PETAR KEHAYOV, *LIINA LINDSTRÖM*, *ELLEN NIIT* (Tartu)

IMPERATIVE IN INTERROGATIVES IN ESTONIAN (KIHNU), LATVIAN AND LIVONIAN*

Abstract. The Estonian subdialect Kihnu, Latvian and Kuronian Livonian share a type of interrogative containing morphemes whose primary function is to mark 3rd person imperatives. This construction is not attested in other Estonian dialects or in Standard Estonian, other than in some petrified idioms. In Kihnu and Latvian, the question type is used for deliberative questions. This interrogative type may have originally been used as a translation of German *Konjunktiv* in embedded interrogatives, but by the desubordination process, it has spread to main clauses as well. This the most probable scenario for Estonian (Kihnu subdialect). Contacts between Kihnu and Livonian and Latvian have probably reinforced this interrogative type in terms of structural relevance and usage frequency.

Keywords: Estonian dialects, Livonian, Latvian, interrogative, imperative, deliberative questions.

1. Introduction

The existing research on Estonian-Latvian linguistic contact in the area of syntax (e.g. Stolz 1991; The Circum-Baltic Languages 2001) has been concerned mostly with comparison of written varieties. Therefore, coinciding dialectal features which have not found their way into the standardized languages have remained unnoticed.

In this paper, we study the use of a special type of interrogative containing imperative marking (II) in the Estonian subdialect Kihnu (spoken on Kihnu Island, belonging to the Insular dialect), in standard and colloquial Latvian and in the Kuronian dialect of Livonian. Compare, for example, the following interrogative sentences in the Estonian subdialect Kihnu (1), Latvian (2), and Kuronian Livonian (3):

(1) *Miokõ   koor   rahvamajas   laul-ga*?
    what_kind_of chorus village_hall:INE sing-3IMP
    'What kind of choir is singing at the village hall?' (Saar 1980)

(2) *Ko   tēvs   no   Rīga-s   bērniem   lai   atnes*?
    what father from Riga-GEN children:PL.DAT PRTCL bring.PRS.3SG
    'What will father bring the children from Riga?'

(3) *Kui siedā   laz   tīe-gõ*?
    how this:PART PRTCL do-3IMP
    'How to do this? (How should this be done?)' (Krautmane 2010 : 70)

Example (1) from Kihnu is a question in which the verb is not in the indicative, as could be expected, but rather in the third person imperative mood, marked by the suffix *-ga/-gä* or *-ka/-kä*. The situation is similar in Latvian (example 2), where the only formal means used to encode third person imperatives, the hortative particle *lai* + finite form of the verb, is employed in the interrogative sentence. Finally, Kuronian Livonian joins Kihnu and Latvian in using its usual strategy for forming third person imperatives, the hortative particle *laz* + third person imperative form of the verb marked by the suffix *-g(õ)*, in questions.

Thus, what these three idioms have in common is the surprising occurrence of the imperative form of the verb in questions. This is a clear grammatical isogloss, which, interestingly, runs between the group Kihnu-Latvian-Livonian and the remaining Estonian dialects and Standard Estonian, as the latter seem to lack such imperative questions. Our aims in the present study are, first, to provide a formal, functional and distributional account of the imperative-in-interrogatives (II) phenomenon in Kihnu, second to compare our findings with the Latvian and Livonian equivalents, and third, to propose the most plausible scenario for the development of this phenomenon in Kihnu.

2. Imperative-in-Interrogatives in Kihnu dialect

The vernacular spoken on Kihnu Island is a subdialect of the Estonian Insular dialect. None of the other documented subdialects of Estonian shows imperative marking in questions, which makes the Kihnu subdialect quite distinctive among them. In Kihnu, the third person imperative marking of the verb is very productive in all possible types of questions; witness (4) containing a yes/no question (formed with the question particle *kas*) and (5)—(7) exemplifying different wh-questions: in (5), the wh-word functions as a subject, in (6) as an attribute, and in (7) as an oblique (adverbial):

(4) *Kas puest   sua-ga   jahu*?
    Q   shop:ELA get-3IMP flour:PART
    'Is it possible to get flour from the shop?'

(5) *Kissi oma lapsi   kuõlita-ga*?
    who own child:PL.PART educate-3IMP
    'Who educates their children?'

(6) *Miokõst   palka   nad viel taht-ka*?
    what_kind_of:PART salary:PART they still want-3IMP
    'What (kind of) a salary do they want?'

(7) *Kellele   Mihkel kosja   tul-ga*?
    who:ALL Mihkel proposing_marriage:ILL come-3IMP
    'To whom is Mihkel coming to propose?'

This lack of syntagmatic restrictions is reflected on the paradigmatic axis as well: the imperative form seems to show the full paradigm available for the (historical) 3rd person verb form. Thus, according to Theodor Saar (1980; 1960), such questions can be derived from impersonal sentences displaying impersonal voice marking on the verb; see example (8) and (9), and in case of past time reference, the verb may be in the past tense; cf. example (10):

(8) *Kui sioksõ jõlmaga mere min-dä-gä?*
how such:GEN weather:COM sea:ILL go-IMPS-3IMP
'How is one supposed to go to sea with such weather?'

(9) *Miks luba-ta-ga üese ulku?*
why allow-IMPS-3IMP during_the_night[ADV] wander_about:INF
'Why is one allowed to wander about during the night?'

(10) *Kas laevad ol-ga ljõnnast tahakohõ tuln?*
Q ship:PL be-3IMP town:ELA back come:PST.PTCP
'Have the ships arrived from the town?'

The only combinatorial restrictions that could be observed from the available material concern person distinctions. Third person imperative marking is also found in interrogative sentences with 1st or 2nd person addressees, but most of the attested examples are indirect (embedded) interrogatives; cf. (11) and (12).

(11) *Küsüti, kas sia ol-ga meilt läin?*
ask:IMPS:PST Q you be-3IMP we:ABL go:PST.PTCP
'People asked if you have left us'

(12) *Tahõti tiädä, kas mia min-gä tänä ljõnna?*
want:IMPS:PST know:INF Q I go-3IMP today town:ILL
'People wanted to know if I am going to town today' (Saar 1960 : 66)

The only way to check the availability of direct questions with 1st or 2nd-person subjects was to present them to native Kihnu speakers. We consulted six native speakers of the Kihnu subdialect who live permanently on the island of Kihnu. All but one of the speakers we consulted considered the constructed example in (13) to be impossible in their dialect. The only consultant whose response to (13) was positive regarded such 1st person direct interrogatives as possible in a situation where someone has the feeling that s/he is lost and is deliberating (by him/herself) which way to go.

(13) *Kussõ mia nüd min-gä?*
where I now go-3IMP
'Where should I go now?'

This brings us to the question about the semantic (or pragmatic) function of the Kihnu imperative interrogatives — this, much like the question about person restrictions, cannot be exhaustively answered by a study of published dialect texts. The only hints concerning semantics that we had before consulting native speakers were Theodor Saar's and Mari Must's remarks that the third person imperative forms in questions express doubt

on the part of the speaker (Saar 1960 : 66; Must 1994). Therefore we decided to present to our Kihnu consultants twelve minimal pairs of constructed questions (based on Saar 1980; 1960) — one with a verb form in indicative and one in imperative mood. Consultants were asked first to evaluate the acceptability of the interrogative sentences containing the imperative form and then to explain the difference in meaning between the sentence with an indicative verb form and the sentence with an imperative verb form.

The majority of our consultants were familiar with the interrogative sentences with imperative marking and considered them functional in the contemporary language (only direct 1st and 2nd person questions were generally seen as ill-formed). As a response to the question about the difference in meaning in the constructed pairs, most of the consultants confirmed that the sentence with the imperative is a deliberating question, which is directed to oneself, not to the listener or anyone else. The purpose of such questions is not to elicit information from the partner in the conversation — on the contrary, the speaker's assumption is that the partner does not have the relevant information — but rather to deliberate over the situation on her own.

Questions which do not seek information but instruction or advice ("direction") have usually been labeled 'deliberating questions' or 'direction questions' (see Huddleston 1994; Metslang 1981 : 30; Palmer 2001 : 128). In the case of Kihnu, it seems that these questions do not necessarily seek an answer from the interlocutor, and therefore they bear resemblance to rhetorical questions; cf. example (14). The deliberating nature of these interrogatives is probably one of the reasons why they are often used in indirect questions in the scope of a negative expression conveying doubt; cf. (15).

(14) *Kõegõ esimene oli   tämä mies, kis   kundõrbandi viina*
    SPRL   first   be:PST.3SG this man who illegal:GEN   alcohol:PART
    *akkas   tuõma.   (**Kas sedä   võe-ga   kirjuta?**)*
    start:PST.3SG deliver:INF Q   this:PART can-3IMP write:INF

    'The first one who started to deliver illegal alcohol was this man. (Is it appropriate to write this down?)' (Saar 1998 : 179)

(15) *Mia ütlesi   pulmarahva   siäs, et ei tiä   **kumbal***
    I   say:PST.1SG wedding_crowd:GEN in   that NEG know which_one:ADE
    enäm kahju ol-ga   kas kirjutajal siast   või tüdrikätel Pärdüst?
    more pity be-3IMP Q   writer:ADE pig:ELA or girl:PL:ADE Pärt:ELA

    'I said in the wedding crowd that I don't know who is feeling more sorry, — the writer, for the pig, or the girl, for Pärt?' (Saar 1984 [1933])

Example (14) is significant not only because it shows the similarity of deliberative and rhetorical questions, but also because it shows the imperative marking on a modal verb of possibility. We have pointed out the fact that the imperative marking in questions does not seem to be syntagmatically or paradigmatically restricted. Example (14) clearly indicates that imperative marking in Kihnu interrogative sentences shows even greater combinatorial freedom than the imperative mood in its typical use as a marker of illocutionary force. Like in other European languages (e.g.

English, cf. Sadock, Zwicky 1985 : 159; Polish, Czech, cf. Besters-Dilger, Drobnjaković, Hansen 2009 : 171), Estonian modal verbs are not compatible with the imperative mood (cf. example (16)), which indicates that Kihnu third person imperative marking in questions no longer displays the same distribution as the imperative mood.

(16) **Või   seda   kirjutada!*
     can.2IMP this:PART write:INF
     '*Can write this!'

As already noted, the use of third person imperative forms is not attested in interrogative sentences in the other Estonian dialects. An automatic query in the Corpus of Estonian Dialects did not reveal any imperatives in interrogative sentences, although admittedly this corpus is not very rich in questions.[1] The basic function of this form in all Estonian dialects and Standard Estonian is to express indirect commands that can be addressed to any person; cf. example (17) from Standard Estonian. This generalized use of the third person imperative marker to express commands whose addressee can also be first and second person is known in Estonian descriptive tradition as jussive mood (see Erelt 2002).

(17) *Isa   ütles,   et ma/sa/ta min-gu ema   juurde maale*
     father say:PST.3SG that I/you/s/he go-3IMP mother:GEN to[POSTP] country:ALL

     'Father said that I/you/she/he should go to mother's place in the countryside'

The jussive is rather common in Estonian dialects, although not in interrogative sentences. One explanation for this would be that such imperative (or jussive) interrogatives have been in use, but have been lost. In contemporary Estonian one can actually find a very restricted use of the imperative in certain frozen rhetorical questions, which display the structure *mis* 'what' + *see* 'this' + *ol-gu* 'be-3IMP'; witness (18) and (19) from the Corpus of Written Estonian.

(18) *Mis kuradi   dekadents see ol-gu — me ümber sarga   tantsime?*
     what devil:GEN decadence this be-3IMP we around coffin:GEN dance:1PL

     'What the hell kind of decadence is this — we are dancing around the coffin?' (ILU1990\ilu0204)

(19) *Noh,   mis   see siis ol-gu!?* —
     INTERJ what this then be-3IMP

     peaaegu et   röögatasid   lugupeetavad
     almost   CONJ yell_out:PST.3PL honourable:PL

     'Well, what is this — the honourables almost yelled out?'

Is this a relic of an earlier, wider use of the third person imperative in interrogative sentences? Unfortunately, this question has to wait for a definitive answer; as yet, both supportive and counter-evidence can be presented for this assumption. Wiedemann notes obsolete uses of imperative in interrogative sentences (like examples 20, 21 and 22) in his grammar of Estonian

---

[1] This is due to the sharp division of the roles of the interviewer and the interviewee during linguistic fieldwork. Also, the interviewer is rarely fluent in the dialect from which linguistic material is collected (see Lindström 2001).

(Wiedemann 1875 : 468); on the other hand, the Corpus of Old Written Estonian does not reveal any examples of imperatives in questions (Külli Habicht, personal communication).

(20) *mis   ta   nüüd seal teh-ku nii kaua*
     what s/he now there do-3IMP so long
     'What is s/he doing there so long now?'

(21) *missugune wara   neil   waestel   ol-gu*
     which   possessions these:ADE poor_person:PL:ADE be-3IMP
     'What kind of possessions are these poor people supposed to have?'

(22) *ei   tea,   mis   mull ol-gu,   nagu minu süda närtsitaks*
     NEG know what I:ADE be-3IMP as_if I:GEN heart make_to_wilt:COND
     'I don't know what it is with me, as if my heart were being made to wilt away.'

    We will return to these sentences from Old Written Estonian in Section 4, where we will discuss the possible triggers for the rise of imperative-in-interrogatives in Kihnu.

3. Imperative-in-Interrogatives in Latvian

Latvian expresses third person imperatives with a periphrastic construction consisting of the imperative/hortative particle *lai* and the finite indicative form of the verb; cf. example (23) from Holvoet (2007 : 111—112).

(23) *Ja viņa negrib   te   palikt, lai   iet   uz virtuvi*
     if 3SG.F NEG:want:PRS3 here stay:INF PRTCL go:PRS3 to kitchen
     'If she doesn't want to stay here, let her to go to the kitchen'

    Much like in Kihnu, this periphrastic construction occurs in interrogative sentences. Holvoet has discussed such occurrences at length in connection with their modality (see Holvoet 2001 : 67—81; 2005; 2007 : 27—29, 111—118); cf. examples (24) and (25).

(24) *Ko   lai   es tagad daru*?
     what PRTCL 1SG now   do:PRS1SG
     'What should I do now?' (Holvoet 2007 : 114)

(25) *Kur   lai   es ņemu   tik daudz līdzekļu?*
     where PRTCL 1SG take:PRS1SG so much means:GEN.PL
     'Where should I get such a sum of money from?' (Holvoet 2007 : 115)

    Holvoet (2007 : 27) distinguishes between questions intended to elicit information and questions to which the expected response is directive. According to him (Holvoet 2007 : 114), it is only the second type of questions (so called 'deontic requests'), where the Latvian imperative/hortative marker *lai* occurs. Such questions have been called 'direction questions' or 'deliberative questions' by other researchers (e.g. Huddleston 1994). The purpose of the speaker in examples (24) and (25) is to elicit a directive rather than information from the addressee. In other words, s/he is expecting to hear something like 'Do this and that!', 'Go here or there!' from the addressee.

As in Kihnu, the Latvian imperative/hortative construction with *lai* occurs both in wh- and yes/no-questions; see (26) and (27).

(26) *Kur   lai   eju*?
　　 where PRTCL go:PRS1SG
　　 'Where should I go?' (Holvoet 2007 : 29)

(27) *Vai lai   eju*?
　　 Q   PRTCL go:PRS1SG
　　 'Should I go?' (Holvoet 2007 : 29)

On the other hand, unlike in Kihnu, where the imperative marker occurs predominantly in questions with third person subjects, in Latvian the construction with *lai* occurs in questions mostly with first person subjects (see examples 24—27), although third person subjects are also attested; cf. (28).

(28) *Kur   nu   viņa tos   pīrāgus   tagad lai   liek*?
　　 where then she those:ACC pastries:ACC now   PRTCL put:PRS3SG

　　 'What is she to do with [where is she to put] these pastries now?' (Holvoet 2001 : 68)

Thus, at first glance it seems that Kihnu and Latvian IIs are rather different: while the Kihnu third person imperative is used as a marker of deliberative questions without obligatory addressees apart from the speaker herself, Latvian *lai* (in combination with the finite verb form) expresses a deontic request to an obligatory addressee. While the Kihnu imperative marker is used in questions mostly with third person subjects, the Latvian imperative/hortative construction is used in questions mostly with first person subjects.

One should note, however, that Latvian *lai* is not exclusively employed to encode deontic requests. All reactions to a query posted to the Baltistics mailing list (baltistika@yahoogroups.com, sent on 20.09.2010) showed that the construction *lai* + V-IND is used in questions to convey doubt on behalf of the speaker; cf. example (2) repeated in (29) and example (30). In terms of pragmatics, such questions coincide with Kihnu deliberative questions.

(29) *Ko   tēvs   no   Rīga-s   bērn-iem   lai   atnes?*
　　 what father from Riga-SG.GEN children-PL.DAT PRTCL bring.PRS.3SG
　　 'What will father bring the children from Riga?'

(30) *Kas   to   lai   zina*?
　　 who it:ACC PRTCL know:PRS3SG
　　 'Who knows it?'

These (constructed) examples are absolutely functional both in Standard and colloquial Latvian[2] as well as in Latvian dialects.[3] The sentence in example (29) has a close equivalent attested in the Kihnu dialect; cf. (31).

---

[2] Andra Kalnača, personal communication.
[3] Dace Markus, personal communication, concerning so-called "deep" Latvian idioms of North-East Vidzeme.

(31) *Mis   aᵉtt   ľõnnast   lastõlõ   tuõ-ga?*
     what dad town:ELA children:PL:ALL bring-3IMP
     'What will dad bring the children from the town?'

Moreover, the epistemic nature of such questions (i.e. the sense of 'doubt' and 'deliberation') is reflected in Latvian by the positional mutability of the hortative particle. Compare example (29) in which *lai* occurs at the end of the sentence just before the verb with example (32), where it occurs at the beginning of the sentence just before the subject.

(32) *Ko   lai   tēvs   no   Rīga-s   bērn-iem   atnes?*
     what PRTCL father from Riga-SG.GEN children-PL.DAT bring.PRS.3SG
     'What will father bring the children from Riga?'

Intuitively, the agent-oriented modality encoded in a 'deontic request' should be iconically expressed with a word order where *lai* occurs next to the subject agent. In its epistemic use, on the other hand, *lai* has a wider (propositional) scope and should be located close to the verbal predicate, which is the core of the proposition. Thus, the availability of sentences like (29) seems to show that *lai* is no longer only an agent-oriented modal.

4. Imperative-in-Interrogatives in Livonian

In Livonian, third person imperatives are often expressed with a structure which looks like a hybrid form of the Estonian synthetic imperative (or jussive) and Latvian analytical imperative with *lai*; cf. example (33).

(33) *Jegaykš   laz   vol-gõ   sīe   vāļikštõks   ala,*
     everyone PRTCL be-3IMP this:GEN authority:COM under
     kīen   võimi   yļ   täm   um
     who:DAT power:PART over s/he:GEN be.PRS3SG
     'Everyone should obey the authority which has power (control) over him' (Krautmane 2010 : 60)

The construction *laz volgõ* shows double hortative marking: the particle *laz* is a precise functional equivalent of Latvian *lai*, and the third person imperative morpheme *-gõ* is the etymological (and functional) equivalent of the Estonian third person imperative marker *-gu/-ku*.

As in Kihnu and Latvian, the structure which is used in Livonian in the formation of third person imperatives is also found in interrogative sentences. The evidence, however, is scarce: the only example we have comes from Krautmane's work on the mood system in Kuronian Livonian;[4] cf. (34).

(34) *Kui   siedā   laz   tīe-gõ?*
     how this:PART PRTCL do-3IMP
     'How should this be done? (How one should do this?)' (Krautmane 2010 : 70)

---

[4] Our search for imperative interrogatives in Sjögren's texts of moribund Salaca Livonian (Sjögren 1986) was fruitless.

5. The development of the imperative from illocutionary force marker to deliberative question marker in Kihnu

The third person imperative has expanded its sphere of use in Kihnu from its original function of expressing orders or requests to a new function of conveying deliberation and doubt in questions. The imperative is essentially a deontic mood and doubt is an epistemic stance of low probability. This means that the Kihnu third person imperative marker has undergone a functional development from deontic to epistemic modality; cf. example (35) and the hypothesized reinterpretation of its modal force in Kihnu.

(35) *Kas luõmad   sedä   vett   juõ-ga?*
     Q   animal:PL this:PART water:PART drink-3IMP
     'Would the animals drink this water?'

     [Do the animals have to drink this water?] > [Is it possible/likely that the animals would drink this water?]

This assumed development is not unprecedented: on the contrary, the development of deontic markers into epistemic ones is very common in the languages of the world (see e.g. Heine, Claudi, Hünnemeyer 1991 : 175—178; van der Auwera, Plungian 1998). A more challenging question is what exactly has triggered this functional shift in Kihnu, especially in light of the fact that other Estonian dialects do not show parallel shifts.

In the search for an answer we looked into the functions of the imperative mood in the documented history of Estonian. Penjam (2004) has observed that in Old Written Estonian, in object and purpose clauses, the third person imperative (jussive) is often used instead of the conditional mood, which is the only option available in contemporary Estonian; cf. (36) in which instead of *jää-ks* 'stay-COND' we find *jä-ku* 'stay-3IMP'.

(36) *Kui minna taha / et   temma jä-ku / senni kui   minna tulle /*
     if   I   want:1SG CONJ s/he   stay-3IMP until when I   come:1SG
     mea   hohlit   sinna seperrast?
     what:PART care:2SG you   about_it

     'And if I want her/him to stay until I come, what do you care about it?' (Penjam 2004 : 74)

According to Penjam (2004), the authors of such texts have interchanged indicative, imperative (jussive) and conditional mood, as well as other devices (such as modal verbs), in search of an appropriate translation equivalent of the German *Konjunktiv* in Estonian object and purpose clauses. The occurrence of third person imperative (jussive) in object clauses in Estonian is significant because many such clauses are actually embedded questions. Recall example (22), repeated in (37), from Wiedemann, who also observed the peculiar use of the imperative mood instead of the conditional in Old Written Estonian.

(37) *ei   tea,   mis   mull olgu,   nagu minu süda närtsitaks*
     NEG know what I:ADE be-3IMP as_if I:GEN heart make_to_fade:COND

     'I don't know what is with me, as if somebody makes my heart fading away' (Wiedemann 1875 : 468)

Such occurrences lead us to the hypothesis that the II sentences in 19th-century Estonian (recall examples (20) and (21) from Wiedemann) are originally embedded questions with the main clause omitted. We may call this a 'desubordination scenario'. This scenario is supported by the fact that in spoken discourse the embedded interrogatives are often treated as containing more important, foregrounded information than the main clause, while the main clause functions more like an epistemic particle. (Keevallik [to appear]) Interlocutors typically answer the question posed in the embedded clause, but not necessarily. Especially the main clause *ei tea* 'don't know' marks uncertainty, the assumed lack of knowledge by the addressee of the projected question and can thus be left unanswered (Keevallik [to appear]; Keevallik 2006).

By the time Wiedemann was compiling his grammar (1875), such embedded questions with imperative marking were already obsolete in the Estonian spoken and written in northern Estonia; nevertheless, such embedded questions are fully productive in the contemporary Kihnu dialect (recall the indirect questions exemplified in (11) and (12)). The problem that we have to resolve if we adopt this scenario is why only the Kihnu dialect has preserved (or developed) imperative interrogatives, there is no reason to assume a stronger German influence and/or a stronger tendency to preserve archaic features of Old Written Estonian in Kihnu than in any other Estonian dialect. However, we also have to take into consideration the possible impact of Latvian and Livonian. It cannot be a coincidence that the imperative/hortative particle *lai* in Latvian and its Livonian counterpart *laz*[5] have both grammaticalized into conjunctions introducing object and purpose clauses; cf. example (38) from Latvian and (39) from Livonian, both of which contain object clauses.

(38) *Es lūdzu mātei,   lai viņa nopērk trešo pulksteni*
     I   beg:1SG mother:DAT CONJ she buy:3SG third watch:ACC

     'I begged my mother to buy a third watch' (Holvoet 2005 : 98)

(39) *Jumal nim um,   kyl īžentšõst pyva*, *aga mēg pālam sīes*
     God:GEN name be:3SG PRTCL by_itself holy but we beg:1PL this:INE

     pālandõksõs, *laz se sā-gõ   pyvastõt ka mäd   vail*
     prayer:INE   CONJ it get-3IMP celebrated also we:GEN among

     'God's name is holy as it is, but we pray in this prayer that it becomes celebrated also among us' (Krautmane 2010 : 61)

It follows from the examples above that Latvian and Livonian are structurally isomorphous with the archaic Estonian as documented by Wiedemann. Geographically, the Kihnu dialect belongs to the North Estonian dialect continuum (on which Written Estonian is based), but at the same time it is within the contact area of Latvian and Livonian. Therefore, we may speculate that the desubordination process of embedded questions containing imperatives has been reinforced in Kihnu by contact with Latvian and Livonian. According to this scenario, Kihnu speakers have derived the simple interrogative sentence with a verb in the imperative

---

[5] In Livonian, it is obligatory to use the third person imperative form after the conjunction *laz* (Krautmane 2010 : 60), which actually means that the whole construction *laz* + V-3IMP serves to encode the subordination, not the particle alone.

mood from a complex sentence with omitted main clause. Thus, a question like *Kumbal enäm kahju ol-ga*? 'which_one:ADE more pity be-3IMP' 'Which one is pitying more?' can be seen as a historical descendant of the complex sentence in (40), attested in Theodor Saar's texts.

(40) *Mia ütlesi   pulmarahva   siäs, et ei tiä   kumbal*
    I   say:PST:1SG wedding_crowd:GEN in   that NEG know which_one:ADE
    enäm kahju ol-ga   kas kirjutajal siast   või tüdrikätel Pärdüst?
    more pity   be-3IMP Q   writer:ADE pig:ELA or   girl:PL:ADE Pärt:ELA

    'I said in the wedding crowd, that I don't know who is feeling more sorry, — the writer, for the pig, or the girl, for Pärt?' (Saar 1984 [1933])

Conclusions

The Kihnu subdialect of Estonian, Livonian and Latvian share a type of interrogative which uses the 3rd person imperative form and which functions mainly as a deliberative question. According to Wiedemann (1875), written Estonian also used to share the feature in some earlier stages. Though the context in which these interrogatives are used varies a bit from language to language, the similarities between Kihnu, Livonian and Latvian are remarkable. This interrogative type is most probably a result of the mutual contacts between Kihnu, Livonian and Latvian, but it may have originally been used as a translation of German *Konjunktiv* in embedded object clauses (embedded interrogatives). By the desubordination process, it has spread to main clauses. This is the most probable scenario for the Kihnu subdialect, but it is quite clear that contacts with Livonian and Latvian have reinforced the structural spread and the usage of the construction in Kihnu.

Addresses

Petar Kehayov
University of Tartu, Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics
petar.kehayov@ut.ee
tel. (+372) 737 6127

Liina Lindström
University of Tartu, Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics
liina.lindstrom@ut.ee
tel. (+372) 737 6127

Ellen Niit
University of Tartu, Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics
ellen.niit@ut.ee
tel. (+372) 737 6127

Petar Kehayov, *Liina Lindström*, *Ellen Niit*

Abbreviations

ABL — ablative case, ACC — accusative case, ADE — adessive case, ADV — adverb, ALL — allative case, COM — comitative case, COND — conditional mood, CONJ — conjunction, DAT — dative case, ELA — elative case, GEN — genitive case, ILL — illative case, IMP — imperative mood, IMPS — impersonal voice, INE — inessive case, INF — infinitive, INTERJ — interjection, NEG — negation marker, PART — partitive case, PL — plural, POSTP — postposition, PRS — present tense, PST — past tense, PTCL — particle, PTCP — participle, SG — singular, SPRL — superlative, **Q** — yes/no-question marker.

R E F E R E N C E S

B e s t e r s - D i l g e r, J., D r o b n j a k o v i ć, A., H a n s e n B. 2009, Modals in the Slavonic Languages. — Modals in the Languages of Europe, Berlin—New York, 167—197.
E r e l t, M. 2002, Does Estonian Have the Jussive. — LU XXXVIII, 110—117.
H e i n e, B., C l a u d i, U., H ü n n e m e y e r, F. 1991, Grammaticalization. A Conceptual Framework, Chicago.
H o l v o e t, A. 2001, Studies in the Latvian Verb, Krakow.
—— 2005, Evidentialität, Modalität und interpretative Verwendung. — Modality in Slavonic Languages. New Perspectives, München (Slavolinguistica 6), 95—105.
—— 2007, Mood and Modality in Baltic, Krakow.
H u d d l e s t o n, R. 1994, The Contrast between Interrogatives and Questions. — Journal of Linguistics 30, 411—439.
K e e v a l l i k, L. 2006, From Discourse Pattern to Epistemic Marker. Estonian (*ei*) *tea* 'don't know'. — Nordic Journal of Linguistics 29, 173—200.
— — [to appear] Interrogative "Complements" and Question Design in Estonian. — 'Subordination' in Conversation. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective, Amsterdam—Philadelphia.
K r a u t m a n e, Ē. 2010, Kuramaa liivi keele kõneviiside süsteem eesti ja läti keele taustal, Tartu (Unpublished MA thesis. Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics of the University of Tartu).
L i n d s t r ö m, L. 2001, Eesti murrete korpuse iseloomustus argivestlustega võrrelduna. — Keele kannul. Pühendusteos Mati Erelti 60. sünnipäevaks, Tartu (Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised 17), 212—221.
M e t s l a n g, H. 1981, Küsilause eesti keeles, Tallinn.
M u s t, M. 1994, Lectures on Kihnu dialect (Manuscript).
P a l m e r, F. R. 2001, Mood and Modality, Cambridge.
P e n j a m, P. 2004, Jussiivi kasutusest eesti vanemas kirjakeeles. — ESA 50 (2004), 68—92.
S a a r, T. 1980, Märkmeid Kihnu grammatika kohta (Manuscript. Institute of Estonian Language, KT 291).
—— 1984 [1933], Murdetekst Kihnust (Manuscript. Archives of Estonian and Kindred Languages, University of Tartu, T 493).
—— 1960, Ülevaade Kihnu verbist (Manuscript. Institute of Estonian Language, KT 184).
—— 1998, Kihnu raamat, Tallinn (Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Emakeele Seltsi toimetised 68).
S a d o c k, J. M., Z w i c k y, A. M. 1985, Speech Act Distinctions in Syntax. — Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol. 1. Clause Structure, Cambridge, 155—196.
S j ö g r e n, A. J. 1861, Joh. Andreas Sjögren's Livische Grammatik nebst Sprachproben / im Auftrage der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften bearbeitet und mit einer historisch-ethnographischen Einleitung versehen von Ferdinand Joh. Wiedemann, St. Petersburg.
S t o l z, T. 1991, Sprachbund im Baltikum? Estnisch und Lettisch im Zentrum einer sprachlichen Konvergenzlandschaft, Bochum (Bochum-Essener Beiträge zur Sprachwandelforschung 13).

The Circum-Baltic Languages. Typology and Contact. Vol. 2. Grammar and Typology, Amsterdam—Philadelphia 2001.

v a n d e r A u w e r a, J., P l u n g i a n, V. 1998, Modality's Semantic Map. — Linguistic Typology 2, 79—124.

W i e d e m a n n, F. J. 1875 (2005), Grammatik der ehstnischen Sprache, zunächst wie sie in Mittelehstland gesprochen wird, mit Berücksichtigung der anderen Dialekte, St. Pétersbourg.

ПЕТЪР КЕХАЙОВ, ЛИЙНА ЛИНДСТРЁМ, ЭЛЛЕН НИЙТ (Тарту)

ИМПЕРАТИВ В ВОПРОСИТЕЛЬНЫХ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЯХ В КИХНУСКОМ ГОВОРЕ ЭСТОНСКОГО ЯЗЫКА, В ЛАТЫШСКОМ И ЛИВСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

В кихнуском говоре эстонского языка, а также в латышском и ливском языках распространен и широко употребляется тип вопросительного предложения, в котором вместо изъявительного наклонения используется глагольная форма 3-го лица повелительного наклонения (и это прежде всего в кихнуском говоре; в латышском языке употребляется побудительная частица *lai*, в ливском — частица *laz* + форма 3-го лица императива). В эстонском литературном языке и других диалектах такое употребление императива не отмечено, он встречается лишь в отдельных застывших конструкциях, например, *mis see olgu* 'что же это такое?' В кихнуском говоре и латышском языке такая конструкция используется как взвешивающий (с оттенком обсуждения) вопрос, цель которого получить от собеседника не информацию, а скорее совет. Вопросительное предложение с маркером императива в кихнуском говоре появилось, очевидно, как переводное соответствие немецкого конъюнктива в придаточных (подчиненных) вопросительных предложениях, откуда оно в результате десубординации распространилось и на главные предложения. По такому же сценарию развивались события в ливском и латышском языках. Контакты с латышским и ливским языками благоприятствовали распространению употребления рассматриваемой конструкции в кихнуском говоре эстонского языка.