

DOES ESTONIAN HAVE THE JUSSIVE?

A peculiar feature of Estonian is that the third person imperative marker has extended to all the persons, as well as the impersonal, e.g.

Ma / sa / ta / me / te / nad kirjutagu kiri 'I / you / he / we / you / they should write a letter'; *Kirjutatagu kiri* 'A letter should be written'.

It is not a recent phenomenon. Such forms can be found already in folk songs and in a 17th-century grammar by J. Hornung. These forms can also be found in the grammars by E. Ahrens and F. J. Wiedemann, e.g.

Saagu sa soossa surema, / Kännu otsa känguma 'May you die in the swamp / wither on a stump'; *Sago minna, piddago minna / sinna / temma* 'May I / you / he go' (Hornung 1693 : 76); *ehk ma jäägu ilma; ehk ma wajugu maa sisse* 'may I be left without it; may I sink into the ground' (Ahrens 1853 : 12); *sāgu ma enne aegu surema / kadugu sa nenda mā pealt kui kaste rohu pealt; ehk meie jägu ilma, teie olgu kidetud; nähku mina sind, kus ma näen* (Wiedemann (1875 : 467–468) 'may my death be premature / may you disappear from the face of earth like dew from the grass; or may we leave without it, may you be praised; may I see you where I can see'.

Karl-August Hermann found a suitable name for these forms in Estonian grammar; he called this paradigm the optative (Hermann 1884 : 99):

"Kõneviiside sekka on ka veel arvata

5. Sooviv kõneviis ehk lühedalt soovkõne (modus optativus) näitab, et midagi soovitakse, ihaldetakse, näituseks: mina palugu, sina palugu, tema palugu, meie palugu, nemad palugu."*

Actually, Mihkel Veske was the first linguist who treated the *gu-/ku*-marked mood as an independent mood and called it the optative¹. However, he thought that the optative was only used in the first person (Veske 1879 : 71, 74). Harald Põld (1923 : 64) may have discussed the optative after the example of these men. However, he did not provide any examples about the first and second persons of this mood.

* 'One should include among the moods

5. The optative mood (modus optativus), which shows that something is wished, desired, for example, I should beg, you should beg, he should beg, we should beg, they should beg.'

¹ Most early grammars used the term 'optative' for the conditional.

The 1960s witnessed a new interest in the existence and peculiarity of this paradigm. Fanny de Sivers, who lived outside Estonia, wrote about the so-called indirect imperative (1969 : 60–61). In Estonia, Mati Hint wrote the following words in his review of the grammar handbook by Johannes Valgma and Nikolai Remmel:

”Juhitagu veel tähelepanu käskiva kõneviisi kolmanda pöörde vormi omapärasele üldistumistendentsile, mida ei ole võimalik ka kirjakeeles enam pidurdada. Kolmanda isiku vorm on kindlalt kasutusel ainsuse esimese isiku (*mina*) puhul, kuid ta levib mujalegi; vrd. lauseid nagu: ”Mina *tehku* tööd ja sina muudkui passid”; ”Mina muudkui *istugu* siin päev läbi”; ”Meie *tehku* kogu see töö ja nemad vahivad pealt”; ”Meie *mingu* koju, nemad võivad peole edasi jääda”; ”Teie (sina) *tehku* tööd, nemad saavad palga”. Selle üldistatud vormiga väljendatav käsk on niisama kaudne või veel kaudsem kui kolmanda isiku puhul. Kirjakeele grammatika ei või ignoreerida sellist täiesti asendamatu väljendusvõimalust, mis lisab käskiva kõneviisi vormistikule paralleelse ja täieliku paradigma.” (Hint 1969 : 335).*

If M. Hint claims that we are dealing with a new tendency towards generalization, then he is wrong. However, that is not important. What is important is that the observation by M. Hint drew the attention of grammarians to this phenomenon. As noted, M. Hint was unable to specify the role of this paradigm in grammar. Huno Rätsep also took an interest in this phenomenon. His well-known article ”Kas kaudne kõneviis on kõneviis?” (1971) introduced a new category into the Estonian grammatical description — the category of the mode of reporting (Estonian *teatelaad*). This category expresses the relation between the speaker and the source of the message and has two members: the direct mode of reporting or directal (Estonian *direktaal*) and the mediated mode of reporting or indirectal (Estonian *indirektaal*). In the first case the speaker acts at the same time as the source of the message; in the second case the source of the message is someone else, the speaker only mediates the message. H. Rätsep claimed that the *gu-/ku*-marked imperative, which has extended to all the persons, is the imperative of the mediated mode of reporting. On the other hand, the oblique mood that had hitherto been regarded as an independent mood (*ma/sa/ta/me/te/nad kirjutavat kirja* 'I/you/he/we/you/they am/is/are said to be writing a letter' is the indicative of the mediated mode of reporting. Thus, according to H. Rätsep, Estonian has only three moods: the indicative, the imperative, and the conditional, whereas the first two occur in two modes of reporting — in the direct and the mediated mode of reporting. According to this treatment, the imperative (leaving aside the past tense and the negative) looks like this:

* 'Let me draw your attention to the peculiar agreement of the third person imperative that we will be unable to stop also in the written language. The third person form is widely used for the first person (*mina* 'I'), but it is spreading elsewhere, cf. such sentences as ”Mina *tehku* tööd ja sina muudkui passid” 'Why should I do the work and you're just idling'; ”Mina muudkui *istugu* siin päev läbi” 'Why should I be sitting here the whole day'; ”Meie *tehku* kogu see töö ja nemad vahivad pealt” 'Why should we do all the work and they're just watching'; ”Meie *mingu* koju, nemad võivad peole edasi jääda” 'Why should we go home, but they can remain at the party'; ”Teie (sina) *tehku* tööd, nemad saavad palga” 'Why should you do the work and they will be paid'. A command expressed by this generalized form is as indirect or even more indirect than in the case of the third person. A grammar of the written language should not ignore this unique possibility of expression that serves as an additional alternative and full paradigm of the imperative mood'.

direct imperative (= Estonian <i>otsene imperatiiv</i>)		
	singular	plural
personal		
1 st person	—	<i>me kirjutagem</i>
2 nd person	<i>sa kirjuta</i> 'write'	<i>te kirjutage</i>
3 rd person	<i>ta kirjutagu</i>	<i>nad kirjutagu</i>
impersonal	<i>kirjutatagu</i>	
mediated imperative (= Estonian <i>vahendatud imperatiiv</i>)		
	singular	plural
personal		
1 st person	<i>ma kirjutagu</i> 'I should write'	<i>me kirjutagu</i>
2 nd person	<i>sa kirjutagu</i>	<i>te kirjutagu</i>
3 rd person	<i>ta kirjutagu</i>	<i>nad kirjutagu</i>

H. Rätsep's theory, however, did not find its way into grammars. Tiit-Rein Viitso's article about the system of Estonian inflectional patterns (1976) mentions briefly that

"Kuigi teatamislaadi analüüs sellisena on mõeldav, pole see vastavate muuteparadigmade defineerimiseks vajalik. Teatamissituatsiooni võib soovi korral vaadelda pärast kõneviiside tuvastamist tavalise kõneviisi määratluse — kõneviisi osutab rääkija suhtumisviisi verbi abil väljendatud tegevusse — järgi." (Viitso 1976 : 158).*

T.-R. Viitso was the third linguist after M. Veske and K. A. Hermann who regarded the *gu-/ku*-marked imperative an independent mood, calling it the concessive mood (Estonian *möönev kõneviis*) or the jussive. T.-R. Viitso's laconic statement does not explain the background of his claim. It is unclear whether he regards the 'speakers mode of attitude' as the meaning of reportedness (the above quotation could be interpreted this way) or the concessive meaning (as one might conclude judging by the choice of the Estonian term). These two meanings, however, are far from identical. Be that as it may, T.-R. Viitso's system of moods was adopted.

The authors of the academic grammar of Estonian (EKG) adopted the mood system, as suggested by T.-R. Viitso, and also the names for the moods. At the same time, they clearly interpreted the mediacy of a command as a meaning that characterizes the mood and regarded concession and doubt as secondary meanings of these moods. Upon choosing this path the naming of the *gu-/ku*-marked mood as the concessive mood or the jussive was not fully justified. These terms were adopted because there were no better ones. However, the authors of the academic grammar took a somewhat broader view of mediacy than H. Rätsep, who had in mind only the difference between the speaker and the source of the message. The authors of the academic grammar treated under the mediated message also those cases where the recipient of the message is not the listener but someone else. This gave rise to the need to change the paradigm of the direct imperative. If mediacy is understood so broadly, then the third person imperative is always mediated.

* 'Although such an analysis of the mode of reporting is conceivable, it is not needed for defining the corresponding inflectional paradigms. If necessary, one can discuss the situation of reporting after the moods are established according to the usual definition of the mood — a mood refers to the speaker's mode of attitude to an action expressed by means of a verb.'

Therefore, it was omitted from the paradigm of the imperative. According to the academic grammar, in the singular the imperative has only the second person, but in the plural it has the first and the second person:

	singular	plural
1 st person	—	<i>kirjutagem</i>
2 nd person	<i>kirjuta</i>	<i>kirjutage</i>
3 rd person	—	—

In addition to the above-mentioned treatment of the imperative, Aarand Roos (1982) has also studied this topic. One should mention, however, that, being an Estonian living abroad, A. Roos was not acquainted with all the research that had been published in Estonia. This would explain the fact that he refers to M. Hint but not to H. Rätsep or T.-R. Viitso. Moreover, A. Roos neglected the papers by M. Veske and K. A. Hermann. Similarly to M. Veske, K. A. Hermann, T.-R. Viitso, and the academic grammar (EKG), A. Roos, too, regards the *gu-/ku*-marked imperative as an independent mood and calls it the optative like M. Veske and K. A. Hermann. A. Roos, however, understands the essence of the optative as indirectness of the source of the command rather than optativity (Roos 1982 : 12–13).

"Käesoleva artikli põhjal tahaksin liigituse aluseks seada lause tõelise "peremehe", predikaadis peituva mõtte algataja või inspireerija. Seega saaks definitsioon järgmise sõnastuse: Kui tegelik käskija-soovija või tegelike käskijate-soovijate hulgas on ka kõneleja, on imperatiiv otsene ja me nime-tamegi kõneviisi imperatiiviks. Kui aga käskijaks-soovijaks on keegi kolmas, on imperatiiv kaudne ja me võiksime seda nimetada kas või optatiiviks. Selle liigituse põhjal langeksid optatiivi kõik juhud, kus käsk esineb kõrval-lauses ja pea- ja kõrvallausel on eri alus, näit. "Õpetaja ütles, ta kirjutagu kirjatöö valmis.""

Actually, A. Roos treats the *gu-/ku*-marked mood in the same vein as the academic grammar. However, it is only a label because on both occasions it is the indirectness of the source of the message that serves as the distinctive feature of the corresponding mood. The treatment of the imperative by A. Roos differs from all the other treatments in that, according to A. Roos, the Estonian direct imperative has also the first person, which is expressed by the same *gu-/ku*-marker. For example, in the following sentence by Tammsaare *Armastagu ma sind vanaisa, ükskõik kui palju, teda armastan ma ikka rohkem* 'No matter how much I love you, grandpa, I love him more anyway' *armastagu ma* expresses an unfulfilled wish of the speaker. Thus, this form does not belong to the paradigm of the optative (Roos 1982 : 12). However, there is no need to supplement the imperative paradigm in such a way because the speaker may act as the source of the command

* 'On the basis of this article the classification should be based on the real "master" of the sentence, the initiator or inspirer of the thought to be found in the predicate. Thus, the definition could be worded as follows: if the actual commander-wisher is the speaker or the speaker is among the actual commanders or wishers, the imperative is direct, and we call this mood the imperative. However, if the commander or wisher is a third party, then the imperative is indirect, and we could call it the optative, if we like. According to this classification, the optative would cover all those cases where the command occurs in a subordinate clause and the main and the subordinate clause have different subjects, e.g. *Õpetaja ütles, ta kirjutagu kirjatöö valmis* 'The teacher said that he should write up his work.'

also for the other persons of the optative, for example, in curses: *Kadugu sa maa pealt!* 'May you disappear from the face of the earth'. Thus, it appears that the mediacy of the command (wish) is not the best criterion for making a distinction between the imperative and the optative.

This is how our grammarians have treated the *gu-/ku-* marked paradigm. We are faced with the problem how we should re-write Estonian grammar in the light of current research. At first sight it seems that it is not difficult to harmonize the treatment by H. Rätsep with the contemporary treatments of evidentiality. It would be tempting to place the mediacy of the source of message both in the indicative and the imperative under the category of the referential (reported) evidential (Willett 1988). We might claim that the morphological evidential, which is associated with a command and is very rare in other languages (see Aikhenvald 2000 : 63), does actually exist in Estonian. The other meanings besides mediacy could be treated as secondary.

Below, however, I would like to explain once again the treatment according to which the *gu-/ku-*marked paradigm is an independent mood and that the imperative has no third person.

About eighty years ago Karl Leetberg (1921 : 50) wrote that "Käskimine võib sündida ainult sellele, kellega räägitakse, s.o. teises tegijas, aga soovimise mõttes ka sellele, kellest räägitakse (kolmandale tegijale): *laulgu tema, laulgu nemad.*"*

This quotation clearly states that a command that is directed at a third party, that is, an addressee outside the speech situation, is not a proper command. Its implication is rather to emphasize a wish or a need that something should occur in relation to a third party. It does not mean that a third party is additionally made to do something. For example, if the speaker tells the recipient about a person who has no personal relation to the recipient that he looks ill — *Ta mingi arsti juurde* 'He had better see a doctor', then it does not mean that the recipient has to visit this person and forward the command. It only emphasizes the need to see a doctor, that is *Ta mingi arsti juurde* has the same meaning as *Ta peaks arsti juurde minema* 'He had better see a doctor'. Thus, the form under discussion has only a modal meaning, to be more precise, an optative and/or a deontic meaning but not an additional directive meaning as in the second person imperative. In many languages there is no third person form for the imperative; the modality that is associated with the third person is expressed by other means. As in Estonian the modal meaning has extended from the situation-external person to the participants in the speech situation, that is, to the first and the second persons, we need not regard such a form of the third person as an imperative. We can accept the existence of an independent mood as we have actually done in our grammar.² We can explain

* 'Giving orders concerns only the person that one is talking, that is, another person, but in the sense of wishing also the person under discussion (a third party): *laulgu tema, laulgu nemad* 'he should sing, they should sing.'

² M. Veske may have proceeded from the same considerations when he separated the third person imperative from the imperative and regarded it as an independent mood. However, we cannot guess a possible reason why K. A. Hermann treated the *gu-/ku-* forms as optative forms but retained them also as third person imperative forms.

the existence of this mood only by the presence of a modal meaning because the modal meaning may, in fact, be the only meaning of the *gu-/ku-* paradigm. The optative meaning occurs, for example, in curses of the type *Va-jugu ma maa sisse!* 'May I rather sink in the ground', which constitute the basic examples of the *gu-/ku-* paradigm but fit in with the contemporary standard language as well. Deontic necessity is expressed, for example, in the following sentence by Arvo Mägi, borrowed from a paper by F. de Sivers (1969 : 60): *Jääd siga auku kinni, sina lased jalga. Mina muudkui istugu ja oodaku hommikut nagu tuhkur puuris* 'A pig gets stuck in a pit, you make off. Why should I be sitting and waiting for the morning like a polecat in a cage'. As for the name of this, then we can keep on calling it the jussive. This term is more or less suitable for our purposes, and one can find it in the grammar of some other languages. We could alternatively call it the optative, like M. Veske and K. A. Hermann and later A. Roos, but perhaps not the concessive mood because concession (*Olgu (pealegi)!* 'That's all right', *Olgu, mis on!* 'Be that as it may', *Tulgu, kes tahes!* 'Anyone is welcome') is not the main meaning of this mood. However, deontic meaning is often accompanied by a reference to an indirect source of the message, that is, to evidential meaning. It is not impossible that the evidential meaning may have developed from the deontic meaning. Even in Estonian, for example, the modal verb *pidama* 'must' has given rise to a semi-auxiliary that expresses indirect evidentiality, e.g. *Ta pidi homme siia tulema* 'He is supposed to come here tomorrow' (Erelt 2001). Evidentiality may proceed from the modal meaning not only in statements but also in commands because someone's specific wish serves as one of the main sources of deontic modality. One can see it explicitly in the use of the jussive in indirect speech, e.g. *Juku ütles, et ma olgu vaik = et ma pean vaik olema* 'Juku told me that I should keep quiet'.

One might claim that the distinctive feature of the Estonian jussive is modality rather than evidentiality. We cannot speak here about morphological evidentiality but about an additional modal meaning, an evidential strategy (Aikhenvald 2000). One should emphasize once again that evidentiality as manifested in the *gu-/ku-* paradigm has nothing to do with the indirectness of the recipient, as the academic grammar erroneously claims; it is only the indirectness of the source of the message. This erroneous view later served as a basis for attempts to show that the past participle in sentences of the type *Tulnud õhtul õigel ajal koju!* 'You shouldn't have come home at a proper time at night' is a past jussive form if it refers to the third person and a past imperative form if it refers to the second person (Muižniece, Metslang, Pajusalu 1999 : 147–148). In previous treatments this form was regarded as a past imperative for all the persons (Saareste 1952 : 37; de Sivers 1969 : 76–77; Mägiste 1976). I think that semantically in all persons, as well as in the impersonal (*Tuldud õhtul õigel ajal koju* 'One should have come home at a proper time at night'), it is the simple past of the jussive or the optative. This form does not express a command but rather a wish, whereas it implies an evidential result (someone's information leads to a conclusion that some action should have been performed in the past). The compound form of the type *olgu tehtud* 'get it done' could be regarded as a perfect form of the jussive or the optative. Actually, it expresses the future in the past (an action reaching a deadline in the future),

e.g. *Olgu see töö homseks tehtud* 'See to it that this job will be finished by tomorrow'. The imperative, however, has no past forms.

By way of conclusion, I will present the imperative and jussive paradigms (in the affirmative) in the way they should look like on the basis of the above treatment.

	imperative		jussive	
personal				
present	—	<i>kirjutagem</i>	<i>ma kirjutagu</i>	<i>me kirjutagu</i>
	<i>sa kirjuta</i>	<i>te kirjutage</i>	<i>sa kirjutagu</i>	<i>te kirjutagu</i>
	—	—	<i>ta kirjutagu</i>	<i>nad kirjutagu</i>
preterite	—	—	—	—
			<i>sa kirjutanud</i>	<i>te kirjutanud</i>
			<i>ta kirjutanud</i>	<i>nad kirjutanud</i>
perfect	—	—	<i>ma olgu kirjutanud</i>	<i>me olgu kirjutanud</i>
			<i>sa olgu kirjutanud</i>	<i>te olgu kirjutanud</i>
			<i>ta olgu kirjutanud</i>	<i>nad olgu kirjutanud</i>
impersonal				
present	—	—	<i>kirjutatagu</i>	
perfect	—	—	<i>olgu kirjutatud</i>	

Abbreviations

EKG — M. Erelt, R. Kasik, H. Metslang, H. Rajandi, K. Ross, H. Saari, K. Tael, S. Vare, Eesti keele grammatika I. Morfoloogia. Sõnamoodustus; II. Süntaks. Lisa: Kiri, Tallinn 1995; 1993.

REFERENCES

- A h r e n s, E. 1853, Grammatik der Ehstnischen Sprache Revalschen Dialektes, Reval.
- A i k h e n v a l d, A. Y. 2000, Evidentials. Melbourne.
- d e S i v e r s, F. 1969, Analyse grammaticale de l'estonien parlé, Clermont-Ferrand.
- E r e l t, M. 2001, Some Notes on the Grammaticalization of the Verb *pidama* in Estonian. — Estonian: Typological Studies V, Tartu (Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised 19), 7–25.
- H e r m a n n, K. A. 1884, Eesti keele grammatik, Tartu.
- H i n t, M. 1969, Eesti grammatikakirjanduse põhimõttelised ja konkreetseid probleemid. — KK 1969, 327–341.
- H o r n u n g, J. 1693, Grammatica Esthonica, Riga.
- L e e t b e r g, K. 1921, Eesti keele grammatika, Tallinn.
- M u i ž n i e c e, L., M e t s l a n g, H., P a j u s a l u, K. 1999, Past Participle Finitization in Estonian and Latvian. — Estonian: Typological Studies III, Tartu (Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised 11), 128–157.
- M ä g i s t e, J. 1976, Viron imperatiivin preteriti. — Vir. 1976, 48–51.
- P ö l d, H. 1923, Eesti keeleõpetus koolidele. I jagu. Kolmas, parandatud trükk, Tallinn.
- R o o s, A. 1982, Imperatiivi *mina*-vormist ja optatiivist. — Finsk-Ugriska småskrifter 5, Lund, 3–14.
- R ä t s e p, H. 1971, Kas kaudne kõneviis on kõneviis? — Keel ja struktuur 5, Tartu, 45–69.
- S a a r e s t e, A. 1952, Kaunis emakeel I, Lund.

- V e s k e, M. 1879, *Eesti keele healte õpetus ja kirjutuse viis*, Tartus.
V i i t s o, T.-R. 1976, *Eesti muutkondade süsteemist*. — *KK* 1976, 148—162.
W i l l e t t, T. 1988, *A Cross-Linguistic Survey of the Grammaticalization of Evidentiality*. — *Studies in Language*, vol. 12, no. 1, Amsterdam, 51—97.
W i e d e m a n n, F. J. 1875, *Grammatik der Ehstnischen Sprache*, St.-Pétersbourg.

МАТИ ЭРЕЛТ (Тарту)

ЕСТЬ ЛИ В ЭСТОНСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ ЮССИВ?

Парадигма *ma / sa / ta / me / te / nad vaada-ku; vaada-ta-gu* в эстонском языке — это явление отнюдь не новейшего времени, оно встречается уже в языке народных песен и в раннем литературном языке. В более новых современных грамматиках эстонского языка данная парадигма трактуется как самостоятельное наклонение — юссив — и утверждается, что указанные формы выражают косвенность источника приказа. В статье сделана попытка показать, что рассмотрение юссива как самостоятельного наклонения и в наши дни оправдано прежде всего тем, что эвиденциальное значение, т.е. косвенный источник приказа, — это не первичное значение юссива, а одно из вторичных его значений, первичным же значением является модальное.