

# Lexical markers of evidentiality in Lithuanian

Björn Wiemer

This article presents a first approximation to lexical evidentiality marking in contemporary Lithuanian, based on newspaper texts from electronic corpora. 26 units (particles, adverbs, conjunctions, parenthetical expressions) are analysed from the perspective of their function as reportive and/or inferential markers. The analysis is based on the typological frameworks of Plungian (2001) and Aikhenvald (2004), which were developed with respect to grammatical evidentiality marking. It is shown that these typologies also prove appropriate for a classification and description of lexical markers. Most of the relevant markers of Lithuanian show variable scope and exhibit a systematic syncretism with epistemic attitudes of the speaker toward the veracity of the evidentially marked message. This syncretism largely parallels evidential-epistemic “overlaps” of Lithuanian participle constructions (cf. Wiemer 2006, forthcoming), with which these markers can be combined freely, just as they can be combined with each other. Other important results of the analysis are that reportive and inferential meanings are often expressed indiscriminately, and that in the majority of cases evidential meanings (as well as epistemic ones) arise only by virtue of discourse pragmatic effects. We thus have to distinguish between conventionalized markers of evidentiality, on the one hand, and markers used in evidential strategies, on the other.

## *1. Introduction*

The present paper is intended as a first approximation to a systematic account of lexical evidentiality marking in Lithuanian, based primarily on corpus data. The analysis focuses on a purely synchronic overview of the pertinent lexical units, leaving a more thorough semantic and discourse-pragmatic investigation of each item for future research. Although I argue for keeping the distinction between the conceptual domain of evidentiality and the one of epistemic modality as clear-cut as possible (as has been demanded by Aikhenvald 2004 and de Haan 1999, among others), in the description of language-specific entities one cannot neglect the fact that meanings from both domains are often intertwined in one lexical unit. This is not a case of polysemy, but rather of syncretism, which is also to be distinguished from lexical diffuseness (or ‘underspecification’, etc.). Thus, we have to reckon with (and do justice to) the fact that in natural languages (or at least in many of them), evidential markers cannot be accounted for without also taking into consideration the actual

speaker's epistemic attitude toward the proposition expressed (see 4.1-4.2).

The paper starts from the assumption that basically the same notional divisions of evidentiality can be assumed for lexical expressions that have also been postulated for grammatical evidentiality (see section 2). Although Aikhenvald (2004:6, f. 1) seems to argue against such a parallelism, I do not see any reason why we should assume *a priori* that the semantic evolution of lexical markers in some conceptual domain should differ from the development of grammatical markers in the same domain. The same applies to their synchronic status. I think this kind of parallelism should be assumed unless it is shown to be false on empirical grounds.

In section 2, I will discuss the criteria allowing a rough classification of evidential markers, which have been applied by an increasing number of typologists. The descriptive part of this contribution is contained in section 3, which begins with hearsay markers (3.1), continues with inferential markers (3.2) and concludes with a discussion of cases for which a discrimination of these two subdomains of evidentiality turns out to be difficult (3.3). In the last section I will tackle the question of interferences between evidential and epistemic meaning components (4.1), discussing whether the combination of evidentiality markers yields any additional functions (4.2). The paper concludes with some resumptive remarks in section 4.3.

## 2. Data and principles of typological comparison

The following description is claimed to be valid for contemporary standard Lithuanian (Lith. 'lietuvių bendrinė kalba'). Since grammars, dictionaries and handbooks make at best casual remarks concerning the units relevant for this investigation and, to my knowledge, hardly any specific research into this issue has been conducted for Lithuanian,<sup>1</sup> I will basically make recourse to a recent paper of my own (Wiemer 2005), in which I gave a first account of the diachronic paths of semantic development of lexical evidentiality markers in Lithuanian, Russian and Polish. A survey of these sources yielded a list, which became the basis of Table 1, to be found at the end of this contribution. The items from this table were checked in an electronic text corpus of contemporary Lithuanian, the majority of texts being from newspaper articles.<sup>2</sup> The precise location of examples will be indicated by abbreviations (see the list at the end); interpretations have been checked with native speakers.<sup>3</sup>

Naturally, the question arises as to what has been looked for and counted as a lexical marker of evidentiality. Without going into any deeper discussion in this regard, I have considered particles, prepositions and conjunctions as such units. Particles can be distinguished from adverbs only with some difficulty.<sup>4</sup> In principle we ought to count as true evidential particles only those units which can take scope over a clause (or a whole sentence, i.e. a combination of clauses) and which are not just ad-verbal (or ad-nominal) modifiers. However, we have to admit that the scope of a marker may also embrace syntactic units below the clause level, i.e. NPs and PPs as well as their modifiers (attributes), and small clauses.<sup>5</sup> This holds for units with variable scope; prepositions by definition take scope only over NPs (see 3.1). In any case, I assume that the speaker marks indirect evidence if (a) s/he makes reference to a denomination uttered in a previous speech act which s/he wants to mark as foreign and quoted, or (b) s/he makes an inference based on other kinds of evidence. Below, I will illustrate this with a couple of examples.

As a conceptual starting point, I will make use of a general classification of evidential expressions which conforms to the typology of grammatical evidentiality given in Plungian (2001) and Aikhenvald (2004). Plungian proposed to divide the “evidential space” on the basis of two parameters: (i) whether or not the evidence is based on personal experience, and (ii) whether the situation S referred to in the proposition P of an utterance (sentence) has been experienced directly or only indirectly. The crucial cross-cut between these two parameters are utterances with a P specified as based on indirect, though personal experience. This is the case with inferentials based on perception: since the speaker observes a situation S2, s/he can infer that S1 must obtain (or have obtained) as well (since it is a precondition of S2). Plungian calls this ‘reflected evidence’ (cf. the figure in Plungian 2001:353). His classification does not coincide completely with the division proposed by Aikhenvald (2003; 2004), who makes a global distinction of [ $\pm$  firsthand] information, too, having found systems with a clear division of labour between markers of (a) direct (= firsthand) vs. (b) inferred and/or (c) reported evidence (= non-firsthand). But, first, within the cases of firsthand-information she further distinguishes between visual and other kinds of perception. Second, she puts more emphasis on the difference between inferences (perception-based) and assumptions (reasoning-based);<sup>6</sup> cf. her table (2004:65). Thus, both researchers first make a global “cut” between indirect evidence conveyed by other people’s utterances (hearsay) and non-firsthand, though personally experienced evidence (inferences). Aikhenvald’s

classification, based on a much broader typological data set, does more justice to the difference between inferences and assumptions (hypotheses)<sup>7</sup> as well as to the fact that for all languages which have evidential distinctions in their grammar, visual direct evidence turns out to be the unmarked case (as opposed to auditory etc. perception); on this issue cf. also Xrakovskij (2005:90). These differentiations will, however, not be focussed on here. Instead, I want to pursue a description for which Plungian's proposal proves more appropriate, insofar as it can better account for the fact that many evidential expressions carry additional epistemic load.

Before starting with the presentation of the evidential markers, some words concerning the problem of translation are in order. English glosses, both in the running text and in the examples, have to be treated with care. One should be aware that, especially in this highly pragmatized domain of speech, where speaker's epistemic attitudes and reference to sources of knowledge and assertions are the main matter of concern, translations can often be only approximate. This problem is particularly difficult to overcome (if it can be overcome at all) in cases where evidential and epistemic meaning components interact and are, as it were, syncretically expressed in one and the same unit.

### *3. Portraits of the particular lexical units*

By and large, the functions of lexical evidentiality markers in Lithuanian turn out to be complementarily distributed between hearsay and inferentiality. Only some of them are used in both domains (see 3.3). Usually, clear preferences for either a reportive or an inferential function can be observed. The specific evidential function of the markers often derives from their etymological origin, so that they have remained quite transparent semantically (see Table 1). It is a much more difficult task to decide whether, and under what circumstances, a given unit bears epistemic overtones: whether these are lexicalized (conventional) parts of the relevant unit's meaning, or whether they result from pragmatic conditions and, thus, seem to be a result of discourse strategies, rather than a matter of semantics. These problems will be dealt with in some more detail below (see 4.1-4.2). Apart from these issues, other difficulties arise in relation to the question of which syntactic function/status is to be ascribed to some particular units (particle, conjunction, etc.), and how they should be treated lexicographically. A closer examination of these questions

is, however, beyond the scope of this paper. The general problems in this regard will be shown only with reference to *esą*, which is the most complex item in syntactic terms (see 3.1.1), and with reference to *matyt*, *matyti*, for whose interpretation scope turns out to be highly relevant (see 3.2.1).

### 3.1. Reportive markers ('hearsay')

#### 3.1.1. Esą

This form is a remnant of the neuter gender of the present active participle of *būti* 'to be'. Since in Lithuanian the neuter has vanished as a control gender, the form *esą* has been isolated from its original paradigm and has become a particle (or conjunction, see ex. 2-3). Presently it could be regarded as a neutral gender form only when no target for gender agreement is available (see ex. 4). Its position is free and it can have variable scope: from (parts of) NPs (1) to entire clauses (2). Here and in the following scope will be indicated by square brackets:

- (1) Pirmą kartą nepažįstamas vyriškis Juozui paskambino šių metų balandžio pabaigoje. Užuominomis jam pasakė, kad turėsiąs mokėti pinigų *esą* [už blogą tarpininkavimą]. Buvo leista suprasti, kad reikia duoklės.  
'The first time an unknown man phoned up Juozas at the end of April this year. Using allusions he told him that he would have to pay money *supposedly* [for bad mediation]. They let him know that a tribute was required.'  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-8)
- (2) R. Ozolas sakė, kad jam bandoma priekaištauti, *esą* [pasitraukus A. Šleževičiui, į jo vietą ateis kitas pareigūnas, kuris darytų lygiai tą patį].  
'R. Ozolas said that there had been attempts to reproach him, for (*as people say*) [when A. Šleževičius will have retired, another official will occupy his place, who will do exactly the same].'  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-9)

When *esą* has clausal scope, it is often difficult to decide whether it should be considered a particle or a conjunction. The situation is clear when *esą* functions as a clause-initial complementizer (2), or when it introduces a clause that functions as an adnominal modifier (3); in this case it serves as a conjunction. Conversely, *esą* has to be considered a particle if it appears after a complementizer (4, *jog*), after a relative pronoun (not illustrated here) or any other kind of clause connector:

- (3) Seniai girdėti ir noriai cituojami argumentai, *esq* [Baltijos valstybės yra Maskvos išlaikytinės].  
'For a long time we have been hearing arguments, *as if* [the Baltic states were Moscow's hostages].'  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-8)
- (4) Profesorius priminė, kad būtent Teisingumo ministerija aiškino, *jog* [žemės grąžinti *esq* negalima], nes ją teisėtai nacionalizavęs Liaudies Seimas.  
'The professor reminded that it was the Ministry of Justice which expounded that supposedly [it is impossible to return the land], because the Folk's Seim (= Parliament) nationalized it legally.'  
(XXI amžius 1995)

This kind of scope variation is rather typical for evidential markers in Lithuanian. A similar syntactic behaviour can be observed with other units discussed below (in particular, with *neva*, 3.1.3, *tarsi*, *tarytum*, 3.1.4, *tariamai*, 3.1.5, *lyg*, 3.2.2).

Beside its status as a particle (or conjunction), *esq* occasionally also functions as a non-finite copula, which is paradigmatically opposed to the finite copula (with predicative nominals) or the auxiliary (in the present perfect) *yra* 'is/are', if the latter combines with a plural subject.<sup>8</sup> In this case, we get a privative opposition, and within this opposition *esq* represents the marked member, unambiguously indicating hearsay: *Jie*.NOM.PL.M *yra*.COP.PRS.3 *atvažiuę*.NOM.PL.M 'They have arrived' vs. *Jie esq*.COP.NOM.PL.M *atvažiuę* 'They are said to have arrived'.<sup>9</sup>

As the examples given in the preceding paragraph demonstrate, the situation is complicated even more by the fact that *esq*, as a remnant of the former neuter gender (and now a particle), is homonymous with the NOM.PL.M-form in the same paradigm of the present active participles of *būti* 'to be', from which it has been isolated. As a consequence, in discourse one cannot always decide whether *esq* is the invariant form (= particle), or whether it is this inflected form of the participle in copula function:

- (5) Autorius paaiškina, kodėl Vilnius toks liūdnas: Lietuvoje 82 proc. gyventojų – lietuviai. O Estijoje estų yra apie 60 proc., Latvijoje latvių – tik apie pusę. Daugiakalbiai.NOM.PL.M Talinas.NOM.SG.M ir Ryga.NOM.SG.F *esq*.NOM.PL.M(?) gyvi NOM.PL.M ir besivystantys.NOM.PL.M miestai.NOM.PL.M “, o “vienakalbis” Vilnius – sustingęs.  
'The author explains why Vilnius is so sad: in Lithuania 82% of the inhabitants are Lithuanians, whereas in Estonia there are about 60% Estonians, and in Latvia about half of the population are Latvians. The multilingual cities Tallinn and Riga *are (said to be)*

“vivacious and steadily developing cities”, whereas the “monolingual” Vilnius is (said to be) lifeless.’  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-8)

In this example, *esą* can be interpreted either as a particle (compare with ex. 1, 4) or as the NOM.PL.M-form showing agreement with the nominal predicate *gyvi ir besivystantys miestai*.NOM.PL.M ‘vivacious and steadily developing cities’.

Cf. another example, in which *esą* co-occurs with the NOM.PL.M-form of a past active participle (*įvykdę < įvykdyti* ‘to perform, carry out’):

- (6) Vėliau kritikai tvirtino, kad stalinizmo pavojus buves prasimanytas ir kad Šaltąjį karą iš esmės sukurstę intelektualieji jo kariai (...); [kultūros laisvę ginantys intelektualai.NOM.PL.M *esą* įvykdę NOM.PL.M naują ‘trahison des clercs’].  
‘Later critics asserted that the danger of stalinism was only invented and that essentially the Cold War was instigated by its intellectual soldiers (...); [the intellectuals who defended the freedom of culture allegedly carried out a new ‘trahison de clercs’].’  
(Šiaurės Atėnai 1995 5-7)

In this case, *esą* should be treated as a particle (not a copula). This is confirmed if the active participle and its subject are replaced by another agreement form such as PL.NOM.F. In that case, *esą* does not change, i.e. it is not subject to rules requiring agreement with the participle, which obtain otherwise:

- (6’) (...) kultūros laisvę ginančios intelektualės.  
PL.NOM.F *esą* įvykdžiusios.PL.NOM.F  
naują ‘trahison des clercs’.  
‘intellectual women who defended the freedom of culture carried out a new ‘trahison de clercs’.

### 3.1.2. Girdi

This petrified PRS.2.SG-form of the verb *girdėti* ‘to hear’ is clearly restricted to a reportive function: in the contexts encountered in the corpus its reference to a previous speech act is either indicated explicitly or can easily be inferred. For instance:

- (7) Kodėl nuotraukos, sveikinimų atvirukai, siunčiami į Amerikos vietoves ir į kitas Europos valstybes, Australiją ar kur kitur adresatus pasiekia, o Lietuvoje ne? Daug kas dėl to kaltina JAV laišku siuntėjus – [kam, *girdi*, deda keletą dolerių banknotą į tą

neperšviečiamą voką su švenčių sveikinimais ar nuotraukomis] (...). 'Why do photos and postcards with congratulations sent to places in America and to other European countries, to Australia or elsewhere reach their addressees, but not in Lithuania? Many people accuse for this the senders of letters from the USA: [why, *people say*, do they put a dollar bill or photos in this non-transparent envelope with congratulations on holydays].'

(Lietuvos Aidas 1997-4)

- (8) Mane išvežė į Machačkala. (...) Maniau, veža sušaudyti. Šį kartą tardė Dagestano saugumo šefas. Vėl siūlė bendradarbiauti ir gerą užmokestį. *Girdi*, [jei nori likti gyvas], privalėsiu tylėti.

'They took me away to Maxačkala. I thought they were taking me there to shoot me. This time the chief of the Dagestania security police interrogated me. Again he proposed me to cooperate with them and (held out the prospect of) a good reward. *He said* [if you want to stay alive] you will have to be silent.'

(Lietuvos Aidas 1997-5)

In many cases, *girdi* follows (or precedes) a speech act verb or another expression more or less unambiguously indicating a speech act (see *kaltina* 'accuse', *tardė* 'interrogated', *siūlė* 'proposed' in ex. 7-8). Moreover, *girdi* quite often has scope over quoted utterances given as direct speech; see ex. (8).

*Girdi* takes scope only over entire clauses, and no examples have come to my attention in which its scope is restricted to a syntactic unit below the clause level.

### 3.1.3. *neva* 'as if'

Unlike *girdi* (but just like *esq*), the scope of *neva* varies from NP-internal modifiers (attributes, see ex. 9) to whole clauses (or even sentences, see ex. 10-11). Since its position is not fixed, it is often a matter of debate whether *neva* should be considered a particle or a conjunction (ex. 10). In this connection it should be noticed that *neva* often occurs after complementizers or conjunctions (ex. 11):

- (9) Spauda pažymi, kad tai dar vienas "hardlaineris" *neva* [demokratinėje] Černomyrdino ekipoje.

'The press stresses that there is yet another "hardliner" in Černomyrdin's *reportedly/supposedly* (?) [democratic] team.'

(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-7)

- (10) Kiti du 13 ir 14 metų paaugliai, susipykę su tėvais, išėjo iš namų. Juos pas save priglaudė 21 metų draugas. Po savaitės jis papriekaištavo *neva* [berniukai veltui čia gyvena ir maitinasi]: "Dirbti reikia ir sumokėti už visa tai".



‘Two other half-grown boys of 13 and 14 years left their house after they had fallen out with their parents. They were accomodated by a 21-year-old friend. After a week he rebuked them *as if* [the boys were living and eating here for nothing]: „One has to work and to pay for all this.”

(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-8)

- (11) Tuo tarpu nuolat stiprėja kaltinimai ir šmeižtai prieš klerikalizmą, teigiama, jog *neva* [Bažnyčia stengiasi valdyti Lenkiją ar sulėtinti lenkų visuomenės politinę emanicaciją].

‘Meanwhile accusations and slander against the clergy are steadily growing. It is asserted *that reportedly* [the Church attempts to rule Poland or to slow down the political emancipation of the Polish society].

(XXI Amžius 1995)

*Neva* can also introduce direct speech. Here is an example in which *neva* introduces an adnominal modification:

- (12) Ministrui dar kartą teko ginti SKATą nuo LDDP nuomonės, *neva* [ten “girtuoklystės, nelaimingi atsitikimai, ginklų grobimai”] (Adomaitis).

‘Once more the minister had to defend SKAT against the allegation of LDDP [a political party in Lithuania; BW] *as if* [there had been “cases of inebriety, accidents and robbings of weapons”].’

(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-7)

Valeckienė (1998: 191) includes *neva* in the class of units which we would classify as ‘inferentials’. However, neither does she give an appropriate example, nor have I come across any.

### 3.1.4. Tarsi, tartum, tarytum ‘as if’

All three units are etymologically related to two verbs with the meaning ‘to say, pronounce’. However, their basic domain of use is the one of comparison. This holds at least for the contemporary language and with respect to token frequency in newspaper texts: in a corpus of approx. 23 MB these three units were encountered in an (at least potentially) evidential function according to the following rough statistics: *tarsi* – 25 tokens (out of 200, i.e. 12,5%), *tartum* – 4 (out of 16, i.e. 25 %), *tarytum* – 14 (out of 113, i.e. ≈ 12%). *Tarsi* and *tarytum* are thus in general much more frequent than *tartum*, even if the percentage of uses in evidential function is low for each of them. In fact, this percentage is probably even lower, because in many cases it is debatable whether *tarsi* and *tarytum* refer to speech acts (see below and section 3.3).

A further intriguing fact about these units is that their scope as hearsay markers varies in a similar way as it does in their use as “comparative particles”. It varies within the same range as do *esq* and *neva*. Here I give examples only for the hearsay use: in (13) the scope includes a NP-internal modifier, whereas in (14) it embraces a whole clause:

- (13) Tikriausiai mano žmona mažiau domėjosi turgumi nei aš dar ir dėl to, kad ji matė jo tamsiąsias puses. (...) kita moteris, parduodanti kilograminį *tarsi* [namuose gamintą] sviestą, iš tiesų dar ir sveriantį mažiau – visa tai įgalina pirkėjus būti budrius.  
‘More precisely, my wife was less interested in the market than me also for the reason that she saw its dark sides. (...) another woman who sold butter that was *allegedly* [produced at home], but in reality it even weighed less – all this forces customers to be on the alert.’  
(Kauno diena 1997-5)
- (14) Taigi po keleriopo patikrinimų, kad “valymo” nėra ir nebus ir kad viskas (...) vyksta sklandžiai, šnektelėjom kita tema – *tarytum* [atgyja kalbos apie lenkų autonomiją].  
‘So that after a few checks that there was no „purification”, that there wouldn’t be any and that everything would go smoothly, we began to talk about another topic – *apparently* [rumours concerning Polish autonomy are gaining strength again].’  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-8)

However, the investigation of the functional split of these particles – comparative vs. reportive – requires much more scrutiny, because in most cases in which they could be regarded as hearsay markers (see the approximate counts given above) it remains unclear whether they should not better be counted as comparative particles, or as both comparative and reportive ones (or as inferentials, see especially ex. 44). For a more detailed analysis of this issue see 3.3.

In general, *tarsi*, *tarytum* and, even more so, *tartum*, are rather peripheral reportive markers which have not yet acquired the status of independent evidentiality markers comparable to *esq*, *girdi* or *atseit* (see 3.1.6). Only rarely do they also mark inferential readings (e.g., *Tartum miego nori* ‘He seems to need [lit. want] a sleep’). *Tarsi* is furthermore occasionally exploited as a question marker (cf. Valeckienė 1998: 191f.).

### 3.1.5. Tariamai

This adverb (deriving from the present passive participle of *tarti* ‘to say, pronounce’) is the most literal equivalent of Eng. *allegedly*, *supposedly*. Semantically, it does not differ from the corresponding adjective *tariamias* (NOM.SG.M) ‘alleged’. However, its text frequency is

very low. For instance, in a corpus of slightly more than 23 MB only 23 records could be found.

*Tariamai* shows variable scope, too. In (15) its scope is restricted to an attribute within a NP, whereas in (16) *tariamai* has clausal scope:

- (15) JAV Mičigano valstijos Holio mieste vykusiame aukcione nė vieno pirkėjo dėmesio nepatraukė du *tariamai* [A. Hitlerio] tapyti paveikslai.

‘During the auction, which took place in the city of Holy (in the state of Michigan), not a single customer took note of two paintings which *allegedly* had been done [by A. Hitler].’

(Kauno diena 1997-5)

- (16) Valstybinis radijas vakar informavo, kad [buvęs premjeras Leonas Kengo Va Dondas praėjusį sekmadienį su visu Zairo išdu *tariamai* pabėgo į Šveicariją].

‘Yesterday the state radio informed that *allegedly* [last Sunday the former prime minister Leon Kengo Va Donde escaped to Switzerland together with the whole treasury of Zaire].’

(Kauno diena 1997-4)

It remains to be clarified whether by using *tariamai* the speaker signals only that s/he does not trust the reported information, or whether s/he even lets the addressee know that this information should be regarded as false. The latter is a stronger negative epistemic attitude than the former.

### 3.1.6. Atseit

The etymology of this particle remains unclear, but in most likelihood it derives from a verb *\*atsieiti* with a purported meaning ‘to come about’ (cf. Wiemer 2005: 119). It is usually used to mark hearsay, *inter alia* with literal quotes (see ex. 18). Here are two typical examples:

- (17) Per spaudą ir visokiais būdais šmeižiami, šių karininkų į savo pusę nepalenkė, o šantažuoti neturėjo kuo, tad beliko vienas psichologinis koziris – skleisti tiesiog gandus, [kad tai *atseit* “raudonieji”, jais pasitikėti negalima].

‘Although they defamed these officers in the press and by other means, they did not make them more inclined for their matter, and they did not have anything to blackmail them. Thus, only one psychological trump card was left to them – to spread rumours [that they were *supposedly* „reds”, that you cannot trust them].’

(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-8)

- (18) (...) man prirašė įžeidžiančią politinę potekstę: *atseit* [aš ilgiosiu „maskvietiškos galvos“, dainuoju su LDDP choru, esu apimtas praeities nostalgijos].  
‘An offensive political concealed text was ascribed to me: *allegedly* [I am longing for the „Moscow rule“, am singing with the choir of LDDP [a political party in Lithuania; BW] and seized by nostalgia for the past].’  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-8)

In these examples *atseit* evokes epistemic overtones, more or less like *esą* and *neva* (see 3.1.1, 3.1.3). However these overtones probably arise as a consequence of context conditions, rather than being inherent to *atseit*. For the time being this point has to be left open (but see 4.1).

A lack of epistemic reservation can be observed in cases where *atseit* is used to mark semiotic acts (gestures etc.) substituting speech acts. Consider the following example:

- (19) Pats redaktorius pasakė, kad vairuodamas ranka žmonėms duoda ženklą – *atseit* [gali eiti]. Tokių mandagių vairuotojų Lietuvos keliuose galima sutikti labai retai.  
‘The editor himself said that when driving his car he gives a sign by hand to the people – *{atseit}* [you can go]. Only rarely can one meet such gentle drivers on Lithuania’s roads.’  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-7)

In this function *atseit* turns out to be almost unique. According to informants, *esą* could be used here, too, but it would include the same additional epistemic reservation which is characteristic of its regular, “non-semiotic” hearsay use. The same probably applies to *neva*. Only one informant thought it possible to replace *atseit* by *girdi* without implying any epistemic overtone (in accordance with its normal hearsay uses, see 3.1.2).

### 3.1.7. Būk(tai)

Etymologically this is the IMP.SG-form of *būti* ‘to be’ (plus an optional demonstrative *tai*). As a reportive marker, it is very rare: among 200 cases with *būk* from newspaper texts only one instance with a (potentially) reportive function could be found:

- (20) “Ar ne sribų valdžia? – klausia moteris. – Kaip jie žaisdavo su nušautais! Vargonininką numetė be kelnių ir juokės, kad *būk* [tai vargšas žvakę saujoj laiko]...”

“Isn’t this the government of ‘stribai’ [collaborators of the Soviet rule in Lithuania after 1944; BW]? – the woman asks. – How they used to play with shot people! They threw down an organist without trousers and laughed (at that sight) (*they said*) [there is this poor man holding a candle in his hollow]...”  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1996-3)

### 3.1.8. *Anot, pasak translation*

Unlike all other units discussed so far, *anot* and *pasak* are prepositions, which means that they take scope only over NPs (in the genitive). They are more or less synonymous and used exclusively for reportive purposes. According to Šukys (1998: 549f.) Lithuanian dialects prefer *anot*, which is also more frequent in colloquial speech, whereas *pasak* is unknown in many of the dialects and seems to be more typical in written texts of standard Lithuanian.

- (21) Jonučiuose (...) gyvena ir dirba tautodailininkas Adolfas Teresius, kurio gyvenimas įprasminamas darbuose. *Pasak A. Teresiaus*, [dirbti jį skatina didelis noras kažką daryti, vidinė kūrybinė galia ir jausmas, kad esi reikalingas].

‘In Jonučiai there lives the folk artist Adolfas Teresius, whose sense of life is reflected in his works. *According to A. Teresius*, [his work is instigated by a deep will to do something, the inner creative power and the feeling that you are needed].’

(XXI Amžius 1995)

- (22) Ponas Juškaitis pasakoja, jog šiame, 5-ajame bute gyveno Žalgų ir Runkauskų šeimos. [Runkauskas, *anot poeto*, keldavosi ketvirtą valandą ryto ir kaldavo]. Juškaitis ir tada rašė skundą (...).

‘Mr. Juškaitis tells that in this, the fifth apartment there lived the Žalgai and Runkauskai families. *According to the poet*, [Mr. Runkauskas used to get up at four o’clock in the morning and to hammer]. Then Mr. Juškaitis wrote his complaint.’

(Lietuvos Aidas 1997-5)

Stylistic handbooks advise against using *anot* or *pasak* if their argument is coreferent with the grammatical subject of the same clause. In such cases it may become unclear whether the referent of the subject is the same person as the argument of *anot*, *pasak* or not (Šukys 1998: 550). We may thus infer that *anot* and *pasak* (by pragmatic implicature?) preclude clause-internal coreference.

Both prepositions are also to be avoided if their argument belongs to another referential class than persons or texts (Šukys 1998: 550); e.g.

- (23a) ? *Anot budistų tikėjimo žmogaus gyvenimas – tai kančios.*  
'According to the buddists' faith, man's life is pains.'
- (23b) recommended: *Kaip moko budistų tikėjimas..., or: Anot/pasak budistų atstovų...*  
'As buddists' faith teaches/tells...' 'According to representatives of buddism...'

With respect to these referential restrictions, *anot* and *pasak* are diametrically opposed to *pagal* (see below discussion of ex. 24).

In some dialects there is a petrified expression, *anot to* (with the demonstrative pronoun *to*), which means 'as people say' (Šukys 1998: 550). In my corpus only one example could be found, which was encountered in a novel.

### 3.1.9. Pagal

The primary meaning of this preposition (+ accusative) is to indicate the basis of measure; its closest English equivalent is therefore *according to*, *in accordance with*. Only exceptionally does *pagal* occur as a reportive marker. The reason why it is included here at all is that prescriptivists sometimes advise against using it as a marker of the source of information (cf. for instance, Šukys 1998: 433). This suggests that it does occur from time to time in this function in natural speech. The corpus provides only one example:

- (24) *Apskaičiuoti normalų kūno svorį galima remiantis šešiais autoriais. Pavyzdžiui, pagal Breitmanį normali kūno masė – tai ūgis (cm) x 0,7-50.*  
'To calculate the normal weight of a body one can rely on six authors. For instance, according to Breitmann, the normal mass of a body equals the height (in cm) x 0,7-50.'  
(Kauno diena 1997-6)

It is, however, a tricky question whether this usage should not better be judged as the result of a reversal of a widespread metonymic switch: 'person/author ← (scientific) work written by him'. We can infer that the lexical meaning of *pagal* is undergoing a process of extension from the domain of gauge and measuring to the domain of hearsay. This extension seems to be a consequence of the metonymic shift just mentioned (author → text, book), whereby the source of an information (assertion) is traced back to its author via an authoritative document (book etc.).

### 3.2. Inferential markers

#### 3.2.1. *Matyti, matyt, mat*

As far as their etymology is concerned, all three units derive from the verb ‘to see’: *matyti* is just the infinitive, *matyt* is a shortened<sup>10</sup> and *mat* a truncated form of the infinitive. In practice, however, these three units have different functional distributions. First of all, *matyti* and *matyt* show a strong tendency toward being in complementary distribution. Whereas only 1% of the occurrences of *matyti* can be considered evidential (inferential) particles (2 from 200 examples in newspaper texts), *matyt* is clearly specialized as an inferential particle (186 out of 200 records, i.e. about 93% of the occurrences).<sup>11</sup> Compare examples for each particle in this function:

- (25) Teisti ir ne visai giminaičiai. Visus juos siejo viena moteriškaitė – 42 m. Janina Navikienė. Ji yra vieno teisiamojų žmona, kito sugyventinė, penkių vaikų motina. “Aš viena atsėdėsiu...” Teisme J. Navikienė visai padoriai atrodė. Bent jau išsiblavė tardymo izoliatoriuje. *Matyti* – [į teismą ruošiasi]. Tik ne atgailai. Pasipuošė, pasidažė. Ir pasiruošė gintis.

‘Apart from family members other people have been subjected to court trial, too. They are all linked to one woman – to the 42-year-old Janina Navikienė. She is the wife of one of the persons on trial, another one’s concubine and the mother of five children. “I will serve all my time in jail alone...” At court J. Navikienė looked quite well. At least she had cleared up at the sobering-up station. *Obviously*, [she had prepared for the trial]. But not for repentance. She had dressed nicely and had made her make-up. And she was prepared to defend herself.’

(Lietuvos Aidas 1996-1)

- (26) Patriarchas Aleksijus II gana nepalankiai atsiliepė apie Katalikų Bažnyčią (...). Pranešime taip pat negailėta kaltinimų ir rytų apeigų Katalikų (unitų) Bažnyčiai, kuri, patriarcho nuomone, jėga užima stačiatikiams priklausančius maldos namus (*matyt* [čia kalbama apie unitams grąžinamas bažnyčias Ukrainoje, kurios po karo, uždraudus rytų apeigų Katalikų Bažnyčią, buvo atiduotos stačiatikiams]).

‘Patriarch Aleksij II answered rather unfavourably on the topic of the Catholic Church. In his statement he also was not short of accusations toward the Unitarian Church, which, in the patriarch’s opinion, forcibly occupies the house of prayers that belongs to the Orthodox community ([here *evidently* the churches in Ukraine are meant which are now being returned to the Unitarians and had been given to the Orthodox after the post-war prohibition of the Unitarian Church]).’

(XXI Amžius 1995)

The predominant meaning of the “full” infinitive *matyti*, besides denoting a concrete (physiological) act (or state) of seeing (ex. 27), refers to a more abstract comprehension of perceived events, by which the author feels entitled to express a judgment (ex. 28).

- (27) Buvusio gaisro ženklai ir dabar *matyti* ant laiptinės lubų.  
‘Even now signs of the fire *can be seen* on the ceiling of the staircase.’  
(Kauno diena 1997-6)
- (28) Sprendžiamas klausimas dėl jos [pirmokės] apgyvendinimo specialiose globos namuose, kadangi mergaitės mama (...), kaip *matyti* iš paskutiniųjų savaitžių įvykių, nebesugeba apsaugoti savo dukters.  
‘The question is now being solved whether the first-grader girl should be given accomodation in a specialized children’s shelter, because the girl’s mother, as *is obvious* from the events of the last weeks, is no longer able to protect her daughter.’  
(Kauno diena 1997-4)

In both cases, *matyti* is associated with dynamic (or: alethic) modality (‘it is possible to see/notice/deduce from’), and this component probably links the original meaning of visual perception with the inferential function, which, in turn, is predominant in the shorter form *matyt*. This difference is also reflected in their scope: neither *matyti* nor *matyt* (regardless of their function) combine with a clausal argument linked by a complementizer (*kad, jog* ‘that’); I at least am not aware of any such case (see f. 11). However, *matyti* occurs as the predicate (nucleus) of the clause in both functions illustrated by (27-28). By contrast, *matyt* has scope over the entire clause including its predicate (see *čia kalbama apie* ≈ ‘here one speaks about’ in ex. 26), as is to be expected for an evidentiality marker.

Let us now turn to *mat*. Often, it functions in the same way as *matyt*, i.e. as an inferential particle; cf.

- (29) Yra žinoma, jog Izaijo pranašysčių knyga buvo rašoma apie du šimtus metų. Jos stilius vientisas, nors ją rašė įvairūs autoriai. *Mat* kiekvienas stengėsi perimti pirmojo kalbėjimo būdą.  
‘It is known that the Izaija’s Book of Predictions was written during some two hundred years. Its style is homogeneous, although different authors wrote it. *Evidently* everybody was anxious to take over the way of speaking of his forerunner.’  
(Šiaurės Atėnai 1995-8/9)

However, *mat* apparently has a further function, which justifies postulating a second, distinct lexical unit in addition to the inferential particle. Namely, *mat* often serves as an argumentive connector, which



introduces the reason given for something said in previous discourse. In this function, *mat* is not inferential, because it does not refer to the speaker's subjective judgment based on perceivable traces (situation S2) which allow him to infer that an earlier situation S1 must have obtained. Instead, when used as an argumentive particle, *mat* introduces more objective circumstances, a state of affairs which the speaker supposes to be obvious, or known from a more general background.<sup>12</sup> In this function *mat* is not interchangeable with *matyt*; cf.:

- (30) Medžiagą apie A. Slaviną noriu papildyti kai kuriais archyviniais duomenimis, kad laikraščio skaitytojai daugiau sužinotų apie šį paslaptinę žmogų, kuris daugeliui Lietuvos gyventojų, tiksliau sakant, buvusiųjų repatriantų iš Vakarų, yra žinomas. *Mat* 1947-1953 m. A. Slavinus buvo Repatriacijos reikalų skyriaus prie Lietuvos SSR Ministrų Tarybos viršininkas ir lėmė ne vieno repatrianto likimą.

'I want to supplement the material on A. Slavinas by adding some archive data, in order for the readers of the newspaper to learn more about this mysterious man, who is known to many inhabitants of Lithuania or, more precisely, to many former repatriants from the West. *After all*, in 1947-1953 A. Slavinas was the head of the Repatriants' Department at the Soviet Lithuanian Ministers' Council and destined the fate of numerous repatriants.'

(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-8)

Put differently, an argumentive particle *mat* allows the speaker to name the reason backing his/her assertion formulated w.r.t. S2 (which precedes S1 in the text). With inferentials this is not necessarily the case (see ex. 25-26).

The sentential scope of *mat* may also embrace an adnominal reportive marker like *anot* or *pasak* (see 3.1.8). This would also be impossible with *matyt*:

- (31) Iki šiol dėstytojai buvo kviečiami iš JAV, Didžiosios Britanijos ir Australijos. Tačiau iš buvusios Sąjungos profesorai visiškai konkurentabilūs ir noriai sutinka dėstyti. *Mat* [\*matyt] anot Tailando švietimo ministerijos atstovo, rusų profesorai pasirengę dirbti net už dešimt kartų mažesnę atlyginimą negu mažiau kvalifikuoti jų kolegos iš JAV.

'Until now lecturers have been invited from the USA, Great Britain and Australia. However, professors from the former USSR are entirely able to hold up competition and readily agree to lecture. *After all*, according to an official of the Thai ministry of education, Russian professors are prepared to work for an even 10 times lower

payment than their US colleagues, whose qualification is worse.’  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-7)

The explanation for this different behaviour is quite straightforward: from a pragmatic viewpoint it would be unusual to base one’s assertion on hearsay and, at the same time, to signal that this reported assertion has to be interpreted only as one’s inference (or impression). In fact, hearsay cannot be “inserted” into the scope of an inferential operator, unless the speaker wants to say that the reported utterance itself can only be inferred. But this is not the message conveyed in (31). This restriction does not apply to *mat* as an argumentive connector, since reference to another speaker can easily be used to corroborate the reason given by the actual speaker of the utterance (author of the text); it is then used in order to substantiate his/her point by giving it some more authority. Exactly this appears to be intended in (31).

### 3.2.2. Lyg, lygtai, lyg ir

Etymologically all these units derive from the root {*lyg*} ‘equal, even’ (cf., e.g., the verb *lyginti*, 1. to compare, 2. to smooth clothes with an iron). *Lygtai* can be regarded as a very rare variant of *lyg*. From a syntactic viewpoint *lyg* is similar to the reportive markers *esq*, *neva* and *tarsi*, *tarytum* in so far as *lyg* both has variable scope and can be treated either as a particle or, if used clause-initially, as a conjunction. Also, its primary meaning is comparable to *tarsi*, *tartum*, *tarytum*, because, in accordance with its etymology, *lyg* serves the purpose of comparison.

Actually, although *lyg* is mentioned, for instance, in Roszko (1993: 55f.) among a couple of salient lexical evidential markers, it functions as such only occasionally, at least in the corpus investigated by me. Among 200 records from newspaper articles, I have not found a single case in which *lyg* could unmistakably be interpreted as an evidential particle. The examples known to me seem to show that *lyg(tai)* reinforces an evidential meaning which can be attributed to other contextual triggers. It is symptomatic that Roszko’s two examples show *lyg(tai)* located in the context of a speech act or mental attitude verb; e.g.

(32) Sako, kad *lygtai* gavo vaistus.

- a. ‘They<sub>i</sub> say that they<sub>k</sub> [= soldiers mentioned earlier] *[evid ?]* got the medicine.’
- b. ‘They<sub>i</sub> say that they<sub>k</sub> *might have* got the medicine.’

The alternative translations are meant to suggest that *lygtai* may be either reportive or inferential, or even both, but only from the perspective of different subjects. This reflects a more serious problem: it is not clear who is the person making the inference ‘they [= the soldiers] got the medicine’; is it the speaker of *sako* ‘they say’, or the subject of *gavo* ‘they got’?

For more discussion of this problem see 3.3, but compare also (33) with *lyg ir* in the context of an unambiguous hearsay marker (*pasak*): is it the secretary to whom the given judgment (‘the Latvians tried to engage Lithuanian officials into nonsensical discussions’) has to be ascribed, or other, unnamed people, to whom the secretary refers? *Lyg ir* is another unit, of which the lexicographic status w.r.t. *lyg* has yet to be clarified. Furthermore, *lyg ir* can also be interpreted as a means of softening the speaker’s judgment. It then functions as a kind of pragmatic hedge (compare Russ. *vrode*, *kak by*, Pol. *niby*, *jakby*). This becomes obvious especially in contexts where another person’s opinion is reported; e.g.

- (33) Pasak sekretoriaus, vienu metu latviai *lyg ir* bandė Lietuvos atstovus įtraukti į beprasmiškas diskusijas, vengdami pagrindinių temų, tačiau, laimei, buvo laiku susigriebta.

‘According to the secretary, at one period it was as if the Latvians tried to engage Lithuanian officials into nonsensical discussions, in order to avoid principal issues, but luckily they found their way to each other just in time.’

(Lietuvos Aidas 1997-5)

In sum, *lyg(tai)*, *lyg ir* can be regarded as a peripheral evidential marker at best. They are used only very rarely as inferential markers, and there are hardly any convincing examples with a reportive use.

### 3.2.3. *Atrodo, rodos, regis, berods*

The first three units are PRS.3-forms of the verbs *atrodyti*, *rodytis*, *regėtis*, respectively, all of them meaning ‘to seem, appear, be(come) visible’. The fourth item, *berods*, can also be included in this “etymological series”, because it clearly derives from the verb *rodyti*, ‘to show’ (+ prefix *be-*).<sup>13</sup> All these forms have been dissociated from their original paradigms (as has *esq*, see 3.1.1). As a consequence, they no longer link a clausal argument with a complementizer (*kad*, *jog*; compare with *matyt* and *mat* in 3.2.1); nor can they themselves serve as conjunctions (contrary to *esq*). They are thus to be classified as particles.

Just like *lyg*, *atrodo* and *rodos* should be included in the inventory of evidential markers only with caution, because as particles their semantics has apparently remained too closely linked to the perceptual meanings of the verbs from which they derive. At least in the corpus investigated by me they are only occasionally encountered as real inferential markers (see examples below).

*Rodos*<sup>14</sup> seems to function as an inferential marker much more frequently than *atrodo*. The latter hardly occurred in my corpus as a particle at all: out of 200 tokens (from newspaper texts) only 9 can be considered as particles, with the rest representing the usual verb form (with a full argument structure). Among these 9 records, in turn, not all cases can clearly be classified as inferential. Here I give two of the clearer cases:

- (34) Užsienio agentūrų pranešimais, Vakarų vadovai gerokai nusivylę prezidentu B. Jelcinu, kuris, *atrodo*, pripažįsta tik jėgos metodus sprendžiant bet kokias krizines situacijas.  
'According to information from foreign agencies, Western leaders are pretty embarrassed by president B. Jelcin, who, *it seems*, in any critical situation acknowledges only force.'  
(XXI Amžius 1995)
- (35) Aišku, kad folkloro festivalis jam [folkloro kolektyvui] svarbesnis (...). Svarbu ir pamatyti, ir pasimokyti iš kitų. Dabar *atrodo* į savivaldybę atėjo galvotėsni žmonės...  
'It is clear that for the folklore ensemble the festival is more important. It is also important to see and to learn from others. Now *it seems* that in the municipality more sensible people have come to rule.'  
(Šiaurės Atėnai 1995-5/7)

*Rodos* appears to be much more widespread as a particle than *atrodo*: in about 120 of 200 records (= 60%) *rodos* can be regarded as such. However, it is very difficult to find convincing examples with an inferential meaning. As a rule, *rodos* implies that the speaker judges the proposition in the scope of *rodos* to be not entirely adequate; in particular, s/he considers it to be based on either deceptive or simply transient perceptions (and reasoning based on this perception), see ex. (36), or else on delusive, incomplete or plainly unreliable remembrance (see ex. 37-38). It is probably for this reason that *rodos* is quite often followed by adversative clauses (introduced by *tačiau* 'however, yet' in ex. 36 and by *bet* 'but' in ex. 37):

- (36) Vadimas Michaliovas kalbėjo apie spektaklio kinematografinį principą: *rodos* scenoje nieko nevyksta, tačiau lyg kine iš atskirų kadru lipdosi veiksmas.  
'Vadim Mixalėv spoke about the cinematographic principle in the performance: *it seems (as if)* nothing happens on the scene, however, as in a movie, a picture is moulded from several close-ups.'  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-8)
- (37) 1978 metų pradžioje (...) Skuode aplankiau parodų salę. Joje buvo rodomi (...) kaimų žmonių rankdarbiai. (...) *Rodos*, Skuodo rajono liaudies menininkus daugmaž neblogai pažinojau, bet nei šių kūrinių iki tol nebuvau matęs, nei jų autoriaus nebuvau susitikęs.  
'In the beginning of 1978 in Skuodas I went to the exhibition room. There, handmade works of peasant people were shown. *It may seem* that I more or less knew the craftsmen from the folk in the Skuodas district, but neither had I seen these pieces of art, nor had I met their authors.'  
(Šiaurės Atėnai 1995-10)
- (38) (...) nepamenu tiksliai dabar kada – atėjo deputatas Ambrazevičius ir paaiškino, kad deputatams reikia pasų ir autonumerių. Tą turėjom padaryt ir padarėm (...). – Visiems Aukščiausiosios Tarybos deputatams? – Ne, aš neprisimenu tiksliai, *rodos* tik kelioms dešimtims. Pats nemačiau sąrašo, tvarkė mūsų apsaugos skyriaus darbuotojai iš techninio skyriaus.  
'Now I don't remember exactly when. Deputy Ambrazevičius came and explained that the deputies needed passports and car numbers. We had to do this and we did it. – For all deputies to the High Council? – No, I don't remember exactly, *it seems* only for some decades of them. I did not see the list myself, everything was regulated by employees of our defence department, but from the technical section.'  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-8)

*Regis*, in turn, being semantically closest to *atrodo*, *rodos* and *matyt*, has a more colloquial flavour than these. As for the relative frequency of inferential uses *regis* is comparable to *rodos*, and likewise with *regis* the inferential meaning often remains debatable. Compare, for instance, the following two examples:

- (39) Visa meno istorija yra skausmingas tos prasmės vaikymasis, jina gali būti aprašyta kaip kančios istorija, kaip nuolatinė žmogaus ir jo sąmonės drama – bet ir kaip džiaugsmo bei svaigulio istorija, kai *regis* jau čia pat, jau atsivers, apsireikš...  
'The entire history of art is the painful pursuit of this sense. It can be described as the history of pains, like the permanent drama of man and his conscience, but also like the history of joy and ecstasy,

when, *as it seems*, it is already here, is already going to open, to manifest itself...'

(Šiaurės Atėnai 1996-2)

- (40) Išeivijoje dominuoja pažiūra, kad Nepriklausomybės atkūrimas, o kartu ir komunistinių tradicijų atmetimas, esąs pozityvus dalykas. Šiuo požiūriu Č. Juršėno teigimas spaudos konferencijoje Vilniuje, kad jis "Australijoje neišgirdęs pagyrimų buvusiai Lietuvos valdžiai ir jos lyderiui V. Landsbergiui", yra perdėm klaidinantis. *Regis* Č. Juršėnas nesuprato, kad svečio akivaizdoje netinka girti jo oponentą.

'Among emigrants the opinion prevails that the recreation of Independence, and by this also the rejection of communist traditions, is a positive thing. From this perspective Č. Juršėnas's statement, uttered at the press conference in Vilnius, that „in Australia he did not hear praises of the rulers in Lithuania and their leader V. Landsbergis”, is utmostly misleading. *Evidently*, Č. Juršėnas did not understand that in front of a guest it is not convenient to praise his opponent.'

(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-9)

Whereas in (39) *regis* is used to refer to a certain kind of abstract perception (or impression), which is then unmasked as illusory, *regis* in (40) indicates a conclusion which the speaker considers to be justified, because s/he gives a judgment concerning the politician's (*Juršėnas*'s) statement, which seems inappropriate to him/her in view of facts and norms assumed by him/her.

Finally, as concerns the particle *berods*, its evidential status is equally questionable as it is for *lyg* (see 3.2.3). It occurs occasionally in contexts with explicit indicators of reported speech. See the following example:

- (41) Labai daug kalbama apie kitą ryškią "IndyCar" asmenybę – Paulą Tracy. Jis *berods* ketina išmėginti jėgas Rogerio Penske's komandoje, kuri kitiems metams ruošia tris automobilius.

'There is very much talk about another outstanding person from "IndyCar", Paul Tracy. He *obviously* plans to try his power in Roger Penske's team, which is preparing three car models for next year.'

(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-9)

*Berods* could thus at best be regarded as a weak reportive marker. Again, its relation to hearsay appears to be a side-effect of the whole context, rather than a part of its meaning.

3.2.4. Gal (gal ir, galbūt), turbūt, ko gero, rasi

*Gal* is the truncated form of *galėti* ‘can’ (probably derived from the PRS.3-form *gali*), *gal ir* (*gal* + ‘and’) and *galbūt* (*gal* + shortened infinitive *būti* ‘to be’) can be considered as one of its variants. *Turbūt* is also a truncated form of *turi*.PRS.3 (< *turėti* ‘to have’) in its modal meaning<sup>15</sup> plus the existential verb *būti* ‘to be’. *Ko gero* is the genitive form of *kas gera*, literally meaning ‘(the one) which is good’.<sup>16</sup> The particle *rasi*, which is the petrified FUT.2.SG-form of the verb *rasti* ‘to find’, is very rare.

These units can be regarded as synonyms, and all of them must likewise be treated with care. The reason is that they primarily appear to function as epistemic modifiers of a proposition P, but this modification does not necessarily rest on an inference. In this regard, they mark epistemic modality, but they are *per se* indifferent as to the specific source which might “substantiate” the speaker’s epistemic judgment. An inferential function can, thus, at best be considered as being on its way to a lexically stable meaning component, which is attained via a contextually strengthened extension from a general epistemic meaning (see 4.1 for a discussion). We can briefly illustrate this for *gal (ir)*; the same applies for the other units.

- (42) Nedidelis Alytaus stadionas buvo beveik pilnas. Dauguma alytiškių palaikė “Inkarą”. *Gal* dėl to, kad iš Alytaus kilęs jo vyr. treneris Rimantas Kochanauskas ir bene žinomiausias dabar “Inkaro” futbolininkas Eimantas Poderis.

‘The small stadion of Alytus was almost filled up. Most people from Alytus sustained “Inkaras”. *Maybe* because of the fact that the chief coach Rimantas Kochanauskas and the probably now most famous football-player of “Inkaras”, Eimantas Poderis, were raised in Alytus.’

(Lietuvos Aidas 1997-5)

*Gal* serves to soften the author’s reasoning (*dėl to* ‘because (of)’) which leads him/her to the assertion made before (*Dauguma alytiškių palaikė “Inkarą”* ‘Most people from Alytus sustained “Inkaras”’). In this respect *gal* is comparable to *mat* as an argumentive connector (see 3.2.1, ex. 30-31). In accordance with its semantics, *gal* merely indicates that the author’s explanation is a very likely one, but alternatives might exist, too.

*Gal* and *rasi* can also be used as question particles (Valeckienė 1998: 192).

### 3.3. Units indiscriminately marking indirect evidence

As a cover term embracing both reportive and inferential evidentiality we may speak of ‘indirect evidence’ (Plungian 2001, see his Figure 2) or of ‘non-firsthand information’ (Aikhenvald 2003; 2004); see section 2. As we will see now, some of the units mentioned above turn out to be underdetermined w.r.t. these two domains, and they often do not discriminate these evidential functions from a merely “comparative” function (comparable to Eng. *as if, as though*).

The most obvious cases are *tarsi*, *tartum* and *tarytum* (see 3.1.4). Their functional indiscriminateness arises even in contexts in which there are other indicators of previous speech acts. It then happens quite often that the expression within their scope can simultaneously be understood as an approximate characterization (of a referent, its property, or an event) made by the speaker.<sup>17</sup> In such contexts *tarsi*, *tartum* and *tarytum* become really ambiguous, because they can then also be interpreted as means of comparison; or an inferential reading is added to the reportive interpretation (see in particular ex. 44). This phenomenon can be illustrated with the following examples:

- (43) Pasak poeto B. Brazdžionio, daina – tautos gyvybės balsas. Daina Lietuvoje skambėjo, skamba ir skambės, *tarsi* [paliudydama – kultūra ir didžiausius sunkmečius įveikia].  
‘According to the poet B. Brazdžionis the song is the voice of the people’s livelihood. In Lithuania the song sounded, sounds and will sound, *as if* [bearing witness that culture overcomes even the hardest times].’  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-8)
- (44) Buvome netgi su psichologais surengę diskusiją šiuo klausimu. Psichologai teigė, kad didžiumai žmonių vėžio diagnozė – smarkus šokas. Bet po kurio laiko žmogus *tarytum* [pradeda viską aiškiau suvokti].  
‘Concerning this question we even had settled on a discussion with psychologists. Psychologists asserted that for most people the diagnosis of cancer means a severe shock. But after some time people *seem* [to begin to comprehend everything more clearly].’  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-8)
- (45) – Beveik prieš dvidešimt metų paskaitų cikle per mūsų radiją jūs kalbėjote apie absoliuto ilgesį, o dabar parašėte apysaką, *tarytum* [atspindinčią šią nostalgiją]. Gal pradžioje priminkite, ką jums reiškia “absoliuto ilgesys”?  
‘– Almost twenty years ago in a series of lectures given for our radio station you spoke about the longing for the absolute. Now you have written a novel which, *as it were / people say* (?), [reflects this nostal-



gia]. Could you perhaps remind us what do you mean by „longing for the absolute”?”

(Šiaurės Atėnai 1995-10)

- (46) Kunigas Jaunius<sub>k</sub>, prisiminęs dieną, kai Gražvydui atsivėrė laisvės vartai, prisipažino, kad jį tada buvo užplūdęs prieštaringas jausmas. Kapelionas<sub>k</sub> džiaugėsi, kad žmogus pagaliau grįžta į jo laukiančią šeimą, bet kartu *tarsi* gailėjosi, jog kolonijos kopyčioje nebus zakristijono, visos bendruomenės pavyzdžio.

‘When priest Jaunius<sub>k</sub> remembered the day on which the gate of freedom opened for Gražvydas, he acknowledged that at that moment he was overcome by a flood of contradictory emotions. The chaplain<sub>k</sub> rejoiced that there was a man who finally returned to his family waiting for him, but at the same time, *properly speaking*, it was a pity for him<sub>k</sub> that in the colony there would no longer be a sacristan, a positive example of the whole community.’

(Kauno diena 1997-5)

In view of the functional underdetermination of these units, there seems to be a general tendency for the hearsay reading of *tarsi* and *tarytum* to be much easier „to get” if the preceding context contains further explicit triggers of reported speech. Such a trigger may be another hearsay expression such as *pasak* ‘according to’ in (43), or a speech act verb in a matrix clause of the immediately preceding sentence, as for instance *teigė, kad* ‘asserted that’ in (44). In such cases *tarsi*, *tarytum* allow one to continue the already established perspective (here: of another person than the author of the text). This perspective may be a purely mental one, too, as in (44): ultimately, it is left to the author of this example whether *tarytum* refers to an assertion made by the psychologists or simply to an opinion (or observation) ascribed to them by the author of (44). The continuation of the perspective seems to suggest that the former is the case.<sup>18</sup>

This discourse pragmatic tendency can be compared to topic continuity as a default in narration; in view of this analogy it is tempting to call the tendency under discussion ‘viewpoint continuity’. Viewpoint continuity is interrupted if the subsequent sentences present a temporal break, as is the case in (45): first, the addressee is ascribed a way of speaking (or preferred topic of talk) which was typical of him/her some 20 years earlier (*prieš 20 metų... jūs kalbėjote apie* ‘20 years ago you spoke about’), but then a switch to the present period occurs (*o dabar* ‘and now’), in which the same person has published another novel. The latter is said to convey a nostalgic atmosphere (*atspindinčią šią nostalgią* ‘reflecting this nostalgia’), but because of the temporal break this characterization is attributed to the interviewee rather than being

understood as a reference to an assertion made earlier by the novel's author. This might explain why my informants were more inclined to read *tarytum* as introducing a simple comparison than regarding it as a reportive marker. (46) demonstrates a more complex case: first the priest's speech is quoted (probably word by word, *kunigas Jaunius prisipažino, kad* 'priest Jaunius acknowledged that'). He then remains the topic of the discourse (continued by an anaphoric definite description, *kapelionas* 'the chaplain'), but his behaviour is described by verbs denoting emotional states (*džiaugėsi* 'rejoiced', *gailėjosi* 'pittied'). It is therefore difficult to unambiguously attribute the choice of these descriptions to either the priest himself or the author of the text. Only in the first interpretation can we assume a reportive function of *tarsi*. This observation is confirmed by the fact that my informants hesitated which function to ascribe to *tarsi* in this case. It is even possible that both functions intersect, since they do not contradict each other, and *tarsi* can fulfil a comparative function in either the priest's perspective or from the viewpoint of the author of the text.

Of course, the explanations I have tried to give can only be tentative. They should be regarded as hypotheses to be checked more thoroughly in a more detailed study based on a larger amount of data with richer contexts. Nonetheless, even these few examples seem to grant the conclusion that not in every case does a hearsay function of certain lexical items arise readily without additional support. Instead, a reportive reading arises if the clause (syntagm) modified by *tarsi* or *tarytum* is situated in a favourable context which already contains other clues of reported speech. It seems justified to assume that the rise of reportive meanings from such favourable discourse conditions becomes a way for lexical changes to occur, in particular with items that are used for comparison. This assumption is corroborated by another item of the same etymological origin, namely *lyg* (see 3.2.2).

To sum up: the units examined above are best characterized as intrinsically indiscriminate (or: underdetermined) w.r.t. their evidential function. These functions may also intersect.

#### 4. Some more far-reaching considerations

As noticed above, reportive as well as inferential functions often arise from, or are at least supported by, favourable discourse conditions. Many of the items discussed in section 3 are only weak indicators of a reportive or inferential function and usually do not function as the only indicators of evidential meaning. This may lead

us to assume that for lexical evidentiality marking we should make the same distinction between conventionalized markers and markers used in evidential strategies that was already drawn by Aikhenvald (2003; 2004) with respect to evidentiality marking in the grammatical systems of languages: conventionalized markers signal evidential meanings *per se*, whereas weak or occasional indicators merely strengthen evidential readings which arise in contexts already containing other clues of evidentiality. Among the former group *esq*, *girdi*, *neva* (reportive) and *matyt* (inferential) should be mentioned, whereas *tarsi*, *tarytum* (reportive) and *lyg*, *rodos* (inferential) clearly belong in the latter group. Notice that this division does not coincide with the division between evidential markers with strong epistemic overtones on the one hand, and those without an evidential-epistemic syncretism, on the other: *esq* and *neva* display this syncretism, whereas *girdi* can be regarded as probably the best Lithuanian example of a purely reportive unit (see 4.1). Yet other units, such as *gal (ir)* and *turbūt*, should probably better be characterized as basically epistemic particles with no salient inferential extension.

#### *4.1. Epistemic overtones: parts of lexical meaning or pragmatic implicature?*

This brings us to a further important issue. Among reportive markers only *girdi* and the prepositions *pasak* and *anot* are definitely void of epistemic nuances, i.e. by themselves they do not evoke any epistemic qualification of the relevant state of affairs (P) by the speaker. By contrast, *tariamai* ‘allegedly’ always indicates that the speaker entertains doubts with respect to (or even dismisses) the truth of the statement reported (see 3.1.5). In the case of practically all other markers considered here it is difficult to draw a line between the lexical semantics and pragmatic implicatures often “imported” into these units from (and by virtue of) contexts in which such implicatures are usually found.

Obviously, in order to solve this problem it is helpful to look at contexts in which no other elements influence the decision as to whether or not the speaker of the utterance takes a specific epistemic stance towards the assertion in the scope of the reportive marker. This methodological requirement is not too difficult to meet, since such contexts can be found in larger corpora (see ex. 1, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 25, 35).<sup>19</sup> However, if we consider whole series of examples for a particular reportive marker in which context factors may influence the speaker’s epistemic qualification of the reported utterance, the picture

changes. It seems reasonable to assume that it is this overall picture, generalized from plenties or myriads of occasions on which these units occur, which is responsible for native speakers' judgments. It seems reasonable to assume that native speakers tend to ascribe epistemic overtones to a reportive marker if this marker occurs often enough in appropriate contexts in which an epistemic stance (doubt etc.) is suggested by other linguistic elements, or just from a clash between the content of the reported message (assertion) and knowledge about the "real" state of affairs assumed by the speaker and/or the listener.

Let me illustrate this point for *esq* and *atseit* by comparing the following examples. In (52) both units are used, and there are no other elements or discourse structure which might suggest an epistemic reservation concerning the assertions contained in this example. Only the officials' opinion is referred to, without the speaker taking any stance as to the truth or validity of their statements:

- (47) Nėra baudžiamosios atsakomybės už vengimą gydytis nuo venerinių ligų. Nėra atsakomybės už kyšį. BK taip suformuluotas, kad yra visos sąlygos išsisukti. O ką sako kodekso rengėjai? Kreipiausi į Teisingumo ministerijos aukšto rango pareigūnus. Jie sako: netiesa. Visais šiais atvejais *atseit* galima taikyti baudžiamąją atsakomybę. Tokie nusikaltimai *esq* reglamentuojami kitais straipsniais. Teismai ir prokuratūra netiksliai interpretuoja, švelniai tariant. 'There is no punishable responsibility if one avoids curing oneself from venereal diseases. There is no responsibility for a bribe. The Penal Code is formulated in such a way that there are all possibilities to extricate oneself. But what do the authors of the codex say? I made a request to high-rank officials in the Ministry of Justice. They say: it's not true. In all these cases (*it is claimed / it turns out*) that punishable responsibility can be applied. Such crimes are (*said to be*) subject to reglementations of other paragraphs. The courts and the prosecuting authorities interpret them not very exactly, to say the least.'  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-7)

The situation changes when *atseit* or *esq* occur in a text whose author relates to somebody else's lies, manipulations or other speech acts meant to misguide or deceive other people:

- (48) Kaip pasakojo mums vienas pažįstamas Maskvos saugumietis, tai daroma taip. Trenkiasi į kokį nors joną kazlauską automobilis. Iššoka vairuotojas, nebėga iš įvykio vietos (paprastai normali reakcija), nes jis nėra ištiktas šoko. Jeigu tas jonas dar gyvas, jį pribaigia. Po to pradeda šaukti kaip tas Hitleris, raunasi plaukus nuo

galvos: tokia nelaimė, tokia nelaimė. Užjaučia nužudytojo vaikus ir gimines. Dalyvauja laidotuvėse, apmoka išlaidas, gauna tris metus lygtinai arba nieko, *atseit* automobilio ratas netikėtai nusimovė, taigi kalta technika. Toks pigus teatras Maskvoje.

‘As we were told by an employee of the Moscow security police, this is done the following way. A car forcefully drives into some John Smith. The driver jumps out, he does not run away from the place of the event (usually the normal reaction), because he is not under shock. If this John Smith is still alive, he puts an end to him. Then he begins to cry like a Hitler and tears his hair: what a disaster, what a disaster. He shares feelings with the murdered man’s children and the relatives. He participates at the funeral, pays for the costs and gets three years on suspension or nothing. *{atseit}* the wheel of the car stripped off unexpectedly, therefore technical problems are to blame. Such a cheap theatre in Moscow.’

(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-9)

The same effect arises when *esą* or *atseit* are used in dependent clauses after verbs of speech or mental attitudes which imply an “epistemic discrepancy” between the statement(s) of the person reported on and the speaker using the reportive marker. The same applies to *neva*. Beside ex. 11 (*stiprėja... šmeižtai... neva Bažnyčia stengiasi valdyti Lenkiją* ‘slander against the clergy have been steadily growing that reportedly the Church wants to rule Poland’), 17 (*skleisti tiesiog gaudus, kad tai atseit “raudonieji”* ‘to spread rumours that this are supposedly „reds”’), 18 (*man prirašė įžeidžiančią politinę potekstę: atseit aš* ‘an offensive political concealed text was ascribed to me: allegedly I...’) see the following example:

- (49) LDDP valdžia net nebando pareikalauti iš buvusių valstybių okupantų nors dalies kompensacijos už genocido ir represijų aukas (...). Kad suklaidintų lengvatikius, kai kurie buvusieji *atseit* daro atgailą, eina į bažnyčią ar, atsiskyrę nuo genocido ir represijų aukų, lanko pastariesiems brangias vietas, paminklus tautos švenčių dienomis.

‘The rulers of LDDP [a political party in Lithuania; BW] did not even try to demand so much as a partial recompensation for the victims of the genocide and the repressions from the former occupying countries. In order to misguide credulous persons, some of the former persons in charge (*as it is claimed*) show repentance, go into church or, during people’s festive days, after having separated from victims of the genocide and repressions, attend to places of remembrance which are close to the hearts of the latter.’

(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-7)

In sum: at least some reportive units which do not *per se* convey epistemic overtones in epistemically neutral contexts, may easily acquire this function in contexts where a “clash” of epistemic evaluation between the message reported (original speaker) and the reporting utterance (actual speaker) comes to the fore. This contextually conditioned accretion of epistemic connotations may then become conventionalized. However, it is difficult to determine when this will happen, which is a matter to be addressed in further research.

#### 4.2. Combinations of hearsay markers

Multiple marking of hearsay is nothing extraordinary in Lithuanian. Basically, all units discussed above can be combined provided they belong to the same evidentiality subdomain (reportive vs. inferential). I am unaware of any other restrictions in this regard. Cf. the following example:

- (50) Praėjusį pavasarį Ševardnadzė įsakė nuginkluoti “Mchedrioni”, *neva* jie *esą* banditai. Iki šiol jos nariai atidavė tik apie 100 ginklų. Kaip žinoma, Ševardnadzė apkaltino Joselianį, kad jis surengęs pasikėsinimą.  
‘Last spring Ševardnadze ordered to disarm „Mxedrioni”, because they are *reportedly* bandits. Until now its members rendered only about 100 weapons. As is known, Ševardnadze accused Joseliani of having prepared a plot.’  
(Lietuvos Aidas 1995-9)

As demonstrated by ex. (1, 4, 6, 50) as well as the following ones, lexical evidentiality markers likewise co-occur freely with participles, which should be regarded as semi-grammaticalized means of indicating hearsay or inferential meanings:<sup>20</sup>

- (51) Albinas Jatkauskas bandė teisintis, kad tokį verslą neseniai pradėjęs. *Girdi*, bėdą turįs, prieš porą metų sudegė tvartas, reikėjo atstatyti.  
‘Albinas Jatkauskas tried to justify himself saying that he had started on such a business only recently. *As he said*, he had fallen into misfortune: some years earlier his shed had burnt down and he had to rebuild it.’  
(Kauno diena 1997-2)
- (52) Dabartinėje dailės kritikoje išryškėjo nuomonė, kad Lietuvos dailė iki šiol *neva* menkai tenagrinėjanti intelektualinę, socialinę, politinę problematiką.

'In the contemporary critics of art the opinion has been expressed that (*as it is stated*) up to now Lithuanian art has been analysing intellectual, social and political problems only poorly.'

(Šiaurės Atėnai 1995-12)

- (53) Kan. J. Stankevičius (...) davė suprasti, jog esąs nusipelnęs mitros Bažnyčios labui Lietuvoje, o nesulaukdamas erzinosi ir kaltino mus, jo žodžiais tariant, "Romos daktarus". *Esą* mes jį kaltina ir net šmeižia. 'Canon J. Stankevičius communicated that for the prosperity of the Church in Lithuania he was a distinguished person. But since he had not been given appropriate appreciation, he was annoyed and accused us, in his words, "the doctors of Rome". *Allegedly* we accuse and even defame him.'

(Švyturys 1995-9)

Epistemic overtones are absent only in (51). However, in the majority of examples found in the corpus the combination of active participles (without copula) with lexical reportive markers expressing the speaker's epistemic stance is not neutral; as a rule, such a combination signals that the speaker distances him/herself from the assertion(s) reported and even doubts its/their veracity. Here we have to take into account that the most frequent reportive markers *esą*, *neva*, as well as *atseit* and others do not necessarily evoke epistemic stance (see 4.1). This is also true for active participles as clausal predicates: first and foremost, they indicate reported assertions and signal that the speaker does not take any responsibility for how they comply with the truth. It is usually only by implicature that the addressee (reader) can infer that the speaker (author) also takes a negative epistemic stance w.r.t. the reported utterance(s). Thus, the effect which, as a tendency, we gain if both active participles and lexical reportive markers cooccur, does not seem to be merely redundant marking. Rather, both means reinforce one another. This effect, in turn, does not result in something like „double/multiple reference” to reported utterances, i.e. it does not lead to a „stressed reportive” meaning. Instead, this reinforcement, as a rule, brings about an additional epistemic stance of doubt. In other words: the combination of reportive markers does not result in a mere mutual reinforcement of their meanings taken at their face value; instead, it yields the accretion of a new, albeit easily associable epistemic meaning.

#### 4.3. Resumptive remarks

This survey has led to several findings concerning (a) the classification of evidential markers, (b) their syntactic behaviour, (c) related

meanings (or uses), (d) a possible indiscriminateness regarding reportive vs. inferential meanings, (e) the interplay between evidential functions and epistemic stance, and (f) discourse effects for single and combined evidentiality marking. These findings are tentative, not only because they are based on an as yet rather small empirical basis (electronically retrievable media texts), but also for a more serious methodological reason. In order to establish and verify the semantic analysis of evidential markers we have to refine the heuristics by which lexical units acquire evidential functions as conventional meaning components, and not just as a side-effect of favourable discourse pragmatic conditions. An analogous remark concerns the additional accretion (or retention) of epistemic meaning components, as demonstrated in 4.1. This requirement is important not only for lexicographic and comparative purposes, but also for a better understanding of how and when lexical units, as it were, “filter out” from speech with distinct meanings. Both strictly semantic analyses and discourse-pragmatic approaches are necessary to eventually cope with this task.

*Address of the Author:*

Björn Wiemer, Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität, Institut für Slavistik, Saarstrasse 21, D- 55099 Mainz, Germany <wiemerb@uni-mainz.de>

*Abbreviations*

COP	copula
2, 3	second, third person
NOM	nominative case
SG, PL	singular, plural number
F, M	feminine, masculine gender
PRS	present
IMP	imperative

*Bibliographical References*

- AIKHENVALD Alexandra Y. 2003. Evidentiality in typological perspective. In AIKHENVALD A.Y. & R.M.W. DIXON (eds.). *Studies in Evidentiality*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins. 1-32.
- AIKHENVALD Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press.
- DE HAAN Ferdinand 1999. Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality: Setting Boundaries. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 18. 83-101.



- PLUNGIAN Vladimir A. 2001. The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33. 349-357.
- ROSZKO Roman 1993. *Wykładniki modalności imperceptywnej w języku polskim i litewskim*. Warszawa: SOW.
- ŠUKYS J. 1998. *Lietuvių kalbos linksniai ir prielinksniai: vartosena ir normos*. Kaunas: Šviesa.
- USONIENĖ Aurelia 2003. Extension of meaning. Verbs of perception in English and Lithuanian. In K.M. JASZCZOLT & K. TURNER (eds.). *Meaning Through Language Contrast*, vol. 1. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins. 193-220.
- USONIENĖ Aurelia. Forthcoming. Tikimybės veiksmažodžiai anglų ir lietuvių kalbose: atitikmenų paieška. *Baltistica* 2006-2.
- VALECKIENĖ A. 1998. *Funkcinė lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijos leidybos institutas.
- WIEMER Björn 1998. Pragmatical inferences at the threshold to grammaticalization – The case of Lithuanian predicative participles and their functions. *Linguistica Baltica* 7. 229-243.
- WIEMER Björn 2005. Conceptual affinities and diachronic relationships between epistemic, inferential and quotative functions (preliminary observations on lexical markers in Russian, Polish and Lithuanian). In HANSEN Björn & Petr KARLÍK (eds.). *Modality in Slavonic languages. New perspectives*. München: Sagner. 107-131.
- WIEMER Björn 2006. Grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian (a typological assessment). *Baltistica* 41-1. 33-49.
- WIEMER Björn. Forthcoming. Kosvennaja zasvidetel'stvovannost' v litovskom jazyke. In Viktor S. XRAKOVSKIJ (ed.). *Tipologija kosvennoj zasvidetel'stvovannosti*. Sankt-Peterburg.
- XRAKOVSKIJ Viktor S. 2005. Ėvidencial'nost' i ėpistemičeskaja modal'nost'. In HANSEN Björn & Petr KARLÍK (eds.). *Modality in Slavonic languages. New perspectives*. München: Sagner. 87-94.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Noticeable exceptions are Roszko (1993) and Usonienė (2003; forthc.), who, however, approach the relevant units from the perspective of their epistemic rather than evidential value.

<sup>2</sup> These are part of the Kaunas internet corpus of contemporary Lithuanian (see: <http://donelaitis.vdu.lt/>).

<sup>3</sup> This gives me opportunity to express my gratitude to my Lithuanian colleagues Saulius Ambrazas, Artūras Judžentis, Vytautas Kardelis, Jurgis Pakerys and Vaiva Žeimantienė. I am particularly indebted to Aurelija Usonienė and Mario Squartini for their valuable remarks on a pre-final version of this article, as well as to Volker Gast for his patient manner of correcting my English. Of course, no one except myself should be blamed for possible misinterpretations or other shortcomings.

<sup>4</sup> A similar remark applies to parentheticals (cf. Germ. 'Schaltwörter', Russ. 'vvodnye slova') or so-called 'discourse markers'.

<sup>5</sup> Depending on what kind of syntactic theory one wants to accept.

<sup>6</sup> Apart from this, she also insists that it sometimes becomes essential to distinguish between simply reported speech (= hearsay) and genuine quotatives, i.e. word-by-word citations. In Lithuanian, however, this division does not become manifest by the choice of different markers and therefore remains irrelevant in this paper.

<sup>7</sup> See, however, Fig. 1 in Plungian (2001), where some more fine-grained distinctions of the same kind are made.

<sup>8</sup> In Lithuanian finite verb forms never distinguish number in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person.

<sup>9</sup> The privative opposition is not a perfect one, since the present tense copula (or auxiliary) can easily be omitted. One could thus also say *Jie Ø atvažiuo*; such an utterance is indiscriminate in terms of its evidentiality status (cf. Wiemer 1998:232f.; forthc.: 2.1.2).

<sup>10</sup> Lithuanian infinitives always end in unstressed {ti}, but colloquially they are very often abbreviated to just {t}. Thus, superficially *matyt* seems to be just another form of the infinitive according to the phonetic tendency of vowel apocope.

<sup>11</sup> Usonienė (2003:212f.) describes the full infinitive *matyti* as an evidential marker. However, in her examples *matyti* takes finite clausal complements connected by *kad* ('that'). We must leave it for future research whether the form of the complement and the presence/absence of a complementizer plays a role in the function of *matyti* (or *matyt*, for that matter).

<sup>12</sup> In this function *mat* is more or less synonymous with Lith. *juk*, *nes* and can be compared with Germ. *denn*, *schließlich*, Russ. *ved'*, Pol. *przecież*.

<sup>13</sup> However, we have to admit that the nature and origin of the final *-s* remains to be clarified.

<sup>14</sup> Considerably more rarely, the form *rodosi*, with the unabbreviated reflexive marker {si} can be encountered, too.

<sup>15</sup> *Turėti* functions as a marker of both deontic and epistemic necessity, but it is never used as a reportive marker (differently from Germ. *sollen* or Pol. *mieć*).

<sup>16</sup> Compare Russ. *čego dobrogo* 'ditto', from which *ko gero* probably has been calqued.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. also Usonienė (forthc.) on this use of *tarsi* (as an equivalent of Eng. *as though*, *as if* and other 'seeming'-predicates).

<sup>18</sup> Notabene, irrespective of who is the subject to whom the proposition under the scope of *tarytum* is to be attributed, this unit can simultaneously mark a comparison (approximate characterization).

<sup>19</sup> At this point, another caveat is in order. The examples given in this article can be judged only when taken at their face value, since only the minimal context which appears to be necessary to "render an impression" for the author's epistemic attitude is provided. Accordingly, it cannot be excluded that these contexts are too local, and that there might be other clues indicating the author's real stance toward the messages conveyed by him/her which are located beyond the range of the context given, and that such clues could influence the conception of the author's epistemic evaluation by the reader.

<sup>20</sup> For a comprehensive description of this grammatical system see Wiemer (1998; 2006; forthc.).

Table 1: Overview of lexical evidentiality markers in Lithuanian

# + ?	central peripheral doubtful	nearest English equivalent	etymology (grammatical form and original conceptual domain)	evidential subfunction	epistemic component?	grammatical function / scope	other functions / meanings
<i>esą</i>	#		PPA.NEUT of <i>būti</i> 'to be'	reportive	yes	particle, conjunction / variable	inflected participle (NOM.PL.M) used particularly in logophoric clauses
<i>girdi</i>	#		PRS.2.SG of <i>girdėti</i> 'to hear'	reportive	no	particle / only clauses	perception verb
<i>neva</i>	#		< negated participle <i>va</i> '(look over) there'	reportive (inferential)	yes	adverb, conjunction / variable	
<i>tarsi</i> <i>tartum</i> ? <i>tarytum</i> +	+ ? +		FUT.2.SG COND.2.SG of <i>tarti</i> 'to say, pronounce' COND.2.SG of <i>tarytum</i> 'ditto'	reportive (inferential)		adverbs / variable	conjunctions, adnominal modifier (in comparisons), <i>tarsi</i> also as question particle
<i>tariamai</i> #	#		adverb of present passive participle of <i>tarti</i> 'to say, pronounce'	reportive	yes	adverb / variable	
<i>atsseit</i>	#		< <i>atsieiti</i> .INF 'to come about' ??	reportive	yes ?	particle	
<i>būk(tai)</i> +	+ ?		< IMP-SG of <i>būti</i> 'to be' (+ DEM.NEUT)	reportive	no		

<i>anot</i>	#		connected to Old Prussian preposition <i>na, no</i> ≈ 'due to, according to'	reportive	no	preposition	
<i>pasak</i>	#		< <i>pasakyti</i> .INF 'to say' ← speech act	reportive	no	preposition	
<i>pagal</i>	?		< <i>pa + galas</i> 'end'	(reportive)	no	preposition	
<i>matyti</i>	?		<i>matyti(i)</i> .INF 'to see'	inferential		particle	perception verb
<i>matyt</i>	#		abridgment of <i>matyt</i> ? ← perception				
<i>mat</i>	+						
<i>lyg, lygtai, lyg ir +</i>			< <i>lyg-us</i> 'even, similar' + particle <i>tai / ir</i>	inferential (reportive)	yes	adverb	conjunction
<i>atrodo, rodos +</i>			PRS.3 of <i>atrodyti / rodytis</i> 'to seem, appear' ← perception	inferential		particle	
<i>berods</i>	?		<i>be- + rodyti</i> 'to show'	(reportive?)		particle	
<i>regis +</i>			PRS.3 of <i>regėtis</i> 'to seem' ← perception	inferential		particle	
<i>gal(būt), gal ir?</i>			< PRS.3 of <i>galėti</i> 'can' + truncated <i>būti</i> .INF 'to be'	(inferential)		particle	question particle (without the element <i>būt</i> )
<i>turbūt</i>	?		< <i>turi būti</i> 'has to, must be' (< <i>turėti</i> .INF 'to have' + <i>būti</i> .INF 'to be')	(inferential)		particle	
<i>ko gero</i>			= GEN of <i>kas gera</i> , lit. 'which/what is good'	(inferential)		particle	
<i>rasi</i>	?		FUT.2.SG of <i>rasti</i> 'to find'	(inferential)		particle	question particle

Remarks:

- particles can also be used as parentheticals (Germ. 'Schaltwörter')