*BIRUTE KLAAS* (Tartu)

## REPORTED COMMANDS IN LITHUANIAN
## COMPARED TO ESTONIAN

The use of various morphosyntactic forms for the expression of the direct and indirect mode of reporting is a typological phenonemon that is characteristic of a large number of European and Asian languages. The languages of the Baltic Sea areal (Estonian, Livonian, Latvian, and most Lithuanian dialects) are characterized by an opposition between the direct and indirect mode of cognition that pervades the entire paradigm (for a more detailed discussion of the oblique mood in the Baltic Sea areal see Klaas 1997). The direct and indirect modes of reporting are also typical of the expression of commands and requests.

The article deals with the essence and morphology of reported commands in Lithuanian, their mood characteristics and tense differentiation. The overview is based on the existing views in Lithuanian linguistics; the provided examples come from the same sources.

According to an Estonian grammar (EKG II), a reported command is expressed by the jussive. The latter developed by generalizing the third person imperative form. Modal verbs expressing deontic modality perform a similar function (e.g. *tulema*: *tal tuleb see töö homseks lõpetada* 'he will have to finish this job by tomorrow') and *las*-constructions, examples (5) and (6).

A jussive command is usually directed from the speaker to a third person who does not participate in the dialogue (EKG II 37):

(1) *Ütle neile, et t u l g u nad homme ise k o h a l e* 'Tell them that they s h o u l d s h o w u p in person tomorrow'.
(2) *Jüri t e h k u see töö ära* 'Jüri s h o u l d d o this job'.

At the same time the jussive allows to express a command that proceeds from the third person. A retrospective command can be directed to all the grammatical persons while its morphological form in Estonian remains the same — the mood is marked by two allomorphs *-gu* and *-ku* (EKG II 37):

(3) *Ema ütles, et mina k a t s u g u oma raha paremini hoida* 'Mother said that I s h o u l d b e more careful with my money'.
(4) *Lapsed nõudsid: t u l g u sina neile päriselt õpetajaks* 'The children demanded that you s h o u l d b e c o m e their regular teacher'.

118

The *las*-construction (*las* + the indicative mood present / *da*-infinitive) acts similarly to the jussive by mediating mainly permissibility and non-prohibition but also less categoric obligation  (EKG II 186):

(5) *L a s  lapsed  m ü r a v a d / m ü r a d a  pealegi* 'The children  m a y  r o m p  a r o u n d  if they like'.

(6) *L a s  see jutt  j ä ä b / j ä ä d a  meie vahele* 'This talk  s h o u l d  r e m a i n  between ourselves'.

## 1. Reported command in Lithuanian

The essence of the reported command shows a number of typological similarities between Estonian and Lithuanian, but there are important differences as well. The reported future command is expressed similarly to Estonian — a wish proceeding from the speaker, that is, the first person, to someone (including the first person both in the singular and plural) so that something should happen. While the Estonian jussive is used to forward both a prospective and a retrospective command, a similar Lithuanian construction cannot convey a retrospective reported request, that is, a request proceeding from the third person, see examples (3) and (4) in Estonian. In Lithuanian a retrospective reported command can be expressed by means of the conditional mood (7), see also Paulauskienė 1994 : 319. Estonian uses a similar means of expression (8).

(7) *Jis pasiūlė, kad aš  p r a š y č i a u* (the first person of the conditional mood) *pagalbos* 'He recommended that I  s h o u l d  a s k   for help'.

(8) *Ta soovitas, et ma  p a l u k s i n* (the first person of the conditional mood) *abi* 'He recommended that I  s h o u l d  a s k   for help' (cf. *ta soovitas, et ma  p a l u g u* (jussive) *abi*).

During the past decades Lithuanian linguists have presented the forms that express direct and reported commands/requests in the same paradigm, that is, the imperative paradigm. At the same time they have emphasized the difference between the direct and indirect modes of reporting, the different morphological expression of the indicative and oblique imperative, and also the different degree of categoricalness in the different persons of the same mood, that is,  the direct and oblique imperative (e.g. Paulauskienė 1994 : 320; DLKG 308—309).

The following scheme characterizes the formation of the direct (the first and second person) and oblique imperative forms (the third person).

<div align="center">

*daryti* 'do'
</div>

| **Singular** | | | **Plural** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. — | | | 1. *dary-ki-me* | 'let us do' |
| 2. *dary-k(-i)* | 'do' | | 2. *dary-ki-te* | 'do' |
| 3. *tegul daro, tedaro* | 'he should do' | | 3. *tegul daro, tedaro* | 'they should do' |
| (*te-dara-i*) | 'he should do' | | (*te-dara-i*) | 'they should do' |
| (*te-ein-ie*) | 'he should go' | | (*te-ein-ie*) | 'they should go' |

The first and the second person of the imperative are formed from the infnitive stem (*dary-*), to which are attached  the imperative marker *-k(i)-* and the personal ending. The third person takes a number of shapes and is rather different from the other persons because it is formed from the

indicative present, to which are attached the modal particle *te-* and the ending *-ie* (or *i-*). In the oblique imperative the command or request is directed at persons or things that do not participate in the speech act.

(9) *Prikabink, Joneli, arklius prie tvoros,  t e a t s i p ū t i e,  kol mes pa- valgysim,  t e p a s t o v i e* (DLKG 309) 'Hitch, Jonas, the horses to the fence,  l e t  them  c a t c h  b r e a t h  until we eat,  l e t  them  h a v e  s o m e  r e s t'

(10) *Kas bus — t e b ū n i e* (LKM 154) 'C o m e  what  m a y'.

(11) *Na ir  t e s k e n d i e  sau*! *Kam tai rūpi*? (LKM 154) 'And  l e t  him  d r o w n! Who cares?'

The prefix *te-* developed from the particle *tegu*(*l*) 'let', and it shows, in addition to request and command, that the action has a limited scope, for example, *Jis tiek ir  t e ž i n o* 'And that's how much he  k n o w s about it'.

Constructionwise the analytic *tegu*(*l*)-constructions resemble the Estonian jussive *las*-constructions and the Russian *пусть*-constructions, where the particle and the present indicative convey a prospective reported command: Estonian *l a s  ta  t e e b,  mis tahab*; Lithuanian *t e g u l  d a r o sau kaip nori*; Russian *п у с т ь  д е л а е т  как хочет* 'l e t  him  d o as he likes'.

In Lithuanian and Russian it is possible to express the same idea in addition to the present verb also by means of the future; in Estonian, however, the *da*-infinitive sometimes replaces the present, see examples (5) and (6).

Although the forms of the reported command, that is, the third person imperative appear in the imperative paradigm, it is emphasized that they are both formally and semantically different from the rest of the imperative, which allows to regard the present together with the modal particles as an independent mood – the optative (DLKG 309).

Many Lithuanian linguists associate such still used but archaic forms as *tedarai*, *teeinie* (see the scheme above) with the historical optative and claim that the Lithuanian imperative and optative — sometimes Lithuanian grammars have also used the term permissive (see LKE 211) — developed historically from the indicative present (Zinkevičius 1981 : 131—136; Kazlauskas 1968 : 373—385). Such forms have practically disappeared from the contemporary language (*teeinie* 'he should go', *terašai* 'he should write', *tenešie* 'he should carry', *tedarai* 'he should do' etc.) but can be found in dialects and old texts. In contemporary standard Lithuanian this kind of archaic morphological expression occurs only in a few verbs, for example, *tebunie* 'he should be', *teeinie* 'he should go'.

As the forms developed from the present indicative have become archaic, their function has once again been taken over by the present indicative forms together with the modal particle *te*, *tegu*(*l*), see the scheme above and LKE 368—369: *tegu*(*l*) *neša*, *teneša* 'he should carry'; *tegu*(*l*) *saugoja*, *tesaugoja* 'he should defend'; *tegu*(*l*) *rašo*, *terašo* 'he should write'.

(12) *T e b ū n a  (te-* + third person indicative present) *ši diena kaip kriš- tolas gryna* (LKM 154) 'M a y  this day  b e  crystal bright'.

Also, the forms of the future indicative are used in the same function together with the above-mentioned modal particle (LKE 368—369): *tegu*(*l*)

*neš*, *teneš* 'he should carry'; *tegu*(*l*) *saugos*, *tesaugos* 'he should defend'; *tegu*(*l*) *rašys*, *terašys* 'he should write'.

(13) *T e g u   kerai pìrma   p r a e i s* (*tegu* + 3rd person of the future indicative), *o paskui apie šliūbą kalbėk* (LKM 155) 'L e t  the bad spell first  d i s a p p e a r, only then start to talk about the wedding'.

The optative can also occur with reflexive verbs (DLKG 309). In that case the verb similarly takes the present indicative form: *tesiprausia*, *tegu*(*l*) *prausiasi* 'he should wash himself', see also examples (14) and (19). The future indicative is also possible: *tesipraus*, *tegu*(*l*) *prausis* 'he should wash himself'.

(14) *P a s i k a r i a   t e g u l — geresnio nėr, man šitokio nereikia* (Paulauskienė 1994 : 323) 'He  m a y  h a n g  h i m s e l f  if he likes — if there is no better one, I don't want this one either'.

As noted, the optative can be expressed both synthetically and analytically. These forms express permission, suggestion, and request, so that the third person, thing, or living being, who is being discussed, should perform some action. The grammatical status of these forms has given rise to heated debates. Adelė Valeckienė is of the opinion that, as far as their modal meaning is concerned, these forms do not differ considerably from the imperative forms with the *k*-formant, which allows to regard them as belonging to the paradigm of the imperative mood (Valeckienė 1998 : 81). Aldona Paulauskienė, too, thinks that semantically the compound forms of the request particle and the indicative mood fit into the imperative paradigm (Paulauskienė 1994 : 312). For this reason, grammars have traditionally described these constructions as the third person forms of the imperative mood. At the same time the same grammars always point out that although the third person forms belong to the imperative mood, they rather express request or permissibility.

However, there is also a recent treatment, according to which all the forms expressing the reported command, both synthetic and analytic, both the ones that occur in contemporary common language and the archaisms, were united into an independent mood — the optative (LKG 62—64).

A similar classification can be seen in grammars of other languages: the third person imperative differs from all the other forms of the imperative mood, for example Russian *делай* 'do (it)' and *пусть делает* 'let him do (it)', the Lithuanian *daryk* 'do (it)' ja *tegul daro* 'let him do (it)' present a similar case.

As noted, in Lithuanian the mediated mode of reporting is used prospectively for the optative forms of the reported mode, that is, proceeding from the first person. In a certain context such a request and call for action may return by way of a circle to the first person. The frequency of occurrence of forms that proceed to the first person to the first person are very rare (Paulauskienė 1994 : 315), see also examples (15) and (16).

(15) *T e p a b u s i u* (*te-* + the first person of the future indicative) *ir aš nors valandėlę šeimininku* (Paulauskienė 1994 : 315) 'L e t  me b e  a landlord even for an hour or so'.

(16) *T e  n e b u s i u* (*te-* + the first person of the negative future indicative) *nieku, jei ne tuo, kuo noriu* (Paulauskienė 1994 : 315). 'M a y  I n o t  b e c o m e  anyone else but the one I want to become'.

## 2. Grammatical tense of the reported command: present or future

In Lithuanian reported optative constructions can be expressed either in the present or the future. Because the action expressed by the future need not be localized into the present, then the action that expresses a command or a request may take place immediately, sometime later, or in unspecified future (an analogy with the direct command and the imperative mood). The following examples illustrate the expression of the reported command by means of the present indicative. An action the occurrence of which is either desirable or called for is temporally unpsecified. It may start immediately after making the request or somewhat later. It may be a concrete command (examples (19), (21) and (23), where it is assumed that the requested action should take place immediately. At the same time the examples represent the so-called rhetorical request, where the concrete temporal realization need not be known to the speaker, (18) and (20).

(17) *Pagaliau  t e b ū n a*  (present) (*t e b u s*  (future)), *kaip tu nori* (DLKG 306) 'Eventually  m a y  it  g o  your way'.

(18) *T e g u  d a r o  sau kaip nori* (LKM 155) 'L e t  him  d o  as he likes'.

(19) *T e n e s i s l e p i a  nuo žmonių,  p a s i s a k o, ką yra sumanęs* (LKM 157) 'He  s h o u l d n't  h i d e  h i m s e l f  from people, he  s h o u l d  s a y  what he intends to do'.

(20) *T e g u  skausmu nė vienos lūpos  n e p a b ą l a* (LKM 157) 'Pain  s h o u l d n't  p a l e  anyone's lips'.

(21) *Pasakyk jam,  t e u ž e i n a  pas mane tuojau* (LKM 157) 'Tell him that he  s h o u l d  d r o p  b y  at once'.

(22) *Aš jam viską atleidau, tik — t e n e p a s t o j a  man kitą kartą kelio* (LKM 157) 'I'll forgive him everything, only he  s h o u l d n' t  s t a n d  in my way anymore'.

(23) *T e g u l  e i n a  pas Driežo Katrę* (Paulauskienė 1994 : 323) 'He  s h o u l d  g o  to Driežo Katre'.

Many famous Lithuanian language planners, for example, Jonas Jablonskis and Arnoldas Piročkinas have felt that the expression of the optative by means of the grammatical future is foreign-like, see LKM 154—155. At the same time, such future forms are widespread both in spoken and written language:

(24) *T e g u  nors kiek  p r a š v i s* (DLKG 306) 'L e t  it  b e c o m e  at least a little lighter'.

(25) *T e g u l  kartu su mano vaikais  g y v e n s, kartu  v a l g y s, iš vienų knygų  m o k y s i s* (DLKG 306) 'L e t  him  l i v e  together with my own children,  l e t  him  e a t  together with them,  l e t  him  s t u d y  from the same books'.

(26) *T e  laimę aš viena  m a t y s i u  tik sapne* (DLKG 306) 'L e t  me  s e e  happiness only in my dream'.

Reported commands expressed by the future are widespread also in Lithuanian dialects and old texts: e.g. *tebus prakeiktas* 'may he be cursed'. It is not fully clear, however, whether the future that occurs in this function in dialects or old texts, for example, *tegul padarys* 'let him do (it)' was borrowed (inspired by similar Russian constructions) or not. It could well be a typological similarity. We may wish for the action take place

now (at the moment of speaking) or in the future. Both the present and future forms are suitable for this purpose. The optative does not differentiate between the present and the future: *tedaro* means both 'he should do it now' and 'he should do it tomorrow' (Paulauskienė 1994 : 314). One could perhaps agree that the Russian influence is revealed not so much in the choice of future forms for the optative constructions as in a higher frequency of their occurrence (LKM 314).

In Lithuanian the use of the grammatical future is not the only way for future reference in the other moods either. Although in Lithuanian it is possible to express the future morphologically, this grammatical means is actually not needed. However, one could use it to emphasize a more distant future, see also Paulauskienė 1994 : 314.

In Lithuanian it is not absolutely necessary to use the imperative for conveying a command or a request. A future tense form is enough, see example (27). Both the mood and the future are often omitted, see examples (28) and (29). The unmarked mood and tense are especially common for the expression of command and request in the case of verbs of motion, see example (30).

(27) *Ar p r a u s k, ar n e p r a u s k* (the 2nd person singular of the present imperative) **/** *ar p r a u s i, ar n e p r a u s i* (the 2nd person singular of the future indicative) *varną — vis juoda* (LKM 156) 'No matter whether you w a s h a crow or n o t — it will remain black anyway'.

(28) *Rytoj e i n i ir a t n e š i* (the 2nd person of the present indicative) *man dažų* (ГЛЯ 225) 'Tomorrow you w i l l g o and b r i n g me some paint'.

(29) *Atsiminkite*: *šiandien l y d i t e* (the 2nd person plural of the present indicative) *mane į kavinę* (ГЛЯ 225) 'Remember: today you w i l l w a l k me to the café'.

(30) *V a ž i u o j a m*! (the first person plural of the present indicative) (ГЛЯ 225) 'L e t' s d r i v e!'.

## 3. Emotional and the so-called reported curse command and request

In addition to the reported command, the Estonian jussive is often used for expressing malicious pleasure (EKG I 83):

(31) *J ä n n a k u pealegi nende masinatega*, *kui ta midagi targemat teha ei mõista* 'M a y he b u s y himself with those machines if he has nothing more sensible to do'.

(32) *K ä i g u nad kuradile*! 'M a y they g o to hell!'

In Lithuanian curse phrases, one can use in addition to optative forms (33) also the present indicative without the *te*-formant or *tegul*- without the particle (34). It is interesting that in Lithuanian it is possible to convey a reported curse command in set phrases by means of a direct address to the person who has to carry out the command (35). The use of the conditional mood to express a reported command is also highly common (36).

(33) *T e g u l i m a jį galas* 'M a y death t a k e him!'

(34) *I m a* (the third person singular of the present indicative) *jį galas* (Paulauskienė 1994 : 315) 'M a y death t a k e him!'

(35) *T r e n k* (the imperative 2nd person singular) *tave perkūnas* (Paulaus-
kienė 1994 : 315) 'M a y  lightning  s t r i k e  you!'

(36) *Kad jį vilkai kur  p a č i u p t ų* (the 3rd person of the conditional
mood) (LKM 152) 'M a y  wolves  c a t c h  him!'

## Concluding remarks

The Lithuanian mediated mode of reporting for the purpose of achieving a
requested action developed historically from the old optative, which was
morphologically expressed by means of the present forms of the indicative
mood. Nowadays these archaic forms reveal a very low frequency of occur-
rence, and actually they can be used with a very small number of verbs.
The archaic morphological expression of  the optative has been replaced by
analytic and synthetic forms, which were again derived from the present
indicative by adding a modal particle or a suffix developed from the latter.
Alternatively, a verb in the grammatical future can be used alongside the
present indicative. One cannot see any important differences in the use of
the grammatical present/past in the temporal localization of the action.

Similarly to Estonian, the optative constructions of the mediated mode
of reporting have a prospective character and proceed from the first per-
son. Unlike Estonian, the Lithuanian grammatical means cannot be used
to express the retrospective direction.

### Abbreviations

**DLKG —** V.  A m b r a z a s,  K.  G a r š v a,  A.   G i r d e n i s,  E.  J a k a-
t i e n ė,  P.  K n i ū k š t a,  S.   K r i n i c k a i t ė,  V.  L a b u t i s,  A.  L a i g o-
n a i t ė,  E.  O g i n s k i e n ė,  J.  P i k č i l i n g i s,  A.  R u ž ė,  N.  S l i ž i e n ė,
K.  U l v y d a s,  V.  U r b u t i s,  A.  V a l e c k i e n ė,  E.  V a l i u l y t ė,  Da-
bartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika, Vilnius 1994; **EKG —** M.  E r e l t,  R.  K a s i k,
H.  M e t s l a n g,  H.  R a j a n d i,  K.  R o s s,  H.  S a a r i,  K.  T a e l,  S.  V a r e,
Eesti keele grammatika I. Morfoloogia. Sõnamoodustus; II. Süntaks. Lisa: Kiri, Tal-
linn 1995; 1993; **LKE —** V.  A m b r a z a s,  A.   G i r d e n i s,  K.  M o r k ū n a s,
A.  S a b a l i a u s k a s,  V.  U r b u t i s,  A.  V a l e c k i e n ė,  A.  V a n a g a s,
Lietuvių kalbos enciklopedija, Vilnius 1999; **LKG —** V.  A m b r a z a s,  Z.  D u-
m a š i ū t ė,  P.  K n i ū k š t a,  V.  L a b u t i s,  A.  R u ž ė,  N.  S l i ž i e n ė,
A.  V a l e c k i e n ė,  E.  V a l i u l y t ė,  Lietuvių kalbos gramatika II, Vilnius
1971; **LKM —** E.  J a k a i t i e n ė,  A.  L a i g o n a i t ė,  A.  P a u l a u s k i e n ė,
Lietuviu kalbos morfologija, Vilnius 1976; **ГЛЯ —** В.  А м б р а з а с,  А.  В а л е ц-
к е н е,  Е.  В а л ю л и т е,  К.  Г а р ш в а,  А.   Г и р д е н и с,  П.  К н ю к ш а,
С.  К р и н и ц к а й т е,  В.  Л а б у т и с,  А.  Л а й г о н а й т е,  Е.  О г и н с к е-
н е,  Ю.  П и к ч и л и н г и с,  А.  Р у ж е,  Н.  С л и ж е н е,  К.  У л ь в и д а с,
Грамматика литовского языка, Вильнюс 1985.

### R E F E R E N C E S

K a z l a u s k a s,  J.  1968, Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika, Vilnius.

K l a a s,  B.  1997, The Quotative Mood in the Baltic Sea Areal. — Estonian: Typo-
logical Studies II, Tartu (Tartu Ülikooli Eesti Keele Õppetooli Toimetised
8), 73—97.

P a u l a u s k i e n ė,  A.  1994,  Lietuvių kalbos morfologija. Paskaitos lituanistams,
Vilnius.

Z i n k e v i č i u s,  Z.  1981,  Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika 2, Vilnius.

V a l e c k i e n ė,  A.  1998, Funkcinė lietuvių kalbos gramatika, Vilnius.

*БИРУТЕ КЛААС* (Тарту)

## ОПОСРЕДОВАННОЕ ПРИКАЗАНИЕ В ЛИТОВСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ В СРАВНЕНИИ С ЭСТОНСКИМ ЯЗЫКОМ

Использование различных морфосинтаксических форм при передаче прямого или опосредованного способа сообщения — это типологическое явление, объединяющее многие языки Европы и Азии. Языкам прибалтийско-финского ареала (эстонскому, ливскому и латышскому, а также некоторым диалектам литовского) присуща пронизывающая всю парадигму оппозиция между прямым и опосредованным способами осознания действия. Прямой и опосредованный способы употребительны и при оформлении приказаний — пожеланий.

В статье рассматриваются суть и формы, используемое наклонение, а также временная дифференцированность приказания в литовском языке.

Опосредованный способ сообщения в литовском языке, нацеленный на достижение желаемого действия, исторически сложился на базе древнего оптатива, морфологически оформленного настоящим временем индикатива. В наше время эти архаичные формы встречаются редко и практически образуются лишь от определенных единичных глаголов. На смену архаичному морфологическому выражению оптатива пришли аналитические и синтетические формы, образованные в свою очередь от форм настоящего времени индикатива путем присоединения к ним модальной частицы или сформировавшегося из нее аффикса. Как параллельный вариант наряду с формами настоящего времени индикатива возможен и глагол, выраженный в грамматической форме будущего времени. Для временной локализации действия существенной разницы в применении грамматических форм настоящего или будущего времени не отмечается.

Как и в эстонском языке, конструкции с опосредованным способом сообщения в литовском языке направлены как перспективные и идут от 1-го лица. В отличие от эстонского языка в литовском с помощью тех же грамматических средств ретроспективную направленность передать невозможно.

125