

BIRUTE KLAAS (Tartu)

### CONDITIONAL MOOD AND POLITENESS IN LITHUANIAN IN COMPARISON WITH ESTONIAN

**Abstract.** The article deals with the morphological forms and functions in Lithuanian, focusing on the possibilities to express volition and action in the framework of politeness strategy and comparing these functions with the functions of the conditional mood in Estonian. Also, the author provides examples of usage frequency of the verbs *prašyti* 'ask, request', *norėti* 'want', and *siūlyti* 'advise' in the indicative and conditional moods, in texts written for various purposes and spoken language. The article analyses the use of the politeness code in the transcripts of the Lithuanian Parliament and makes an attempt to establish the reasons why a speaker selects the indicative or the conditional mood for expressing volition or bringing forth some action. The data come from an electronic corpus of Lithuanian that is available on the home page of the Lithuanian Language Institute ([www.lki.lt](http://www.lki.lt)).

#### 1.1. Conditional mood in Lithuanian. Morphological markers

Lithuanian has four moods: the indicative, conditional, imperative, and the oblique moods. The 1st and 2nd person forms of the conditional both in the singular and plural are formed from the infinitive stem by adding the marker *čia-* in the first person singular and *tum(ė)-* in the second person singular and the first and second persons plural, for example, *būčiau* '(I) would be', *bū-tu(mė)-me* '(we) would be', *bū-tum* '(you) would be', *bū-tumė-te* '(you) would be'. The third person form both in the singular and plural coincides with the supine, which in turn is formed by attaching the formant *tų* to the infinitive stem, for example, *bū-tų* '(he, she, it) would be', *bū-tų* '(they) would be'.

In addition to the synthetic forms, Lithuanian has also the analytic conditional, which is formed by means of the finite conditional forms of the verb *būti* 'be' and the past personal participle (perfect), for example, *būčiau atnešęs* 'I would have brought'. The conditional mood can be used also in the passive together with the analytic forms that are formed with the help of the finite forms of the verb *būti* 'be' and the passive present participle, for example, *būčiau atnešamas* 'I would be bringable' or the finite conditional forms of the verb *būti* 'be' and the passive past participle, for example, *būčiau atneštas* 'I would have been brought'.

## **1.2. Functions of the conditional mood. Politeness code**

The functions of the conditional mood in Lithuanian will be dealt with in accordance with the treatments to be found in academic handbooks and comparing them with the theoretical starting points in the treatments of the functions of the conditional mood in Estonian and Finnish in the work by Helle Metslang (1999) and Anneli Kauppinen (1998) and in the scholarly grammar of the Estonian language (EKG).

The most general function of the conditional mood is to express a conditional (i.e. unreal) action, the implementation of which can be still possible if certain conditions are met (LKM 316). In Estonian, too, the purpose of the conditional is to express that the source of the message regards the action situation as unreal, the action can occur under certain conditions, but in the opinion of the message of the source it is likely that it may not take place (EKG 81). In Lithuanian the conditional mood expresses the following four main functions (DLKG 308; LKE 638): 1) possibility; 2) conditionality; 3) volition; 4) incitement to action. Aldona Paulauskienė provides a more refined classification of the four main functions by adding the functions of potential occurrence and doubtful occurrence of an action (LKM 318). Adelė Valeckienė draws attention to the circumstance that the possibility of an action, occurrence under some circumstances, and desirability add a modal shade to statements (1998 : 85).

Possibility and condition would mean an action taking place or having taken place under certain conditions, in fact an action that could have taken place if the conditions had been met. Also, the action can be planned in the future, and its occurrence/non-occurrence could once again depend on the presence or absence of the conditions needed for carrying out the action (Valeckienė 1998 : 86). The functions of possibility and conditionality can be covered by using the term *frame interpretation* (see Kauppinen 1998 : 165; Metslang 1999 : 104).

However, volition and incitement to action assume a real action, that is, the speaker hopes (wishes) to call forth a certain action with the speech act. Thus, one is dealing with intention interpretation (Kauppinen 1998 : 173–176). In such cases the modal meaning of the conditional mood makes it resemble the imperative; however, it allows the speaker to express his or her wish in a more distanced and milder way.

In Lithuanian it is possible to express volition and incitement to action also by means of the indicative (both the present and future) and the imperative. We can observe the same in Estonian. For example, both in Estonian and Lithuanian the imperative mood is used to express imperativeness with highly different shades — starting with a polite wish and ending with a peremptory command. Intonation helps to bring out the differences, but so does the addition of lexical politeness markers (Est. *palun*, Lith. *prašau* 'please').

In Lithuanian the politeness code is closely related to intention interpretation, which is also so in Estonian and Finnish (see Metslang 1999 : 97; Kauppinen 1998 : 218–223). The scholarly grammar of Estonian states that the conditional can express a polite, emphatically modest command, also an unfulfilled wish or yearning (EKG 81). According to H. Metslang (1999 : 127), intention interpretation belongs to the background structure

of the sentence that includes the possibility of achieving the desired result. While in the case of frame interpretation there is no correspondence between the prerequisites and the desired results in the real world, volition and incitement to action can be regarded as a speech act where the speaker presumes that the situation or action that he wishes and brings forth will really take place. The conditional is regarded as an expression of politeness especially in the case of the 1st person whereas by using a precise definition one can speak about the politeness marker of the conditional in those cases where the volitional expression of the conditional remains redundant because of lexical material or syntactic form (Kauppinen 1998 : 169).

Also, Lithuanian linguistic publications pay some attention to the use of the conditional mood as a politeness code. A. Paulauskienė is an exception because her survey does not cover functions of the conditional mood (LKM 316—319). According to A. Valeckienė, the conditional mood adds the meanings of a polite request, wish, and recommendation to the verbs *prašyti* 'ask, request', *norėti* 'want', *patarti* 'advise', and *linkėti* 'desire' (1998 : 87). Also, the academic grammar of Lithuanian states that a wish originating from the 1st person, that is, the speaker, is softened by using the verbs *norėti* 'want', *pageidauti* 'desire', *prašyti* 'ask, request', *patarti* 'advise', and *siūlyti* 'suggest' (DLKG 308). In the case of these verbs and verbs with similar semantics the conditional mood is used in place of the indicative in order to make a request, wish, proposal, or advice more polite.

Below one can find some examples from Lithuanian grammars. The author of this article has made an attempt to transform the functions of the conditional mood described in the Lithuanian linguistic literature into frame interpretation (1, 2) and intention interpretation (3—7). The examples are supplied with Estonian translations that offer comparison how the same functions are rendered in Estonian.

- (1) *Tinkamai aprenęta, sušukuota, ji būtų net ir labai graži* (DLKG 308) Est *Sobivalt riides, kammitud, oleks ta isegi väga ilus* 'If appropriately dressed, combed, she would be even very beautiful';
- (2) *Kad būtų čia u tą dieną atsikėlęs valanda vėliau, būtų mane ir šiandien geruoju gyvenę* (DLKG 308); Est *Kui ma oleksin sel päeval ärگانۇد tunni võrra hiljem, oleksime ka täna hästi edasi elanud* 'Had I woken up an hour later on that day, we would continue to have a good life today as well'.

Using frame interpretation for the analysis of sentence 1, one could bring out the conditions that should be met in order regard the described person as beautiful from the perspective of the speaker — the person should be appropriately dressed and combed. Although these conditions have not been met, there is still a chance that they could be met; thus, the situation has a conditional character. Also, in sentence 2 the conditional describes a situation and action that actually did not take place — on that day the speaker did not wake up an hour later and today has not brought a good life.

- (3) *Prašyti čia u mielus svečius tvarkos neardyti* (DLKG 308); Est *Paluksin armsaid külalisi korda mitte segada* 'I would like to ask our dear guests not to break the rules';

- (4) *P a t a r č i a u j u m s d a u g i a u b ū t i g r y n a m e o r e* (DLKG 308); Est *S o o v i - t a k s i n t e i l r o h k e m v ā r s k e s ō h u s v i i b i d a* 'I w o u l d r e c o m m e n d you to spend more time in the open air';
- (5) *N o r ė č i a u t a v e p a s v e i k i n t i* (Valeckienė 1998 : 87); Est *T a h a k s i n s u l l e ō n n e s o o v i d a* 'I w o u l d l i k e t o c o n g r a t u l a t e y o u'.

Although sentence 3 makes use of the verb *prašyti* 'ask, request' that already belongs to the lexical politeness code due to its semantics, the speaker has felt it necessary to further soften the request by using the conditional. Also, in sentence 4 the conditional adds some cautiousness to the recommendation and softens the directness of the recommendation. However, in both examples it is quite clear that the speaker expects a result from his or her utterance: in sentence 3 that the guests should not break the rules and in sentence 4 that the recipient should spend more time in the open air. In example sentence 5 the speaker opens the speech act with the conditional form of the verb *norėti* 'want' and refers to an action that will take place soon — extending a congratulation. It is true that the conditional carries the politeness code, but the action expressed by the sentence — wishing good luck — does not actually require any additional politeness. Rather, it is a fossilized or stereotyped construction, a rhetorical figure, that can be found in other languages, too (cf. Kauppinen 1998 : 170). The translation of example sentence 5 is perceived as a stereotyped construction also in Estonian.

While sentences 3, 4, and 5 expressed the speaker's wish morphologically by using the 1st person, 6 and 7 express the conditional by using the 2nd person in the singular and plural, inciting the interlocutor to carry out the desired action. In that case the function of the conditional is similar to the imperative. However, the use of the conditional instead of the imperative increases politeness and cautiousness. In the following example sentences straightforward proposals with the conditional — help to pour (6) and find (7) — acquire a command-softening and, thus, a more polite shade.

- (6) *J u r g e l , t u m i d ū p i l s t y t i p a d ė t u m* (LKM 319); Est *J u r g e l i s , a i t a k s i d ( e h k ) m ō d u k a l l a t a* 'Jurgelis, c o u l d y o u ( p e r h a p s ) h e l p t o p o u r the mead';
- (7) *S a k a u , g a l j ū s p a s i d a i r y t u m ė t , k u r k o k i o k a m p o* (DLKG 308); Est *Ū t l e n , e h k v a a t a k s i t e e n d a l e m i n g i n u r g a k e s e* 'What I'm saying is that perhaps y o u c o u l d f i n d s o m e c o r n e r f o r y o u r s e l f'.

While in Lithuanian and Estonian the conditional mood is generally used to soften wishes and commands and to increase their politeness, there are some constructions where the conditional mood, by contrast, makes the command even more categorical and 'less polite', namely the constructions with the conjunction *kad* 'that', example sentences 8 and 9. In Estonian, too, similar constructions (*et* 'that' + conditional mood) are definitely more imperative, categorical, and call to obey a command without questioning than the use of the imperative. And in Estonian, too, such constructions are 'less polite'. In sentence 8, however, the passive participle (*tud*-participle) adds categoricalness to the Estonian command.

- (8) *Žiūrėk, kad laiku s u g r i ž t u m!* (DLKG 308); Est *Vaata, et o l e k s õigeks ajaks tagasi t u l d u d!* 'See to it that you'll b e b a c k i n t i m e l!';
- (9) *Kad man rytoj čia tavo nē kvapo n e l i k t u!* (LKM 319); Est *Et sinust homme siin lõhnagi alles p o l e k s!* 'See to it that you'll b e g o n e b y t o m o r r o w!'.

In Lithuanian it is also possible to render a request by the shortened 1st person plural form *prašom* of the modal verb *prašyti*, which has lost the category of person and number. It means that it does not show the person or number of the recipient or the time when the action takes place, having become a modal marker of the imperative mood (Valeckienė 1998 : 79). Thus, the sentence *P r a š o m balsuoti!* 'P l e a s e v o t e!' has to be interpreted as a polite suggestion to vote where the infinitive carries a lexical meaning and the verb of request renders the politeness code. The parliament transcripts of the corpus of Lithuanian included an exceptionally large number of such addresses — 7486 cases.

However, in Lithuanian the modal politeness marker together with the infinitive may carry the totally opposite meaning, being a means of expressing an especially harsh and even brutal command (Valeckienė 1998 : 80): *P r a š o m išeiti!* 'P l e a s e l e a v e!', cf. also the Estonian expression with the same meaning *P a l u n lahkuda!* Here one can see a similarity to the use of the conditional mood, where in *kad*-constructions the conditional mood lost its politeness code and became a means of rendering a categorical demand.

Even nowadays Lithuanian uses the archaic 2nd person politeness pronoun *tamsta*. This personal pronoun is used together with a verb in the imperative 2nd person singular, for example, *t a m s t a eik 'go'*, and it can replace the so-called formal you (Valeckienė 1998 : 80). This construction, however, is rather unproductive in contemporary Lithuanian, which is proved by the corpus of Lithuanian. The parliament transcripts contain 119 occurrences of *tamsta*.

## 2. Selection of material

Because there is no spoken corpus of Lithuanian, the transcripts of parliament sessions constitute the only possibility to obtain data about spoken usage despite the fact that the situation and the registers used in parliamentary debates do not provide an adequate picture of actual spoken usage. The empirical material of the article comes from the electronic corpus of Lithuanian (<http://donelaitis.vdu.lt/>), which was created at the Lithuanian Language Institute by the Centre for Computational Linguistics at the Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas.

Politeness theoreticians, for example, Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson divide politeness strategies into two large groups: positive and negative (Brown, Levinson 1987 : 61). Positive politeness emphasizes belonging to a group and corporativism, that is, it stresses unity and reduces distance. Negative politeness strategy, on the other hand, renders isolation, distance, expresses respect to the recipient, stressing the position of the recipient. The transcripts of the Lithuanian parliament can be placed in the discourse of negative politeness, which is characterized by such keywords as formalism and distance. Although the members of the parlia-

ment could place themselves together with their colleagues in a discourse that seeks corporativism and proximity, it is not actually so. One strategy of negative politeness is the use of the 2Pl form instead of 2Sg (formal use of you, which is also a characteristic manifestation of negative politeness strategy in Estonian). The formal you is on average one hundred times more frequent in transcripts than the informal you, which proves intended formality and distance.

### 3. Use of the politeness code in the transcripts of the Lithuanian Parliament. Quantitative analysis

Below you will find a quantitative and qualitative comparison of the use of three verbs that denote bringing forth a desired action and behaviour in the transcripts of the Lithuanian Parliament, the total size of which is 2 907 999 words. These verbs are *prašyti* 'ask, request', *norėti* 'want', and *siūlyti* 'make a proposal, recommend'. The compared forms include the 1Sg of the present indicative and the 1Sg of the conditional mood because depending on the specific character of parliament speeches the 1st person singular is by far the most frequent form. For example, *noriu* 'I want' occurs 4 264 times, *norime* 'we want' 338 times; *norėčiau* 'I would like' 5 634 times and *norėtume* 'we would like' 167 times. Only the affirmative forms of self-expression will be considered because negative forms of these verbs were extremely rare or altogether absent in the transcripts; for example, there were 4 850 occurrences of *prašau* 'I ask' and 13 occurrences of *neprašau* 'I don't ask'. There were no occurrences of the negative conditional of the verb of request. Nor was the occurrence of the negative forms of *siūlyti* 'make a proposal, recommend' remarkable. However, the negative 1Sg of the verb *norėti* 'want' was more frequent both in the present indicative (277 occurrences) and the conditional (324 occurrences).

A comparison of the degree politeness in the semantics of the three verbs reveals that *prašyti* 'ask, request' is clearly a lexical means of rendering a polite wish; the semantics of the verbs *norėti* 'want' and *siūlyti* 'make a proposal, recommend' does not refer to politeness. It could well be that for this reason the conditional has been often used in the transcripts to soften the meaning of the verb of volition. There were 4 850 occurrences of the 1st person present indicative of the verb *prašyti* 'ask, request'; use of the conditional in the same person was 3.5 times less common — 1 355 occurrences. There were 2 317 occurrences of the indicative of the verb *siūlyti* 'make a proposal, recommend' but only 1 374 occurrences of the conditional — 1.7 times less. As noted, in the case of the verb *norėti* 'want' the conditional that belongs to the politeness register was much more common: 4 264 occurrences of the 1st person indicative present along with 5 634 occurrences of the same person in the conditional, that is, 1.3 times more.

The author of the present article also compared the use of the indicative and the conditional of the verb *norėti* 'want' in the remaining subcorpora of the Lithuanian corpus in order to find out whether the verb of wanting is commonly used in the politeness code in other registers, too. These forms occurred in all the subcorpora with the exception of state documents.

The frequency of this verb was the highest in the parliament transcripts, both in the indicative and conditional moods (*noriu* 'I want' — 4 264

occurrences and *norēčiau* 'I would like' — 5 634 occurrences; cf. national periodicals — 1 533 and 1 384; local periodicals — 1 635 and 1 547; popular-scientific periodicals — 2 060 and 1 636; special-subject periodicals — 730 and 928; fiction (books) — 1 722 and 751; non-fiction (books) — 578 and 478; memoirs — 424 and 411; translated philosophical texts — 287 and 193). Also, when comparing the use of the indicative and conditional moods in the subcorpora, the indicative forms were much more frequent. However, the conditional forms were somewhat more common only in the subcorpus of special-subject periodicals. Because the subcorpus of parliament transcripts is over three times smaller in comparison with the subcorpus of special-subject periodicals, the use of the politeness code could be regarded as a phenomenon that is characteristic of spoken language, at least in the case of the verb *norēti* 'want'.

### 3.1. *norīu* 'I want': *norēčiau* 'I would want'

The semantics and pragmatics of the Estonian verb *tahtma* 'want' has been studied rather thoroughly by Renate Pajusalu, Ilona Tragel, Ann Veismann, and Maigi Vija (2004 : 28–30), without dealing with the use of the modal verbs in politeness constructions. Referring to Külli Habicht, they claim that Estonian has not undergone a development similar to English and German where the verb under discussion (*will, wollen*) has been reduced to an auxiliary verb (see Pajusalu, Tragel, Veismann, Vija 2004 : 29). An analysis of the occurrences of the verb of volition in the transcripts of the Lithuanian Parliament revealed no modality that would be directed at overcoming an obstacle. They were mostly constructions where the agent was making preparations to report something or to draw attention to something (10–11). In these utterances the speaker has not considered it necessary to emphasize distance and self-withdrawal.

(10) *Taip pat aš norīu jus informuoti, kad...* 'Also, I want to inform you that...';

(11) *Baigdamas aš norīu pasakyti, kad jeigu bus balsuojama...* 'Finally, I want to say that if you vote...'

Only in some cases the verb of volition introduced an action as a result of which someone else had to become the agent of the desired action. Such constructions are formed with the verb *klausyti* 'ask', and they describe enquiries addressed to specific parliament or government members (12) or to a somewhat wider circle respondents (13). However, there were also a few rhetorical questions where the person asking a question may not actually expect an answer (14).

(12) *Tāčiau aš norīu paklausti pono Juršēno* 'Nevertheless I wish to ask Mr Juršenā...';

(13) *Aš tik norīu paklausti, ar opozicijas atstovai...* 'I only want to ask if the representatives of the opposition...';

(14) *Aš, pritardamas šiam projektui, norīu paklausti, ar nereikētų pasirūpinti...* 'Supporting this project, I want to ask whether one should not take care of...'

The conditional mood is much more frequent in those utterances where the speaker wishes to elicit a response of the partner or partners, where there is a wish to make the partner act (15–16).

(15) *Aš norėčiau išgirsti jūsų nuomonę, pone Semenovičiaus...* 'I would like to hear your opinion, Mr Semenovičius...';

(16) *Kolegos, aš norėčiau jūsų paprašyti pritarti...* 'Colleagues, I would like to ask you to agree...'.

Also, a subordinate clause often extends the verb of volition. Characteristically, the politeness code, that is, the conditional mood is used also in the verbs of the subordinate clause. There is a wish to make somebody act; the speaker addresses his utterance to a specific person or a parliament group (e.g. the opposition), sentences (17) and (18).

(17) *Galbūt jūs apsirikote, ir aš norėčiau, kad jūs šitą momentą patikslintum* 'You may have made a mistake, and therefore I would like you to specify this circumstance';

(18) *Dabar aš norėčiau, kad ponas Pronckus eitų į tribūną* 'Now I would like Mr Pronckus take the floor'.

The use of the indicative in the principal clause is much less common but still possible. In that case an object clause extends the *norėti*-verb. The verb of the conditional clause is in the conditional. The recipient is unspecified or a larger group — thus less personalized, cf. Mr Pronckus in sentence (18) and the parliament in sentence (19).

(19) *... bet tik noriu, kad Seimas gerai prisimintų jog...* '... I only want the parliament to well remember that...'.

Anneli Kauppinen analyses the possibilities of making Finnish verbs of volition more polite. She finds that in comparison with, for example, Spanish and German in Finnish, too, the use of the imperfect of the verb of volition allows the speaker to soften his or her wish so that the volitional act is placed earlier than the speech act (1998 : 218–219). Similarly to Estonian, in Lithuanian, too, it is possible to use this politeness strategy, cf. *Kuule, ma t a h t s i n sulle ainult öelda, et ootan neid andmeid homseks* 'Listen, I only want ed to tell you that I expect these data by tomorrow'. The analysis of the transcripts of the Lithuanian parliament revealed 914 cases where the speaker strategically selected the past form *norėjau* 'I wanted'. Although the verb refers to the past, it introduces the utterance by which the speaker wishes to transmit information, draw attention to something, or elicit some response or action of the partner. The use of the past form of the verb of wanting is especially common in questions to somebody. The data, though, reveal also a large number of sentences where the imperfect *norėjau* 'I wanted' does not render a polite address but refers specifically to the past. For example, a sentence 20 often ends an address or speech. However, a verb of volition as part of the politeness strategy often opens a turn of asking for information or pointing, sentences 21–25. Sentences 21–25 are supplied with Estonian translations in order to show how characteristic it is also of the Estonian language that the speaker chooses for distancing with the volitional process and for more polite self-expression the address in the imperfect.



- (20) *Tai ir viskas, ką norėjau pasakyti* 'That's all I wanted to talk about';
- (21) *Aš norėjau dėl procedūros pasakyti; Est Ma t a h t s i n öelda protseduuri kohta* 'I wanted to say something about the procedure';
- (22) *Gerbiamasis ministre, aš norėjau jums užduoti tokį politinį klausimą; Est Lugupeetud minister, ma t a h t s i n teile esitada sellise poliitilise küsimuse* 'Esteemed minister, I wanted to ask such a political question';
- (23) *Aš labai norėjau sužinoti iš pono Bajoro, ar jis...; Est Ma t a h t s i n väga härra Bajorase käest teada saada, kas ta...* 'I wanted so much to ask Mr Bajoras if he...';
- (24) *Aš norėjau užduoti tris klausimus; Est Ma t a h t s i n esitada kolm küsimust* 'I wanted to ask three questions';
- (25) *Aš norėjau, jeigu leisit, porą žodžių dėl projekto; Est Ma t a h t s i n, kui lubate, paar sõna projekti kohta* 'I wanted, if you allow me, to say a few words about the project'.

### 3.2. *prašau* 'I ask': *prašyčiau* 'I would ask'

As a single utterance the indicative *prašau* 'please' often introduces the speech by an MP or an invited guest. The speaker addresses the recipient directly. In such cases the data did not reveal the conditional, that is, the more polite usage. It is a matter-of-fact giving the floor to somebody where the verb of requesting is already polite enough and does not have to be made politer.

- (26) *Seimo narys Baležentis. Prašau* 'MP Baležentis. Please';
- (27) *Seimo nary Alesionka, norite oponuoti? Prašau* 'MP Alesionka, would you like to oppose? Please'.

The conditional, however, is very common in those cases where the speaker addresses somebody indirectly (28–30). The speaker wishes to politely signal that the recipient is expected to perform a certain action (speaking, taking the floor, consent, etc.). In such constructions the recipient acts as the object of the verb *prašyti* 'ask, request'.

Krista Vogelberg has compared and analysed the models of linguistic politeness in different cultures (2002 : 297–312), and her article characterizes markers of the higher degree of politeness (the empirical material is based on studies of Estonian, Russian, and Anglo-American politeness behaviour carried out under the supervision of K. Vogelberg at the University of Tartu). Conventional indirectness and the use of the conditional mood are also listed among the politeness strategies of the higher degree, which are used in the studied cultures to address foreigners and socially superior and more distant people (Vogelberg 2002 : 301). Also, in the sentences under discussion both politeness strategies are combined, which proves that the speaker emphasizes the formality of the situation as well as the wish to show respect and politeness towards the recipient. The Estonian translations of sentences (28–30) show that in Estonian, too, it is possible to form such sentences belonging to the framework of politeness strategy, where conventional indirectness and the conditional mood occur together.

- (28) *Prašyčiau gerbiamąjį Bernatonį į tribūną; Est Paluksin austatud Bernatonise kõnetooli* 'I would ask esteemed Bernatonis to take the floor';

- (29) *Aš labai prašyčiau gerbiamuosius Seimo narius pritarti...; Est Ma paluk s i n vāga aустatud seimi liikmeid nõustuda... 'I would ask the highly esteemed MPs to agree...';*
- (30) *Todėl aš šiandien prašyčiau Seimo Pirmininko, kuris sėdi šalia; Est See-tõttu ma paluk s i n täna seimi esimeest, kes istub kõrval 'Therefore I would ask today the speaker of the parliament who is sitting next to'.*

The parliament transcripts show that the speaker uses the politeness code to soften the so-called calling the audience to order, to mitigate reproaches, and in situations that are uncomfortable to the speaker. The speaker typically addressed the recipient directly, softened the reproach by means of the conditional, but excluded conventional indirectness from his or her strategy (31).

- (31) *Kolega Bendinskai, prašyčiau geriau parinkti epitetus 'Colleague Bendinskas, I would ask you to be more careful with your choice of epithets'.*

### 3.3. *siūlau* 'I recommend': *siūlyčiau* 'I would recommend'

In the case of the verb of advice the transcripts did not explicitly reveal the conditions and the situation why the speaker preferred to use the conditional (32b) instead of the indicative (32a). In similar constructions where the extensions were the same or semantically close verbs, the speaker sometimes preferred one and sometimes the other mood. It is difficult to judge on the basis of the transcripts why the speaker decided to choose the more polite expression. One could think of a large number of factors: the speaker's person and speaking style, his or her emotions at the moment, the entire prevailing atmosphere, and many other things.

- (32a) *Gerbiamieji kolegos, aš siūlau baigti debatus! 'Esteemed colleagues, I propose that the discussion should be finished!';*
- (32b) *Tai siūlyčiau baigti svarstymą ir kitą savaitę... 'Thus I would propose that the discussion should be finished and next week...'*

Also, the verbs *prašyti* 'ask, request' and *norėti* 'want' provide a host of examples where the speaker uses in the same syntactic and semantic environment one on one occasion the indicative (33a, 34a) and on other occasions the conditional (33b, 34b).

- (33a) *Komiteto vardu prašau pritarti 'On behalf of the committee I ask your approval';*
- (33b) *Prašyčiau pritarti tokiam ... įstatymui 'I would ask you to approve this... law';*
- (34a) *Aš noriu jūsų paklausti: kodėl jūs nenorite... 'I wish to ask two things from you, why don't you wish to...';*
- (34b) *O dabar norėčiau jūsų paklausti: kaip jūs žiūrite... 'But now I would like to ask from you, what's your opinion of...'*

## 4. Conclusions

The functions of the conditional mood in Lithuanian and in Estonian include the expression of: 1) frame interpretation — an unreal action that

could be feasible if certain conditions are met, that is, the function of possibility and conditionality, and 2) intention interpretation — a really occurring action that the speaker expects to call forth by means of the speech act, that is, wish and the function of incitement to action. Although manifestations of volition and elicitation can also be expressed by means of the present indicative, the future (Estonian, however, lacks a morphological marker of the future), and the imperative (the degree of politeness depends mainly on intonation), the politeness code in Lithuanian and in Estonian is mostly related to the intention interpretation of the conditional mood.

The conditional mood was the most common in the case of *norėti* 'want'. The form *norėčiau* 'I would like' with 5 634 occurrences was the only one that surpasses the number of addresses in the indicative. A comparison of the frequency of use of the indicative and the conditional of *norėti* 'want' in the other subcorpora of Lithuanian showed well enough that the conditional is particularly common in the parliament transcripts.

The conditional is often preferred in those cases where the speaker addresses some specific person or a group with the wish to call forth some action or response (*Aš norėčiau išgirsti jūsų nuomonę, pone Semenovičiaus* 'I would like to hear your opinion, Mr Semenovičius'); with regard to conventional indirectness (*Prašyčiau gerbiamąjį Bernatoni į tribūną* 'I would like to ask esteemed Bernatoni to take the floor'); to soften reproaches and in a situation that is uncomfortable for the speaker (*Nepaisant to, kad jūs moteris, prašyčiau laikytis tvarkos* 'Despite the fact that you're a female, I would ask you to stick to the order'). At the same time the data includes a large number of examples where in the same or similar semantic and syntactic constructions the speaker used alternately the indicative and the conditional (*Todėl siūlau palaikyti šį įstatymo projektą* 'Therefore I make a proposal to support this draft law'; *Aš šilų lyčiau palaikyti kolegą Bičkauską* 'I would make a proposal to support colleague Bičkauskas'). It is difficult to judge on the basis of the transcripts what prompted a specific choice, was it the speaker's person, speaking style, emotions of the moment, atmosphere in the hall, or something else.

The article deals also briefly with some other manifestations of politeness strategies in Lithuanian and brings out their frequency of occurrence in parliament transcripts: 1) the shortened 1Pl form *prašom* of the modal verb *prašyti* 'ask, request', which has lost the categories of person, number, and tense and has become a politeness marker of the imperative — 7 486 occurrences. The parliament speaker prefers this politeness marker to the other possibilities in order to express his or her wish and volition in a more or less polite manner. Statistically the frequency of *prašom* exceeds the total number of other occurrences of the same verb; 2) the archaic 2nd person politeness pronoun *tamsta*, which is used with imperative verbs — 119 occurrences; 3) use of the 1Sg imperfect of the verb of volition *norėjau* 'I wanted', which places the act of volition before the speech act, allowing the speaker to keep some distance with his or her manifestation of volition — 914 occurrences. It is also characteristic of Estonian that the speaker uses the imperfect for softening his or her volition and emphasizing distance.

### Abbreviations

**DLKG** — Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika, Vilnius 1994; **EKG** — M. Erelt, R. Kasik, H. Metslang, H. Rajandi, K. Ross, H. Saari, K. Tael, S. Vare, Eesti keele grammatika II. Süntaks. Lisa: kiri, Tallinn 1993; **LKE** — Lietuvių kalbos enciklopedija, Vilnius 1999.

### REFERENCES

- Brown, P., Levinson, S. C. 1987, Politeness. Some Universals in Language Use, Cambridge.
- Kauppinen, A. 1998, Puhekuviot, tilanteen ja rakenteen liitto. Tutkimus kielten omaksumisesta ja suomen konditionaalista, Helsinki.
- Metslang, H. 1999, Is the Estonian and Finnish Conditional Actually a Conditional? — Estonian: Typological Studies III, Tartu (Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised 11), 97–127.
- Pajusalu, R., Tragel, I., Veismann, A., Vija, M. 2004, Tuumsõnade semantikat ja pragmaatikat, Tartu (Tartu Ülikooli üldkeeleteaduse õppetooli toimetised 5).
- Paulauskienė, A. 1994, Lietuvių kalbos morfologija. Paskaitos lituanistams, Vilnius.
- Valeckienė, A. 1998, Funkcinė lietuvių kalbos gramatika, Vilnius.
- Vogelberg, K. 2002, Keelelise viisakuse mudelite mõnedest vaieldavatest aspektidest eesti, vene ja inglise keele võrdlevate uuringute valguses. — Teoreetiline keeleteadus Eestis, Tartu (Tartu Ülikooli üldkeeleteaduse õppetooli toimetised 4), 297–312.

БИРУТЕ КЛААС (Тарту)

### УСЛОВНОЕ НАКЛОНЕНИЕ И ВЫРАЖЕНИЕ ВЕЖЛИВОСТИ В ЛИТОВСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ ПО СРАВНЕНИЮ С ЭСТОНСКИМ

В статье рассматриваются морфологические формы выражения и функции кондиционалиса в литовском языке, прежде всего — возможности передачи пожелания и побуждения к действию в рамках стратегии вежливости, в сравнении с теми же функциями в эстонском языке. На основе стенограмм заседаний парламента Литвы анализируется использование кода вежливости и делается попытка выявить причины, по которым выступающие для выражения пожелания и побуждения к действию при обращении употребляют то изъявительное наклонение, то — условное.

Хотя волеизъявления и побуждение к действию могут быть выражены и с помощью императива (степень вежливости зависит прежде всего от интонации), код вежливости в обоих языках связан именно с осмыслением целеустремленности с помощью условного наклонения. Из трех глаголов этой направленности *prašyti* 'просить', *norėti* 'хотеть', *siūlyti* 'требовать' в подкорпусе стенограмм парламента Литвы условное наклонение доминирует у глагола *norėti*. Сравнивая с частотой употребления этого глагола в изъявительном и условном наклонениях в других подкорпусах литовского языка, замечаем, что условное наклонение особенно часто встречается в стенограммах парламентских заседаний. Условное наклонение предпочитается при обращении к конкретному лицу или группе лиц с пожеланием побудить к действию или вызвать реакцию, в связи с конвенциональной опосредованностью, для смягчения упреков и в ситуациях, неудобных для выступающего. В то же время материал предоставляет очень много примеров, когда в одинаковых с точки зрения как семантики, так и синтаксиса конструкциях выступающий употреблял и изъявительное, и условное наклонение. Чем конкретно обусловлен выбор, по стенограммам судить трудно.