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

**Björn Wiemer**  
University of Mainz

From the syntactic point of view, *esq* 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 *esq* 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, *esq* 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 and 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 *esq* 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 *esq* as results of lexicalization. The rest of the study is devoted to a comparison of *esq* 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.
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0. **Introduction**

Lith. *esq* 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 *esq*, which interests us here, represents the former neuter gender:
(1) \( bū-ti.\text{INF} \) ‘to be’  \( \Rightarrow es-q-s, es-\text{ant-is}.\text{NOM.SG.M} \)
\( es-an-ti.\text{NOM.SG.F} \)
\( es-q, es-\text{ant-ys}.\text{NOM.PL.M} \)
\( es-ančios.\text{NOM.PL.F} \)
\( \text{(} < *es-\text{antj-ös} \text{)} \)
\( *es-on(t).\text{NOM} = \text{ACC.N} \quad \text{†}es-\text{q}.N(\text{SG}) \quad > \quad esq \)

As a continuation of the otherwise extinct neuter form, \( esq \) 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), \( esq \) indicates hearsay and, thus, has to be considered as an evidential, more specifically, a reportive, marker.

In contemporary Lithuanian the form \( esq \), 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, \( esq \) 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. Beforehand, in section 3, I will dwell on the question of whether, and to which degree, \( esq \) 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 (-q/-antis, -q/-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 prieštarangi ir įvairūs.*
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.

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 nominatal 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 rimtai 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) **Jej 9–12 klasėje tiesiog brukami kontraceptikai, tai**

*tie, kuriems jų dar neprireikė,*

*those.NOM RP:DAT.PL.M they GEN yet NEGF:become_necessary.PAST.3 become.PRS.3 esq lyg ir nevykėliai.*

*become.pl.m* [Dienovis 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**


‘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 įsisamoninti, kad esi alkoholikas, o tai reiškia — est bejegis prieš alkoholį ir todėl negali jo vartoti. Suprantu, kai žmonės patys nori gydytis.**


‘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, —

both.NOM.M you.NOM.PL likewise stubbornly

assert.PRS.2 PL be:PTCP:NOM.PL.M sole.NOM.PL.M

Teigiate esą 

protingi, tačiau... [Dienvidis 1995/11]

‘Yes, — you both insistently STATE you are the only clever ones, but...’

(9) [...] Tad be galo džiugino tai, kai po mūsų renginių ar radijo, 

televisijos 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 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 \(esq\), 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 \(esq\) 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 \(esq\), 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 \(esq\) 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. \(Esq\) 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 \(esq\) 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-

---

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 pasiakė penki Steigiamojo seimo atstovai, iš kurių tik socialdemokratas

K. Venclauskis **SUABEJOJO, esą „negalima**

mažai žmonių grupė perduoti

Steigiamojo seimo teises“, jo nuomone, pilna

Constitutivne Parlamenәte.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. Paklausaiau, kaip auga anūkai. Ji atsakė anūkų nebeturinti. Perėjo per kūną šaltis, émiau galvoti, kas galėjo nutikti tokiems mieliams vaikams?

**Pastebėjusi mano akyse nuostabą buvusi**

neighbor.NOM.SG.F

---

⁶ I have not found any instances of esą with sentential complements of perception predicates. Indeed, such cases seem hardly imaginable; 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 ??Jas pasirodė / vaidenosi, esą [ = lyg ?] Jonas krito nuo medžio to mean ‘It seemed to him as if Jonas fell from a tree’ (→ perceptually based inferential?).
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.'
The Maestro ADMITS the music of the Genius [Mozart] was very beautiful to him in those days.'

(15) [...] O autoritetai — profesionalai architektai, paminklosau- 
gininkai, valdinkai, — užuot davę atkirtį tiems triukšmadariams, 
bando kažką įrodieti, atsikalbinėti ar try.PRS.3 something.ACC prove.INF, decline.INF or 
kvailai TEISINTIS, esq „tiltas ir stupidly justify.INF:RM HS_COMB bridge.NOM.SG.M and 
stovyklos — tai vienas ansamblis“.
camp.NOM.PL.F this.NEUT one ensemble.NOM.SG.M

[149x492] O autoritetai — profesionalai architektai, paminklosau-
gininkai, valdinkai, — užuot davę atkirtį tiems triukšmadariams, 
bando kažką įrodieti, atsikalbinėti ar try.PRS.3 something.ACC prove.INF, decline.INF or 
kvailai TEISINTIS, esq „tiltas ir stupidly justify.INF:RM HS_COMB bridge.NOM.SG.M and 
stovyklos — tai vienas ansamblis“.
camp.NOM.PL.F this.NEUT one ensemble.NOM.SG.M

‘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, esq instantly be:SBJV.1SG accuse:PTCP:NOM.SG.M HS_COMB 
ruošiuosi nešti nuo duobės prepare:PRS.1SG.RM carry.INF from pit.GEN.SG.F 
kudašį ir mandatą... oit [Dienovidas 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 reals supposition, e.g. by modal auxiliaries (e.g., galima, dera pasakyti) or verbs with an equivalent causative meaning (neigalina 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 moderniai kardiologijos aparatūrai įsigyti turėjo padėti kredito linija iš Šveicarijos. Galėjo būti vienas sėkmingesnių mokslo projektų, dej...

Vieno miesto dienraštyje

(18) Pasakotojo TVIRTINIMA, esą jam

"vis dar rodosi", —

all the time appear.PRS.3

‘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 TVIRTINIMA, esą jam

narrator.GEN.SG.M assertion.ACC.SG.M HS_REL him.DAT

„vis dar rodosi“, —

all the_time appear.PRS.3
In a sense, esq here fulfills the function of a relativizer. However, this function cannot be generalized, since esq 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 esq 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
‘(...) 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. esq 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). Together 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 common 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, nubreukiančių visa, kas buvo sukurtas 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 [...]. handful.DAT.SG.F

\[\text{[Lituanistika 1995/3]}\]

‘Cultural continuity has become problematic. The issue of traditions has arisen. Voices have been heard sympathizing with the leftist Bolshevisim, 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 conjunct (…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 deginavo tik Kurše ir Vidžemėje. Šias apeigas,
tarp ju ir Kalédų išvakarių, mini nemaža šaltinių. Seniausias iš
ju — įrašas Limbadžių bažnyčios 1609 m. vizitacijos protokole.
Ten rašoma: „Daugelis Kalėdų vakare deda į ugniakurus didėles,
storas trinkas, o
kas nuo jų lieka, saugoja
what. NOM from them. GEN remain.PRS.3 save.PRS.3
ir užšukia audros metu, esq
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 esq [„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.’
Ir ženšenio eliksyras, bičių pienelis, ištirpdytas Tibeto žolių antpile, šaltalankio aliejus, gudobelių ekstraktas, regis, šiandien nublanksta prieš visokiausius “drinkus” iš Europos nusenusių produktų ir gėrimų sąvartyno.

Vienas iš tokių energijos drinkų plačiai reklamuojamas gėrimas, esą [iš Austrijos].

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 obscured 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


‘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 following instances:

(25) Mokslo teorija praplečia mūsų žinias, leidžia suprasti tai, ko antraip nesuprastume ir nežinotume. Dorovės teorijos lyg ir atlieka 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 percepčijas.

Teorija šiuos nujautimus, arba pirminius įvertinimus, apibendrina, suteikia jiems racionalų pagrindą ir, esą, arba nustato, kas darytina ateityje panašionis 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 correspondences, 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 paaškintų anomalius atvejus. Nepaisant nesėkmų, ilgai buvo viliamasi, kad netrukus bus pašalintos likusios klūtys;
esą, reikia tik kai ką

‘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)\(^\text{10}\):

(27) *Naugardo kunigaikštis* Aleksandras Nevskis […] XIII a.  
PN:GEN duke: NOM.SG.M PN:NOM.M 13th c.  
viduryje *esq* „per keletą dienų* 
middle.LOC HS: PTC through a: couple: ACC day: GEN.PL  
septynis kartus nugalėjo lietuvius,  
o jo kariai, koneveikdami belaisvius, raišiojo juos prie arkių 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, *esq* can be easily discerned if it goes together with a conjunction (28) or a relative pronoun (29, see also ex. 21)\(^\text{11}\) since the latter ones then fulfill the conjunctive function:

(28) *Kaip savo burvaltes seniau vadino Kuršių nerijos žvejai — kopininkai — 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 *esq* Kuršmarių žvejai  
valtimis“. *Tačiau niekur kitio pavadinimo rasti neteko.*  
boat: INS: PL: F  
[Mokslas ir gyvenimas 1995/10]

\(\text{10}\) In this respect ex. (21) is particularly interesting: here *esq* 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.

\(\text{11}\) Usually *esq* 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), esq 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 esq raises problems, at least from an analytic perspective. In fact, corpus data abound in cases in which the syntactic status of esq 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. 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 sakę, 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 esą yet
nebaigtį jo pradėti

12 In Valskys (2002, 33) esą as a function word has rather indiscriminately been regarded as a “modal particle” (“modalinė dalėlytė”) despite some doubtful cases as well as cases in which esą evidently functions as complementizer or copula.
Does esą function here as a copula or particle? If we treat it as a copula, we must also assume that esą 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 esą, 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 esą 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\(^\text{13}\) 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.\(^\text{14}\)

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).\(^\text{15}\) 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.’


(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’ (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 ulus.

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
visq lietuvį 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.
bet 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 nesq, the negative equivalent of esq, does not occur other than as a participle (see ex. 49) and is therefore irrelevant for the present discussion.

If from this background we return to our unit esq, 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 dvitiui „Poezija“ (1946).
Jame esq pervertinti
him.LOC HS_? exaggerate:PTCP:NOM.PL.M

---

18 For other examples cf. Ambrazas (2006, 146): Rugių nesq ‘There’s no rye, they say’ (Slm, Vkš); Pirktų šuva mėsą, tik piminę nesq ‘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
culture. GEN. SG. F development. DAT. SG. F
esą būdingi du etapai:
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 mokiniam). 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 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 esq 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, la-bai įtikinamai nušviečiau istorinę tiesą, tačiau ji (...) vis tiek į mano pasakojimus esq 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.’

Esq does not show agreement with the feminine participle žiūrėjusi ‘looked, as looking’. We can, therefore, qualify this token of esq 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, esq 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 skaitintojas kritikas Marselis Raichas-Ranickis savaitraštyje „Der Spiegel“ paskelbė atvirą laišką „brangiam Giunteriui Grasui“, kuriame dievagojosi, kad vis dar tebesižavi jo talentu,
bet esq 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* 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:


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 pristaikyti 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 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 socialistinis ekonominis lygis žemesnis, tol klaipėdiškiai lietuviai laikytasi didele garbe priklausyti vokiečių kultūrai, LINKSIĄ į Vokiečijos pusę. Klaipėdos krašto valstiečiai ir 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
Under this condition the chance that esq 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 esq 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:
In both cases esq 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 esq 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 Sajunga pažeidė susitarimą, ir Vokietija to neatleis.

(52) Similarly he, speaking after a sentence boundary: (52) Taigi, užimdama Lietuvą, Sovietų Sajunga pažeidė susitarimą, ir Vokietija to neatleis.

Of course, dots and other means of punctuation 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 context19.

---

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 sugrižimas į Lietuvą taip pat buvo labai mīslingas. Nežinia, kaip Voldemaras jiems aiškinosi pirmųjų tardymų metu, tačiau

Ordžonikidžėje 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

mėnesi išvykęs užsienin vien dėl

month.ACC leave:PTCP:NOM.SG.M abroad only for
to, kad

this.GEN COMP

galėtų pakreipti Lietuvos politiką Sovietų Sajungai 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 šventas, joms ruošdavosi, kartais net ilgai, ir visos brandos šventės vieną ar kitaip siedavosi su skausmu, įtampa. Dabar mes stengiamės vaikus atriboti ir nuo skausmo, ir nuo įtampos: esą both from pain.GEN.M and from tension.GEN.F HS_?

egzaminai traumatize

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 maturity 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 examinations 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 effort 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:


‘In addition, there is another version of Krèvè-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, it was allegedly suggested to Voldemaras that he return, but he disagreed.

The clause which starts with esą 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 esą could be ‘attached’ syntactically. Such conditions, which detach esą 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 esą 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 esą was uttered. Compare (55) once more: esą only signals that there has been (or can be imagined to have been) a previous utterance containing the proposition in esą’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, esą 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 esą 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 mandagų vairuotojų Lietuvos keliose 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 esą, and in which status esą 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 esą being some kind or other of uninflected function word (complementizer, particle) which has become isolated from its former paradigm, and esą as a regular participle integrated into that paradigm (see Introduction). We might further assume that this demarcation tightly correlates with esą not carrying reportive meaning by itself (→ regular participle) vs. esą 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) esą, which must have incorporated this meaning; otherwise we could not explain why, in a context containing the particle esą 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), esą 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 esą 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 esą 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 esą 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 esą 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, esą 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 esą 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 esą 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 esą 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 esą as regular participle and esą 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 esą 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 esą unambiguously serves as a hearsay indicator. Now, in (25-26), where esą is used as a particle, the author only mentions some theories (dorovės teorijos) and it is up to the recipient to infer that esą 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 viliaması ‘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 esą. These two instances in which esą has very different morphosyntactic status (inflected participle vs. particle) show that, regardless of its status, esą 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 esą 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 esą 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 esą in terms of grammar and the lexicon.

Returning now to that perspective, I want to stress that as a complementizer and particle esą becomes a new lexical unit (or even two such units; see Wiemer, forthcoming2). The changes that have led to the exploitation of esą 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.” Esą 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 fossilization23, so that a new unit entered the lexical stock of Lithuanian. But where are the ‘more comprehensive signs’ in the formation of which esą 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 cri-
teron of grammaticalization, as it occurs in lexical change as well; 
nor is subjectification such a criterion\textsuperscript{24}. But even if we accepted an 
crease of abstractness of meaning as an exclusive criterion of gram-
maticalization, 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 com-
plementizer more abstract than the verb būti ‘to be’, which this form 
belds 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 
ify 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 complement-
tizer 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 
inte into paradigms? Certainly not. This is the difference between, 
for instance, an inflectional ending or a slot in a serial verb construc-
tion, 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’ < 
\emph{des de}, bajo ‘below’ < \emph{baxo de}) and conjunctions (like \emph{en la medida en} 
que ‘to the extent that’, \emph{después de que} ‘after’). The structural scope of 

\footnote{\textsuperscript{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. *esą* 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 *esą*:

(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. *esą* both in terms of the source verb (‘to be’) and the grammatical form (participle, originally neuter; see 1), namely: *esot*. See, for instance
Compare this with the same meaning in Lith. Jis esq 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. esq (< †es-q; see Introduction). But contrary to Lith. esq, 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):

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

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,
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)-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. *esq* (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. *esq* 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 $e\gamma e\rho r$ 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 $e\gamma e\rho r$ 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 $e\gamma e\rho r$ formally derives from the participle used for the analytic perfect while Lith. $e\sigma q$ goes back to the paradigm of present active participles. Apart from that, $e\gamma e\rho r$ 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. $e\gamma e\rho r$, 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. $e\sigma q$ 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) \[ Viņš \quad *it kā \quad ir \quad slims. \]
\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{he.NOM} & \text{COP.PRS.3} & \text{ill.NOM.SG.M} \\
\end{array} \]

‘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. *esą* (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 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) \[ *Viņš \quad TEICA, \quad KA \quad *it kā \quad ir \quad slims. \]
\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{he.NOM} & \text{assert.PRS.3} & \text{COP.PRS.3} & \text{ill.NOM.SG.M} \\
\end{array} \]

to mean ‘He SAYS/CLAIMS THAT s/he **allegedly/apparently** is ill.’

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

(61a) \[ Jis \quad teigia, \quad kad \quad *esą* \quad serga. \]
\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{he.NOM} & \text{claim.PRS.3} & \text{HS_PTC} & \text{be_ill.PRS.3} \\
\end{array} \]

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, esą 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 esą as a particle in a complement of a speech verb. This (very preliminary!) observation might justify the assumption that the syntactic ‘versatility’ of esą 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 DIRĪĢĒJOT 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. esą would be impossible, but also Pol. jakoby (and all the more its Russian cognate jákoby) 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. esq.

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 repor tive 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, 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 młodsze 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 Stepień (2008, 328).
nie kochała swego miasta... (Stolica 10/1962)

‘It would be an error to assume that the young people aged 17–18 don’t love their town.’

(66) Platforma Obywatelska [...] twierdzi, jakoby

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

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. 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. esq: as shown in section 2.3 and 3, esq 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), esą 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 (esą), 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 esą used as particle, but it is typical (maybe even exclusive; see f. 6) already for esą 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
Lithuanian esq — a heterosemic reportive marker in its contemporary stage

can be accessed only holistically; we may abbreviate this sort of unit as SAYC. Compare Rom. cică < zice că, Sp. disque < 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-duce 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, forthcoming, 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 esą on a lexicon—grammar cline, I have tried to determine the semantic potential of esą 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*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Esą</th>
<th>(A) reference to original speaker</th>
<th>(B) nature of speech event</th>
<th>(C) scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. particle</td>
<td>concrete-specific, unanimous or generic (depending on context)</td>
<td>propositional content, literal quote, semiotic substitute of speech</td>
<td>propositional but variable (can be narrowed to adjuncts or NP-internal attributes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To properties (A–C) we should add that (D) only as a copula (or existential predicate) and as a particle can esą 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 esą 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 esą 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) Esą 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). 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 esq interacts with other evidential markers (or these among each other).

Taken together, these properties yield a profile of esq 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 esq, but also and moreover in the sense that esq seems to have neither any such ‘match’ in immediately genealogically and/or areally related languages, nor against a broader European background. Lith. esq 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 esq

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>etymology and grammatical provenance</th>
<th>heterosemy? (as function word)</th>
<th>range of evidential functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>closest equivalents in terms of etymology and grammatical provenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latv. esot</td>
<td>participle of ‘be’</td>
<td>(no)*: only as participle (copula + auxiliary) without case inflection</td>
<td>only reportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. olevat</td>
<td>participle of ‘be’</td>
<td>no: only as particle</td>
<td>general indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.Arm. eγer</td>
<td>participle of ‘be’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>etymology and grammatical provenance</th>
<th>heterosemy? (as function word)</th>
<th>range of evidential functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georg. turme</td>
<td>‘if’ + ‘a little’ + INDEF</td>
<td>no: only as particle</td>
<td>general indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lith. neva</td>
<td>comparison + demonstrative particle</td>
<td>yes: as complementizer and particle</td>
<td>general indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. jakoby</td>
<td>comparison + subjunctive marker</td>
<td>yes: as complementizer and particle</td>
<td>general indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ. jākoby</td>
<td>comparison + [IMP.SG of ‘be’ + particle]</td>
<td>(yes): as particle, obsolete as complementizer</td>
<td>only reportive (inferential is obsolete)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ. kak budto</td>
<td>comparison + [IMP.SG of ‘be’ + particle]</td>
<td>yes: as complementizer and particle</td>
<td>general indirect (no reportive function as particle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ. budto by</td>
<td>[IMP.SG of ‘be’ + particle] + subjunctive marker</td>
<td>as complementizer and particle</td>
<td>general indirect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3SG PRESENT of ‘say’ + complementizer</th>
<th>no: only as particle</th>
<th>only reportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romance (except French)</td>
<td>narat + chi ‘tells that’</td>
<td>yes: as particle and predicative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sard. nachi</td>
<td>zice + că ‘says that’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom. cică</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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.
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