

Björn WIEMER
Konstanz University

GRAMMATICAL EVIDENTIALITY IN LITHUANIAN (A TYPOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT)

This article¹ aims to provide an overview of grammatical structures associated with the domain of evidentiality in Lithuanian. The data is presented and discussed against the background of relevant typological observations. In section 1 I will discuss Lithuanian evidential markers from the viewpoint of the ‘gram’-approach established by Bybee and Dahl (cf., *inter alia*, Bybee, Dahl 1989), which allows us to better understand their form : function relations. In particular, it reveals that grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian depends on morphological marking only to a minor extent. Section 2 contains comments on the functional distribution of Lithuanian evidential marking techniques and their tight interaction with other categories marked on the verb (predicate). In section 3 the typological framework developed in Aikhenvald (2003; 2004) will be used as a reference point for a typological assessment of the data; her criteria will be applied to grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian. I will not dwell on areal affinities to neighboring languages², nor will I give any systematic account on the historical development of the relevant marking devices. Finally, section 4 presents conclusions to be drawn from the analysis and discusses criteria determining the degree of grammaticalization of evidentiality marking in Lithuanian as well as the typological status of the system.

Two further remarks are in order here. The first concerns the notion of ‘grammatical’ marker. I will treat as a grammatical (vs. lexical) marker every kind of structure which recurs productively and exhibits a paradigmatic ordering. Excluded from this kind of marking are therefore particles, conjunctions and other lexical units used to indicate the source of knowledge (for the latter see, e.g., Roszko 1993, 48–58 and Wiemer 2005)³. The second remark relates to the distinction of evidentiality

¹ I am obliged to Volker Gast (Berlin) for his careful reading of the text and his help in putting it into more idiomatic English. Of course, any remaining shortcomings are my fault. In order to make the exposition a little bit less dense I decided to be redundant at a couple of places.

² Thus, ‘gram families’ (in the sense of Dahl 2000) will not be touched upon here. For questions of areal diffusion cf. Wälchli 2000.

³ In Wiemer (to appear 1) conjunctions and particles are discussed jointly with genuine grammatical markers. Aikhenvald does not make a clear distinction, insofar as she includes, *inter alia*, particles into grammatical evidentiality marking. Nonetheless, she repeatedly admits that particles often do not partake in a clear system of paradigmatic choices and, as a rule, are not obligatory (see her discussion of critical cases, e.g., in Aikhenvald 2004, 80–82, 148–151).

from the field of epistemic modality. Until recently these two domains were usually treated indiscriminately. Here I will adopt Aikhenvald's (2004) strict separation of both in terms of their conceptual and functional nature. Thus, evidentiality refers to the source of information on the basis of which a speaker makes a statement; this may be a previous utterance (from another speaker), inference from visual, acoustic or some other kind of perception, or assumptions based on some common sense or general background knowledge. Notably, statements based on direct perception ('firsthand'; e.g., *Va, žiūrėk – ateina!* 'Look, there s/he is / they are coming!') are also included in the notion of evidentiality; they represent its functionally (and conceptually) unmarked case (just as, e.g., the indicative is the notionally unmarked member in mood distinctions). Contrary to this, epistemic modality pertains to the subjective assessment of the speaker with regard to the probability or reliability of the utterance in question. To put it briefly, evidentiality concerns the source of information, epistemic modality its validation. Both notions have often been mixed up. One of the reasons certainly is that at least in European languages grammatical and lexical markers which serve to indicate the source of information usually show a syncretism of this function with an epistemic function, by which the speaker critically assesses the propositional content of the message⁴. Lithuanian is a good case to illustrate this (see 3.3 and section 4). Therefore, although the markers used for evidential purposes often show a simultaneous "epistemic load", the two domains should be kept apart. A further reason is that not all languages with evidential markers exhibit this kind of functional (semantic) syncretism, as is amply illustrated in Aikhenvald (2004). For details the reader is referred to her book, cf. also de Haan (1999).

1. Any evidentiality grams?

Grams are conceived of as "structurally significant entities in grammatical systems"; these entities can "combine elements from several domains in their semantics" (Dahl 2000, 7). The discussion in the literature concerning grams shows that more often than not they have the expression format of morphemes (free, clitic or bound), i.e. they are parts of either words or periphrastic units.

Essentially, in Lithuanian there are two grammatical techniques of marking evidentiality. The first consists in using active participles of any tense stem (preterite,

⁴ To give an example from the group of lexical evidentiality markers, just look at Engl. *allegedly* (which is often misleadingly used in glosses to render the semantics of an evidential, in particular a hearsay, marker): by using this lexeme the speaker not only indicates that s/he is not the author of the original message (→ evidential), but also that s/he doubts the trustworthiness of the original message (→ epistemic). Analogous examples would be Russ. *jakoby*, Pol. *rzekomo*, Germ. *angeblich*, Lith. *esq, neva* (cf. Wiemer 2005).

present, or future) that agree with a subject in case (nominative), number and gender⁵. It will henceforth be called Construction I:

Construction I

- | | | |
|------|---|---|
| (1) | <i>Petras parašė</i> | ‘Peter wrote (that)’ |
| (1a) | <i>atvažiav-ęs jau prieš savaitę.</i>
come:PTC_PAST.NOM.SG.M | ‘... (he had) arrived already a week ago.’ |
| (1b) | <i>atvažiuoj-qs šiandien.</i>
come:PTC_PRS.NOM.SG.M | ‘... (he is) coming today.’ |
| (1c) | <i>atvažiuo-si-qs, kai pasibaigs užsiėmimai.</i>
come:PTC_FUT.NOM.SG.M | ‘... (he) will come when the courses will be finished.’ |

The other construction comprises subjectless clauses with the predicate expressed by a participle with the *t-* or *m-*suffix and an unstressed ending {a} (henceforth Construction II). The *ta/ma*-participle cannot agree with any noun phrase; it has to be considered a gender-neutral form (descended from the otherwise obsolescent neuter gender). As a rule, it occurs with one- or zero-place verbs; transitive verbs (with an Undergoer) as lexical input of these forms are exceptional, in general two- or three-place verbs are rare. When it is expressed, the single or highest-ranking argument is in the genitive (see ex. 2):

Construction II

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| (2) | <i>Čia vai-ko miego-t-a.</i>
here child.GEN sleep:PTC_T.NEUT | ‘(Obviously) the/a child has slept here.’ |
| (3) | <i>Vakar kambaryje buvo šokama.</i>
yesterday room.LOC COP.PAST.3 dance:PTC_M.NEUT | ‘(Apparently) yesterday in this room people danced.’ |
| (4) | <i>Naktį pasnigta.</i>
night.ACC snow:PTC_T.NEUT | ‘(Apparently) snow fell / has fallen last night.’ |

As for Construction II, it should be stressed that the *ma*-participle (based on the present stem) carries an inferential value less often than the *ta*-participle (derived from the past stem). Examples like (3) are therefore more likely to be interpreted simply as argument-demoting constructions (“impersonal passives”) than examples like (2) or (4). The proper reasons for this state of affairs have remained uninvestigated. Among the factors influencing the evidential value of the *ma*-participle, its lexical input and the syntactic realization of its arguments ought to be analysed (cf. Wiemer, to appear 2). Here I will not take up this very complex question, but we will return to it briefly at the end of section 2.

⁵ In subject-less clauses a gender-neutral form in {a} or {ę} is chosen, e.g., *Čia nieko.GEN nebuve* ‘(Apparently) nobody was/has been here’, *(Sako) rytoj lysią* ‘(They say) it will rain tomorrow’.

Constructions I and II can neither be combined with each other, nor are they used in any mood except the indicative⁶. They are not recursive, in the sense that they cannot be applied twice within a single clause, and they are not obligatory (see next section). On the scope of negation see 3.6.

Both constructions show a split of functions (within evidentiality) which makes them almost complementary (see next section). Since tense distinctions in Lithuanian are marked by alternations of the verbal stem, and since these stems are also the basis for participles (and other verbal derivatives), these participles exhibit a full tense paradigm (see ex. 1a–c). Contrary to active participles used in Construction I, *ta/ma*-participles are restricted to inferred situations prior to (*-ta*) or simultaneous with (*-ma*) the actual speech act; they cannot be used to express inferences concerning a time posterior to the moment of utterance (see further 3.4). The tense paradigm of Construction II with the *ta*-participle is defective insofar as it does not occur with a copula (regulating tense)⁷. The *ma*-participle, however, does allow for the past tense copula *buvo* (e.g., *(Matyt) čia buvo šokama* lit. ≈ ‘(Apparently), here was some dancing’), but it is hardly ever used with the future copula (*bus*), unless as a conjecture concerning the near future (*Šioje salėje bus šokama* ≈ ‘In this room people will dance (shortly)’), which has nothing to do with evidentiality. Thus, the analytic problems in the interpretation of the *ma*-participle construction are basically the same as with the active participles: the absence of a present tense copula (*yra*) does usually, but not by necessity, imply inferential meaning (see section 2, ex. 5).

As we see, both constructions are composed of participles, and they are the only grammatical devices to indicate evidential meanings. This fact not only testifies to the important role of participles in the grammatical system of Lithuanian (cf. Wiemer 2001; to appear 1, 2.1), it also demonstrates that for Lithuanian it is problematic to speak of evidential grams. What we have are constructions centring around participles. But at least the agreeing participles used in Construction I are by no means exclusively or even predominantly used for evidential purposes. The *ta*-participle may be regarded as a more reliable morphological indicator of evidentiality: it occurs nowhere else, except for those functions with which inferential evidentiality in Lithuanian interacts anyway (see section 2); the evidential function seems to be foregrounded. Anyway, this participle (or its construction) has not developed through morphologization, a process well-known from

⁶ Here we can leave aside certain East Lithuanian dialects mentioned by Ambrazas (1990, 220), in which combinations of inflectional endings of the active participles with the *t*-suffix and combinations with conditional forms can occasionally be encountered.

⁷ Again, this holds for the standard language. Ambrazas (1990, 207) mentions a dialect area in which *ta*-participles of both main verb and copula can be combined (e.g., *būta išeita* lit. ‘(it) had been went out’). This reminds us of double perfects like the French “formes surcomposées”, but it does not add anything essential to the issues addressed here.

studies on grammaticalization. Instead, its appearance has been due to the retention of relics of the neuter gender in former agreement targets, among which belong participles. (This is not the entire story, but the part of it which is relevant for the present argument.)

We may thus conclude that grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian does not rest on a well-developed set of morphological markers, either periphrastic or bound to the verb (or any other syntactic class of referential units). Within Lithuanian grammar, evidentiality can be expressed only by constructions which also fulfil other functions in the language. The reasons for this have to be sought in the “parasitic” nature of these grammatical devices: Construction II is based on the perfect, Construction I historically derives from logophoric clause combining and probably also started with the perfect (i.e. anterior participles, see ex. 1a)⁸.

2. Functional distribution and intersections

In the modern standard language (Lith. ‘bendrinė kalba’) Constructions I and II tend to be used for different kinds of evidential functions: Construction I, as a rule, is an indicator of reported evidentiality (reported events/states may be located prior to, simultaneously with or after the moment of the actual speech act, depending on the stem of the participle; see ex. 1a–c), whereas Construction II signals inferential meanings (as a rule restricted to sensory evidence at speech time; but see the discussion of ex. 9). This almost complementary distribution has to be regarded as the outcome of dialect levelling and normificatory work, which I cannot go into here. Suffice it to say that Construction I is backed by the dialects in the northern and western parts of the country, whereas Construction II originates from eastern and southern dialects (cf. Wiemer, to appear 1, section 5, and further references cited there). However, both constructions demonstrate a considerable degree of “epistemic overtones”, which are conveyed together with the relevant evidential meanings (see 3.3).

The agreeing participles used in Construction I can be used anywhere in Lithuanian syntax, both as adnominal modifiers (attributes) in the appropriate case and as predicates (with or without the copula)⁹. Active participles of the past tense stem, ending in

⁸ For the details cf. Ambrazas (1990, 222–228), Wälchli (2000, 191–197), Wiemer (1998, 236–239; to appear 1, section 4).

⁹ One may single out an intermediate syntactic use type, called “semi-predicative” (or “appositive”) by Ambrazas (1990, 98 ff.), which performs the function of relative clauses. An argument for postulating such a third syntactic environment for participles is the existence of participles which are specialized only for this purpose, namely: the “half-participles” (Lith. ‘pusdalyviai’), ending in *-damas* (for the masculine singular); see Wiemer (2001, 67). Their functional equivalent, likewise restricted to appositive uses, are, e.g., Russian gerunds (adverbial participles). We need not pursue this thread here, since it is not at all crucial for the discussion.

-*ęs*.NOM.M.SG / -*usi*.NOM.F.SG (see ex. 1a and 5–8), form the central component of the system of perfect tenses. Active participles based on other tense stems are irrelevant for this category (paradigm), but they play a role whenever they are used to (implicitly or explicitly) indicate reported speech (see ex. 1b–c). All active participles are used in narrative folklore, particularly in legends of origin (cf. Wälchli 2000, 192 f.)¹⁰. Furthermore, present active participles (ending in -*ąs*/*-įs*.NOM.M.SG / -*anti*/*-inti*.NOM.F.SG) are often considered as components of certain compound tenses (Lith. ‘*sudurtiniai laikai*’) with specific aspectual values, but these are highly infrequent and do not add anything new to our understanding of the relation between evidentiality and other categories associated with verb paradigms.

As concerns the perfect, it interacts with (reported) evidentiality in a systematic way on the present and past tense level (the future perfect behaves differently; see below ex. 7c and 8). It is precisely for this reason that the evidential has a subordinate status in Lithuanian grammar: it too heavily rests on pragmatic inferences, which are hardly backed by morphosyntactic distinctions. The only distinction, which is usually mentioned by standard grammars, is the presence or absence of the copula. But this distinction is made only in the present perfect (vs. reported evidential), since on past tense level a copula must always be present. Moreover, the empirical situation is far less clear than normative grammars, textbooks and most articles on this topic want us to believe. The descriptive problem is exactly the same as in the case of Bulgarian so-called ‘*preizkaznieto naklonenie*’: active past participles used predicatively often occur without a copula in contexts that are undoubtedly not evidential; this is consonant with a general tendency of the language to avoid (or “drop”) the copula with nominal predicates. Consequently, a zero copula does not allow us to induce evidential meaning. In practice, in this case evidential readings are strengthened by context factors, pragmatic background and encyclopaedic knowledge.

There are, however, peculiarities in the “story of evidentiality and the perfect” which make it different from its Bulgarian counterpart (see also 3.4, 3.7 and section 4). Reported evidentiality can be signalled unambiguously if the copula itself is used in a participial form; this form must agree with the participle of the main verb. Thus, among the forms in (5), only *esanti* (lit. ‘being.NOM.F.SG’) conveys evidentiality; a zero marker (∅) allows for such an interpretation, but does not require it; the finite copula (*yra*) is just the usual form used in the present perfect:

¹⁰ Notably, this shows that evidential (reported) use dismisses the prohibition of perfect tenses in narrative discourse, which is otherwise very strict. (This observation is paralleled by the analogous forms in Bulgarian.) This distinguishes the active forms (Construction I) from the *ta/ma*-participle (Construction II): the latter is never exploited in narrative contexts, it cannot be used for the sequencing of events.

This conclusion is supplemented by one last comment on this part of the “evidential story” in Lithuanian: unlike utterances of the (artificial) type in (7c), active past tense participles with the *f i n i t e* future copula are not interpreted as evidentials; they convey a purely epistemic meaning:

- (8) *Jos (jau) bus atvažiuosios.*
 she.NOM.PL already COP.FUT.3 arrive:PTC_PAST.NOM.PL.F
 ‘They (fem.) have probably arrived (already).’

This meaning shift from future to epistemic judgments (without any preservation of future meaning) is widespread in other European languages, irrespective of the existence of grammatical evidentiality markers (compare, e.g., Germ. *Sie werden schon angekommen sein*; cf. B y b e e et al. 1994, 206–208, 240, 265 f.). This, incidentally, is a strong structural argument for distinguishing evidentiality from epistemic modality.

The weakness of the formal distinction between the “usual” Present Perfect and its evidential interpretation becomes even more striking in the case of non-inflected *ta*-participles used in Construction II. It can be characterized as a perfect, too, with either resultative or experiential functions (depending on the lexical stem). Apart from its formal structure, it differs from Construction I in two respects: (i) it is mainly used as an inferential evidential (not a reported one), (ii) its evidential function is much more salient, i.e. by using this construction the speaker can be understood to express an inference with much more confidence than in the case of the reported function of Construction I. However, Construction II interacts not only with one, but even with two grammatical categories, namely the perfect and the passive or, more broadly, argument-demotion. This thread cannot be pursued here (cf. W i e m e r, to appear 2). Suffice it to say that categorial syncretism of an inferential evidential function with argument-demoting devices is encountered also at other, very different places in the world (A i k h e n v a l d 2004, 116 f.). Thus, Lithuanian does not appear to be outstanding in this particular respect, either.

For both constructions the semantic-pragmatic link between evidential meanings and the perfect (either resultative or experiential) seems self-evident. As this has been commented on very often in the relevant literature, I refrain from making any further comments on this issue. However, with respect to Construction I this link can, for obvious reasons, hold only for participles of the past tense stem; the rest must be explained by analogy and development from logophoric clause linkage (cf. W ä l c h l i 2000, 194–197). As for Construction II, the combination of inferential evidentiality with argument-demotion probably has to be treated as a parallel development starting from resultative participles derived from the past stem (*ta*-participle). By virtue of this

hypothesis the inferential reading of (“simultaneous”) *ma*-participles likewise must have arisen via analogy with the (“anterior”) *ta*-participles. If this line of reasoning is true it would explain why *ma*-participles are weaker carriers of inferential evidentiality than *ta*-participles (see comments on examples 2–4 above).

3. Aikhenvald’s framework

Equipped with some basic knowledge of grammatical evidentiality marking in Lithuanian, we are now in a position to evaluate this system on a broader typological basis. In what follows I try to briefly recapitulate those criteria elaborated on in Aikhenvald (2003; 2004) which are applicable to Lithuanian. A “wholesale” assessment on the basis of Aikhenvald’s criteria, however, which she applies to systems of grammatical evidentiality markers in areally and genetically diverse languages all over the globe, is not possible. Her criteria may nonetheless be used as a reference point for further comparison and a means of assessing degrees of grammaticalization. Here they help us to show the rather incomplete character of grammatical evidentiality marking in Lithuanian. The reader is reminded that only the standard language is taken into consideration.

3.1. Grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian has to be characterized as a system with only two choices, in which firsthand and non-firsthand experience¹² are opposed to each other. However the kind of non-firsthand information may further be divided into reported (→ Construction I) and inferential (→ Construction II), neither of which is an obligatory interpretation, and both of which have “epistemic overtones” (as is typical for indiscriminate evidentials; cf. Aikhenvald 2003, 12 and 2004 *passim*). Functional overlap of the two domains can hardly ever be observed (see 3.3).

It is a tricky question to decide whether the whole system belongs to Aikhenvald’s type A1 (‘Firsthand vs. Non-firsthand’) or to her type A2 (‘Non-firsthand vs. everything else’)¹³. Despite the more or less complementary functional distribution of Constructions

¹² To avoid confusion let me stress that the opposition ‘firsthand vs. non-firsthand experience’ is not identical to, but intersects with, the opposition of ‘personal vs. non-personal experience’. The former opposition distinguishes whether the speaker of the actual utterance has directly experienced (visually or by other senses) the state of affairs expressed, whereas within the latter opposition ‘personal’ includes situations in which the speaker experiences only traces of some anterior event(s) P, which allow him/her to infer that P has taken place, e.g., a fire-place which justifies the judgment *Toje vietoje būta žmonių*. GEN ‘At this place some people have been’. Thus, personal experience has a wider extension than firsthand experience; both intersect in the function of inferentials (cf. on this cross-cutting in Plungian 2001, 353, which he calls ‘Reflected evidence’). See also 3.7.

¹³ Aikhenvald’s classification of Lithuanian evidentials as belonging to type A3 (‘reported vs. everything else’) is probably a misunderstanding (cf. 2004, 238), which contradicts her own treatment of *ta/ma*-participles as inferentials.

I and II, it is certainly not a three-choice system (cf. type B1: ‘Direct, or Visual, vs. Inferred vs. Reported’), since the Lithuanian indicative cannot be characterized as an indicator of ‘Direct evidentiality’: it does not have a positive value, but is just a neutral choice without any implications for the value of evidentiality. For the same reason it is certainly most adequate to classify the Lithuanian system as belonging to type A2: the indicative cannot be ascribed a specific value in comparison to the evidential values associated with Constructions I and II. In other words: indicative forms and these constructions do not constitute an equipollent opposition, but a privative one. This conclusion is corroborated by the fact already commented on in the preceding section: the reported and inferential meanings are no stable values of Constructions I and II, respectively, but might better be characterized as an evidential extension of the perfect. This situation is comparable to the “Balkan type” evidential systems. There are, however, some important differences (see 3.4, 3.7 and section 4).

At this point, a further problem arises: since the two types of participle constructions tend to be complementarily distributed, should they not be considered as representing two (sub)systems? On the one hand, the answer to this question depends on our assumptions about their different diachronic and regional origins (which were briefly commented on in section 2). Taking into account the historical and dialectal background, we ought to treat them as separate systems. On the other hand, from a purely synchronic viewpoint, and restricting our attention to the standard language, both constructions can well be regarded as interacting within one system: they share the same domain of non-firsthand evidentiality by dividing it up into different core meanings (hearsay vs. inference-based judgments), and from the formal point of view they cannot be combined with each other, because the participles, so to speak, fill identical slots in the constructional frame that they constitute. As far as I can tell, Aikhenvald is not clear on how to deal with such cases. This may be due to the fact that evidentiality in Lithuanian is not marked by grams, or also to the fact that the non-firsthand evidential values arise as a result of a strategy, rather than as meanings firmly established in the grammar (see preceding sections).

3.2. This brings us to the next point. Another problematic fact is that the evidential functions of both constructions are parasitic on other grammatical categories and might probably best be considered as evidential strategies, i.e. as functional extensions of the system of perfect tenses and the so-called “impersonal passive” (*ta/ma*-participles), rather than as functionally independent paradigms. Aikhenvald discusses this analytical problem at length throughout her book (e.g., 2004, 38 f.). Lithuanian fits in with the general picture of (northern) Eurasian languages, in which ‘evidential perfects’ showing the entire range of non-firsthand meanings are quite common. Lithuanian differs from

other languages of this vast area only in distributing hearsay and inferential readings over two different constructions. A related problem is that neither of the two constructions is obligatory; the speaker is free to choose them or leave out grammatical coding of non-firsthand information. Thus, there is no clear paradigmatic opposition, which correlates with a lacking commitment on the part of the speaker as to the source of information. Consequently, the unmarked indicative forms (the perfect or the passive) likewise do not give any unambiguous clue as to whether or not the speaker has directly experienced the state of affairs expressed .

3.3. While Constructions I and II are commonly accompanied by an epistemic distance towards the veracity of the proposition conveyed by the utterance, it is questionable whether each construction extends its territory into the evidential subdomain covered by the other construction (cf. Wiemer, to appear 1, 3.3–3.4). With Construction II this happens only occasionally; if it bears inferential meaning, it does so as a rule without any additional implication of hearsay. Note, however, that *ta*-participles (past tense stem) may occur in utterances which refer to very remote periods of time; cf. one such example:

- (9) *Mindaugo* GEN *būta* *žiaurus* GEN.
 ‘Mindaugas is said to have been cruel.’
 (Duke Mindaugas is considered as the founder of the first Lithuanian state in the 13th century.)

As a consequence of the temporal distance between the related event (or state) and the time of utterance the inferential function weakens and the reported function comes to the fore. I am not aware of any appropriate example with a *ma*-participle (present tense stem). Notably, lack of extension into the domain of hearsay with this participle is in all likelihood due to its inherent time reference to a situation that is simultaneous with the speech act.

Despite an occasional hearsay-function, *ta*-participles are hardly ever used for purposes of narration. This clearly distinguishes them from active past participles (in *-ęs/-usi*; see ex. 1a–c, 7a), which are a typical feature of folklore, in particular of legends of origin. This genre forms a natural ‘bridge’ between reported and inferential evidential, for it easily serves as an “explanation” of why certain things have appeared (and are present at speech time).

As for active participles, i.e. Construction I, their hearsay function quite often carries epistemic overtones: in this case the speaker pragmatically implies that second-hand information is less trustworthy than information deriving from one’s own experience. However, this construction, as far as I can tell, does not show any extension into the inferential subdomain. Here arises another analytic problem: let us consider utterances like the following, in which the active past participle (*atvažiavęs* ‘he has arrived’,

išlaikiusi ‘she has passed’) can be understood as an indication of hearsay (at least if the copula *yra* ‘is’ is left out; see section 2), at the same time being within the scope of inferential adverbs like *turbūt* ‘must be, most probably, very likely’ or *matyt* ‘obviously, apparently’:

- (10) *Jonas turbūt jau (yra) atvažiavęs.*
 PN.NOM.M must_be already COP.PRS.3 arrive:PTC_PAST.NOM.SG.M
 ‘Jonas must have already arrived (as/since I have heard talking about it).’
- (11) *Matyt Žaneta (yra) išlaikiusi egzaminą.*
 obviously PN.NOM.F COP.PRS.3 pass:PTC_PAST.NOM.SG.F exam.ACC.SG
 ‘Žaneta obviously has passed her exam (as/since I have heard talking about it).’

Can we conclude that *turbūt* and *matyt* impose an inferential reading on the participle? Certainly not: although the scope of these adverbs with inferential meanings contains the participial predicate, inferential and reported evidential meanings do not contradict each other. They can thus occur in the same clause, one taking scope over the other. For instance, the speaker of (10) might suggest that he is not sure about Jonas’s arrival, but remembers that he has heard about it and therefore infers that Jonas has (i.e. must have) arrived. Likewise, the speaker of (11) has heard someone talking about Žaneta and her success in the exam and therefore feels inclined to infer (and to believe) that this is true.

The analytic problem hinted at above can be solved only through an empirical investigation of spontaneous interpretations given to such utterances in colloquial speech by native informants. Such utterances should be taken both from text corpora and from spontaneous speech.

3.4. Evidential readings of Constructions I and II (irrespective of whether or not they are regarded as strategies or grammatical meanings) are fused with tense – not however in the typologically more widespread sense of inflectional endings, but via stem derivation (see section 1). As usual in Baltic (and Slavic), past (or infinitive) and present tense are distinguished by morphological alternations in the stem itself; these correlate with separate sets of inflectional endings (for person and number) suffixed to these stems. Therefore, reported or inferential readings arise on this derivational basis, not by morphologization. This is particularly evident in the case of Construction II: its time reference depends on the stem suffixes *-t-* (→ anterior, past) vs. *-m-* (→ simultaneous, present), but not on an inflectional paradigm (which is absent because of the petrified forms of these participles). Thus, the *ta*-participle is linked to past time reference (implication of an anterior event/situation), just as in Bulgarian (and many other languages) evidentiality marking “is often distinguished just in past and/or perfect” (A i k h e n v a l d 2004, 263).

Note, however, that Bulgarian does not use a pattern like Construction II and can express evidential meanings only using active anteriority participles (with the *l*-suffix), which correspond to Construction I. Unlike in Bulgarian, evidentiality in Lithuanian – more precisely, Construction I – is not restricted to anteriority participles; in other words: it is not restricted by the paradigm of the perfect. There are two reasons for this: first, active participles distinguish tense by stem alternations (see ex. 1a–c), and second, Construction I, i.e. the syntactically independent use of active participles, partially arose via logophoric clause combining (see section 1), for which the relation between time of event and time of reported speech act may vary (see ex. 1a–c). This does not seem to have been the case in Bulgarian.

3.5. As concerns markedness relations, from the layout in sections 1–2 we can conclude that formal markedness is opposite to functional markedness: if we abstract away from the unclear paradigmatic oppositions (and speakers’ communicative commitments), we notice that the functionally marked member, reported or inferential (vs. direct) evidentiality, is said to be marked by a zero copula in the paradigm of the perfect.

3.6. Constructions I and II can of course be negated, but it is never the evidential value that gets under the scope of negation. In (12) and (13) respectively, neither the implied foreign speech act(s) nor the inference made by the actual speaker are negated:

(12) *Dainius nepardavęs savo namo.*

‘(It is said that) Dainius has not sold / did not sell his house.’

(13) *Dainiaus čia nesėdėta. (Kitaip jis būtų palikęs savo laikraštį.)*

‘Apparently Dainius has not sat here. (Otherwise he would have left his newspaper.)’

This seems to be a consequence of the fact that reported and inferential meanings are not marked by distinct morphemes (as it is in Aikhenvald’s examples, cf. 2004, 97 f.), but by constructions with conventionalized evidential implicatures.

3.7. Finally, a comparison of grammatical evidentiality marking in Lithuanian and Bulgarian reveals differences not only on the formal (paradigmatic) level (see 3.4), but also with regard to the relations between particular evidential functions and their possible implications for concomitant epistemic judgments. Whereas the Lithuanian Construction I, which is the formal equivalent of Bulgarian ‘preizkaznite formi’, appears to be basically restricted to hearsay, the Bulgarian perfect forms represent a typical case of a general ‘non-firsthand’ evidential; i.e. they do not discriminate between an inferential and a hearsay meaning. This seems to be a consequence of the existence of Construction II in Lithuanian, which takes over the complementary function of an inferential and which lacks a formal equivalent in Bulgarian.

According to Plungian (2001, 353–355) the Bulgarian system focusses on the functional opposition [\pm personal evidence], with the value [+ personal] including

Aikhenvald's 'non-firsthand' insofar as it is based on inferences and reasoning (but not hearsay). If this can be accepted, the reported function of Bulgarian 'preizkaznite formi' would have to be considered as a mere extension of a basic inferential value associated with these forms. By contrast, the Lithuanian constructions partition a domain which is covered by Plungian's [+ indirect evidence] (= Aikhenvald's 'non-firsthand'). Plungian would predict that an admirative function can be acquired only by an indiscriminate non-firsthand marker (as, for instance, by the Bulgarian forms), whereas markers having a hearsay, but not an inferential function would not show such a polysemy. Lithuanian is a clear counterexample to this prediction, since both constructions are encountered in admirative uses; even those active participles which do not belong to the perfect paradigm appear in such a context (cf. Wiemer, to appear 1, 3.2).

4. Conclusions concerning grammaticalization and typological comparison

Grammaticalization of evidentiality in Lithuanian has not progressed very far, at least in terms of obligatoriness, functional accuracy and – in particular with regard to Construction I – in terms of paradigmatic distinctiveness. The latter means that evidential functions of both constructions can be considered to be parasitic on at least one other verbal category in Lithuanian grammar: on the perfect and, as far as Construction II is concerned, on productive argument-demotion ("impersonal passive"). Note, however, that Construction I is not entirely confined to the perfect paradigm, insofar as active participles of all tense stems can feed it. There are also no restrictions on the argument structure, actionality or other lexical properties of the verb stems capable of entering into this construction. As for Construction II, there are some obvious restrictions, in particular with regard to argument structure and argument realization (see section 1). This, however, is an issue that remains to be investigated in more thorough future research (cf. Wiemer, to appear 2).

Although both participle constructions show a more or less complementary distribution with regard to the domain of non-firsthand evidentiality ('inferential' vs. 'reported' according to Aikhenvald 2003; 2004, 'reflected' vs. 'mediated' according to Plungian 2001), their use is often accompanied by non-evidential meanings: first of all, both of them often show epistemic overtones, and they may be used as admiratives ("counter-expectation markers"). In fact, both constructions appear to be on the verge between evidential discourse-strategies and grammaticalized meanings of morphosyntactic patterns. In addition to not being obligatory, in the contemporary standard language their use is restricted to certain discourse genres (in particular, folklore and some publicistic genres).

Although the Lithuanian way of marking evidentiality by grammatical means shows many features commonly known elsewhere, especially in Northern Eurasia, both in terms of structure and in terms of functional indiscriminateness and intersection (or syncretism) with other verbal categories of the language, it seems to be peculiar in at least one respect: there are two, not only one, participial paradigms which constitute the core of discourse strategies that is in the process of developing towards grammatical evidential markers. In the light of what was said above the Lithuanian system should thus be characterized as being somehow intermediate between the system of Latvian (the language closest to Lithuanian in both genetic and areal terms) and the system of Bulgarian (and some other Balkan languages). Both have only one set of forms, but Latvian focuses on hearsay, whereas Bulgarian has a rather indiscriminate non-firsthand marking device, based on the same kind of paradigm. Neither of them has an equivalent of Lithuanian Construction II (“evidential passive”), which in turn can be encountered in a couple of other languages outside Europe (cf. A i k h e n v a l d 2004, 116 f.). It may be for this reason that P l u n g i a n’s (2001) classification does not easily accommodate Lithuanian (following his argument, it would belong neither to “Latvian-type” languages, in which only a reported evidential is developed, nor to the “Balkan type” with its strongly “modalized evidential systems”). Neither does Aikhenvald’s typology give a clear answer to the question where the Lithuanian system belongs (see 3.1). There are at least two reasons why it should not be considered as a three-choice system (type B1): first, because of the privative (non-equipollent) nature of the formal distinctions between ‘direct’, ‘inferential’, and ‘reported’ (with the indicative as the unmarked member), and second, because both constructions relevant to the discussion have to a large degree preserved their character of a discourse strategy. At present we can only speculate as to whether this instable system will become more conventionalized and independent, e.g., of lexical reinforcing (not discussed here), whether it will retreat, or simply remain as it is.

Abbreviations (in morphological comments)

PTC_PAST, _PRS, _FUT	past, present, future participle
PTC_T, PTC_M	<i>ta-</i> , <i>ma-</i> participle
PAST, PRS, FUT	past, present, future (finite forms)
COP	copula
3	third person
NOM, GEN, ACC, LOC	nominative, genitive, accusative, locative case
SG, PL	singular, plural
F, M	feminine, masculine gender
NEUT	gender-neutral form (predicative)
PN	proper name

LIETUVIŲ KALBOS EVIDENCIALUMO GRAMATINĖ RAIŠKA (TIPOLOGINIS POŽIŪRIS)

Santrauka

Straipsnyje apžvelgiamos ir įvertinamos tipologiškai lietuvių kalbos gramatinės priemonės evidencialumui reikšti. Apsiribota bendrine kalba. Evidencialumas suprantamas kaip visuma reikšmių, rodančių šaltinį ar pagrindą, kuriuo kalbėtojas remiasi perteikdamas informaciją. Nuo evidencialumo skirtinas episteminis modalumas (kaip kalbėtojas vertina informaciją). Lietuvių kalboje evidencialumui reikšti vartojamos dviejų tipų dalyvinės konstrukcijos, kurių vienai būdinga perpasakojamoji (*ang. hearsay*), kitai – inferentinė funkcija. Tačiau abi konstrukcijos dažnai pasižymi papildomomis episteminėmis funkcijomis – paprastai kalbėtojo abejonės informacijos patikimumu.

Lietuvių kalbos dalyviai patys savaime evidencialumo reikšmės neturi; ji išryškėja tikrai tam tikrose konstrukcijose, kurių branduolį sudaro dalyviai. Todėl galima teigti, kad lietuvių (bendrinėje) kalboje nėra specialių morfologinių priemonių evidencialumui žymėti. Be to, evidencialumo reikšmė visai nėra būtina net ir tam tikrose dalyvinėse konstrukcijose; ji vyrauja tik kai kuriuose kalbos stiliuose – tautosakoje ir publicistikoje. Galų gale, dalyvinės konstrukcijos tarsi šliejasi prie kitų gramatinių kategorijų (perfekto ir argumentų sumažinimo būdų, *ang. argument demotion*), kurių paradigmų pagrindą sudaro tie patys dalyviai.

Straipsnyje lietuvių kalbos konstrukcijos evidencialumui žymėti lyginamos su bulgarų kalbos perfektu, nuo kurio lietuvių kalbos perfektas skiriasi pagrindine perpasakojamąja funkcija, „nesikertančia“ su inferentine funkcija. Apskritai lietuvių kalbos sistema dėl opozicijos, neturinčios atitiktens bulgarų kalboje, su *-ta/-ma-* dalyvių konstrukcija pasižymi kiek skirtingais formų ir reikšmių santykiais. Tačiau ir bulgarų, ir lietuvių kalbos kategorijos silpnai skiriasi nuo episteminio modalumo.

Lietuvių kalbos evidencialumo gramatinės raiškos sistema, palyginti su kitomis Eurazijos kalbomis, turinčiomis ne visai sugramatintą šios kategorijos sistemą, išsiskiria tuo, kad evidencialumas žymimas dviem priemonėmis, o ne viena.

REFERENCES

- A i k h e n v a l d A. Y., 2003, Evidentiality in typological perspective, – Studies in evidentiality, eds. A. Y. Aikhenvald, R. M. W. Dixon, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1–31.
- A i k h e n v a l d A. Y., 2004, Evidentiality, Oxford, etc.
- A m b r a z a s 1990 – В. Амбразас, Сравнительный синтаксис причастий балтийских языков, Vilnius.
- B y b e e J., Ö D a h l, 1989, The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world, – Studies in Language, XIII (1), 51–103.
- B y b e e et al., 1994 – J. Bybee, R. Perkins, W. Pagliuca, The evolution of grammar (Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world), Chicago, London.
- D a h l Ö., 2000, The tense-aspect systems of European languages in a typological perspective, – Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe, ed. Ö. Dahl, Berlin, New York, 3–25.
- d e H a a n F., 1999, Evidentiality and epistemic modality: Setting boundaries, – Southwest Journal of Linguistics, XVIII, 83–101.
- P l u n g i a n V. A., 2001, The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space, – Journal of Pragmatics, XXXIII, 349–357.

Roszkó R., 1993, Wykładniki modalności imperceptywnej w języku polskim i litewskim, Warszawa.

Wälchli B., 2000, Infinite predication as a marker of evidentiality and modality in the languages of the Baltic region, – Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung, LIV (3), 186–210.

Wiemer B., 1998, Pragmatical inferences at the threshold to grammaticalization – The case of Lithuanian predicative participles and their functions, – Linguistica Baltica, VII, 229–243.

Wiemer B., 2001, Partizipien zwischen Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik: Ein Überblick zu aspektuellen, diathesebezogenen und diskursrelevanten Eigenschaften im modernen Litauischen, – Sprachbeschreibung & Typologie (Publikation zum Workshop vom 16. Dezember 2000 in Bern). Arbeitspapiere 38, eds. B. Wälchli, F. Zúñiga, Bern, 65–81.

Wiemer B., 2005, Conceptual affinities and diachronic relationships between epistemic, inferential and quotative functions (preliminary observations on lexical markers in Russian, Polish and Lithuanian), – Modality in Slavonic languages. New perspectives, eds. B. Hansen, P. Karlík, München, 107–131.

Wiemer B., (to appear 1), Косвенная засвидетельствованность в литовском языке, – Типология косвенной засвидетельствованности, ред. В. С. Храковский, Санкт-Петербург.

Wiemer B., (to appear 2), Relations between Actor-demoting devices in Lithuanian, – Passive insights across, eds. W. Abraham, L. Leisiö, Amsterdam, Philadelphia.

Björn WIEMER
Universität Konstanz
FB Sprachwissenschaft / Slavistik
Postfach 55 60, D 179
D-78457 Konstanz
Deutschland
[bjoern.wiemer@uni-konstanz.de]