

THE LIVONIAN JUSSIVE: PERSON AND FUNCTION

Milda Dailidēnaitē

University of Tartu, EE

University of Latvia, LV

milda@ut.ee

Abstract. Alongside the imperative proper, Livonian has developed a secondary indirect imperative paradigm referred to as the jussive. The category of person is the most controversial category concerning imperatives. The scope of the functions of imperatives has also received a lot of attention. This study focuses on the distribution of the person forms of the Livonian jussive and the covariance between function and person. Jussive occurrences from two corpora have been analysed for person and function, cross-referenced, and analysed for prototypicality of function. The Livonian jussive is most frequently used in the third person, but all person forms are attested. All forms occur in prototypical and non-prototypical imperative functions, but the first-person forms are used more frequently for non-prototypical functions, while other forms are used more often for prototypical functions. The results suggest that prototypicality might be determined both by mood as well as person, meaning that prototypical imperative functions might be different for every person.

Keywords: Livonian, jussive, person category, indirect imperative, third-person imperative

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2022.13.1.03>

1. Introduction

Imperatives and especially the scope of imperative paradigms is a long-lived issue in linguistics (Xrakovskij & Volodin 2001, Takahashi 2004, Auwera, Dobrushina & Goussev 2005, Aikhenvald 2010, Gusev 2013, Jary & Kissine 2016, Porter 2018) – and the person category is the most debated category within discussion of imperatives. Many linguists distinguish between what is and is not an imperative based on the person category, namely, second-person forms are referred to as imperatives while other forms are referred to as hortatives, jussives, adhortatives, cohortatives, and others (for a discussion about this terminology see, e.g., Auwera, Dobrushina & Goussev 2005, Jary & Kissine 2016).

Some scholars have also suggested using terminology more liberally when it comes to person, or using umbrella terms, which would include second-person imperatives as well as other person forms. Auwera, Dobrushina & Goussev (2005) have suggested the umbrella term *imperative-hortatives*, Aikhenvald (2010) has suggested referring to second-person imperatives as *canonical* and other person imperatives as *non-canonical*, Jary & Kissine (2016) have suggested applying the term *imperative* to all forms that are morphologically and syntactically consistent with the second-person form and are used to express all functions that are typically associated with imperatives.

Some languages, including Livonian, have multiple paradigms, which can convey a similar range of functions. Livonian has an imperative proper paradigm which is used with the second person and with first-person plural (Viitso 2008: 2019) and a paradigm referred to as the jussive, which is used with all persons (Viitso 2008: 320). Similarly to Livonian, Estonian also has an imperative proper paradigm used with all persons except the first-person singular (Erelt 2017b: 166), and a jussive paradigm (Erelt 2017b: 172).

Person is clearly a widely debated category considering imperatives as well as differences in the function of directive constructions in different persons. Aikhenvald (2010: 3, 2017: 7) points out that second-person imperatives manifest primarily as commands, while first-person imperatives “may develop overtones of suggestion or permission, and the ones oriented towards third person shade into the expression of indirect, mediated wishes”. Lyons (1977: 638–639) states that the first and second persons are fundamentally different from the third person, which is illustrated even by the fact that all known languages have first- and second-person pronouns¹, but there are many languages which do not have a third-person pronoun, or languages in which third-person pronouns can be replaced by demonstrative pronouns, which is also the case in Livonian (e.g., *ta*, *tāmā* ‘he/she’ and *se* ‘this, that, he/she/it’), Finnish (e.g., *hän* ‘he/she’ and *se* ‘this, that, he/she/it’), etc. As Siewierska (2004: 6–7) pointed out, the third person can also differ from the first and second person in many other ways, e.g., different word order, case marking, number and gender marking, with differences

1 As Lyons (1977: 639) also notes, first- and second-person pronouns are not essential, as the person category can also be indicated by verbal inflection.

possibly a result of the first and second person being fundamentally deictic, while the third person is essentially anaphoric. This means, that the identity of the first and second person depend on extralinguistic context, while the identity of the third person is usually established within the linguistic context.

A previous study (Dailidėnaitė 2022) has shown that the Livonian jussive is used in a range of functions typically associated with imperatives (see Section 2), but its usage has also expanded to functions that are not typically associated with imperatives – such as introducing concessive and purpose clauses as well as questions – and that all of its functions occur with all persons. It has also been observed (Dailidėnaitė 2022) that the Livonian jussive is most frequently used with the third person. This study also showed that forms other than those in the third person are also used for prototypical imperative functions; however, the correlation of person forms and functions was not addressed. The aim of this study is twofold: on the one hand, to take a closer look at the person distribution of the Livonian jussive and, on the other hand, to examine the covariance between function and person. The aim of the latter is to see whether all person forms are used to express the full range of functions, or whether some forms are used either more for prototypical or non-prototypical imperative functions, and whether there are any notable restrictions between the way the Livonian jussive is used with the first and second persons compared to the third person.

2. The Livonian jussive

The Livonian jussive is the “youngest” of all the Livonian moods. The jussive forms constitute a full paradigm and are attested in the oldest Livonian grammar (Sjögren & Wiedemann 1861: 130) as well as in a description by Kettunen (1938: LX-LXV); however, historically they have been classified as imperative forms. The term *jussive* was introduced into descriptions of Livonian following Estonian linguistic practice. Estonian has also developed a secondary imperative paradigm (referred to as the jussive), the forms of which were classified as third-person imperative forms in the past (e.g., Wiedemann 2011 [1875]). It was noted (Wiedemann 2011 [1875]: 509), however, that the imperative markers of the other [non-third] persons are used when the imperative

conveys a command, whereas the *third-person imperative* marker is also used with the first and second persons when an imperative conveys a wish, a curse, or permission. Rätsep (1971) proposed that the forms previously called *third-person imperative* forms in fact constitute a separate paradigm when used with other persons. He analysed the forms and suggested a classification based on evidentiality² to differentiate between a direct and indirect imperative and compared it with the opposition between the indicative and the quotative mood. He stated (1971: 57) that aside from being mediated, the communicational situation of the direct and indirect imperatives is the same. Viitso (1976: 157) proposed that the newly acknowledged paradigm be referred to as the *jussive*, and this approach was adopted by Estonian linguists; later it was also applied to the Livonian indirect imperative paradigm (Viitso 2008: 320), on which this study focuses.

The Livonian jussive markers are *-kkõ*, *-kõ*, *-gõ*, *-g*, *-õg* and the plural marker is *-d*; usually, it is used with the hortative particle *laz*³ ‘let’ (Viitso 2008: 318). It is used with all persons; however, it is inflected only for number, but not for person, e.g., *laz āndag* ‘let me/you/him/her give’, *laz āndagõd* ‘let us/you/them give’; it is negated using the negation auxiliary *algõ* ‘let not’ (Viitso 2008: 321, Metslang, Pajusalu & Viitso 2015), e.g., *algõ ta āndag* ‘let him/her not give’. According to Viitso (2008: 321), the auxiliary is conjugated for number (e.g., *algõd āndagõd* ‘let (them) not give’). Sjögren & Wiedemann (1861: 156–157) note that the singular form can also be used with plural predicates and that a secondary strategy using an indicative negation auxiliary also occurs, e.g., *laz mēg āb sā* ‘let us not get’.

Viitso (2008: 320) states that the Livonian jussive is used to convey an obligation, concession, wish, or command. Examples of the Livonian jussive introducing purpose and concessive clauses are also

2 He used the terms *direct speech* and *indirect speech*, *direct imperative* and *mediated imperative*, but did not use the term *evidentiality*.

3 It is derived from the verb *laskõ* ‘let, allow’ and is a cognate of Estonian *las* ‘let’, which is derived from the Estonian verb *laskma* ‘let, allow’. Similar particles can be also found in other languages of the region (e.g., Latvian *lai* ‘let’, from *laist* ‘let, allow’, Lithuanian *tegu* ‘let’, from a permissive form of the verb *gulėti* ‘to lay’, Russian *nycmь* ‘let’ from *nyctumbь* ‘let, allow’). In the other languages of the region, the particle is used with forms of the indicative mood; in Livonian, however, the particle is used with the jussive, which makes it a secondary marker of an indirect imperative.

attested in Sjögren & Wiedemann (1861: 278, 280), but not discussed specifically as a subordination strategy. A previous study (Dailidēnaitė 2022) focused on the functions in which the Livonian jussive mood and the Latvian analytical third-person imperative are used. This study showed that the Livonian jussive can convey a wide range of functions. The function classification used in Dailidēnaitė (2022) is also used in the current article, as jussive occurrences in the data used in this study were used for the same range of functions (with an addition of a couple of sentences used for other functions), the results of the previous study were confirmed. The functions are discussed below.

Imperatives are most commonly used to convey commands, orders, or instructions (Brown & Miller 2013: 220, Aikhenvald 2010: 3, Crystal 2008: 237, Takahashi 2004: 13). Such uses are typically associated with directive force or ‘psychosocial influence’ (Takahashi 2004: 12–17). These uses are referred to here as directives (1) and include orders, commands, advice, instructions, etc. They are directive, usually giving the addressee a compelling reason to act, which is typically associated with an elevated status for the addresser, e.g., in (1) the addresser presumably has superior knowledge, in (2) the addresser has a superior status. Requests (3) are directive; however, the speaker does not have direct influence over the addressees’ actions and thus the addressee is not compelled to act by external circumstances. Both directives and requests have specific addressees. Exhortations (4) do not compel the addressee to act, but rather propose an activity and are low in directiveness, generally have an addressee, but might also be rhetorical – as in (5).

- (1) *Piški* *kuṛē* *u'm* *opātōn,* *laz*
 small.N.SG devil.N.SG be.3SG teach.APP HORT
perīmīez *ki'llōg* *vīļa* *sūozō.* (OL)
 landlord.N.SG sow.JUSS.SG grain.ACC.SG swamp.ILL.SG
 ‘The little devil has told (taught) the landlord **to sow** the grain in the swamp.’
- (2) *Jumāl* *um* *kītōn,* *laz* *ta* *lāk* *mōtsō*
 god.N.SG be.3SG tell.APP HORT 3SG.N go.JUSS.SG forest.ILL
 ‘God told him to go to the forest’

- (3) *Se um pallōn, laz purīņtōg umārd*
 it.N.SG be.3SG ask.APP HORT shake.JUSS.SG apple.ACC.PL
mōzō. (OL)
 down
 ‘It asked **to shake** the apples off.’
- (4) *Laz ni strōdnikād sīegōd un jūogōd! (OL)*
 HORT now worker.N.PL eat.JUSS.PL and drink.JUSS.PL
 ‘Let the workers eat and drink now!’
- (5) *Kis äb usk, laz pavaņtļōg. (OL)*
 who.N.SG NEG.1SG believe.CNG.SG HORT take_a_look.JUSS.SG
 ‘If one does not believe, they may come and see for themselves (~who does not believe, let [them] look).

The Livonian jussive is also used to express permissions (6) that are also low in directiveness, but rather than compelling action or proposing an activity, they do not interfere with an action proposed by the addressee. Unlike the previous functions, they appear in the second position of a conversational exchange following a request for permission – verbal or not. For example, in (7), there is no verbal request for permission. Instead, the woman’s wish to have a cow is indicated by the first sentence of the folk tale, stating that the woman did not have a cow. In this case, this constitutes a situational request for permission, due to the fact that the sea maidens had many cows. Wishes (8) express the volition of the speaker and are characterised by a lack of control over the outcome of the utterance. They are not directive and do not require the addressee to act and can also occur without a specific addressee. Wishes here include good wishes, curses (or bad wishes), prayers, mediated wishes, and similar statements of volition for the subjects of the jussive predicates. Most wishes are mediated and occur in subordinate clauses; however, they can also occur in the main clause, e.g., (9).

- (6) *Se pòis um kītõn, ku ta tōb*
 this.N.SG boy.N.SG be.3SG say.APP that 3SG.N want.3SG
lādõ pōzõd si'zzõl.
 go.INF bush.G.PL inside
Un se izānd um kītõn, laz ta
 and this.N.SG lord.N.SG be.3SG say.APP HORT 3SG.N.SG
lūk. (OL)
 go.JUSS.SG
 ‘The boy said he wanted to go to the bushes. And the lord told him **to go.**’
- (7) *Naizõn āb ūo nīem vōnd. Pivāpāva ūoṅdzõl lānd Kuolkõ. Sūr barā*
siṅži nīemõdi sīend. Ikš neitst ka vōnd, selli līti pu'nni strīplimi
gūngaserk vōnd, um vōnd mōtsānaigās. Ku se um siedā nāizta nānd,
siz se um nuttõn sīe tuoiz kōrapaintõn: “Griet, ajā nīemõd mierrõ!”
Irgõnd nuttõ: “Līgid mierrõ, nīemõd, līgid mierrõ!” Un at lānõd.
Bet ikš nīemõ um īend sīṅ'iz sīemõ, āb ūo lānd īṅõ, ku ne munt nīemõd
at mierrõ nuolānõd.
 ‘One woman did not have a cow. On Sunday morning [she] went to Kūolka. A big herd of blue cows had been grazing (~eating). A girl was also there, [she was wearing] a short, striped skirt and was next to the forest. When she saw the woman, she yelled to the other herder: “Griet, lead the cows to the sea!” [She] started to call: “Go to the sea, cows, go to the sea!” and they went. But one cow remained in place to graze (~eat), [it] did not go with them (~together), when the other cows went to the sea.’
- Siz se mierneitst um kītõn sīe*
 then this.N.SG sea_maiden.N.SG be.3SG say.APP this.G.SG
mōnaizõn, laz vōtāg eṅšõn sīe
 land_woman.DAT.SG HORT take.JUSS.SG self.DAT.SG this.G.SG
nīemõ, mis sīṅ um īend. (OL)
 COW.P.SG that.N.SG here be.3SG stay.APP
 ‘Then the sea maiden told the land woman to take the cow that stayed here for herself.’
- (8) *Un siz se kēṅijemānd tō'b, laz sa*
 and then this.N.SG queen.N.SG want.3SG HORT 2SG.N
mīgõ, *ta sin āndab rō'dõ.* (OL)
 sell.JUSS.SG 3SG.N 2SG.DAT give.3SG money.P.PL
 ‘And then the queen will want you **to sell,** she will give you money.’

- (9) *Laz ne gilgōgōd pāvaļikīz kūldas ja*
 HORT 3PL.N swim.JUSS.SG sun.G.SG gold.INE.SG and
tundōgōd rīemō eņtš jelāmizōs. (Ābēd)
 feel.JUSS.SG joy.P.SG POSS.G.SG living.INE.SG
 ‘Let them swim in the gold of the sun and feel joy in their life.’

The Livonian jussive introduces concessive (10) and purpose clauses (12) as well as questions (13). Concessive clauses are characterised by incompatibility and/or counter-expectation between the situations expressed in the main clause and in the subordinate clause (Hetterle 2015: 50). They usually show the irrelevance of the circumstances described in the subordinate clause to the outcome of the main clause, have no specific addressee, and are not directive. They can use secondary markers of concession, such as juxtaposing negated and affirmative verbs, particles as in (11), or antonyms, e.g., adjectives.

Purpose clauses (12) are also not directive and do not have an addressee. Purpose clauses are subordinate clauses of main clauses, which encode intentional actions that are taken with the goal of bringing about the desired result described in the purpose clauses (Hetterle 2015: 51, Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 20, Cristofaro 2003: 157). The Livonian jussive is used both in direct (13) and indirect (15) questions. Addressees can be stated overtly in questions, but can also be absent and are frequently rhetorical (16). As Holvoet (1998: 106) noted for the similar Latvian constructions, these may not necessarily be requests for information, but rather requests for a directive. Directives, requests, exhortations, permissions, wishes, and questions occur both in main and subordinate clauses, while concession and purpose occur only in subordinate clauses.

- (10) *Maksāg, mis maksōs, agā tāmpō um*
 cost.JUSS.SG what cost.GER but today be.3SG
kanā vōzzō sōmōst!
 chicken.G.SG meat.P.SG get.DEB
 ‘Let [it] cost as much as it takes, but today [we] must get some chicken!’

- (11) *Mikš mi'nnõn ä'b ūo mittõ jõvīst leibõ*
 why 1SG.DAT NEG be.CNG.SG not good.P.SG bread.P.SG
sīedõb, la'z ma kil ne'i lālamstiz
 eat.PPP HORT 1SG.N though so hard.ADV
tīegõ tīedõ.
 do.JUSS.SG work.P.SG
 'Why don't I even have any good bread to eat, even though I work so hard.'
- (12) *Ta ka um lānd kēņig jūr, laz kēņig*
 3SG.N too be.3SG go.APP king.G.SG to HORT king.N.SG
āndag tām̄mõn tīedõ. (OL)
 give.JUSS.SG 3SG.DAT work.P.SG
 'He did go to the king so the king **would give** him a job.'
- (13) *Kui la'z siedā tī'egõ? (JL)*
 how HORT this.P.SG do.JUSS.SG
 'How do you do it (~to do it)?'
- (14) *Ānda mi'nnõn ka nõ'vvõ, kui la'z*
 give.IMP.3SG 1SG.DAT too advice.P.SG how HORT
sõgõ kaļḑi. (JL)
 get.JUSS.SG fish.P.PL
 'Give me advice too, how to get fish.'
- (15) *Kis laz siedā kītõgõ! (Abēd)*
 who.N.SG HORT this.P.SG say.JUSS.SG
 'Nobody could tell/know this! (~Who could tell this!)

Imperatives are usually used to convey commands or other directive speech acts, which in most definitions aside from commands and orders include requests, suggestions, pleas, warnings, advice, prohibitions, and permissions (Jary & Kissine 2016: 122), whereas good wishes are seen as a peripheral use. Jary & Kissine (2016: 125) state that “good wishes are speech acts that recruit forms that, cross-linguistically, lie at the intersection between the imperative and the optative/subjunctive type”. It is clear that directives, requests, exhortations, and permissions are generally seen as directive speech acts and thus typical uses of imperatives.

It is also clear that purpose, concession, or questions are not typical uses of imperatives. Admittedly, both imperative proper and indirect imperative markers are commonly used to express concession in many languages in the Baltic Sea region (e.g., Lithuanian (Ambrazas et al. 2005: 687–688), Estonian (Erelt 2017a: 735), Latvian (Auziņa et al. 2015: 873–874)). The imperative is also used to introduce purpose clauses in Hungarian (Péteri 2012: 450), though not nearly as productively. The analytical third-person imperative usage has also been expanded and is used productively to introduce purpose clauses in Latvian (Dailidēnaite 2022, Auziņa et al. 2015: 869). Indirect imperatives are attested in interrogatives in Latvian, Livonian, and the Estonian dialect of Kihnu (Kehayov, Lindström & Niit 2011); however, such usage – while not unique – is not typical and is not considered a part of imperative usage in general linguistics and is specific to languages or regions. This makes it clear that concession, purpose, and questions are non-prototypical functions of imperatives.

When it comes to prototypical and non-prototypical imperative functions, conveying wishes is typically seen as peripheral (Aikhenvald 2010: 200, Jary & Kissine 2016: 125). On the other hand, the volition of the speaker is also often seen as an important element of the semantics of the imperative (e.g., Auwera, Dobrushina & Goussev 2005, Telban 2017: 269). It is also true that using imperatives to express wishes, good wishes, or curses (or bad wishes) is common (e.g., Japanese (Jarky 2017: 179–180), Koroway (Vries 2017: 252), Wolaitta (Amha 2017: 287, 290, 297), etc.), even though the productivity among languages may vary (Jary & Kissine 2016: 124–125). Aikhenvald (2017: 7, 2010: 3) pointed out that third-person imperatives can have a tendency towards expressing indirect or mediated wishes, while second-person imperatives usually convey commands and first-person imperatives tend towards suggestions or permissions. She also noted that mediated imperatives (Aikhenvald 2010: 55) and/or third-person imperatives (Aikhenvald 2010: 75) have a strong tendency towards wishes. This suggests that the prototypicality of the function of a form or a construction can be determined by the mood, on the one hand, and by the person, on the other. If this is the case, the prototypicality of functions of imperatives could be better viewed as a continuum with different levels of prototypicality of functions for every person.

Considering that the Livonian jussive is most productively used in the third person (ranging from 90.8% to 98.6% in different types

of texts (Dailidėnaitė 2022)) the expected prototypicality of function of the Livonian jussive could be expected to be more similar to the uses, which are more typical of third-person imperatives rather than the imperative proper. This would suggest that conveying wishes using the Livonian jussive would be expected and, moreover, typical. It is also worth noting that in the languages of the Baltic Sea region, it is not atypical (though admittedly secondary) to convey a wish also with the imperative proper (e.g., Estonian (Erelt 2017b: 167)). However, the true frequency or productivity of conveying wishes with imperatives has admittedly not yet been studied and needs to be researched in order to make any conclusions concerning the prototypicality of such usage. Due to the reasons detailed above, conveying wishes is viewed as a prototypical function of the Livonian jussive (and possibly also of the imperative proper), which leads to a classification of prototypical functions containing directives, requests, exhortations, permissions, and wishes, and non-prototypical functions containing concession clauses, purpose clauses, and questions.

3. Data and method

3.1. Data

The data were collected from two corpora. The first corpus was composed of a portion of the Estonian Dialect Corpus, which is fully morphologically annotated. Most of the texts in the corpus (38 7373 words) were folk tales collected by E.N. Setälä in 1888 and 1912 on the Livonian Coast and published in 1953 (Setälä 1953). A smaller portion (5511 words) consisted of transcribed recordings of Grizelda Kristiņ and Poulīn Kļaviņ (all the jussive occurrences that had sufficient context were from Setälä (1953)); a total of 444 jussive occurrences.

The second corpus was the Livonian Corpus, which is a part of the Livonian.tech platform dedicated to Livonian language and culture resources. It included texts from the New Testament (translated by Kōrli Stalte; henceforth, ŪT), the Livonian-Estonian-Latvian Dictionary (LELS),⁴ the Livonian primer written by Kōrli Stalte (1937), the Catechism (translated by Edgar Vālgamā (1936)), the reading book

4 Data from the dictionary were excluded because the context was insufficient to determine the functions.

written by Pētōr Damberg (1935), the transcribed recordings of Pētōr Damberg, the Livonian-Esperanto dictionary (Čače, Damberg, Grīva 1966), and the folk tales collected by O. Loorits during the interwar period on the Livonian Coast (OL).

At the time the data were collected, the latter corpus was still under development, thus only a small part of the corpus was morphologically annotated. The search was completed using the annotation (for jussive singular, jussive plural, jussive connegative singular, and jussive connegative plural) and using text search, which included *laz*, *las*, *algō*, *algōd*, **g*, **ōg*, **gōd*, **ōgōd*, **k*, **kō*. The search results were sorted manually identifying 2805 potential jussive occurrences. At this stage it turned out that 1553 of the examples were from the translation of the New Testament. The first 400 of the examples from the New Testament were selected for the dataset (the other examples from the New Testament were left out), while all the rest of the examples came from other texts. Some of the occurrences were excluded due to insufficient context or due to spelling variation, which meant that some of the occurrences were not jussive, but second-person plural imperatives. The final number of occurrences (including the occurrences from the first corpus) was 1849.

3.2. Method

Sentences that included the jussive were analysed for the person of the jussive form as well as for the function of the jussive occurrence. The jussive occurrences were divided based on whether they showed a prototypical (typically associated with imperatives) or non-prototypical (typically not associated with imperatives) function. It is important to note that the majority of the texts analysed in the study predominantly featured reported speech. This means that most of the jussive occurrences are found in subordinate or complement clauses. For this reason, the only distinction used in this study is between the functions that can occur in the main clause (directive, request, exhortation, permission, wish, question) and those that cannot (concession, purpose); however, individual occurrences are not analysed based on whether they appear in the main or the subordinate clause. Note that third-person jussive forms can be used as a generic reference (e.g., (10)), but the occurrences are not analysed for this.

For the purposes of this study, the functions of the Livonian jussive will be shown in a generalised manner, meaning that the prototypical imperative functions (directive, request, exhortation, permission, and wish) will be presented combined, and the non-prototypical functions (concession, purpose, and question) will be presented both combined and separately, and the total number as well as percentage of every person form will be given for each position.

4. Results

4.1. Person distribution

The Livonian jussive is used with all persons (Viitso 2008: 320–321), which is also attested in the data of this study; however, it also shows a very clear tendency to be used most frequently with the third person. The distribution of person forms is shown in Table 1 below, which contains the absolute numbers of occurrences as well as percentages, and the relevant example for each person is given in parentheses.

Table 1. Person distribution.

	Sg	Pl	Total:
1	52 (2.8%) (16)	24 (1.3%) (17)	76 (4.1%)
2	29 (1.6%) (8)	22 (1.2%) (18)	51 (2.8%)
3	1440 (77.9%) (1)	282 (15.3%) (9)	1722 (93.1%)
Total:	1521 (82.3%)	328 (17.7%)	1849 (100%)

- (16) *Laz minā kītōg, ku ma vōtšūb eņš*
 HORT 1SG.N tell.JUSS.SG that 1SG.N search.3SG 1SG.POSS
mīestō. (OL)
 husband.P.SG
 ‘I will (~let me) tell, that I am looking for my husband.’

- (17) *Mis siz mēg laz tīegōm? (ŪT)*
 what then 1PL.N HORT do.JUSS.PL
 ‘What should we do?’

- (18) *Nūzigid,* *pālagid* *Jumālt,* *algō* *tēg*
 wake_up.IMP.2PL pray.IMP.2PL God.P.SG NEG 2PL.N
tulgōd *kērtamiz* *sizzōl.* (ŪT)
 come.JUSS.PL temptation.G.SG inside
 ‘Wake up, pray to God, so you do **not give in** to temptation.’

The third-person occurrences make up the vast majority of the cases (93.1%) and most of these occurrences are singular forms (77.9%). Unsurprisingly, second-person occurrences are the rarest (2.8%). First-person occurrences are slightly more frequent, but still make up only a small fraction of all occurrences (4.1%). As with the third person, singular forms are also more frequent in the first and second person; however, the difference is not as significant. Second-person plural forms are the rarest and are attested only in the translation of the New Testament. All of the other forms occur in all the texts.

4.2. Function distribution and the person category

Table 2 illustrates with which functions the person forms were used. The frequencies of functions are counted separately for each person and since the distribution of person forms is very unequal, the percentages are shown first and then the absolute frequency is given in parentheses. The distribution is provided for singular and plural forms both separately and combined. To make the overview clear, the functions are presented in a generalised manner, combining all of the prototypical imperative functions and non-prototypical functions (see Section 2). In two cases (third-person singular and third-person plural), the function was impossible to determine due to insufficient context, so these two cases are excluded from this overview.

As illustrated in Table 2, third-person forms are used prototypically most often (70.5%). The third-person singular forms are used for prototypical imperative functions more frequently (73.2%) than the plural forms (56.8%). What is even more surprising is that second-person forms were also used for prototypical imperative functions in most cases (60.8%). Moreover, they were used for prototypical functions more frequently than third-person plural forms, though, admittedly not by very much and more so in plural.

Table 2. Person and function prototypicality.

Function	1SG	1PL	2SG	2PL	3SG	3PL
Proto-typical	32.7% (17)	37.5% (9)	58.6% (17)	63.6% (14)	73.2% (1054)	56.8% (159)
	34.2% (26)		60.8% (31)		70.5% (1213)	
Non-prototypical	67.3% (35)	62.5% (15)	41.4% (12)	36.4% (8)	26.8% (385)	43.4% (122)
	65.8% (50)		39.2% (20)		29.5% (507)	
Total	52	24	29	22	1439	281

The first-person forms are used for prototypical imperative functions the least frequently (34.2%); notably, the plural forms are used for prototypical imperative functions more often (37.5%) than the singular forms (32.7%). These results seem to suggest that there might be some truth to the hypothesis expressed in Section 3.2, that the most *prototypical* functions may not necessarily be only mood dependent, but also person dependent. The data indicate that the first-person singular forms are used in prototypical imperative functions the least, which indicates that this form is typically used in non-prototypical functions, while the third-person and second-person forms of the Livonian jussive seem to be used most typically for prototypical imperative functions. It is worth noting though, that both first and second person is more frequently used for prototypical imperative functions in plural than singular, while it is the opposite in third person.

Third-person forms are the most frequent – especially third-person singular – and second-person forms are the rarest (with the second-person plural occurring only in the New Testament). It is safe to say that third-person forms are the most prototypical forms of the Livonian jussive. It could be expected that with second-person forms being the rarest, these would overwhelmingly be used for functions typically not associated with imperatives; however, this is not the case. It is also notable, that all persons differ when it comes to the prototypicality distribution in singular and plural forms.

It might be the case that the second person has a strong tendency to be used for prototypical imperative functions and, thus, is used this way even in the case of the jussive, which is rarely used in the second person. Similarly, it could be expected that the first person in general is typically

not used for prototypical imperative functions, in which case the prototypical functions of the Livonian jussive for each of the persons might be different. At least in the given dataset, the proportion of prototypical imperative functions does not correlate with the frequency of the form, e.g., third-person plural is much more frequent than the second person (the low frequency of which would validate seeing it as a peripheral use of the Livonian jussive), yet second-person forms are used more frequently for prototypical imperative functions. The person hierarchy of the proportion of the prototypical uses is as follows:

$$3 \gg 2 \gg 1$$

However, if we also take number into account, it becomes rather different:

$$3\text{SG} \gg 2\text{PL} \gg 2\text{SG} \gg 3\text{PL} \gg 1\text{PL} \gg 1\text{SG}$$

It does not correlate with the frequency of the forms:

$$3 \gg 1 \gg 2$$

Or, also considering number:

$$3\text{SG} \gg 3\text{PL} \gg 1\text{SG} \gg 2\text{SG} \gg 1\text{PL} \gg 2\text{PL}$$

Table 3 illustrates for which non-prototypical functions each person form is used. The distribution is given as percentages and absolute frequencies are shown in parentheses. As can be seen in the table, aside from prototypical usage, the jussive is used most productively for expressing purpose and is somewhat productive for questions. Concession occurs less frequently for all persons and the distribution of the non-prototypical jussive functions is consistent for all persons. The main differences are notable in the proportion of the prototypical jussive functions.

Table 3. Function and person correlation.

Person	Function	Sg	Pl	Total
1	Prototypical	32.7% (17)	37.5% (9)	34.2% (26)
	Concession	3.8% (2)	1.9% (1)	3.9% (3)
	Purpose	32.7% (17)	41.7% (10)	35.5% (27)
	Question	30.8% (16)	16.7% (4)	26.3% (20)
	Total	52	24	76
2	Prototypical	58.6% (17)	63.6% (14)	60.8% (31)
	Concession	–	9.1% (2)	3.9% (2)
	Purpose	34.5% (10)	18.2% (4)	23.5% (12)
	Question	6.9% (2)	9.1% (2)	5.9% (3)
	Total	29	22	51
3	Prototypical	73.2% (1054)	56.6% (159)	70.5% (1213)
	Concession	2.7% (39)	0.4% (1)	2.3% (40)
	Purpose	20.2% (291)	40.9% (115)	23.6% (406)
	Question	3.8% (55)	2.1% (5)	3.5% (60)
	Manner	–	0.4% (1)	0.1% (1)
	Total	1439	281	1720

The function distribution in the first person is the most consistent but differs more in the second and third person. The first person is used consistently to express concession; however, first-person singular is used less frequently for prototypical functions and purpose and significantly more frequently for questions compared to first-person plural. The third person is used consistently for introducing concessive clauses and in questions, while third-person singular is used much more frequently for prototypical functions and noticeably less frequently for introducing purpose clauses than the plural form.

Questions are by far the most frequent with first-person forms and, furthermore, almost twice as frequent in singular than plural. They are also more frequent in singular than in plural in other persons; however, the difference is not as striking. This makes for a clear hierarchy:

$$1 \gg 2 \gg 3$$

The hierarchy also works for all persons if we take number into account:

$$1\text{SG} \gg 1\text{PL} \gg 2\text{SG} \gg 2\text{PL} \gg 3\text{SG} \gg 3\text{PL}$$

The relative frequency of purpose clauses is similar in first-person plural and third-person plural, but is lower in third-person singular and first-person singular. The hierarchy is as follows:

$$1\text{PL} \gg 3\text{PL} \gg 2\text{SG} \gg 1\text{SG} \gg 3\text{SG} \gg 2\text{PL}$$

Notably, in both first- and third-person plural, purpose clauses are more frequent than in the singular – the opposite pattern is observed for second person. In this case, it is important to note that the number of second-person (and first-person) occurrences is quite low and thus a larger sample might give different results.

5. Discussion

The results confirm the previously made claim that the Livonian jussive is used directly in all persons (Dailidēnaitė 2022). It is clear that the third-person singular is by all accounts the most prototypical form of the Livonian jussive, as it is by far the most frequent and is used the most often for prototypical imperative functions. The third-person plural is also quite frequent and often used for prototypical imperative functions; however, its usage is more similar to the other persons than the third-person singular. This may indicate that when it comes to the Livonian jussive, every person form is also distinct based on number – not just person (it is the most noticeable in the third person and secondly in the first person).

Indirect (or third-person) imperative paradigms are found in all the languages that are spoken around the historical Livonian area: Latvian (the analytical “third-person imperative”, which is also used with other persons, for a discussion see Dailidēnaitė 2022), Lithuanian (which has both analytical and synthetic forms expressing indirect commands to all persons; the third-person or indirect imperative forms and constructions are thought to be remnants of a historical mood in Lithuanian

called the permissive (for a description see Kazlauskas 1966: 373)), Estonian (similarly to Livonian, it has a full jussive paradigm and an imperative proper paradigm, which has all forms except for the first-person singular (Erelt 2017b: 166)), and Russian (which also has an analytical third-person imperative (Dobrushina 2018)). Having full indirect imperative paradigms is clearly one of the areal phenomena in the contact area between Baltic, Slavic, and Finnic languages – alongside evidentiality (Wälchli 2000, Kehayov, Metslang & Pajusalu 2012), verb particles (Wälchli 2001), and many other features (see Larsson 2001).

Indirect imperatives are used productively for non-prototypical functions in multiple languages, most notably Livonian and Latvian. Introducing purpose clauses using an indirect imperative form is unique to Latvian and Livonian in the region (somewhat similar usage has also been attested in Hungarian (Péteri 2012)). Using indirect imperatives in questions is also a peculiar usage specific to Livonian and Latvian, such usage is also attested on Kihnu in Estonia (Kehayov, Lindström & Niit 2011). Note that Kihnu might have been in close contact with Livonians and/or Latvians.

Using indirect imperatives to introduce concessive clauses is also attested in Lithuanian (Ambrazas et al. 2005: 687–688) and Estonian (Erelt 2017a: 735). However, the function distribution of these constructions (also the function distribution in relation to person forms) has not been studied in any of these languages. Further research involving the other languages of the region is necessary in order to better understand the true nature and possible origin of the indirect imperatives as well as their atypical functions (e.g., introducing purpose, concessive clauses, and questions) in this area. Since Livonian has been in intense contact with Latvian which resulted in many shared features in these languages (see for example Rudzīte 1994, 1996, Wälchli 2000, 2001, Larsson 2001, Ernštreits & Kļava 2014) and since the indirect imperatives cover the same range of functions in both languages (Dailidēnaitē 2022), studying the function distribution of the indirect imperative constructions within different persons, as well as person distribution in Latvian, would be beneficial in order to better understand the usage of the Livonian jussive.

The most remarkable find is that the second-person jussive occurrences were primarily used for prototypical imperative functions and, in fact, were used for prototypical imperative functions more frequently

than third-person plural jussive occurrences. This seems to indicate that the second person has a very strong tendency to be used directly and prototypically even when it comes to indirect imperatives (however, more research needs to be done to confirm this) and even when they exist alongside an imperative proper paradigm.

The results of this study confirm and are congruent with the observations made by Aikhenvald (2010: 3, 2017: 7), meaning that the first-person jussive occurrences tend to be used more for non-prototypical functions whereas second-person jussive occurrences, even though the least frequent, tend to be used for functions typically associated with imperatives. Also, the differences between the third-person singular and third-person plural and the similarities between third-person plural and the first and second persons might suggest that there could be differences in how the identity of the third person is established in Livonian. Siewierska (2004: 6–7) has pointed out that the first and second persons are deictic, while the third person is anaphoric, i.e., that the identities of the first and second persons are determined by extralinguistic factors, while the identity of the third person is established within the linguistic context. She also pointed out that the third person can be used deictically (e.g., seeing someone and talking about them while looking/pointing at them), but that its main use is still anaphoric, and that in some languages deictic use can only be achieved using demonstratives rather than third-person pronouns. In Livonian, it is common to use demonstratives in place of third-person pronouns, in fact, in the plural, the shorter version (*ne* ‘they’) of the pronoun *nāmād* ‘they’ coincides with the demonstrative: *ne* ‘these, those’. Note that *nāmād* ‘they’ does not appear in the dataset used in this study. This raises the question of whether the third-person plural is used more often anaphorically or deictically and also how different it is from the third-person singular. However, further research is necessary in order to understand the differences in the usage of the third-person singular and third-person plural.

6. Conclusions

The analysis of the use of the Livonian jussive in the two corpora shows conclusively that Livonian third-person jussive forms are by far the most productive and that other persons are clearly used in a secondary capacity. The results also clearly show that person forms are used differently in terms of function. The function distribution within the different persons shows that the first person – especially the first-person singular – is used least frequently for prototypical jussive functions and is used most frequently to introduce purpose clauses and questions. The second-person jussive forms are used most frequently for prototypical jussive functions and are also used quite frequently to introduce purpose clauses, but not concessive clauses or questions. It must be noted, however, that both first- and second-person forms are very rare in the corpora (6.9% combined) and second-person plural forms only occurred in the translation of the New Testament. It is also notable that third-person plural is used in prototypical imperative functions significantly less frequently than third-person singular and also less frequently than second-person jussive forms.

The function distribution of first- and second-person occurrences is not conclusive based on this dataset and could potentially fluctuate significantly in other texts. It is, however, clear that the Livonian jussive is used with all persons and all person forms are used both for prototypical imperative functions and non-prototypical functions, which means that Livonian has a full and functional indirect imperative paradigm alongside the imperative proper, which has second-person forms and a first-person plural (Viitso 2008: 319–320). Admittedly, the third-person forms are by far the most frequent and used more prototypically than other person forms. The results of this study also suggest that the prototypical usage of each of the persons might be different within one paradigm and the prototypicality of the function should be looked at considering both the mood category as well as the person category.

Acknowledgements

This study is supported by the State Research Programme “Multi-functional dictionary of Livonian” No. VPP-LETONIKA-2021/2-0002 (2021–2024).

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 – persons, ACC – accusative, APP – active past participle, CNG – connegative, DAT – dative, DEB – debitive, G – genitive, GER – gerund, HORT – hortative, ILL – illative, IMP – imperative, INF – infinitive, INM – instrumental, JUSS – jussive, N – nominative, NEG – negation, P – partitive, PL – plural, POSS – possessive, SG – singular, SUP – supine.

Sources

- Čače, Ints, Pēteris Dambergs & Hilda Grīva. 1966. *Esperantisto en Latvio ėe livoj*. Pumpuri.
- Damberg, Pētōr. 1935. *Jemakiel lugdōbrāntōz skūol ja kuod pierāst*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Kirjapainon OY.
- M. Luther. *Piški katkismus*. Helsinki. 1936.
- LELS = Viitso, Tiit-Rein & Valts Ernštreits. 2013. *Līvōkīel-ēstikīel-leļkīel sōnārōntōz. Liivi-eesti-lāti sōnaraamat. Lībiešu-igauņu-latviešu vārdnīca*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikool, Rīga: Latviešu valodas aģentūra.
- OL = Loorits, Oskar. *Collection of Livonian folktales*. Estonian Literary Museum. (LF IV 6; ERA-13302-70814-18895)
- Setälä, Eemil Nestor. 1953. *Näytteitä liivin kielestä*. Väinö Kyrölä (ed.), Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran toimituksia 106, 532. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Stalte, Kōrli. 1936. *Jelzi sōnā. Abēd ja ȳrgandōks lugdōbrāntōz*. Tartu: Akadeemiline Emakeele Selts.
- The Livonian corpus*. Estonian Dialect Corpus (Eesti murdekorpus). Available at: <http://www.murre.ut.ee/mkweb/> (viewed in August, 2019).
- The Corpus of Livonian*. Livonian.tech. University of Latvia Livonian Institute. Available at: <https://livonian.tech> (viewed in August 2021)
- ŪT = *Ūž testament*. Helsinki. 1937.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2010. *Imperatives and commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2017. Imperatives and commands: a cross-linguistic view. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Commands. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, 1–45. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198803225.003.0001>.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2020. “Damn your eyes!” (not really): Imperative imperatives, and curses as commands. In Nico Nassenstein & Anne Storch (eds.),

- Swearing and Cursing – Contexts and Practices in a Critical Linguistic Perspective. Language and Social Life*, 53–78. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501511202-003>.
- Ambrasas, Vytautas, Kazimieras Garšva, Aleksas Girdenis, Evalda Jakaitienė, Pranas Kniūkšta, Stasė Krinickaitė, Vitas Labutis, Adelė Laigonaitė, Elena Oginskienė, Juozas Pikčilingis, Albertas Ružė, Nijolė Sližienė, Kazys Ulvydas, Vincas Urbutis, Adelė Valeckienė & Elena Valiulytė. 2005. *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. (Ed.) Vytautas Ambrasas. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas & Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- Amha, Azeb. 2017. Commands in Wolaitta. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Commands. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, 283–300. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198803225.003.0014>.
- Auziņa, Ilze, Ieva Brenķe, Juris Grigorjevs, Inese Indričāne, Baiba Ivulāne, Andra Kalnača, Linda Lauze, Ilze Lokmane, Dace Markus, Daina Nītiņa, Gunta Smiltņiece, Baiba Valkovska & Anna Vulāne. 2015. *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. LU Latviešu valodas institūts: Rīga.
- Auwers, Johan van der, Nina Dobrushina & Valentin Goussev. 2005. A semantic map for imperative-hortatives. In Dominique Willems, Bart Defrancq, Timothy Coleman, & Dirk Noël (eds.), *Contrastive analysis in language*, 44–66. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brown, Keith & Jim Miller. 2013. *The Cambridge dictionary of linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139049412>.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination* (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crystal, David. 2008. *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*, 6th edn. New Jersey: Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444302776>.
- Dailidēnaitė, Milda. 2022. Functions of Livonian and Latvian indirect imperatives and their further developments. In Helle Metslang, Andra Kalnača & Miina Norvik (eds.), *Circum-Baltic languages: varieties, comparisons, and change*, 63–94. Potsdam Linguistic Investigations series. Frankfurt: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Dobrushina, Nina. 2018. Status konstrukcii s chastitsami *pust' i puskaj* v russkomazykye. *Russian Linguistics* 43. 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11185-018-09208-0>.
- Dobrushina, Nina. 2012. What is the jussive for? A study of third person commands in six Caucasian Languages. *Linguistics* 50(1). 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2012-0001>.
- Erelt, Mati. 2017a. Liitlause. In Mati Erelt & Helle Metslang (eds.), *Eesti keele süntaks*. (Eesti keele varamu III), 93–239. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Erelt, Mati. 2017b. Õeldis. In Mati Erelt & Helle Metslang (eds.), *Eesti keele süntaks*. (Eesti keele varamu III), 93–239. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Ernštreits, Valts & Gunta Kļava. 2014. Grammatical changes caused by contact between Livonian and Latvian. *Eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteaduse ajakiri. Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 5(1). 77–90. <https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2014.5.1.05>.

- Gusev, Valentin. 2013. *Tipologija imperativa*. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoj kulturi.
- Hetterle, Katja. 2015. *Adverbial clauses in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin & Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110409857>.
- Holvoet, Axel. 1998. On the functions and grammatical status of the Latvian modal particle *lai*. *Baltistica* 33(1). 103–113.
- Jary, Mark & Mikhaïl Kissine. 2016. When terminology matters: The imperative as a comparative concept. *Linguistics* 54(1). 119–148. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2015-0039>.
- Jarkey, Nerida. 2017. Imperatives and commands in Japanese. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Commands. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, 169–188. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198803225.003.0008>.
- Kehayov, Petar, Liina Lindström & Ellen Niit. 2011. Imperative in interrogatives in Estonian (Kihnu), Latvian and Livonian. *Linguistica Uralica* 47(2). 81–93. <https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.2011.2.01>.
- Kehayov, Petar, Helle Metslang & Karl Pajusalu. 2012. Evidentiality in Livonian. *Linguistica Uralica* 48(1). 41–54. <https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.2012.1.04>.
- Kettunen, Lauri. 1938. *Livisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Einleitung*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Larsson, Lars-Gunnar. 2001. Baltic influence on Finnic languages. In Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm, *Circum-Baltic Languages. Past and Present*, 237–256. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.54.12lar>.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics* (vol. II). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Metslang, Helle, Karl Pajusalu & Tiit-Rein Viitso. 2015. Negation in Livonian. In Matti Miestamo, Anne Tamm & Beáta Wagner-Nagy (eds.), *Negation in Uralic languages* (Typological Studies in Language 108), 433–456. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.108.16met>.
- Péteri, Attila. 2012. The Hungarian imperative particle *hadd*. A contrastive look at the development of sentence mood in some European languages. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 59(4). 439–463. <https://doi.org/10.1556/ALing.59.2012.4.3>.
- Porter, Stanley E. 2018. Aspect and imperatives once more. In Stanley E. Porter & Matthew Brook O'Donnell (eds.), *Biblical and Ancient Greek Linguistics* 7, 141–172. Eugene: Pickwick Publications.
- Rätsep, Huno. 1971. Kas kaudne kõneviis on kõneviis? In *Keel ja struktuur 5. Töid matemaatilise ja struktuuraalse lingvistika alalt*, 43–69. Tartu: Tartu Riiklik Ülikool.
- Rudzīte, Marta. 1994. Latviešu un lībiešu savstarpējā ietekme. In Kersti Boiko (ed.), *Lībieši*, 288–319. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Rudzīte, Marta. 1996. Latviešu un lībiešu valodas kontaktu atspulgi. *Baltu filoloģija* 6. 3–7.
- Schmidtke-Bode, Karsten. 2009. *A typology of purpose clauses* (Typological Studies in Language 88). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.88>.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511812729>.

- Sjögren, Andreas J. & Ferdinand J. Wiedemann. 1861. *Joh. Andreas Sjögren's Livische Grammatik nebst Sprachproben*. Joh. Andreas Sjögren's Gesammelte Schriften. Band II. Theil I. St. Petersburg.
- Takahashi, Hidemitsu. 2004. *The English imperative: A cognitive and functional analysis*. Hokkaido University. Ph.D. thesis.
- Telban, Borut. 2017. Commands as a form of intimacy among the Karawari of Papua New Guinea. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Commands. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, 266–282. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198803225.003.0013>.
- Vitso, Tiit-Rein. 1976. Eesti muutkondade süsteemist. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 19(3). 148–162.
- Vitso, Tiit-Rein. 2008. *Liivi keel ja läänemeresoome keelemaastikud*. Tartu & Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- Vries, Lourens de. 2017. The imperative paradigm of Korowai, a Greater Auyu language of West Papua. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Commands. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, 250–265. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198803225.003.0012>.
- Wiedemann, Ferdinand Johan. 2011. *Eesti keele grammatika*. Translated by Heli Laanekask. Tallinn: Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Emakeele Selts.
- Wälchli, Bernhard. 2000. Infinite predication as a marker of evidentiality and modality in the languages of the Baltic region. *Language Typology and Universals* 54(2). 186–210. <https://doi.org/10.1524/stuf.2000.53.2.186>.
- Wälchli, Bernhard. 2001. Lexical evidence for the parallel development of the Latvian and Livonian verb particles. In Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *Circum-Baltic Languages: Volume 2: Grammar and Typology*, 413–442. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.55.06wal>.
- Xrakovskij, Viktor & Aleksandr Volodin. 2001. *Semantika i tipologija imperativov. Russkij imperativ*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo nauchnoj i uchebnoj literatury.

Kokkuvõte. Milda Dailidēnaitē: Liivi jussiiv: isik ja funktsioon. Liivi keeles on imperatiivi kõrval välja kujunenud sekundaarne indirektne imperatiiv, mida kutsutakse jussiiviks. Jussiivi kasutatakse kõikide isikutega. Kuna isikukategooria on tekitanud imperatiivide puhul kõige rohkem vaidlusi ning palju tähelepanu on pälvinud ka funktsioonid, milles imperatiivid tüüpiliselt esinevad, on selle uurimuse keskmes liivi jussiivi isikuvormide distributsioon ning isiku ja funktsiooni kovariatsioon.

Uurimuses on analüüsitud kahe liivi keele korpuse andmeid. Kõigepealt on määratud jussiivi vormide isik ja funktsioon ning seejärel vaadatud, kui prototüüpselt ja millistes funktsioonides on iga isiku vorme kasutatud. Uurimus näitab, et kolmas isik on kindlalt kõige prototüüpsem liivi jussiivi vorm, kuid kõik isikuvormid on andmetes esindatud. Kõiki jussiivi isikuvorme on kasutatud nii prototüüpsetes kui ka mitteprototüüpsetes funktsioonides.

Kolmanda ja teise isiku vormid ilmnevad enamasti prototūpsetes imperatiivi funktsioonides, esimese isiku vormid aga funktsioonides, mida tavaliselt imperatiividega ei seostata, näiteks mөөndlauses, otstarbelauses vői kūsilauses. Uurimistulemused viitavad sellele, et liivi jussivi funktsioonide prototūpsust vōib määarata nii kõneviis kui ka isik, mis tähendab, et iga isiku puhul vōivad olla prototūpsed imperatiivi funktsioonid erinevad.

Vōtmesōnad: liivi keel, jussivi, isiku kategooria, kaugimperatiiv, kolmanda isiku imperatiiv

Kubbōvōttōks. Milda Dailidēnaitē: Līvō kīel jussiv: pārsōn ja funksij. Līvō kīels imperatīv kilgs um suggōn sekundāri ābkūoḡi imperatīv, mis sōb nuttōd jussivōks. Jussiv sōb kōlbatōd amād pārsōnōdōks. Imperatīvōd kategōrijšti amā jemīḡ um rōkāndtōd iḡ pārsōn kategōrij. Pāḡiḡ tādōlpanmiz alā ātō vōnnōd ka funksijd, kus imperatīvōd sōbōd kōlbatōd. Sīepierāst sīe tuḡšlimiz sidāms um kūoḡōn līvō jussiv pārsōn formōd distributsij, nei iḡ ka pārsōn ja funksij kovariātsij. Tuḡšlimizōs ātō kōlbatōd kōd līvō kīel korpus dattōd.

Tuḡšlimi nāḡḡōb, ku kuolmōz pārsōn um amā prototīpli līvō kīel jussiv form, bet lieudtōb ātō ka amād munt pārsōnōd formōd. Āmḡi jussiv formidi vōib kōlbatō nei prototīplizis, ku ka ābprototīplizis funksijši. Kuolmōnd ja tuoiz pārsōn formōd amā jemīḡ sōbōd kōlbatōd prototīplizis imperatīv funksijši, bet ezmiz pārsōn formōd funksijši, mis irdistiz āb sōtō pidtōd imperatīv funksijdōks, nāḡḡōbōks, kontsesij, vōttōks aga kizzimiz kītōmis. Tuḡšlimiz rezultātōd nāḡḡōbōd, ku līvō jussiv funksijd prototīplizitō vōibōd mōjjō nei rōkvīḡ, ku ka pārsōn, mis tāntōb, ku jegā pārsōnōn imperatīv prototīplizt funksijd vōibōd vōlda mōitizt.