Lithuanian *esą* — a heterosemic reportive marker in its contemporary stage

Björn Wiemer
University of Mainz

From the syntactic point of view, *esą* is the most diversified Lithuanian evidential marker of all as it covers uses not only in regular paradigms, but also as a function word. This stage can be captured by the notion of heterosemy. Diachronically *esą* derives from the former neuter of the present active participle of *būti* 'to be', which is homonymous with the regular NOM.PL.M form of the same participle. In contemporary Lithuanian, *esą* has also become an uninflected function word used as a particle and a complementizer after certain groups of verbs. Today its uses as a participle and as a function word coexist. This article provides a corpus-based investigation into the syntactic distribution of this unit, which neatly distinguishes its grammatical und lexical status and asks in which usage types and why a reportive meaning arises. The study then focuses on frequent cases in which the syntactic status of *esą* is ambiguous, also taking into account possible discourse pragmatic cues. The second part of the article starts with an argument for considering the function word uses of *esą* as results of lexicalization. The rest of the study is devoted to a comparison of *esą* with functionally equivalent evidential units on a broader areal (basically Eastern European) background. This comparison sheds light on differences and similarities in the etymology, evolution and contemporary syntactic and semantic range of functions of lexicalized reportive markers.

Keywords: evidentiality, lexicalization, particles, complementation, diachronic semantics

0. Introduction

Lith. *esą* is an isolated offspring of the participial paradigm of the verb *būti* 'to be'. The stem of its present active participles is based on the suppletive root *es-*; the item *esą*, which interests us here, represents the former neuter gender:

(1) *bū-ti*.INF   'to be'   ⇒   *es-q-s, es-ant-is*.NOM.SG.M
                                     es-an-ti.NOM.SG.F
                                     es-ą, *es-ant-ys*.NOM.PL.M[1]
                                     es-ančios.NOM.PL.F
                                     (< *es-antj-os*)

$$*es\text{-}on(t).\text{NOM} = \text{ACC.N} \;\boxed{> \dagger es\text{-}ą.\text{N(SG)}^{2}} > \textbf{esą}$$

As a continuation of the otherwise extinct neuter form, *esą* can no longer be morphologically analyzed and is, in this respect, lexicalized (see sections 3 and 4.1). It is homonymous with the paradigmatic form of the masculine plural used as a usual participle in various kinds of construction (see section 1). However, in almost all kinds of usage, i.e. practically irrespective of its syntactic behavior (grammatical status), *esą* indicates hearsay and, thus, has to be considered as an evidential, more specifically, a reportive, marker.

In contemporary Lithuanian the form *esą,* which has split off from its former paradigm, shows variable syntactic behavior. Consequently, its grammatical nature and its status as a lexical unit (function word) raises certain questions which can be answered only after a straightforward distributional analysis; this analysis will be provided in sections 1 and 2. From a syntactic point of view, *esą* is probably the most variegated item among all functional units that serve as evidential markers in Lithuanian (for an overview cf. Wiemer 2007a). But it also deserves special attention in terms of its genesis and areal background; the latter will become the subject of section 4[3]. Beforehand, in section 3, I will dwell on the question of whether, and to which degree, *esą* has to be seen as the product of lexicalization.

The distributional analysis will be based on corpus data from the internet corpus http://donelaitis.vdu.lt/m, which has been assembled by R. Marcinkevičienė and collaborators in Kaunas; I will occasionally supplement this data with examples from other written sources (see

---

[1] On the distribution of the short (contracted) and the long form in the masculine singular and plural (-*ąs / -antis*, -*ą / -antys*) cf. LG (1997, 330).

[2] For the etymology cf. Ambrazas (2006, 145). The sign † means 'has fallen into oblivion, obsolete'.

[3] I want to thank Jurgis Pakerys and, first of all, Erika Jasionytė for judgments concerning a couple of examples as well as for valuable comments. I am also grateful to Nicole Nau and Bernhard Wälchli for their advice on Latvian and Estonian. Of course, all interpretations are mine and the usual disclaimers apply.

References). From the Kaunas corpus, 108 random hits on *esq* were submitted to analysis (see Table 1), all of them came from journals published predominantly in the 1990s.

1. Basic syntactic distribution (usage types)

The form *esq* is widely used in at least three, possibly four different syntactic functions. In 1.1 I will first make some remarks about uses of the form *esq* which still must be interpreted not as a petrified (paradigmatically isolated) unit, but rather as a regular, paradigmatic form of the present active participle of *būti* 'to be' (see above). I want to include these remarks for two reasons: first, the usage types of *esq* as a functional word which have 'split off' from the paradigm of present active participles must be diachronically closely related to those paradigmatic forms; correspondingly, the hearsay function of *esq* as a paradigmatically isolated function word appears to be 'inherited' from particular uses of the regular participle in a specific kind of context. As such, this diachronic link will not be submitted to scrutiny any more in this article, but it is important to bear it in mind. Second, *esq* as a function word and *esq* as a representative of the regular participial paradigm can be mixed up in some contexts. This observation is crucial for the discussion in section 2, where it will be shown that the grammatical status of *esq* becomes notoriously ambiguous under certain well-definable syntactic conditions, which render the job hard for the linguist.

Subsection 1.2 will be devoted to the usage types, defined by syntactic behavior, of *esq* as an uninflected function word. On the basis of this, I will then, in section 2, concentrate on those cases which are hard (if at all) to decide upon from an analytic perspective.

1.1. *Esq* as part of the regular participial paradigm

As the NOM.M.PL-form of the paradigm of present active participles of *būti* (see above), *esq* can be used (a) as a non-finite copula or (b) as an existential verb. For the former see (2), for the latter (3):

(2) *Iki mūsų dienų išlikę duomenys, kaip senovės žmogus įsivaizdavo Perkūną, yra gana prieštaringi ir įvairūs.*

Poetas, remdamasis tais duomenimis,   pateikia
poet.NOM   tender.PRS.3
kelis   atsakymus,   kas   gi
some.ACC.PL.M answer.ACC.PL.M what.NOM PTC
esą   *žaibai.*
be:PTCP:NOM.PL.M   lightning.NOM.PL.M
Viena iš versijų: žaibai — ugninės šakos.
[*Darbai ir dienos* 1995/1]
'The data remaining until the present day, regarding how ancient people imagined the Thunder God, is contradictory and varied. The poet, referring to those quotes, provides some answers as to what lightning **is**. One of the versions says: lightning is flaming branches.'

(3)   *Kai kreipėmės į policiją. Atseit tos sistemos, kai pradeda pypti, staugti, kaukti — įsiveržia į mokesčių mokėtojo miegą, į jo buitį, būtį, sąmonę, namus pagaliau, pažeidžia asmens teritoriją — gal galima tuos signalus nutildyt,   jei   šeimininkai*
                                          if   host.NOM.PL.M
jų   negirdi   ar   negali
them.GEN   NEG.hear.PRS.3   or   NEG.can.PRS.3
*girdėt,   nes   **esą***
hear.INF   because   be:PTCP:NOM.PL.M
kur nors   toli   nuo   savo   automobilių,
somewhere far   from   REFL   car.GEN.PL
ar tiesiog neima galvon, kad jų mašinos klykia vidury nakties, vidury miegančio miesto, gal galima ką nors tokio padaryt, imtis priemonių? Ne, pasakius policija, nes negalim brautis į privačias valdas. Vadinasi, mano miegas ne privačios, o visuomeninės valdos. [*Šluota* 1995/9]
'When we appealed to the police. When those systems start to beep, squeal, howl — burst into a taxpayer's nightmare, life, existence, consciousness, not least his home, infringe his personal area — maybe it's possible to silence those signals, if their owners don't hear them or are not able to hear them because they **are** far from their cars or just don't care that their cars squeal in the middle of the night, in the middle of the sleeping city, maybe it's possible to do something, to

set something in motion? No, the police said that we can't trespass on one somebody's private domain. So it means my sleep is not a private but a public domain.'

In almost all cases this form represents the NOM.PL.M-form of the participle; very rarely does *esą* correspond to the homonymous neuter form (see ex. 1). This can only happen in a very restricted environment, namely: if the respective clause does not have a nominatival subject, i.e. no agreement-triggering NP, or if the subject function is performed by the demonstrative *tai* 'this' (a remnant of the neuter control gender)[4]. Since in the investigated corpus sample no convincing example has been found, as an illustration I adduce here an example from Wiemer (2007b, 218):

(4) *[…] Labiausiai jam patikę tai, kad „procesai" vyksta ramiai, nekonfliktiškai, pavyksta susitarti dėl užsienio politikos.*
     Baltarusijoje **esą** *kitaip,*
     Belarus'.LOC be:PTCP(?).NEUT differently
     ten jau ne pirmas mėnuo tęsiasi rimti nesutarimai tarp prezidento A. Lukašenkos ir Aukščiausios Tarybos. [Dienovidis 1996]
     'Most of all he liked the fact that the 'processes' run quietly, without conflicts, and people succeed in coming to common views concerning foreign policy. In Belarus it **is apparently** different. It is not the first month for continuing serious disagreements between president A. Lukashenko and the Supreme Council.'

As we will see in 2.1, such instances are, however, not 'water-tight' proof of copular use either.

A similar caveat to that of the homonymous NOM.PL.M-form of the regular participle concerns *esą* occurring as part of a nominal predicate which links a clause to a semi-copula like *pasirodyti* 'to turn out', *pasidaryti* 'to become, turn into' (5) or to certain emotive, perceptual (6), epistemic (7), or illocutive (8–9) verbs:

---

[4] Since modern Lithuanian no longer has neuter in nouns (i.e. it lacks units able to exert 'control gender' in the sense of Corbett 1991), *esą* as a relic of the neuter cannot be used as a NP-internal attribute, nor as an apposition. Note, however, that even the homonymous form *esą*.NOM.PL.M can only theoretically be imagined in appositive use. In the analyzed sample, I have not come across a single instance, thus we may presume that it is extremely rare or altogether absent in real speech.

(5) *Jei 9–12 klasėje tiesiog brukami kontraceptikai, tai*

tie,	*kuriems*	*jų*	*dar*
those.NOM	RP:DAT.PL.M	they.GEN	yet

neprireikė,	*PASIDARO*
NEG:become_necessary.PAST.3	become.PRS.3

esą	*lyg ir*	*nevykėliai.*
be:PTCP:NOM.PL.M	as_though	loser.NOM.PL.M

[*Dienovidis* 1995/ 10]

'If contraceptives are forced on 9–12th graders, those who haven't needed them yet **supposedly** BECOME losers.'

(6) […] *Tuo tarpu kolektyvui* […] *vienas svarbiausių individo vertės matų — jo santykis su darbu. Ne veltui nemokantys ir nenorintys*

dirbti	*Kukio*	*sūnus*	*ir*
	PN:GEN	son.NOM.SG.M	and

marti	*JAUČIASI*
daughter-in-law-NOM.SG.F	feel.PRS.3:RM

esą	*kaimo*	*pašaipos*
be:PTCP:NOM.PL.M	village.GEN	derision.GEN

objektas. [*Lituanistika* 1995/3]
object.NOM.SG.M

'Meanwhile, for the collective, one of the most important measures of an individual's value is his relation to work. Inept and unwilling to work, Kukys's sons and daughter-in-law are FEELING as if they **are** objects of derision.'

(7) […] *Aš galbūt irgi norėčiau, kaip kiti žmonės, kultūringai išgerti, bet, kartoju, būtina įsisąmoninti, kad esi alkoholikas, o tai reiš-kia — esi bejėgis prieš alkoholį ir todėl negali jo vartoti. Suprantu, kai žmonės patys nori gydytis.*

Bet	*ką*	*daryti*	*su*	*tais,*	*kurie*
but	what.ACC	do.INF	with	those.INS	RP:NOM.PL.M

NESUVOKIA	**esą**	*alkoholikai?*
NEG:conceive.PRS.3	be:PTCP:NOM.PL.M	alcoholic.NOM.PL.M

Kaip jiems padėti? [*Caritas* 1995/1]

'Perhaps I would like to drink as any other man as well, but, I repeat, it is necessary to realize that you are an alcoholic and it means — you are helpless against alcohol and you cannot use it. I understand when people want to

get medical treatment. But what about those, who DON'T PERCEIVE themselves **to be** alcoholics? How are they to be helped?'

(8) […] *Taip, —*
abu   jūs   vienodai   atkakliai
both.NOM.M you.NOM.PL likewise   stubbornly
TEIGIATE   esą   vieninteliai
assert.PRS.2 PL   be:PTCP:NOM.PL.M   sole.NOM.PL.M
protingi,   tačiau... [*Dienovidis* 1995/11]
intelligent.NOM.PL.M   but
'Yes, — you both insistently STATE **you are** the only clever ones, but…'

(9) […] *Tad be galo džiugino tai, kai po mūsų renginių ar radijo,*
televizijos laidų   prieidavo   studentai   arba
                come.IT_PAST.3   student.NOM.PL.M or
dėstytojai   ir   PASISAKYDAVO
teacher.NOM.PL.M and   say:RM:IT_PAST.3
esą   knygnešių
be:PTCP:NOM.PL.M   book_smuggler.GEN.PL
provaikaičiai,   girdėję ar išlaikę šeimoje relikvijas iš senų.
grandchildren.PL.M
laikų [*Mokslas ir gyvenimas* 1996/2]
'So it is very pleasant that, after our events or radio and television programs, students or teachers used to come to DECLARE THEMSELVES **to be** the great-grandchildren of book smugglers, who heard about or passed on relics from the past.'

In such cases *esą* serves as a clause-connecting device and thereby performs a twofold function: it functions as both the connector to a complement-taking predicate and as the copula in the nucleus of the propositional argument. If this propositional argument happens to complement an illocutive verb (as in ex. 8–9), the result is a logophoric sentence. Such a type of clause linkage (with complex predication linking a non-finite complement to a predicate with a propositional argument) has been attested throughout the entire history of Lithuanian documented by written sources; and it is still in use in more elaborate text genres and registers as well as in some dialects.

There is strong reason to assume that it was exactly sentences of such structure which played an important role in the rise of the so-called 'modus relativus', i.e. to a kind of 'renarrative mood' which bears a close relation to evidentiality[5]. From a diachronic perspective, it is only natural to explain the hearsay function of contemporary *esą*, used as an uninflected function word, as a continuation of the syntactic embedding by non-finite clause-combining *būti*. In this evolution two processes must have been decisive: (i) the transition from syntactic embedding to syntactically independent sentences (at once the change from a clause connecting device to a particle), (ii) pragmatic strengthening (in the sense of Traugott 1989 and subsequent publications) of the speech act component 'transmitted' from syntactically superior illocutive predicates. The illocutive (thence hearsay) component must have been incorporated semantically into *esą* as it developed from a clause-embedding connective to a particle, i.e. a device which does not bear any syntactic relationship to the proposition it modifies. This part of the story of hearsay marking in Lithuanian has so far remained unstudied (and I will not undertake it here, either). Suffice it to again mention that the form *esą*, as it appears in (5–9), does not represent the obsolete neuter, which will interest us further, but rather the homonymous NOM.PL.M-form in a function which is akin to apposition (see f. 4). In this sense, the rise of *esą* as an uninflected function word can be seen as the (relative) endpoint of consecutive steps in diachronic evolution. The issue of which consequences this brings about for the modern standard language will be taken up in section 3.

1.2. *Esą* as an uninflected function word

1.2.1. As complementizer or relativizer

I choose to treat these two functions under one heading because the relativizing function of *esą* turns out to be only a special case of its complementizer use, which occurs after nominalizations of complement-taking verbs or after otherwise semantically closely related nouns (see below). At the same time I consider it advisable to keep apart the us-

---

[5] Cf. Ambrazas (1979, 188–198; 1990, 222–228; 2006, 391–395), Wiemer (1998, 236–239; 2007b, 228–234).

age as a relativizer, since we cannot know *a priori* whether there are no places in the grammar of natural languages in which adverbal and adnominal clausal modifiers (i.e. complementizers vs. relativizers) are treated differently.

In fact, *esą* is amply attested with various grammatical forms of complement-taking verbs denoting illocutive acts or mental events (or processes)[6]:

(10) [...] *Debatuose dėl šio pasiūlymo pasisakė penki Steigiamojo seimo atstovai, iš kurių tik   socialdemokratas*
                        social_democrat.NOM.SG.M
K. Venclauskis SUABEJOJO, **esą**   *„negalima*
PN:NOM   doubt.PAST.3 HS_COMP one_cannot
mažai   žmonių   grupei   perduoti
small.DAT.SG.F people.GEN group.DAT.SG.F render.INF
Steigiamojo seimo   teises",   jo nuomone, pilna
Constitutive_Parliament.GEN   right.ACC.PL.F
Steigiamojo seimo sudėtis turėtų didesnį autoritetą gyventojų tarpe
[...]. [*Mokslas ir gyvenimas* 1995/7]
'In the debates, five members of Constitutive Parliament spoke up for this proposal and only one of them, social democrat K. Venclauskis, VOICED HIS DOUBTS **pointing out** that "the rights of the Constitutive Parliament should not be given to a small group of people". In his opinion, a full composition of the Constitutive Parliament would have greater authority among the population.'

(11) *Su buvusia savo kaimyne turėjau įdomų pokalbį. Paklausiau, kaip auga anūkai. Ji atsakė anūkų nebeturinti. Perėjo per kūną šaltis, ėmiau galvoti, kas galėjo nutikti tokiems mieliems vaikams? Pastebėjusi mano akyse nuostabą buvusi   kaimynė*
                        neighbor.NOM.SG.F

---

[6] I have not found any instances of *esą* with sentential complements of perception predicates. Indeed, such cases seem hardly imagineable; compare the strangeness of, e.g, ??*Jis girdėjo / matė, esą Jonas pakliuvo į avariją* to mean 'He heard / saw that [as though] Jonas was involved in an accident' (→ *girdėjo, esą* marking hearsay?), or ??*Jam pasirodė / vaidenosi, esą* [= lyg ?] *Jonas krito nuo medžio* to mean 'It seemed to him as if Jonas fell from a tree' (→ perceptually based inferential?).

> PASAKĖ, **esą** jos sūnus
> say.PAST.3 HS_COMP her.GEN son.NOM.SG.M
> išėjęs gyventi pas kitą
> go_away:PTCP:NOM.SG.M live.INF at other.ACC.SG.F
> moterį. Buvusi marti gyvenanti su savo
> woman.ACC.SG.F
> trimis vaikais. [Šeima 1995/6]
> 'I had an interesting conversation with my ex-neighbor. I asked how her grandchildren were growing up. She answered that she didn't have any grandchildren anymore. I felt cold all over my body and started to think what could have happened to such nice children. After she noticed my wonder she SAID her son had **allegedly** gone to live with another woman. Her ex-daughter-in-law lived with her 3 children.'

(12) [...] *Tačiau kad ir koks ilgas jis būtų,*
> dar nieko neįgalina TEIGTI,
> yet nothing.GEN NEG:make_possible.PRS.3 assert.INF
> **esą** pasiekėme kelio galą.
> HS_COMP reach.PAST.1PL road.GEN.SG.M end.ACC.SG.M
> [*Santara* 1996/25]
> 'No matter how long it is, it doesn't give anybody the right to STATE that we **have** reached the end of the path.'

(13) *Pastaruoju metu SKELBIAMA (tas būdinga didesnėms valstybėms)*
> lately announce:PTCP_INDECL
> **esą** ekologinės problemos žmonijai
> HS_COMP ecological problem.NOM.PL.F mankind.DAT
> yra grėsmingesnės nei
> COP.PRS.3 threatful:COMPAR.NOM.PL.F than
> *visuomenės gyvensenos dėsningumų pažeidimai* [...]. [*Mokslas ir gyvenimas* 1995/8]
> 'It has recently BEEN PUBLICIZED (this is typical for bigger states) that ecological problems **are allegedly** more threatening to society than the violation of societal life style.'

(14) *Maestro PRISIPAŽĮSTA, esą labai*
> maestro.NOM.SG.M admit.PRS.3 HS_COMP very

> graži   jam   anuomet   buvusi
> nice.NOM.SG.F him.DAT at_that_time be:PTCP:NOM.SG.F
> *Genijaus*   *muzika.* [*Santara* 1996/25]
> genius.GEN   music.NOM.SG.F
> 'The Maestro ADMITS the music of the Genius [Mozart] was
> very beautiful to him in those days.'

(15) *[…] O autoritetai — profesionalai architektai, paminklosau-*
gininkai, valdininkai, — užuot davę atkirtį tiems triukšmadariams,
bando   kažką   įrodinėti,   atsikalbinėti ar
try.PRS.3 something.ACC prove.INF, decline.INF   or
kvailai TEISINTIS,   esą   „tiltas   ir
stupidly justify.INF:RM HS_COMP bridge.NOM.SG.M and
stovyklos —   tai   vienas   ansamblis".
camp.NOM.PL.F this.NEUT one   ensemble.NOM.SG.M
[*Dienovidis* 1995/11]
'And authorities — professional architects, monument pro-
tectors, officers — instead of countering troublemakers have
been trying to prove something, run around or MAKE silly
EXCUSES, that **supposedly** "the bridge and the camps are
one ensemble".'

(16) *Įsivaizduokite, jog būčiau įsigijęs mobilų, net viršgarsinį lėktuvą.*
Bemat   būčiau   APKALTINTAS,   esą
instantly be:SBJV.1SG accuse:PTCP:NOM.SG.M   HS_COMP
ruošiuosi   nešti   nuo   duobės
prepare:PRS.1SG.RM carry.INF from pit.GEN.SG.F
kudašių   ir   mandatą...   oi! [*Dienovidis* 1995/10]
shit.GEN.PL also mandate.ACC.SG.M
'Imagine if I had purchased a mobile, even an ultrasonic
airplane. I would HAVE BEEN ACCUSED at once that, **purport-
edly,** I was going to do a runner and take away my mandate!'

This use of *esq* particularly often happens to be difficult to distinguish
from its particle use (see 1.2). From these examples we also see that
esq can refer to speech in different ways: it introduces literal quotes
(see ex. 10, 15), it refers to reformulations of previously uttered
speech (see ex. 11, 13, 14), or it serves as a means to insert potential
speech, i.e. to propositional content that most probably has not been

uttered previously by anyone (see ex. 12, 16). In the latter case, *esą* introduces sentential arguments of illocutive or epistemic predicates that are themselves modified by operators which suspend the realis supposition, e.g. by modal auxiliaries (e.g., *galima, dera pasakyti*) or verbs with an equivalent causative meaning (*neįgalina teigti* in 12), or by the subjunctive (*būčiau apkaltintas* in 16).

Some instances show *esą* being used as a means to introduce attributes to nouns. Such cases are not very numerous and, more importantly, the modified nouns are always related to speech acts:

(17) *Bankas tapo Širdies asociacijos įkūrimo iniciatorius. Lėšų mo-derniai kardiologijos aparatūrai įsigyti turėjo padėti kredito linija iš Šveicarijos. Galėjo būti vienas sėkmingesnių mokslo projektų, deja...*

Vieno	*miesto*	*dienraštyje*
one.GEN.M	town.GEN.SG.M	newspaper.LOC.SG.M

paskleistos	*NUOGIRDOS,*	***esą***	*Akcinis*
spread:PTCP:NOM.PL.F	rumor.NOM.PL.F	HS_REL	

inovacinis	*bankas*	*pretenduojąs*
	bank.NOM.SG.M	lay_claim:PTCP:NOM.SG.M

privatizuoti	*klinikas.*
privatize.INF	clinic.ACC.PL.F

Susidariusiomis aplinkybėmis bankas tęsti numatytą projektą atsisakė. [*Mokslas ir technika* 1995/2]

'The Bank became the initiator of the establishment of the Heart Association. A credit line from Switzerland should help the foundation to purchase modern cardiology equipment. It could be one of the most successful scientific projects but, unfortunately … one city newspaper disseminated the RUMOR **that** the Innovative Shareholders Bank was going to privatize the clinics. In these circumstances, the bank refused to continue the project.'

(18)
Pasakotojo	*TVIRTINIMĄ,*	***esą***	*jam*
narrator.GEN.SG.M	assertion.ACC.SG.M	HS_REL	him.DAT

„*vis dar*	*rodosi",* —
all_the_time	appear.PRS.3

> *papildo*   *ir*   *realizuoja*
> complement.PRS.3   and   realize.PRS.3
> *vaizduotės*   *pasaulis.* [*Lituanistika* 1995/3]
> imagination.GEN.SG.F   world.NOM.SG.M
> 'The narrator's CLAIM **as though** 'he constantly has visions' —
> is completed and put into practice by his imagination.'

In a sense, *esǫ* here fulfils the function of a relativizer. However, this function cannot be generalized, since *esǫ* is unable to link sentential attributes to head nouns with meanings beyond the narrow domain of illocutions (see f. 6). See the following example in which *esǫ* occurs after a proper relative pronoun (and should thus be treated as a particle, see ex. 28 in 1.2.2):

> (19)   *(…) viduryje normalus radioaktyviosios spinduliuotės fonas buvo vertinamas 1,5 mSv (…). Dabar ši reikšmė padidinta iki 2,5–3 mSv.*
> *Aiškinama,*   *kad*   *dabar įvertintas*
> clarify:PTCP_INDECL   COMP   now   assess:PTCP:NOM.SG.M
> *ir*   *radono*   INDĖLIS,   *kuris*
> also   radon.GEN   contribution.NOM.SG.M   RP:NOM.SG.M
> ***esǫ***   *anksčiau nevertintas.* [*Mokslas ir gyvenimas* 1996/2]
> HS_PTC   earlier   NEG:assess:PTCP:NOM.SG.M
> '(…) in the middle, the normal background of radioactive radiation was measured for 1.5 mSv (…). Now this measure is increased to 2.5–3 mSv. The explanation is that now the LEVEL of radon is assessed, which **apparently** earlier was not assessed.'

The relative pronoun could not be left out, i.e. *esǫ* by itself is unable to function as an adnominal connective if the noun does not refer to speech acts.

1.2.2. As particle

I take particles as a class of uninflected function words which do not partake in constituency structure but do themselves modify certain constituents, parts thereof or constituents housing entire propositions (in the form of clauses and complex sentences). The latter case even

seems to be the most frequent one (on varying scope see below). To-gether with scope, *esą* as a particle can occupy virtually any position in the utterance[7].

Variable placement and the ability to take whole propositions into its scope make the particle *esą* differ markedly from the 'homonymous' complementizer discussed in 1.2.1, and bring it close to so-called modal particles[8]. With modal particles, *esą* as an evidential particle shares general properties. Apart from scopal properties, among these com-mon properties we find non-negatability (non-questionability). This should not be confused with non-stressability; in fact, *esą* — as is true of many modal particles — can be stressed (compare examples below) albeit probably not for the purpose of contrastive foci. Furthermore, one should be aware that the scope of *esą* can vary (cf. Wiemer 2007a, 177f.). Here and in the following square brackets [...] will be used to indicate scope:

Scope over clause:

(20) *Problemiškas tapo kultūros tęstinumas, iškilo tradicijų klausimas. Pasigirdo kairuoliško bolševizmo pozicijai artimų balsų, nubrau-kiančių visa, kas buvo sukurta nepriklausomos Lietuvos metais visose kultūros srityse, nes*

[*tai* **esą** *tarnavo tik plutokratų*
this.NEUT HS_PTC serve.PRT.3 only plutocrat.GEN.PL
saujelei], *o ir pačių pasiekimų tarsi nebūta [...]*[9].
handful.DAT.SG.F

[*Lituanistika* 1995/3]

'Cultural continuity has become problematic. The issue of traditions has arisen. Voices have been heard sympathizing with the leftist Bolshevism, which wiped away everything that

---

[7] Holvoet (2007, 86) calls the paradigmatically isolated form *esą* "a kind of evidential sentence adverbial". Here I am not going to discuss whether 'particle' or '(sentence) adverb(ial)' is to be regarded as the more suitable term. More often than not both terms are used interchangeably, probably because both share most syntactic properties, primarily they take scope over whole propositions (cf. Wiemer, forthcoming1: 2.5).

[8] In German they are often called 'Abtönungspartikeln' because they are considered to attenuate an utterance's propositional content.

[9] It is arguable whether, in this case, *esą* does not take scope over the following con-junct (...*o ir pačių pasiekimų tarsi nebūta* 'and does not seem to have achieved anything whatsoever'), too. This problem is interesting the more that *tarsi* itself seems to acquire hearsay function. But here it is not the place to elucidate this issue.

was set up in independent Lithuania in all cultural fields due to the fact [it **allegedly** only served a handful of plutocrats] and does not seem to have achieved anything whatsoever.'

(21) *Nors XIX a. „blukio vakarai" buvo žinomi beveik visoje Latvijoje, tačiau trinką degindavo tik Kurše ir Vidžemėje. Šias apeigas, tarp jų ir Kalėdų išvakarių, mini nemaža šaltinių. Seniausias iš jų — įrašas Limbadžių bažnyčios 1609 m. vizitacijos protokole. Ten rašoma: „Daugelis Kalėdų vakare deda į ugniakurus dideles, storas trinkas, o*

kas	*nuo*	*jų*	*lieka,*	*saugoja*
what.NOM	from	them.GEN	remain.PRS.3	save.PRS.3

ir	*užkuria*	*audros*	*metu,*	*esą*
and	burn.PRS.3	storm.GEN.SG.F	during	HS_PTC

[*taip nuvaroma   šalin perkūnija*]".
so   whisk:PTCP:NOM.SG.F away thunderstorm.NOM.SG.F
[*Liaudies kultūra* 1995/5]
'Although in the 19th century 'blukio vakarai' [known as Christmas Eve] was known in almost all of Latvia, a log used to be burnt only in Curonia and Midland, these rituals also including Christmas Eve are mentioned in many sources. The oldest one is the record of the visit report in the Limbadžiai church in 1609. There it is written: 'Most people put big thick logs in fireplaces and what is left of them is saved and kindled during storm time, **reportedly** in order to whisk a thunderstorm away.'

Scope over adjuncts or NP-internal attributes:

(22) *(...) Juk, pavyzdžiui,*
piliečiai (ypač apsukresni kolchozų vadukai) griebė   [...]
citizen.NOM.PL.M   snatch.PAST.3

svetimą	*žemę*	*esą*	[*„nuomai"*],
foreign.ACC.SG.F	land.ACC.SG.F	HS_PTC	rent.DAT.F

o nūnai ją „suprivatizavo".
[*Švyturys* 1996/3]
'After all, for example, citizens (especially dodgy Kolkhoz heads) snatched stranger's land **supposedly** "for rent", but nowadays it has been privatized.'

(23) *Ir ženšenio eliksyras, bičių pienelis, ištirpdytas Tibeto žolių antpile,*
šaltalankio aliejus, gudobelių ekstraktas, regis, šiandien nu-
blanksta prieš visokiausius "drinkus" iš Europos nusenusių pro-
duktų ir gėrimų sąvartyno.

Vienas		*iš tokių*	*energijos*	*drinkų*
one.NOM.M	of	such.GEN.PL	energy.GEN	drink.GEN.PL.M

plačiai   reklamuojamas   gėrimas,
broadly advertize:PTCP:NOM.SG.M   drink.NOM.SG.M

esą   [*iš   Austrijos*].
HS_PTC from   Austria.GEN

Ko tik jame nėra! [*Švyturys* 1996/3]

'And elixir of ginseng, royal jelly, melted in Tibetan herb
dressing, mulberry oil, hawthorn extract, appears to be ob-
scured today by all types of out of date food and drinks from
Europe's garbage dumps. One of those widely advertised
drinks **is apparently** [from Austria]. It contains everything
but the kitchen sink.'

One might consider whether the last example does not testify to scope
over attributes (i.e. NP-internal); *iš Austrijos* 'from Austria' could be
understood as modifying either the noun *energijos drinkai* 'energy drinks'
or as a PP adjoined to the preceding sentence. Although I have not
found any example with *esą* unambiguously taking scope only over an
NP-internal part (i.e. an attribute), such use is in principle imaginable;
compare, for instance

(24) *Jonas   nusipirko   **esą**   [saugiausią*
     *PN:*NOM   buy.PAST.3   HS_PTC   safe:SPL.ACC.SG.M
     world.LOC   car.ACC.SG.M
     pasaulyje]   automobilį.
     'Jonas bought what was **claimed to be** [the safest] car [in
     the world].'

Only as a particle does *esą* allow for parenthetical use, as in the fol-
lowing instances:

(25) *Mokslo teorija praplečia mūsų žinias, leidžia suprasti tai, ko*
     antraip nesuprastume ir nežinotume. Dorovės teorijos lyg ir at-
     lieka panašų vaidmenį.

Mūsų   pirminės   dorovinės   nuojautos
our   initial.NOM.PL.F ethical.NOM.PL.F feeling.NOM.PL.F
dėl   poelgio   dorovinių   savybių,
concerning behavior.GEN ethical.GEN.PL property.GEN.PL
esą,   *atitinka   percepcijas.*
HS_PTC correspond.PRS.3 perception.ACC.PL.F
*Teorija šiuos nujautimus, arba pirminius įvertinimus, apibend-
rina, suteikia jiems racionalų pagrindą ir, **esą,** arba nustato, kas
darytina ateityje panašiomis aplinkybėmis, arba išryškina mūsų
nuojautas, kai jie neaiškūs ar prieštaringi.* [*Naujasis židinys*
1995/1–12]
'Scientific theory extends our knowledge, suggests something,
which otherwise we wouldn't understand and wouldn't know.
Moral theory seems to perform a similar role. Our initial
moral feelings of assuming the moral properties of human
conduct **as is said**, correspond to perception. A theory of
this premonition or initial assessments summarizes such cor-
respondences, gives them a rational basis and, **allegedly**,
determines what is to be done in the future under similar
circumstances, or to highlight our suspicion when they are
unclear or contradictory.'

(26) [...] *Sugalvota bent dvidešimt utilitarizmo variantų, stengiantis
taikyti principus taip, kad jie paaiškintų anomalius atvejus. Ne-
paisant nesėkmių, ilgai buvo viliamasi, kad netrukus bus pašalintos
likusios kliūtys;*
esą,   *reikia   tik   kai ką*
HS_PTC be_necessary.PRS.3 only something.ACC
papildyti ir   patikslinti. [*Naujasis židinys* 1995/1–12]
add.INF and specify.INF
'At least 20 variations of utilitarianism have been created,
trying to apply principles that could explain anomalous cases.
Despite failures, there has been hope that all the remaining
barriers would soon be removed. **Apparently**, something
just needs to be added or specified.'

As concerns types of reportive subfunctions, *esą* does not seem to differ
from *esą* used as a complementizer; it can be encountered either with

literal quotes (see the following example) or with reformulations of previously uttered speech (see examples above)[10]:

(27) *Naugardo kunigaikštis   Aleksandras Nevskis* [...] *XIII a.*
PN:GEN   duke:NOM.SG.M PN:NOM.M   13th c.
viduryje   esą   „per   keletą   dienų
middle.LOC HS_PTC through a_couple.ACC day.GEN.PL
septynis   kartus   nugalėjo   lietuvius,
seven.ACC time.ACC.PL defeat.PAST.3 Lithuanian.ACC.PL.M
o jo kariai, koneveikdami belaisvius, raišiojo juos prie arklių
uodegų“. [*Lituanistika* 1995/3]
'In the middle of the 13th century, the Duke of Novgorod, Alexander Nevsky, **seems to** have defeated the Lithuanians in several days seven times and his soldiers abused prisoners and tied them to horses' tails.'

As a particle, *esą* can be easily discerned if it goes together with a conjunction (28) or a relative pronoun (29, see also ex. 21)[11] since the latter ones then fulfill the conjunctive function:

(28) *Kaip savo burvaltes seniau vadino Kuršių nerijos žvejai — ko-pininkai — ligšiol nežinoma.*
Viename   XIX a.   vokiečių   leidinyje
one.LOC.M 19th century German.GEN publication.LOC.M
kadaise man   pavyko   rasti   užuominą,
once   me.DAT succeed.PAST.3 find.INF note.ACC.SG.F
JOG   esą   Kuršmarių   žvejai
COMP HS_PTC Curonian.GEN.PL fisherman.NOM.PL.M
jas   vadinę   „kurėnų
them.ACC.PL.F name:PTCP:NOM.PL.M PN:GEN.PL
valtimis“.   Tačiau niekur kitur tokio pavadinimo rasti neteko.
boat.INS.PL.F
[*Mokslas ir gyvenimas* 1995/10]

---

[10] In this respect ex. (21) is particularly interesting: here *esą* is placed in the midst of a quote although it certainly was not part of the cited text but rather must be ascribed to the actual (= quoting) speaker. In fact, this point is unclear and requires more scrutinized study.

[11] Usually *esą* appears immediately after these units.

'How Curonian Spit fishermen — Kopininkai — named their sailboats is unknown until now. Once, in one German publication of the 19th century, I managed to find a suggestion THAT Curonian Spit fishermen **allegedly** used to call them 'Kurėnai boats'. However, such a name hasn't been found anywhere else.'

(29) *Ten ponia Paliokienė sugebėjo gražiai atkirsdama pakalbėti apie lietuvių moters santykį su Katalikų bažnyčia.*

Ten	*buvo*	*cituojama*	*moteris,*
there	be.PAST.3	cite:PTCP:NOM.SG.F	woman.NOM.SG

KURIĄ	***esą***	*pavergė*	*tikėjimas,*
RP:ACC.SG.F	HS_PTC	enslave.PAST.3	faith.NOM.SG.M

moko nesipriešinti vyrui, kad ir koks jis blogas būtų! [*Lietuvos aidas* 1995/7]

'There, Mrs Paliokienė managed to retort deftly regarding the Lithuanian woman's relation to the Catholic Church. There was a quotation from the woman WHO **seemed to be** enslaved by faith, teaching not to oppose one's husband no matter how bad he is!'

1.1.3. Interim summary

From the rough analysis supplied so far above we see that, regardless of its syntactic behavior (and regardless of whether it represents the former neuter or the NOM.PL.M), *esą* almost always carries a reportive function. The only exclusion is the use of the NOM.PL.M-form in nominal predicates of propositional arguments of verbs other than illocutive ones (see ex. 5–7). We have not yet touched upon cases in which the syntactic status of *esą* raises problems, at least from an analytic perspective. In fact, corpus data abound in cases in which the syntactic status of *esą* is anything but clear, because its behavior is far less straightforward as the analysis up to this point might have suggested. The problems which we encounter can be sensed already if we take a closer look at ex. (4): it could be interpreted as the remnant of the neuter target gender (being the default whenever agreement targets are lacking) of a participial (and thus non-finite) copula, but it could likewise be analyzed as a particle with some sort of zero copula (see

2.1). This reasoning and the problems raised by the janus-faced behavior of *esą* in actual discourse are the topic of the subsequent section.

2. Troublesome cases

There are two reasons why decisions regarding the syntactic function of *esą* are often difficult to make. One reason resides in the analysis which a linguist can conduct on the basis of given corpus data; the immediate syntactic context frequently does not suffice to disambiguate whether *esą* functions as a sort of 'hanging' complementizer, as a particle or as a copula. The other reason lies in the fact that *esą* indeed happens to fulfil a twofold function; if *esą* occurs in the original function in which it has been at once a connective of a propositional argument and part of this argument's nucleus (see 1.1). Regardless of the reason why *esą* proves to be ambiguous, the broader discourse context often helps, if not to make an ultimate decision, at least in order to motivate one or other of the functions.

In the analyzed corpus sample, ambiguity of *esą* most frequently occurs when we have to decide whether it is a particle or a copula, less prominently, but still occurring quite often, ambiguity concerns its status as either particle or complementizer. We will now look at these cases more closely[12].

2.1. Particle or copula?

This question arises because of the doubtful status of a zero copula in Lithuanian sentences with nominal predicates. Consider ex. (4) or the following one:

(30) […] *Jis   sakė,   jog   nežada*
        he.NOM   say.PAST.3   COMP   NEG:promise.PRS.3
    pats   ATSISTATYDINTI, nes   esą   dar
    self.NOM.SG.M resign:RM.INF   because HS_? yet
    nebaigti   jo   pradėti
    NEG:finish:PTCP:NOM.PL.M his.GEN begin:PTCP:NOM.PL.M

---

[12] In Valskys (2002, 33) *esą* as a function word has rather indiscriminately been regarded as a "modal particle" („modalinė dalelytė") despite some doubtful cases as well as cases in which *esą* evidently functions as complementizer or copula.

> *darbai.*
> work.NOM.PL.M
> *Tiek jau pridirbta, o dar nebaigti...* [*Šluota* 1995/10]
> 'He said that he didn't promise to RESIGN because (**he claimed**) his works still remained unfinished. So much has already been done but not finished yet …'

Does *esq* function here as a copula or particle? If we treat is as a copula, we must also assume that *esq* substitutes either for the inflected copula of the indicative (*yra*) or for an empty element which, in analogy to Russian, could be considered as a zero copula (Ø). In other words: we would be forced to assume a paradigmatic relation between *esq, yra* and Ø. The assumption of an empty element (to represent sort of 'dropped' *yra*) also becomes necessary if, in examples like (4, 30), we treat *esq* as a particle. How shall we decide?

In general, to postulate a zero element in morphology or syntax, one needs to show that a lack of the element 'suspected' to be zero inevitably leads to an interpretation that would not apply if that element occurred in the given place. In order for such an element to be assumed, it must enter into tight complementary distribution[13] with other elements which jointly constitute a paradigm; complementary distribution, in turn, presupposes obligatoriness of choice from among the members of that paradigm. Otherwise 'lack' of a phonologically shaped element (assumed to be 'zero'), in particular a 'gap' in some sort of syntactic structure, does not force the language user to interpret this gap as a member of that paradigm.[14]

An indisputable zero copula can be assumed for the present tense in Russian. The present tense form *est'* must be 'omitted' unless in existential-representative constructions (32) or for the needs of emphatic focus (33)[15]. This is why it belongs to the paradigm of nominal predicates substituting each other depending on tense and mood (compare 31a–b):

---

[13] Strict structuralists might add that this distribution must be equipollent, not privative.

[14] These requirements seem to have been overlooked by Valskys (2002). For a comprehensive discussion and analysis of phenomena claimed to represent morphological or syntactic zeroes the reader may be referred to Weiss (1993).

[15] Both examples are taken from the Russian National Corpus: http://www.ruscorpora.ru/.

          byl   učitelem.

(31a) *Vasja* Ø   *učitel'.*   (31b)   **Vasja est' učitel' / učitelem.*
            budet učitelem. to mean 'Vasja is a teacher.'
            byl by učitelem.
      'Vasja was / is / will be / would be a teacher.'

(32) *Kniga „Vlastelin kolec" stala kul'tovoj / i **est'** ljudi / kotorye sozdajut miry / opisannye tam.*
'The book *The Lord of the rings* has achieved cult status / and **there are** people / who create worlds / that are described there.'
(A. Filatov. Radioprogramma „Polnolunie", *Radio-Pik*, Irkutsk 2000–2004)

(33) [*Opuskaet lico v ruki, Xudožnik*] *Ax, vot kak! Značit, ona ėto i **est'**… každuju minutu...*
Devuška. Da net, net! Ja navsegda, navsegda!
'[The artist, burying his face in his hands:] Oh, well, look! You see, she **is** it… every minute… [The girl:] Oh no, no! I'm here forever, forever!'
(*Ordinamenti* (2004). *Ėkran i scena*, 2004.05.06)

In Lithuanian, the situation differs because Lithuanian is rather 'sloppy' in using the present tense form *yra* 's/he is, they are'[16] (as well as *esu* 'I am', *esi* 'you.SG are', etc.). One can use it or not so that either variant in (34–38) is grammatically acceptable (without any noticeable meaning alternation)[17]:

(34) *Jonas   yra   / Ø   mokytojas.*
PN:NOM   COP.PRS.3   teacher.NOM.SG.M
'Jonas is a teacher.'

(35) *Jonas   yra   / Ø   uolus.*
PN:NOM   COP.PRS.3   diligent.NOM.SG.M
'Jonas is diligent.'

---

[16] Baltic finite verbs never distinguish number in the 3rd person.

[17] Actually, the factors that are responsible for this variation still wait to be fully investigated.

(36) *Jonas   yra   / Ø   išstudijavęs*
PN:NOM   AUX.PRS.3   study:PTCP:NOM.SG.M
visą   lietuvių   gramatiką.
all.ACC.SG.F   Lithuanian   grammar.ACC.SG.F
'Jonas has studied all the grammar of the Lithuanian language.'

(37) *Visa   tai   yra   / Ø   neteisybė.*
all.NEUT   this.NEUT   COP.PRS.3   untruth.NOM.SG.F
'All this is not true.'

(38) *Pranešime   klausimų   yra   / Ø daug,*
report.LOC.SG.M   question.GEN.PL   COP.PRS.3   many
bet išeitis   yra   / Ø   viena.
but exit.NOM.SG.F COP.PRS.3   one.NOM.F
'The report names many problems, but there is one solution.'

Of course, one might object that with negated copulae the situation changes; their 'omission' is grammatically meaningful (cf. Wiemer 1998, 232f.). This, however, does not alter our argument since *nesą*, the negative equivalent of *esą*, does not occur other than as a participle (see ex. 49)[18] and is therefore irrelevant for the present discussion.

If from this background we return to our unit *esą*, we can only point out numerous text tokens in which the grammatical status of this unit remains obscure. In examples like (30) or the following ones we can either regard it as a non-finite copula, which then corresponds to the NOM.M.PL-form of the regular participle showing agreement with the nominal predicate (and altering with the finite copula *yra* or its omission with dubious 'zéroïde' status), or as a particle with the dubious, but quite normal 'gap' of the copula:

(39) *Dar LKP(b) CK XV plenume (1947) Antano Sniečkaus pranešime Venclovai buvo nurodytos klaidos, padarytos įžanginiame straipsnyje Salomėjos Nėries poezijos dvitomiui „Poezija" (1946).*
Jame   esą   pervertinti
him.LOC   HS_?   exaggerate:PTCP:NOM.PL.M

---

[18] For other examples cf. Ambrazas (2006, 146): *Rugių **nesą*** 'There's **no** rye, **they say**' (Slm, Vkš); *Pirktų šuva mėsą, tik pinigų **nėsą*** 'The dog would buy the meat, but there's **no** money, **people say** [or: the dog says]' (Baranauskas).

> „Trečio fronto"   nuopelnai   dėl   Nėries
> third front.GEN.SG.M   merit.NOM.PL.M concerning PN:GEN
> pasukimo   kairėn.   [*Lituanistika* 1995/3]
> switch.GEN.M leftwards
> 'Even in the 15th plenum (1947) of CPL CC in Antanas
> Sniečkus' report, mistakes were pointed out which had been
> made by Venclova in his introductory article to the two-
> volume collection of Salomėja Nėris' *Poetry* (1946). In this
> volume the merits of the 'Third Front' with regard to Nėris'
> turn to the left were **allegedly** exaggerated.'

(40) *Tautinio ir visuotinio pradų santykį Šalkauskis nagrinėjo ir*
istorijos filosofijos plotmėje.
Konkrečios   *kultūros*   *raidai*
concrete.GEN.SG.F culture.GEN.SG.F development.DAT.SG.F
esą *būdingi*   *du*   *etapai:*
HS_? characteristic.NOM.PL.M two.M stage.NOM.PL.M
tautos   *ir*   *nacijos.*   [*Naujasis židinys* 1995/1–12]
people.GEN and nation.GEN
'Šalkauskis studied the relation between folk and global
origins in a historiosophical context. **He claimed** that two
stages of evolution are specific to culture: those of people-
hood and nationhood.'

This difficulty does not vanish if the respective clause does not have
any subject that could control agreement. In cases like (4) and the fol-
lowing ones, *esą* can be understood either as the remnant of the neuter
(as target gender) of the participle, i.e. as a non-finite copula, which
again could be replaced by *yra* or *Ø*, or as a particle:

(41) *Vieniems atrodo, kad būsimiesiems pedagogams nėra būtini tvirti*
dėstomojo dalyko mokslo pagrindai
(svarbu   ***esą*** *suprasti,*   *kas*
important.NEUT HS_? understand.INF what.NOM
parašyta   *vadovėliuose*[,]   *ir*   *tinkamai*
write:PTCP:NEUT textbook.LOC.PL.M and adequately
visa   *tai*   *išdėstyti*   *mokiniams).*
all.NEUT   this.NEUT explain.INF   pupil.DAT.PL.M
[*Mokslas ir gyvenimas* 1995/11]

'For some it seems that strong basic knowledge of the taught subject matter is not necessary for future teachers (it **is claimed** to be important to understand what is written in textbooks and to explain it to students properly).'

(42) [...] *pro   mus   praėjo   du   vokiečių*
       through us.ACC pass.PAST.3 two.M German.GEN.PL
       kariai   ir   pasakė,   kad už   jų
       soldier.NOM.PL.M and say.PAST.3 COMP behind them.GEN
       *jau   slenka   rusai,   kurių   **esą***
       already move.PRS.3 Russian.NOM.PL.M RP:GEN.PL HS_?
       labai   daug. [Z. Zinkevičius, *Prie lituanistikos židinio*, p. 55]
       very   many
       'Two German soldiers passed by and **said** that the Russians were already approaching and that there were lots of them.'

This problem resolves only if *esą* happens to be juxtaposed with a predicative participle that agrees with a nominatival subject in the singular or in the feminine plural. Compare the following instance:

(43) *(...) Antai Londono dienraščio „Spectator" redaktorei Annei Applebaum pokalbio metu Baltų filologijos katedroje, rodos, labai įtikinamai nušviečiau istorinę tiesą, tačiau*
       JI *(...)   vis tiek   į   mano pasakojimus   **esą***
       she.NOM nonetheless in   my   narration.ACC.PL.M HS_PTC
       ŽIŪRĖJUSI   skeptiškai.
       look:PTCP:NOM.SG.F   sceptically
       (Z. Zinkevičius: *Prie lituanistikos židinio*, p. 381)
       'For example, it seems to me that during an interview I gave to the editor of the London newspaper *Spectator*, Anne Applebaum, at the department of Baltic Philology, I disclosed the historical truth very convincingly, but SHE **apparently** LOOKED very sceptically on my narratives.'

Esą does not show agreement with the feminine participle *žiūrėjusi* 'looked, as looking'. We can, therefore, qualify this token of *esą* as a particle and interpret the structure in (43) as one with an omitted copula; it would thus correlate with (43a) or with (43b):

(43a) ... *ji*   *į*   *mano*   *pasakojimus*
        she.NOM   in   my   narration.ACC.PL.M
     ŽIŪRĖJUSI   *skeptiškai.*
     look:PTCP:NOM.SG.F   sceptically
     'She looked sceptically on my narratives.'

(43b) ... *ji*   *į*   *mano*   *pasakojimus*   *YRA*
        she.NOM   in   my   narration.ACC.PL.M   COP.PRS.3
     ŽIŪRĖJUSI   *skeptiškai.*
     look:PTCP:NOM.SG.F   sceptically
     'She looked sceptically on my narratives.'

For the feminine plural:

(43') *Jos*   *į*   *mano*   *pasakojimus*   **esą / yra / Ø**
     they.nom.f   in   my   narration.ACC.PL.M   COP.PRS.3
     žiūrėjusios   *skeptiškai.*
     look:PTCP:NOM.PL.F   sceptically
     'They **apparently** looked sceptically on my narratives.'

Of course, *esą* can also unambiguously be interpreted as a particle if it occurs in the same clause with an explicit copula, as in the following instance:

(44) [...] *Na, o pirmasis rankraščio skaitytojas kritikas Marselis Raichas-Ranickis savaitraštyje „Der Spiegel" paskelbė atvirą laišką „brangiajam Giunteriui Grasui", kuriame dievagojosi, kad vis dar tebesižavi jo talentu,*
     bet **esą**   *YRA*   *priverstas*   *išsakyti*
     but   HS_PTC   COP.PRS.3   force:PTCP:NOM.SG.M   spell_out.INF
     ir   *tai,*   *kas*   *maudžia*   *širdį.*
     also   that.NEUT   what.NOM   ache.PRS.3   heart.ACC.SG.F
     [*Nemunas* 1996/02]
     'Well, the first reader of the manuscript, the critic Marcel Reich-Ranicki, published his open letter to 'dear Günter Grass' in the weekly newspaper *Der Spiegel*, in which he swore black and blue that he still adored his talent but, **as he wrote**, WAS forced to ease his mind.'

However, such examples are very rare; in my sample I have found only the one just adduced.

Furthermore, we might consider whether the status of *esą* as a particle does not become clearer when it occurs together with modal auxiliaries, even if these are uninflected. Compare the following example:

(45) *Daugelyje vietovių Kūčių vakarą valstiečiai lankė sodus tikėdami, kad Kūčių dieną galima padidinti medžių, ypač obelų ir kriaušių, derlingumą.*

Tai	***esą***	*GALIMA*	*padaryti*	*medžius*
this.NEUT	HS_?	be_possible	do.INF	tree.ACC.PL.M

purtant,	*t. y. žadinant, ant šakų kabinant vaisių imitacijas,*
shake.CVB	

kamienus aprišant šiaudų ryšeliais. [*Liaudies kultūra* 1995/5]
'In most areas on Christmas Eve, peasants visited gardens in the belief that on Christmas Eve it is possible to increase the fertility of trees, especially of apple and pear trees. This, **people say**, is possible by shaking trees, i.e. by hanging fruit imitations on branches as a means of waking them, by tying straws to trunks.'

The decision again hinges on the question of whether we would expect an explicit copula in the present tense to co-occur with the uninflected auxiliary. In principle, both options are possible: *tai galima padaryti* vs. *tai yra galima padaryti* 'This can be done'. We have to leave this question here for lack of reliable empirical data on the distribution (and its functional motives) of explicit vs. 'omitted' copulae with uninflected auxiliaries (as well as with predicatives). The same could be said about *esą* occurring with a predicative adjective in the 'neuter' (if no agreement is required); compare

(46) [...] *Štai ir aną sekmadienį*

klebonas	*vėl*	*gyrė*	*vikarą*	*dėl*
priest.NOM	again	praise.PAST.3	vicar.ACC.SG.M	for

jo	*gražių*	*pamokslų,*	*kurių*	*ir*
his.GEN	nice.GEN.PL	sermon.GEN.PL	RP:GEN.PL	also

jam	***esą***	*MALONU*	*klausytis,*
him.DAT	HS_?	pleasant	listen.INF

ruošdamas dirvą būsimam prašymui. [*Dienovidis* 1995/10]

'Here, last Sunday, the parish priest again praised the vicar for his beautiful sermon, which, **as he said**, was a pleasure to listen to. In this way he also prepared ground for the future request.'

Whereas in the context types mentioned last *esą* should better be qualified as a particle, in the data one kind of context exists in which the ambiguous nature of *esą* can be decided on in favor of its status as a copula. This context type is very rare (again, I have only come across one example) and quite peculiar. Compare the following example:

(47) *Asfaltavimo darbų beveik neatliekama. Prasidėjus reformai, kelininkai nepuolė draskyti savo ūkio sistemos, sugebėjo išlaikyti gamybinę bazę, mechanizmus, įrangą ir žmones. Pasikeitimai vyko — kelių tiesimo įmonės tapo privačios, nors kelių priežiūros įmonės liko valstybinės.*
Taip **esą**   *ir*   *Vakarų*   *Europos*   *šalyse.*
so   HS_COP also Western Europe.GEN country.LOC.PL.F
Reforma, bet ne draskymas, kelininkų ūkyje tebevyksta — norima prisitaikyti prie vakarietiškų reikalavimų, veiklos būdų.
[*Mokslas ir technika* 1995/6]
'Paving works are almost omitted. After the reform had started, the road menders didn't start to destroy their economic system, they were able to maintain the manufacturing base, machinery, equipment and people. There were changes — road construction companies became private, although road maintenance companies remained public. This, **apparently**, is the way things are done in Western European countries as well. A reform, but not destruction, is still ongoing in the road construction economy — there is the will to adjust to the western requirements and business methods.'

Here *esą* finds itself inserted between two units (*taip … ir*), of which the first (*taip*) refers back to the immediately preceding text, whereas the other (*ir*) functions as a focus particle. If *esą* were lacking, the result would be the structure

(47a) *Taip*↑ *ir*   *Vakarų*   *Europos*   *šalyse.*
so   also Western Europe.GEN country.LOC.PL.F
'The same things happen in Western European countries.'

The first unit of this structure gets marked as an emphatic (or contrastive) topic, just as in a sentence like

(48) *Berniukas*↑   *mėgsta*   *skaityti, o*   *mergaitė*↑ —
      boy.NOM.SG like.PRS.3 read.INF, and girl.NOM.SG
      piešti.
      paint.INF
      'The boy likes reading, and the girl — painting.'

In another possible intonation, *taip ir* should rather be treated as one lexical unit (compare the equivalent Russian *tak i*, which likewise conditions an emphatic topic). But, importantly, if *esą* remains where it is in the original example (47), it itself becomes the centre of the intonational unit with rising contour, and this kind of contour is atypical (maybe even excluded) for particles characterized by propositional scope. Thus in this peculiar case *esą* should be treated as a copula.

Given this situation in which the syntactic status of *esą* is notoriously ambiguous (or, from the perspective of the addressee, underdetermined), discourse factors sometimes can help favoring an interpretation as either a non-finite copula or a particle. One such factor appears to be parallelism of *esą* with forms of predicative active participles, all the more if the latter are used without a copula to indicate reported speech. Example (50) illustrates exactly this (the predicative active participles are in small capitals):

(49) [...] *o Prancūzijos vokiečių demokratinės krypties laikraštis*
      „Freies Deutschland", pažymėdamas, jog Lietuvos vyriausybė
      tyliai ir kantriai stebėjo nacių terorą, kaip jos šalininkai mušami,
      terorizuojami, žudomi. Jai buvę sunku, nes kol Lietuvoje socia-
      linis ekonominis lygis žemesnis, tol klaipėdiškiai lietuviai LAI-
      KYSIĄ *didele garbe priklausyti vokiečių kultūrai,* LINKSIĄ *į Vo-*
      kietijos pusę.
      Klaipėdos krašto   *valstiečiai*   *ir*
      PN:GEN   territory.GEN peasant.NOM.PL.M and
      žvejai   **esą**   *neturtingi*
      fisherman.NOM.PL.M HS_COP(?).NOM.PL.M poor.NOM.PL.M
      ir   *vokiečiai*   *juos*
      and   German.NOM.PL.M   them.ACC.M

VILIOJĄ   *pažadais.*
seduce:PTCP:NOM.PL.M   promise.INS.PL.M

*Tačiau nereikia manyti, — toliau rašė laikraštis, — kad klaipėdiškiai **esą** perdėm vokiečiai. Daugiau kaip pusė klaipėdiškių etnografiškai NESĄ vokiečiai. Teiginys — kol Lietuvoje socialinis ekonominis lygis žemesnis, tol klaipėdiškiai lietuviai LAIKYSIĄ didele garbe priklausyti vokiečių kultūrai, LINKSIĄ į Vokietijos pusę, — yra aktualus ir šiomis dienomis.* [*Dienovidis* 1996/5]
'[…] the democratically inclined newspaper of Germans living in France *Freies Deutschland* indicated that the Lithuanian government was observing Nazi terror silently and patiently. It merely observed as its followers were beaten, terrorized and killed. It was said that for the government it WAS a hard time, because as long as Lithuania's socio-economic level was lower, Klaipėdan Lithuanians WOULD THINK it a great honor to belong the German culture, they would favor Germany. The peasants and fishermen from Klaipėda's region were **considered** poor and Germans SEEMED TO SEDUCE them with promises. Yet it need not be thought — hereafter the newspaper writes — that all Klaipėda's inhabitants were Germans. More than a half of Klaipėda's population DOES NOT ethnographically SEEM TO BE German. The assertion that, as long as Lithuania's socio-economic level is lower, Klaipėdan Lithuanians WILL FIND it a great honor to belong to German culture and favor Germany — is topical nowadays as well.'

Under this condition the chance that *esą* will be interpreted as anything other than a non-finite copula decreases to a minimum.

2.2. Particle or complementizer?

This question arises in many cases when *esą* occurs clause-initially but is not immediately preceded by a clause with a complement-taking predicate. These predicates may occur somewhere earlier in the respective stretch of discourse, in which there are also often other signs of reported speech. Compare the following examples:

(50) *(...) Šiame rašinyje* [„Žemaiczių ir Lietuvos Apžvalgoje"
1884 m. Nr. 24] *naudojamasi Pietario „Rinktinių raštų" (V.,
1973) publikacija, kurioje niekas, be kelių rašybos pataisymų,
nekeista.*

Pietaris   laiške   Jakštui-Dambrauskui
PN:NOM   letter.LOC.SG.M   PN:DAT
TVIRTINO,   JOG   šis   kūrinys —
assert.PAST.3   COMP   this.NOM.SG.M   work.NOM.SG.M
joks   jo   nuopelnas,   esą   jis
no.NOM.SG.M   his.GEN   merit.NOM.SG.M   HS_?   he.NOM
tik   viską   užrašė   iš   brolio,
only   all.ACC   write_down.PAST.3   from   brother.GEN
didelio pasakoriaus. [*Lituanistika* 1995/3]
'In this essay [*Žemaiczių ir Lietuvos Apžvalga* 1884 No. 24],
the publication of Pietaris's *Selected letters* (V., 1973) is used.
Nothing is changed here, except for a few spelling corrections.
Pietaris MAINTAINED, in his letter to Jakštas-Dambrauskas,
THAT this work couldn't be attributed to him at all, he **supposedly** just wrote everything down from his brother — a
great storyteller.'

(51) *Po   pietų   pabėgėliai   PASAKOJO,   KAD*
after   noon.GEN   refugee.NOM.PL.M   tell.PAST.3   COMP
Kaune   jau   lietuviška   valdžia,
PN:LOC   already   Lithuanian.NOM.SG.F   authority.NOM.SG.F
esą   tai   buvę   paskelbta
HS_?   this.NEUT   be:PTCP:NEUT   announce:PTCP:NEUT
per   radiją.
through   radio.ACC
(Z. Zinkevičius, *Prie lituanistikos židinio*, p. 44)
'In the afternoon, the refugees told that Kaunas has already
gained Lithuanian authority, it had **apparently** been announced on the radio.'

In both cases *esą* introduces a clause that could be read as a conjunct
co-subordinated with the immediately preceding clause, which, in
turn, contains an indisputable complementizer (*kad, jog*) following
a speech act verb. The part which begins with *esą* can thus easily be
understood as just adding another sentential complement to this verb.

The situation changes slightly if the clause that begins with *esą* is not preceded by any complement clause subordinated to an illocutive verb but is separated from it by a dot marking a sentence border:

(52) [...] *Taigi, užimdama Lietuvą, Sovietų Sąjunga pažeidė susita-*
    rimą, ir Vokietija to neatleis.
    Panašiai   jis [= Voldemaras] KALBĖJO   *ir*
    similarly he.NOM   speak.PAST.3   also
    kalėjimo   kameroje   1941 m rugpjūčio   mėnesį.
    prison.GEN cell.LOC.SG.F 1941   August.GEN   month.ACC
    Esą   Vokietija   negalėjusi   leisti,
    HS_? Germany.NOM.F NEG:can:PTCP:NOM.SG.F allow.INF
    kad   jos pašonėje būtų komunistinė Lietuva, nes ekonomiškai
    COMP
    Lietuva priklausė nuo Vokietijos. [*Lituanistika* 1995/ 3]
    '[…] So occupying Lithuania, the Soviet Union violated the agreement and Germany would not forgive that. In a similar manner, he [= Voldemaras] WAS TALKING in his prison cell in August 1941. Germany could not **apparently** acknowledge being close to communist Lithuania because Lithuania was economically dependent on Germany.'

Of course, dots and other means of interpunction cannot be regarded as reliable indicators of syntactic structure; often they rather serve to mark intonational units. More important is the fact that, in (52), *kalbėti* 'to speak' does not necessarily require a propositional argument (as, for instance, *tvirtinti* 'to assert, claim' and *pasakyti* 'to say' in 50–51 do). Both factors taken together produce an effect whereby the clause introduced by *esą* can be read as sort of an afterthought, i.e. as a syntactic unit whose syntactic dependency on the preceding context is loose. That, despite of this, *esą* refers back to speech produced by the referent of the first argument of *kalbėti* (namely, to *Voldemaras*), can only be explained as a joined effect of the lexical meaning of *esą* as a reportive unit and a pragmatic default whereby the 'anchor' for the original author of speech is searched for in the immediately preceding context[19].

---

[19] This kind of "default retrieval" resembles mechanisms of (transphrastic) anaphora. It is indeed natural to assume that this discourse pragmatic default of *esą* is just a specific subcase of very general cooperative principles à la Grice according to which interlocutors

A very similar remark holds for clause-initial *esą* modifying a speech-related noun, which, thus, can be understood as a relativizer for that narrowly defined group of nouns (see 1.1.1 on ex. 17–18):

(53) *(...) Enkavedistams Voldemaro sugrįžimas į Lietuvą taip pat buvo labai mįslingas. Nežinia, kaip Voldemaras jiems aiškinosi pirmųjų tardymų metu, tačiau*

Ordžonikidzėje	*rašytuose*		*parodymuose*
PN:LOC	write:PTCP:LOC.PL.M		testimony.LOC.PL.M

išklojo	*tiesiog*	*fantastišką*
lay_out.PAST.3	utterly	unbelievable.ACC.SG.F

VERSIJĄ.	***Esą***	*jis*	*1940 m.*	*sausio*
version.ACC.SG.F	HS_?	he.NOM	1940	January.GEN

mėnesį	*išvykęs*		*užsienin*	*vien*	*dėl*
month.ACC	leave:PTCP:NOM.SG.M		abroad	only	for

to,	*kad*
this.GEN	COMP

galėtų pakreipti Lietuvos politiką Sovietų Sąjungai palankia linkme, nes matęs, jog Smetona nesilaiko su SSSR sudarytos savitarpio pagalbos sutarties. [*Lituanistika* 1995/3]

'(…) Voldemaras' return to Lithuania was also mysterious to the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs (NKVD). It's unknown how Voldemaras explained his departure during the first inquiries, but in the testimonies written in Ordžonikidze he stated an unbelievable VERSION. He **supposedly** left the country on January 1940 solely so that he could turn Lithuanian politics in a direction advantageous to the Soviet Union because he had allegedly noticed that Smetona had not obeyed the mutual assistance treaty with USSR.'

Finally, clause-initial *esą* sometimes occurs in a context which does not by any explicit means prepare the reader (addressee) for reported speech. Compare:

(54) [...] *Pirmykštės bendruomenės turėjo vienos ar net kelių pakopų*

---

try to make discourse as coherent as possible. Here is not the place to enter into this topic more systematically.

brandos šventes, joms ruošdavosi, kartais net ilgai, ir visos bran-
dos šventės vienaip ar kitaip siedavosi su skausmu, įtampa.
Dabar mes   stengiamės   vaikus   atriboti
now   we.NOM try.PRS.1PL   children.ACC mark_off.INF
ir   nuo   skausmo,   ir   nuo   įtampos: esą
both from pain.GEN.M and from tension.GEN.F HS_?
egzaminai   traumuoja
exam.NOM.PL.M   traumatize.PRS.3,
rykštė   neleistina auklėjimo priemonė ir t.t., pamokų galima
neatsakinėti, namie parašyti rašinį ir pan. [*Mokslas ir gyvenimas*
1995/6]
'Primitive communities had one or several stages of ma-
turity festivities, they used to prepare for them sometimes
even for a long time, and all maturity festivities used to be
somehow related with pain and stress. Now we are trying
to keep pain and stress away from children: **allegedly** ex-
aminations traumatize, the rod is an inadmissible means of
education and so on. It is not necessary to answer to lessons,
do homework, etc.'

In such a case, the addressee is required to invest more cognitive ef-
fort in order to make the text that begins with *esą* coherent with the
preceding stretch of discourse. An analogous remark applies to the
next token of clause-initial *esą*:

(55) *(...) Beje, egzistuoja ir kitas Krėvės-Mickevičiaus atsiminimų va-*
riantas, kuriame jis teigia, jog jam net keletą kartų skambinęs
sovietų pasiuntinys Nikolajus Pozdniakovas ir primygtinai prašė
įspėti   Voldemarą, kad   jis   negrįžtų   į
warn.INF PN:ACC   COMP he.NOM NEG.return.SBJV.3 in
Lietuvą.   Esą   Virbalio stotyje   Voldemarui
Lithuania.ACC HS_? PN:GEN station.LOC.SG.F PN:DAT
buvo   siūloma   grįžti   atgal, tačiau
be.PAST.3 propose:PTCP:NEUT return.INF back but
*jis   nepaklausė.   [*Lituanistika* 1995/3]
he.NOM   NEG.listen.PAST.3
'In addition, there is another version of Krėvė-Mickevičius'
memoirs where he proclaims that USSR messenger Nikolai

> Pozdniakov even called him several times and obstinately asked to warn Voldemaras not to return to Lithuania. In the station of Virbalis, itwas **allegedly** suggested to Voldemaras that he return, but he disagreed.'

The clause which starts with *esq* does by no means introduce a sentential complement to *įspėti* 'to warn'[20]; it is therefore no co-subordinate conjunct with the preceding *kad*-complement clause. The context does not give any cues as to where *esq* could be 'attached' syntactically. Such conditions, which detach *esq* from its syntactic environment, compel us to classify it as a particle.

2.3. Additional remarks concerning meaning

Syntactic detachment seems to be accompanied by a tendency to obscure the referential relationship with potential referents in the preceding discourse: as soon as *esq* has to be interpreted as a particle, it becomes difficult or even impossible to point out a referent mentioned in the context, or at least deducible from it, which can (or has to be) identified as the author of the speech act by which the proposition in the scope of *esq* was uttered. Compare (55) once more: *esq* only signals that there has been (or can be imagined to have been) a previous utterance containing the proposition in *esq*'s scope; based on general discourse principles (see f. 19), the author of this utterance will first be 'looked for' in the most immediate context. But it is questionable whether it was Pozdniakovas mentioned in the preceding sentence who expressed the proposal *Voldemarui buvo siūloma grįžti atgal* 'it was suggested to Voldemaras that he return', and possibly this is even irrelevant for the given moment of narration since the sense of the given fragment is to point out that Voldemaras got a warning, not from whom it was issued or conveyed. In any case, *esq* remains vague (not ambiguous!) as to who the original author of that proposal was, and, moreover, whether s/he coincided with the person who uttered that proposal to Voldemaras.

---

[20] Among other things, *įspėti* implies directive illocutionary force, while *esq* is compatible only with propositions assumed to be factive or submittable to truth-conditional tests (a property I cannot dwell on here in any detail).

As a particle *esq* generally displays a clear tendency to 'anonymize' the author of the original utterance, and this tendency parallels its isolation both from the participial paradigm and from constituency structure. We may, however, assume that *esq* as such did not 'lose' its referential potential, rather it never possessed any: in all other syntactic contexts (as complementizer and non-finite copula, in logophoric constructions) identifiability of the original author turns out to be possible not because of some specific referential potential of *esq* but as a result from the environment within which *esq* enters into tight syntactic relations. Put differently: if *esq* is not used as a particle (or as the copula, which is anyway often doubtful), it indicates syntactic embedding under a speech-related verb or noun. When these relations get lost, *esq* automatically loses 'referential support' which otherwise would have been provided by the syntactic context.

Inherent referential vagueness of *esq* in ANY kind of usage is one side of the coin. The complementary side of the coin is that *esq* does not preclude identifiability of a specific author of the original utterance (viz. the proposition carried by it) even as a particle. Consider, for instance, examples like (21, 22, 27, 44) in which *esq* functions as a particle, or the syntactically arguable example (46). In these cases *esq* occurs with quoted speech or, as in (44), the original author is mentioned in the preceding context (namely, *Marcel Reich-Ranicki*). In fact, one may object that in most of the other examples the author of the quote is not named, (at least not in the nearest context) so that s/he remains anonymous throughout. But the fact that *esq* is also used for direct quotes and can occur as a particle if the original author is named shows that the particle *esq* remains compatible with identifiable original authors of propositions to which it refers.

Now, after having clarified that vagueness with respect to the original author of the speech act referred to remains a stable property of *esq* regardless of its syntactic (grammatical) status, let us consider the ontological nature of the speech EVENTS THEMSELVES THAT *esq* refers to. From the examples adduced in 1.1, we already inferred that for *esq* as a complementizer no restriction applies for either the form of the complement-taking predicate or the exactness (literal character) of the speech act(s) specified. This holds for other usage types as well. All examples known to me demonstrate that *esq* refers to the PROPOSITIONAL content of speech acts; it does not highlight the manner of

speaking, and, in this respect, differs from real quotative markers (as Eng. *like* or *he goes*)[21]. However, it seems possible to use *esą* with reference to semiotic substitutes of speech, e.g. gestures. I have not found an authentic example in my corpus sample, but, according to informants, variation of other authentic instances allow to conclude that *esą* is able to refer to such substitutes, which bring it close to quotative markers. Compare the following example in which original *atseit* has been replaced by *esą*[22]:

(56) *Pats redaktorius pasakė, kad vairuodamas ranka žmonėms duoda ženklą – **esą** gali eiti. Tokių mandagių vairuotojų Lietuvos keliuose galima sutikti labai retai.* (*Lietuvos Aidas* 1995–7; modified)

'The editor himself said that when driving his car he gives a sign by hand to the people — {*esą*} you can go. Only rarely can one meet such polite drivers on Lithuania's roads.'

Here, once more, the syntactic status of *esą* is debatable: is *esą* to be considered as a particle or rather as a relativizer adding an attribute (*gali eiti*) to the head noun *ženklas* 'sign', or even as a conjunction connecting this verb group to the predicate *duoti ženklą*? 'to give a sign' (Compare the discussion on *esą* being an adnominal conjunctive or a complementizer in 1.2.1.)

2.4. Summary of analysis

Although certainly the frequency and usage types of units like *esą* underlie some considerable fluctuation depending on text genres and some more parameters of discourse pragmatics, nonetheless some approximate proportions of *esą* used in different syntactic environments show up on the basis of a random sample of texts from Lithuanian journals printed mainly in the 1990s. The results of the analysis provided in 1.1-1.2, which was based on 108 random tokens from the Kaunas corpus, are summarized in the following table.

---

[21] Cf., inter alia, Barbieri (2005).

[22] For the original example cf. Wiemer (2007a, 184).

Table 1: Syntactic distribution of esą *(sample from journals)*

(a)	participle in non-predicative function:	0
(b)	participle as copula or existential verb:	4
(c)	participle as part of a complex predicate	
	with a semi-copula (*pasirodyti* 'to turn out' etc.):	17
	• from these in logophoric constructions	
	(with illocutive verbs)	4
(d)	as conjunction:	24
	• among these (i) adnominal	16
	(ii) with passive participle	1
(e)	as particle:	30
(f)	syntactically unclear cases	33
	SUM	**108**

Although the number of analyzed corpus hits is not high, we have been able to figure out certain tendencies at least in preliminary terms.

3. Heterosemy and lexical vs. grammatical status of *esą*

The syntactically variable behavior of *esą* raises the question of its lexicographic treatment. This issue is discussed by Wiemer (forthcoming2). In this contribution I am now going to add short considerations concerning the general status of *esą* in the grammar and lexicon of contemporary Lithuanian.

In fact, the distribution of *esą* entitles us to consider it as representative of what has been called 'heterosemy'. This term was coined by Lichtenberk (1991, 476) who applied it to cases "where two or more meanings or functions that are historically related, in the sense of deriving from the same ultimate source, are borne by reflexes of the common source element that belong in different morphosyntactic categories". Heterosemy, i.e. changes in morphosyntactic status is not (at least not necessarily) accompanied by a change in meaning. As has been pointed out beforehand, *esą* takes part in conveying reportive

meaning regardless of how it functions syntactically. The question, however, is in which morphosyntactic status the reportive meaning is really inherent (detachable) to *esq*, and in which status *esq* is just compatible with hearsay, while hearsay is indicated by other elements of the sentential or immediate context.

To answer this question we could try to establish a clear demarcation between *esq* being some kind or other of uninflected function word (complementizer, particle) which has become isolated from its former paradigm, and *esq* as a regular participle integrated into that paradigm (see Introduction). We might further assume that this demarcation tightly correlates with *esq* not carrying reportive meaning by itself (→ regular participle) vs. *esq* having, as it were, incorporated that evidential function as a stable part of its lexical meaning (→ uninflected function word). This correlation works well (and the demarcation line proves correct) with the particle (and the somewhat 'dubious' copula) *esq*, which must have incorporated this meaning; otherwise we could not explain why, in a context containing the particle *esq* but no explicit sign of hearsay (or reported speech), we infer that the actual speaker bases the propositional content of what s/he is saying on hearsay (compare ex. 23, 41, 43, 45, 47, 54). Incidentally in (55), *esq* even allows us to conclude that the proposition it modifies was uttered by another speaker than the one referred to in the immediately preceding sentence (see the remarks in 2.3). Likewise, the assumed correlation fits well, as it were from the opposite end, with all cases in which *esq* is the regular participle. In these cases, it is always the context which either clearly states or allows to infer that the speaker is evoking another person's claims: either *esq* is sort of pivot between two logophorically linked cores (see ex. 8–9) or in the sentence there is at least one speech act-related verb or noun — as a rule, with specification of who was the original author (see ex. 2) — or *esq* as a predicative participle belongs to a broader context at the beginning of which it was made clear that the author is reporting other people's utterances. In such stretches of discourse *esq* normally occurs in sequences of predicative participles (see ex. 49).

Unfortunately, the assumed correlation between participle vs. function word, on the one hand, and contextually triggered vs. semantically incorporated reportive meaning is not perfect for at least two reasons.

First, *esq* as a complementizer (or even as a relativizer) is by definition determined as a syntactic subordinator, and it can fulfil this function only if it is adjoined to a verb or noun related to speech. Thus in this syntactic function there is no way of proving that it is ultimately *esq* which is the only means carrying a hearsay function. Second, in practice it turns out to be very difficult to reliably determine what it means for a discourse context not to provide CLEAR ENOUGH cues pointing to hearsay or reported speech. In the preceding paragraph, I made lack of such cues an analytic precondition for the claim that *esq* as a particle must have an inherent reportive meaning on its own. However, a perusal of the corpus examples adduced in the previous sections revealed contexts which, before *esq* appears, covertly allow the recipient to infer that the speaker is verbalizing (or easily could verbalize) another person's (sometimes also his/her own) previously uttered opinion. In such contexts both *esq* as regular participle and *esq* as particle (or copula) can be encountered; compare, for instance, ex. (3) vs. (25–26). Ex. (3) contains a report on some of the speaker's own troubles; the relation even begins with another reportive marker (*atseit*). The whole relation is laid out in the indicative, and only after a considerable stretch of discourse does the speaker use *esq* as a participial copula inflected for NOM.PL.M (with an elliptic subject, *jie*, i.e. *šeimininkai* 'the hosts'). Despite this very implicit relation to the speaker's own previous utterance, participial *esq* unambiguously serves as a hearsay indicator. Now, in (25-26), where *esq* is used as a particle, the author only mentions some theories (*dorovės teorijos*) and it is up to the recipient to infer that *esq* most likely modifies propositions uttered by the exponents of these theories. Analogically in (26): an emotive state verb in a grammatical form that conceals the subject of that state (*buvo viliamasi* 'there has been hope') can only be identified by some inferences with those people who uttered something like *reikia tik kai ką papildyti ir patikslinti* 'something just needs to be added or specified', i.e. a proposition in the scope of *esq*. These two instances in which *esq* has very different morphosyntactic status (inflected participle vs. particle) show that, regardless of its status, *esq* serves as a trigger for very vague (if any) preparatory hints at hearsay (or reported speech).

In general, a perusal of all examples given above made me sceptical as to whether definitively 'water-tight' properties of (narrative) discourse can be formulated which allow those elements in a text to be pinpointed

with which hearsay markers like *esq* can operate in order to mark a switch to previously uttered speech. Together with this, an as yet open task remains: to formulate operative criteria able to draw a clear-cut distinction between explicit and implicit (or absence of) indicators of previously uttered speech (propositions) and, correspondingly, to determine whether a unit like *esq* conveys reportive meaning by itself, without contextual support, or only by virtue of some contextual cues. Here we are facing a task that deserves thorough discourse-analytic study. It cannot be pursued here where the focus is on the syntactic behavior and status of *esq* in terms of grammar and the lexicon.

Returning now to that perspective, I want to stress that as a complementizer and particle *esq* becomes a new LEXICAL unit (or even two such units; see Wiemer, forthcoming2). The changes that have led to the exploitation of *esq* as a complementizer and a particle do not represent grammaticalization but lexicalization, at least if we abide by Lehmann (2002) and Himmelmann (2004). According to Lehmann (2002, 1), "[a] sign is lexicalized if it is withdrawn from analytic access and inventorized. On the other hand, for a sign to be grammaticalized means for it to acquire functions in the analytic formation of more comprehensive signs." *Esq* became a function word by losing its relationship with the paradigm of the present active participle of *būti* 'to be', in other words: it is the result of petrification, or fossilization[23], so that a new unit entered the lexical stock of Lithuanian. But where are the 'more comprehensive signs' in the formation of which *esq* participates?

First, function words are part of a language's grammar in the (rather trivial) sense that they fulfil some function on a more abstract level, e.g. because their meaning consists in clarifying syntactic relations and/or information structure (compare, e.g., focus particles or markers of marked topics), or in highlighting some kind or other of meaning relation between clauses, sentences or larger portions of discourse (without a necessary impact on their propositional content). Evidential particles and complementizers belong to the last mentioned species. Gradual change of meaning of particular units from less to

---

[23] For fossilization to occur it is irrelevant whether the former paradigm continues to exist or not, because the syntactic distribution of this petrified form differs from the distribution of the regular participles (see sections 1-2).

more abstract meanings (functions) is by no means an exclusive criterion of grammaticalization, as it occurs in lexical change as well; nor is subjectification such a criterion[24]. But even if we accepted an increase of abstractness of meaning as an exclusive criterion of grammaticalization, what should we claim has become more abstract with *esq*? Is the meaning of the evidential particle *esq* more abstract than its (certainly diachronically primary) use as an inflected participle in logophoric constructions (see ex. 8–9)? Is *esq* as a particle or a complementizer more abstract than the verb *būti* 'to be', which this form belongs to paradigmatically? Obviously, for *esq* there is no such cline toward increasingly abstract meaning. This property has been used as an argument (as it seems, the single argument) by those who want to justify why units that have split off from their former paradigms — and possibly undergone fusion with other morphemes (as happened, e.g., with *jakoby*, *budto* or SAYC-units; see 4.2.4 and 4.3) — and begin to be used as uninflected function words (without showing any concomitant changes) should be considered as cases of grammaticalization.

Second, let me reiterate: where are the 'more comprehensive signs' that *esq* participates in the formation of? As an evidential complementizer *esq* has scope over a clause, as an evidential particle it has scope over any even larger unit able to house a proposition. Thus the only more comprehensive signs *esq* could enter into are discourse stretches or, at best, clauses. But do clauses and discourse stretches conveniently unite into paradigms? Certainly not. This is the difference between, for instance, an inflectional ending or a slot in a serial verb construction, on the one hand, and markers with very wide scope and without any tight syntactic or morphologic relation to any other word form or within constituency structure on the other.

One of the prime examples used by Lehmann (2002) to support his point of view are Spanish complex prepositions (like *desde* 'since' < *des de*, *bajo* 'below' < *baxo de*) and conjunctions (like *en la medida en que* 'to the extent that', *después de que* 'after'). The structural scope of

---

[24] This has been put into words most clearly by that person with whom the term 'subjectification' is now probably associated most intimately; cf. Traugott/Dasher (2002, 89f.): "Subjectification as a factor in change came to be of particular interest in the context of discussion of grammaticalization. However, it is typical of semantic change in general and is not limited to grammaticalization."

these units is equal to or lower than the structural scope of evidential complementizers and particles, and yet by no means do they testify to grammaticalization: "Those numerous complex prepositions and conjunctions which constantly come and go do not indicate incomplete grammaticalization processes, but are simply products of lexical change" (Lehmann 2002, 16). Lehmann's point is consistent with what Himmelmann (2004) calls 'host class formation': the grammaticalization of a linguistic unit crucially depends on its ability to enter into a regular and general structural relationship with open class items (verbs, nouns, etc.). Clauses and utterances can, in a sense, be conceived of as open class items, but we can hardly call them a host class unless we are ready to reckon with the absurd consequence that, in that case, any word has a host class.

These remarks basically hold for all units treated in section 4, too. For this reason I regard all of them as instances of lexicalization.

4. Comparison against a broader areal background

Let us now round up our examination of Lith. *esq* by giving a brief survey in order to check whether there are no comparable units against a broader European background. Comparability concerns any one of the four following aspects belonging to the profile of *esq*:

(i)   etymological origin ('be'-verb),

(ii) grammatical origin (present active participle),

(iii) syntactic usage types of lexicalized (paradigmatically isolated and fossilized) units and, thus, degree of heterosemy,

(iv) range of evidential functions (only reportive or inferential as well ?).

4.1. Units deriving from a 'be'-verb vs. units of other etymological origin

We should begin with units of an identical or similar etymological origin. In this respect we find the closest correspondence in Latvian, the extant Baltic 'sister' of Lithuanian. Latvian has a cognate of Lith. *esq* both in terms of the source verb ('to be') and the grammatical form (participle, originally neuter; see 1), namely: *esot*. See, for instance

(57) *Viņš* **esot** *dzīvojis.* Latvian
he.NOM be.PTCP_INDECL live:PTCP:NOM.SG.M
'He lived, **people say.***'*

Compare this with the same meaning in Lith. *Jis* **esą** *gyvenęs.* The grammatical status of Latv. *esot,* however, differs sharply. First, it has remained an uninflected, but morphologically transparent, participle by form, which, however, has acquired functions of finite verb forms (see below, especially f. 25). Second, it does not function as a particle or complementizer and, to this extent, does not betray even a trait of heterosemy. The form *esot* consists of one of the roots for 'be' (*es-*) and a suffix which originally belonged to the paradigm of the inflected present active participle (*-ot*), just as was originally the case with Lith. *esą* (< †*es-ą;* see Introduction). But contrary to Lith. *esą,* Latv. *esot* has not fossilized since the suffix *-ot* is applied regularly to the present (as well as to the future) tense stem. As such, it has become a grammatical device for rendering reported speech or hearsay (cf. Holvoet 2007, 89), but, contrary to Lithuanian present (and future) active participles, it does not inflect for case, number or gender. This can be seen in one of the examples given in Holvoet (2007, 83), in which the compound form *esot pamodies* occurs coordinated with another uninflected participle (*kliedzot*):

(58) *Matīsiņš* **es-ot** *pamodies*
PN:NOM be:PCTP_INDECL wake_up:PTCP:NOM.SG.M
un KLIEDZ-OT *pēc viņa.*
and cry:PTCP_INDECL for him
'(She says) little Matthew has woken up and IS CRYING for him.' (R. Blaumanis)

In other words: *esot* is the output of a regular morphological operation by which verb stems are supplied with a participial suffix (*-ot*). These participles do not mark usual agreement categories and serve only as main predicates triggering a reportive interpretation. Insofar as they are uninflected, they have been isolated from the paradigm of present active participles. Correspondingly, *esot* cannot occur in any other syntactic function than that of the main predicate, either as copula (existential verb) or as auxiliary in compound forms tightly connected to the paradigm of the perfect tenses (cf. Holvoet 2001,

117f.)[25]. If we want to make a categorial distinction between copula and auxiliary, we may say that *esot* is a heterosemic unit. However, this kind of heterosemy would concern only VP-internal distinctions and be of an entirely different type than heterosemy of lexicalized offsprings of grammatical forms anyway.

As far as compound forms are concerned, one wonders whether *esot* only strengthens the reportive function of the active participle (*dzīvojis* in 57, *pamodies* in 58). If, however, *esot* occurs as copula, as in e.g.,

(59) *Viņš   es-ot   slinks.*
     he.NOM   COP.HS   lazy.NOM.SG.M
     'He is said to be lazy.'

it unanimously becomes the only carrier of reportive function and, thus, must have incorporated that function as a stable component of its meaning.

The Estonian participial form, *olevat* (= *ol(e)-* 'be' + -v(a):PTCP:PRS. ACTIVE + -t.PARTITIVE), very much resembles the Baltic units just discussed in terms of both lexical source and grammatical provenance. But like Latv. *esot*, it has not fossilized into a separate particle or other lexical item. In this respect, Latvian and its Finnic neighbor to the northeast are closer to each other than Latvian and Lithuanian. But both the Latvian and the Estonian unit do not betray any other evidential function beside the reportive one and in this respect correspond fully to Lith. *esą* (cf. Wiemer, forthcoming1, 2.2.1, with further references).

In Europe, as far as I have been able to establish, from the etymological point of view, there is only one further language that has a lexicalized evidential particle deriving directly from a participle of a 'be'-verb. This is Western Armenian *eγer*. This unit can be used together

---

[25] In fact, Holvoet (2007, 104f.) argues that, since *-ot* has become the proper morphological sign of reportive evidentiality and participles marked with it fulfil only this function as main predicates in the clause, a "process of finitisation" has occurred by which contemporarily one is justified to dissociate verb stems with this evidential marker from the usual participial paradigms. A further argument addressed by Holvoet is the fact that Latv. *-ot* can be used in the debitive (marked with *jā-*) and, in some dialects, with the conditional mood. Note that such facts show that *-ot* has become very deeply entrenched into Latvian morphosyntax. They thus lend additional support to the point made here, namely: that Lith. *esą* and Latv. *esot*, being cognates both in terms of their lexical root and in terms of their original grammatical form, have been developing very differently, actually into directly opposed directions on a lexicon—grammar cline.

with evidentially interpreted perfect forms, but *eγer* can occur as well with simple tense forms, i.e. with finite verbs unable to function as grammatical markers of evidentiality. The crucial difference in comparison to the Baltic and Estonian units mentioned above is that *eγer* is not restricted to hearsay, rather should be characterized as a general marker of indirect evidentiality (Donabédian 1996, 95f.). It is tempting to connect this difference to the fact that *eγer* formally derives from the participle used for the analytic perfect while Lith. *esą* goes back to the paradigm of PRESENT active participles. Apart from that, *eγer* does not seem to be used as a complementizer (at least Donabédian does not mention such a usage type).

Let us now look for reportive function words of other etymological provenance. These are of two kinds:

Type A: Units used as complementizers and particles that can be explained as functional extensions from complex lexemes meaning comparison (usually comparison with an unreal or hypothetical situation and thus correlated with some kind of irrealis semantics). In general these can be glossed 'as if, as though'.

Type B: Units used as particles and, to a lesser extent, as complementizers which derive from petrified accretions of a general 'say'-verb with a complementizer.

Both kinds of units represent heterosemy, although B-Type units do so to a considerably lesser extent. Moreover, both kinds differ not only in terms of their etymological sources, but also in semantic and areal-genealogical terms: A-Type markers are usually general markers of indirect evidentiality (as is Western Arm. *eγer*, see above), whose reportive reading has often remained highly dependent on the syntactic or broader discourse context, whereas B-Type units are restricted to reportive evidentiality. A-Type markers have developed only in the northeastern part of Europe, while B-Type markers are encountered in diverse varieties of Romance languages. Types A and B differ crucially in the absence vs. presence of complementizer uses, and this correlates with their functional range and the way in which they (most likely) have evolved diachronically. The brief survey to follow is not meant to give an exhaustive or even satisfying description of the units discussed, it is just a sketch of a more general picture against the background of which Lith. *esą* should be evaluated typologically. I therefore refrain

from any details not directly relevant to the issue of hearsay marking and heterosemy.

4.2. Type A

4.2.1. Latvian *it kā*

The only systematic account of this unit to date is a yet unpublished article by Chojnicka (forthcoming). According to her, *it kā* has uses as both a conjunction and a particle. Only as a particle can it mark hearsay, e.g.

(60) *Viņš*   **it kā**   *ir*   *slims.*
      he.NOM   COP.PRS.3   ill.NOM.SG.M
      'He is said to be ill.'

From Chojnicka's analysis we have to infer that *it kā* does not function as a complementizer; the author argues that *it kā* never introduces a propositional argument of a speech act verb. This contrasts with Lith. *esq* (compare examples like 10–16). However, Holvoet (forthcoming, section 4) demonstrated that *it kā* does occur as a complementizer as well; this occurrence has been observed at least with 'pretence predicates': "these predicates have as a characteristic that the world described by the proposition embodied in the complement is not the real world" (Noonan [2]2007, 126; cited after Holvoet, forthcoming, section 4).

     Apart from this, if *it kā* is used as a particle, it cannot occur in the propositional argument of a speech act verb. Sentences like the following one would be ungrammatical:

(61) **Viņš*   TEICA,   KA   **it kā** *ir*   *slims.*
      he.NOM   assert.PRS.3   COMP   COP.PRS.3   ill.NOM.SG.M
      to mean 'He SAYS/CLAIMS THAT s/he **allegedly/apparently** is ill.'

Compare this to Lith. *esq* in the direct translation of (61):

(61a)? *Jis*   *teigia,*   *kad*   **esq**   *serga.*
       he.NOM   claim.PRS.3   COMP   HS_PTC   be_ill.PRS.3

Such an utterance would, in principle, seem grammatically accept-

able, but informants judge it as very strange or dismiss it altogether. Interestingly, I have not found any comparable example in my sample: as shown in 1.2.2, *esq* often occurs as a particle in different kinds of subordinate clauses (both with finite and participial predicates), but there was not a single instance of *esq* as a particle in a complement of a SPEECH verb. This (very preliminary!) observation might justify the assumption that the syntactic 'versatility' of *esq* has remained somehow restricted, more precisely: to the disfavor of contexts which are identical with one of the distributional restrictions of Latv. *it kā*.

Now, as far as the latter are concerned, we are led to the rather peculiar conclusion that, when used as a reportive particle, *it kā* cannot be embedded in the grammatical structure which most explicitly indicates reported speech. In this respect it markedly differs from all other units belonging to Type A (see below). On the other hand, *it kā* can be used in relative clauses and other kinds of syntactic subordination and, moreover, *it kā* "almost always needs additional markers of evidentiality, most frequently a form of the oblique mood, which means that its reportive meaning is not an inherent part of its semantics" (Chojnicka, forthcoming). Obviously, as a particle, *it kā* must be considered an indifferent marker of indirect evidentiality for which the reportive function is only incipient and still depends on contextual support, whereas with other syntactic functions this unit excludes hearsay and its functions center around inferentiality and hypothetical comparison (irrealis, counterfactivity). These functions also come to the fore in a usage type which Chojnicka rightly treats as syntactically intermediate between conjunctional and particle use, namely: as the initial component of participial adjuncts. Compare one of her examples:

(62) *Bet atnācējs*   *ar*   *veselo*   *roku*
but who_came.NOM.SG.M with healthy hand.INS.SG.F
māja,   ***it kā***   DIRIĢĒJOT   *orķestri.*
wave.PAST.3   conduct.CVB   orchestra.ACC.SG
'But the person who had come was waving his healthy hand,
as if conducting [= as if one conducted] an orchestra.'

In such cases, *it kā* does not have evidential function since it only marks a comparison with an unreal situation. Note that, in such a function, not only Lith. *esq* would be impossible, but also Pol. *jakoby* (and all the more its Russian cognate *jàkoby*) and even Russ. *budto by*,

kak budto[26] (see 4.2.3) are now very unusual with infinite verb forms, despite their etymology and 'functional profile', which is similar to the provenance and range of *it kā*.

4.2.2. Georgian *turme*

Giacalone Ramat/Topadze (2007, 13f.) describe this particle as "a compound made up of the conjunction *tu* 'if', particle *-re* 'somewhat, a little' and the indefinite particle *-me*" (2007, 37, f. 7; for more details cf. Boeder 2000, 313f., f. 14). Its etymology is thus rather close to Latv. *it kā*: one may presume that it was a sort of an emphatic particle, used in contexts of negative polarity[27], and *kā* 'like' is a 'comparative particle' (compare with Pol. *jako* as in *jako + by* > *jakoby*, discussed in 4.2.4). As with Latv. *it kā* (and all other units mentioned in this subsection), the meaning of contemporary Georg. *turme* has lost its compositional character (Topadze 2008, 53). It has thus been "withdrawn from analytic access and inventorized" as a lexical unit (cf. Lehmann 2002, see section 3). Its functional range and categorial status is identical to Western Arm. *eγer* (see 4.1): *turme* is an indifferent marker of indirect evidentiality and is not used as a complementizer, i.e. no heterosemy has developed; in this respect it differs from both Latv. *it kā* and Lith. *esq̨*.

4.2.3. Lith. *neva*

According to the diachronic-comparative analysis conducted by Petit (2009), *neva* is an accretion of the demonstrative-exclamative *va* '(look) here!' (compare Russ. *vot*, Pol. *ot(óż)*, It. *ecco*, Fr. *voici, voilà*) with the particle *ne*. The latter contemporarily serves as a negation marker, but a close look at historical and dialectal documents of Lithuanian and older stages of other IE. languages shows a quite usual evolution of negation out of comparison markers (Petit 2009, 72–75). For *neva*

---

[26] In "comparison function" these markers of indirect evidentiality have largely been replaced by Pol. *jakby* and Russ. *kak by*, respectively.

[27] Compare, e.g., to Germ. *gar* as in *gar nicht, nichts* 'absolutely not, nothing' or the focus particle *sogar* 'even'. Lith. *itin* 'especially, particularly' is a cognate of Latv. *it*.

we thus get an original structure (Germ. 'innere Wortform') which is very similar to other 'as if'-units. In particular, Petit's analysis allows the inference that the accretion *nè + và > nevà* to a new lexical unit must have occurred before semantic reanalysis of comparative function toward negation took place. Moreover, this kind of reanalysis looks similar to what one can often observe with negative polarity items and what might have happened to Latv. *it* after it merged with *kā* into one unit *it kā* (see 4.2.2). However, *neva* slightly differs from *it kā* in its further semantic and syntactic development since *it kā* cannot be used as a complementizer, it sort of 'avoids' reportive meaning and has retained much more of its (probably original) comparative meaning (see 4.2.1) while *neva* can be used either as a complementizer or a particle (cf. Petit 2009, 65f., who, however, calls it a conjunction, as was also still the case in Wiemer 2007a, 180f.) and in both functions marks hearsay. Inferential meanings have been stated to exist, too, although this usage appears to be much less common than the reportive function. Petit (2009, 64) adduces an example from the Lithuanian academy dictionary:

(63) *Atrodo, **neva** serga.* 'It seems **as if** s/he is ill / they are ill'.

We should thus still qualify *neva* as an undifferentiated marker of indirect evidentiality whose specific value (inferential or reportive) depends on the immediate syntactic context. Functionally, *neva* is most similar to Polish and Russian 'as if'-markers discussed in 4.2.4; whether it has a reportive meaning on its own as a particle — i.e. independently of syntactic subordination to speech-related verbs or nouns — remains an open question.

   Note, finally, that in examples like (63) we encounter the same potential syntactic ambiguity which we discussed for *esq* in 2.1: is *neva* really a complementizer, or does it rather represent a clause-initial particle? This problem arises because *atrodo* 'it seems, looks (like, as if)', in turn, can be interpreted as either a regular finite verb with a propositional argument (then introduced by *neva* = complementizer), or a parenthetical unit (either the same finite verb or a petrified unit; compare Russ. *kažetsja*, Pol. *zdaje się*, Engl. *it seems*, Fr. *paraît-il*, etc.); in the latter case *neva serga* would be simply juxtaposed to *atrodo* and *neva* to be considered as a particle.

4.2.4. Polish and Russian 'as if'-markers

Russian and, first of all, Polish appear to be the only Slavic languages in which we can encounter A-Type units[28], and all of them share their etymological background with Latv. *it kā* as units which originally arose to mark comparisons either with a nominal constituent (as in *This book is **like** BALSAM for my soul*) or with a clausal adjunct (as in *She looked **as if** SHE DID NOT UNDERSTAND*). Evidently, *it kā* has preserved both uses, whereas almost all of the Slavic units to be discussed now have lost their use with nominal constituents but have extended their use with clauses into the domain of inferential and thence into reportive evidentiality. Alongside this functional extension, whilst all Slavic units have acquired complementizer status, some of them (Pol. *jakoby*, Russ. *jàkoby*) have lost their use as conjunctions. Russ. *jàkoby*, but not Pol. *jakoby*, has become almost obsolete as a complementizer (see below). Most of these units have also become particles whose use 'oscillates' to different degrees between inferential and reportive functions.

Pol. *jakoby* can be used either as complementizer (62–64) or as particle (65)[29]:

(64)   *Zdaje*   *mi*   *się,* **jakoby-m** *słyszał*   *jakieś*
      seem.PRS.3SG me.DAT RM as_if-1SG hear.PAST.M some.N
      wołanie.
      shouting.N
      'It seems to me **as though I** am hearing people shouting.'
      [lit. '… some shouting']

(65)   *Byłoby*   *błędem*   *sądzić,*   **jakoby**
      be.N.SBJV mistake.INS.SG.M   assume.INF as_if
      młodzież   *w* *wieku*   *17–18 lat*
      young_people.NOM.SG.F in age.LOC   year.GEN.PL

---

[28] I have not checked non-standard varieties. It is also possible that in Belarusian and Ukrainian cognates of the Polish and Russian markers are occasionally found in identical use. This, however, would add nothing to the basic point that this kind of evidential marker appears to be restricted areally to Lithuanian and its near neighbors, although it would make the claim for areally conditioned factors all the more stringent.

[29] (64, 65, 67) are quoted from Wiemer (2006, 40, 45; 2008, 367), (66) is from Stępień (2008, 328).

> *nie   kochała   swego   miasta... (Stolica 10/1962)*
> NEG like.PAST.3.F REFL.GEN town.GEN.SG.N
> 'It would be an error to assume **that** the young people aged 17–18 don't love their town.'

(66) *Platforma Obywatelska* [...] *twierdzi,*   ***jakoby***
  PN:NOM   assert.PRS.3SG as_though
  podatek liniowy był tym elementem czy instrumentem, który rozwiąże wszystkie nabrzmiałe problemy.
  'The Platforma Obywatelska [a political party; BW] claims **that** linear tax will be the element or instrument (of policy) which will solve all urgently arising problems.'

(67) [...] *Instytut przesłał listę tematów, które jego zdaniem stanowiły niewątpliwe osiągnięcia. Dwa tygodnie później*
  ten sam   Instytut   usiłował
  the_same.NOM.SG.M institute.NOM.SG.M try.PAST.3SG
  wycofać   kilka   tematów,   które
  withdraw.INF a_couple topic.GEN.PL RP:ACC.PL.M
  jakoby *podał*   *przez   przeoczenie,*
  allegedly name.PAST.3SG.M through oversight.ACC
  w tym wszystkie prace Brzozowskiego. (*Życie i Nowoczesność* 551, 1981)
  '[...] the Institute sent a list of topics which, in its opinion, were unquestionable achievements. Two weeks later, the same Institute attempted to withdraw several topics which it had **supposedly** supplied in oversight, including all papers by Brzozowski.'

These examples show *jakoby* not only being used in two different syntactic functions, but also that *jakoby* as a complementizer is not restricted to a reportive function (as in ex. 66) but can be used as a complementizer after epistemic (65) and perceptual (64) predicates. I do not know of any case in which *jakoby* as a particle would refer to anything other than hearsay (see ex. 67). In other words: as a complementizer, *jakoby* has a considerably broader meaning range than as a particle, and only as a complementizer can it be used in non-evidential contexts. The latter contexts are diachronically primary to the evidential uses, and there is reason to assume that the reportive meaning of

the particle has developed subsequently: the Russian cognate of Pol. *jakoby* (*jàkoby*) has almost ceased to function as a complementizer, and as a particle it is not used with inferential meaning; instead it shows an inextricable combination of reportive and epistemic meaning, as it implies that the actual speaker doubts the veracity of the proposition referred to[30]. The epistemic load has to be judged not as a newly acquired one but as 'inherited' from its earlier use as marker of comparison with unreal, or counterfactual situations. This property holds for all A-Type units, and it can be clearly explained on the basis of their etymology.

Letučij has analyzed *(kak) budto (by)* vs. *kak by* (Letučij 2008) and *budto*-units (Letuchiy, forthcoming) in contemporary Russian. Not only does he show that *kak by* has remained a marker of pure (irreal, hypothetical) comparison, whereas *kak budto* and *budto (by)* have moved into the realm of evidentiality. He also points to the fact that *kak budto* and *budto by* have a slightly different range of functions within evidentiality: both units are heterosemic, as either of them can be used as complementizer or particle (as well as sort of conjunction for clausal adjuncts). But only *budto by* carries a more or less stable (and detachable) reportive meaning if used as a particle; the specific evidential function (reportive or inferential) of *kak budto* depends on the meaning of the matrix predicate in complementizer use, and *kak budto,* as a rule, is restricted to inferential meaning if used as a particle (i.e. if it occurs without immediate contextual support by a speech act verb). These Russian function words should best be compared to Latv. *it kā*: taken together, *kak by, kak budto* and *budto by* coincide with the syntactic and semantic functions of the Latvian unit (if we ignore the complementizer use, absent for *it kā*), but each of them is more specialized than Latv. *it kā* in both syntactic and semantic terms. Thus, based on this, *it kā* remains much more vague.

The difference between *kak budto* and *budto by* renders a nice parallel to context-dependent and context-independent reportive functions of Lith. *esą*: as shown in section 2.3 and 3, *esą* acquires an inherent

---

[30] Cf. Rakhilina (1996), also Wiemer (2008, 362–369) where a comparative analysis including the last 200 years is presented.

reportive function only as a particle (as does Russ. *budto by*); as long as it enters into a tight syntactic relation with a matrix predicate (i.e. as a pivot linking two cores of a logophoric construction, or as a complementizer), *esq* cannot indisputably be ascribed a hearsay component on its own. At this point two different lines of development converge: the evolution of 'as if'-units and the evolution of a 'be'-verb participle. Obviously, the former ('as if') originate from contexts of perception and appearance (but not speech!) and ONLY THEN extend into speech act-related contexts before some of them (*kak budto, budto by*) happen to become independent markers of evidential functions and, more specifically, of hearsay (*budto by*); the latter (*esq)*, on the contrary, originates from contexts of syntactic subordination under illocutive, epistemic and perceptual predicates and, by becoming a particle (i.e. a syntactically independent unit), restricts its function to hearsay, i.e. a function related to typical constructions and usage types with which the predecessor of that particle has always been involved. Moreover, a restriction to reportive contexts is not exclusively characteristic of *esq* used as particle, but it is typical (maybe even exclusive; see f. 6) already for *esq* as a complementizer and thus in ANY type of use as a function word.

4.3. Type B

For sure, we can find numerous units in diverse languages in which some form or other of a general 'say'-verb has lexicalized (or shows tendencies thereof) into a reportive marker, in particular into a reportive particle; cf., inter alia, Czech *prý*, Slovak *vraj*, Russ. *mol, deskat', grit/grju,* Bulg. *kaj*, Mac. *veli,* Greek *lei*, It. *dice* or Fr. *dit-on*. But cases in which such a fossilized form behaves like a heterosemic unit are rather exceptional. In the cases known to me, heterosemic behavior correlates with the fact that a 'say'-unit has additionally fused with its former complementizer.

This type is well attested all over different varieties of Romance (with the apparent exception of French), both in Europe (Cruschina/Remberger 2008) and in South and Middle America (Olbertz 2007; Travis 2006). In all cases, the general 'say'-verb has fused with a complementizer so that the whole unit becomes unanalyzable and

can be accessed only holistically[31]; we may abbreviate this sort of unit as SAYC. Compare Rom. *cică* < *zice că*, Sp. *dizque* < *dice que*, Srd. *nachi* < *narat chi*, etc. SAYC units in general have to be classified as particles because they do not enter into any syntactic relations with constituency structure; e.g. in Romanian (quoted after Cruschina/Remberger 2008, 96)

(67) **Cică** *banul*   *n-aduce*   *fericirea.*
     HS   money.DEFART NEG-bring.PRS.3SG happiness.DEFART
     'Money doesn't give you happiness, **they say**.'

Interestingly, the authors demonstrate in some more detail that Romance SAYC units "can occur with other complementizer(-like) elements" (2008, 102). We thus encounter sentences like the following one from Sardinian (quoted 2008, 104):

(68) *E*   **nachi** *CHI*   *issa*   *no*   *b'*
     and   HS   COMP   she   NEG   there.CL
     andaiada   *nudda.*
     go.IMPF.3.SG   nothing
     'And it **is said** THAT she didn't go there at all.'

Comparable examples could be cited for Rom. *cică*, too.

    Strictly speaking, if a unit takes a (propositional) argument (introduced by a complementizer), it cannot count as a particle. Rather we should treat it as a predicative (cf. Wiemer, forthcoming1, 2.4). This yields another kind of heterosemy (particle—predicative) that markedly differs from the types of heterosemy which I have disclosed above for the Baltic and neighboring Slavic languages (particle—complementizer(—copula), or particle—conjunction(—complementizer)). According to the analyses referred to here, Romance SAYC units do not show any signs of functional extension into inferential evidentiality. This can certainly be explained on the basis of their etymology; in any case this corresponds to the functional range of Lith. *esq* with a totally different diachronic pathway.

---

[31] All these units thus illustrate lexicalization (see section 3). Cruschina/Remberger (2008), who regard them as results of grammaticalization, admit that they use this term in a rather loose way ("as the general process consisting of those phenomena involving change and reanalysis of linguistic forms"; 2008, 96, f. 1).

5. Conclusions

My analysis has comprised different levels; beside a focus on the syntactic behavior and the status of *esq* on a lexicon—grammar cline, I have tried to determine the semantic potential of *esq* as a function word and to discern inherent reportive meaning from a merely contextually compatible reportive potential. The results of this analysis are summarized in the following table.

Table 2. Syntactic and semantic properties of esą

Esą	(A) reference to original speaker	(B) nature of speech event	(C) scope
1. **inflected participle:** NOM.PL.M (including logophoric construction)	if logophoric: concrete-specific (by construction)	only propositional content (usually not literal quote)	clausal (by construction)
2. **copular or existential 'be'** (a) NOM.PL.M (b) NEUTER (if gender controlling subject lacks)	can be unanimous, but not inherent to *esq*		clausal (could be over whole sentences)
3. **adnominal conjunction** (relativizer)	concrete-specific, unanimous or generic (depending on context, if not on heading NP or predicate, respectively)		clausal
4. **complementizer**			

Continuation of Table 2.

Esq	(A) reference to original speaker	(B) nature of speech event	(C) scope
5. **particle**	concrete-specific, unanimous or generic (depending on context)	propositional content, literal quote, semiotic substitute of speech	propositional but variable (can be narrowed to adjuncts or NP-internal attributes)

To properties (A–C) we should add that

(D) only as a copula (or existential predicate) and as a particle can *esq* unanimously be said to have an inherent reportive component on its own. In all other usage types, an inherently reportive meaning cannot be assumed for sure because *esq* here is syntactically subordinate to some linguistic element (NP, illocutive verb) which lexically refers to some kind of speech.

We should further add two properties, which have not been examined in this paper, but which can be stated as evident from the examples given in sections 1–2:

(E) In no usage type is *esq* obligatory, it can always be replaced by some other unit (relative pronoun, complementizer, finite copula) or construction (instead of a logophoric construction the complement of an illocutive verb can be finite with a complementizer), or it can simply be 'omitted' (as a particle).

(F) *Esq* is compatible with other markers of reportive meaning, both lexical and grammatical, i.e. with active participles. In fact, it very often occurs together, especially with the latter ones (see ex. 4, 43, 49, 51–53)[32]. Further studies should be designed to investigate the

---

[32] Further examples with lexical markers or active participles are cited in Wiemer (2007b: 218-224).

ways in which *esą* interacts with other evidential markers (or these among each other).

Taken together, these properties yield a profile of *esą* as a heterosemic unit representing a sort of bundle of distinct grammatical and lexicographic units. This profile is unique not only in the sense that no other unit in Lithuanian shares an identical combination of properties with *esą*, but also and moreover in the sense that *esą* seems to have neither any such 'match' in immediately genealogically and/or areally related languages, nor against a broader European background. Lith. *esą* reveals only partial correspondencies with distinct hearsay units in other European languages, which are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Syntactic, semantic and etymological correspondencies with esą

	etymology and grammatical provenance	heterosemy ? (as function word)	range of evidential functions
closest equivalents in terms of etymology and grammatical provenance			
Latv. *esot*	participle of 'be'	(no)*: only as participle (copula + auxiliary) without case inflection	only reportive
Est. *olevat*			
W.Arm. *eγer*	participle of 'be'	no: only as particle	general indirect
Type A 'as if': contains most of the closest equivalents in terms of heterosemy			
Latv. *it kā*	NEG.POL + comparison	yes: as conjunction, complementizer or particle	inferential (impossible in complements of illocutive predicates)

---

[*] See the proviso made in 4.1.

Continuation of Table 3.

	etymology and grammatical provenance	heterosemy ? (as function word)	range of evidential functions
Georg. *turme*	'if' + 'a little' + INDEF	no: only as particle	general indirect
Lith. *neva*	comparison + demonstrative particle	yes: as complementizer and as particle	general indirect
Pol. *jakoby*	comparison + subjunctive marker	yes: as complementizer and particle	general indirect
Russ. *jàkoby*		(yes): as particle, obsolete as complementizer	only reportive (inferential is obsolete)
Russ. *kak budto*	comparison + [IMP.SG of 'be' + particle]	yes: as complementizer and particle	general indirect (no reportive function as particle)
Russ. *budto by*	[IMP.SG of 'be' + particle] + subjunctive marker		general indirect

Type B SAYC: closest equivalents in terms of restriction to hearsay

Romance (except French)	3SG PRESENT of 'say' + complementizer	no: only as particle	
Sard. *nachi*	*narat* + *chi* 'tells that'	yes: as particle and predicative	only reportive
Rom. *cică*	*zice* + *că* 'says that'		

Björn Wiemer
Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität
Institut für Slavistik
Jakob-Welder-Weg 18, D-55099 Mainz
wiemerb@uni-mainz.de

ABBREVIATIONS

ACC — accusative, CL — clitic (in Romance), COMP — complementizer, COMPAR — comparative degree, CVB — gerund ('half-participle'), DAT — dative, DEFART — definite article, F — feminine, FUT — future tense, GEN — genitive, HS — hearsay marker, HS_COMP — Hearsay complementizer, HS_COP — hearsay copula, HS_PTC — hearsay particle, HS_REL — hearsay relativizer, HS_? — hearsay marker with doubtful syntactic status, IMPF — imperfect tense (Romance), INF — infinitive, INS — instrumental, IT_PAST — iterative past tense, LOC — locative, M — masculine, N — neuter, NEUT — neuter gender (only as default in lack of agreement controller), NOM — nominative, PAST — past tense, PL — plural, PN — proper noun, PRS — present tense, PTCP — inflected participle, PTCP_INDECL — uninflected participle (other than gerund), REFL — reflexive pronoun, RM — reflexive marker (agglutinated or clitic), RP — relative pronoun, SBJV — subjunctive, SG — singular, SPL — superlative degree, 1 / 2 / 3 — 1st / 2nd / 3rd person.

REFERENCES

AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS. 1979. *Lietuvių kalbos dalyvių istorinė sintaksė.* Vilnius: Mokslas.

AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS. 1990. *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskix jazykov.* Vilnius: Mokslas.

AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS. 2006. *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė sintaksė.* Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

BARBIERI, FREDERICA. 2005. Quotative use in American English: A corpus-based, cross-register comparison. *Journal of English Linguistics* 33:3, 222–256.

BOEDER, WINFRIED. 2000. Evidentiality in Georgian. In: Lars Johan-

son & Bo Utas, eds., *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 275–328.

CHOJNICKA, JOANNA. Forthcoming. On the Latvian word *it kā*. To appear in: Nicole Nau & Norbert Ostrwoski, eds., *Studies on Particles and Connectives in the Baltic Languages*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas & Academia Salensis.

CORBETT, GREVILLE G. 1991. *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CRUSCHINA, SILVIO & EVA-MARIA REMBERGER. 2008. Hearsay and reported speech: evidentiality in Romance. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 33, 95–116.

DONABÉDIAN, ANAÏDE. 1996. Pour une interprétation des différentes valeurs du médiatif en arménien occidental. In: Zlatka Guentchéva, ed., *L'énonciation mediatisée*. Louvain, Paris: Peeters, 87–108.

GIACALONE RAMAT, ANNA & MANANA TOPADZE. 2007. The coding of evidentiality: a comparative look at Georgian and Italian. *Rivista di Linguistica* 19:1: *Evidentiality Between Lexicon and Grammar*, ed. by Mario Squartini, 7–38.

HIMMELMANN, NIKOLAUS P. 2004. Lexicalization and grammaticization: Opposite or orthogonal? In: Walter Bisang, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Bjoern Wiemer, eds., *What Makes Grammaticalization? A Look from its Fringes and its Components*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 21–42.

HOLVOET, AXEL. 2001. *Studies in the Latvian verb*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. (*Baltica Varsoviensia,* 4.)

HOLVOET, AXEL. 2007. *Mood and modality in Baltic*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. (*Baltica Varsoviensia*, 6.)

HOLVOET, AXEL. Forthcoming. Notes on Complementisers in Baltic. To appear in: Nicole Nau & Norbert Ostrowski, eds., *Studies on Particles and Connectives in the Baltic Languages*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas & Academia Salensis.

LEHMANN, CHRISTIAN 2002. New reflections on grammaticalization and lexicalization. In: Ilse Wischer & Gabriele Diewald, eds., *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1–18.

LETUČIJ [= LETUCHIY], ALEKSANDR 2008. Sravnitel'nye konstruk-

cii, irrealis i ėvidencial'nost'. In: Björn Wiemer & Vladimir A. Plungjan, eds., *Lexikalische Evidenzialitätsmarker in slavischen Sprachen* (= *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Sonderband 72). München, Wien: Otto Sagner, 215–238.

LETUCHIY, ALEKSANDR (forthcoming): Syntactic change and shifts in evidential meanings: four Russian units. In: Björn Wiemer & Katerina Stathi, eds., *Database on Evidentiality Markers in European Languages*. (= *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung*, Special Issue).

LG = AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS *et al.* 1997. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.

LICHTENBERK, FRANTIŠEK. 1991. Semantic Change and Heterosemy in Grammaticalization. *Language* 67, 475–509.

NOONAN, MICHAEL. 2007. Complementation. In: Timothy Shopen, ed., *Language Typology and Syntactic description*. Vol. I. *Complex constructions*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 52–150.

OLBERTZ, HELLA. 2007. *Dizque* in Mexican Spanish: the subjectification of reportative meaning. *Rivista di Linguistica* 19:1: *Evidentiality Between Lexicon and Grammar*, ed. by Mario Squartini, 151–172.

PETIT, DANIEL. 2009. Zum Ausdruck der Evidentialität im Baltischen: die litauische Partikel *neva*. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 59, 57–80.

RAKHILINA, EKATERINA V. 1996. *Jakoby* comme procédé de médiatisation en russe. In: Zlatka Guentchéva, ed., *L'énonciation médiatisée*. Louvain, Paris: Peeters, 299–304.

STĘPIEŃ, MARZENA. 2008. O wzajemnym przenikaniu się ewidencjalności i modalności (na przykładzie wybranych polskich czasowników i wyrażeń funkcyjnych). In: Björn Wiemer & Vladimir A. Plungjan, eds., *Lexikalische Evidenzialitätsmarker in slavischen Sprachen* (= *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Sonderband 72). München, Wien: Otto Sagner, 313–333.

TOPADZE, MANANA. 2008. *Mezzi de espressione dell'evidenzialità in georgiano*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Pavia: Facoltà di lettere e filosofia.

TRAUGOTT, ELISABETH C. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: an example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65, 3–55.

Traugott, Elisabeth C. & Richard B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Travis, Catherine E. 2006. *Dizque*: a Colombian evidentiality strategy. *Linguistics* 44:6, 1269–1297.

Valskys, Vidas. 2002. Netiesioginės nuosakos raiška bevardės giminės dalyviais. *Lietuvių kalba ir tarmės* 1:4, 30–35.

Weiss, Daniel 1993. Die Faszination der Leere (Die moderne russische Umgangssprache und ihre Liebe zur Null). *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 53, 42–82.

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 2006. Particles, parentheticals, conjunctions and prepositions as evidentiality markers in contemporary Polish (A first exploratory study). *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 3, 5–67.

Wiemer, Björn 2007a. Lexical markers of evidentiality in Lithuanian. *Rivista di Linguistica* 19:1: *Evidentiality between lexicon and grammar*, ed. by Mario Squartini, 173-208.

Wiemer, Björn. 2007b. Kosvennaja zasvidetel'stvovannost' v litovskom jazyke. In: Viktor S. Xrakovskij, ed., *Ėvidencial'nost' v jazykax Evropy i Azii. Sbornik statej pamjati Natalii Andreevny Kozincevoj*. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka, 197–240.

Wiemer, Björn, 2008. Pokazateli s citativnoj i inferentivnoj funkcijami v russkom i pol'skom jazykax — kommunikativnye mexanizmy semantičeskogo sdviga. In: Björn Wiemer, B. & Vladimir A. Plungjan, eds., *Lexikalische Evidenzialitätsmarker in slavischen Sprachen* (= *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Sonderband 72). München, Wien: Otto Sagner, 335–376.

Wiemer, Björn. Forthcoming1. Hearsay in European languages: toward an integrative account of grammatical and lexical marking. In: Gabriele Diewald & Elena Smirnova, eds.: *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wiemer, Björn. Forthcoming2. On the lexicographic treatment of Lith. *esq* (against the background of other particles in Lithuanian and elsewhere). In: Nicole Nau & Norbert Ostrowski, eds., *Studies on Particles and Connectives in the Baltic Languages*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas & Academia Salensis.

Sources

http://donelaitis.vdu.lt/
http://www.ruscorpora.ru/
ZINKEVIČIUS, ZIGMAS. 1999. *Prie lituanistikos židinio*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.