educationists who live on their pension'
 pension-ADE educationist-PL
- d. *las-te-ta kommunisti-d*
 child-PL-ABE Communist-PL
 'Communist Party members who have no children'
- e. *prilli-de-ga professor* 'a professor who is wearing eyeglasses'
 glass-PL-COM professor

Oblique-case attributes of the type (6) and those of the type (7) will be referred to as A-type and B-type attributes respectively in the discussion.

3.4.1. Comparing constructions with an A-type attribute and those with a B-type attribute, one notices that the two types of attributes differ from each other in a number of ways.

In the first place, there exists a twin construction with a deverbal noun in *-mine* as head instead of one in *-ja*:

- (8) a. *bussi-s istu-mine* '(act of) sitting in the bus'
 bus-INE sit-ING
- b. *lõpp-peatus-te-sse sõit-mine* '(act of) traveling to the terminals'
 end-stop-PL-ILL go-ING

- c. *koosoleku-st osa-võt-mine* '(act of) taking part in the meeting'
meeting-ELA part-take-ING
- d. *sekretäri-ks taht-mine* '(act of) wanting to become a secretary'
secretary-TRA want-ING
- e. *uimasti-te-ga kaubitse-mine* '(act of) trafficking in drugs'
narcotic-PL-COM trade-ING

Besides its complete regularity, this process of substitution is unique in that two nouns belonging to rather different semantic categories can share the same attribute. No similar process exists for constructions in (7).

3.4.2. Secondly, each pair of *-ja/-mine* constructions can be associated with a construction consisting of the same dependent but with a verb as head:

- (9) a. *(ta) istu-b bussis* '(he) is sitting in the bus'
he sit-3SG bus-INE
- b. *(nad) sõida-vad lõpp-peatus-te-sse*
they go-3PL end-stop-PL-ILL
'(they) are traveling to the terminals'
- c. *(ta) võta-b koosoleku-st osa* '(he) takes part in the meeting'
he take-3SG meeting-ELA part
- d. *(ta) taha-b sekretäri-ks* '(she) wants to become a secretary'
she want-3SG secretary-TRA
- e. *(ta) kaubitse-b uimasti-te-ga* '(he) traffics in drugs'
he trade-3SG narcotic-PL-COM

The three types of constructions thus associated, (6), (8) and (9), are so similar in nature that one cannot help concluding that they all involve one and the same type of head-dependent relation. In marked contrast to them, no regular association with a verbal construction seems to exist for constructions in (7).

3.4.3. Thirdly, nouns in *-ja* are generally very choosy about their attributes, whereas nouns occurring with B-type attributes are quite open-minded as far as their attributes go:

- (10) a. *?bussis taht-ja*
b. *lõpp-peatus-te-sse taht-ja-d*
end-stop-PL-ILL want-ER-PL
'those who want to go to the terminals'
- c. *?koosoleku-st taht-ja*
d. *?uimasti-te-ga taht-ja*

- (11) a. *paanika-s professor* 'a professor who is in a panic'
panic-INE professor
- b. *eestlase-st professor* 'a professor who is an Estonian'
Estonian-ELA professor
- c. *pensionil professor* 'a professor who lives on his pension'
pension-ADE professor
- d. *las-te-ta professor* 'a professor who has no children'
child-PL-ABE professor

As is shown by (10), only one of the other four attributes in (6) can replace *sekretäriks* in (6d): *lõpp-peatustesse tahtjad* 'those who want to go to the terminals'. Though (10a), (10c) and (10d) are perhaps not necessarily to be considered "ungrammatical", they are certainly anomalous or at least elliptical in unusual ways, and one needs surrealistic imagination to decipher any message possibly conveyed by them. In contrast, any of the other four attributes in (7) can replace *prillidega* in (7e) as is shown by (11), where the four constructions are all impeccable Estonian expressions.

3.4.4. Fourthly, the B-type attribute can occur in general quite freely with no apparent lexical preference or restriction as to the head, as (13) shows. Each A-type attribute, in contrast to the B-type attribute, seems to occur with a strictly limited subset of the deverbal nouns in *-ja*, as is shown in (12):

- (12) a. ?*koosoleku-st istu-ja*
b. ?*koosoleku-st sõit-ja*
c. *koosoleku-st osa-võt-ja* 'one who takes part in the meeting' (=6c)
meeting-ELA part-take-ER
d. ?*koosoleku-st taht-ja*
e. ?*koosoleku-st kaubitse-ja*
- (13) a. *paanika-s kontoriametnik* 'a clerk who is in a panic' (=7a)
panic-INE clerk
- b. *paanika-s pastor* 'a pastor who is in a panic'
panic-INE pastor
- c. *paanika-s pedagoogi-d* 'educationists who are in a panic'
panic-INE educationist-PL
- d. *paanika-s kommunisti-d*
panic-INE Communist-PL
'Communist Party members who are in a panic'
- e. *paanika-s professor* 'a professor who is in a panic'
panic-INE professor

(12) shows that none of the other four nouns in *-ja* in (6) can replace *osavõtja* in (6c), whereas (13) shows that any of the other four nouns occurring as head in (7) can replace *kontoriametnik* in (7a).

3.4.5. Finally, there is good reason to maintain that in a construction with a B-type attribute, it is the semantics of the noun occurring as attribute that determines the possible form class(es) in which it can occur as attribute, whereas the semantics of the head seems to play little, if any, role in the process. Compare carefully the way (14a-d) are anomalous with the way (15b-c) are anomalous:

- (14) a. ?*uimasti-te-s kaubitse-ja*
 b. ?*uimasti-te-sse kaubitse-ja*
 c. ?*uimasti-te-st kaubitse-ja*
 d. ?*uimasti-te-ks kaubitse-ja*
 e. *uimasti-te-ga kaubitse-ja* 'one who traffics in drugs' (=6e)
 narcotic-PL-COM trade-ER
- (15) a. *prilli-de-s professor* 'a professor who is wearing eyeglasses'
 glass-PL-INE professor
- b. ?*prilli-de-st professor*
 c. ?*prilli-de-l professor*
 d. *prilli-de-ta professor* 'a professor who is wearing no eyeglasses'
 glass-PL-ABE professor
 e. *prilli-de-ga professor*
 glass-PL-COM professor
 'a professor who is wearing eyeglasses' (=7e)

The native speaker's reaction to the anomaly of (14a-d) will not be quite the same as his reaction to the anomaly of (15b-c). In the former case he will find the same type of acceptability distribution that he finds in (10) and (12). He will thus point out that the attributes in (14a-d) all occur in the "wrong" case forms, i.e., in forms not expected by the head *kaubitseja*. The same is not the case with (15). Here the acceptability distribution is different from that which he finds in (11) and (13), where all the constructions are more or less equally acceptable. An appeal to the head *professor* would not give much help, either, since the anomaly of (15b), for example, does not seem to be dependent on the head. That there is nothing wrong with an relative attribute occurring with *professor* is shown by (16):

- (16) a. *eestlase-st professor* 'a professor who is an Estonian' (=11b)
 Estonian-ELA professor
- b. *kommunisti-st professor*
 Communist-ELA professor
 'a professor who is a Communist Party member'

The real reason for the anomaly of (15b) seems to be that because of its meaning, the noun *prillid* 'eyeglasses' cannot receive any appropriate interpretation in this environment:

- (17) a. ?*prilli-de-st kontoriametnik*
 b. ?*prilli-de-st pastor*
 c. ?*prilli-de-st pedagoogi-d*
 d. ?*prilli-de-st kommunisti-d*

3.4.6. These facts are clear indications that though they are indiscriminately put into one and the same category of 'adverbial attributes' by Riikoja (1974), A-type and B-type attributes represent very different types of attributes. A-type attributes are tightly bound to the head, and thus subject to restrictions imposed by the head. B-type attributes, on the other hand, are rather loosely related to the head, and thus can combine freely with a wide variety of heads insofar as its semantic compatibility with the environment is guaranteed. It is safe to conclude that if a distinction similar to that introduced for VP dependents is to apply, then it is these two types of attributes that must be distinguished from each other first and foremost.

It would be convenient to introduce a set of terms here to establish the distinction that has emerged for both VP and NP dependents. Such dependents as are tightly bound to the head and subject to restrictions imposed by it will be referred to as COMPLEMENTS. The relation that a complement bears to its head is then COMPLEMENTATION. Any dependent that is not a complement might be called non-complement dependent.

4. COMPLEMENTATION AND MODIFICATION

The objective of this last section is to argue for the hypothesis that the two types of subordination we recognized above, modification and complementation, constitute the two major types of subordination in Estonian.

4.1. We have seen above that a typical case of modification is the adjectival attribute. It is hardly necessary to point out that the features we attributed to B-type attributes in the preceding section are also the properties characteristic of adjectival attributes. That B-type attributes are very much like adjectival attributes but A-type attributes are not is also borne out by the fact that the question with *missugune* 'what kind of, was für ein' seems to go with B-type attributes more smoothly than with A-type attributes. Compare (18b) with (19b):

- (18) a. *Otsi-ta-kse pensioni-l pedagoogi.*
 seek-PASS-PRES pension-ADE educationist-PAR
 'They are looking for an educationist who lives on a pension.'
 b. *Missugus-t pedagoogi otsi-ta-kse?*
 what kind of-PAR educationist-PAR seek-PASS-PRES
 'What kind of educationist are they looking for?'

- (19) a. *Otsi-ta-kse sekretäri-ks taht-ja-t.*
 seek-PASS-PRES secretary-TRA want-ER-PAR
 'They are looking for someone who wants to become a secretary.'
- b. ?*Missugus-t taht-ja-t otsi-ta-kse?*
 what kind of-PAR want-ER-PAR seek-PASS-PRES
 'What kind of "someone who wants" are they looking for?'

The view that B-type attributes are of the same type as adjectival attributes in general is also expressed by Erelt (1988), who regards them as a type of 'adjectival attribute' (*adjektiivatribuut*). He points, among others, to the fact that B-type attributes can occur predicatively as well:

- (20) a. *eesti soo-st helilooja* 'a composer of Estonian parentage'
 Estonian kin-ELA composer
- b. *See helilooja on eesti soo-st.*
 this composer be-3SG Estonian kin-ELA
 'This composer comes of Estonian parentage.'
- (21) a. *habeme-ga mees* 'a man with a beard'
 beard-COM man
- b. *See mees on habeme-ga.* 'This man has a beard.'
 this man be-3SG beard-COM

If we refer to any attribute which is in a relation of modification to the head as MODIFIER, we find little reason to deny that B-type attributes are modifiers.

4.2. So far we have been dealing with attributes occurring at the pre-head position only. Estonian has also oblique-case attributes occurring at the post-head position. Though they need separate study, there are indications that they too can be classified on the basis of complementation/modification. Thus there are post-head oblique-case attributes that are more like complements than modifiers:

- (22) a. *vaade akna-st* 'a view from the window'
 view window-ELA
- b. *mulje Eesti-st* 'impression of Estonia'
 impression Estonia-ELA

Others seem to be more like modifiers than complements:

- (23) a. *mees Tartu-st* 'a man who is from Tartu'
 man Tartu-ELA
- b. *valu selja-s* 'pain in the back'
 pain back-INE

It should be noted, however, that though the difference between (22) and (23) is fairly clear, the contrast is not so distinct as in the case of pre-head attributes.

4.3. Seeing that the renowned dichotomy between *Ergänzungen* 'complements' and *Angaben* 'adjuncts' in valency grammar, with all its theoretical attraction as well as its proven utility in foreign language teaching, has turned out to be rather too simplified a view of the nature of VP dependents,¹⁶ it would not be very sensible to attempt to establish a strict dichotomy of attributes, at least insofar as post-head attributes are concerned. The real situation with post-head oblique-case attributes seems to be that they all lie somewhere between the two major types of attributes. If we are to establish a different kind of typology of attributes than the one presented by Riikoja (1974) under the name of 'classification', then the analysis based on the complement/modification scale seems to be a promising one.

FOOTNOTES

* I am grateful to the following persons in Tallinn and Helsinki for their valuable comments and suggestions upon reading the earlier version of the present paper: Mati Erelt, Seppo Suhonen, Ago Künnap, Bertil Tikkanen, Tiit Kukk and Toomas Help. Errors are of course all mine.

¹ The Estonian language belongs to the Baltic-Finnic group within the Finno-Ugric family of languages. Over nine-tenths of its little-over-a-million speakers live in the Estonian SSR, a constituent republic of the USSR lying on the Baltic Sea. The following abbreviations are used in the glosses of Estonian words cited in the text:

ABE	abessive	ING	nomen actionis
ACC	accusative	PAR	partitive
ADE	adessive	PASS	passive
ALL	allative	PAST	past tense
COM	comitative	PL	plural
COND	conditional	PRES	present tense
ELA	elative	TRA	translative
ER	nomen agentis	1SG	first person singular
GEN	genitive	1PL	first person plural
ILL	illative	3SG	third person singular
INE	inessive	3PL	third person plural

² Readers may be referred to Erelt (1986) and (1987).

³ I will follow, as much as possible, the terminology of Matthews (1981). That such a view of general structure of NPs is shared *mutatis mutandis* by grammarians of different theoretical backgrounds might be ascertained by consulting such grammars as Huddleston (1984), Chapter 6; Engel (1988: 604-648), who employs the term *Kern* and *Satellit*; and Radford (1988), Chapters 4 and 5. For Estonian, see Erelt (1986: 11), who uses the term *põhi* 'base' and *laiend* 'extension'. Note that Erelt's use of the term *sõnaühend* in the sense of phrase deviates from the tradition (Erelt 1986: 33). *Sõnaühend* in the traditional sense is rendered into English as 'word collocation' in the present paper.

⁴ See Valgma & Rimmel (1968: 142) as well as Mihkla et al. (1974: 13).

⁵ Another type of WCL is called coordinative. In a coordinative WCL, the two words are 'syntactically equivalent' (*samaväärsed*) (Mihkla et al. 1974: 13).

⁶ The term *kaassõna* 'adposition' refers to the class of words comprised of postpositions and prepositions.

⁷ See Matthews (1981: 71ff.). It is interesting to find that some grammarians working with valency grammar, a variant of dependency model of syntax, have incorporated the notion of phrase into their theory. Compare, for example, the notions of *Wortgruppe*, *Phrase* and *syntaktisches Glied* in Engel (1988). See also Erelt (1986: 33) for his criticism of the WCL model.

⁸ The use of the term 'attribute' in this sense follows the Estonian tradition. It deviates considerably from the terminology of Matthews (1981), however, because it will include the three types of NP dependents distinguished by Matthews: determiners, complements and modifiers. In Matthews' terminology, only modifiers would be called 'attributes'.

⁹ Erelt's definition of agreement (Erelt 1986: 10), though worded a bit differently, does not seem to differ in content from Valgma & Rimmel's, and can be regarded as equivalent with the latter for our present purposes.

¹⁰ The definitions of agreement given by Mihkla et al. (1974: 14) and Mihkla & Valmis (1979: 9) are both misleadingly worded, so that they sound as if the phenomenon of congruence between subject and verb were not included into the category of agreement. That this is not the case is revealed by the fact that the authors of both grammars discuss the subject-verb congruence by means of the term 'agreement' (*ühildumine*) in the respective sections dealing with the predicate.

¹¹ It is apparent that the traditional definition of agreement is inadequate even for Estonian itself. As cross-linguistic studies have shown, there are two possible

“directions” of agreement: the head “triggers” agreement on the dependent or the dependent on the head (Nichols 1986). In Estonian, then, the noun-attribute agreement represents one type of agreement and the subject-verb agreement the other. Note that the view held by Valgma & Remmel (1968: 153) that the predicate verb is dependent on the subject finds hardly any supporters nowadays, though it is the only view that is “consistent” with the traditional definition of agreement in Estonian grammar.

¹² The claim by Mihkla & Valmis (1979: 12-13) that there is yet a third type of subordination, *külgnemine* ‘adjunction’, defined as a type of subordination in which subordination is left formally unexpressed (*grammatiliselt vormistamata*), is another example of confusing ‘markers’ of subordination with ‘types’ of subordination.

¹³ Rätsep is one of those who have attempted to restrict the notion of government in Estonian grammar. However, his definition of government (Rätsep 1978: 64) sounds rather traditional, at least in wording, so that it is very difficult to appreciate in what way it differs from the traditional definition.

¹⁴ The Estonian term for ‘government’ is *sõltumus/sõltumine*, which are derivatives of the verb *sõltuma* ‘to depend on’. This verb is employed in the passages cited from Valgma & Remmel (1968) as well as Riikoja (1974).

¹⁵ The parenthetical expression, *enamasti* ‘in most cases’, seems to be added here to exclude such cases as *tassi-st kohvi-st* (cup-ELA coffee-ELA) ‘from a cup of coffee’ from the government relation (Riikoja 1974: 294).

¹⁶ See Matthews (1981), Chapters 6 and 7, as well as Somers (1984) and Vater (1978).

REFERENCES

- Engel, Ulrich 1988. *Deutsche Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Julius Groos
- Erelt, Mati 1986. *Eesti lauseõpetuse põhimõtted*. Preprint KKI-43, Tallinn
- 1987. *Sekundaartarindid eesti keeles*. Preprint KKI-50, Tallinn
- 1988. *Eesti atribuudist*. (Unpublished manuscript)
- Huddleston, Rodney 1984. *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Matsumura, Kazuto 1986. Compounds and the so-called "adverbial attributes" in Estonian. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 31, Tokyo, 120-126
- Matthews, P. H. 1981. *Syntax*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press
- Mihkla, Karl 1963. Sõnaühend kaasaja eesti keeles. *Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituudi Uurimused VIII*, Tallinn, 98-215
- , Rannut, L., Riikoja, E. & Admann, A. 1974. *Eesti keele lauseõpetuse põhiõoned I*. Tallinn: Valgus
- & Valmis, Aavo 1979. *Eesti keele süntaks kõrgkoolidele*. Tallinn: Valgus
- Nichols, Johanna 1986. Head-marking and dependent-marking grammar. *Language* 62, 56-119
- Radford, Andrew 1988. *Transformational Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Rätsep, Huno 1978. *Eesti keele lihtlauseete tüübid*. Tallinn: Valgus
- Riikoja, E. 1974. Täiend. Mihkla et al. (1974), 238-364
- Somers, Harold 1984. On the validity of the complement-adjunct distinction in valency grammar. *Linguistics* 22, 507-530
- Valgma, J. & Remmel, N. 1968. *Eesti keele grammatika*. Tallinn: Valgus
- Vater, Heinz 1978. On the possibility of distinguishing between complements and adjuncts. Abraham, Werner, ed., *Valence, Semantic Case, and Grammatical Relations*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 21-45

*Institute for the Study of Languages
and Cultures of Asia and Africa
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies*