

MATI EREL'T (Tartu)

EVIDENTIALITY IN ESTONIAN AND SOME OTHER LANGUAGES. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Estonian belongs to those languages, where evidentiality, that is, reference to the source of information is expressed morphologically (Standard Estonian, present: *ma / sa / ta / me / te / nad l u g e v a t* 'I / you / he / we / you / they are said to read'; past: *ma / sa / ta / me / te / nad (o l e v a t) l u g e n u d*) 'I / you / he / we / you / they are said to have read'. In Estonian linguistics the morphological paradigm of evidentiality has been called the oblique mood (*modus obliquus*). However, because we are dealing with reported evidentiality, more recent grammars use the term 'quotative' (EKG 1993; 1995). The same phenomenon occurs in Livonian, for example, *ta l u' g g i j i* 'he is said to read', and in the Baltic languages, for example, Standard Latvian: *viņš l ā s o t* 'he is said to read'; Standard Lithuanian: *Jis daug d i r b a s* 'He is said to work a lot'. In addition to those Standard Estonian forms that are treated as a mood, Common Estonian, especially the Estonian dialects, knows some other possibilities to express evidentiality in declarative sentences, both morphological and periphrastic. One of the peculiarities of Estonian is that in addition to the quotative, the third person imperative forms, which have become generalized into all the persons, have also evidential implications (Standard Estonian, present: *ma / sa / ta / me / te / nad l u g e g u* 'I / you / he / we / you / they should read'). Estonian linguists have regarded this paradigm as an independent mood as well — the jussive, which differs from the imperative. However, the essence of this mood has remained unclear. A mood that is similar to the Estonian jussive can be found in Livonian as well, for example, (*laz*) *ma l u' g g õ g* 'I should read'.

The evidentiality systems of Estonian, as well as Livonian and the Baltic languages, were discussed at the seminar "Indirect Mode of Reporting — a Specific Feature of the Baltic Areal?" held at Pühajärve in South Estonia on November 16, 2001. The seminar was organized in the framework of the conference "Language Contacts of Small Languages" (November 15–17). Efforts were made to find typological parallels in more distant languages as well. Petar Kehayov compared the Estonian evidential with that of Bulgarian, and Ago Künnap provided an overview of a symposium on

evidentiality held at the University of La Trobe (Melbourne). The present issue publishes four presentations made at Pühajärve and the presentation about the Enets evidential by Ago Künnap at the University of La Trobe. The other presentations made at Pühajärve will be published in the conference proceedings "Väikeste keelte kontaktid" (Võru 2002; in press).

Both in Estonian and the Baltic languages the oblique moods developed from the participles. In Standard Estonian the present form of indirect mood is marked by *-vat* (historically the partitive form of the present participle). The standard language adopted it from South Estonian dialects. At the same time the Võru dialect uses as a quotative marker in addition to the partitive form of the present participle also the *v*-final nominative of the present participle, for example, *ta ei t u n d õ v tedä ärq* 'he is said not to recognize him'. At present efforts are being made to establish this older but now rare form in the Võru literary language. Sulev Iva showed in his report "Expression of Indirectness in the Võru Language" (to be published in the conference proceedings) that in certain word types the language tries to keep the *v*-marked oblique mood also formally separated from the present participle. Namely, in verbal monosyllabic stems that end in consonants the present participle ends in *-va/-vã*, for example, *võtvã*; the oblique form, however, still ends in *-v*, for example, *võttõv*. The oblique mood was distinguished from the present participle also in those verbal stems that end in a long vowel or a diphthong, where the oblique marker was formed from two present markers that where connected with a schwa: *-bev/-bõv*, for example, *pernasõ tiitär k u d a b õ v kangast* 'the landlady's daughter is said to be weaving a fabric' (see also Kask 1984 : 251–270; Keem 1997 : 49).

One of the peculiarities of Estonian in comparison with the other circum-Baltic languages is that in North and Central Estonian the infinitives are used as evidential markers. In North Estonian the *da*-infinitive, which is to a certain extent used in common Estonian, is the main evidential form, for example, *Ta o l l a haige* 'He is reported to be ill'. In the Central Estonian the present evidential is expressed by means of the *ma*-infinitive, for example, *Ta e l a m a hästi* 'He is said to live well'. However, in both areas one can come across other evidential forms. The report "About the Reportive Mode in the Western Estonian Dialects" by Ellen Niit (to be published in the conference proceedings) focused on these forms in western dialects. The report showed that in the western dialect the *da*-infinitive marker has become regrammaticalized to such an extent that it is attached to the impersonal stem as well, for example, Muhu: *joanibe t u l d a d e meitele külase* 'it is said that we are going to have quests on midsummer day'.

In addition to the oblique forms that are clearly based on the participle and the infinitive, the northwestern part of the Tartu dialect (Rannu, Nõo, Puhja) reveals the *na*-marked form, for example, Rannu: *karu o l n a serände luum, et ...* 'the bear is reported to be such an animal that ...', and in Saaremaa one can find the *na/-ne*-marked oblique forms, for example, *Juhan k i i t n a, et ta noor obu j o o s n a tükkis nobemini kut Sandri oma; Ta p i d a n e andama aja, milla ta näitama akab* 'Juhan is reported to brag that his young horse can run much faster than Sander's horse; He should provide a time when he will begin to show it'. The origin of these forms is somewhat unclear. Because these forms have mostly a present

meaning, one may assume that they proceeded from the *ne*-marked potential. In fact, this assumption has been made concerning the insular dialect (Grünthal 1910; Kask 1984 : 279–281); in the case of the Tartu dialect, however, it has been suggested that these forms may have proceeded also from the *nud*-participle (Kask 1984 : 280). The article "Evidentiality in South Estonian" by Helle Metslang and Karl Pajusalu compares these two development paths from the point of view of the contemporary theory of grammaticalization and draws a conclusion that the hypothesis concerning the potential is somewhat better grounded.

It would have been worthwhile to discuss one of the main means of expressing (present) evidentiality in North Estonian dialects in the contemporary standard language, namely, the construction with the modal verb *pidama* 'must, have to'. In the standard language the imperfect form of the *pidama*-verb expresses reported evidentiality in the present, for example, *Ta p i d i haige o l e m a* (= *Ta o l e v a t haige*) 'He is said to be ill'. On the other hand, the present form of the *pidama*-verb has the meaning of inferred evidentiality, for example, *See p e a b k üll karu o l e m a, kes siin käinud* 'A bear must have visited this place' (cf. Erelt 2001). In the North Estonian dialects, however, the *pidama*-verb clearly implies reported evidentiality, for example, Anseküla: *Ta p e a b outu juht o l e m a* 'He is said to be a driver'.

A number of seminar reports discussed the relationship between evidentiality and commands. The article "Does Estonian Have the Jussive?" by Mati Erelt is based on his seminar report. It attempts to prove that the Estonian jussive, which developed by generalizing the third person imperative form into the other persons (*ma / sa / ta / me / te / nad l u g e g u* 'I / you / he / we / you / they should read'), is actually an optative paradigm that has only some evidential implications. Therefore, its treatment as an independent mood is justified.

This view finds indirect support in the article "Reported Commands in Lithuanian Compared to Estonian" by Birute Klaas, which provides an overview of the treatment of the possibilities to express commands that are directed at the third person in Lithuanian grammars. B. Klaas shows that although the third person forms are usually regarded as belonging to the imperative paradigm, they clearly have an optative meaning. In fact, some forms that have become archaic have developed from the old optative. On the other hand, the more recent forms have also developed from the present indicative by attaching a modal particle or a suffix that has developed from the latter. However, in Lithuanian the optative meaning has not extended to the first and the second persons, as is the case in Estonian, and unlike Estonian, it has no evidential implications. In Lithuanian evidentiality is related to only statements. A command that is directed at the speaker is expressed only by means of the complex sentence, whereas the verb in the subordinate clause stands in the conditional. This alternative is possible in Estonian as well, for example, *Ta ütles, et ma t e e k s i n = t e h k u see töö ära* 'He said that I should do this job'.

In Latvian the third person imperative form has not become generalized to the other persons either. Liena Muižniece showed in her report "Concerning the Expression of the Indirect Command in Latvian" (to be published in the conference proceedings) that in Latvian indirect commands

are now expressed by means of the particle *lai* 'let'. This particle is associated with the present indicative or the oblique mood, for example, *l a i t u s k a t o t i e s* 'you should look'. The corresponding Estonian particle *las* has no evidential meaning; the construction expresses a command that is directed at the listener, for example, *l a s m a t e e n* 'let me do it', *l a s t a t e e b* 'tell him that he should do it; allow him to do it'.

Livonian reveals an unusual situation as well. Similarly to Estonian, the third person imperative has become generalized into the first and the second persons, but almost always the particle *laz* is added to this form. We are dealing with a clear case of reported imperative: (*l a z*) *m a l u' g g õ g* — (*l a z*) *m e g l u' g g õ g õ d* 'I should read — We should read'. Livonian also shows a peculiarity in that evidentiality is expressed in the declarative sentence by an agent noun (performing various functions of the present participle), which agrees with the subject in number (e.g. *t a l u' g g i j i* — *n e l u' g g i j i d* 'he read; they read'. Erika Krautmane discussed evidentiality in Livonian in her report "Concerning the Expression of Indirectness in Livonian".

Two articles discuss languages other than the circum-Baltic languages. The article by Petar Kehayov "Typology of Grammaticalized Evidentiality in Bulgarian and Estonian" focuses on the comparison of Estonian and Bulgarian systems of evidentiality. The article shows that the systems are rather different both functionally and formally. Functionally Bulgarian seems to be closer to Lithuanian than to Estonian. For example, both in Bulgarian and in Lithuanian the evidential forms also perform the function of inferentiality and mirativity (Ambrazas 1997 : 263–265).

The article "On the Enets Evidential Suffixes" by Ago Künnap presents an evidential system where in addition to indirect evidentiality also direct auditive evidentiality is represented.

Evidentiality has been a topical problem in typological linguistics for over a decade. This was proved by Ago Künnap's account of the international symposium at the University of La Trobe (Melbourne). We hope that the Pühajärve seminar also made a contribution to the description of this phenomenon.

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 m b r a z a s, V. 1997, Lithuanian Grammar, Vilnius.
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 18), 7–25.
G r ü n t h a l, V. 1941, Itämerensuomalaisten kielten yksikön nominatiivi objektin edustajana aktiivin yhteydessä, Helsinki.
K a s k, A. 1984, Eesti murded ja kirjakeel, Tallinn (Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia Emakeele Seltsi toimetised 16).
K e e m, H. 1997, Võru keel, Tallinn.

МАТИ ЭРЕЛТ (Тарту)

**ЭВИДЕНЦИАЛЬНОСТЬ В ЭСТОНСКОМ
И НЕКОТОРЫХ ДРУГИХ ЯЗЫКАХ. ВВОДНЫЕ ЗАМЕЧАНИЯ**

16 ноября 2001 года в Пюхаярве (Эстония) в рамках конференции «Контакты малых языков» состоялся семинар на тему «Опосредованный способ передачи сообщения — особенность языков балтийского ареала?», на котором рассматривалось выражение категории эвиденциальности в эстонском, ливском, балтийских языках, а также привлекались типологические параллели из более дальних языков. В предлагаемом номере журнала опубликованы четыре прозвучавших на семинаре доклада: Мати Эрелта — о статусе юссива в эстонском языке, Хелле Метсланг и Карла Паюсалу — анализ происхождения косвенного наклонения с признаком *-na* в тартуском диалекте, Бируте Клаас — о выражении опосредованного приказа в литовском языке и Петра Кехайова — сопоставление эвиденциальных систем болгарского и эстонского языков. Кроме того, опубликована статья Аго Кюннапа, посвященная эвиденциальной системе энецкого языка. Остальные доклады, прочитанные в Пюхаярве, в которых рассматривалось выражение эвиденциальности в вырусском диалекте (Сулев Ива), в западных диалектах Эстонии (Эллен Нийт), в ливском языке (Эрика Краутмане) и в латышском языке (Лиена Муйжнице) увидят свет в сборнике конференции.