FOREWORD

This volume is the second special issue of the Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics dedicated to usage-based approaches to Finnic grammar. Like its predecessor that came out in 2017, it includes papers first presented at the workshop series titled "On milking grammar". The main objective of both special issues has been to bring together usage-based grammar studies of Finnish, Estonian, and other Baltic-Finnic languages.

Usage-based linguistics is a cover term for a number of cognitive, functional, and interactional approaches to language. Their common denominator is that they see grammar as a system that consists of entrenched schemas that emerge in actual usage and gradually conventionalize to a greater or lesser degree. During the last few decades, these schools of thought have become increasingly prominent in the study of the Baltic-Finnic languages.

The workshop series lightheartedly titled "On milking grammar" was launched in the year 2011 and is intended to bring together scholars from both sides of the Gulf of Finland working on usage-based approaches. The first "milking" took place in Tartu (2011); this was followed by a second one in Kuressaare (2012), a third one in Turku (2014), and the fourth (2016) and fifth (2019) ones again in Tartu. The title "On milking grammar" is a deliberately ambiguous metaphor, which leaves room for interpretations. For instance, grammar may be thought of as something "milked" out of language by the grammarian, or it may itself be something out of which the grammarian milks new ideas and analyses. From its very beginning, the workshop intended to bring together scholars at different stages of their careers who are interested in Baltic-Finnic and utilize usage-based approaches in their work.

We hope that this second "milking" volume will serve to bring those insights to the attention of a wider audience interested in up-to-date grammatical approaches to Baltic-Finnic, as well as usage-based theories and different kinds of data analyses and methodologies. The papers in the present volume were originally presented at the 2019 "milking" workshop in Tartu, organized by the guest editors. They combine

qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, theoretical insights, as well as experimental methods. They test the methodologies against data from the Baltic-Finnic languages, addressing and discussing a number of problematic issues.

Most papers in the current volume are based on linguistic corpora and apply either quantitative or qualitative approaches to linguistic data. In papers by Basile and Ivaska, Hint *et al*., Klavan, and Pook, quantitative, multivariate methods are used for analyzing linguistic variation; quantitative measures are used also in Pilvik's paper. Other papers combine qualitative research with some quantitative data (Simmul, Veismann, Uusitupa) or focus mostly on qualitative research (Huumo, Vilkuna) but still rely on actual language data from linguistic corpora. Two papers (Tomson & Tragel, Tragel & Klavan) make use of innovative experimental methods and elicit their data from linguistic experiments.

The article by Rodolfo Basile and Ilmari Ivaska is a corpus analysis of the Finnish nominative vs. partitive alternation in the case marking of the subject of the verb *löytyä* ('to be found'; 'to turn up'). The material is analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively by means of statistical methods. The variables used in the analysis are subject number, subject divisibility, subject part of speech, word order, tense, agreement, and subject lemma, which is the only random variable. With the help of regression analysis, the subject case is predicted on the basis of these variables and of their interaction. In the qualitative part of the paper, the authors discuss the relationship of these morphosyntactic and semantic variables with the existential interpretation of the clause, as well as with the quantity and definiteness of the subject.

Outi Duvallon's article is a study of two kinds of Finnish nominal expressions that contain the morpheme *-kin* (with the basic meaning 'also'): 1) pronouns composed of a pronominal stem (*jo-*, *ku-*, *mi-*) and the suffix *-kin*, and 2) the NP=*kin* construction, in which *-kin* is a clitic focus particle attached to an independent noun. The author's hypothesis is that the pronouns with *-kin* have something in common with the NP=*kin* construction with respect to their referential properties. The analysis is based on the concept of *scanning* (Fr. *parcours*), an operation of going through items of a class without stopping at any single one of them. In addition to the simple pronouns *jokin* 'something' and *kukin* 'each one', attention is paid to two-part expressions with a distributive meaning such as *milloin mikin* 'at different times, different things'. The

author demonstrates that the concept of scanning makes it possible to understand the meaning and discourse functions of the NP=*kin* construction.

Helen Hint, Piia Taremaa, Maria Reile, and Renate Pajusalu investigate the variation of definite determiner constructions in Estonian. They focus on determining the differences between the use of a demonstrative pronoun (*see* 'this', *too* 'that') in a locative case and a demonstrative adverb (*siin* 'here', *seal* 'there') when occupying a determiner position in an NP. Their statistical analysis of corpus data reveals that demonstrative adverbs are preferred as determiners in NPs with spatial nouns and concrete nouns, while non-spatial nouns and abstract nouns combine with demonstrative pronouns. Based on their results, the authors argue that demonstrative adverbs are productive determiners in Estonian and that the main difference in the use of demonstrative pronouns and demonstrative adverbs lies in the way in which the referent is construed.

Tuomas Huumo's article is a theory-driven analysis of scalar meanings of Finnish projective adpositions (e.g., *edessä* 'in front of', *takana* 'behind', *yllä* 'above', *vasemmalla* 'to the left of'). The author starts from the observation that many adpositions take degree modifiers (*hieman* 'somewhat', *hyvin* 'very', *melkein* 'almost' *ihan* 'quite') to elaborate their scalar meanings and argues that the scalar meanings correlate with the frame of reference used to localize the Figure (the entity to be located) with respect to the Ground (the entity with respect to which the Figure is located). The author argues that the scalar meaning of the Finnish projective adpositions is often centripetal, in which case it is inversely proportional to the distance between Figure and Ground (e.g., *ihan edessä* 'right in front of' = 'immediately; maximally near'), but it can also be vector-based, in which case it is inversely proportional with the deviation of Figure's location from an axis projected from the Ground (e.g., *ihan edessä* 'right in front of' = 'directly; exactly').

Jane Klavan investigates the alternation between exterior locative cases (allative, adessive, ablative) and the corresponding postpositions (*peale*, *peal*, *pealt*) in Estonian web texts. She uses a multivariate analysis of corpus data to explore the probabilistic variation patterns and determine the competing constraints guiding the speakers' choices. She argues that the effects of factors that have been found significant in the previous studies are relatively stable in terms of the direction of those factors across different varieties of Estonian. The author also points out

that the strength of different factors varies by the type and frequency of the constructions and that the variation in the use of exterior locative cases and the postpositions is driven by stylistic preferences among registers and speakers, situational forces, and by cognitive pressures related to language processing.

Maarja-Liisa Pilvik's article provides an empirical, usage-based account of the aspects of productivity of three Estonian deverbal suffixes (*-mine*, *-us*, and *-ja*) in five different registers (scientific texts, newspaper texts, fiction, spoken spontaneous language, and spoken regional dialects). She uses corpus data and applies quantitative measures of morphological productivity to show that the derivation patterns demonstrate varying degrees of productivity under different communicative settings. She argues that the differences in productivity across registers and suffixes arise from a complex interplay between structural, semantic, pragmatic, and paradigmatic constraints. Overall, Pilvik's results suggest that the quantitative measures and relative frequencies prove to be a useful empirical approximation of morphological productivity in different registers even for samples with relatively low token counts.

Hanna Pook's article examines the object case variation of the pronoun *mis* 'what' in spontaneous spoken Estonian and Estonian dialects. Using corpus data and multivariate statistical modeling, the author shows that the factors which significantly affect the object case variation are verb type, clause type, length of the following word, and dialect. She also discusses the differences between the two sets of language data and shows, for example, that variation in the contemporary spoken spontaneous data is significantly more substantial than in the dialect data. The author also elaborates on the multiple sources of motivation for object case variation, such as language contact, high usage frequency, and the effect of standardization of language.

Carl Eric Simmul studies converb constructions in Estonian, especially concerning their informational status in sentences. This study reveals that the Estonian converb construction has four main informational roles: 1) frame-setting topic, 2) background of the comment, 3) focused part of the comment and 4) distinct information unit. The informational role of the converb construction is closely related to word order within the converb construction and beyond it.

Kairit Tomson and Ilona Tragel study linguistic means that are used for expressing causality in Estonian. The study is based on an experiment designed for the project *Causality Across Languages*. The experiment includes video clips that show causal situations; the participants were asked to answer the question "What happened?". As a result, we can see a wide range of linguistic means that can express causative relations in Estonian.

In the paper by Ilona Tragel and Jane Klavan, an innovative experiment was designed and used for extracting regularities of the general conceptual structure from the speakers' mind: a drawing task with a think-aloud protocol. By using this method, the authors focus on the inherent (schematic) direction of two related verbs: an intransitive verb *jääma* 'remain' and it's transitive counterpart *jätma* 'leave something somewhere'. The study shows that the differences in the transitivity of the two verbs are reflected in the drawings and explanations given by the participants.

Milla Uusitupa's article is a contribution to the discussion on open reference, with a particular focus on the open-reference use of second person singular elements in Finnish and other European languages. The author focuses on four referentially open constructions: the zero construction, the necessive construction, the second-person singular construction, and the imperative construction. She analyzes their interplay and variation in spoken discourse in Border Karelian dialects. Her three main objectives are: 1) to argue that the four open-person constructions are fundamentally separate types; 2) to expand the ongoing discussion on open reference in Finnish by analyzing the person system of its closely related cognate language, Karelian, and 3) to raise the question whether, in a wider Finnic context, the zero construction is, above all, a Finnish way of leaving the reference open and unspecified.

Ann Veismann's paper examines the border area between adpositions and adverbs in Estonian and seeks to answer the question how the use of adpositions without explicit noun complements can be analyzed and how we understand the missing complement. Based on the example of three adpositions, she has detected the following main patterns: a) a complement noun is mentioned in the same or the previous sentence; b) a complement noun has occurred somewhere in the foregoing text; c) a suitable complement noun can be established from general knowledge about the world; d) phrases have quasi-complements that do

not occur in the typical complement case; e) phrases include a demonstrative pro-adverb which refers to the place of the complement entity.

Maria Vilkuna's article shows that Finnish has the option of expressing 'only'-like exclusive meanings with a clausal construction, called the Exclusive-Negative Construction (ENC). The author compares the Finnish construction with the better-known French *ne…que* construction and shows that the two differ at many points where Finnish and French grammar differ, especially as regards the expression of negation. The Finnish ENC contains overt negation, which accounts for its somewhat narrower distribution than the alternative expression, the use of the focus particle *vain*/*vaan* 'only'. Adopting the Construction Grammar framework, the author argues that the ENC is a simple clausal construction with the idiosyncrasy of mixed polarity, a formal division of the clause into a negative and affirmative part. Derivation from an underlying comparative is rejected, but it is shown that the ENC has associations to more explicit ways of expressing exclusion. These conclusions receive support from dialectal and other non-standard data.

The Editors Tuomas Huumo, Liina Lindström, and Maarja-Liisa Pilvik