Electronic offprint from

BALTIC LINGUISTICS

Responsive discourse particles in Lithuanian dialog

Lea Sawicki
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

The article deals with the discourse functions of two Lithuanian turn-opening particles, *kad* and *na*. The turn-opening particles are not exclusively conjunctions or connectives. They do not combine clauses in any traditional way, and neither coordination nor subordination is effected by them. Nevertheless, they play a specific role in marking the utterance they open as reactive and expressing the attitude of the speaker towards the content of the previous turn, thus serving as a cohesive device in dialog and enhancing its coherence. The responses opening with *kad* convey various shades of skepticism, reservations or uneasiness of the speaker about the content of the previous turn and offer justifications or excuses for not complying or obeying.

The particle *na* is found in strictly non-narrative text portions, usually in dialog, but also in inner speech passages. In most of its environments it has to do with removing obstacles to the conversation flow.

Keywords: dialog, discourse markers, particles, reactive, responsive

0. Particles in dialog

In recent text-linguistic research dialog is well established as a distinct texteme[1]. In Lithuanian, as in various other languages, its characteristics include such unmistakable features as specific deictic indications, use of first and especially second persons, and typical interjections, conversational particles or discourse markers[2]. Some languages show

---

[1] Texteme is a textual unit; the term has been coined by analogy to phoneme, morpheme, etc.

[2] Discourse markers and discourse particles are not distinguished here. In some studies they are treated as partially overlapping classes of items, see, e. g., the overview of approaches and terminology in Nau & Ostrowski (2010, 8–13). In the last decades these items have been widely studied in many languages, using various frameworks and methodologies, see, e. g., Schiffrin (1987, 2001). An extensive collection of works on discourse markers (in electronic form) prepared by Bruce Fraser of Boston University for his students (http://people.bu.edu/bfraser/) gives an idea of the body of research on the subject in English alone.

even deeper distinctions between narrative and dialogic text-portions, distinctions that pertain to the very system of tense-forms employed in each of the textemes (e. g., Old Babylonian, Cohen 2006; cf. Fleischman 1990, 113–119). A key point for the study of dialog is the unavoidable dependence of the structure of a dialogic turn on its environment, specifically on the structure and semantics of the preceding turn or turns. Such dependence on environment, by no means negligible for narrative structure, is crucial for dialog analysis (as can be seen in the examples below). For a clause occurring in dialog neither meaning nor function can be established in isolation and, especially, a non-initial, i. e., reactive, dialogic turn does not constitute a full interpretative or syntactic unit.

For both spoken and written dialogs, including dialogic text-portions in literary fiction, the occurrence of a large number of particles is most striking. Some of them are restricted to this texteme (e. g., the particle *na* in Lithuanian), others (e. g., *kad* in Lithuanian) can be found in the narrative texteme as well; however, in dialog they often have markedly distinct functions. Particles occurring in dialog as tools contributing to cohesion between consecutive turns, or in other ways enhancing conversation management and flow, form a sub-class usually referred to as discourse particles or discourse markers.

Such particles occurring in responsive turns of dialog (i. e., in turns following questions) or in reactive turns (following other utterances), especially turn-initially, require special attention, as they typically express the attitude of the speaker towards the content of the previous turn.

Turn-opening particles are not necessarily conjunctions (according to the usual definitions of this term), nor are they connectives, as the term is used, e. g., in Pander Maat & Sanders (2006, 33). Often they do not combine clauses in any traditional way and neither coordination nor subordination is effected by them. Nevertheless, they play a specific role in marking the utterance they open as reactive, thus serving as a cohesive device in dialog and enhancing its coherence.

Particles in general, and especially discourse particles (or discourse markers), are notorious for their multi-functionality, and, what is more troubling, for their 'elusive' meaning. The endeavors of lexicographers to capture the essence of particles lead, in most cases, only to partial

success. This state of affairs stems from two separate kinds of difficulties, one having to do with the need for broad context and the other with the distribution of these items in various texts. The ᴌᴋž, e. g., quotes numerous examples of full clauses containing the particle *na*; however, although this particle is first and foremost reactive, the quotations do not include the turn preceding the one opening with *na*; we shall discuss the consequences of such treatment below. Another kind of difficulty stems from the well known fact that the use of particles is as a rule a trait of personal style, so that the occurrence of a given particle and the frequency of its occurrence differs considerably between different speakers and different texts.

0.1 Data and object of study

The present paper is an attempt to overcome some of the difficulties by examining dialogic text passages occurring in a full, single running text. The data come from a voluminous (about 600 pages) novel *Kur lygūs laukai* by Jonas Mikelinskas published in 1981. Using a literary source for examining dialog may seem unnatural in the age of a growing collection of electronic corpora. However, such corpora, often presented in the form of a transcript, rarely give evidence of the intonation and of the broader context and co-situation. Using literary texts as a source for data may to some degree help to overcome these disadvantages since data of this nature often include direct speech framing verbs and provide information on the participants as well as on the situation in which a given utterance is pronounced.

The two particles examined here are *na* and *kad*. Both are found in dialogic text passages but their overall distribution differs considerably. While *na* is typical almost exclusively for dialog (although, as we shall see below, it can be found also in monolog passages), *kad* is not restricted to any specific texteme; however, the question whether in different environments we still have to do with the same item, is an open one.

Discourse particles are considered to be devoid of lexical meaning which leads to the lexicographical difficulties mentioned above and to the notorious difficulties in translating such items into other languages. As dictionary entries, discourse particles are items to which no meaning

can be attached. It does not mean, of course, that they have no textual meaning: their meaning is to be found in the texteme as a whole.

1. Multifunctionality of *kad*

This item functions as an element connecting clauses (i. e., as connector or conjunction) and as a particle. The conjunction occurs both in narrative and in dialog in several distinct functions, nominal or adverbial (Holvoet & Judžentis 2003). *Kad* can open a temporal, a causal, a conditional or a purpose clause, as well as a content clause and some others. The variety of usages brings Ambrazas (2006, 429) to refer to *kad* as an 'asemantic' conjunction which indicates "subordination of a conjunct without explicating the semantic relationship which is dependent upon the structural properties of a sentence".

The various types of subordinate clauses introduced by *kad* that occur in narrative text portions can be found in dialog turns as well, e. g.:

(1) — *O ką jūs padarėt,* **kad** *tasai klaikus debesis neužgriūtų ant jūsų galvų?* (204)[3]
'— And what did you do **in order to** [prevent] this terrible cloud from falling on your heads?'

But the repertoire of usages in dialog is notably wider than the one in narrative.

1.1. *Kad* as an interjection in dialog

Beside its subordinating role, the dialogic texteme demonstrates two additional functions of *kad,* not found at all in narrative, where only instances of subordinate *kad* occur. The most typical non-narrative function of *kad* is marking a positive or a negative wish. The particle *kad,* in this case functioning specifically as an interjection, opens (some-

---

[3] I will deliberately refrain from giving a consistent translation for each occurrence of the particle used, whether word-for-word or by idiom, since its rendition depends in each occurrence on the context and specific dialogic environment and structure. A fortiori, in an article discussing discourse particles rather than morphosyntax, I find that interlinear grammatical glossing is distracting and counterproductive to the presentation of my description and argument, and hence I will refrain from using it here.

times with another interjection) an optatival type of clause containing a subjunctive verb-form, e. g.:

(2)   — *O, **kad** galėčiau nesikamuoti!* (178)
      '— Oh, **how** I would want not to be tormented!'

(3)   ***Kad** tu prasmegtum, rakali* […] (133)
      '**May** you perish, you rascal!'

1.2. Subordinating *kad* in dialog

Kad in dialog can also serve as a clause-opening responsive or reactive discourse marker. In this function it differs sharply both in its meaning and in its structural status from the *kad* found in narrative—usually described and exemplified in dictionaries and in grammatical accounts. For instance, the rich and detailed ʟᴋž lists ten 'meanings' of *kad* (not counting *kad* as an interjection). All the examples quoted are of *kad* opening a subordinated clause, either preceding or following the main clause. Where the examples are quoted from dialog passages, both clauses are from the same utterance by the same speaker. The only exception, i. e., a passage in which *kad* is turn-initial, is again a subordinate, in this case causal, clause. It is a response to a question explicitly requesting information about cause or reason: *„Ko tu buvai išvažiavęs į Kauną?—Kad brolis be galo prašė, meldė" J. Jabl.* 'Why had you traveled to Kaunas—Because my brother constantly asked and begged [me].'

Such responses to questions inquiring about cause or reason open with *kad* quite frequently in dialog, e. g.:

(4)   A — *O kodėl jūs,* […] *manęs neleisit?*
      B — ***Kad** tau ir čia gerai,* […]. (223)
      '— And why won't you let me [go]?
      — **Because** it is good for you here also [= you like it here].'

The answer may occur in a separate clause of the same turn as the question and constitute a suggested response from the same speaker who has delivered the question:

(5)   — *O kodėl jis jau toks šventas?* […] ***Kad** daugiau tyli, negu šneka?* (227)

'— And why is he such a saint? […] **Because** he keeps silent more than he talks?'

Kad often opens responsive content clauses following specific interrogative turns inquiring about content of speech or thought:

(6) A — *O ką daugiau sakė?*
B — ***Kad** jūs to komunisto, kuris pagrobė Benvenuto dukterį draugas* […]. (272)
'— What else did he say?
— **That** you are a friend of this communist who seized Benvenutas's daughter […].'

In the next passage *kad* opens not a responsive, as in (6), but an interrogative turn which structurally forms a single clause together with the preceding utterance. It serves as a suggested topic to the rhematic *gerai* 'well' of the preceding turn:

(7) A — *Aš jaunasis ūkininkas, — pasigiria. — Bet sunku visur suspėti.*
B — *Irgi gerai.*
A — ***Kad** sunku suspėti?* (272)
'— I am the young farmer — he brags — But it is difficult to find time for everything.
— Very well.
— **That** it is difficult to find time?'

The question is clearly reactive, it constitutes a reaction to the content of the preceding turn, but involves a kind of manipulation on the part of speaker A: he reacts by inquiring ironically whether what is implied by *Irgi gerai* is that it is fine that speaker A finds it difficult to manage everything, while the intention of speaker B is to relate his "very well" to speaker A's statement that he is a young peasant. In any case "very well" in the second turn, must be taken as the rheme of the clause and the following *kad*-opening turn — as its topic.

Such usages have equivalents in other textemes as well: e. g., a function similar to that found in (4) may occur in non-dialogic texts as in: *Mes tavęs neleisim, **kad** tau ir čia gerai,* […]. 'We won't you let you [go], **because** it is good for you here also.'. Compare also the function in (6): *Jis sakė **kad** jūs to komunisto, kuris pagrobė Benvenuto*

dukterį draugas. 'He said **that** you were a friend of this communist who seized Benvenutas's daughter.' and (7): *Irgi gerai **kad** sunku suspėti.* '[It's] very well **that** it is difficult to find time.'

1.3. *Kad* as a discourse marker

Kad as a discourse marker is another matter. It is typically turn-initial although it may be preceded by another particle. In such instances *kad* is neither a conjunction (or a subordinator) nor an interjection. It does not affect the pattern of the clause it opens or the structure of the dialogic exchange as a whole. It is found in clauses carrying responses to various types of utterances. In (8) the clause B introduced by *kad* is a response to a nexus question[4]:

(8)   A — […] *Supranti, ką aš noriu dabar pasakyti?*
      B — ***Kad** gal nelabai, dėde.* (37)
      '— Do you understand what I want to tell now?
      — **Well**[5] maybe not really, uncle.'

The answer is hesitant: the adverb *nelabai* is a polite way to avoid a straightforward negative response.[6] *Kad* does not contribute to the structure of the utterance, it does, however, contribute (in addition to the modal *gal*) to its modal coloring. It expresses uneasiness of the speaker in face of the question put to him.

We find a similar response to another nexus question further in the same conversation:

(9)   A — […] *Ar žinai, kas altarista?*
      B — ***Kad** gal ne, dėde.* (37)

---

[4] This type of question is often termed in literature a 'yes/no' question; for languages other than English I prefer using the less language-specific term 'nexus question'. For the same reason I use 'sentence-part question' and not 'wh-question'.

[5] *Kad* in its function as a discourse marker is rendered here for lack of better solution, by 'well' or 'but' (in bold); this is, however, by no means an equivalent of the original. While in many cases I find the English word 'but' to be a suitable translation of *kad*, it should be borne in mind that such a rendering is possible for the specific responsive *kad* only. Otherwise the semantics of *kad* and 'but' are different.

[6] Halliday and Hasan (1976, 207–212) call similar responses in which no informative answer is given 'indirect'. However, their taxonomy of 'rejoinders' (cohesive sequels by a different speaker) is not based on discourse markers used.

'— Do you know what an altarist is?

— **Well** maybe not, uncle.'

In the next passage (10) the *kad*-initial response is a way to avert the need to reply and an attempt to stop the questioning:

(10) A — *Ką davė pusryčiams Benvenutienė?* […]
B — *Barščių su mėsa.*
A — *Vakarykščių?* […]
B — ***Kad** ir nepasakysiu…* (370)
'— What did Benvenutienė give for breakfast?
— Beetroot soup with meat.
— [Was it] Yesterday's?
— **But** I couldn't even say…'

A similar response may be triggered by a tag question. In (11) the simple question by A is meant to inquire whether the recited poem came to an end. The boy does not answer, but offers a justification for stopping:

(11) A — *Viskas? — staiga paklausė Benvenutas […], kai vaikas kiek pritilo. — A?*
B — ***Kad** niekas nesiklauso, — su apmaudu burbtelėjo berniukas* […]. (491)
'— That's all?' — suddenly asked Benvenutas […] when the child got a bit silent. — Eh?
— [But] nobody is listening' — the boy grunted with annoyance […].'

The nexus question in (12) is an interrogatively packaged invitation or proposition:

(12) A — […] *Švilpiam? Ką?*
B — *Ačiū. Tai **kad** vis tiek dar turiu pusbrolį susirasti.*
A — *Na taip, na taip, žinoma, su brolėnu reiki susitikti* […].
Ir jiedu susitarė po valandos, vėliausiai po dviejų susitikti čia […] (80-81)
'— We are running? Eh?
— Thank you. **But** in any case I have to find my cousin.
— Well yes, well yes, certainly, you have to meet your cousin […].

> And the two of them agreed to meet here in an hour, at the
> latest in two hours […].'

The response, untypically, does not open here with *kad*. First conventional thanks are expressed, followed by a clause opening with *tai kad*. *Tai* in combination with *kad* serves as a frequent additional marker of cohesion (cf. also the passages (13), (14), (17), (18), (21)). The response is again not directly negative; *kad* marks the utterance as an explanation or an excuse that is meant to justify the implicit refusal. The subsequent turn shows that the explanation was accepted and further in the text the non-dialogic passage confirms that the plan was postponed (*Ir jiedu susitarė po valandos, vėliausiai po dviejų susitikti čia* 'And the two of them agreed to meet here in an hour, at the latest in two hours […].').

> (13) A — *Tikiuosi, kad pats nepasielgsi taip kaip tasai Kaupas? A?*
>   B — *Tai **kad** jūs nebeturit… dukters.* (367)
>   '— I hope that you yourself will not behave like this Kaupas? Eh?
>   — **But** you don't have… [another] daughter.'

The conversation in (13) refers to the fact that the aforementioned Kaupas eloped with the daughter of speaker A. Speaker B, not wishing to discuss his own future behavior, finds a pretext to stop this line of conversation.

In (14) the response to the sentence-part question is not the expected answer stating the time; *kad* marks it as reluctant and uneasy (note the pause graphically indicated by the three dots). The speaker B feels he needs to justify his inability to answer the question:

> (14) A — *Kada buvot išpažinties?*
>   B — *Tai **kad**… nebeprisimenu.* (196)
>   '— When was your last confession?
>   — **Well**… I don't remember.'

Similarly in (15), no expected answer to the question is given by speaker B:

> (15) A — *Kuo teiksies būti?*
>   B — *Hm… dar nežinau, tamsta…*

A — *Agronomu, daktaru, daktaru, kunigu ar rašytoju?*
B — **Kad**... *dar neišsirinkau.* (327)
'— Who will you become?
— Hm... I don't know yet, sir...
— An agronomist, a doctor, a priest or a writer?
— **But**... I didn't choose yet.'

After some pressure from enquirer A, speaker B opens his response with *kad*... Here speaker B (a young boy) tries to explain why he cannot answer the question.

The clause opening with *kad* may contain a reaction not only to a question but to any type of utterance. In (16) the utterance is a response to a speech-act in the preceding turn which the speaker does not understand:

(16) A — *Tai sveikinu, Albinai, iš visos širdies ir plaučių, sveikinu!*
B — **Kad** *nežinau dėl ko.* (110)
'— So I congratulate you, Albinas, with all my heart I congratulate you very much!
— **But** I don't know what for.'

In (17) and (18) the *kad* opening utterances are reactions to a command, request or invitation expressed by an imperative.

(17) A — *Dėkis prie mūsų — sudarysim trejybę.*
B — *Tai **kad**... — žingtelėjęs dar žingsnį pirmyn, bandė atsiskalbinėti Algirdas [...], — butą dar reikės susirasti.*
A — *Be jokių kad!* (408)
'— Join us — we'll make a trio.
— **But**... — having made another step forward Algirdas tried to excuse himself [...], — I have to find a lodging.
— No buts!'

In (17) the specific nature of the reactive utterance is explicitly expressed in the frame-verb *bandė atsiskalbinėti* 'tried to excuse himself'.

In (18) in his dream speaker B is engaged in a conversation with his dead wife A who is flying around in the air:

(18) A — *Dominyte, skrisk pas mane!*
B — *Tai **kad** sparnų neturiu, Mortyčiuk.* (183)

'— Dominykas, fly to me!

— But I don't have wings, Morta.'

She invites him to join her and he responds (without explicitly refusing her invitation) with a justification for not doing so. The response offered may be understood as implying that speaker B is not responsible for not complying since he would do whatever he is asked to do if only he could. This reading can pertain not only to responses to formal requests but also to requests or propositions packaged in other ways, such as to the question in (12) above, to a non-verbal urging, as in (19), or to a statement, as in (20) and (21) below:

(19) A — *Mikliau, mikliau, seniūne!* […].

B — ***Kad** klingės liežuvio sugrubusios rankos nebeužgriebia. O dar ta košė akis užklijavo, — kukliai pasiteisino seniūnas* […]. (485)

'— Faster, faster, starost!

— **But** the stiff hands can't find the latch. And on top of this the grit gummed up my eyes, — the starost justified himself softly […].'

(20) A — *Tu diktuok, Vinculi, o aš rašysiu.*

B — *Ne, geriau abu.*

A — ***Kad** kažko nesigalvoja.* (179)

'— You dictate, Vinculis, and I will write.

— No, better both [=we should both write].

— **But** somehow I can't think of anything.'

(21) A — *Tegul… bus pašlovintas.*

B — *Per amžių amžius amen.*

Tyla […]

B — *Aš klausau.*

A — *Tai **kad**, dvasiškas tėveli, viskas susimaišė* […]. (195)

'— The Lord … be praised.

— For ever and ever amen.

Silence […]

— I am listening.

— **But** spiritual father, everything got confused […].'

The utterance *Aš klausau*, formally declarative, urges the interlocutor to speak up. The apologetic response gives the justification for the prolonged silence.

In (22) *kad* opens a response to advice:

> (22) A — *Tai kiek jau užraukei?*
> B — *Tris.*
> A — *Mažokai, brolau. Reikėjo išspausti bent keturias, tada galėtum kur nors įsisukti raštinėn, kontoron ar šiaip kur.*
> B — ***Kad** tas laikas nesimėto.* (356)
> '— So how many [grades] have you finished already?
> — Three.
> — Not many, brother. You needed to squeeze out at least four, then you could wriggle yourself somewhere into a secretariat or an office or something.
> — **But** time is hard to find.'

The advice is built as an impersonal comment (the 'you' in the English translation is not interlocutive). However the responding speaker B takes it as referring directly to himself and reacts with an irritated justification (for not being able to follow the advice).

In other cases it is an 'innocent' statement that triggers a reaction opening with *kad*:

> (23) A — *Tau mokytoja linkėjimus siunčia* […].
> B — *Mokytoja? — nušvito Joniuko veidas. — Ar ta jaunoji?*
> A — *O kokia dar yra kita? Mūsų mokytoja.*
> B — ***Kad** aš jos beveik nepažįstu, tik…* (333)
> '— The teacher sends you her regards […].
> — The teacher? — Joniukas's face lit up. — The young one?
> — Is there another one? Our teacher.
> — [But] I almost don't know her, only…'

Similar means of expressing emotional reactions of this kind are found in dialog textemes of additional languages, e. g., in Polish (*kiedy*) and, most notably, in Yiddish (*az*).[7] In these languages, like in Lithuanian, such reactive discourse markers show clear affinity to conjunctions used in other contexts.

---

[7] Taube (forthcoming) gives a detailed account of the phenomenon in Yiddish and suggests that it might be triggered by Polish.

1.4. The pragmatics of *kad*

Kad as a discourse marker differs sharply from other functions of the lexeme. It does not play a role in the syntactic structure of the clause it opens or in the structure of the dialogic exchange. In terms of the pragmatics of conversation the utterances opening with *kad* (or *tai kad*) discussed here all involve non-predictable responses to dialog turns (Sawicki forthcoming). Following turns of nexus questions, *kad*-clauses convey inability of the speaker to answer the question put to him either way. When following sentence-part questions, commands, invitations, suggestions, advice etc., the *kad-* clauses produce (without voicing explicit rejection or refusal) justifications or excuses for not complying or obeying. Following turns containing statements, *kad*-clauses express skepticism or reservations as to the content of the previous turn.

2. The particle *na*

Unlike the multifunctional *kad, na* has a strictly conversational use and prototypically belongs exclusively to the dialog texteme. In most of its occurrences *na* opens a reactive utterance.

A discourse marker of similar type is quite common in various languages. Moreover, in many of these languages the forms used are (as far as it can be established) either etymological cognates, as in Baltic (*na*), Slavic (*no, nu*) (for Polish see Kryk 1992, for Russian, e. g., Multisilta 1995), and Germanic (*na, nu, nun, nuna, nå*) (for Danish see Emmersten and Heinemann 2010), including a very prominent presence in Yiddish (*nu*) (Assouline forthcoming), or borrowed items as in Hebrew (*nu*) (Maschler 2009), Kazakh (*nu*) and possibly Finnish (*no(h)*, *ny(t)*) (Sorjonen 2002).

Although it may occur in situations other than conversational ones, it is not found in typically narrative plot-advancing text portions. As an extension of its basic dialogic function *na* can be found in monologic textemes, in passages relaying speech or thought of a character.

2.1. *Na* in lexicography

The ʟᴋž dictionary lists two separate entries *na*: an interjection and a particle (*na* considered a particle in the dictionary does not occur in our corpus). The interjection *na* has no less than 17 definitions, each of them exemplified by a reactive conversational turn, but again, as in the case of *kad*, the turn preceding the one opening with *na* is not included in the quotation. The picture arising from the dictionary definitions is an extremely complicated one and the many usages are not easily reducible to any common 'core' meaning.

2.2. *Na* as a cohesive device in dialog

The main conversational function of *na* is to assure cohesion in dialog. In initial position at a point of shift of participants it may convey different attitudes toward the content of a previous utterance:

(24) A — […] *Per „Kalbaneum". Girdėjai tokia…*
    B — *Ne tik girdėjau, bet ir pats savo kailiu išmėginau.*
    A — ***Na** ir ką?*
    B — *Firma rimta* (356/397)
    '— […] Through "Kalbaneum". Did you hear [about] such a...
    — Not only did I hear [about it] but I tested [it] on myself.
    — **Well**[8] and how [is it]?
    — A serious firm.'

(25) A — *Tai tu rimtai, kaip šnekėjom, žadi spausti?*
    B — *O ką darysi? Benvenutas jos geruoju neatiduos.*
    A — ***Na**, o ji? Bėgs su tavim?* (263)
    '— So seriously, as we were saying, you want to run?
    — And what can you do? Benvenutas will not give her away willingly.
    — **Well,** and she? will she run away with you?'

In (24) and (25) the last turn is marked by *na* as inviting the dialog participant to add information. This turn in both passages could be

---

[8] Not surprisingly, no suitable rendering for *na* can be found in English, as is most often the case with particles.

164

paraphrased as "in consideration of what I have presently heard I now say/ask".

In (26) *na* opens a similar utterance conveying a reaction to the previous turn; in the framing passage, inserted into the last utterance of speaker A, the precise nature of the reaction is made clear by the participle *suglumęs* 'embarrassed'.

(26) A — *O jeigu aš iš tikrųjų nenoriu likti skolingas?*
B — *Juo blogiau tau: be laiko susigrauši, patyręs gyvenime ne tokių paslaugų ir negalėdamas atsilyginti.*
A — **Na** *kaip čia dabar, Klemai — skėstelėjo rankomis suglumęs Albinas* […]. *— Darbas, gaišatis…* (72)
'— And if I really don't want to remain in debt?
— All the worse for you: you'll upset yourself at the wrong time having experienced in life more serious favors without being able to repay [the service].
— **Well**, how so, Klemas — Albinas spread his arms in embarrassment […]. Work, loss of time…'

It seems that in many cases the particle *na* has to do with hastening the flow of the discourse by marking the reluctant but necessary endeavor to put aside obstacles that usually stem from the preceding turn.

2.3. *Na* and discourse flow

Putting aside obstacles to the discourse-flow may require agreement with the content of the previous turn. When the agreement is less than enthusiastic, a tool is needed to achieve that goal. In such cases an utterance opening with *na* is often used to mark the response as a somewhat reluctant or reserved agreement. In (27), a passage we have discussed above as (12), after the invitation extended by speaker A is politely declined by speaker B, speaker A willy-nilly responds with a *na*-opening agreement:

(27) A — […] *Švilpiam? Ką?*
B — *Ačiū. Tai kad vis tiek dar turiu pusbrolį susirasti.*
A — **Na** *taip,* **na** *taip, žinoma, su brolėnu reikia susitikti* […]. (80-81)

'— Are we running? Eh?

— Thank you. [But] in any case I have to find my cousin.

— **Well** yes, **well** yes, certainly, you have to meet your cousin […]. '

(28) A — *Aš žinau ir kai ką daugiau* […].

B — *Daugiau? O ką?*

A — *Nesakysiu.*

B — *Kaip sau norit.*

A — **Na**, *galiu ir pasakyti, — tučtuojau pasitaiso ji* […]. (272)

'— I also know something else […].

— Something else? What?

— I won't say.

— As you wish.

— **Well**, I can say — she immediately corrects herself […].'

In (28), *na* in the last turn marks the consent as reluctant. Speaker A, a girl, is in fact eager to tell what she knows but pretends to decline, hoping to be implored. When speaker B does not press her she gives up her refusal quite quickly.

Often the reluctant agreement is additionally marked by concessive *tegul* following *na*:

(29) A — *Nenorėjau užduoti širdies mamai.*

B — *O man? Norėjai?*

A — *Tu — ne mama.*

B — **Na** *tegul. Bet ir rašyti nieko ne rašei.* (102)

'— I didn't want to hurt my mother's heart.

— And mine? You did?

— You are not mother.

— **OK**, let it be. But you didn't even write.'

(30) A — *Nieko prieš nieką aš nenustatinėju, nepjudau.*

B — **Na** *tegul ir ne visai tu. Albinai. Tegul.* (379)

'— I don't set, [or] incite anybody against anybody.

— **OK**, let['s say] not entirely you, Albinas. Let [it be].'

(31) A — *Kažkas apie šulinį vaikšto. Girdi? Ir svirtis girgžda.*

B — *Velenas. Jau velenas.*

A — **Na**, *tegul ir velenas. Ne tas dabar man galvoj.* (260)

'— Somebody is walking around the well. Did you hear? And the well sweep is creaking.

— [It's] a windlass. Already a windlass.

— **OK**, let it be a windlass. This is not what is on my mind now.'

A concessive attitude is expressed in (32) by *na* followed by *sakykim* 'let's say' marking the agreement as not only reluctant but tentative:

(32) A — *Ką tu supranti? Tu gi labai dar jaunas. Kiek?*
B — *Aštuoniolikti […].*
A — ***Na, sakykim, supranti,*** [...]. (260)
'— What do you understand? You are still very young. How old are you?
— Eighteen […].
— **OK**, let's say you do understand, [...].'

2.3.1 Attenuated responses opening with *na kad ir*

Na followed by *kad* and *ir* as a response to a question has a similar effect; such a turn expresses the reluctance of the speaker to elaborate on the subject with a note of impatience:

(33) A — *Ką jūs norit tuo pasakyti?*
B — *Daug ką […].*
A — *Pavyzdžiui?*
B — ***Na kad*** *ir apie paskutinį žygdarbį.* (251)
'— What do you want to say by that?
— A lot.
— For instance?
— **Well,** [things] about the last heroic deed.'

The first utterance of speaker B, being openly teasing, triggers the request for clarification in the next turn of speaker A. The *na*-opening response is, at least on the surface, reluctant. The next passages (34) and (35) show identical conversation structure:

(34) A — *O man atrodo, kad ji tenai mato ir dar kažką,* […].
B — *Pavyzdžiui?*
A — ***Na kad*** *ir tokį poną su spinningu.* (370)
'— To me it seems that she sees there someone else too […].

— For instance?
— **Let's say** some man with a Spinning.'

(35) A — *O kas gi tau taip sakė?*
B — ***Na kad** ir tas Žąsinas.* (373)
'— And who told you so?
— **Let's say** this Žąsinas.'

2.4. *Na* opening impatient reactions

Expressing impatience may even be the central function of the *na*-opening utterance, as in (36):

(36) A — *Pas mus naujokas yra, — paaiškino tie patys linksmi balsai.*
B — ***Na** ir puiku: po dienos kitos bus jau nebe naujokas, — atrėžė mokytojas* […]. (337)
'— We have a new pupil — explained the same joyful voices.
— **Well**, great: after a day or two he will not be new anymore
— cut the teacher.'

In (37) speaker A, not having received an answer to his question, reacts with an utterance opening with a double *na*:

(37) A — *Šakny, kaip tu ir išaugini tokią šaunią jaunąją kartą?*
B — *Aš nekišu prie jų nagų* […].
A — **Na**, **na**, *išsisukinėji, kukliniesi, Šakny* [...]. (253)
'— Šaknys, how did you bring up such a magnificent young generation?
— I didn't put my nail into it [= I had nothing to do with it] [...].
— **Come on**, **come on**, you are being coy, being modest, Šaknys.'

A note of urging or even pressure put on the interlocutor with some degree of impatience is especially prominent in imperative utterances opening with *na*:

(38) A — *Kas yra?*
B — *Nie-ko… šiaip sau.*
A — ***Na**, sakyk, sakyk, Joniuk. Nebijok!* (42)
'— What is it?

— No-thing… no reason.

— **Come on**, say [it], say [it], Joniukas. Don't be afraid!'

(39) A — *Susipykai su šeimininku?* […]

B — *Ne, bet aš jau seniai…*

A — ***Na, na**, liek, liek viską, ką turi ant širdies, – paragina tėvas* […]. (372)

'— Did you quarrel with the master? [...]

— No, but I have already for some time...

— **Come on**, **come on**, let it out, let out everything that bothers you – father encourages [him].'

The reduplication of the imperative form in (38) and (39) as well as the doubling of *na* in (39) and (40) produces an additional effect of pressure.

(40) A — *Turi ką pasakyti svarbaus?*

B — *Svarbaus kaip svarbaus, bet šis tas atsiras.*

A — ***Na**, klok, tik būk trumpas.*

B — *Tai gal kitą kartą – suabejoja Šakniukas. – Labai jūs užsiėmęs.*

A — ***Na, na**, nepadžiauk nosies* […]. *Nagi drožk, pasiklausysiu.* (355)

'— Do you have anything important to say?

— Important or not but something will be found.

— **OK**, speak, only be brief.

— So maybe some other time – Šakniukas has doubts. – You are very busy.

— **Come on**, **come on**, don't sulk [...]. So, spill [it] out, I'll listen'

(41) A — *Na kaip čia dabar, Klemai? — skėstelėjo rankomis suglumęs Albinas* […]. *— Darbas, gaišatis…*

B — ***Na, na**, nebūk mažas* [...]*!* (72)

'— Well, how so, Klemas — Albinas spread his arms in embarrassment […]. Work, loss of time…

— **Come on**, **come on**, don't be a child […].'

The context of the utterances opening with *na* gives more than a hint to its function: the frame-verb *atrėžti* 'to cut' in (36) above and the imperative *būk trumpas* 'be brief' in (40) explicitly denote the impa-

tience of the speaker, his wish to put the subject of conversation behind him. In the last passage (41) the imperative *nebūk mažas* 'don't be a child' is a request to stop behaving like a child meaning to leave the subject alone.

Na may mark an urging or impatient reaction not only to an utterance but also to an action of another conversation participant or to a situation encountered by the speaker. It may contain an imperative or another form of address.

In (42) the speaker is interfering in a quarrel; his reaction is not to a specific utterance but to the situation as a whole:

> (42) — ***Na, vyrai, vyručiai!*** — *ima juos raminti ir aušinti Dalnius* […] — ***Na, nereikia. Užteks.*** (345/385)
> '— **Come on**, men, guys! — Dalnius began to calm and soothe them — **Come on**, there is no need. Enough.'

In (43) a man addresses his own aching stomach:

> (43) — ***Na** ramiau ramiau, maištininke.* (365)
> '— **Come on**, quiet, quiet, you rebel.'

2.5. *Na* opening hesitant reaction

Na opening a responsive utterance and followed by a pause (marked in the written text by three dots) is usually a hesitant reply to a question. This is a case where the source of the obstacle to conversation flow originates in the interlocutor's difficulty to come up with a proper, or a properly worded answer.

> (44) A — *O ko troškai, dėduliuk?*
> B — ***Na, na**… kad pagytų mano mamuliukas.* (136)
> '— And what did you desire, uncle?
> — **Well**, **well**… that my mum would get well.'
> (45) A — *Gailiesi?* […]
> B — *Kodėl?.. Ko?..*
> A — ***Na**… to.* (179)
> '— Do you regret [it]?
> — Why?… What?..
> — **Well**… this.'

Na marking hesitation may occur in dialog not only utterance-initially but also in the middle of a response, following a pause, just before the part of the response about which the speaker is hesitant, or which the speaker delivers after giving it some thought, as in (46):

(46) A — *Ateis laikas, ir suprasi.*
      B — *Tave ar ją?*
      A — *Mane, save… **na** ir ją.* (264)
      '— Time will come and you will understand.
      — You or her?
      — Me, yourself… **well**, and her.'

Replies or responses of this kind, arrived at with some difficulty, are again a means for removing obstacles to the conversation flow.

2.6. *Na* as a dialog opener

Less reactive is *na* used as an opening of a dialog urging the interlocutor to enter the conversation; it might be perceived as a reaction to the very appearance of the interlocutor on the scene:

(47) *Sustabdys jį kas nors […], jis […] pasiteiraus:*
      — ***Na**, pilieti, kaip gyvenimas klijuojasi?* (63)
      'If someone will stop him […], he'll […] ask:
      — **Well**, citizen, how is life going?'
(48) *Įeina, nusirengia, vėl atsigula. Tyla […].*
      — ***Na** kaip ten? — girdi žmonos balsą. — Ar nieko?* (394)
      'He comes in, undresses, lies down again. It is quiet […]
      — **So** how is [everything]? — he hears his wife's voice. —
      Alright?'
(49) *[…] buvo tarp jų štai koks pokalbis:*
      — ***Na**, Alguti, kaip tavo kelnaitės? — sustabdo jį šitas […]
      frantelis […].* (344)
      '[…] the following conversation took place between them:
      — **Well**, Algutis, how are your shorts? — stopped him this
      […] dandy […].'

2.7. *Na ir* opening exclamations of amazement

Na followed by *ir* has a distinct function. This complex interjection opens an exclamation of amazement, which may be either expressed aloud or be part of an inner monolog[9]:

(50) — ***Na ir*** *merga, na ir merga! Ne merga, o tikra pekla.* (149)
'— **What a** girl, what a girl! Not a girl but real hell.'

(51) ***Na ir*** *žolė,* ***na ir*** *žolelė! Iš kur tik ji ir semiasi sau stiprybės syvų* [...]*?* (31)
'**What** grass, what grass! Where does it draw its strength from [...]'

(52) — ***Na ir*** *burnelė tavo, ponas Rapolai! – nustebi ponia Kunegunda* [...]*.* (55)
'— **What a** mouth you have, Mr. Rapolas! — wonders Mrs. Kunegunda [...].'

2.8. *Na* in inner monolog

Although *na* is primarily a conversational particle, it can be found not only in dialog but also in passages reproducing thought. In this environment the particle does not lose its basic function but extends to serve in inner monologs where a participant is engaged in pondering over some issue or even debating with himself and commenting on his own statements or answering his own questions. Passages of inner speech are often built as a dialog in which the same speaker produces the consecutive turns:

(53) *Kas? Kiaupša dar žiburiuoja?* ***Na,*** *aišku, kad vaidenasi:* [...]. (31)
'What? At Kiaupša's the light is still on? **Well**, clearly it's an illusion [...].'

(54) *Kunigas* [...] *turi būti griežtas, smarkus* [...]. ***Na, žinoma, dar ir teisingas.*** (198)
'A priest has to be stern, strong [...]. Well, and, of course, also just.'

---

[9] Monologs delivered aloud in front of hearers and those of inner speech are not distinct in structure (Bickerton 1967) and can be analyzed together.

(55) *O kuo atsilyginti?* [...] ***Na** tegul parodys, išaiškins, viską sustatys į vietas laikas.* (72-3/ 81)
'And with what [can you] repay? **Well**, let time show, make clear and put everything in its place.'

(56) *Gerai, kad toks rūkas: niekas pašalinis čia neužsuks* [...]. *Nebent kas netikėtai pačiam sau užklystų.* ***Na** ir tegul...* (435)
'It's good that there is such fog: no stranger will appear [...]. Unless somebody would arrive unexpectedly for himself. **Well**, let him [it doesn't matter].'

2.9. Pragmatics of *na*

The discourse particle *na* is found in strictly non-narrative text portions, usually in dialog, but also in inner speech passages. In most of its occurrences it is reactive, opening responses to the previous turn of a dialog or to the situation perceived by the speaker. *Na* followed by a pause may also express hesitation of the speaker. In most of its environments this discourse particle has to do with an endeavor for removing obstacles to the conversation flow, stemming either from the previous turn or from the utterance of the same speaker. It may also mark a reaction to a situation encountered by the speaker.

3. Conclusions

As we have seen, the two particles used as discourse markers in dialog play an important role in discourse management, in its cohesion and coherence, and in securing the conversation flow. While turns opening with *kad* convey uneasiness or discomfort of the speaker toward the content of the preceding turn, the dialog turns opening with *na* express an effort on the part of the speaker to hasten the conversation flow or to overcome obstacles to it. These functions of the particles come to light only when the analysis is performed not on a single sentence, or even a single dialog turn, but on a relevant dialog passage. Considering a wider context is conducive to establishing the nature of the relations between sentences or turns of a conversation expressed by these particles. Such an approach provides descriptions of the

functions of the particles that go beyond the information available in current lexicography.

Lea Sawicki
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Department of Linguistics
Mount Scopus, IL-91905 Jerusalem
mslea@mscc.huji.ac.il

References

Ambrazas, Vytautas *et al.* 2006. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Institute of the Lithuanian Language.

Assouline, Dalit. forthcoming. The discourse marker *nu* in Israeli ultra-orthodox Yiddish. Paper delivered at the workshop of FRIAS School of Language and Literature.

Bickerton, Derek. 1967. Modes of interior monologue: a formal definition. *Modern Language Quarterly* 28 (2), 229–239.

Cohen, Eran. 2006. The tense-aspect system of the Old Babylonian epic. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 96, 31–68.

Emmersten, Sofie & Trine Heinemann. 2010. Realization as a device for remedying problems of affiliation in interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43 (2), 109–132.

Fleischman, Suzanne. 1990. *Tense and Narrativity*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Halliday, Michael A. K. & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London & New York: Longman.

Holvoet, Axel & Artūras Judžentis. 2003. Sudėtino prijungiamojo sakinio aprašymo pagrindai. In: Axel Holvoet & Artūras Judžentis, eds., *Sintaksinių ryšių tyrimai*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 117–172.

Kryk, Barbara. 1992. The pragmatics of interjections: the case of Polish *no*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18, 193–207.

lkž—Lietuvių kalbos žodynas (Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language). http://www.lkz.lt/

Maschler, Yael. 2009. *Metalanguage in Interaction. Hebrew Discourse markers*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mikelinskas, Jonas. 1981. *Kur lygūs laukai*. Vilnius: Vaga.

MULTISILTA, TEIJA. 1995. Pragmatic particles *nu* and *vot* in spoken Russian. In: Brita Wårvik, Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen & Risto Hiltungen, eds., *Organization in Discourse: Proceedings from the Turku Conference* (Anglicana Turkuensia, 14). Turku: University of Turku, 381–392.

NAU, NICOLE & NORBERT OSTROWSKI. 2010. Background and perspectives for the study of particles and connectives in Baltic languages. In: Nicole Nau & Norbert Ostrowski, eds., *Particles and Connectives in Baltic* (Acta Salensia, 2). Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas & Asociacija "Academia Salensis", 1–37.

PANDER MAAT, HENK & TED SANDERS. 2006. Connectives in text. In: Keith Brown, ed., *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Elsevier, vol. 3, 33–41.

SAWICKI, LEA. forthcoming. Nexus question and response. To appear in a Festschrift.

SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH. 2001. Discourse markers: language, meaning and context. In: Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen & Heidi E. Hamilton, eds., *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 54–75.

SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

TAUBE, MOSHE. forthcoming. On argumentative *az*-clauses in Yiddish. To appear in a Festschrift.

SORJONEN, MARJA-LEENA. 2002. Recipient activities: The particle *no* as a go-ahead response in Finnish conversations. In Cecilia E. Ford, Barbara A. Fox and Sandra A. Thompson, eds., *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. New York: Oxford University Press, 165–195.