DEVELOPMENT OF THE MODAL FUNCTION
OF THE VERB *tulema* ‘COME’ IN WRITTEN ESTONIAN*

Abstract. The central grammatical function of the verb *tulema* ‘come’ in Modern Estonian is to express the modality of obligation and necessity; a modal construction related to the verb *tulema* is one of the most essential means of expressing agent-oriented obligation. The article offers an overview how modal constructions of the verb *tulema* appeared and developed in Written Estonian in the 17th—20th centuries and presents suggestions about possible genesis of the construction.

It is possible to formulate different hypotheses about the development of the modal usage of the verb *tulema*. One possible source of analogy could be detected in the influence of neighbouring Indo-European languages; however, for development of *tulema* construction there probably were not enough examples in the contact languages. One might think that the modal *tulema-*construction could have existed considerably earlier in the spoken language than in its written version. In case we still suppose that written language reflects the development of *tulema*-construction adequately, we could consider the modal *olema*-construction as a possible example.
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The central grammatical function of the verb *tulema* in contemporary Estonian is to express modalities of obligation and necessity. The *tulema*-verb acquires a modal meaning in the construction, where the *tulema*-verb expresses obligation or necessity in the third person singular, and the modalized situation is presented as a *da*-infinitive construction.\(^1\) The sentence may also have a deontic agent as an optional member, which takes the adessive. For example,

\[(1) \text{ Mei-l tule-b töö lõpeta-da.}^2\]

\[\begin{array}{ll}
1\text{PL-ADE} & \text{come-3SG} \\
\text{job} & \text{finish-daINF}
\end{array}\]

‘We have to finish the job.’

---

* The article is based on the master’s thesis defended at the Department of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics at the University of Tartu (Penjam 2005). The author is grateful to her academic supervisor Assoc. Prof. Külli Habicht for her expert assistance.

\(^1\) According to the academic Estonian grammar (EKG 237), an infinitive construction consists of the infinitival form of a verb and the dependents of this verb. Thus, an infinitive construction can be a part of a modal construction.

\(^2\) Here and henceforth in example sentences the *tulema*-verb and the head of the subordinated infinitive construction is in bold type, and the part of the sentence denoting the
A similar modal construction based on the *tulema*-verb can be found also in other Finnic languages (Saukkonen 1965: 150—155).

The modal construction with the verb *tulema* together with the verb *pidama* 'must' with the same meaning are important means of expressing agent-oriented necessity in Estonian; in some text types it is even the most frequent means (Nurmi 1991: 735). Against this background it is somewhat unexpected that in the older survived Estonian-language texts the verb *tulema* does not occur in the modal meaning. It serves as a basis for the hypothesis that the data of Old Written Estonian could show the development of the modal use of the verb *tulema* (Habicht 2001: 273).

The article provides a survey of the appearance and development of the modal *tulema*-construction in written Estonian from the 17th to the 20th centuries, and assumptions will be made about the possible origin of the construction. The analysis is based on a 5,438-page sample of North Estonian written texts from 1600—1850; the data from the end of the 19th century and the 20th century come from the Tartu University Corpus of Estonian Literary Language (1890—2000; http://test.cl.ut.ee/korpused/baaskorpus).

1. Estonian modal *tulema*-construction in the light of construction grammar and grammaticalization theory

In contemporary linguistics the concept of construction grammar covers a number of different research trends. In this article construction grammar means only the classical trend of construction grammar, as represented by Charles Fillmore, Paul Kay, George Lakoff, and Adele Goldberg (see e.g. Goldberg 1995; Fried, Östman 2004; Östman, Fried 2005, Fillmore, Kay, O’Connor 1988; Kay, Fillmore 1997).

A. Goldberg (1995: 4) in her treatment of argument structure constructions of verbs defines the main term of construction grammar, the construction, as follows: "C is a construction iff C is a form—meaning pair <F_i, S_i> such that some aspect of F_i or some aspect of S_i is not strictly predictable from C's component parts or from other previously established constructions." Thus, in construction grammar form and function are regarded as inseparable from each other (Fried, Östman 2004: 12); the description of a grammatical construction includes at the same time information about the morphosyntactic properties, prosodic and phonetic shape, meaning, and function of the construction (Fried, Östman 2004: 19—23).

A. Goldberg (1995) described the argument structure constructions of verbs in great detail from the perspective of construction grammar. The main claim of A. Goldberg’s monograph could be worded as follows: the constructions of the principal clause types are independent correspondences of form and meaning, the semantic side of which cannot be reduced to the meanings of the words occurring in the sentence. The final interpretation of a specific sentence (construct) is formed as a combination of the meanings of the words in the sentence and the meaning of the syntactic construction (Goldberg 1995: 9—10).

The modal use of the *tulema*-verb in contemporary Estonian presumes a definite sentence pattern: (AG ade) V_3SG DA (the abbreviation AG ade denotes agent of modality is underlined. Italics mark the part of the sentence that is analysed as the object of the infinitive construction in contemporary Estonian grammar.)
an adessive agent, $V_{3SG}$ stands for a verb in the third person singular, and $DA$ is the da-infinitive), a modalized situation can be expressed only as an infinitive construction (Rätsep 1978: 35—39, 188; EKG 182). Thus, the modal meaning of the tulema-verb is first and foremost a constructional meaning; the verb can acquire a modal meaning only in a definite syntactic environment (Pajusalu, Tragel, Veismann, Vija 2004: 30—31), and it is convenient to describe the semantics of the tulema-verb in the modal construction by means of the tools and concepts of construction grammar.

Most studies in the vein of construction grammar describe language from the synchronic aspect, discussing only briefly the historical development of a language (e.g. Goldberg 1995: 132, but see also Leino 2003: 63—118). Nevertheless, at first sight one cannot see any conflicting circumstance between the language description according to construction grammar and the generally accepted understanding regularities with regard to the historical development of languages and grammaticalization. Michael Israel (1996) analysed the development of the way-construction in English, and his treatment fully supports the view that the construction develops in accordance with the previously described principles of the grammaticalization process — changes take place in the course of a long time, the conceptual content of the construction has extended gradually, the original concrete content has been replaced by more abstract content; the form of the construction has become increasingly fossilized; its frequency has increased (see e.g. Heine, Claudi, Hünnemeyer 1991; Heine, Kuteva 2002; Hopper, Traugott 1993; Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994; Diewald 1997; New Reflections on Grammaticalization 2002).

Construction grammar and grammaticalization theory can be linked also from another aspect by describing the grammaticalization of a lexicon unit as transition of the unit to such an unproductive grammatical construction where it had not occurred previously.

At first lexicon units are grammaticalized only in a certain semantically and grammatically narrowly demarcated environment. Therefore, researchers have claimed that it would more appropriate to speak about the grammaticalization of constructions rather than that of single words and forms (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 11; Hopper, Traugott 1993: 4); the grammaticalization of the construction-related word form is only a side effect of grammaticalization (Lehmann 2002: 7). The basis for creating a new construction is its similarity to previous constructions (Itkonen 2002: 418). Therefore, many cases of grammaticalization could be explained not as grammaticalization of the construction but as conventionalization of a new lexicon unit in a previously existing grammatical construction where this specific unit had not occurred previously. It is likely that also the origin of the modal tulema-construction could be analysed as integration of a new lexicon unit, the tulema-verb, with the unproductive necessive construction $<N_{ade} V_{3SG}^{1} V_{DA}^{2}>$ (the abbreviation $N_{ade}$ denotes an adessive noun, $V_{3SG}$ stands for a verb in the third person singular, and $V_{DA}$ is the da-infinitive).

2. The modal tulema-construction in Old Written Estonian

The material of the old written language revealed 4,929 occurrences of the tulema-verb; in 114 cases the verb was used modally (2.3% of all the occurrences of the tulema-verb in the old written language). In 108 cases
the *tulema*-verb was almost clearly used modally; there were six more instances where the modal meaning could be regarded primary but an alternative interpretation is possible, too. The modal construction is absent in the oldest texts; the earliest examples date from the last decade of the 17th century, e.g.

(2) Agga et sesamma [=kirikuseaduse] sees sedda üxpeine on sädut/ mis keikennamist Kirko Asja on/ ja et mitte korra perrast echk issipeine on kirjotat/ mis lutlusse Ammeti monnisuggust Asja Ajamissel *tule-p what* come-3SG

Kirko Wisi nink kombe echk monne mu issipeinse Luggu polest tähhelepan-na … (Kässi-Ramat 1699 : i—ii)

pay attention-daINF

'But that in this ecclesiastical book it is only provided what church matters are, and that it has not been written separately what one needs to pay attention to while taking care of the business of the preacher’s profession in connection with the ways and customs of the church or some other peculiar episode …'

In the next centuries the modal use is already rather common; one can find such examples in almost all the texts from the 18th and the 19th centuries. However, the number of modal constructions by comparison with the number of all the occurrences of the *tulema*-verb is still rather small, with the exception of legal acts and texts providing various kinds of practical advice. Such a finding can be regarded as expected because the need to express modal meanings is much lower in narrative texts than in non-fiction texts.

2.1. The meaning and functions of the modal *tulema*-construction in the old written language

In modally interpreted sentences the semantics and functions of the *tulema*-verb (or rather those of the related construction) are similar to contemporary language — the *tulema*-construction is used to convey necessity and obligation modality, e.g.

(3) Osta siis ennesele nisuggust riet, mis saksad nimmetawad: marliks; tee sest kotti, kellel pitkus 2 künart ja laius 1¼ künart pohjas on, seält *tulle-b ta nenda kitsoke leika-da.* come-3SG 3SG cut-daINF

et kotti su laius ei olle ennam kui ¼ künart. (Willmann 1782 : 195)

'Buy then the kind of cloth that the Germans call gauze; make a sack from it that is two ells in length and the width from the bottom is 1¼ ells; there you’ll have to cut it so narrow that the opening of the sack will not exceed ¼ ells.'

(4) *Seddasīnas-t seādus-t tulle-b ka selle tallomehhe jures täita.* this-PRT law-PRT come-3SG apply+daINF

kes kulutanud, et koggodussest tahhab wäljaminna. (Seäduste-täitmisse tükkid 1845 : 10)

'This law must be applied also to the farmer who has said that he wishes to leave the congregation.'
Usually the agent of obligation is not expressed in the sentence; modal obligation / necessity is directed at the generic person (5), or the agent becomes clear from the context (6), e.g.

(5) Kui üks kerbne arwab, et keik koggematta mailma sees on sündind, siis se tulle-b mitte pahhaks- pan-na... (Willmann 1782 : 34)

'If a fly thinks that everything has happened in the world by chance, then one should not disapprove of it...'

(6) Oli Westen äratunnud, et lugu nendega nenda, siis teadis tema kaa, mis tul-i-Ø teh-a. (Toomas Westen 1844 : 18)

'Once Westen had realized the situation they were in, then he also knew what had to be done.'

It is difficult to assess whether necessity/obligation expressed by means of the tulema-construction is of the same degree of intensity as nowadays. On the basis of only a few examples one might assume that the tulema-construction could be interpreted somewhat softer than now. In two instances the tulema-construction expressed a promise rather than an obligation, e.g.

(7) Wimaks läksid [prouad ja preilid] temmaga tantsima, siis olli kärra öige lahti, sest se tulle-b kül arwa-da

kuida temma [joobnud talupoeg] teistega on tantsind. (Willmann 1782 : 62)

'Eventually [married women and young ladies] went to dance with him; all hell broke loose then because one might imagine how he [drunken peasant] was dancing with the others.'

In one case the tulema- and pidama-constructions were used side by side, whereas one gets the impression that the pidama-construction adds intensity to the obligation:

(8) Mis tulle-b teh-h-a. ja mis pea-d tegge-ma.

kui innimesed sind ehk parremaks ehk pahhemaks peawad, kui sa ei olle? (Masing 1824 : 35)

'What one has to do and what have you to do if people regard you better or worse than you are?'

Because in contemporary Estonian the pidama- and tulema-constructions are almost synonymous, this intensifying use leads us to the idea that even in the 19th century obligation expressed by the tulema-verb was perceived more weakly than in the contemporary language.

From the perspective of the development of the modal construction such examples are of special interest where the meaning of the tulema-verb allows multiple interpretations. However, the sample had few such examples, and in all these cases the modal interpretation seems to be primary.

By comparison it is worth mentioning that in contemporary Finnish the deontic force of the tulla-construction is clearly weaker than that of the pidama-construction (Kangasniemi 1992 : 100).
In the case of one example the possibility of multiple interpretations is totally accidental. In the sentence (9) the da-infinitive construction is subordinated to the tulema-verb, and the construction is likely to carry the meaning of general necessity.

(9) senni kui Jummal neile wimaks ühte Kunningast andis nende Palwede peäle, tulle-b ühtekokko-arwa-ta liggimalt kolmsada ja come-3SG add up-daINF almost three hundred and nellikümmend Aasta-d. (Jummala surest Teggudest 1789 : 334) forty year-PRT/PL NOM

‘until eventually God gave them a king in response to their request, it has to be considered altogether almost 340 years’ / ‘it took altogether almost 340 years.’

At the same time it is possible to interpret the sentence this way that the meaning of the tulema-verb is ‘be added up’ and the da-infinitive construction acts rather in the function of the gerund, cf.

(10) aega seni, kuni Jumal neile viimaks ühe kuninga andis, tule-b ühtekokku-arwa-tes liggimalt kolmsada ja come-3SG add up-GER almost three hundred and nellikümmend Aasta-d. (Jummala surest Teggudest 1789 : 334) forty year-PRT/PL NOM

‘until eventually God gave them a king in response to their request, it took altogether almost 340 years.’

In four cases one might assume that the tulema-verb acts as a future auxiliary in the sentence although the primary interpretation would still be modal, e.g.

(11) Ja Samuel räkis Rahwa ette ueste keik Kunninga Öigust, ja mis Woimus temmal olleks, ja mis temmale keik tulle-ks-Ø anda what come-CND-3SG give+daINF ja maks-ta. (Jummala surest Teggudest 1789 : 389) and pay-daINF

‘And Samuel told the crowd once again about all the rights of the king and about what kind of power he would enjoy and what should/would be given and paid to him’.

2.2. Grammatical structure of the modal tulema-constructions in the old written language

In the necessive construction \( \text{AG}_{ADE} V_{13SG} V_{2DA} \) of contemporary Estonian the \( V_{2DA} \) role is performed by a non-finite verb form or a longer verb phrase, to which in turn the object could be subordinated. Thus, in each case \( V_2 \) is embedded in the model together with its dependents, which should not be regarded as belonging to the necessive construction itself. Because the old written language includes many examples where the part of the sentence that is regarded as the object of the infinitive construction according to the present interpretation agrees with the tulema-verb in number, it is expedient in the future analysis to consider this part of the sentence (henceforth N) as being part of the construction.
The model (AG) tulema (N) DA describes most generally the structure of the modal construction related to the tulema-verb in the old written language. Naturally, sentences may additionally have various kinds of optional members.

In five sentences of the studied material two successively coordinated da-infinitive constructions are subordinated to the tulema-verb; one sentence includes three coordinated infinitive constructions — thus, the following overview is based on 121 modal constructions including the tulema-verb.

It appears that in the studied material of the old written language the agent of modality is explicitly represented in 11 cases, that is, in almost every ten modal constructions related to the tulema-verb.\(^4\) If the agent is present in the sentence, in eight cases it is in the adessive (12) and in three cases in the allative (13), e.g.

(12) Nende tähtes sannade sees tulle-wad come-3PL mei-l keige ennamiste.

\[ \text{kaks asja tähhele-pan-na...} \quad \text{(Seitse Paasto-Jutlust 1817 : 56)} \]
\[ \text{two thing+FRT pay attention-daINF} \]
‘Of these important words we must pay most attention to two things...’

(13) Se on üks wägga tarwelinne assi, et meie kohhe ärratassume, kus meie mele middagi tuelle.

\[ \text{mis mei-le tassu-da tulle-b.} \quad \text{(Luggemisse-Ramat 1815 : 36)} \]
\[ \text{that IPL-ALL pay-daINF come-3SG} \]
‘It is a highly necessary thing that we will pay off right away when we recall something that we have to pay for.’

The present examples do not allow making conclusion about the historical change in preferred forms; it is likely that the adessive and the allative uses may have competed with each other over several centuries.

It is possible to follow the change in agreement in those constructions where N is in the plural and the tulema-verb is in the affirmative. It appears that in the 17th and the 18th centuries N always agreed with the tulema-verb in the developing necessive construction, which proves that the nominative N was still interpreted as the subject, e.g.

(14) Wämla-d tulle-wad arwata-da regard-daINF temma wasto körreks,

cudgel-PL. come-3PL regard-daINF

\[ \text{ja ta naerab odda kärrinat. (Piibli Ramat 1739 : Iob 41:21)} \]
‘Cudgels should be regarded as straws by comparison with him, and he laughs at the rattle of the spear.’

Non-agreed examples appear in the 19th century, being in minority at first and structurally restricted: in all the examples the relative pronoun mis ‘that’ performs the role of N, which is referenced to the plural noun phrase of the main clause, e.g.

---
\(^4\) The leading articles of Estonian newspapers in 1906—1907 show a similar relative frequency of the tulema-constructions with the agent; over the 20th century the ratio of constructions with the agent has somewhat increased (Nurmi 1991 : 738).
But the bigger crimes constitute a totally different matter, which, as previously, should be left to the higher court.

There are only four sentences that do not include N. Extensive agreement of the plural N is to some extent in conflict with the fact that quite often (25 examples, in addition four ambiguous examples) N is in the partitive and seems to fulfil the function of the object and not the partial subject in the perception of language users. Examples of partitive N are numerous already in the 1739 Bible, e.g.

God is fearsome in the secret council of saints, and he is more feared than anyone else surrounding him.

The existence of partitive forms, on the one hand, and the agreement of nominative forms, on the other, enables us to assume that the construction could be analysed differently depending on the form of N — the partitive as a prototypical object case suggested the interpretation of the noun phrase as the object; the nominative N, however, was still perceived as the subject and not the total object.

Of the moods the modal tulema-construction in the old written language reveals the indicative and six occurrences of the conditional, which softens the categoricalness of obligation, e.g.

As expected, the tulema-verb in necessive constructions is mostly in the present. However, some texts from the second half of the 18th century and the 19th century reveal also some past uses (six examples), e.g.

Negation of modality can take two forms: it is possible to negate the main verb (e.g. You mustn’t pay the fine) or the modal verb (e.g. You don’t have to pay the fine) (Brinton 2000 : 148).
The negation of the *pidama*-construction means the negation of the modal verb in contemporary Estonian; in the case of the *tulema*-verb one can negate both the infinitive construction that carries the content of the proposition (19) and the *tulema*-verb (20) (see 3.1 for a more detailed discussion):

(19) **Ei tule-Ø arva-ta.**

\[ \text{NEG come-3SG think-daINF} \]

nagu asuksid remondijaokonnas lendsalgad, kes iga äparduse puhul kohale tõttavad. (AJA1970\ol0016)

‘as if there were flying squads at the repairs department that will rush to the scene in the case of each problem.’

(20) "Juhul kui suudame ettevõtted piisavalt hästi ette valmistada, ei tule- Ø järgmise privatiseerimislane ning ettevõtte-i-d majandusministeeriumi bilanssi enam uuesti tagasi- võtta.”

\[ \text{NEG come-3SG enterprise-PL-PRT return+daINF} \]

lisas ta. (AJA1990\ap0342)

‘In case we can prepare the enterprises well enough, it won’t be necessary to return the enterprises to the balance of the ministry of economy during the next wave of privatization”, he added.’

Examples of negative constructions in the old written language show that the infinitive construction is in the scope of negation, e.g.

(21) **Siiski ei tulle-Ø temma wäljaspiddisse-d kannatamisse-d ühtegi arwa-ta regaard-daINF**

\[ \text{NEG come-3SG his outward-PL suffering-PL regard-daINF} \]

se pühha ja öige, piddi tundma pattustega ühhes-kous ellades. (Jutlussed 1844 : 144)

‘Nevertheless one should regard his outward sufferings as nothing in comparison with his spiritual sufferings that he had to go through while living together with the sinners.’

In one case (altogether in connection with three constructions) *tulema* occurs in a very complicated construction as a non-finite dependent of the *arvama*-verb; the *tulema*-verb acting as the head of the *vat*-construction:

(22) **Isse Assi on se/ mis Kirk-issanda-t issiernaste Asjade sees/...**

\[ \text{what church father-PL} \]

targaste arwa-wat **tulle-wa** teisi teh-a/

think-3PL come-vatINF differently do-daINF

terra- echk körwa-panna/... (Kässi-Ramat 1699 : iii—iv)

away or aside put-daINF

‘It’s a different matter what church fathers in the case of special cases ... wisely think that should be done differently or put away or aside...’

It is interesting that such a highly complicated use occurred in the 17th century, in the same text that contains the earliest examples of modal constructions of the sample.
3. Modal *tulema*-construction in the 20th-century written language

The Tartu Corpus of Literary Estonian had altogether 11,489 occurrences of the *tulema*-verb, of which 2,888 occurrences were modal (25.1% of all uses of the *tulema*-verb in the corpus). Because in some cases the *tulema*-verb was used in the same sentence as a head of a number of successively coordinated infinitive constructions, the total number of necessive constructions including the *tulema*-verb was even higher (altogether 3,313 necessive constructions). The necessive use of the *tulema*-verb is much more frequent in medial language than in fiction. Considering the content of the texts, it is understandable.

It appears that the proportion of modal examples among all the uses of the *tulema*-verb increased to a considerable degree in the first half of the 20th century and in the mid-century. While in the last decade of the 19th century the necessive uses of the *tulema*-verb in the media texts accounted only for 14.6 per cent of all the used, by the 1930s this indicator had already reached 42 per cent. In the media texts of the 1950s the proportion of the modal use of the *tulema*-verb is even 71.1 per cent (probably due to the imperative content of the media texts in the early years of Soviet occupation); in later media texts the proportion of necessive uses of the *tulema*-verb remained in the range 45—60%.

3.1. Semantics and functions of the modal *tulema*-construction in the Tartu University Corpus of Literary Estonian

In the 20th-century literary language the *tulema*-construction was used to convey participant-internal necessity (23), participant-external non-deontic necessity (24), and deontic obligation (25) e.g.

(23) ... ent oma teades mu-l just aru puudus-t reason+GEN lack-PRT
    kannata-da p-ole- tulnud, suffer-daINF NEG-come+PF+3SG
    ainult mälu, see, jah, pole tugev... (ILU1930\nov0014)
    ‘... but as far as I’m aware I haven’t suffered from lack of reason. only memory, yes, that’s not good...’

(24) Videovend ise vahel naeris, et
    tema aparaadi tule-b vedruga üles- keera-ta
    his device+PRT come-3SG wound up-daINF
    nagu grammofoni, või vääritis selle olevat lampvastuvõtja. (ILU1990\ilu0043)
    ‘The video guy used to laugh at times that his device should be wound up like a gramophone, or he claimed it to be a valve radio.’

(25) Küll aga
    tule-b tei-l küsimata püüda toota knupu,
    come-3SG 2PL-ADE try+daINF produce+daINF good+PL+PRT
    millel oleks minekut ja mis võiks sealt mõned kaubad välja lüüa. (AJA1990\ap0311)
    ‘In fact, you’ll have to try to produce without asking goods that would be successful and that could knock out some goods from there’.
The context often does not show unambiguously which kind of modality is meant, e.g.

(26) Sääärane pikk jutlus tul-i-Ø valmis- mötel-da.
such long sermon come-IMPF-3SG think up-daINF
kirja- pan-na ja pähe- öppi-da.  (ILU1980\stkt0035)
put down-daINF and learn by heart-daINF

'Such a long sermon had to be thought up, put down, and learned by heart.'

It seems that the commonest function of the necessive tulema-verb is to express participant-external necessity. Typically, the agent of obligation is not represented in the sentence; it could be inferred from the context (27) or can be a generic person (28), e.g.

(27) "Kas sa hoolitsed mu ema eest!" kisendas ta üle laua treenerile, katkus-
des peast salkudena juukseid; mis tulid liiga kergesti ära, liiga kergesti
lahkusid rumalad juuksed targast peast, võib-olla
ole-ks-Ø- tulnud süü-a vitamiine...  (ILU1990'\ilu0069)
come-CND-3SG+PRET eat-daINF vitamin+PL+PRT

'"Will you take care of my mother!", he shouted to the coach over the table, pulling his hair in tufts, which came off too easily, too easily the stupid hair left the wise head; perhaps he should have eaten vitamins…'

(28) Kui päris uhhaad tahetaks, siis
tule-b ikka kala ka pan-na.  (AJA1970\ed0040)
come-3SG fish+PRT put-daINF

'If you want to have real fish soup, then you should add some fish, too.'

In the case of the negative modal tulema-constuction it is possible to follow the semantic change in the construction. In the old written language the negative necessive constructions of the tulema-verb had an infinitive construction in the scope of negation that extended the tulema-verb; most corpus examples from the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century had the same semantics, e.g.

(29) Hobuse-i-d ei tule- Ø ööseks wälja- jätta.  (AJA1900\aja0090)
horse-PL-PRT NEG come-3SG leave outside+daINF

'Horses should not be left outside at night.'

There are also a few ambiguous sentences (30), and there are also a few sentences where the tulema-verb is in the scope of negation (31), e.g.

(30) "Korralikku saatmis-f" ei tule-Ø seeläbi mitte toeta-da.
regular+PRT dispatch-PRT NEG come-3SG support-daINF
waid meie rääkisime nim. kirjawastuses ühe kaastööliste priilehest, mille
käima-aega meie sellele pikendame, kellest näeme, et ta oma töötust ära
ei unusta.  (AJA1890\pos0710)

"'Regular dispatches" should not be supported through this, but in this reply we touched upon the free copy of a contributor, the subscription of which we will renew, of whom we can see that he will not forget his promise.'
Help should be rendered to him not only on the occasions of accidents but also during illness and unemployment and in one’s old age.

In the corpus of the 1930s most of the negated tulema-constructions can be regarded as ambiguous, e.g.

(32) Öhtu tuleb korraldata!
Sellest ei tule- Ø loobu-da!       (ILU1930\nov0016)
NEG come-3SG give up-daINF

'The evening has to be organized! You shouldn’t give it up!'

In the 1950s negation of the modal verb was already more frequent, e.g.

(33) Küsiti, kas ei saaks õpilaste arstliku järelevaatust korraldada nii, et õpilas-te-l ei tule-ks- Ø ooda-ta ambalantsides pupil-PL-ADE NEG come-CND-3SG wait-daINF
kuu järjekorras. (AJA1950\rh0234)

'It was asked whether the medical check-up of pupils could be organized so that the pupils would not have to queue long at the outpatient clinics'.

In the 1950s there are also many ambiguous sentences (34); negation of the infinitive construction is represented by a single construction (35), e.g.

(34) Colder ütles, et "abi" ei tule- Ø anda,
aid+PRT NEG come-3SG give+daINF
kui abi taotlev maa ei loobu "natsionaliseerimise edasisest program-
mist... (AJA1950\rh0294)

'Colder said that no 'aid' should be provided if the applicant country did not stop "the further programme of nationalization…’

(35) Seejuures ei tohi lubada maa varjamist, harimiskõlblikku maad ei tohi lugeda sooks, rabaks või liivaluteiks,
soodustusi ei tule-Ø anda majandele,
concession+PL+PRT NEG come-3SG give+daINF
kellel nende saamiseks ei ole õigust. (AJA1950\rh0274)

'At this one should not allow the concealment of land; arable land should not be classified as swamp, bog, or sand dunes; no concessions should be made to those farms than are not entitled to them'.

By the end of the 20th century the negation of the necessive verb is clearly predominant, e.g.

(36) SEAL tegelikult korraldusi jaga-da ei tule-Ø.
order+PL+PRT distribute-daINF NEG come-3SG
kõik vanad olijad ja roolid ammu jaotatud ... (ILU1990\ilu0009)

'Actually, you don’t have to give orders there; all of them are old hands, and the roles were assigned long ago…'

(37) Pudeli pani ta klaasi kõrvalte, et juhul kui janu suurem on,
et tule-ks-Ø kaugelt otsi-da
NEG come-CND-3SG look for-daINF
ja lisaküsimusega *põhitegevust* katkesta-da. (ILU1980\stkt0053)

‘He placed the bottle next to the glass; in case the thirst is stronger, you wouldn’t have to walk far to fetch it and to stop the main activity by additional questions.’

The corpus material of the last decades of the 20th century did not reveal any more such sentences where the *tulema*-verb refers unambiguously to the fact that there is an infinitive construction in the scope of negation; however, one could find some ambiguous sentences, e.g.

(38) Ja uusi *kirjastusi*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>new+PL+PRT</th>
<th>publishing house+PL+PRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ei</td>
<td><em>organiseeri-da</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG come-3SG</td>
<td>organise-da1NF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘And new publishing houses should not be organized from top; they must come into existence in response to the need of culture.’

Thus, the semantics of negative *tulema*-constructions has undergone a gradual change in the 20th century, in the course of which the scope of negation in the construction shifted from the infinitive construction to the modal *tulema*-verb.

3.2. Grammatical structure of modal *tulema*-constructions in the Tartu University Corpus of Literary Estonian

In the corpus material the agent of modality was explicitly expressed in almost every fifth modal *tulema*-construction (i.e. about twice as frequently as in the texts of the old written language). The past century did not witness any big changes in the frequency of expressing the agent.

In case the agent is explicitly expressed in the sentence, it usually takes the adessive, e.g.

(39) Eriti *tule-b pinguta-da nen-de-| töökolletiivi-de-|.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>come-3SG</th>
<th>labour-da1NF</th>
<th>this-PL-ADE</th>
<th>labour collective-PL-ADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

‘Those labour collectives have to put in much more effort where the production volume was in January and February lower than in the past year.’

At the end of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century the agent was occasionally conveyed by the construction with the adposition *poolt*, e.g.

(40) Nendele kirikuõpetajatele, kes 30 aastat ametit on pidanud.

| tule-b kihelkonna poolt paiuki-t maks-ta ja nimelt |
| come-3SG parish+GEN from pension-PRT pay-da1NF |

pool palka, s. o. tuhat rubla aastas, ilma korterita. (AJA 1900\aja0094) ‘Those ministers who have served thirty years have to be provided by the parish and namely half of their salary, that is, a thousand roubles per year without lodgings.’
There are also a few examples where the sentence is ambiguous regarding the fact whether the adessive adverbial functions as the agent in the sentence or only expresses the place of action, e.g.

(41) Üheksandal viisaastakul come-3SG Tatarimaa-ADE toota produce+daINF

vähemalt 500 miljoni-t tonni nafta-t. (AJA1970\rh0038)

at least 500 million-PRT ton+PRT oil-PRT

'During the next five years Tatarstan will have to produce at least five hundred million tons of oil.' / 'During the next five years at least five hundred million tons of oil has to be produced in Tatarstan.'

According to the academic Estonian grammar (EKG 53), the nominal part of the sentence N that was analysed as the object of the non-finite construction occurred in the construction in about 75% of cases, which is much less frequent than in texts of the old written language. As expected, the nominal part of speech was most frequent as the noun phrase; there were also over a hundred examples of the dependent with a clausal structure. The number of nominative and partitive noun phrases was almost equal. The nominal part of the sentence was expressed as a quantifier phrase in 3.4% of the constructions.

The tulema-verb occurs in the construction mostly in the indicative or the conditional; the other moods were used in single cases. The conditional was more frequent than in the old written language, about twelve per cent of the tulema-constructions, but the frequency of the conditional did not change much during the 20th century. For example,

(42) Peaasi, et poja-l son-ADE või tütre-l daughter-ADE oma isa pärast NEG come-CND-3SG häbene-da. (ILU1960\ilu0010)

'The main thing is that the son or the daughter shouldn’t be ashamed of their father.'

As before, the predominant tense in the tulema-construction is the present, and the commonest past tense is the imperfect (about 18% of the constructions), e.g.

(43) Esialgu ei olnud kerge, üksnes esimese aasta jooksul come-IMPF-3SG change-+daINF
tul-i-Ø eight place of residence+PRT

kahekxa elamiskohta. (AJA1970\nh0106)

eight place of residence+PRT

'In the beginning it wasn’t easy; during the first year alone we had to change the place of residence eight times.'

The past tenses were used in fiction, where since the 1930s the proportion of the imperfect has constantly been higher than 35%. It could be explained by the fact that fiction often describes past events.

The negative tulema is very rare in the necessive construction; only about two per cent of the constructions were negative. Before the 1930s negative constructions were somewhat more frequent (4—5% of all the constructions). Rare use of the construction could be explained by its ambiguity (see also 3.1).
The corpus includes agreeing examples of only those tulema-constructions where the nominal part of the sentence is a noun phrase in the nominative plural (44), or where the conjunctive of the relative clause mis/kes refers to a plural noun phrase (45).

(44) Läbirääkimistel selgu sid ja põhijooned,
  kuidas tule-wad moodusta-da
  come-3PL form-daINF
  seltskondliku-d komitee-d. (AJA1930\waba017)
  social-PL committee-PL

  'The talks resulted in the ways and principal features how social committees should be set up.'

(45) Viimase aasta jooksul on ta Pekingi valitsusele
  hulga projekti-sid ette pannud,
  large number+GEN project-PL+PRT
  mis Venemaale tule-ksi-vad ette pan-na... (AJA1910\pl0018)
  that come-CND-3PL forward put-daINF

  'Last year he suggested a large number of projects to the Peking government that should be put forward to Russia...'

It appears that agreement in number in the tulema-construction decreased gradually: agreeing construction prevailed in the last decade of the 19th century; later on there proportion decreased with each decade among the constructions that allowed agreement. While agreement could be absent from texts in the old written language only in the case of the conjunctive mis referring to a plural noun phrase, the corpus material does not reveal such distinction any more. By the 1930s the agreeing clauses remained in minority among the constructions that allowed agreement. In the 1950s agreement suddenly disappears; it could be explained by the rules laid down by normative grammars and strict editing of texts in the post-war years. Most normative and descriptive grammars published at the end of the 19th century and during the first decades of the 20th century did not discuss agreement of the necessive construction (e.g. Hermann 1896; Loorits 1923 and others), or they mentioned the concurrent use of agreeing and non-agreeing examples (Kettunen 1924 : 21—22). However, starting with the 1930s normative grammars required the singular use of the tulema-verb in the necessive construction (e.g. Aavik 1936 : 82; Muuk, Mihkla, Tedre 1941 : 17; Jänes, Parlo 1943 : 61; Remmel, Valgma, Riikoja 1957 : 153). It also made an impact on practical use — the post-war material revealed only three examples of the necessive construction with the agreeing tulema-verb, e.g.

(46) 3. võistlustsoonis olevad kari- ja kodulooma-
  livestock and domestic animal-PL
  tule-vad võistluspäeval hoida koidetult
  come-3PL keep+daINF
  500 m kaugusel ringteest... (AJA1960\rh0036)

  'Livestock and domestic animals in the third competition area are to be kept tethered at a distance of 500 m from the speedway...'

Thus, non-agreement in number of the necessive tulema-construction is likely to have become predominant due to language-external factors.
However, the makings of it were also present in the development of the language, and agreement had begun to disappear already before the decisive impact of language planning.

4. Concerning the possible development of the modal tulema-construction in Estonian

For many centuries Estonian has been influenced by the example of Indo-European contact languages. Therefore, when studying the origin of any language phenomenon, one should take into account possible foreign influences. The text sample on which the study is based shows that the modal tulema-construction appears in written Estonian at the end of the 17th century (the earliest examples being from 1699). Although the grammatical structure of the construction had not taken the final shape by then, its functions in the earliest examples already resembled the modern functions, and the construction could be used in a highly sophisticated grammatical environment. Thus, the old written language does not reflect the gradual development of the grammatical functions of the modal tulema-construction over a longer period of time. It is likely that the authors who were the first to use modal constructions may have had in mind a similar construction.

When studying the development of infinitive constructions in Finnic languages, Pauli Saukkonen (1965: 150—155) claimed that the modal tulema-construction originated because of two parallel processes: language(s)-internal development and the example of contact languages. Finnish and partly the Karelian Onones dialects reveal examples of the construction tulema-verb + ma-infinitive that expresses obligation modality (Saukkonen 1965: 151). Thus, the same-subject infinitive construction tulla + supine has the meaning of 'have to, be obliged'. Re-analysis of the subject of the tulla-verb as an object subordinated to the infinitive changed the construction into a da-infinitive construction, e.g. työ tulee tehdä 'the job needs to be done' (Saukkonen 1965: 151—152). Modal use of the tulema-construction occurs in all the Finnic languages; it is likely that similar use in the contact languages may have contributed to its spread, cf. Swedish det tilla kommer mig att göra 'I have to do', German es kommt mir zu 'I have to do it', Russian вам придется подождать 'you’ll have to wait' (Saukkonen 1965: 152). P. Saukkonen’s treatment leaves open the time of changes; the only thing that is clear is that in standard Finnish already the works by Agricola in the 16th century reveal examples of the modal tulema-construction (Saukkonen 1965: 154). As the modal construction tulla + supine occurs only in a few Finnic dialects and,

5 In order to exclude, as far as possible, the possibility that the modal tulema-construction may have been used already before the 1690s, the author checked its possible earlier occurrence in the selected early texts of written Estonian compiled by A. Saareste and A. R. Cederberg (VEKVM). The earliest example in the collection belonged to the same period as the sample of this study; one can find it in a publication by Johann Hornung "Ma Kele Koddo ning Kirgo Ramat" (1695; ‘Home and Church Book of the Estonian Language’); Ñüh ulla he ke sest õppeühendamist essesest k u u l d a (VEKVM 222). ‘Now one has to hear about the destruction itself’. In addition to the modal interpretation, in this case the tulema-verb could be interpreted as a future auxiliary.
Thus, could not serve as the source of the development of the construction in most of the language area, one might assume that P. Saukkonen regards language contacts as the main factor in the origin of the construction.

Nevertheless, one might question the claim by P. Saukkonen that the development of the Finnic *tulla*-construction had been greatly influenced by the Indo-European example. The Swedish impact was evidently not that extensive in order to become decisive in the development of the construction in the entire Finnic area; moreover, the Swedish modal *tulla*-construction came into existence only during the period of Modern Swedish (starting with the 16th—17th centuries). Therefore, it is unlikely that it could have been the source of the Finnic construction. It is true that the German *zukommen*-construction, presented by P. Saukkonen was used in the 19th century to translate the Finnic *tulla*-construction in dialect collections and grammars (Saukkonen 1965: 153). However, this construction is generally very unusual in German; nor is such an example reflected in the German sources that serve as the basis for our earlier texts. Nor were contacts with the Russian language close enough in this area so that one might suspect the impact of the Russian construction.

In written Finnish the modal *tulla*-construction has been used from the very beginning; however, the construction appears in written Estonian almost one hundred and fifty years later. The grammatical structure of the construction is not fully identical in Finnish and Estonian (the agent is expressed by means of the adessive in Estonian but by the genitive in Finnish); in addition, the preconditions of language-internal development are different because of the earlier constructions. Thus, one might ask whether the Estonian and Finnish *tulla*-constructions are clearly of the same origin.

The assumption of the common origin is supported by the fact that a rather similar construction can be found in all the Finnic languages. The absence of the *tulema*-construction in Older Written Estonian could be explained by the fact that the synonymous *pidama*-construction was sufficient for the expression of obligation modality. The assumption is further supported by the fact that earlier Estonian texts were translations, and the tradition of morpheme-morpheme translation contributed to the translation of the German *mülsen*-construction into Estonian by means of the *pidama*-construction.

Lea Laitinen has studied the development of the Finnish necessive construction as evidenced by the verbs *täytyä* 'have to', *tarvita* 'need', and *pitää* 'must' (Laitinen 1992; 1993; Laitinen, Vilkuna 1993). According to L. Laitinen, the modalization of the necessive verbs followed the following scheme: at first the full lexical verb denoted the state of the subject as the required precondition of the action denoted by the infinitive form of the transitive verb. The necessive structure developed in those

---

6 This information comes from Florian Siegl; he also suggested a source that discusses this point in greater detail: Wessén 1992: 124—127.
7 However, assuming that the *tulema*-construction is old enough in the Finnic languages, the difference between the Estonian and the Finnish constructions need not be important from the perspective of the history of the construction because the *n*-ending genitive may have an adverbial background (Huumo, Inaba 1997).
constructions where the subject was a singular noun that referred to an inanimate creature or an impersonal referent; thus, from the very beginning the necessive verb in the construction was in the third person singular. (Laitinen 1993: 169) Also, one might think of the Estonian tulema-verb in the sense 'start to be, exist in the future' as the required precondition for the action described by its non-finite dependent and, thus, suspect its common origin with the other necessive verbs. Moreover, the tulema-verb is used modally only in the third person singular (or it acts as a dependent to some other verb in the third person singular). Unlike what is described by L. Laitinen the tulema-construction is congruent in earlier texts.

The use of the Finnish and the Estonian tulla-construction is different in that to this day in Finnish the tulla-construction has occurred mostly in literary texts and not in dialect texts (Saukkonen 1965: 152); the tulema-construction, however, is rather common in the dialects, e.g. (47)

\[
\text{veęču-D tule-vaD meręe laₐšsa} \quad \text{([Jõelähtme])}
\]
\[
\text{net-PL come-3PL cast+daINF}
\]

'nets have to be dropped into the sea'

(48) ėna-t tule-vaD s ámb tih-à kui nₐd kₜₐ₁vₐd on (Anna)

\[
\text{hay-PL come-3PL make-daINF}
\]

'the hay has to be stacked while it's dry'

(49) suřlě tule-s aũ aₐₐₐₐ

\[
\text{come-3SG honour+PRT give+daINF}
\]

'the hay has to be stacked while it's dry'

(50) elₐₐₐₐ tule-vaD aₐₐₐₐ la₁ₐ₁ₐke (Nₐö)

\[
\text{come-3SG let+daINF}
\]

'the animals should be allowed to enter the pen'

(51) maₐ₁ₐₐₐ tule-vaD mₐₐ₁ₐų (Pₐ₁ₐₐ)

\[
\text{come-3PL wash+daINF}
\]

'these berries need washing'

Although one should not overestimate the trustworthiness of dialect material (the literary language had influenced spoken language already for a few centuries by the time Estonian and Finnish dialect texts were collected), nevertheless dialect texts could serve as a basis for the hypothesis that in Finnish and Estonian the tulema-construction may have developed differently. In Estonian it came into existence as a result of language-internal development; in Finnish, however, it had a literary background from the very beginning, and its occurrence in the earliest texts is related to the emergence of a similar construction in Swedish.

The Estonian language separated from the Finnic dialects in the second millennium AD (Rätsep 1989). Assuming that the tulema-construction is original and peculiar to Estonian, one has to conclude that it must be of rather recent origin. However, it does not rule out the possibility that the

8 The dialect examples come from the general card index of dialect vocabulary at the Institute of the Estonian Language.
occurrence of the *tulema*-construction in Old Written Estonian could nevertheless reflect its use in the spoken language of that time.

Because the *tulema*-construction appears in Written Estonian with well-established functions and occurs in complicated constructions from the very beginning, the language must have previously had some means of expression with similar functions and structure. The *olema*-construction performed this role in written Estonian in the 17th—19th centuries, e.g.

(52) Sest *meile ep olle-Ø mitte*

1PL-ALL NEG be-3SG NEG

Leeha ninck Were kahs *woidelda.*

fight-daINF

Dann wir haben nicht mit Fleisch vnnd Blut zu kämpffen. (Staheln 1641 : 291)

‘Because we don’t have to fight flesh and blood.’

(53) Pahategude kokkjuhtumise korral [–––] teiste kurja tegudega.

*be+3SG article-INE 1126 act on the criminal proceedings-INE*

*20ma-st Novembr-i-st 1864 ole-va-i-d eeskirju*

*20-ELA November-ELA 1864 be-øPTC-PL-PRT rule+PL+PRT*

*tähele-pan-na.* (Seadus Rahukohtunikudest 1880 : 7)

notice-daINF

‘In the case of multiple wrongdoings, one has to follow the rules laid out in article 1126 of the act on the criminal proceedings of 20 November 1864.’

In contemporary Estonian the sense of obligation has remained in the background in the *olema*-construction; what is important is the function denoting existence, possession, or possibility, e.g.

(54) Et *nimikonna-l on vali-da*

human race-ADE be+3SG choose-daINF

ja õnne vahel ja et suurem osa inimkonnst eelistab õnne.

‘That the human race can choose between liberty and happiness and that the majority of humankind prefers happiness.’

(55) Kaugelt *on kuul-da, kuidas koera-d haugu-vad.*

be+3SG hear-daINF how dog-PL bark-3PL

‘One can hear from the distance how the dogs are barking.’

The same construction was interpreted in two ways also in the 19th century. For example, an Estonian syntax by Eduard Ahrens published in 1853 interpreted such *olema*-constructions as follows:

(56) *laud on pesta* ‘der Tisch ist zu waschen [ = ] muß gewaschen werden [ = ] wird gewaschen’ (Ahrens 2003 : 393).

*laud on pes-ta*

*table be+3SG wash-daINF*

‘the table has to be washed’ / ‘the table will be washed’

As the examples show, the *olema*-construction has an analogue in German. At the same time in the Estonian dialects the *olema*-construction...
has been used more extensively in the deontic and dynamic senses than it would be possible in the contemporary standard language, e.g.

(57) kolm nädalit olI-Ø päälin õllä (Otepää)
be+IMPF-3SG be-dafINF
‘one had to attend confirmation classes for three weeks’

(58) kui laimbad olið meizad.
siz ol-í-Ø karituleio noppo-da [meizale] (Järva-Jaanı)
be-IMPF-3SG potato-PL-PRT pick-daINF
‘when the sheep were at the manor, one had to pick potatoes [for the manor]’

However, because the development of obligation modality on the basis of possession and existential verbs is typologically highly common in the world’s languages (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994 : 183), it leaves open the possibility that the Estonian olema-construction could have been original and not introduced artificially to the written language through translation. There is no modal olema-construction in Finnish.

The Estonian olema- and tulema-verbs are often contrasted as expressing the present and the future, which makes one think that perhaps also the modal tulema-construction may have come into existence as a future variant of the olema-construction. The hypothesis is, for example, supported by the few examples that allowed multiple interpretations of the tulema-verb in the construction with the da-infinitive construction and where modality was one of the meanings; in such cases the other possible interpretation carried the meaning of future. The Estonian dialects reveal even such examples where the olema- and tulema-modality are contrasted as the (relative) present and the (relative) future in one and the same sentence, e.g.

(59) têzè pühà ol-í-Ø tüxar rišti-da
be-IMPF-3SG daughter baptise-daINF
têzè pühà tul-í-Ø maita (Pärnu-Jaagupi)
come-IMPF-3SG bury+daINF
‘one one holiday the daughter had to be baptized, on the next holiday she had to be buried’

Although it is characteristic of the world’s languages that the meaning of the future develops on the basis of agent-oriented modality and not the other way round (Heine, Kuteva 2002 : 218), the emergence of modal use on the basis of the meaning of future would not contradict the unidirectionality of grammaticalization. The modal meaning had developed already in the olema-construction; the emergence of the tulema-construction added only a future shade to the previously existed modal meaning. For the same reason there is no conflict with L. Laitinen’s treatment.

5. Conclusions

The earliest modal uses of the tulema-verb come from the last decade of the 17th century. It seems that from the very beginning the construction carried a clear necessive function, and it was used in a highly complex grammatical environment as early as in the 17th century. In the case of
some necessive *tulema*-constructions in the Old Written Language one can assume the possibility of non-modal interpretation; the overlap of the modal and future functions is rather systematic.

In sentences with modal interpretation the semantics and the functions of the *tulema*-verb in the Old Written Language resemble those in the contemporary language: in a few cases on might suspect that obligation in the meaning of the construction was perceived somewhat more weakly than now. The grammatical structure of the construction varied throughout the period of the Old Written Language. It is likely that the nominal part of the sentence, which in contemporary Estonian grammar is analysed as the object of the infinitive construction, was in many constructions previously perceived as the subject that was subordinated to the main verb (agreement of the *tulema*-verb with this part of the sentence points to this). Frequent use of the nominal part in the partitive indicates that the object interpretation existed at the same time. Usually the *tulema*-verb in modal constructions of the Old Written Language occurs in the affirmative indicative of the present tense; in some cases also the conditional and the imperfect are used.

The corpus of 20th-century Literary Estonian enables me to claim that there were no major semantic changes in the modal use of the *tulema*-verb during the century or by comparison with the earlier period. The most notable semantic shift concerns negative necessive constructions, where in the course of the century the scope of negation shifted from the infinitive construction to the modal *tulema*-verb.

As for the grammatical structure of the necessive *tulema*-construction, the most striking change is the disappearance of the agreement in number. The proportion of congruent examples decreased decade by decade during the first half of the century; starting with the 1950s there were almost no examples of congruence. Abrupt disappearance of congruence after the Second World War can be explained by the impact of language planning.

One could put forward a number of hypotheses with regard to the development of the modal use of the *tulema*-verb. The modal *tulema*-construction emerges in the written language at once with a clearly necessive meaning; thus, the written language does not enable us to follow the gradual development of the modality of the *tulema*-verb on the basis of other senses. It is likely that there may have been some similar construction in the minds of the people that introduced the construction to the written language. One possible source of analogy could be the influence of Indo-European languages, but one cannot think of any example in the contact languages that is sufficiently widespread. Absence of a similar construction in the German texts that served as the basis of early Estonian-language translations enables us to suggest that the modal *tulema*-construction could have existed in spoken Estonian much earlier than in written language. In written texts the *tulema*-construction need not have been necessary because in the tradition of word-for-word translation the same function was fulfilled by the synonymous *pidama*-construction, the structure of which corresponded to the German *sollen* - and *müssen*-constructions.

However, assuming that the written language reflects adequately the development of the *tulema*-construction, one should look for a suitable
similar construction in earlier Estonian, the example of which could assign an unambiguous grammatical function and a rather well-established form to the tulema-construction since the first uses. A possible example is the modal olema-construction, which was used in the Old Written Language and also in the Estonian dialects more extensively than in the contemporary standard language. In Estonian the olema- and tulema-verbs are often used to contrast present and past events; therefore, it is conceivable that the tulema-construction may have been introduced as future analogue of the olema-construction.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 — person; ADE — adessive; CMP — comparative; CND — conditional; daINF — da-infinitive; GER — gerund; IMPF — imperfect; maINF — ma-infinitive; NEG — negative; PF — perfect; PL — plural; PL_NOM — plural (nominative); PRET — pretéritic; PRT — partitive; SG — singular; varINF — va-infinitive; vPTC — v-participle.

Sources


8 The entire work was not used; the selection covered 195 pages of the Old Testament and 55 pages of the New Testament. Maple V 4.00c software was used to generate a random selection of pages.
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ПИЛЛЕ ПЕНЬЯМ (Тарту)

ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ МОДАЛЬНОГО ЗНАЧЕНИЯ ГЛАГОЛА tulema 'ПРИХОДИТЬ' В ЭСТОНСКОМ ЛИТЕРАТУРНОМ ЯЗЫКЕ XVII—XX ВЕКОВ

Основная грамматическая функция глагола tulema 'приходить' в современном эстонском языке — выражение модальных значений неизбежности и обязательности. Статья представляет собой обзор формирования модального значения глагола tulema в эстонском литературном языке.

Начало модального использования глагола tulema относится к последнemu десятилетию XVII века. Модальная конструкция сразу стала выражать обязательность и уже в XVII веке использовалась в крайне сложном грамматическом контексте. В предложениях с модальной интерпретацией семантика и функции глагола tulema в старом литературном языке совпадают с современными. Грамматическое строение конструкции варьирует на протяжении всего периода существования старого литературного языка.

На материале корпуса эстонского литературного языка XX века можно утверждать, что больших изменений в семантике модального использования глагола tulema за прошедшие столетие по сравнению с более ранним периодом не произошло.

Возникновение модального значения глагола tulema можно объяснить с помощью разных гипотез. В литературном языке постепенное формирование мо-
далности на базе других значений глагола *tulema* не прослеживается, следовательно, в сознании вводящих эту конструкцию в литературный язык должна была существовать какая-либо аналогичная конструкция. Отсутствие такой в немецких текстах, послуживших основой для ранних эстонских переводов, позволяет предположить, что модальная конструкция существовала в эстонском разговорном языке до появления ее в литературном.

Если все же предположить, что литературный язык адекватно отражает формирование модальной конструкции, в качестве аналогии можно рассмотреть модальную конструкцию с глаголом *olema* ‘быть’, которая использовалась в старом литературном языке и в эстонских диалектах на протяжении более длительного времени, чем в современном эстонском языке. Глаголы *olema* и *tulema* часто употребляются в эстонском языке для противопоставления действий, происходящих в настоящем и будущем времени, вероятно, конструкция с глаголом *tulema* вошла в язык как аналог конструкции с глаголом *olema*, используемой для настоящего времени.

*Development of the Modal Function of the Verb tulema 'come'...*