

TOOMAS HELP (Tallinn)

COMPLEMENTATION IN ESTONIAN

In Estonian complementation may result in a finite subordinate clause beginning with a complementizer. Usually, the complementizer *et* with the meaning of a complementizer only is used, cf. (1):

(1) *Onu ütles, et ta ujub*

Uncle said COMP he swims

Alternatively, in order to question the usual positive implications associated with the complement predicate, the complementizer *kas* is used, cf. (2) and (3):

(2) *Onu ei teadnud, et ta ujub*

Uncle NEG knew COMP he swims: He did swim

(3) *Onu ei teadnud, kas ta ujub*

Uncle NEG knew COMP he swims: He did or did not swim

In addition, *kas* functions as a question word, cf. (4):

(4) *Kas onu ujub?*

QW uncle swim: 'Does the uncle swim?'

Mood distinctions in Estonian verbs do not differentiate between indicative and subjunctive functions, e. g. the quotative mood may appear in matrix and complement predicates without mutual constraining, cf

(5) — (8):

(5) *Tädi ütleb, et onu ujub*

Aunt says COMP uncle swims

'The aunt says that the uncle swims'

(6) *Tädi ütlevat, et onu ujub*

Aunt says. QUOT COMP uncle swims

'According to somebody, the aunt says that the uncle swims'

(7) *Tädi ütleb, et onu ujuvat*

Aunt says COMP uncle swims. QUOT

'The aunt says that, according to somebody, the uncle swims'

(8) *Tädi ütlevat, et onu ujuvat*

Aunt says. QUOT COMP uncle swims. QUOT

'According to somebody, the aunt says that, according to somebody, the uncle swims'

In Estonian, the only grammatical feature that reported speech and indirect quotation may differ in is the option of the complementizer. In reported speech, the complementizer *et* has to be lacking, cf. (9), (10):

(9) *Tädi ütles: «Onu ujub»*

Aunt said uncle swims

(10) *Tädi küsis: «Kas onu ujub?»*

Aunt asked QW uncle swims

In indirect quotation, the complementizer *et* or *kas* must be present, cf. (11), (12):

- (11) *Tädi ütles, et onu ujub*  
Aunt said COMP uncel swims  
(12) *Tädi küsis, kas onu ujub*  
Aunt asked COMP uncle swims

In colloquial Estonian, the actual ambiguity of (10) and (12) is removed by using the additional complementizer *et* in indirect quotation, cf. (12) and (13):

- (13) *Tädi küsis, et kas onu ujub*  
Aunt asked COMP COMP uncle swims

A complementation resulting in an infinite subordinate clause beginning with a complementizer is possible with the complementizer *kas*, cf. (14):

- (14) *Onu ei teadnud, kas ujuda*  
Uncle NEG knew COMP swim. INFINITIVE  
'The uncle did not know whether to swim'

However, the complementizer *et* instead of it points to a purpose clause, cf. (15), (16):

- (15) *Onu ei teadnud, et ujuda*  
Uncle NEG knew, COMP swim. INFINITIVE  
'The uncle did not know in order to swim'

- (16) *Onu hüppas vette, et ujuda*  
Uncle jumped into water COMP swim. INFINITIVE  
'The uncle jumped into water in order to swim'

In Estonian, complementation may result in a construction containing an infinite verb used without a complementizer. A peculiarity of Estonian infinitives is the lack of prototypical infinitives (i.e. verb like entities that do not bear syntactic relations to their notional subjects) among them. Instead, the morphological structure of Estonian «infinitives» often shows an external argument that has to be attached to its closest NP higher in the sentence structure.

In Estonian, the functional parallel of the prototypical infinitive is the independent infinitive which conceptualizes a predication of its own. The independent infinitive has two versions. The agentive independent infinitive (AII) ending in *-ma* has agent as its external argument (and patient as its internal argument), cf. (17), (18); below = marks the external argument and — the internal argument relation:

- (17) *Tädi (AGENT) ujub*  
Aunt swims: tädi = UJUMA  
(18) *Isa (AGENT) kuivatab ema (PATIENT)*  
Father dries mother: isa =, ema — KUIVATAMA

The patientive independent infinitive (PII) ending in *-da*, *-ta*, or *-a* has patient as its external argument (and agent as its internal argument), cf. (19), (20):

- (19) *Tädi (AGENT) ujub*  
Aunt swims: tädi — UJUDA  
(20) *Isa (AGENT) kuivatab ema (PATIENT)*  
Father dries mother: ema =, isa — KUIVATADA

Semantically, AII implies the beginning of the predicated situation, cf. *ujuma* 'to start swimming', PII its flow or end, cf. *ujuda* 'to perform swimming'.

An infinite verb that is used without a complementizer may appear in two alternative structures. In the attributive infinite structure, the external argument of the infinite is simultaneously the low argument of the matrix. If the matrix has two arguments, then the argument with more control over the matrix verb (i.e. the more agentive argument)

is the high argument of the matrix, and the argument with less control over the matrix verb (i.e. the more patientive argument) is the low argument of the matrix, cf. the attributive infinite structures in (21)–(23):

- (21) *Onu saatis tädi ujuma*

Uncle sent aunt swim. AII

'The uncle sent the aunt to swim'

Onu (HIGH) saatis tädi (LOW); tädi = ujuma

- (22) *Onu saatis isa ema kuivatama*

Uncle sent father mother dry. AII

'The uncle sent the father to dry the mother'

Onu (HIGH) saatis isa (LOW); isa =, ema — kuivatama

- (23) *Onu saatis ema isa kuivatada*

Uncle sent mother father dry. PII

'The uncle sent the mother to be dried by the father'

Onu (HIGH) saatis ema (LOW); ema =, isa — kuivatada

The single argument of the matrix is the low argument if it exerts little control over the matrix verb (i.e. if it is patientive enough to be the low argument), cf. the attributive infinite structures in (24)–(26);

- (24) *Tädi jäi ujuma*

Aunt remained swim. AII

'The aunt remained to swim'

Tädi (LOW) jäi; tädi = ujuma

- (25) *Isa jäi ema kuivatama*

Father remained mother dry. AII

'The father remained to dry the mother'

Isa (LOW) jäi; isa =, ema — kuivatama

- 26) *Ema jäi isa kuivatada*

Father remained mother dry. PII

'The mother remained to be dried by the father'

Ema (LOW) jäi; ema =, isa — kuivatada

The single argument of the matrix is the high argument if it exerts much control over the matrix verb (i.e. if it is agentive enough to be the high argument). In this case the attributive infinite structure is lacking, cf. (27):

- (27) \**Tädi kavatses ujuma*

Aunt planned swim. AII

Tädi (HIGH) kavatses; tädi = ujuma

Similarly, the attributive infinite structure is lacking if the infinite has no external argument in its morphological structure, cf. (19) and (28), (29):

- (28) \**Tädi jäi ujuda*

Aunt remained swim. PII

Tädi (LOW) jäi; tädi — ujuda

- (29) \**Onu saatis tädi ujuda*

Uncle sent aunt swim. PII

Onu (HIGH) saatis tädi (LOW), tädi — ujuda

Because of semantic inconsistency, the attributive infinite structure is lacking if the low argument that exerts little control over the matrix verb exceeds, however, the control extent with which its meaning may be interpreted as the external argument of the infinite, cf. (23) and (30):

- (30) \**Onu keelas ema isa kuivatada*

Uncle forbade mother father dry. PII

Onu (HIGH) keelas ema (LOW); ema =, isa — kuivatada

Compare as well (26) and (31):

(31) \**Ema kiirustas isa kuivatada*

Mother hurried father dry. PII

Ema (LOW) kiirustas; ema =, isa kuivatada

In the clausal infinite structure, the external argument of the infinite verb is the subject of the infinite clause and the low argument of the matrix is coindexed with the infinite clause as its agent. Compare (32), (33), below the coindexing is marked by apostrophes after the infinite clause, [x]', and its agent, x':

(32) *Onu keelas isa ema kuivatada*

Uncle forbade father mother dry. PII

'The uncle forbade the father to dry the mother'

Onu (HIGH) keelas isa (LOW)' [ema = kuivatada]'

(33) *Isa kiirustas ema kuivatada*

Father hurried mother dry. PII

'The father hurried to dry mother'

Isa (LOW)' kiirustas [ema = kuivatada]'

If the infinite verb has no external argument, then the subject of the infinite clause is lacking, Cf. (34), (35):

(43) *Onu keelas tädi ujuda*

Uncle forbade aunt swim. PII

'The uncle forbade the aunt to swim'

Onu (HIGH) keelas tädi (LOW)' [ujuda]'

(35) *Tädi kiirustas ujuda*

Aunt hurried swim. PII

'The aunt hurried to swim'

Tädi (LOW)' kiirustas [ujuda]'

If the matrix has no low argument, then the coindexing is lacking and the agent of the infinite clause depends on the semantics of the matrix clause, cf. (36), (37):

(36) *Tädi kavatses ujuda*

Aunt planned swim. PII

'The aunt planned to swim'

Tädi (HIGH) kavatses [ujuda]

(37) *Onu soovitas ujuda*

Uncle recommended swim. PII

'The uncle recommended to swim'

Onu (HIGH) soovitas [ujuda]

In (36) the agent of the infinite clause is the high argument of the matrix, in (37)—some other entity.

The clausal infinite structure is lacking if the infinite clause contains an agent. First, there are no infinite clauses with an agent as the external argument, cf. (38), (39):

(38) \**Onu keelas isa tädi ujuma*

Uncle forbade father aunt swim. AII

Onu (HIGH) keelas isa (LOW) [tädi' = ujuma]'

(39) \**Onu kiirustas isa (ema) kuivatama*

Uncle hurried father (mother) dry. AII

Onu (LOW) kiirustas [isa' =, (ema —) kuivatama]'

Second, there are no infinite clauses with an agent as the internal argument, cf. (40), (41):

(40) \**Tädi keelas onu ema isa kuivatada*

Aunt forbade uncle mother father dry. PII

Tädi (HIGH) keelas onu (LOW) [ema =, isa' — kuivatada]'

(41) \**Onu kiirustas tädi ujuda*

Uncle hurried aunt swim. PII

Onu (LOW) kiirustas [tädi' — ujuda]'

Note that because of the constraints exemplified by (28) and (40), the formula (19) appears obligatorily in a reduced form, cf. (19'):

(19') *Tädi* (AGENT) *ujub*

Aunt swims: UJUDA (without any argument)

Because of semantic inconsistency, the clausal infinite structure is lacking if the low argument that exerts little control over the matrix verb does not reach the control extent with which its meaning may be interpreted as the agent of the infinite clause, cf. (32) and (42):

(42) \**Onu saatis isa ema kuivatada*

Uncle sent father mother dry. PII

*Onu* (HIGH) *saatis isa* (LOW)' [*ema* = *kuivatada*']

Compare as well (33) and (43):

(43) \**Isa jäi ema kuivatada*

Father remained mother dry. PII

*Isa* (LOW)' *jäi* [*ema* = *kuivatada*']

Note that in the attributive and clausal infinite structure the constraints on the control extent of the low argument of the matrix verb are opposite to each other, cf. (23), (30) for the attributive and (32),

(42) for the clausal structure:

(23) *Onu saatis ema isa kuivatada*

(30) \**Onu keelas ema isa kuivatada*

(32) *Onu keelas isa ema kuivatada*

(42) \**Onu saatis isa ema kuivatada*

However, by a matrix verb the constraints need not be mutually exclusive, cf. the attributive structure in (44) and the clausal in (45):

(44) *Isa aitas tädi onu pesta*

Father helped aunt uncle wash. PII

'The father helped the aunt to be washed by the uncle'

*Isa* (HIGH) *aitas tädi* (LOW); *tädi* =, *onu* — *pesta*

(45) *Isa aitas tädi onu pesta*

Father helped aunt uncle wash. PII

'The father helped the aunt to wash the uncle'

*Isa* (HIGH) *aitas tädi* (LOW)' [*onu* = *pesta*']

Estonian complement-taking-predicates that opt for AII or PII without a complementizer divide into (I) predicates that, while actualized in a matrix, have lexically inherited arguments only, and into (II) predicates that, while actualized in the matrix, have the low matrix argument filled by an argument of the infinitive instead, if possible (i.e. if there is no low argument in the matrix and if the infinitive has a suitable argument).

There are complement-taking-predicates that inherit lexically one low argument. While in the matrix, it is their single argument, cf. (46)—(50):

(46) *Isa jõudis ema kuivatama*

Father managed mother dry. AII

'The father managed to dry (to start drying) the mother'

*Isa* (LOW) *jõudis*; *isa* =, *ema* — *kuivatama*

(47) *Isa jõudis ema kuivatada*

Father managed mother dry. PII

'The father managed to dry (to perform drying) the mother'

*Isa* (LOW)' *jõudis* [*ema* = *kuivatada*']

(48) *Ema jõudis isa kuivatada*

Mother managed father dry. PII

'The mother managed to be dried by the father'

*Ema* (LOW) *jõudis*; *ema* =, *isa* — *kuivatada*

(49) *Tädi jõudis ujuma*

Aunt managed swim. AII

- 'The aunt managed to swim (to start swimming)'  
 Tädi (LOW) jõudis; tädi = ujuma  
 (50) *Tädi jõudis ujuda*  
 Aunt managed swim. PII  
 'The aunt managed to swim (to perform swimming)'  
 Tädi (LOW)' jõudis [ujuda]'

There are complement-taking-predicates that inherit lexically one high argument. While in the matrix, it may be accompanied by a low argument issuing from the infinitive, cf. (51) — (55):

- (51) *Onu käskis isa ema kuivatama*  
 Uncle ordered father mother dry. AII  
 'The uncle ordered the father to dry (to start drying) the mother'  
 Onu (HIGH) käskis / isa =, ema — kuivatama >  
 Onu (HIGH) käskis isa (LOW); isa =, ema — kuivatama  
 (52) *Onu käskis isa ema kuivatada*  
 Uncle ordered father mother dry. PII  
 'The uncle ordered the father to dry (to perform drying) the mother'  
 Onu (HIGH) käskis / ema =, isa — kuivatada >  
 Onu (HIGH) käskis isa (LOW)' [ema = kuivatada]'  
 (53) *Onu käskis ema isa kuivatada*  
 Uncle ordered mother father dry. PII  
 'The uncle ordered the mother to be dried by the father'  
 Onu (HIGH) käskis / ema =, isa — kuivatada >  
 Onu (HIGH) käskis ema (LOW); ema =, isa — kuivatama  
 (54) *Onu käskis tädi ujuma*  
 Uncle ordered aunt swim. AII  
 'The uncle ordered the aunt to swim (to start swimming)'  
 Onu (HIGH) käskis / tädi = ujuma >  
 Onu (HIGH) käskis tädi (LOW); tädi = ujuma  
 (55) *Onu käskis tädi ujuda*  
 Uncle ordered aunt swim. PII  
 'The uncle ordered the aunt to swim (to perform swimming)'  
 Onu (HIGH) käskis / tädi ujuda >  
 Onu (high) käskis tädi (LOW)' [ujuda]'

There are complement-taking-predicates that do not inherit any argument lexically. While in the matrix, some of them stay without any argument, some have obligatorily a low argument issuing from the infinitive if available, and some take it optionally. As for the latter, cf. (56) — (60), especially (56), (57):

- (56) *Kõlbas ema-d kuivatada*  
 was. fit mother-PL dry. PII  
 'If was fit to dry the mothers'  
 Kõlbas [emad = kuivatada]  
 (57) *Emad-d kõlbas-id (isa) kuivatada*  
 Mother-PL was. fit-PL (father) dry. PII  
 'The mothers were fit to be dried (by the father)'  
 Kõlbas / emad =, (isa —) kuivatada >  
 Emad (LOW) kõlbasid; emad =, (isa —) kuivatada  
 (58) *Isad-d kõlbas-id ema kuivatama*  
 Father-PL was. fit-PL mother dry. AII  
 'The fathers were fit to dry the mother'  
 Kõlbas / isad =, ema — kuivatama >  
 Isad (LOW) kõlbasid; isad =, ema — kuivatama  
 (59) *Kõlbas ujuda*  
 was. fit swim. PII  
 'It was fit to swim'

- Kõlbas [ujuda]  
 (61) *Tädi-d kõlbas-id ujuma*  
 aunt-PL was. fit-PL swim. ADI  
 'The aunts were fit to swim'  
 Kõlbas / tädid = ujuma >  
 Tädid (LOW) kõlbasid; tädid = ujuma

In Estonian, a border case between the functional parallel of the prototypical infinitive and participle is the dependent infinitive, which contributes to the conceptualization of a predication that is conceptualized mainly by the verb (verbal unit) of the matrix. The active dependent infinitive (ADI) ending in *-vat* has agent as its external argument (and patient as its internal argument), cf. (61), (62):

- (61) *Tädi (AGENT) ujub*  
 Aunt swims: tädi = UJUVAT  
 (62) *Isa (AGENT) kuivatab ema (PATIENT)*  
 Father dries mother: isa =, ema — KUIVATAVAT

The passive dependent infinitive (PDI) ending in *-tavat*, or *-davat* has patient as its external argument (and no internal argument the agent being deleted altogether), cf. (63), (64):

- (63) *Tädi (AGENT) ujub*  
 Aunt swims: UJUTAVAT (without any argument)  
 (64) *Isa (AGENT) kuivatab ema (PATIENT)*  
 Father dries mother: ema = KUIVATAVAT

Estonian complement-taking-predicates that opt for ADI or PDI are predicates which, while actualized in the matrix, usually have the low matrix argument filled by an argument of the infinitive in the attributive infinite structure. On the one hand, there are complement-taking-predicates that inherit lexically a high argument and draw a low argument from the infinitive, cf. (65)—(67):

- (65) *Onu nägi tädi ujuvat*  
 Uncle saw aunt swim. ADI  
 'The uncle saw the aunt swimming'  
 Onu (HIGH) nägi / tädi = ujuvat >  
 Onu (HIGH) nägi tädi (LOW); tädi = ujuvat  
 (66) *Onu nägi isa ema kuivatavat*  
 Uncle saw father mother dry. ADI  
 'The uncle saw the father drying the mother'  
 Onu (HIGH) nägi / isa =, ema — kuivatavat >  
 Onu (HIGH) nägi isa (LOW); isa =, ema — kuivatavat  
 (67) *Onu nägi ema kuivatavat*  
 Uncle saw mother dry. PDI  
 'The uncle saw the mother being dried'  
 Onu (HIGH) nägi / ema = kuivatavat >  
 Onu (HIGH) nägi ema (LOW); ema = kuivatavat

On the other hand, there are complement-taking-predicates that do not inherit any argument lexically and draw a low argument from the infinitive, cf. (68)—(70):

- (68) *Tädi-d näis-id ujuvat*  
 Aunt-PL seemed-PL swim. ADI  
 'The aunts seemed to swim'  
 Näis / tädid = ujuvat >  
 Tädid (LOW) näisid; tädid = ujuvat  
 (69) *Isa-d näis-id ema kuivatavat*  
 Father-PL seemed-PL mother dry. ADI  
 'The fathers seemed to dry the mother'  
 Näis / isad =, ema — kuivatavat >

- Isad (LOW) näisid; isad =, ema — kuivatavat  
 (70) *Ema-d näisid kuivatatavat*  
 Mother-PL seemed-PL dry. PDI  
 'The mothers seemed to be dried'  
 Näis / emad = kuivatatavat >  
 Emad (LOW) näisid; emad = kuivatatavat

However, if the predicate cannot draw a low argument from the infinitive, the clausal infinite structure is available as well, cf. (71), (72):

- (71) *Onu nägi ujutavat*  
 Uncle saw swim. PDI  
 'The uncle saw someone swimming'  
 Onu (HIGH) nägi [ujutavat]  
 (72) *Näis ujutavat*  
 Seemed swim. PDI  
 'Someone seemed to swim'  
 Näis [ujutavat]

ТООМАС ХЕЛП (Таллинн)

### КОМПЛЕМЕНТАЦИЯ В ЭСТОНСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

В эстонском языке комплементация выражается формой (I) финитного подчиненного предложения, начинающегося частицей комплементации; (II) нефинитного подчиненного предложения, начинающегося частицей комплементации; (III) нефинитного глагола, употребленного без частицы комплементации.

Для (I) характерно наличие частицы *et* и/или *kas*, для (II) — только *kas*.

В эстонском языке отсутствуют прототипные инфинитивы, т. е. глагольные единицы без синтаксической связи со своими нотативными субъектами. При (III) вместо прототипных инфинитивов употребляется либо «независимый инфинитив», либо «зависимый инфинитив», оба в двух вариантах: агентивный «независимый инфинитив» на *-ta*, пациентивный «независимый инфинитив» на *-da*, *-ta* или *-a*, активный «зависимый инфинитив» на *-vat* и пассивный «зависимый инфинитив» на *-tavat* или *-davat*.

При (III) «инфинитив» выступает либо в атрибутивной конструкции, либо в клаузуальной.

При (III) аргументы финитного предиката, от которого зависит «инфинитив», либо все имеют лексикальное происхождение, либо нижний аргумент происходит от «инфинитива». Таким образом, финитные предикаты, от которых зависит «инфинитив», делятся на предикаты с единственным нижним аргументом лексикального происхождения, предикаты с верхним аргументом лексикального происхождения, который либо является единственным аргументом, либо дополняется нижним аргументом, происходящим от «инфинитива»; и предикаты без аргументов лексикального происхождения — либо без аргументов вообще, либо с единственным аргументом, происходящим от «инфинитива».

- Onu (HIGH) nägi emad (LOW) kuivatavat.  
 The uncle saw the mothers dry.  
 (71) *Onu nägi ujutavat*  
 The uncle saw swim.  
 Onu (HIGH) nägi [ujutavat]  
 The uncle saw swim.  
 (72) *Näis ujutavat*  
 Seemed swim.  
 Näis [ujutavat]  
 Seemed swim.