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0. There is a small class of words that has not received much attention in Finnish grammars. This group includes words such as *paljon* 'a lot, many, much', *vähän* 'a little, few', *jonkin verran* 'some, somewhat', etc. In the following, I will focus on *paljon*, but the properties in which I am interested characterize a number of other words as well.

One likely reason for the inconspicuousness of *paljon* in most grammars is the fact that it does not properly fit into the traditional scheme of word classes. Historically, *paljon* apparently is an inflected form of the measure noun *paljo* 'a lot', which rarely occurs in Standard Finnish. One wonders how the current expression in (1) is related to its now archaic or dialectal paraphrase given in (2).

(1) *Siellä oli paljon väää* 'A lot of people were there';
(2) *Siellä oli paljo väää* 'A lot of people were there'.

1. In sentences such as (1), *paljon* was formerly regarded as an adverb, and *väää* as the subject. According to Setälä's analysis (SKL, 122), the phrase *paljon väää* does not form a syntactic constituent. This counterintuitive parsing has now generally been rejected, and both (1) and (2) are usually analyzed in the same manner as (3) (Penttilä, SK, 263).²

(3) *Siellä oli joukko väää* 'A crowd of people was there'.

That is, *paljon väää* in (1) is considered to be a syntactic construction in which *paljon* is the head noun and *väää* an attributive modifier. In the following, I will deviate from this standard analysis only in a minor way. It seems to me that the grammaticality of sentences such as the examples in (4) and the ungrammaticality of the examples in (5) provides enough justification for classifying *paljon*, not as a measure noun like *joukko*, but as a member of a special class of adjectives called 'quantifiers'. This class includes words like *moni* 'many', *usea* 'several', *harva* 'few', etc.

(4) (a) *Pariisissa on liian paljon turisteja* 'There are too many tourists in Paris'.
(c) Tapasin meluisan joukon turisteja 'I met a noisy crowd of tourists';
(5) (a) *Pariisissa on liian joukko turisteja;
(b) *Kuinke joukko turisteja siellä on?
(c) *Tapasin meluisan paljon turisteja.

Like any adjective quantifier, paljon can be preceded by pre-adjectival modifiers, such as liian 'too'; on the other hand, it cannot take adjective attributes like the noun joukko. As far as the rest of the paper is concerned, this issue does not really make much difference, as long as it is granted that, in sentences like (1), paljon goes into a construction with the following noun and is not an adverb.

1.1. There are many contexts in which paljon undoubtedly is a genuine adverb. For instance, consider the examples in (6).

(6) (a) Pekka käy paljon elokuvissa 'Pekka often goes to the movies';
(b) Matti ajatteli paljon, mutta puhui vähän 'Matti thought a lot but said little';
(c) Liisa pitää paljon jäätelöstä 'Liisa likes ice cream very much'.

It is also possible to construct ambiguous examples where paljon can be understood either as a quantifier or as an adverb. The example in (7) is one such sentence.

(7) Liisa toi voi paljon sitä jäätelöstä 'Liisa wished very much for that ice cream' or 'Liisa wished for a lot of that ice cream'.

Without knowing more about the context one could not decide about the meaning. In (7), it is possible to assign paljon as a modifier either to the preceding verb, as I have indicated in (8a), or to the following noun phrase (NP), as shown in (8b).

(8) (a) Liisa [toi voi paljon] sitä jää telöstä;
(b) Liisa toi voi [paljon sitä jää telöstä].

In (9), I have tried to give two contexts in which (7) would not be ambiguous.

(9) (a) Liisa toi voi paljon sitä jää telöstä, mutta Pekka ei antanut sitä hä nelle 'Liisa wished for that ice cream very much but Pekka didn't give it to her';
(b) Liisa toi voi paljon sitä jää telöstä, eikä pientä annosta 'Liisa wished for a lot of that ice cream, not for a small serving'.

In the following, I will concentrate on the use of paljon as a quantifier. I will not be concerned as much with the adverb paljon; and I will ignore altogether other cases such as the use of paljon in connection with comparative forms of adjectives (paljon suurempi talo 'a much bigger house').
can be used as a quantifier. It will soon become apparent that this word has a very peculiar distribution.

First of all, a noun phrase quantified by *paljon* must be in the partitive case. This restriction already excludes all NPs to which some other case is assigned by syntactic rules. In such noun phrases, some other quantifier has to be used. For example, the word *moni* 'many' can always be used where *paljon* is excluded by this constraint. See the example in (10).

(10) *Olen asunut* {"paljon monissa"} kaupungeissa 'I have lived in many cities'.

But there are also instances where *paljon* cannot be used in spite of the fact that the NP in question is in the partitive. As the example in (11) shows, *paljon* is out of place in prepositional phrases.

(11) *Lumimajat ovat vailla {"paljon monia"} nykyaikaisia mukavuksia* 'Igloos are without many modern conveniences'.

In fact, it appears that *paljon* is an acceptable quantifier only in two environments: in a noun phrase that is either the subject or the object of the sentence in question.

2.1. Let us first consider *paljon* in the subject NP. Since *paljon* requires that the NP be in the partitive, its use in this position is limited to sentences in which a partitive subject is possible, that is to say to the so called 'existential sentences'. There are no further restrictions; in any existential sentence the subject NP may contain *paljon*. For instance, consider the examples in (12).

(12) (a) *Lumimajoista puuttuu paljon nykyaikaisia mukavuksia* 'Igloos lack many modern conveniences';
(b) *Paljon sotilaita syöksyi sisään* 'A lot of soldiers rushed in';
(c) *Paljon maitoa jäi lasiin* 'A lot of milk remained in the glass';
(d) *Hänellä sanotaan olevan paljon rahaa* 'He is said to have a lot of money'.

As the last example shows, possessive sentences are included in existential constructions.

On the other hand, *paljon* cannot occur as a quantifier in the subject NP of a non-existential sentence. This group includes all transitive sentences and some intransitive ones as well, as shown in (13).

(13) (a) *Paljon miehiä pelaa korttia* 'A lot of men are playing cards';
(b) *Paljon yleisöä nauraa* 'A lot of the audience are laughing'.

This fact follows directly from the earlier observation that *paljon* can only occur with a noun phrase which would have to be in the partitive
would expect to find no particular restrictions on the use of *paljon* in
the object NPs except that the NP must be in the partitive. Surprisingly
enough, this expectation proves wrong. Consider the following two sets
of examples.

(14) (a) *Rahapaja löi paljon kolikoida* 'This mint struck a lot of coins';
(b) *Kokouksessa tehtiin paljon päätöksiä* 'A lot of resolutions were
passed at the meeting';
(c) *Siellä näytettiin paljon elokuvia* 'They showed a lot of movies
there';
(d) *Pekka tuntee paljon tyttöjä* 'Pekka knows a lot of girls'.

(15) (a) *Isä löi paljon lapsia* 'Father hit a lot of children';
(b) *Kokouksessa vastustettiin paljon päätöksiä* 'They opposed a lot
of resolutions at the meeting';
(c) *Elokuvia miellyttä paljon katsojia* 'The movie pleased a lot of
viewers';
(d) *Pekka rakastaa paljon tyttöjä* 'Pekka is in love with a lot of
girls'.

All the examples in (14) are perfectly grammatical. On the other hand,
all of the examples in (15) are ungrammatical in the intended sense. If
they are acceptable Finnish sentences at all, they are acceptable only
under a very different interpretation. Under this other reading, *paljon*
in (15) has to be understood as an adverb. For example, the sentence
(15d) is acceptable as a paraphrase of (15d').

(15d') *Pekka rakastaa kovasti tyttöjä* 'Pekka is very much in love with
girls'.

The important point here is that, in (15), it is absolutely impossible to
interpret *paljon* as a quantifier. On the other hand, all the examples in
(14) could be paraphrased by replacing the word *paljon* with some other
quantifier, such as *moni* 'many'. (14d) means approximately the same
as (14d') below.

(14d') *Pekka tuntee monta tyttöä* 'Pekka knows many girls'.

These examples show clearly that the case of the object NP does not alone
decide whether or not the NP could contain *paljon*. In addition, here it
looks as if the quantifier *paljon* and the adverb *paljon* were in a com-
plementary distribution; these sentences are not ambiguous, as (7) is.
Some partitive objects can be quantified in this manner, some cannot;
and somehow this must depend on what the main verb is. To solve
this problem, we have to find out what makes the verbs in (15) different
from those in (14).

3. It has been known for a long time that in Finnish verbs of certain
semantic classes only occur with partitive objects. For the lack of a bet-

INHERENTLY IRRESULTATIVE VERBS:
(a) emotive verbs: pelätä 'be afraid of', rakastaa 'be in love with', vihata 'hate', ihailta 'admire';
(b) verbs of judging: haukku 'abuse', moittia 'criticize', parjata 'slander', ylisätä 'praise';
(c) psychological causatives: harmittaa 'annoy', miellyttää 'please', huvittaa 'amuse', ärsyttää 'irritate'.

These verbs can never occur with accusative objects, as shown by the examples in (17).

(17) (a) Liisa pelkää {*opettajan opettajaa} 'Liisa is afraid of the teacher';
    (b) On moitittu {*hallitoksen hallitusta} 'They have criticized the government';
    (c) Juttu huvittaa {*pojan poikaa} 'The story amuses the boy'.

Most important, it is just these verbs which do not permit their objects to be quantified by paljon. Consider the examples in (18).

(18) (a) *Liisa pelkää [paljon opettajia] 'Liisa is afraid of many teachers';
    (b) *On moitittu [paljon hallituksia] 'They have criticized many governments';
    (c) *Juttu huvittaa [paljon poikia] 'The story amuses many boys'.

On the other hand, verbs which are inherently irresultative can all be modified adverbially by paljon. This is shown by the examples in (19).

(19) (a) Liisa pelkää opettajia paljon 'Liisa is very afraid of teachers';
    (b) Ei saa haukkuun niin paljon hallitusta 'One shouldn't criticize the government so much';
    (c) Meitä on paljon huvittanut hänen kirjeensä 'His letter has amused us very much'.

4. There are also verbs which always take accusative objects unless there is some independent reason for the object to be in the partitive. By "independent reason" I mean something that has nothing to do with the main verb itself, such as the presence of negation or the fact that the object NP happens to refer to some indefinite quantity of a larger whole. I will call such verbs "inherently resultative verbs", although I admit that the traditional term "resultative" does not adequately describe all of the verbs in this class. A small sample of these verbs is given in (20).

(20) INHERENTLY RESULTATIVE VERBS:
(a) keskeyttää 'interrupt'; kerätä 'collect', 'gather';
(b) kaatoo 'break'; kerää 'collect'; määräa 'specify';
(c) kerää 'collect', 'gather'; määrää 'specify';
(d) tähdät 'point at'; määrää 'specify';
(e) kaatoo 'break'; kerää 'collect'; määrää 'specify';
(f) kerää 'collect'; määrää 'specify';
(g) kaatoo 'break'; määrää 'specify';
(h) kerää 'collect'; määrää 'specify';
(i) kaatoo 'break'; määrää 'specify';
(j) kerää 'collect'; määrää 'specify';
(k) kaatoo 'break'; määrää 'specify';
(l) kerää 'collect'; määrää 'specify';
(m) kaatoo 'break'; määrää 'specify';
(n) kerää 'collect'; määrää 'specify';
(o) kaatoo 'break'; määrää 'specify';
(p) kerää 'collect'; määrää 'specify';
(q) kaatoo 'break'; määrää 'specify';
(r) kerää 'collect'; määrää 'specify';
(s) kaatoo 'break'; määrää 'specify';
(t) kerää 'collect'; määrää 'specify';
(u) kaatoo 'break'; määrää 'specify';
(v) kerää 'collect'; määrää 'specify';
(w) kaatoo 'break'; määrää 'specify';
(x) kerää 'collect'; määrää 'specify';
(y) kaatoo 'break'; määrää 'specify';
(z) kerää 'collect'; määrää 'specify';

The verbs in (20) are all resultative in the sense that they take accusative objects. However, they differ from the verbs in (19) in that they cannot be modified adverbially by paljon. Consider the examples in (21).

(21) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

In contrast, the verbs in (19) can be modified adverbially by paljon, as shown by the examples in (22).

(22) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

5. The verbs in (19) and (20) are also resultative in the sense that they can be modified adverbially by paljon. Consider the examples in (23).

(23) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

In contrast, the verbs in (19) cannot be modified adverbially by paljon, as shown by the examples in (24).

(24) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

The verbs in (19) and (20) are also resultative in the sense that they take accusative objects. However, they differ from the verbs in (19) in that they cannot be modified adverbially by paljon. Consider the examples in (25).

(25) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

In contrast, the verbs in (19) can be modified adverbially by paljon, as shown by the examples in (26).

(26) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

The verbs in (19) and (20) are also resultative in the sense that they can be modified adverbially by paljon. Consider the examples in (27).

(27) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

In contrast, the verbs in (19) cannot be modified adverbially by paljon, as shown by the examples in (28).

(28) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

The verbs in (19) and (20) are also resultative in the sense that they take accusative objects. However, they differ from the verbs in (19) in that they cannot be modified adverbially by paljon. Consider the examples in (29).

(29) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

In contrast, the verbs in (19) can be modified adverbially by paljon, as shown by the examples in (30).

(30) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

The verbs in (19) and (20) are also resultative in the sense that they can be modified adverbially by paljon. Consider the examples in (31).

(31) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

In contrast, the verbs in (19) cannot be modified adverbially by paljon, as shown by the examples in (32).

(32) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

The verbs in (19) and (20) are also resultative in the sense that they take accusative objects. However, they differ from the verbs in (19) in that they cannot be modified adverbially by paljon. Consider the examples in (33).

(33) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

In contrast, the verbs in (19) can be modified adverbially by paljon, as shown by the examples in (34).

(34) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

The verbs in (19) and (20) are also resultative in the sense that they can be modified adverbially by paljon. Consider the examples in (35).

(35) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';

In contrast, the verbs in (19) cannot be modified adverbially by paljon, as shown by the examples in (36).

(36) (a) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (b) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
    (c) Liisa kerää paljon 'Liisa has collected a lot';
(b) verbs of cognitive states: muistaa 'remember', tietää 'know', ymmärtää 'understand', tuntea 'know';
(c) perceptual verbs (achievement/state): nähdä 'see', kuulla 'hear', havaita 'perceive';
(d) verbs of encompassment: omistaa 'possess', sisällyttää 'contain', käsittää 'include'.

Of course, all of these verbs can occur with partitive objects. However, when this happens, it is not because of the verb, but because the sentence meets some other condition which requires a partitive object. This is the case in the following examples.

(21) (a) Löysin korista mansikoita 'I found some strawberries in the basket' (indefinite quantity);
(b) Näin leivässä hometta 'I saw some mold on the bread';
(c) Pekka ei tiedä oikeata vastausta 'Pekka doesn't know the right answer' (negative sentence);
(d) Pakkaus ei sisällä juustoaa 'The package does not contain cheese'.

When none of the other conditions is operative, the object NP of an inherently resultative verb must be in the accusative. This is shown by the examples in (22).

(22) (a) Saksa on hävinnyt {*sotaa sodan} 'Germany has lost the war';
(b) Tiedän {*osoitetta osoitteen} 'I know the address';
(c) Kuulin {*hauskaa uutista hauskan uutisen} 'I heard an amusing news item';
(d) Liisa omistaa {*taloa talon} 'Liisa owns a house'.

What is interesting here is that all of the inherently resultative verbs permit their object NPs to be quantified by paljon. See the examples in (23).

(23) (a) Saksa on hävinnyt paljon sotia 'Germany has lost many wars';
(b) Tiedän paljon osoitteita 'I know many addresses';
(c) Kuulin paljon hauskoja uutisia 'I heard many amusing news items';
(d) Liisa omistaa paljon taloja 'Liisa owns a lot of houses'.

These examples should be compared with those in (18) which are all ungrammatical. The only significant difference between these two sets of examples is that in (18) the verb is an inherently irresultative verb; in (23) we have inherently resultative verbs. Thus it appears that the mysterious facts which are sometimes attributed to language as a whole are really due to the interaction of the verbal meaning and the syntactic requirement of the clause structure.
to Finnish grammarians: the resultative vs. irresultative distinction.

5. The remaining problems with (14) and (15) are easily cleared away. For instance, the verb *lyödä* can be used either in a resultative or in an irresultative sense.

(14a) *Rahapaja löi paljon kolikoita* 'The mint struck a lot of coins';
(15a) *Isa löi paljon lapsia* 'Father hit a lot of children'.

In (14a), we have *lyödä* in its resultative sense; therefore, *paljon kolikoita* is an acceptable object. *Lyödä* in the sense of 'hit' is irresultative; consequently, *paljon lapsia* in (15a) is not acceptable as the object.

I will give just one more example from the large class of transitive verbs that can be used either in a resultative or irresultative sense. Consider the verb *ampua* 'shoot'. If the object is in the singular, its case indicates how the sentence is to be understood. This is shown by the examples in (24).

(24) (a) *Metsästäjä ampui linnun* 'The hunter shot the bird';
     (b) *Metsästäjä ampui lintua* 'The hunter shot at the bird'.

On the other hand, (25) with the object in the plural partitive is ambiguous.

(25) *Metsästäjä ampui lintuja* 'The hunter shot birds' or 'The hunter shot at birds'.

The insertion of the quantifier *paljon* would resolve the ambiguity. It is clear that (26) can only be understood in one way.

(26) *Metsästäjä ampui paljon lintuja* 'The hunter shot a lot of birds'.

*Paljon* in the object NP is compatible only with the resultative interpretation of the verb *ampua*.

6. What we have found thus far is the following. As a quantifier, *paljon* has a very limited distribution. It is restricted to two environments: (i) the subject NP of an intransitive, existential sentence and (ii) the object NP of a transitive, resultative sentence. Why this should be the case seems at first something of a mystery. Upon consideration, however, one recalls that, in Finnish, there are many other connections between subjects of intransitive sentences and objects of transitive sentences. For instance, it is well known that two of the three rules for choosing between a partitive and a nominative subject duplicate rules that determine the case of the object. The only aspect in which the case selection for subject NPs is commonly regarded as different involves the question whether or not the verb counts as an "existential verb". On the other hand, the only object rule that supposedly has no parallel in the subject rules involves the notion "resultative verb".

The facts presented in this paper argue very strongly that these two environments are, in fact, indistinguishable under any of the criteria that determine gender on this question.
Let us recall some of the familiar characterizations of existential verbs. Such verbs are said to express 'being, coming into being, ceasing to be, movement, or change of state' (Setälä, SKL, 9). Intuitively, it would seem equally justified to describe some of these subcategories as "resultatives". Verbs that involve 'coming into being', like syntyä 'be born' or löytyä 'be found; ceasing to be', like kuolla 'die' or hävittää 'disappear', are remarkably similar to "achievement verbs" listed as one of the subcategories of inherently resultative verbs in (20). Similarly, there are many parallels between stative existential verbs and stative resultative verbs; for example, consider pairs like näkyä 'be visible' — nähdä 'see' and kuulua 'be audible' — kuulla 'hear'. An illustrative sample of parallel examples is given in (27) and (28) below.

(27) (a) Satamassa näkyy paljon laivoja 'There are many ships to be seen in the harbor';  
(b) Kissalle tuli paljon pentuja 'The cat had many kittens';  
(c) Maahan putosi paljon roskia 'A lot of trash fell on the ground';  
(d) Pekalta unohtui paljon asioita 'A lot of things slipped Pekka's mind';  
(e) Liisalla on paljon sormuksia 'Liisa has many rings';  
(f) Paketissa on paljon kirjoja 'There are many books in the package'.

(28) (a) Nän satamassa paljon laivoja 'I saw many ships in the harbor';  
(b) Kissä sai paljon pentuja 'The cat had many kittens';  
(c) Pudotin maahan paljon roskia 'I dropped a lot of trash on the ground';  
(d) Pekka unohti paljon asioita 'Pekka forgot a lot of things';  
(e) Liisa omistaa paljon sormuksia 'Liisa owns many rings';  
(f) Paketissa sisältyy paljon kirjoja 'The package contains many books'.

All the sentences in (27) are typical examples of "existential sentences"; their counterparts in (28) are transitive sentences with "resultative" verbs as predicate. It can hardly be regarded as a mere coincidence that these two sentence types are the only ones which permit the use of paljon as a quantifier.

To put my case as strongly as possible; it seems to me that the terms existential/non-existential, which we ordinarily associate only with intransitive sentences, are but different labels for the same semantic distinction which is made with the pair resultative/irresultative in talking about transitive sentences. Existential and resultative verbs seem to belong to the same semantic category. Although I have not come close to proving that this conjecture is correct, the peculiar facts about the word paljon suggest that it is worth further consideration.
Notes

1 This work was supported by the National Science Foundation through USDP Grant GU-1598 to the University of Texas and by the 1970 MSSB Mathematical Linguistics Seminar.

2 There are some inconsistencies in Penttilä’s presentation. Later on (SK, 405), he again accepts Setälä’s analysis, according to which *paljon* in (1) is regarded as an adverb.

3 The word “inherently” is intended to indicate that, unlike most transitive verbs, these cannot be used alternatively either in a resultative or in an irresultative sense. That is, they are not like the verb *ampua* which can mean either ‘shoot’ or ‘shoot at’.

4 The first three subcategories are from Zeno Vendler’s interesting study of verbs and time expressions (1967). In addition, Vendler also has a category of “accomplishment verbs”, which correspond fairly closely to verbs which in Finnish have both resultative and irresultative uses.
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Die Schöpfer und ersten Benutzer der estnischen Schriftsprache waren in ihrer Mehrzahl Deutsche, daher bedarf es keiner Erläuterung, daß im Estnischen vorhandene, im Deutschen jedoch fehlende grammatische Formen ihnen nicht immer bewußt wurden. So ist die indirekte Rede­weise (der Modus obliquus) der gesamten älteren estnischen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur zweiten Hälfte des vorigen Jahrhunderts unbekannt, obwohl keine Zweifel bestehen, daß entsprechende Formen in der damaligen estnischen Volkssprache existierten und im Sprach­gebrauch lebendig waren.

In der älteren estnischen Schriftsprache wurden ausschließlich derar­tige Formen des Modus obliquus akzeptiert, die auch im Deutschen gän­sig waren. Eine derartige Möglichkeit bot die Konstruktion mit dem Zeitwort peab (Ta peab haige olema pro Ta olevat haige in der Bedeutung 'Er soll krank sein'). Sie ist bereits im älteren geistlichen Schrifttum zu finden, beispielsweise im Bibeldruck von 1739: Wata ma ollen kuulnud, et Egiptuses peab vilja olemama; mingle sinna alla ja ostke meile sealit (I. Mos. 42 2) 'Siehe, ich höre, es sei in Ägypten Getreide fehl; ziehst hinab und kaufet uns Getreide' u. dgl.
