

MATI ERELT (Tartu), HELLE METSLANG (Tallinn—Helsinki)

ESTONIAN CLAUSE PATTERNS — FROM FINNO-UGRIC
TO STANDARD AVERAGE EUROPEAN*

Abstract. Estonian clauses can be divided into two basic patterns: unmarked basic clauses and marked basic clauses, depending on whether the clause-initial topic is the subject or not. The main clausal topic of the unmarked basic clause has the typical coding and behavioural properties of the subject. The main clausal topic of the marked basic clauses is less grammaticalized than in the case of the unmarked basic clause. It may be realized not as a prototypical grammatical subject but as an adverbial (or an oblique or a direct object). If the sentence has the subject, it is a non-prototypical subject and its neutral position is after the verb (basic word order XVS). The main types of marked basic clauses include existential, possessive, source-marking resultative, and experiential clauses. The marked possessive, resultative and experiential clauses have their counterparts among unmarked clauses. Current trends in language use show expanding use of unmarked possessive and experiential basic clauses at the expense of marked clauses. This could be seen both as a language contact-induced shift from the Finno-Ugric clause patterns towards Standard Average European (SAE) patterns and as (just) simplification of the internal structure of the language. Resultative constructions show a tendency to use the focussed clause-final subject in both clause patterns.

Keywords: Estonian, Finnish, Finno-Ugric, SAE, syntax, topic, subject, grammaticalization, unmarked basic clauses, marked basic clauses, existential clauses, possessive clauses, resultative clauses, experiential clauses, syntactic change.

1. Both Estonian and Finnish linguists have either explicitly or covertly regarded types of the simple sentence as the main types of clauses, which differ with regard to the realization of the main clausal topic and its attendant circumstances (cf. e.g. Hakulinen, Karlsson 1979 : 91—97; ISK 847—849; Vähämäki 1987; EKG II 14—15). Estonian clauses can be divided into two basic patterns: *u n m a r k e d b a s i c c l a u s e s* (also multifunctional clauses, normal clauses) and *m a r k e d b a s i c c l a u s e s* (also monofunctional clauses, inverted clauses), based on whether the main clausal topic is realized as the nominative subject (i.e. it is fully grammaticalized in the sense of Givon 1997) or not.

Due to the sentence-initial position of the topic, the basic word order of the unmarked clause is SVX (subject — verb — non-subject). The third coding property of the prototypical subject, in addition to the nominative

* This work has been partly supported by Estonian Science Foundation, grant no. 6147.

marking and clause-initial position (as in 1, 2a, 2b), is that the subject of the normal clause can trigger verbal agreement (cf. 2a and 2b). One of the most important behavioural properties of the prototypical subject in Estonian and Finnish is that unlike the object, negation does not affect case marking of the subject, as in (1).¹

- (1) *J a a n e h i t a - s / e i e h i t a - n u d s u v i l a - t*
 Jaan:NOM build-PST:3SG / NEG build-PPTC summer_cottage-PRTV
 'Jaan built / did not build a summer cottage'
- (2a) *M a e h i t a - n s u v i l a - t*
 I:NOM build-PRS:1SG summer_cottage-PRTV
 'I'm building a summer cottage'
- (2b) *M e e h i t a - m e s u v i l a - t*
 we:NOM build-PRS:1PL summer_cottage-PRTV
 'We are building a summer cottage'

The main clausal topic of the marked basic clauses is less grammaticalized than in the case of the unmarked basic clause. It is realized not as a prototypical grammatical subject but as an adverbial (or an oblique or a direct object). If the sentence has a subject, it is a non-prototypical subject, and its neutral position is after the verb (basic word order XVS). The main types of marked basic clauses include *e x i s t e n t i a l* (3), *p o s s e s s i v e* (4), *s o u r c e - m a r k i n g r e s u l t a t i v e* (5) and *e x p e r i e n t i a l* (6) clauses.

- (3) *A i a - s o l - i l i l l i*
 garden-INESS be-PST:3SG flower:PL:PRTV
 'There were some flowers in the garden'
- (4) *J a a n i - l o n a u t o*
 Jaan-ADESS be:3SG car:NOM
 'Jaan has a car'
- (5) *A n n e - s t s a - i k i r j a n i k*
 Anne-ELAT become-PST writer:NOM
 'Anne became a writer'
- (6) *A n n e - l e m e e l d i - b d ž ä s s*
 Anne-ALL like-3SG jazz:NOM
 'Anne likes jazz'

The first three types of clauses share several properties. If there is a subject-NP in the clause, it is usually indefinite. If the subject-NP is a mass

¹ The other behavioural properties of the prototypical subject in Estonian include at least the following: (a) the subject is an antecedent for reflexives, e.g. *Jaan ehitas endale suvilat* 'Jaan was building himself a summer cottage'; (b) in the case of coordination the subject of the second clause can be deleted if it is co-referential with the subject of the first clause, e.g. *Jaan ehitas suvila ja _ müüs selle maha* 'Jaan built a summer cottage and sold it'; (c) the deep subject of the infinitive construction is deleted, and the deletion is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause, e.g. *Jaan tahtis _ suvilat ehitada* 'Jaan wanted to build a summer cottage'; (d) the subject of the embedded clause may be raised to the subject or object of the main clause, e.g. *Näib, et Jaan ehitab suvila* 'It seems that Jaan is building a summer cottage' — *Jaan (subject) näib suvilat ehitavat* 'Jaan seems to be building a summer cottage'; *Ma arvan, et Jaan ehitab suvilat* 'I think that Jaan is building a summer cottage' — *Ma arvan Jaani (object) suvilat ehitavat* 'I think Jaan must be building a summer cottage'. Cf. also Hiietam 2003; Erelt 2003.

noun or a count noun in the plural, quantitative indefiniteness may be marked by the partitive. In the (non-contrastive) negative clause the use of the partitive is obligatory. The marked possessive, resultative and experiential clauses have their counterparts among unmarked clauses (see Table 1).

Table 1

Possessive, resultative and experiential clauses and their unmarked counterparts		
	MARKED BASIC CLAUSES	UNMARKED COUNTERPARTS OF THE MARKED BASIC CLAUSES
Possessive clauses	<i>J a a n i - l o n a u t o</i> Jaan-ADESS be:3SG car:NOM 'Jaan has a car'	<i>J a a n o m a - b a u t o - t</i> Jaan:NOM have-3SG car-PRTV 'Jaan has a car'
Source-marking resultative clauses	<i>A n n e - s t s a - i k i r j a n i k</i> Anne-ELAT become-PST writer:NOM 'Anne became writer'	<i>A n n e s a - i k i r j a n i k u - k s</i> Anne:NOM become-PST writer-TRNSL 'Anne became a writer'
Experiential clauses	<i>A n n e - l e m e e l d i - b d ž ä s s</i> Anne-ALL like-3SG jazz:NOM 'Anne likes jazz'	<i>A n n e a r m a s t a - b d ž ä s s i</i> Anne:NOM like-3SG jazz:PRTV 'Anne likes jazz'
	<i>M i n - d h u v i t a - b t e i e a r v a m u s</i> I-PRTV interest-3SG your opinion:NOM 'I'm interested in your opinion'	<i>M a t e a - n t e i e a r v a m u s - t</i> I know-1SG your opinion-PRTV 'I know your opinion'

The present article is an attempt to find out to what extent the Estonian marked basic clauses differ from the unmarked clauses. What is characteristic of Estonian in the background of the closely related neighbouring Finnish language (which has a well-established system of marked basic clauses) and SAE (where unmarked basic clauses dominate more)? Can one observe any dynamics in Estonian in the use of the basic clauses in the past decades?

The dynamics will be studied on the basis of newspaper language that adopts changes rather easily. Changes in usage could be explained, on the one hand, by language-internal trends; on the other hand, language-external conditions may change, too (e.g. weakening of language editing that makes the undergoing changes visible; closer contacts with English and Finnish, changes in expression needs). The use of the constructions will be observed on the basis of the material of the newspaper *Postimees*, which is one of the two major Estonian dailies. The material comes from the years 1995, 2000, and 2005, for a more detailed treatment see Metslang 2006.

2. Marked basic clauses in Estonian

2.1. In existential clauses, as in (7)–(10), the clause-initial constituent is an adverbial of location (or time), and the clause performs a presentative function.²

- (7) *A i a - s k a s v a - s i d l i l l e - d*
garden-INESS grow-PST:3PL flower-PL:NOM
'In the garden were growing some flowers'

² For a more detailed discussion see e.g. Nemvalts 1996; Tiainen 1997.

- (8) *Aia-s ei kasva-mud lilli*
 garden-INESS NEG grow-PPTC flower:PL:PRTV
 'There were no flowers growing in the garden'
- (9) *Aia-s kasva-s lilli*
 garden-INESS grow-PST:3SG flower:PL:PRTV
 'There were some flowers (growing) in the garden'
- (10) *Klaasi-s loksu-s vesi / vett*
 glass-INESS slosh-PST:3SG water:NOM / PRTV
 'There was some water sloshing in the glass / It was water sloshing in the glass'

The post-verb position of the subject-NP of an existential clause and the possibility of partitive-marking make it closer to the object. In fact, sometimes it has been regarded as the object (Erelt 1978). However, in Estonian the partitive is obligatory only in the case of negation, e.g. (8). In an affirmative clause a mass or a plural count noun can be in the nominative also in the case of quantitative indefiniteness, e.g. (7) and (10). In this respect Estonian differs from Finnish, where the partitive is obligatory with plural and mass nouns, e.g. (11). Estonian differs from Finnish also in that the verb agrees with the nominative subject-NP of an existential clause in number (7); in Finnish, however, it is usually not the case (12) (cf. ISK 851, 1227).

- (11) *Lasi-ssa on vett-ä (*vesi)*
 glass-INESS be:3SG water-PRTV (water:NOM)
 'There is some water in the glass'
- (12) *Lume-en jäi-tä tasaise-t jälje-t*
 snow-ILLAT be_left-PST:3SG uniform-PL:NOM track-PL:NOM
 'Uniform tracks were left behind in the snow'

The subject of the existential clause in Estonian has more subject-like features than the Finnish one. The subject of the Finnish existential sentence is more object-like and therefore tends to belong to the VP. The Finnish existential sentence type is more differentiated from the unmarked basic clause than the Estonian existential sentence.

During the period 1995–2000, one could observe a relative increase in the number of nominative subjects in the Estonian existential sentences. The subject nouns studied included some frequent mass nouns, such as *liiv* 'sand', *tolm* 'dust' (13), *lõhn* 'smell', the plural form *inimesed* 'people' (14), (15); we also studied the verb *leiduma* 'occur' (15), which typically occurs with a partitive subject. In examples (13)–(15), the subjects *tolm* 'dust', *inimesed* 'people', *sellised inimesed* 'such people' are in the nominative.

- (13) ... *paljudele töödele on aja jooksul ladestunud tol m.* (2000)
 '... on many pieces of art there has descended dust.'
- (14) *Nüüd on kõik jälle nullis, sest ministriumis on uued inimesed.* (2000)
 'Now it's back to square one because there are new people at the Ministry.'
- (15) *Jalgpallikauges USAs leidusid sellised inimesed.* (2005)
 'In the USA, where soccer is not popular, there were such people.'

2.2. Possessive clauses

In possessive clauses the possessor-NP is represented as a topical complement in the adessive case, the possessee is encoded as the subject and the verb *olema* 'to be' serves as the verbal item of the construction (*Location Schema* according to Heine 1997):³

- (16) *Jaani-l ol-i-d hea-d sõbra-d*
 Jaan-ADESS be-PST-3PL good-PL:NOM friend-PL:NOM
 'Jaan had good friends'

The possessor-complement has in addition to the clause-initial position some behavioural properties of the subject, for example, antecedent control over the reflexive pronouns (17).

- (17) *Mu-l on oma venna-ga ühine maja*
 I-ADESS be:3SG POSS:PRN brother-COM common:NOM house:NOM
 'I share a house with my brother'

The possessee-NP has accordingly fewer properties of a prototypical subject. Similarly to the existential sentence, the subject of a possessive clause can stand in the partitive, whereas it is obligatory in the case of negation (18). However, while the use of the partitive in existential clauses is far from obligatory in the case of a non-count subject (10), in possessive clauses it is obligatory (19) (but not in the case of a plural noun, cf. (16), (20)).

- (18) *Mu-l ei ole vendad*
 I-ADESS NEG be brother:PRTV
 'I don't have a brother'
- (19) *Mu-l ol-i head veini*
 I-ADESS be-PST:3SG good-PRTV wine:PRTV
 'I had some good wine'
- (20) *Jaani-l ol-i häd-i-d sõpru*
 Jaan-ADESS be-PST:3SG good-PL-PRTV friend:PL:PRTV
 'Jaan had some good friends'

The Estonian NP expressing possessee, however, has again more subject properties than the corresponding constituent of the Finnish possessive clause. In Finnish it does not usually trigger verbal agreement (ISK 852—853, 1227), which is the case in Estonian, cf. (21) and (16). Second, if the NP is a personal pronoun, in Finnish this kind of a subject takes the case of the object, that is, the *t*-ending accusative (ISK 853), e.g. (22). Estonian does not have this possibility, however.

- (21) *Vaari-lla on (*ova-t) teko hampaa-t*
 grandpa-ADESS be:3SG be-3PL false_tooth-PL:NOM
 'Grandpa has false teeth'
- (22) *Onneksi minu-lla on sinu-t, äiti sano-i*
 fortunately I-ADESS be:3SG thou-ACC mother say-PST
 'Fortunately, I have you — the mother said'

³ See e.g. Oinas 1993. While in Estonian and Finnish the possessive construction is based on the locative schema, other structures can be found in other Finno-Ugric languages, see Inaba 1998; Haspelmath, Dryer, Gil, Comrie 2005 : 476—477.

The subject (possessee-NP) of the Estonian clauses with a possessive meaning is farther from the prototypical subject than the subject of the existential sentence, but it is more subject-like than the subject of the Finnish possessive clause.

Occasionally, possessive constructions can be formed according to the model of unmarked basic clauses, that is, encoding the possessor as the subject and using a special transitive *HAVE*-verb, as in SAE (cf. Dahl 1990; Haspelmath 1998). Estonian has even two verbs of possession: *omama* and *evima* (23), which have the same meaning in contemporary Estonian.

- (23) *Jaan oma-b / evi-b hea-d maine-t*
 Jaan have-3SG good-PRTV reputation-PRTV
 'Jaan has a good reputation'

The transitive possessives were introduced into Estonian in the course of developing Estonian during the first decades of the 20th century. The existence of two verbs can be explained by the fact that once the verb *omama* had in addition to the meaning 'own' also the meaning 'acquire', then in 1918 the language reformer Johannes Aavik introduced the unambiguous artificial *evima* 'have' as a replacement (see Aavik 1924 : 167). The construction appeared in media language in the 1930s; it then disappeared and reappeared again in the 1990s (Heinberk 2003). According to the data of the media language, the sphere of use of the transitive construction is expanding from abstract notions (24) to properties (25), documents (26), inanimate objects (27), and occasionally to animate objects (28). Also the verb *evima* is spreading along with *omama*; the meanings 'have' and 'own' have merged in both verbs.

- (24) *"Teil pole absoluutselt mingit põhjust kõrvale hoida või arvata, et te ei evi oma d u s i, m i d a l ä h e b v a j a e t t e v õ t t e j u h - t i m i s e k s," andis ta nõu naissoost pärijatele.* (2000)
 'You have absolutely no reason whatsoever to stay away from it or to assume that you don't have the properties that are needed to manage a company', he advised female enquirers.'
- (25) *Vodafone omab jälle 20 protsenti Cegeteli tütarfirmast SFR.* (2000)
 'Vodafone again owns 20 percent of SFR, a subsidiary of Cegetel.'
- (26) *Et lahendada nende inimeste probleem, kes ei ole ühegi riigi kodanikud ja seetõttu ei oma reisi dokumendi, esitasime valitsusele välismaalase passi määruse muutmise eelnõu, mida valitsus ei ole siiski veel kinnitanud.* (1995)
 'In order to solve the problem of those people who are not citizens of any country and for this reason have no travel document, we submitted to the government the draft of changing the decree concerning the alien's passport, which, however, has not been approved by the government as yet.'
- (27) *Leetma omab ja majandab virtuaalset jalgpalliklubi virtuaalses jalgpallikeskkonnas Hattrick.* (2005)
 'Leetma owns and manages a virtual soccer club in the virtual soccer environment Hattrick.'

- (28) *Kuigi Venemaa president Vladimir Putin hankis äsja oma vastuseisule USA raketikaitsekiilbile heakskiidu Hiinast ja omab ka Euroopa Liidu liikmete näol mõttekassalaasi, ähvardab raketikaitseüsteemi arutelu siiski jääda Kolmanda Maaailma probleemide jalgu.* (2000)
 'Although Russia's president Vladimir Putin obtained China's approval to his opposition to the US anti-missile shield and has followers among the members of the European Union, the discussion of the anti-missile shield is likely to get in the way when it comes to third-world problems.'

While in edited newspaper language the use of the foreign transitive possessive construction shows moderate growth, then *Google* shows its real massive spread in many registers (29), (30). The search word *omab* 'has' gave 275,000 references to Estonian web pages on 27/10/2005; however, on 7/10/2006 the number of hits amounted to 771,000; the figures for *evib* were 397 and 1,000, respectively. In many cases they can be direct translations from English. (Similarly, Jean-Baptiste Coyos (2006) has pointed out the tendency towards *HAVE*-construction in Basque, which also belongs to the periphery of SAE.)

- (29) *Mõned haiged raske von Willebrandi haiguse vormiga (tüüp3) ei oma perekonnas teisi haigeid.* (27/10/2005)
 'Some patients with a form of the von Willebrand disease (type 3) do not have any other persons suffering from this disease in their families.'
- (30) *See paindlik multifunktsionaalne seade evib mitut paberisahtlit, dokumendi koostamise ja klammerdamise valikuid, kolme eri funktsiooniga paberipesa ja digitaalse dokumendi saatmise võimalust.* (27/10/2005)
 'This flexible multifunctional device has several paper drawers, options of making and stapling documents, a paper feeder with three different functions and a possibility to send documents.'

The *HAVE*-construction is used also in Finnish; Finnish also has two verbs: *omata* and *omistaa*. The verb *omata* has a broader use; *omistaa*, however, expresses the (legal) ownership relation, e.g. *Hän omataa laajat tiedot alalta* 'He has great erudition in this field'. *Valtio omistaa tämän tontin* 'The state owns this land'. Finnish language planners, too, have made efforts to reduce the use of the *HAVE*-construction.

2.3. Source-marking resultative clause

The source-marking (SM) resultative clause is a marginal type of the resultative clause, where not the resultant state is marked, as in the unmarked (or goal-marking, GM) resultative clause (32), but an entity that changes its state (31). (See Erelt 2005.)

- (31) *Pois-te-s-t kasva-sid mehe-d*
 boy-PL-ELAT grow-PST:3PL man-PL:NOM
 'The boys grew into men'
- (32) *Poiss kasva-s mehe-ks / suure-ks*
 boy:NOM grow-PST:3SG man-TRNSL / big-TRNSL
 'The boy grew into a man / big'

As in the case of other marked basic clauses, in SM-resultative clauses, too, the clause-initial NP has some properties of the subject, for example, it controls reflexivization (33). Post-verb NP, on the other hand, has some properties of the object. In negative sentences the NP stands in the partitive case, e.g. (34).

- (33) *P o i s i - s t k a s v a - s o m a i s a - l e v ä ä r i l i n e m e e s*
 boy-ELAT grow-PST:3SG POSS:PRN father-ALL worthy:NOM man:NOM
 'The boy grew into a man worthy of his father'
- (34) *P o i s i - s t e i k a s v a - n u d m e e s - t*
 boy-ELAT NEG grow-PPTC man-PRTV
 'The boy did not grow into a man'

However, in the case of affirmation the partitive is usually not possible. Because in the case of affirmation the post-verb NP triggers also verb agreement, the NP is still the subject. Once again Estonian is in this respect different from Finnish, where also in the case of affirmation non-mass and plural NP are mostly in the partitive (35) and where even a nominative NP does not trigger verb agreement (36).

- (35) *M e i - s t ä t u l e e t a n s s i j o - i - t a / k u u l u i s i a*
 we-ELAT come:3PL dancers-PL-PRTV / famous-PL-PRTV
 'We'll become dancers / famous'
- (36) *T y t ö - i - s t ä k a s v a a m e i - l l e h y v ä - t a p u l a i s e - t*
 girl-PL-ELAT grow:3SG we-ADESS good-PL:NOM helper-PL:NOM
 'The girls grow into our good helpers'

Unlike Estonian, in Finnish the resultative state can be expressed also by a predicate adjective (35). For this reason, in Finnish linguistics the syntactic element expressing the resultative state of an SM-resultative clause has been regarded as a predicative (ISK 860) or some kind of element standing between the predicative and the subject (e.g. Hakulinen, Karlsson 1979 : 98; Vilkuna 1996 : 158—159). In Estonian there is no reason for such a treatment (Erelt 2005).

The main type of resultative clauses in Estonian is still unmarked (GM-) resultative clause, as in (32). Here the resultative state can be expressed also by the adjective, but also in the case of nouns this clause type is more common than in Finnish.

The use of the source-marking construction in newspaper language has been jerky over the past century. We cannot find this construction in the 1890s (German-influenced literary Estonian), but it was common in the 1930s when the Estonian language was developed after the example of Finnish. It was then used mainly to denote changes in people (37); later its usage has expanded. The present usage has resulted also in inanimate objects (38), events, actions, and abstract notions (39). The previous decade reveals a tendency in the use of the resultative constructions to focus both on the goal (*Tomsonist sai direktor* lit. 'from Tomson became a director'; (40)) and the source (*Direktoriks sai Tomson* lit. 'as director became Tomson'; (41), (42)) by means of the sentence-final subject, which serves the pragmatic need of foregrounding.

- (37) *Temast sai ühe aastaga miljonär ... (1930s)*
 'He became a millionaire in a year...'

- (38) *Tohisoo pargist sai kultuurimaja direktori Vello Kanguri abiga suveaed laululava ja istepinkidega.* (1990s)
 'Tohisoo Park became a summer garden with a singing platform and benches with the assistance of Vello Kangur, manager of the cultural centre.'
- (39) *Samm, mida Stalin Teise maailmasõja lõppedes — kui Saksamaaga enam polnudki vaja midagi arutada — taas kavandama hakkas ja millest sai üks Ühendriikidega külm sõja puhkemise ajendeid.* (2000)
 'The step that Stalin began to plan at the end of the Second World War — when there was no need whatsoever to discuss anything with Germany — and which became a pretext for the Cold War with the United States.'
- (40) *Saksamaad esindavast soomlasest saab 2006. aastal tiimi põhisõitja.* (2005)
 lit. 'Out of a Finn representing Germany becomes the principal driver of the team in 2006.'
- (41) *Divisjoni direktoriks saab Jaak Anton.* (2000)
 lit. 'as director of the division becomes Jaak Anton'.
- (42) *Analüüsi aluseks saab 2006. aastal esitatav tuludeklaratsioon 2005. aasta tulude kohta.* (2005)
 'The analysis will be based on the tax return for 2005 revenue to be sent in 2006.'

2.4. Experiential clauses

Experiential basic clauses constitute a marked type of the basic clauses that realize the experiential relation not according to the possessive pattern but in a special way.⁴ There are two subtypes of experiential clauses in Estonian. In the case of some experiential verbs (e.g. *meeldima* 'like', *näima*, *paistma*, *tunduma* 'seem' etc.) the experiencer has to be encoded as the allative oblique (43). In the case of others (*huvitama* 'take an interest in', *hämmastama* 'amaze', *kurvastama* 'sadden', *üllatama* 'surprise' etc.) it can be expressed as the direct object in the partitive case (44).

- (43) *J a a n i - l e m e e l d i - v a d l a p s e - d*
 Jaan-ALL like-3PL child-NOM:PL
 'Jaan loves children'
- (44) *A n n e - t h u v i t a - b t e i e a r v a m u s*
 Anne-PRTV interest-3SG you:GEN opinion:NOM
 'Anne is interested in your opinion'

Similarly to possessive clauses, in clauses with allative experiencers the subject properties are distributed between two constituents. The clause-initial NP again controls at least reflexivization (45). Nevertheless, differently from the previous clause types the NP expressing the stimulus cannot take the partitive and always triggers verbal agreement; thus it clearly acts as the grammatical subject of the sentence.

⁴ According to Martin Haspelmath (2001 : 62), Estonian, Finnish, Livonian, Sami, Mari, and Mordvinian are languages with predominant dative/patient-like (not agent-like) experiencers.

- (45) *J a a n i - l e m e e l d i - b o l l - a o m a l a s - t e - g a k o o s*
 Jaan-ALL like-3SG be-INF POSS:PRN child-PL-COM together
 'Jaan likes to be together with his children'

In Estonian clauses with clause-initial experiencer in the partitive are much less common than in Finnish. Finnish has also experiential clauses of state without the stimulus-NP (46), which is not the case in Estonian.⁵ But for inverted word order, in Estonian indirect realization of the experiencer is not accompanied by any other structural features.

- (46) *M i n u - a h ä v e t t ä ä*
 I-PRTV shame:3SG
 'I am ashamed of myself' (lit. 'it shames me')

In addition to these specific but rather uncommon patterns, Estonian expresses the experiential relation (including modality) by means of the *Location Schema*, which is typical of possessive clauses, where topical experiencer is expressed by the adessive case, cf. (47)–(49).

- (47) *M u - l o n h ä b i / p i i n l i k*
 I-ADESS be:3SG shame:NOM / embarrassing:NOM
 'I am ashamed / I feel embarrassed'
- (48) *M u - l o n v a j a t ö ö t a - d a*
 I-ADESS be:3SG need work-INF
 'I need to do some work'
- (49) *M u - l õ n n e s t u - s t ö ö t a - d a*
 I-ADESS succeed-PST:3SG work-INF
 'I succeeded in doing some work'

The corresponding Finnish pattern is the one with a genitive experiencer argument, which sometimes actually alternates with an adessive argument, that is with the possessive clause type, as in (50) (ISK 862; Jaakola 2003).

- (50) *M i n u - n ~ m i n u - l l a o n i k ä v ä h ä n - t ä*
 I-GEN ~ I-ADESS be:3SG sorry:NOM he-PRTV
 'I feel sorry for him'

A number of experiential verbs take a nominative experiencer (51), that is, the unmarked clause pattern, typical of SAE (cf. Haspelmath 1998; 2001). For example, the verb *rõõmustama* 'rejoice' takes both patterns (52), (53).

- (51) *M a a r m a s t a - n s i n - d*
 I:NOM love-1SG you-PRTV
 'I love you'
- (52) *A n n e r õ õ m u s t a - s v õ i d u ü l e*
 Anne:NOM rejoice-PST victory:GEN over
 'Anne rejoiced over the victory'
- (53) *V õ i t r õ õ m u s t a - s A n n e - t*
 victory:NOM rejoice-PST Anne-PRTV
 'The victory made Anne happy'

⁵ A possible exception could be such sentences with support verb constructions as *Mind ajab kogu aeg naerma* 'It makes me laugh all the time'.

The sphere of use and/or relative frequency of the sentences with nominative experiencer increased during the period under study (comparison of the use of clauses with verbs *meeldima* 'like' — *armastama* 'love' in the meaning 'like' (54); *vaja olema* (experiencer in allative or adessive) — *vajama* (experiencer in nominative) 'need' (56); *rõõmustama* 'rejoice', *õnnestuma* 'succeed' (55), *ebaõnnestuma* 'fail' with both patterns).

- (54) *Inimesed armastavad seal istumas käia.* (2000)
'People like to hang around there.'
- (55) *Selles Jakoblev ei õnnestu n u d, kuid me hindame kõrgelt tema toonaseid jõupingutusi ning hilisemaid toetusavaldusi Eestile, Lätile ja Leedule.* (2005)
'Yakovlev did not succeed in it, but we highly appreciate his efforts then and his later manifestations of support to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.'
- (56) *Me vajame teineteist.* (2000)
'We need each other.'

In the case of the verb *õnnestuma* 'succeed', but especially in the case of *ebaõnnestuma* 'fail', one can notice only a few cases of the nominative experiencer as the predicate (55). However, there are many more forms and derivatives that must have developed from the pattern with the nominative experiencer, e.g. impersonal (57), active participle (58), agent noun (59). They denote success/unsuccess in sports and other competitions, in one's professional career, and in one's private life. The pattern with the nominative experiencer predominates in Finnish; a probable channel of its spread is the sports casts of Finnish TV.

- (57) *Kohati uute lavastustega õnnestuti, möödunud teisipäeval esietendus.* (2000)
'At times the new productions were a success (lit. 'one succeeded with the new productions'), last Tuesday there was a premiere.'
- (58) *Pikka aega ebaõnnestunud rammumees suutis Moskva valikturniiril taltsutada perutama kippuvaid närve.* (2000)
'The strongman who had not been successful for a long time (lit. 'the for a long time failed strongman') was able to restrain his frayed nerves.'
- (59) *Kiiruisutamise 500 m starti asus ka igavene ebaõnnestuja ameeriklane Dan Jansen.* (2000)
'The perennial failure American Dan Jansen lined up at the 500m start in speed skating.'

The prominence of the nominative experiencer could be regarded as part of a general shift from a non-subject experiencer to a subject experiencer (Haspelmath 2001 : 75, 78).

Conclusions

Estonian, similarly to Finnish, has marked existential, possessive, experiential and resultative clause types. In Estonian, the marked clauses are more subject-centred, and their subjects have more features of typical

subjects than in Finnish. The marked clauses in Estonian are less differentiated from the unmarked clauses. The clause types and their syntactic properties differ less from SAE in Estonian than in Finnish.

Estonian has also unmarked clauses with possessive, resultative, and experiential meanings and their use is expanding. The general language-internal shifts and models of contact languages, also the need to highlight one or another participant in the text, may influence the choice between the alternative structures. The studied shifts make the usage tendencies of Estonian closer to SAE languages.

Abbreviations and symbols

EKG II — M. Erelt, R. Kasik, H. Metslang, H. Rajandi, K. Ross, H. Saari, K. Tael, S. Vare, *Eesti keele grammatika II. Süntaks*. Lisa: kiri, Tallinn 1993; **ISK** — A. Hakulinen, M. Vilkuna, R. Korhonen, V. Koivisto, T. R. Heinonen, I. Alho, *Iso suomen kielioppi*, Helsinki 2004.

ADESS — adessive; **ALL** — allative; **COM** — comitative; **ELAT** — elative; **GEN** — genitive; **INESS** — inessive; **INF** — infinitive; **NEG** — negation; **NOM** — nominative; **PL** — plural; **POSS** — possessive; **PPTC** — past participle; **PRN** — pronoun; **PRS** — present; **PRTV** — partitive; **PST** — past; **TRNSL** — translative.

1PL — 1st person in plural; **1SG** — 1st person in singular; **2PL** — 2nd person in plural; **2SG** — 2nd person in plural; **3PL** — 3rd person in plural; **3SG** — 3rd person in singular.

REFERENCES

- Aavik, J. 1924, *Keeleuuenduse äärmised võimalused*, Tartu.
- Coyos, J.-B. 2006, *Dynamique de la transitivité en basque souletin: économie interne, contacts de langues et / ou nouvelle conception de l'agent?* (Paper presented at the Colloque International Connaissance bilingue et traduction — un défi pour l'identité culturelle de l'Europe. Paris, 30–31 mars 2006).
- Dahl, Ö. 1990, *Standard Average European as an Exotic Language. — Toward a Typology of European Languages*, Berlin, 3–8.
- Erelt, M. 1978, *Märkmeid partsiaalsubjekti kohta eesti keeles. — Keel ja struktuur* 10, Tartu, 3–9.
- 2004, *Lauseliigendusprobleeme eesti grammatikas. — Lauseliikmeist eesti keeles*, Tartu (Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli preprintid I), 7–15.
- 2005, *Source-Marking Resultatives in Estonian. — LU XLI*, 20–29.
- Givón, T. 1997, *Grammatical Relations. Introduction. — Grammatical Relations. A Functionalist Perspective*, Amsterdam—Philadelphia, 1–84.
- Hakulinen, A., Karlsson, F. 1979, *Nykysuomen lauseoppia*, Jyväskylä (SKST 350).
- Haspelmath, M. 1998, *How Young is Standard Average European? — Linguistic Sciences* 20, 272–287.
- 2001, *Non-Canonical Marking of Core Arguments in European Languages. — Non-Canonical Marking of Subjects and Objects*, Amsterdam—Philadelphia, 55–83.
- Haspelmath, M., Dryer, M. S., Gil, D., Comrie, B. 2005, *World Atlas of Language Structures*, Oxford.
- Heinberk, I. 2003, *Atribuut- ja predikaatpossessiivkonstruktsioonid eesti kirjakeeles ühe sajandi jooksul* (Tallinn University. Unpublished Bachelor thesis).
- Heine, B. 1997, *Possession. Cognitive Sources, Forces, and Grammaticalization*, Cambridge.

- Hiieta m, K. 2003, Definiteness and Grammatical Relations in Estonian (University of Manchester. Unpublished PhD Diss).
- Inaba, N. 1998, Suomalais-ugrialaisten kielten omistusrakenteesta: typologinen ja geneettinen näkökulma. — Kieliopillistumisesta, analogiasta ja typologiasta, Helsinki (Suomi 185), 144—181.
- Jakola, M. 2003, Kokijarakenteen kontrastointia. — VIRSU. Viro ja suomi — kohdekielet kontrastissa, Joensuu (Lähivertailuja 13), 167—177.
- Metslang, H. 2006, Predikaat ajastut kogemas. — KK, 714—727.
- Nemvalts, P. 1996, Case Marking of Subject Phrases in Modern Standard Estonian, Uppsala (Studia Uralica Upsaliensia 25).
- Oinas, Z. 1993, Mõnest eesti ja soome possessiivtarindist. — KK, 537—542.
- Tiainen, O. 1997, Suomen eksistentiaalilause — päättymätön tarina. — Vir., 563—571.
- Vähämäki, B. K. 1987, On Defining Basic Sentences in Finnish. — Fennistica festiva in honorem Göran Karlsson septuagenarii, Turku (Fennistica 9), 174—188.
- Vilkuna, M. 1996, Suomen lauseopin perusteet, Helsinki (Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 90).

МАТИ ЭРЕЛТ (Тарту), ХЕЛЛЕ МЕТСЛАНГ (Таллинн—Хельсинки)

**ТИПЫ (ПРОСТОГО) ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЯ ЭСТОНСКОГО ЯЗЫКА
НА ПУТИ ОТ ФИННО-УГОРСКИХ МОДЕЛЕЙ
К МОДЕЛЯМ СРЕДНЕЕВРОПЕЙСКОГО СТАНДАРТА**

В зависимости от того, является топик подлежащим или нет, эстонские (простые) предложения делятся на немаркированные и маркированные. В немаркированном предложении (напр. *Jaan ehitab suvilat* 'Яан строит дачу') топик имеет и типичное оформление подлежащего (начальная позиция в предложении, именительный падеж, согласование глагола), и типичные синтаксические свойства подлежащего. Топик маркированного предложения менее грамматизирован, чем топик немаркированного предложения. В предложении он обычно играет роль обстоятельства (или прямого дополнения). Если в предложении есть и подлежащее, то оно не типично и нейтральная позиция его — после глагола. Основные типы маркированных предложений: экзистенциональное (напр. *Aias kasvab lilli* 'В саду растут цветы'), посессивное (напр. *Jaanil on auto* 'У Яана автомобиль'), маркирующее исходное состояние результативное предложение (напр. *Poisist kasvas mees* букв. 'Из мальчика вырос мужчина') и предложение с экспериенцером (напр. *Talle meeldib muusika* 'Ему нравится музыка'). Однако по своим синтаксическим свойствам эстонские маркированные предложения не отличаются от немаркированных настолько явно, как соответствующие предложения финского языка. В этом плане эстонский язык ближе к среднеевропейскому стандарту, чем финский. Отношения посессивности, результативности, психического состояния и восприятия передаются и с помощью предложений немаркированного типа (напр. *Jaan otab head mainet* 'Яан имеет хорошую репутацию', *Pois kasvas meheks* букв. 'Мальчик вырос мужчиной', *Ta armastab muusikat* 'Он любит музыку'). Процессы, происходившие в эстонском языке в последние десятилетия, свидетельствуют о том, что в своем развитии эстонский язык постепенно сближается со среднеевропейским языковым стандартом. Причинами этого служат, вероятно, как внутриязыковые тенденции, так и влияние других языков.