

Electronic offprint from
NICOLE NAU,
NORBERT OSTROWSKI, eds.,

Particles and Connectives in Baltic

Vilniaus universitetas
& Asociacija "Academia Salensis"
Vilnius, 2010

(= Acta Salensia, 2)

ISBN 978-609-95126-1-7
ISSN 2029-2880

Background and perspectives for the study of particles and connectives in Baltic languages

0. Introduction

The present volume contains contributions to a field of study that has become the subject of increasing interest in various branches of linguistics during the last two decades. However, most of the research devoted to various kinds of particles and connectives that is discussed on an international level considers only a small part of European languages: Germanic languages, especially English, German, and Dutch, followed by Romance and, more sporadically, Slavic languages. If data from Baltic languages are lacking in this discussion, it is certainly not that these languages have nothing to offer. On the contrary — Lithuanian, Latvian, and Latgalian are comparatively rich in “small words” with pragmatic or linking functions, and their synchronic and diachronic investigation reveals many interesting facts that are relevant also outside of Baltic philology. One of the purposes of this volume is to make Baltic data more easily accessible to linguists from other fields. In addition, scholars of Baltic languages may profit from the general discussion and from research carried out on other languages, as these will open new perspectives for both diachronic and synchronic studies.

We will begin this introduction with a short overview of existing studies on conjunctions and particles in Lithuanian and Latvian. In section 2 we will describe some (but surely not all) of the approaches to particles and connectives that are reflected in recent contributions by scholars of other languages

or written with a general perspective. This section shall also serve as a guide to the terminology used — unfortunately, often inconsistently — in this field. In section 3 we will discuss some questions concerning the origin and development of Baltic connectives and particles. The final section 4 will present the articles contained in this volume and pose some questions for further research.

1. Previous studies of conjunctions and particles in Lithuanian and Latvian

Stating that the topic of this volume has been (too) little studied in Baltic linguistics, we are of course not claiming that it is totally new or has not been investigated at all. Important contributions have been made to this topic for over a century. Concerning the history of Lithuanian conjunctions we refer to Drotvinas (1958; 1964; 1967; 1968a; 1968b) and more recent contributions by Judžentis (2002), Judžentis & Pajėdienė (2001, 2005a, 2005b) and Kibildaitė (2001). The focus of these studies is on the synchronic description of constructions in Old Lithuanian. The origin and development of Lithuanian particles and connectives is the subject of older studies that haven't lost their relevance: in the first place the two monographs written by Hermann (1912; 1926), but also shorter contributions by Leskien (1903) and Fraenkel (1926; 1933; 1935/37). Some recent diachronic studies are Lühr (1995, 1998), Ostrowski (2008, 2009), Petit (2009), Judžentis (2009, 2010) and Ambrazas (2006). The latter also presents a synthesis of hypotheses put forward so far. For the synchronic description of particles and connectives in Modern Lithuanian the first reference is the comprehensive grammars of Lithuanian: a lot of interesting material can be found in the second volume of *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika* (Ulvydas 1971), while Ambrazas *et al.* (1997) present overviews of Lithuanian conjunctions and particles in English. For more special contributions see articles by Holvoet

contained in Holvoet & Judžentis (2003) on clause-linking in Modern Lithuanian, Wiemer (2007; 2010) on evidential particles. In all studies mentioned the linguistic variety investigated is the (written) standard language. Particles and connectives in dialects are still “terra incognita”, and so are Lithuanian texts of the 18th and 19th c.

Concerning Latvian, the first author to mention is August Bielenstein, who devotes more than 40 pages of his grammar to conjunctions and (focus) particles. His description contains data and insights that are still important for modern researchers (Bielenstein 1864, II, 338–380). Worth mentioning is also the respective chapter in Bielenstein’s shorter grammar (Bielenstein 1863: 388–411, xiv. *Conjunctionen und Hervorhebungspartikeln*). In Kārlis Mühlenbach’s early monograph on the sentence in Latvian (1898, reprint Mīlenbahs 2009) several points of Bielenstein’s description and etymologies are discussed and new thoughts added. Bielenstein’s and Mühlenbach’s works are also the main sources for the treatment of particles and connectives in Endzelin’s grammar (Endzelin 1922). During the 20th century Latvian research on function words paid special attention to their proper categorization and was also concerned with questions of standardization. This is reflected in the treatment of these words in grammars and dictionaries (for example Kalme 2001). There is much less diachronic or historical research on Latvian than on Lithuanian. The state of the art of Latvian research on particles and connectives, with a focus on their use in written sources from the 16th to the 20th century, is documented in the recent volume on the history of indeclinable words (Pokrotņiece 2007), with two separate chapters on conjunctions (Blinkena 2007) and particles (Porīte 2007; this chapter was written about 25 years earlier).

2. New approaches and changing terminology in studies of particles and connectives

The two terms appearing in the title of this volume are broad, and they have often been used with different meanings¹. Rather than propose our definition of these terms, we will here review some of the terminology found in the literature and briefly characterize the approaches where this terminology is used. It should be noted right from the beginning that in most approaches, “particles” and “connectives” do not refer to mutually exclusive classes — some particles are also connectives. In some lines of 20th c. traditional or structuralism-inspired descriptive grammar, the labels “particle” and “conjunction” are used for word-classes in a taxonomy where each class is distinguished from others by at least one necessary and sufficient criterion (this tradition is still vital in Latvian and Lithuanian linguistics). Older grammars and dictionaries often use “particle” as a cover term for various function words, so that conjunctions are treated as a special kind of particle (for example in the terminology used in Endzelin 1922). Some recent grammars of European languages have returned to this use, such as the new comprehensive grammar of Finnish (Hakulinen et al. 2004), where conjunctions (*konjunktiot*) are one of eight classes of particles (*partikkelit*).

2.1 From “conjunction” to “connective”

With the advancement of syntactic studies the traditional category CONJUNCTION has been challenged, modified, or completely abandoned by linguists of different persuasion. At the base of these processes are alternative views on different types of clause linkage and their mutual relationship. While traditional grammar distinguished mainly between coordination and subordination,

¹ Terminological confusion is nothing new in linguistics, cf. Kroon (1995: 3): “Ever since the term particle was introduced in ancient rhetorical and grammatical theory it has been used quite loosely and for a number of different phenomena”.

some modern approaches make a fundamental distinction between complementation and adverbial subordination. In these approaches the element that links a complement clause to the main clause (more precisely to the complement taking predicate) is called a *COMPLEMENTIZER*, while for clause-linking devices used in adverbial clauses the term (*ADVERBIAL*) *SUBORDINATOR* is used². There are various arguments for this division, some are language-specific (see for example Pasch 1994 for German), some are more general. Complement clauses are semantic and syntactic arguments of the complement taking predicate. Furthermore, in complementation (as in relativization) the subordinated clause and the main clause are two parts of one proposition, while in adverbial subordination and in coordination there are two independent propositions. A third type of clause-linkers are *COORDINATIVE CONJUNCTIONS* (or *COORDINATORS*) such as *and*, *but*; this term has about the same meaning in traditional and modern approaches. There are also linguists that continue to use the term *CONJUNCTION* for both subordinators and coordinators, in distinction to complementizers.

Some scholars treat coordination of clauses, adverbial subordination, complement clauses, and relative clauses as four different kinds of clause-linkage (for example Croft 2001, see below; for Lithuanian see Holvoet & Judžentis 2003, 2003a), but others group two or three of these constructions together — in various ways. Traditional grammar has a concept of subordinate clause comprising adverbial subordination, complement clauses and relative clauses. Functional approaches to grammar often group adverbial subordination and coordination of clauses together under the notion *CLAUSE-COMBINING* (as against *EMBEDDING*) (Halliday 1994; Dixon 2006), and acknowledge that the distinction between subordination and coordination may be blurred. The latter point has been discussed quite extensively

² In German terminology we find *Subordinator* along *Subjunktion* and *Subjunktör*.

in linguistics since the 1980s, see Fabricius-Hansen & Ramm (2008) for an overview.

The distinction of the categories complementizer, subordinator, and coordinator, is based on the distinction between the constructions in which these elements are used. It is however questionable whether it is wise to make these syntactic criteria the base for distinguishing LEXICAL categories (word-classes). It is not unusual, to say the least, that a given lexical element is used in more than one of these functions, as well as in functions beyond clause-linkage. Famous examples from English are words like *since* that appear in syntactic positions characteristic for subordinators (*she was unhappy since he left*), prepositions (*he was unhappy since their divorce*), and adverbs (*they have been unhappy ever since*). It is unsatisfying to postulate three different lexemes in these cases and ignore what they have in common. Formal approaches to grammar deal with this problem by paying less attention to the categorization of lexical items, and by establishing larger classes — for example, in generative grammar prepositions and adverbial subordinators are both instances of the category P³. Functional and cognitive approaches often use continua and/or prototypes to account for the fact that the borders of linguistic categories are not always neat and that there may be “cases in between”. Analyzing different types of clause-linkage and their relationships, Croft (2001) postulates a conceptual space “continuum of complex sentence types”, which he visualizes by a square with the four corners coordination, adverbial clauses, complements and relative clauses. Constructions in individual languages tend to correspond to one of the corner constructions, but they may also fall into one of the six regions in between any two of the four corners (Croft 2001: 322–328). But if the constructions themselves are not neatly distinguished, isn’t their use for defining lexical categories even more limited?

³ See Kortmann (1997: 24–28) for a critical survey of the treatment of adverbial subordinators in generative grammar.

In his book on adverbial subordinators in European languages, Kortmann (1997) demonstrates how the functional approach can cope with this dilemma. He first establishes “multi-level category continua”, where adverbial subordinators are posited between complementizers and relativizers on the one hand, and between adpositions and adverbs on the other hand, with the opposite pole of coordinators in a third continuum. The labeled points on the continua “should be viewed as prototypical concepts” (Kortmann 1997: 59), thus allowing for non-prototypical cases that resemble the prototypes only in some respects. In a second step, the category that is the object of Kortmann’s cross-linguistic investigation is determined by concrete defining criteria for the “ideal” adverbial subordinator — linguistic elements that match the prototype —, which allows for listing the corresponding items in individual languages (71–76). Kortmann’s definition combines syntactic and morphological criteria. This approach shows, *inter alia*, that a lexical category (a class of lexical elements) is better defined by more than the syntactic position the elements belonging to the category (may) take. By using such criteria and the concept of prototype or “ideal”, Kortmann manages to establish SUBORDINATOR as a lexical class whose members can be identified cross-linguistically, at least in European languages.

While the split of the traditional category conjunction into complementizer, subordinator, and coordinator was motivated by studies within the field of syntax (in a more narrow sense), text linguistics and pragmatics brought about the need for a broader concept of elements connecting parts of text. Such elements were called CONNECTIVES⁴ and defined as “one-word items or fixed word combinations that express the relation between clauses, sentences, or utterances in the discourse of a particular speaker” (Pander Maat & Sanders 2006: 33; a similar definition is

⁴ *Connective* is commonly used in English, while in German *Konnektor* is more common than *Konnektiv*.

given in Fabricius-Hansen 2000: 331). Connectives thus include the traditional conjunctions, but also words traditionally classified as adverbs or particles, such as English *however*, *therefore*, *in fact*, *so* and their counterparts in many European languages. What unites connectives is their function (“express the relation between clauses...”) and their morphological status (“one-word items or fixed word combinations”), but with respect to syntax they may behave quite differently — “connective” is definitely NOT a syntactic category, but neither is it a lexical category. The authors of the *Handbuch deutscher Konnektoren* (Pasch *et al.* 2003) explicitly state that *Konnektor* in their understanding is not a word-class in the traditional sense of part-of-speech, but a functionally motivated category — it is a FUNCTION that can be filled out by elements of various morphosyntactically defined parts-of-speech (Pasch *et al.* 2003: 38–39)⁵. Comprehensive work on connectives in a single language, their syntactic subclasses and their semantics has been carried out in Germany (see especially Pasch *et al.* 2003; Blühdorn *et al.* 2004).

2.2 From “particle” to “discourse marker”

German linguists (on both sides of the Iron Curtain) were also among the first to systematically explore the category PARTICLE in their language — pioneering work was carried out in the 1970s and 1980s. Characteristic for this period is the combination of pragmatics, at the time still a new and exciting branch of linguistics, with lexicology and lexicography, resulting in in-depth studies of individual particles as well as dictionaries

⁵ „Tatsächlich betrachten wir das Konzept Konnektor als eine zu den wie beschrieben ermittelten Wortarten quer liegende, rein semantisch-funktional begründete Klassenbildung. „Konnektoren“ [...] bezeichnen keine morphosyntaktisch begründete Wortart im obigen Sinne, sondern sind Ausdrücke für eine Funktion von Wortschatzeinheiten für den Aufbau komplexer syntaktischer Strukturen und textueller Komplexe. Diese Funktion kann von Einheiten unterschiedlicher Wortarten realisiert werden, deren formale Gemeinsamkeit lediglich die Nicht-Flektierbarkeit ist. [...] Sie bedürfen deshalb ergänzend einer einzelsprachlichen Subklassifizierung.“ (Pasch *et al.* 2003: 38–39)

and teaching aids (see especially Helbig 1988⁶ and the papers in Weydt ed. 1979; 1983; 1989; Hentschel 1986 for an example of a monographic study from both a synchronic and a diachronic point of view; Wolski 1986 for lexicographic considerations; Hartmann 1994 for an overview of research questions based mainly on the German tradition; Métrich & Faucher 2009 for a recent example of a dictionary of German particles). As several of the authors remark, German seems to be especially rich in such particles, and the problems they pose in translation or in second language learning has been an important motivation for their investigation for several decades and surely continues to be so.

Particles in German can be defined as a word-class, set apart from other classes by morphosyntactic rather than semantic criteria. For example, modal particles like *wohl* and modal adverbs like *wahrscheinlich* may have a very similar meaning ('probably'), but are clearly distinguished by the positions they may take in the clause and their combinability with other elements. In general, the meaning of particles is much more difficult to fix than the meaning of adverbs, and it often depends on the position and the linguistic context. This makes the question of the MEANING of particles especially tricky. A further interesting fact about German particles is their POLYFUNCTIONALITY — we often find the same word-form as a particle and an adverb, a conjunction and/or an interjection⁷. This fact raises questions about the nature of the class particle and its relation to other classes. If these categories are conceived as mutually exclusive lexical classes, items with the same sound shape and similar meaning but different syntactic behavior have to be counted as homonyms, a solution that in many cases is counter-intuitive

⁶ This rather small dictionary contains a programmatic introduction with definitions and discussion of some problems and desiderata of particle research. In a later edition (Helbig & Helbig 1995) this introduction has been shortened to a few pages.

⁷ Compare Hartmann (1994: 2956): "Words that are only modal particles do not exist in German."

(comparable to the problem with English *since* as preposition, conjunction, and adverb, referred to above).

Several semantic subclasses of particles are distinguished. The class that has probably been discussed most often are MODAL PARTICLES (in German terminology also called *Abtönungspartikeln*). The exact meaning of such particles is notoriously difficult to describe, they have in common that they “give a statement a specific shade, and also express relations between utterances, the information contained in them, and previously available knowledge” (Hartmann 1994: 2956). Modal particles are often regarded as “typical German”⁸, probably because they don’t have exact equivalents in English and their contribution to an utterance is rendered by very different means in that language — intonation, word order, auxiliary verbs and others (see for example Nehls 1989). For this reason, the term PARTICLE is less familiar in English linguistics, or has been used with a different meaning (Miller 2006). However, on a broader European background the absence of modal particles in English might be more remarkable than their presence in German. In the Baltic languages many parallels can be found, for example the particle *jau* in both Lithuanian and Latvian, which resembles the German unstressed particle *ja* in many respects. Another semantic subclass of particles are FOCUS OR SCALAR PARTICLES such as English *only* and *even* (for a thorough analysis of focus particles, mainly their semantics, based on German and English see König 1991; a recent treatment of German focus particles in a formal framework is Sudhoff 2010).

As mentioned above, the abundance of (modal) particles in German, (re)discovered at a time when pragmatics and

⁸ A recent example for this view are the following research questions given in a call for papers for a panel on particles and discourse markers on the 12th International Pragmatics conference (Manchester 2011): “In this context the question arises whether German modal particles such as *aber, ja, doch* are a language-specific phenomenon with hardly any equivalents in other languages? If there are equivalents, what features do they have to share with the German modal particles?”

communication research became popular in linguistics, was a major factor to stimulate research on particles in European languages in the 1970s. About fifteen years later, a similar process set in with the “discovery” of DISCOURSE MARKERS in English, whose study became an important part of linguistic discourse analysis.⁹ As with “particle”, the term discourse marker is used in a heterogeneous way, and Schiffrin, whose pioneering monograph (1987) on the phenomenon has inspired much later work, concludes in an overview: “Discourse markers are parts of language that scholars want to study, even if they do not always agree on what particular parts they are studying or what to call the object of their interest” (Schiffrin 2001: 65). Brinton (1996: 29) cites a “plethora of other terms” used to name this object of interest, among them PRAGMATIC PARTICLE, PRAGMATIC MARKER, and (DISCOURSE) CONNECTIVE. Part of the confusion stems from the fact that the term “discourse marker”, like “connective” as defined above, is used to name a set of diverse linguistic expressions united by a particular (though often only vaguely defined) function in language use. See, for example, the definition given by Risselada & Spooren (1998: 132): “[...] discourse markers can be defined as those natural language expressions whose primary function is to facilitate the process of interpreting the coherence relation(s) between a particular unit of discourse and other, surrounding units and/or aspects of the communicative situation”. Frazer (1999) defines discourse markers more narrowly as a pragmatic class of lexical expressions that “signal a relationship between the segment they introduce, S2, and the prior segment, S1. They have a core meaning which is procedural, not conceptual, and their more specific interpretation is ‘negotiated’ by the

⁹ Under names like *Gesprächswörter* (‘discourse words’ or ‘conversational words’) equivalents of English discourse markers had also been discussed within the German particle research, but as these elements do not form a lexical class their investigation was not part of the dominant line of research; see Helbig (1988) with further references.

context, both linguistic and conceptual” (Frazer 1999: 950). The linguistic expressions that function as discourse markers are even more diverse than those called connective: besides particles (*well*), adverbs (*now*) and conjunctions (*and*), they also include interjections (*oh*), non-word signals like *mm*, and especially in English, parenthetically used phrases like *I think, you know* that have lost most of their original meaning. Discourse markers are thus neither a lexical nor a syntactic, but a pragmatic category, and the study of discourse markers is primarily a study of discourse, most often of spoken discourse in spontaneous conversations. This fact was already pointed out by Helbig (1988: 54, referring to earlier work by Stickel and Wolski) in his discussion of the relations between “discourse words” (*Gesprächswörter*) and particles¹⁰ and has recently been emphasized by Romero Trillo: “It is my belief that what we find in discourse is not just a series of discourse markers, rather, we are dealing with discourse slots (functions), where any element — provided it fulfills several conditions related to context and prosody — can function as a discourse marker” (Trillo 2006: 640). This approach is parallel to syntactic approaches where, for example, complementizers and subordinators are defined as those linguistic elements that fill a certain syntactic position, and it is opposed to traditional grammar, where broadly defined lexical categories such as conjunctions are the building blocks of structures and thus the starting point of analysis. Starting instead with syntactic or, in the case of discourse markers, pragmatic functions it becomes more difficult to arrive at lexical classes. Such a class may be defined as the set of elements (words or fixed combinations of words) that have become conventionalized

¹⁰ “Somit liegt bei der Einordnung der Abtönungspartikeln in die „Gesprächswörter“ eigentlich keine Klassifikation von Wortarten vor, sondern eine Klassifikation von Gesprächsfunktionen [...], eine Klassifizierung nicht nach Morphosyntax und/oder Bedeutung, sondern eine Rubrizierung von (morphosyntaktisch und semantisch) heterogenen Einheiten nach kommunikativen Äußerungsfunktionen” (Helbig 1988: 54).

for this function: “discourse markers are elements that have undergone a process of discourse grammaticalization and have included in their semantic/grammatical meaning a pragmatic dimension that has interactional purposes” (Trillo 2006: 640).

2.3 Conclusions

In linguistics, as in ordinary life, there are as many ways of categorizing as there are ways of looking at things — in our case, words and other units of language and speech. Categories labeled “particle”, “connective”, “conjunction”, “subordinator”, “discourse marker” etc. are not given a priori, they are the result of linguists’ reflections, highlighting certain aspects of the elements classified and neglecting others. In this section we have tried to show the considerations and the research context that led to the use of particular terms with a particular meaning. Obviously these are categories of different kinds — syntactic categories defined by structural positions, lexical classes defined by morphosyntactic and functional properties, pragmatic classes or sets of diverse linguistic elements fulfilling a certain function in discourse. To a larger extent it is the goal of the research that determines how categories are defined, delimited, and opposed to others: lexicography creates different needs than conversation analysis or formal semantics. Still, where the object of interest is the same, some of the research questions and parts of the answers will overlap, and different approaches complement each other.

Among the research questions concerning particles and connectives, the following have been prominent in the research of linguists working on various European languages, as reflected in the topics of monographs, conferences, and contributions to edited volumes of recent years (some of the latter that haven’t been mentioned so far are Celle & Huart 2008; Couper-Kuhlen & Kortmann 2000; Laury 2008; Drescher & Frank-Job 2006):

- the semantic side of clause-combining and the meaning of connectives;
- polyfunctionality and the delimitation of (discourse) particles and (syntactic) connectives;
- discourse functions of words of different parts-of-speech;
- origin and development of particles and connectives: grammaticalization, lexicalization and/or “pragmaticalization”.

Syntactic research, as mentioned above, focuses on the constructions and not the elements contained in them; still, recent volumes on coordination (Haspelmath 2004; Mauri 2008), subordination and/or complementation (Cristofaro 2003; Dixon & Aikhenvald 2006; Nordström 2010) also contain discussions of the respective types of clause-linking elements.

3. Origin and development of particles and conjunctions in Baltic

Meillet ([1915/16] 1975) observed that conjunctions, although they belong to the most frequent words in a language and have grammatical rather than lexical meaning, are often instable. In the history of a language we often witness a “renewal” of conjunctions, which may take several paths. Data from Baltic languages confirm Meillet’s observation and offer an interesting object for studies of the origin and development of connectives. Despite their close genetic relationship, Lithuanian and Latvian have many different conjunctions. Even the basic coordinators ‘and’ and ‘or’ are not cognate — Latvian has borrowed these words from contact languages (*un* ‘and’ from German, *vai* ‘or’ from a Finnic language).

In this section we will present some tendencies in the development of Baltic conjunctions and particles, discussing examples which in our eyes may be of interest to scholars of Baltic languages as well as to linguists from other disciplines. It goes without saying that we do not intend to give an exhaustive

overview and that many of the facts mentioned here are still awaiting a more thorough description and analysis.

3.1 Diachronic relations between particles and conjunctions

The double use of an element as coordinator and focus particle is a well-known fact in various languages, for example Latin *et* ‘and’, ‘also’ or Malayalam *-um* (König 1991: 2). In such cases it is often difficult to decide which of the uses came first — whether the development went from conjunction to particle or the other way around. The Lithuanian additive particle *irgi* ‘also’ is interesting in this respect, as its history unambiguously shows a development from conjunction to additive focus particle. The word consists of the conjunction *ir* ‘and’ and the focus particle *-gi*, which in older Lithuanian is always used postpositively. In Old Lithuanian, for example in the writings by Mažvydas (second half of the 16th century), *irgi* is still used as a coordinative conjunction, while in Modern Lithuanian it is only an additive particle.

A development in the other direction, from particle to conjunction, is found less often. In the history of Lithuanian there are probably only two such cases. The first one is the disjunctive conjunction *arba* ‘or’, containing the question particle *ar* and the clitic *-ba*, whose etymology is unclear. The question particle *ar* is also found as disjunctive conjunction without the clitic.

The second case is particles based on the negation, which first developed uses as conjunctions and later as scalar additive particles. These cases will be regarded more closely below.

3.1.1 Lithuanian *net* ‘even’: negation > conjunction > scalar particle

Up to this time, the only monographs devoted to the origin of Lithuanian conjunctions and particles are Eduard Hermanns’ studies published in 1912 and 1926. Although outdated in some

points, they still contain much valuable data and several analyses worth remembering, such as the etymology of the polyfunctional conjunction Old Lithuanian *net* ‘but; unless; until; because; than; in order to’ < *neta* / *nete*. This conjunction developed from the combination of the negative particle *ne* and enclitic forms of the demonstrative pronoun *-ta* / *-te*. The development of the conjunction is described by Hermann (1912: 82–3) as follows:

„Die Bedeutung von *net(a)* ist zumeist ‘sondern’, diese muß man sich etwa so entstanden denken: *schitta kosanis netiktai wienims piemenims kalbama ira, net wissam swietui (...)* ‘diese Predigt ist nicht nur zu den Hirten allein gesprochen, nein: zu der ganzen Welt’.“

In the terminology used by Haspelmath (2007: 28), the function of *net* in this construction is that of marking “substitutive adversative coordination” (as German *sondern*). The clause headed by the conjunction *net* is always the second clause of the sentence, which is an argument (though not a sufficient one) to classify the construction as paratactic.

The early functions of Lithuanian *net* are thus similar to those of Latvian *neba* (see Nau, this volume). The postposition *-ta/-te* included in *net* was an anaphoric element. Then, later development turned *net* into a scalar additive particle ‘even’; this is the only use of this word in contemporary Lithuanian. In the oldest Lithuanian texts (of the 16th century) such a use is comparatively rare. It most likely developed from another meaning the conjunction *net* had in Old Lithuanian, namely ‘until’. In his discussion of the origin of scalar particles, König (1991: 165–6) cites several cases of ‘until’ > ‘even’¹¹.

¹¹ “Particles like Spanish *incluso*, Fr. *jusqu’à* (‘until, up to’) or Swed. *till och med* (‘to and with’) directly express an ordering and the inclusion of an extreme value as part of their earlier meaning: *Il y a des noms et jusqu’à des personnes que j’ai complètement oubliés*. ‘There are names and even persons that I have completely forgotten.’” (König 1991: 166).

In Bretkunas' *Postilla* (1591), the conjunction *net* in both meanings 'but' and 'unless' appears almost exclusively after clauses containing a negation (Leskien 1903: 112). It is associated with the semantic category of CONTRAST¹²: the clause containing *net* implies a situation contrary to the one expressed in the first clause. Compare Polish *On tego nie zrobi, chyba że ty mu pomożesz* 'He will not do it **unless** you help him', which implies *On tego nie zrobi, ale jeśli mu pomożesz, wówczas zrobi to* 'He will not do it, but if you help him, he will'; we may thus speak of a cancelled implicature in the second clause. In contrast to the clauses with *net* 'but', clauses with *net* 'unless' are conditional clauses, more precisely, they contain a negated condition, a meaning explicitly contained for example in Latin *nisi* 'if not, unless, apart from'. The relatedness of the two meanings contained in Lithuanian *net* can also be seen in the Czech conjunction *leč* 'but; unless'.

Also clauses containing *net* 'until' imply a situation in contrast to the one expressed in the previous clause, which provides the basis for the transition from *net* 'unless' to *net* 'until' after clauses with negation (Hermann 1926: 391–2; Leskien 1903: 112). Consider the following example from the *Postylla*:

- (1) *ir ne nóri atftót nūg io / nēt igīuś wīſſa ko prāſe.* (DP 114.3)
 Polish: *a niechce odejść od niego / aż otrzyma wszystko o co prosi*
 'and doesn't want to leave him / **unless** ~ **until** he gets all
 he asks for'

The closeness of the meanings 'unless' and 'until' may also be demonstrated with the following example from contemporary English (from Terry Pratchett's novel *Pyramids*), where the conjunction *unless* may easily be exchanged by *until*:

- (2) *They [= camels] never understand anything unless you hit them with a stick*

¹² "The connection of contrast means that in the speaker's opinion two propositions A and B are valid simultaneously and proposition B marks a contrast to the information given in proposition A." (Rudolph 1996: 20)

3.1.2 Lithuanian *nė* and *nei* ‘even’

Another scalar additive particle besides *net* is *nė* ‘even’; this particle is found in the oldest Lithuanian texts as well as in the contemporary language. Although the origin of the lengthening of the vowel in *nė* is not easy to explain, there is no doubt that the particle is etymologically related to the negation *ne* ‘no, not’. There is also a negative conjunction *nė* ‘neither, nor’ used in correlative constructions such as the following:

- (3) *Neturiu nė tėvo, nė motinos*
‘I have **neither** father **nor** mother’ (LKŽ 8, 597)

The origin of the particle *nė* ‘even’ has not been described up to now. It seems likely that it developed from the conjunction *nė* in functions that are not attested in Lithuanian texts. The history of another scalar additive particle known from Lithuanian dialects may give us a hint in this case, namely the particle *nei* ‘(not) even’:

- (4) *Aš nei duonos neturiu*
‘I don’t even have bread’ (LKŽ 8, 623)

The same form *nei* is also found as a negative correlative coordinator:

- (5) *Nėra nei arklio, nei kiaulės*
‘There is neither a horse nor a pig’ (LKŽ 8, 622)

Remarkably, in the oldest Lithuanian texts, the conjunction *nei* is also found in sentences containing asyndetic clause-combining where the first clause does not contain a negation, for example¹³:

- (6) *O tatau Dievas visą reg / nei nuleis nekarota*
‘But God sees everything / (still/nevertheless) it is not punished’ (BP I 166, 6–7)

¹³ For further examples see Ostrowski (2008: 468)

At a certain moment *nei* probably was reanalysed as a conjunction, which reminds us of the use of Latin *ne-que* ‘and not’ used in correlative sentences (*nec (neque) ... nec (neque)* ‘neither ... nor’) and as a scalar additive particle ‘not even’.

3.1.3 Coordinator > focus particle > question particle

Our next example concerns the transition of the Lithuanian conjunction *be* ‘and’ to a focus particle. The following examples shall illustrate the two functions:

Lithuanian *be* as coordinator¹⁴:

- (7) Aš **be** tu eisiva medžioti
 I and you go:FUT.1DUAL hunt:INF
 ‘You and I (we two) will go hunting’ (LKŽ 1, 703)

Lithuanian *be* as focus particle:

- (8) **Be** ką rūdysiu jauna mergelė
 FOC WH:ACC.SG rust:FUT:1SG young miss
 už tave seno našlelio.
 PREP 2SG:GEN old:GEN.SG widower:GEN.SG
 ‘But shall I, a young girl, get rusty at your side, old widower?’

The focus particle in turn gave rise to a question particle *be*. A context favorable for such a development is provided in rhetorical questions. Parallels may be found in the use of Polish *i* ‘and’ in rhetorical questions¹⁵, and in combinations of the Lithuanian negation *ne* with the clitic particles *-jau* and *-gi* (forms: *ne-jaũ-gi* / *ne-jaũ* / *ne-gi*) that may be translated approximately as ‘really?’:

- (9) *Nejaũgi / nejaũ / negi tũ skĩrsies su manim?*
 ‘Will you really divorce me (= I can’t believe it)?’ (Ambrasas 1997: 400)

¹⁴ This function is rare in Lithuanian, but the cognate Old Prussian <bhe> /be/ ‘and’ is widely attested.

¹⁵ For example: *I Janek przyjechał? Niemożliwe* ‘Has Janek [really] arrived? Impossible’.

A further parallel is found in the development of the Lithuanian conjunction *bei* ‘and’, which in dialects is also used as a complementizer in interrogative sentences:

- (10) *Kažin, bei būsi matęs?*
 who.knows BEI be:FUT:2SG see:PAP:M.SG
 ‘Who knows if you’ll see [it]?’ (LKŽ 1, 733; see also Ostrowski, forthcoming)¹⁶

In general, the genesis of question particles in Baltic languages is a question still lacking thorough investigation and description.

3.2 From copula to conjunction and from conjunction to adverb

The conjunction *be*, discussed above, was also at the base of the adverb Old Lithuanian *be* ‘still, yet’, for example in *kolei be diena* (BB Jeremiah 6,4) = *weil es noch hoch tag ist* (Luther, 1545). In Old Lithuanian texts this adverb is attested only in existential clauses where the existential verb is not expressed. In a next step, *be* was grammaticalized as a continuative prefix; in Lithuanian texts of the 16th century this prefix appears most often with stative and modal verbs such as *būti* ‘be’, *turėti* ‘have’, *galėti* ‘be able’ and others. In Modern Lithuanian *be-* is used as a progressive prefix, for example *Pavargau be-vaikščiodamas po miestą* ‘I got tired while walking about in town’ (Holvoet 2007, 39). The development continuative > progressive is described by Bybee *et al.* (1994: 164–175). A parallel development conjunction > continuative adverb can be witnessed in the case of Old Lithuanian *dabar* ‘still, yet’, for example: *Pone / nusidawe / ka tu insakej / Bet dabar wieta ira.* (BP II 204.16–17) ‘Lord, it is done as thou hast commanded, and yet there is room’ (Luke 14, 22), where *dabar* is the result of the conflation of three elements:

¹⁶ The role of rhetorical questions for the reanalysis of coordinating conjunctions as question particles is discussed by Lühr (1995).

the Old Lithuanian conjunction *da* ‘and’¹⁷, the particle *-ba-* and the deictic particle *-r* (Hermann 1926: 352; Ostrowski 2009). A further case in point is German *noch* ‘still’ < **nu-h* ‘now-and’, where *nu* is the root of German *nun* ‘now’ and *-h* is cognate to Latin *-que* (Kluge-Seebold 1995: 590). This is something like the mirror image of the process we witness in the case of Old Greek *eti*, Old Indic *ati* ‘still, yet’ and Latin *et* ‘and’, where the Latin conjunction is traditionally regarded as secondary in relation to the adverb in Greek and Indic. The modern meaning of *dabar* ‘now’ is the result of a conventionalized implicature (Ostrowski 2009).

Concerning the origin of the conjunction Old Lithuanian *be*, Old Prussian <*bhe*> /*be*/ ‘and’, it is likely that it stems from a form of the copula (compare Old Prussian *be* ‘was’) and continues a former preterit *bijā* ‘was’ (Latvian *bija*). In the transition phase copula > conjunction the element probably functioned as a narrative discourse marker ‘and then’, ‘thereafter’ (as described by Heine & Kuteva 2002: 95, who also give examples for the development copula > consecutive). The formal side of this development was as follows: *bijā* > *bjā* > *bjē* > *bē* > *be* (cf. Ostrowski, this volume, on Latvian *jeb*). Due to the late beginning of written documents in Lithuanian, Latvian and Old Prussian, we unfortunately will never be able to attest all stages of this process.

In combination with the enclitic demonstrative *tai* ‘this, that’ the conjunction *be* ‘and’ became the source of Lithuanian and Latvian *bet* ‘but’ (Old Lithuanian *betai-g* ‘but’), cf. Hermann (1926: 335–6); Fraenkel (1962: 41). The adversative meaning of the conjunction *bet* suggests that *be* ‘and’ already might have included a notion of opposition, comparable to Polish and Russian *a*, and thus, in the terminology used by Haspelmath (2007: 28) can be classified as an OPPOSITIVE COORDINATOR, “used when there is a contrast between the two coordinands, but no conflicting expectations”. An example from Polish with the coordinator *a*

¹⁷ Most likely a loan from Belarusian.

in this function: *Za wsią jest las, a za lasem rzeka* ‘There is a forest behind the village **and** behind the forest [there is] a river’.

3.3. Conjunctions as the outcome of lexicalization

The second component in Old Lithuanian *ne-ta / ne-te* is an enclitic form of the demonstrative pronoun *-ta*, a continuation of IE nom/acc.sg.neutr. **tod*. In non-enclitic form it is attested in the pronoun *ta-taĩ* ‘this’, a nice example of reinforcement: the deictic pronoun was reinforced by adding a second deictic pronoun *taĩ* ‘that, this’, a case reminiscent of Latin *is-te*. Later *ta-taĩ* was reanalyzed as *tat-aĩ*, that is, containing the focus particle *-ai*, after the model of other pronouns such as *tas* ‘he’: *tas-aĩ* ‘exactly this one’ (cf. German *eben der*). The element *tat* which had arisen in this way was then in turn combined with the focus particle *jaũ*, which in the position after pronouns expressed what König (1991: 128) calls “emphatic assertion of identity”; it had the same functions as German *eben*, described by König as follows:

“in its use as focus particle, *eben* is almost entirely restricted to demonstrative pronouns and anaphoric expressions as potential foci. [...] Demonstrative and anaphoric elements express referential identity of two expressions and *eben* emphasises this identity.” (König 1991: 128)

The combination **tat jaũ* was lexicalized as the connective *tačiaũ* ‘however’ that is used in Lithuanian adversative and concessive clauses. The development of this connective corresponds exactly to what König (1991: 125–128) described as “identical values in conflicting roles”¹⁸ (see Ostrowski, forthcoming).

¹⁸ “Especially *gerade*, *eben* and *ausgerechnet* express something over and above mere identity of two values. These three particles often carry an implication of dissonance or incompatibility concerning the two propositions over which they operate [...]. These particles are typically used in contexts where the relevant propositions ‘p’ and ‘q’ do not usually go together. In other words, these contexts and these particles often suggest that there is an adversative or concessive relationship between the relevant propositions.” (König 1991: 128)

3.4 From pragmatics to grammar: causal connectives in Lithuanian

There are two causal conjunctions in Lithuanian: *kadangi* and *nes*. The first one is an adverbial subordinator that goes back to the Old Lithuanian temporal connective *kada* < **kadan* ‘when’ (Hermann 1926: 309–310). Consider the following example, where *kada* has a causal meaning:

- (11) **Kada** *regeiei mane Tomaschau / tikeiei* (БР I 408.4-5)
 German (Luther 1545): **Dieweil** *du mich gesehen hast Thomas, so gleubestu*
 ‘Thomas, **because** thou hast seen me, thou hast believed’
 (John 20, 29)

The origin of *nes* is more problematic. This connective is used in coordinate (paratactic) constructions (Holvoet 2003: 109). It appears in Old Lithuanian texts and in the dialects in a wide range of varieties (*nès / nesa / nēs / nèsà / nesang*). The causal connective originally had two endings: *nes-a* and *nes-q*; the latter arose in analogy to the causal conjunction **kadan*, *kadangi* (Endzelin [1931] 1979: 582). Endzelin put forward the hypothesis that *nes* stems from a combination **ne-es-*, originally an interrogative construction with a meaning such as French *n-est-ce pas?* This hypothesis, however, leaves us with the problem of how a causal connective could develop out of a question. Ostrowski (2008: 467–8) proposes that *nes* originates from an auxiliary verb used in perfect tense. Such constructions can be found in Lithuanian dialects:

- (12) *Man nesa danti sopėje.*
 1SG:DAT AUX tooth:ACC.SG hurt:PAP:NEUTR
 ‘my tooth has not hurt’

In perfect tense the auxiliary verb may be omitted in Lithuanian, for example *jis nėra atvažiavęs* = *jis Ø ne-atvažiavęs* ‘he hasn’t arrived’. This gave rise to the following reanalysis:

[Teip] [nėsa buvę] → [Teip nėra] [nebuvę]

This hypothesis also explains why *nes* in Old Lithuanian is found in the second position in the clause, according to Wackernagel's law, for example:

- (13) *Tassai nes buwa praneschens ape Wieta Uschgimimo* (BP I 59, 3)
 (Hermann 1926, 369 ff.)
 'Because he was the one who foretold the place where [Jesus] would be born.'

Due to the late beginning of written documents (16th c.) it is not possible to trace the development of the causal meaning of *nes*, but it surely arose in asyndetically linked clauses; consequently, the conjunction *nes* has preserved its paratactic character until today.

3.5 Clitic particles in Lithuanian

A very promising field of study that hasn't received thorough description and analysis since the times of Hermann (1926) are clitic particles in the Baltic languages. One of the unsolved puzzles is the fact that Latvian has completely lost the cognates to Lithuanian clitics which it possessed in earlier stages. It seems that Lithuanian, too, experiences a gradual loss of its clitics. Comparing Old Lithuanian with the contemporary language, we witness the loss of the deictic particles *-te* and *-re*¹⁹, the focusing particle *-gi* and the question particle *-gu*. The latter were still widespread in the 16th century, but are no longer productive today.

3.5.1 The deictic clitic *-te* 'behold'

An example of *-te* was already given above in our discussion of the polyfunctional conjunction *ne-te*. In the oldest Lithuanian

¹⁹For example, *aurè* 'there, behold' < **ava-rè* 'look here', compare French *voilà* and *vois là* 'look there'; Latvian *re!* < *redz(i)* 'sieh!, schau!' (ME, vol. 3, 501). See also Petit, this volume.

texts this deictic particle functions as Russian *vot* and Polish *oto*, for example in the Postilla of Wolfenbüttel (16th c.):

- (14) *sunuste szmaniu eiti, kaip ape ghj raschita ira* (133b.10; Hermann 1926, 386)
 ‘The Son of Man goeth as it is written of him’ (Matthew 26, 24)

As an enclitic element it was subject to tmesis. This situation is still found in Eastern Lithuanian dialects, for example:

- (15) *pragitejódžiau bérą žirgėlį, (...) vis ažù tavo to gražumėlio*
 ‘behold, I have exhausted my bay horse, (...) and all this because of your beauty’ (Būga 1961, Vol. 3, 918)

Remarkably, in Dauksza’s *Postilla* (1599) the enclitic *-te-* appears with a restrictive function, for example in *pra-te-brėkštant*, literally ‘as soon as it dawned’ (= ‘at daybreak’) in the following sentence:

- (16) *patôgi y=rá karalîfte dağų žmôgui hûkinikui kuris ißėio pratebrėkštant*
šamdîtų darbinîkų winî=czion sawón. (DP 92.34–36)
 ‘The Kingdom of Heaven is like a farmer who went out at daybreak to hire workers for his vineyard.’ (Matthew 20, 1)

It is not clear how Old Lithuanian *-te-* as in *pra-te-brėkštant* may be related to the restrictive *te-* of Modern Lithuanian. The latter always takes the initial position in a verb (on *te-* in contemporary Lithuanian see Arkadiev 2010). Another Lithuanian clitic, the reflexive marker *-si-*, always shows tmesis if used together with other prefixes, but with non-prefixed verbs it appears at the end of the word-form, for example *keliuo-si* ‘rises’: *at-si-keliu* ‘wakes up’; it never appears initially. On the other hand, the Old Lithuanian enclitic *-gi* is continued in Modern Lithuanian as a proclitic (see below).

We also find *-te* in Lithuanian *būtent* ‘namely; just, exactly, precisely’ < **būten-te*. This adverb originates from a deverbal derivation with the ending *-te* < **-ten*, used in constructions of the type FIGURA ETYMOLOGICA, where it emphasizes the intensity

of an activity, for example *Jis juokte juokēsi* ‘He laughed his head off’, where *juokte* < **juok-ten* from *juok-ti* ‘to joke’. Thus, *būtent* < **bū-ten-te* is derived from *bū-ti* ‘be’, and the starting point was a phrase **būten-te buvo* ‘it really was’, with *buvo* omitted (Ostrowski 2008: 469–470).

3.5.2 The focus particle *-gi*

This enclitic particle had exact counterparts in Old Latvian *-dz* < **-gi* and in Old Prussian *-gi*, for example in *ni perweckammai neggi ernertimai* ‘neither contempt nor enrage’ (Enchiridion 31.4-5). The Latvian particle is preserved only in the form *nedz* ‘nor’ (in *ne... nedz...* ‘neither... nor’).

In Old Lithuanian the particle *-gi* marked the part of a clause being in focus, for example:

- (17) *Potam ischgulda iemus Penktan-gi prisakima sawa dangaus Tiewa.*
 ‘Then he lectured them on the fifth commandment of his heavenly Father’ (BP II 284.18–19)²⁰

For more information on the particle *-gi* in Old Lithuanian, the reader is referred to Hermann (1926: 106–171) and Ambrazas (2006: 80–82).

In contemporary Lithuanian *gi* appears as a proclitic, for example:

- (18) *Gi gerai, kai pašalę — sausa*
 ‘It is good when there has been frost — it’s dry.’ (Ulvydas ed. 1971: 569)

We don’t know when the change from an enclitic to a proclitic took place and whether it was connected to the change of constituent order in Lithuanian from *sov* (older Lithuanian) to *svo*

²⁰ In this example the focus is also graphically marked, by using the capital letter in <Penktangi> ‘fifth’.

(contemporary Lithuanian). Another unsolved question is in how far we witness here a general tendency of the Baltic languages. As mentioned above, in Latvian, enclitic particles can only be found by diachronic analysis. The Lithuanian particle *-gu*, to which we will turn now, is a further case in point.

3.5.3. Lithuanian *-gu*: from interrogative to conditional

Old Lithuanian *-gu* originally was a question particle that appeared in Wackernagel position, for example:

- (19) *Tu-gu man kaias masgosi?*
'Will you wash my feet?' (BP I 360.7)

Its reflex in Latvian was *-g < *-gu*, for example: *jau-g verd?* 'kocht es schon?' ('does it boil already?') (Endzelin 1922: 542).

In Lithuanian *-gu* acquired a secondary function as a marker of the protasis in conditional sentences (Drotvinaš 1967); compare Haiman (1978: 571) on the relationship between interrogatives and elements of conditional clauses²¹. In contemporary Lithuanian *-gu* is found most often as part of the conditional conjunction *jei-gu* 'if'; this conjunction is rare in 16th and 17th century texts (Ambrazas 2006: 465). The combination of *-gu* with *jei* is another example of reinforcement; it is connected to the fact that *jei* in Old Lithuanian had acquired a bundle of secondary functions besides its primary function in conditional clauses (see Ostrowski, this volume).

4. Questions for future research and the contributions to this volume

The articles gathered in this volume are concerned with questions that at the same time may be formulated as questions for

²¹ Similar uses as interrogative and conditional are attested for the particle *-li* in Old Polish.

further research on particles and connectives in Baltic languages. They may be broadly grouped into two fields:

Questions concerning the MEANING AND FUNCTION of particles (including connective particles, i.e. the traditional conjunctions), for example: How can the meaning of particles be described? Do they have an invariant meaning, or are they more or less empty words whose interpretation depends largely on the context? Are particles with different interpretations (for example, cause, condition, contrast) polysemous or semantically vague? Which role is played by conversational implicature? Which particles include a component of subjectivity / intersubjectivity and how does this component manifest itself? Are there semantic classes of particles typical for the Baltic languages? Which semantic differences are expressed by connectives with the same syntactic function?

Questions concerning SYNTACTIC ASPECTS and FORMAL CLASSIFICATIONS including the following: Is the traditional broad syntactic division between particles and conjunctions still useful for modern grammatical descriptions, or should it be replaced by more narrowly defined syntactic categories? Which different types of connectives may be distinguished by morphosyntactic criteria, what are their specific features in the individual languages? How are words with one shape but different syntactic behavior best described — as homonyms or as polysemous (heterosemous) items? How should syntactically multifunctional items be described in dictionaries?

In each of the following articles several of these questions are combined.

JOANNA CHOJNICKA investigates the different functions and meanings of the Latvian lexical unit *it kā* ‘as if, as though’. Her study is based on the occurrences of this unit in the first Latvian online-corpus (1 million word-forms). On syntactic grounds two basically different uses of *it kā* may be distinguished: a conjunction (in the traditional sense, including the functions of adver-

bial subordinator and of complementizer) and a particle. As a conjunction *it k̄a* is always found in clauses with the subjunctive mood, and its meaning is described as either “hypothetical comparison” or “inferred reason”. As a particle *it k̄a* may carry epistemic modality, more rarely (reportive) evidentiality, or it is used as a hedge. Despite some slight semantic differences between the two syntactic functions, the author argues for a description of *it k̄a* as one heterosemic lexical unit. Chojnicka also shows that the treatment of *it k̄a* in dictionaries has been unsatisfying, and her detailed description may serve as a base for future lexicographic work.

AXEL HOLVOET’s article is written from a syntactic perspective, his object of interest being complement clauses in Lithuanian and Latvian. He investigates which syntactic and semantic distinctions are manifest in the choice of complementizer, or in the interplay of complementizer and mood. Parameters that are shown to be important in one or both languages are the distinction between realis and irrealis, a special treatment of volitional predicates (‘want’) and clauses expressing apprehension (‘fear’), as well as the speaker’s evaluation of the truth of the proposition. The author considers not only the contemporary languages but also older stages, where the situation may be different. In Old Lithuanian Holvoet finds a consistent distinction of realis and irrealis by choice of complementizer (*jog* vs. *kad* or *idant*) that has been lost in the modern language. Holvoet’s article is an important contribution to the synchronic and diachronic study of complementation in Baltic languages and additionally shows the fruitfulness of approaching the study of function words from the syntactic side, focusing on the constructions they are used in.

NICOLE NAU explores the uses of the particle *neba* ‘not (that)’, a word often used in discussions carried out on the Internet and whose translation heavily depends on the context. Clauses introduced by *neba* may stand in a causal relation (on the text plane) to the previous clause, that is, they formulate the reason

for the illocution expressed in the first clause. In other cases the clause with *neba* stands in a relation of contrast to a following clause. Grammars and dictionaries of the 19th and the early 20th century described *neba* on these grounds as a causal and adversative conjunction, but Nau argues that neither the clause-linking force nor the causal or adversative meaning are lexicalized in *neba*; rather, they are the result of conversational implicatures. The author also discusses reasons for the popularity of the word in one particular genre and argues that its syntactic characteristics make it useful for argumentative dialogical texts. Furthermore, they partly compensate for the lack of prosody in written discussions.

NORBERT OSTROWSKI is concerned with the development of the disjunctive coordinator *jeb* ‘or’ in Latvian, which he traces in Old Latvian texts. He shows that in Old Latvian writings *jeb* had a variety of functions: it was used in conditional (‘if’), concessive-conditional (‘even if’) and concessive (‘although’) clauses. The concessive-conditional context was the foundation for the development of the disjunctive conjunction (‘or’). Comparing his findings to results from research on other languages, the author demonstrates how these meanings are related. He further discusses the Lithuanian cognate *jeib* ‘if’ and the etymology of both items and its relation to the subjunctive mood.

DANIEL PETIT’S article is devoted to a class of particles that in traditional descriptions (if treated at all) are subsumed under the category interjection: Lithuanian *anà, aurè, šitai, tè* and others, Latvian *re, lūk*. The author shows that it makes sense to treat presentative particles as a class in its own right, for these words display syntactic and pragmatic characteristics that distinguish them from local adverbs (from which several of them are derived) as well as from interjections. Presentative particles in Lithuanian and Latvian always appear clause-initially, they cannot be negated, and they may form the predicate of a non-verbal clause. A pragmatic specification is that their use implies

explicitly addressing a speech partner. The same syntactic and pragmatic features characterize presentative particles in other languages, for example Latin *ecce* or Russian *vot*.

BJÖRN WIEMER's contribution shows that the proper treatment of particles and connectives in dictionaries requires a broad and careful investigation of all the uses of the item in question. In the case he is concerned with, Lithuanian *esą*, the first problem encountered is the delimitation of lexical units, for the same sound shape is used as a participle and as a function word with several syntactic possibilities. Syntactic criteria make it possible to distinguish between a use as complementizer and as particle, both associated with the meaning of reportive evidentiality. This situation is described as heterosemy. The further analysis shows that the reportive meaning component is inherent in the particle, but not in the conjunction. These findings justify the lexicographic treatment of the function word *esą* in two separate entries. On his quest for the proper description of *esą*, the author also considers functionally related units in Lithuanian as well as Latvian, Russian, and Polish.

We hope that this volume will show that particles and connectives in Baltic languages are a promising field for both synchronic and diachronic studies. Many facts are still waiting to be discovered, thoroughly described and analyzed. Future research will doubtlessly profit from new methods of data collection and data analysis as they are used in corpus studies, discourse analysis, research on spontaneous spoken language and on the language of the Internet. New approaches will also complement (rather than substitute) traditional methods used in fields such as historical comparative grammar, etymology, or lexicography.

Last but not least, we would like to express our gratitude to Axel Holvoet for accepting this volume in the series *Acta Salensia* and for his consistent support during the editing process.

References

- AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS *et al.* 1997. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lan-
kos.
- AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS. 2006. *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė sintaksė*. Vilnius: Lietu-
vių kalbos institutas.
- ARKADIEV, PETER. 2010. Notes on the Lithuanian restrictive. *Baltic Linguis-
tics* 1, 9–50.
- BB = BIBLIA tatai esti Wissas Schwentas Raschtas, Lietuwischkai perguldi-
tas per Janą Bretkuną [...] 1590. In: J. PALIONIS & J. ŽUKAUSKAITĖ, eds.,
1983. *Jonas Bretkūnas. Rinktiniai raštai*. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- BIELENSTEIN, AUGUST. 1863. *Lettische Grammatik*. Mitau: Fr. Lucas' Buch-
handlung.
- BIELENSTEIN, AUGUST. 1864. *Die lettische Sprache nach ihren Lauten und For-
men erklärend und vergleichend dargestellt. Zweiter Theil. Die Wortbeu-
gung*. Berlin: Ferd. Dümmler's Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- BLINKENA, AINA. 2007. Konjunkcija (saiklis). In: POKROTNIECE, ed. 2007,
100–309.
- BLÜHDORN, HARDARIK, EVA BREINDL & ULRICH HERMANN WASSNER, eds.
2004. *Brücken schlagen. Grundlagen der Konnektorenssemantik*. Berlin,
New York: de Gruyter.
- BP = Jono Bretkūno POSTILĖ: Studija, faksimilė ir kompaktinė plokštelė / Lietuvių
kalbos institutas. ONA ALEKNAVIČIENĖ, ed., 2005. Vilnius: Lietuvių kal-
bos instituto leidykla.
- BRINTON, LAUREL. 1996. *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization
and Discourse Functions*. Berlin: Mouton.
- BYBEE, JOAN, REVERE PERKINS & WILLIAM PAGLIUCA. 1994. *The Evolution of
Grammar*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- CELLE, AGNÈS & RUTH HUART, eds. 2007. *Connectives as Discourse Landmarks*.
Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- COUPER-KUHLEN, ELIZABETH & BERND KORTMANN, eds. 2000. *Cause, Condi-
tion, Concession, Contrast. Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*. Berlin, New
York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- CRISTOFARO, SONIA. 2003. *Subordination*. New York: Oxford University
Press.

- CROFT, WILLIAM. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DIXON, R. M. W. 2006. Complement clauses and complementation strategies in typological perspective. In: DIXON & AIKHENVALD, eds., 1–48.
- DIXON, R. M. W. & ALEKSANDRA Y. AIKHENVALD, eds. 2006. *Complementation. A Cross-linguistic Typology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- DRESCHER, MARTINA & BARBARA FRANK-JOB, eds. 2006. *Les marqueurs discursifs dans les langues romanes*. Frankfurt/M. etc.: Lang.
- DROTVINAS, LEONARDAS. 1958. Uslovnye konstrukcii (sojuznye) w Postille M. Daukši. *Kalbotyra* 1, 123–146.
- DROTVINAS, LEONARDAS. 1964. Priežasties ir tikslo sudėtinės konstrukcijos XVI–XVII a. lietuvių kalbos raštuose. *Kalbotyra* 10, 19–52.
- DROTVINAS, LEONARDAS. 1967. K voprosu o svjazi voprositel'nych i uslovných konstrukcij v drevnelitovskom jazyke. *Baltistica* 39:1, 57–60.
- DROTVINAS, LEONARDAS. 1967a. Padarinio konstrukcijos lietuvių literatūrinėje kalboje. *Kalbotyra* 17, 61–80.
- DROTVINAS, LEONARDAS. 1968. Laiko aplinkybės šalutinių sakinių prijungimo priemonės senuosiuose lietuvių kalbos raštuose. *Kalbotyra* 19, 89–98.
- DROTVINAS, LEONARDAS. 1968a. Sudėtinės prijungiamosios laiko konstrukcijos senuosiuose lietuvių kalbos raštuose. *Kalbotyra* 19, 67–88.
- ENDZELIN, J[AN]. 1922. *Lettische Grammatik*. Riga: Gulbis.
- FABRICIUS-HANSEN, CATHRINE. 2000. Formen der Konnexion. In: KLAUS BRINKER *et al.*, eds. *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik. Ein Handbuch internationaler Forschung*. 1. Halbband Berlin: de Gruyter, 331–343. (HSK 16.1)
- FRAENKEL, ERNST. 1933. Baltica II. *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* 60, 237–253.
- FRAENKEL, ERNST. 1936–37. Zur slavischen und baltischen Grammatik. *Slavia* 14, 496–509.
- FRAENKEL, ERNST. 1926. Zur Parataxe und Hypotaxe im Griechischen, Baltoslawischen und Albanischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 43, 290–315.
- FRAENKEL, ERNST. 1962. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. 1. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- FRASER, BRUCE. 1999. What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 931–952.

- HAKULINEN, AULI et al. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: sks.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Second edition. London: Arnold.
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN, ed. 2004. *Coordinating Constructions*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 2007. Coordination. In: T. SHOPEN, ed. *Language Typology and Linguistic Description*. Vol. II: *Complex Constructions*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–51.
- HEINE, BERND & TANIA KUTEVA. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: University Press.
- HELBIG, GERHARD. 1988. *Lexikon deutscher Partikeln*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.
- HELBIG, GERHARD & AGNES HELBIG. 1995. *Deutsche Partikeln: Richtig gebraucht*. Leipzig: Langenscheidt Enzyklopädie.
- HENTSCHEL, ELKE. 1986. *Funktion und Geschichte deutscher Partikeln*. Ja, doch, halt und eben. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- HERMANN, EDUARD. 1912. *Über die Entwicklung der litauischen Konjunktionalsätze*. Jena: Frommannsche Buchdruckerei (Hermann Pohle).
- HERMANN, EDUARD. 1926. *Litauische Studien. Eine historische Untersuchung schwachbetonter Wörter im Litauischen*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- HOLVOET, AXEL. 2007. *Mood and Modality in Baltic*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ.
- HOLVOET, AXEL & ARTŪRAS JUDŽENTIS. 2003. Sudėtinio prijungiamojo sakinio aprašymo pagrindai. In: HOLVOET & JUDŽENTIS, eds., 2003b, 115–172.
- HOLVOET, AXEL & ARTŪRAS JUDŽENTIS. 2003a. Sujungiamojo ryšio aprašymo pagrindai. In: HOLVOET & JUDŽENTIS, eds., 2003b, 173–198.
- HOLVOET, AXEL & ARTŪRAS JUDŽENTIS, eds. 2003b. *Sintaksinių ryšių tyrimai*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 115–172. (Lietuvių kalbos gramatikos darbai 1.)
- JUDŽENTIS, ARTŪRAS. 2002. Mikalojaus Daukšos *Katekizmo* (1595) sudėtiniai aiškinamieji sakiniai. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 47, 19–29.
- JUDŽENTIS, ARTŪRAS & JŪRATĖ PAJĖDIENĖ. 2001. Mikalojaus Daukšos *Katekizmo* (1595) sudėtiniai sujungiamieji sakiniai. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 45, 63–92.
- JUDŽENTIS, ARTŪRAS & JŪRATĖ PAJĖDIENĖ. 2005. M. Daukšos *Katekizmo* (1595) lyginamieji sakiniai. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 53, 23–31.

- JUDŽENTIS, ARTŪRAS & JŪRATĒ PAJĒDIENĒ. 2005a. Mikalojaus Daukšos *Katekizmo* (1595) sudėtiniai prijungiamieji vietos ir laiko sakiniai. *Baltu filologija* 14:1, 53–65.
- KALME, VILMA. 2001. *Nelokāmās vārdšķiras latviešu literārajā valodā*. Liepāja: LiePa.
- KIBILDAITĒ, EDITA. 2001. Priežasties šalutiniai sakiniai Bretkūno postilėjė. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 44, 129–144.
- KLUGE-SEEBOLD = *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Bearbeitet von ELMAR SEEBOLD. 23., erweiterte Auflage. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter 1995.
- KÖNIG, EKKEHARD. 1991. *The Meaning of Focus Particles. A Comparative Perspective*. London and New York: Routledge.
- KROON, CAROLINE. 1995. *Discourse Particles in Latin. A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- LAURY, RITVA, ed. 2008. *Cross-linguistic studies of clause-combining. The multifunctionality of conjunctions*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins. (Typological Studies in Language 80.)
- LESKIEN, AUGUST. 1903. Litauische Partikeln und Konjunktionen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 14, 89–113.
- LKŽ = Lietuvių kalbos žodynas. Volumes 1–20 (1968–2002), Vilnius.
- LÜHR, ROSEMARIE. 1995. Zur Umfunktionierung von *und* und *oder* zu Frage-satzpartikeln im Litauischen. *Linguistica Baltica* 4, 119–130.
- LÜHR, ROSEMARIE. 1998. Zur Genese von konzessiven Strukturen im Litauischen. In: ALFRED BAMMESBERGER, ed., *Baltistik: Aufgaben und Methoden*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 269–288. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Dritte Reihe: Untersuchungen, Bd. 19)
- MAURI, CATERINA. 2008. *Coordinating relations in the languages of Europe and beyond*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- MEILLET, ANTOINE. [1915/16] 1975. Le renouvellement des conjonction. In: A. MEILLET, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 159–174.
- MÉTRICH, RENÉ & EUGÈNE FAUCHER. 2009. *Wörterbuch deutscher Partikeln. Unter Berücksichtigung ihrer französischen Äquivalente*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- MILLER, J. 2006. Particles in spoken discourse. In: KEITH BROWN, ed. in

- chief, *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd edition. Amsterdam: Elsevier, Vol. 9, 214–217.
- MÜHLENBACHS, K[ĀRLIS]. [1898] 2009. *Teikums*. Reprinted in: KĀRLIS MĪLENBACHS: *Darbu izlase*. Rīga: Latviešu valodas institūts, 221–296.
- NEHLS, DIETRICH. 1989. German modal particles rendered by English auxiliary verbs. In: WEYDT, ed. 1989, 282–292.
- NORDSTRÖM, JACKIE. [2009] 2010. *Modality and subordinators in the Germanic languages and beyond*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins. [first published at Lund University, Centre for languages and literature, Lund 2009]
- OSTROWSKI, NORBERT. 2008. Istorinės morfologijos ir sintaksės mažmožiai (Miscellen der historischen Morphologie und Syntax.) *Baltistica* 43:3, 463–473.
- OSTROWSKI, NORBERT. 2009. Litewskie *dabar* ‘jeszcze, teraz’. In: NIJOLA BIRGIEL & MARTA GRZYBOWSKA, eds. *Praca Bałtystyczne* 4. Warszawa: KJOWPIB UW, 57–70.
- OSTROWSKI, NORBERT. (forthcoming). The Old Lithuanian postposition *jau* as a focus marker. *Baltic Linguistics* 2.
- PANDER MAAT, H. & T. SANDERS. 2006. Connectives in text. In: KEITH BROWN, ed. in chief, *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd edition. Amsterdam: Elsevier, Vol. 3, 33–41.
- PASCH, RENATE. 1994. Benötigen Grammatiken und Wörterbücher des Deutschen eine Wortklasse “Konjunktionen”? *Deutsche Sprache* 2, 97–116.
- PASCH, RENATE, URSULA BRAUSSE, EVA BREINDL & ULRICH HERMANN WASSNER. 2003. *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren. Linguistische Grundlage der Beschreibung und syntaktische Merkmale der deutschen Satzverknüpfers (Konjunktionen, Satzadverbien und Partikeln)*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- PETIT, DANIEL. 2009. Zum Ausdruck der Evidentialität im Baltischen: die litauische Partikel *neva*. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 59, 57–80.
- POKROTNIECE, KORNĒLIJA, ed. 2007. *Latviešu valodas morfoloģiskās sistēmas attīstība: Nelokāmās vārdšķiras*. Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts.
- PORĪTE, TAMĀRA. 2007. Partikula. In: POKROTNIECE, ed. 2007, 310–343.

- RISSELADA, RODI & WILBERT SPOOREN, eds. 1998. Special issue on discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30 (1998).
- RUDOLPH, ELISABETH. 1996. *Contrast. Adversative and Concessive Relations and their Expressions in English, German, Spanish, Portuguese on Sentence and Text Level*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter. (Research in Text Theory, Vol. 23.)
- SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH. 2001. Discourse markers. In: D. SCHIFFRIN, D. TANNEN & H. HAMILTON, eds., *Handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 54–75.
- SUDHOFF, STEFAN. 2010. *Focus particles in German*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- [ROMERO] TRILLO, J. 2006. Discourse markers. In: KEITH BROWN, ed. in chief, *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd edition. Amsterdam: Elsevier, Vol. 3, 639–662.
- WEYDT, HARALD, ed. 1979. *Die Partikeln der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- WEYDT, HARALD, ed. 1983. *Partikeln und Interaktion*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- WEYDT, HARALD, ed. 1989. *Sprechen mit Partikeln*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- WIEMER, BJÖRN. 2007. Lexical markers of evidentiality in Lithuanian. *Rivista di Linguistica* 19:1. *Evidentiality between lexicon and grammar*, ed. by Mario Squartini, 173–208.
- WIEMER, BJÖRN. 2010. Lithuanian *esq* — a heterosemic reportive marker in its contemporary stage. *Baltic Linguistics* 1, 245–308.
- WOLSKI, WERNER. 1986. *Partikelllexikographie. Ein Beitrag zur praktischen Lexikologie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.